THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

U.S. LEADERSHIP IN THE ARCTIC

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, March 12, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

BRUCE JONES
Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speaker:

ADMIRAL ROBERT J. PAPP, JR.
U.S. Special Representative for the Arctic

Moderator:

CHARLES K. EBINGER
Senior Fellow, Energy Security and Climate Initiative
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. JONES: Good morning, everybody. Welcome. My name is Bruce Jones. I'm the interim vice president for Foreign Policy here at Brookings and delighted to welcome you all today.

Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge and thank Charlie Ebinger and Tim Boersma form our Energy Security Initiative who organized today's event, and I'd also like to acknowledge and thank Commander Jason Toma who's a Federal Executive Fellow from the Coast Guard here at Brookings. He's been a terrific colleague over the last several months. Admiral, I know you're going to steal him back from us soon, but I hope we might borrow him back sometime down the road.

As all of you know, in April the United States will assume the chairmanship of the Arctic Council for two years. If we go back about five years, I would say there were two things that were true: One, in all frankness, not that many people heard of the Arctic Council, and two, people who were writing about the Arctic Council were writing about it in real saber-rattling terms. This was about to become the new area of great power tension and insecurity and clashes between those dangerous nations: The Canadians and others. I'm Canadian, among other things, so I can say that.

Of course, the most dire predictions about how things would evolve in the Arctic have not come true, and I think at least an in my important piece of the story has been the institutionalization and the development of the Arctic Council.

Of course, things are changing fast in the Arctic region that one of our board members describes as the next emerging market. Since 1979, we've seen a 40 percent reduction in the ice coverage. That's having important impacts on indigenous communities, on wildlife; it's changing the pattern of fisheries. But of course, even more substantially, it's meant that since 2007 the Northwest Passage is open year-round, at

least for countries that have the right capabilities.

Of particular importance, it seems to me, it's opening up new prospects in terms of oil and gas developments and really huge levels of reserves in the Arctic, particularly for Russia, driving a sense of potential for the reason, but also, of course, challenges in terms of where that energy lies and claimants to it. It's a region, without any question, with a growing strategic and economic importance to the United States, but also to India, Japan, China, and of course Russia.

We are, therefore, delighted to have Admiral John Papp here with us today about all of these issues. The Admiral was appointed in July 2014 as special representative for the Arctic. he is the 24th Commandant of the Coast Guard, has had an illustrious 39-year career in the Coast Guard, a graduate of the Coast Guard Academy, has two Masters degrees: One in security studies and one in management, and as a Coast Guard officer has served on six ships, commanding four of them including what I'm reliably informed is the U.S. government's only active sailing tall ship, the Coast Guard Training Barque Eagle. I am also reliably informed that on that ship he is frequently found up in the sails inspecting the rigging; a sailor to sailor, not just a leader, but a leader also held in hugely high regard within the Coast Guard and by his colleagues and the rest of the defense and security community.

It seems to me extremely appropriate to have a sailor to sailor serve as our country's representative to the Arctic in this upcoming period, and so we're delighted to have you here. Thank you very much for your service, and thank you for joining us today. The floor is yours. (Applause)

MR. PAPP: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. What a great crowd. This is wonderful. I feel great. I think I met here at Brookings when I was the commandant. Its pronounced commandant. (Laughter) I know Canadians pronounce

things a little bit different. Actually, I have been introduced as the 24th Commandment before. (Laughter) I know the first 12 Commandments. I'm not sure what happened to the ones in-between, but I thought at the time, the 24th Commandment, that's a pretty good title. I like that.

Thanks for the introduction, and yes, Canada is one of those dangerous places. In fact, I remember going a couple years ago. They brought a bunch of us up to the foreign relations committee up in the Senate. Secretary Kerry was the chairman at that time. We did a hearing on the Law of the Sea. We might want to talk about the Law of the Sea at some point this morning, but at that particular event one of the senators said, we don't need a Law of the Sea treaty. We can do anything that we want.

