

**Pacific Northwest Tribal Climate Change Project
DRAFT Meeting Notes – Wednesday, May 23 2012**

Call Participants

- Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
- Marla Emery, USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station
- Josh Foster, Oregon Climate Change Research Institute
- Laura Gephart, Columba River Intertribal Fish Commission
- Oliver Grah, Nooksack Tribe
- Scott Hauser, Upper Snake River Tribes Foundation
- Preston Hardison, Tulalip Tribes
- George Hart, Navy Region NW
- Kathy Lynn, University of Oregon
- John Mankowski, North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative
- Larry Mercurieff, Seven Generations Consulting
- Frank Lake, USDA Forest Service PSW Research Station
- Claire Schary, EPA Region 10
- Patricia Tillman, National Wildlife Federation
- Carson Viles, University of Oregon
- Kirsten Vinyeta, University of Oregon
- Daniel Wildcat, Haskell Indian Nations University

Meeting Notes - Table of Contents

Upcoming PNW Tribal Climate Change Network Conference Call Dates:..... 1

General Updates 2

 Indigenous Peoples and Climate Change Conference – May 23-24, 2012 2

 Tribal Profiles..... 2

 Climate Change Funding Guide for Tribes - Reviewers Needed 3

Discussion on Tribal Engagement Strategy Document 3

Upcoming Conference and Trainings: 6

 First Stewards Symposium 6

 ITEP Training: Climate Change Adaptation Planning (Wisconsin) 6

 Training: Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment 7

 ITEP Training: Climate Change Adaptation Planning (Montana) 7

Additional Resources 7

 Joint Center Report Documents Climate Change Threats and Absence of Planning for Communities of Color
 across Six Key Southern, Western States 7

 CAMEL Webinars - Climate Change Continuing Education Symposium – Recordings 7

Upcoming PNW Tribal Climate Change Network Conference Call Dates:

- June 27, 2012
 - July 25, 2012
 - August 22, 2012
 - September 26, 2012
 - October 24, 2012
 - November 28, 2012
- Call-in Information:*
Call Time: 10:00 am - 11:30 Pacific
Call-in #: 1-888-858-2144
Pass code: 5064716

General Updates

Indigenous Peoples and Climate Change Conference – May 23-24, 2012

The conference, which featured a keynote address from Larry Mercurieff and Daniel Wildcat, was a great success. You can download a podcast interview that Larry and Daniel did with Jefferson Public Radio at: http://hw.libsyn.com/p/4/5/c/45c9fb339b0b8039/The_Jefferson_Exchange_5_21_2012_Hour_2.mp3?sid=0ac91054578fe29a3eee8b510fd7c453&l_sid=31985&l_eid=&l_mid=3016152&expiration=1338323419&hwt=063562e7981b7b7f5920960906b73108. The broadcast of the interview starts at about 6 minutes into the podcast.

The second day of the conference included oral and poster presentations from students in the University of Oregon Honors College class on Indigenous Communities, Climate Change and Environmental Knowledge, as well as three visiting students – Lehua Ka’uhane from the Environmental Law Program at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Mary Kennedy from the Craig Tribal Association in Alaska, and Forrest Callaghan at Northwest Indian College. Many thanks to PNW Tribal Climate Change Network participants Cindy Spiry, Laura Gephart, Kate Sloan and Joe Hostler for attending! We will post the video from the keynote address as soon as it is available.

Tribal Profiles

The PNW Tribal Climate Change Project released two new profiles. Both of these profiles were developed in close collaboration with tribal staff with each of the tribes. They are posted on the UO website and the ITEP Tribes and Climate Change website.