I gave as an example that between the Yukon Territory and Alaska there is a segment that is colored gray because the United States and Canada has not been able to agree on a border there. The senator said, you can't tell me that we cannot come to an agreement with Canada. Yes, that's true. We can't, and it still exists today. Although we might want to touch on that because I think there's some interesting developments in terms of continental shelf claims that we could talk about.

It's great to be here at Brookings. I feel good because all my basic needs have been taken care of. I was served a hot breakfast. I have coffee. They brought in a team over breakfast to warm me up with a lot of challenging questions, so I feel ready to go. But as I look around the room, I'm also a little concerned because I see so many faces that I've seen in so many other places, and you start after a while losing track of who you've spoken to and what sea stories you've told and whatever else.

There's one other thing I have to correct. I can't take Jason back. I'm no longer the commandant of the Coast Guard, so the current commandant may be concerned about him coming back. You can keep him as far as I'm concerned.

(Laughter)

Drue Pierce, where are you? Senator Pierce from Alaska, welcome. Thanks for being at the hearing last week in front of Senator McCloskey's committee. Drue has heard my story many times, so I'm going to have to watch and make sure I don't do any repeats this morning.

Because there are so many people that have heard me talk in other venues, I thought I'd take a different course this morning. I'll start off with an Alaska story.

Back last fall, I went up to Alaska for my second series of listening sessions. We're in the city of Kotzebue, and there was an Alaskan native in Kotzebue who got up to talk to us. My recollection is his name was Icoluzak. He's a subsistence hunter, and he's involved with marine mammals; a very articulate and interesting individual.

But he was talking about the challenges of Washington coming up and telling Alaskans what to do and etc., etc. The example that he used was he said, one of the departments sent the seal expert up here to talk to us. Now, Icoluzak is a seal hunter, a subsistence hunter, and it's been in his culture, in his tribe, for thousands of years, and as I looked out across the bay there in Kotzebue, I could understand why. Everywhere I looked, you could see the heads of seals. The Alaskan natives revere them. It's a part of their culture. They use it for food, for furs, and other things. It's a part of their life.

The seal expert came up from Washington, came in to speak to a group of them, and when he was introduced as the seal expert, Icoluzak looked at him and he said, so, you're the seal expert? How many seals have you eaten? (Laughter)

I like to tell that story because as I have gone and started talking about

the Arctic, I find that I can usually classify people into seal hunters and seal experts. Now, there's an awful lot of people in-between: Some who are sincerely interested in the Arctic, others that couldn't care less about the Arctic. Hopefully during our chairmanship of the Arctic Council, we'll be able to bring more of those people into that category of people who are interested in the Arctic.

I found that it's very important to listen to the seal hunters, and I use that as a metaphor. There are certain people that have spent a lot of time in the Arctic, that are interested in it, that are passionate about it. In this city,

I find a lot of people who are seal experts. I was in a meeting the other day or preparing to go into a meeting over at the state department, and a young staffer came up to me and she said, oh, Admiral Papp, I'm so excited about meeting you. She says, I'm passionate about the Arctic. There's so much work to be done up there. She went on and on and on, and I finally said, well, when's the last time you visited the Arctic? Well, I've never been there, but I'm passionate about it. I've watched the nature channel, etc., etc., and there's so much that needs to be done up there.

That can be excused. It's great for youth and young people to be interested and have that passion because we need more of that in this country, particularly as we address the Arctic. Where I'm concerned is when senior leaders are in that seal expert category.

I had a Senate hearing last week, and there were a couple of senators who had very legitimate, very good questions. There were others on the panel who -- you can sense it. They almost have to establish their credibility first. One of them, and I know Ambassador Gearheart -- are you still here? From Iceland? Oh, there he is. In fact, I looked at him because one of the senators, to establish credibility, said, well, my wife traveled to Iceland one. You have a very nice country there. I turned around and I

looked at the ambassador, and he's there, 'uh,' because you know at that point they have some sort of very shallow interest or knowledge about the Arctic, and yet here they are making decisions.

Another one mentioned to the Alaskans who were in attendance that he had visited Alaska once. I checked up later on, and I'm told -- I can't confirm this, but one of the other senators told me that he took a cruise to Alaska once, so therefore establishes credibility in terms of understanding Alaska.