- **Karuk Tribe: Integrating Traditional Ecological Knowledge within Natural Resource Management.** Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) plays a significant role in the Karuk Tribe's approach to natural resource management, which is guided by a respect for the relationships between species, their habitats and the belief that fostering ecosystem resilience is critical to ensuring sustainability. In 2010, the Karuk Tribe released a draft Eco-Cultural Resources Management Plan to create a long-term adaptation strategy for the protection, enhancement and utilization of cultural and natural resources. The Eco-Cultural Resources Management Plan establishes a framework for considering a wide range of human and environmental stressors to the Karuk Tribe, including climate change. This profile explores the role of traditional ecological knowledge in the Karuk Tribe's Eco-Cultural Resource Management Plan, the ways in which this unique approach may contribute to tribal efforts to address climate change, and the importance of the federal-tribal relationship in addressing climate change. Download at: http://tribalclimate.uoregon.edu/files/2010/11/Karuk_profile_5_14-12_web.pdf or visit www4.nau.edu/tribalclimatechange/tribes/northwest_karuk.asp.
- **Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians: Siletz Tribal Energy Program** The Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, located on the Oregon coast, have created an innovative renewable energy program. The Siletz Tribal Planning Department created the Siletz Tribal Energy Program (STEP) through a grant from the Administration for Native Americans in 2009. STEP works within the tribal community to encourage efficient energy use and reduced energy consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Much of their work is focused on improving tribal buildings and homes. STEP prioritizes community involvement as a way to increase awareness of tribal members, promote skills-training in the tribal community and promote tribal independence in energy; tribal outreach is a major aspect of STEP's work. This profile examines the ranges of their programs, including weatherization and energy efficiency, conservation, renewable power and solar. Download at: http://tribalclimate.uoregon.edu/files/2010/11/STEP_profile_5-14-12_web.pdf or visit www4.nau.edu/tribalclimatechange/tribes/northwest_siletz.asp.

Climate Change Funding Guide for Tribes - Reviewers Needed

Michelle Davis, EPA Region 10 and the PNW Tribal Climate Change Project have been working on compiling information for a tribal climate change funding guide. A draft is available for review is attached. Please send any comments, questions, or additional funding sources to kathy@uoregon.edu.

Discussion on Tribal Engagement Strategy Document

Kathy provided a brief overview of the revised document proposing a tribal outreach and engagement strategy for the North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative. This document builds on previous Network discussions about how to increase opportunities for tribes to be engaged partners in climate science and studies through the Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) and Climate Science Centers (CSC). This revised strategy proposes a pilot outreach strategy within the North Pacific LCC as a way to build on a process led by the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) within the NPLCC, which has focused on building an understanding of climate science and science-support needs through a series of surveys, focus groups and in-person meetings for marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Previous discussions have focused on broad outreach within the Northwest Climate Science region, including the Great Northern and Great Basin LCCs. The focus on the NPLCC was intended to help us hone in on a more manageable geographic area, but we will come back to the discussion of broader outreach within the NW CSC and LCC regions. Some key questions to be addressed are below:

- NPLCC has done outreach with tribes, but we recognize that there are relevant issues to tribes that need further work, and that tribes are separate from broader stakeholder engagement. How can they effectively reach and work with tribes in such a large region? / scale?
- How do we balance the need to engage directly with tribal leaders need to engage directly with tribal staff?
- We need to reach out to tribal leaders, although we have limited budget and recognize limited budgets of tribes. During the April call, we explored the importance of have a separate line of communication with tribal leaders. How do we make this happen, how do we engage with tribal leaders while also gaining information on tribal science needs?

John Mankowski expressed how he has been working toward creating a specific tribal engagement strategy with 5 tribes from Alaska, B.C. and U.S. NW. He viewed the focus group as a good pilot opportunity for the NPLCC's future engagement strategies. NPLCC has identified a need to be accessible to tribes and collaborate with them, sees the focus group outreach as a way to do this. LCCs are already working to reach out and ask tribal representatives what their tribal science needs are. The LCCs also realize, however, that a proposal needs formulated so that a more detailed approach can be undertaken. John also noted that the NPLCC is working on a mapping of the indigenous communities within the NPLCC region. John described the NPLCC efforts to include tribal voice in their work. The NPLCC has established a tribal/First Nations committee intended to discuss how climate change is affecting them, how TEK can inform LCC actions, and what tribal/native community concerns are. This committee is still soliciting members. In addition, the NPLCC steering committee has 5 slots reserved for tribal representatives – one each from Alaska, British Columbia, Oregon, Washington and California. The NPLCC has also recently closed a RFP on how to better incorporate TEK into natural resources management.

Mary Kennedy raised concerns about how LCCs are currently conducting outreach. She wondered if the tribal representation in the NPLCC was extensive enough, and used her situation at home to exemplify. NPLCC selected a tribal representative for her area, but the representative is from a different region. She

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

stated that in SE Alaska, there are four-plus communities near her with different needs that have not been met in NPLCC. Mary wondered how this could be addressed. How does proper representation occur? A main concern of hers was that the state of Alaska has one representative, although there are many native communities there. Mary also expressed concern that her tribes are not getting information to provide proposals and take part in the process. John spoke to these concerns. He stated that the steering committee limits representatives because they have to limit voices to ensure efficient work. He did note that the NPLCC is trying to make sure that every tribal community is engaged and able to be heard. He also advertised that there is a Tribe/ First Nations Committee being formed to ensure that tribal voices are better heard. With regards to Mary's concern that her and other communities are not receiving opportunities to be involved, e.g. information, etc., John stated that this is a main goal of organizing the outreach project: to use this network to send information out more efficiently. By holding these focus groups, the NPLCC is trying to coordinate a better information distribution process. John also wanted to emphasize that the doors are open, and he would like Mary and others to participate. This discussion with Mary raised some key questions:

- How does proper tribal representation occur within the NPLCC?
- Should all states/British Columbia have equal number of representatives?

Kathy asked Larry Mercurieff and Daniel Wildcat, visiting speakers for the Indigenous Communities and Climate Change conference, to share their feedback and perspectives on the proposed outreach strategy. Larry opened his comments reflecting on challenge of coordinating outreach in Alaska, where there are over 220 tribes and over 100,000 people. Larry reflected on the importance of engaging tribal leaders and ensuring strong protocols for communication. Larry suggested that the most effective way to bring tribal leaders together would be to support an existing indigenous organization in doing so. There are a number of ways to organize, by region, by state, steering committee. Larry suggested that it is critical for native peoples to have their own forum to discuss these issues that is separate from government or sponsoring agencies. He gave the example of tribal leaders in Alaska meeting to represent 40,000 people. Ultimately, they agreed that TEK is not able to be easily "integrated" into modern science because scientific knowledge is fundamentally flawed and arrogant. These tribal leaders agreed that they need funding and capacity from allies to pursue their priorities. Larry suggested that in a more equal context between native and non-native organizations, tribal leaders might be more comfortable meeting periodically with outside agencies to collaborate and strengthen organizational missions. Larry applied the Alaskan leader's case to the NPLCC to note that tribal voice and tribal priorities can be established within tribal organizational framework.

Larry also noted that tribes are being inundated with requests from governmental agencies, schools and other agencies for research that wisdom bearers are being spread out too thinly. Tribal leadership is beginning to examine how best to utilize human resources they have, instead of accepting any invitation to work with them. Climate change issues are so serious that native communities need to more effectively focus on the most critical issues. Helping an agency to do research is no longer acceptable; Larry argued that for many, this is a waste of time. Native people need to focus on issues impacting their community. Therefore, it is critical that the focus groups empowers native people to identify the issues impacting their communities, and moves forward in a way that is meaningful to these people.

Daniel Wildcat offered his thoughts on the focus group, as well. He noted that with regards to leaders, there is a large variation in how tribal leaders see climate change as an issue. Therefore, he felt that the first thing to do is find "leaders among the leaders" in tribal community: those who share common goal of identifying climate change as a pressing reality and concern. Daniel saw this as a critical aspect in mobilizing native peoples on climate change issues. He stated that a critical mass of "leaders among leaders" together, could lead to momentum in addressing the issues at hand.

Daniel also addressed Larry's point about limited human resources in native communities, and how

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

research can be a waste of time. He stated that he understands that most researchers are genuine about partnership. However, many native communities are at the point that within indigenous institutions there is a strong cadre of scholars and TEK holders who are looking at social, planning, cultural issues that are related to climate change. How can these voices be involved? Specifically, Daniel suggested talking to these “leaders among the leaders” to find who they want to represent native interests in climate change, i.e. who they view as the most important indigenous voices in climate change. He also related his own experience in watching indigenous and tribal leaders work with scientific experts, noting that it takes only a few minutes for indigenous people to tune out to this approach. So, there is an opportunity here to make an indigenous agenda. This is on the interface of political and cultural sovereignty. There are unique issues that need addressed with a tribal voice.

In response to Larry and Daniel’s comments, there was a Q & A:

- John asked Larry if he was open to concept of distinct but parallel tracks? (I.e. Government continues science, tribes work separate but parallel process.) Larry spoke again from his experience with the top native leadership in Alaska, who concluded that it doesn't work because institutions/scientific communities are extracting discrete pieces of information that fit into their mission. If it doesn't fit the priorities of the community, these priorities aren't included. Qualitative, deep information that people in Alaska have cannot be extracted outside of its context. Larry gave the example of Steller sea lion decline. Scientists studied the relationship between sea lions and fish species in isolation, ignoring food webs described by his peoples’ knowledge system. They ignored cultural context in which Larry’s people made their observations. This leads to only looking at surface pieces of information. Larry emphasized that there is a history of dissecting and ignoring knowledge. For this reason, he does not believe that collaboration on parallel tracks can work, and is a waste of time for tribal resources. Larry also stated that there is no critical thinking in the approach of bringing together science and TEK, it is ad hoc. For that reason it is randomly successful, i.e. is not a dependable method.
- John also asked about the NPLCC scale. Does it make sense to work in smaller subunits, or within the entire LCC geographic region? Larry suggested that concurrent processes need to occur, but that outreach to native people must be led by native people. The agenda should not be suggested by non-native organizations. Daniel agreed and suggested that there must be some ability to outreach to smaller localized regions because of common issues. However, the regional NPLCC scale allows collaboration and valuable exchange of information between native people facing similar issues.
- Preston offered his comments on the structure of the focus group. It is necessary for tribes to be in driver’s seat so that they can ask and frame questions. Preston that suggested that while the proposal focuses on how TEK relates to climate change impacts for indigenous peoples, the proposal should go further into address TEK in the context of mitigation and adaptation strategies. Sharing TEK with scientists carries with it its own implication. Preston also spoke about the issue that tribes are lacking the ability to meet among themselves. This is where tribes need support, to start addressing our own issues. Preston also suggested that TEK shouldn't be considered as separate information, but rather a lifeway that can't be detached from peoples or land, in a very real sense. It isn't just about sharing info about species; there are obligations and burdens that run with the knowledge. Unfortunately, when knowledge is shared outside indigenous communities, there is little legal protection for this knowledge. We need processes that allow tribes to exercise their sovereign rights to knowledge. For example, co-management is a preferred method in PNW, as opposed to pure TEK. A concern that Preston has with this focus group is: *Is this a tribally led process that will allow native people to frame the issues?* Tribes may not be aware that they have sovereign jurisdiction over their cultural heritage...we don't want to start pumping people into tribal forums without letting them figure out how they will manage the process themselves.

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

- Is it important that we first engage tribal leaders/council first, before interacting with staff? Or can we work with tribal staff, and others, directly? Should we rein that in a little so we don't put staff ahead of leaders? Larry responded to this question, noting that it was a common concern in working with native peoples. Trial-and-error has led us to know how to handle this. Because of tribal sovereignty, if any group is saying they will unilaterally start a conference, etc. there will be problems. One option to explore is to have some of the top leadership from each of the states that the NPLCC covers to get together on their own and create their own agenda on the issue, and give advice on how to proceed from there. Top leaders usually know kinks of local issues, and tout their advice based on experience, not officially speaking for tribal communities. Larry suggested that the most productive thing is to support tribal communities getting together to talk what scale is best to organize native leadership, but let them set the agenda. Larry also emphasized that native people are ready to act on the impacts they see around them. A major need in the native community is to organize and talk about “where do we go from here?” as opposed to researching what concerns currently exist.
- Mary inquired about the Alaska Native Brotherhood and Alaska Native Sisterhood. She asked Larry how they could get involved in organizing native voices. In response, Larry described to the call how the ANB and ANS have complex deliberative processes that could provide a good model of the kind of native organizations that would be desirable to work with.
- Larry suggested that he thinks that we need all of these efforts. We are spread too thin, and need to organize and focus our energy. If tribes can supply information to others over what they want and need to focus on, they can more efficiently help others and themselves. Larry is encouraging us to continue working on this, but consider real partnerships as opposed to tribes cooperating and outsiders managing. These issues can be resolved, but first outside agencies must show themselves as allies to native people, as there to help. Larry stated “that is part of our way.”
- Daniel extended an invitation for next American Indian Alaska Native Climate Change Working Group, which will take place in the fall of 2012 in Anchorage, Alaska. Kathy will forward information to the Network about the meeting as soon as it is made available.

Kathy will work on the proposed outreach strategy based on this discussion and put forward recommendations on how to proceed before the next call. Kathy also talked about the need to frame this discussion on a broader level, including the Northwest Climate Science Center and other Landscape Conservation Cooperatives in the region.

Upcoming Conference and Trainings:

First Stewards Symposium: Coastal Peoples Address Climate Change

July 17-20, Washington, DC at the National Museum of the American Indian. The symposium will be hosted by the four Coastal Treaty Tribes (Hoh, Makah, Quileute, and Quinault) in conjunction with the US Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, the Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian and the Nature Conservancy. The symposium will bring together four regional panels; one each for the West Coast states; Alaska; the U.S. Pacific states and territories; and the Great Lakes, Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, and Gulf of Mexico states. www.firststewards.org/

ITEP Training: Climate Change Adaptation Planning

June 5-7, Oneida, WI. This course provides an introduction to planning for climate change impacts, highlighting efforts of a local tribe. The course is intended for tribal environmental and natural resource professionals who expect to be involved in climate change adaptation planning. For more information or questions, contact: Susan.Wotkyns@nau.edu. www4.nau.edu/itep/climatechange/

Training: Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment

June 19-21, Shepherdstown, WV. This US Fish and Wildlife Service course is based on the publication "Scanning the Conservation Horizon-A Guide to Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment" and is designed to guide conservation and resource management practitioners in two essential elements in the design of climate adaptation plans. It will provide guidance in identifying which species or habitats are likely to be most strongly affected by projected changes; and understanding why these resources are likely to be vulnerable. Registration is open to all applicants through the FWS's National Conservation Training Center. http://training.fws.gov/CSP/Resources/climate_change/ccva_course_announcement.html

ITEP Training: Climate Change Adaptation Planning

September 11-13, Missoula, MT. Hosted by Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. This course provides an introduction to planning for climate change impacts, highlighting efforts of a local tribe. The course is intended for tribal environmental and natural resource professionals who expect to be involved in climate change adaptation planning. Since the course will focus on climate change impacts in the northern Rockies and Plains, we especially encourage people from those regions to attend. For more information, contact Susan.Wotkyns@nau.edu. www4.nau.edu/itep/climatechange/

Additional Resources

Joint Center Report Documents Climate Change Threats and Absence of Planning for Communities of Color across Six Key Southern, Western States

WASHINGTON, DC – Communities of color in six southern and western states face a “perfect storm” of poor health, socioeconomic barriers and climate-related challenges, and many are being left out of government climate change and disaster planning activities, according to a report released today by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. The report prepared by researchers at the Texas Health Institute, *Climate Change, Environmental Challenges and Vulnerable Communities: Assessing Legacies of the Past, Building Opportunities for the Future*, is the first to coalesce data and research across a range of demographic, health, environmental and climate-related measures for Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas. It examines state and local initiatives for climate change mitigation and adaptation, assessing the integration of vulnerable communities into the planning process. Download the report at <http://jointcenter.org/events/preparing-for-climate-change-are-vulnerable-communities-being-included>.

CAMEL Webinars - Climate Change Continuing Education Symposium – Recordings

<http://www.camelclimatechange.org/articles/view/174555/>

The following recorded webinars are now available:

[Webinar #1: Introduction to the CAMEL Resource](#)

[Webinar #2: Recent Climate Change](#)

[Webinar #3 - Climate Change and Wine](#)

[Webinar #5 - Climate Change Impacts on Colorado River Water Supply](#)

[Webinar #6 - Overcoming Climate Change Misconceptions](#)

[Webinar #7 - Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Climate Change](#)

[Webinar #8 - NASA Time Machine Visualization](#)

[Webinar #9 - Integrating Games in Teaching: Responding to Climate Change](#)

[Webinar #10 - Climate Change and Food](#)

Webinar #11 - Climate Change and Energy from an American Indian Perspective (to be posted soon)