I would never put myself in the category of a seal hunter. I respect the seal hunters. I respect our Alaskan natives, and I've learned a lot from them. I would say I am in that category of people that is very interested, that is concerned about the Arctic, and I have limited amount of knowledge.

I started out my Coast Guard career in Alaska. I was, let us say, academically challenged at the Academy, and in those days we selected our first assignment based upon your class standing. There were not many choices left when it came down to me, and I saw a ship in Alaska. I said, well, that looks exciting. Alaska, and a kid from Connecticut going to Alaska.

The ship was home ported in a place called Adak, Alaska, and I didn't know where Adak was, but it sounded exciting. I went back to my room, and I broke out an atlas, great big atlas, opened it up -- believe me, do this. Open up an atlas, and usually Alaska will cover two pages in the atlas except down at the bottom there's an insert that has part of the Alaskan peninsula, and then the first couple islands of the Aleutian chain. Then there's another insert that covers the rest of the Aleutian chain, and Adak was halfway out in the second insert.

Suffice to say, my fiancé at the time was not too pleased. However, after going out to Adak, I think it got us off to a great start in terms of our marriage, and she's

with me 39 years later. It probably was a good experience.

Professionally, it was a great experience. I learned a lot about being a sailor in Alaska. First of all, you have to deal with I call the tyranny of time and distance, and we're still challenged with that today. Going back to my Coast Guard position, the nearest air station that can fly helicopters for search and rescue up in the North Slope is about 850 miles away in Kodiak, Alaska. That's tyranny of time and distance, and when you're sailing ships up there, when you have to refuel and the nearest port is 800, 900 miles away that you can get to for fuel, it causes you to be cautious and concerned.

Then the weather you have to deal with up there. I have seen the worst sustained weather of my entire career was during my first two years up in Alaska. I've seen weather in the Caribbean that lasts 24 or 48 hours. They call them hurricanes down there. The same weather conditions in the Bering Sea they call normal weather during the wintertime, and it lasts for weeks on end.

The challenges that I faced serving and learning as a sailor up in Alaska stayed with me my entire career and then drove me to be very interested about 36 years later when I became the commandant of the Coast Guard. Of course, at that time it was almost forced upon us because there were a lot of Coast Guard equities involved in the opening of the Arctic. We began a process of coming up with a Coast Guard Arctic strategy.

At the end of that and after trying to campaign for resources to better prepare our country for what was happening up in the Arctic, I was about to retire on May 30th of last year. On the evening of the 29th, Secretary John Kerry called me and asked me if I might come to the State Department to help coordinate activities in preparation for the Arctic Council.

I didn't even have to hesitate. Asked to serve your country by a senior

official of the government in an area that I was passionate about, there was no decision involved. I automatically said yes, and here I am about 7 or 8 months later. I am very happy with that decision and very excited about the prospect of us taking on the chairmanship in about a month here.

As I came into the job, the big task was organizing our U.S. program for the Arctic. What I was very pleased to find was there was an awful lot of work that transpired in preparation. In fact, if nothing else, what we had to do was pair down a little bit, package it, and then market it is really the way I describe it, and we've been about that process.

There was something called the Arctic Policy Group, the APG, that works across the interagency and also consults with Alaska. We have a senior Arctic official, Julie Gourley, who's been working in that job for about 10 years, and she has a lot of good contacts not only with the other countries but also with groups in Alaska.

What I found during my career as an officer and as a ship captain is one of the most important things you do in terms of developing policy, programs, or carrying out a mission is you listen to people. We set about the business or listening to others, forming our program, and packaging it together.

We came up with a rough idea, first of all, for a theme, which is one Arctic, shared opportunities, challenges, and responsibilities. If nothing else comes across during our chairmanship, that's the theme that I want everybody to remember because it is on Arctic that's not just shared by the eight countries of the Arctic Council, but it is a part of our world, and things that go on in the Arctic impact the rest of the world. We want to develop interest in other countries about eth Arctic as well.

Then we had this collection of projects, literally scores of projects that we could choose from, and we started lumping them into categories. One that appealed to

me as a former commandant of the Coast Guard was Arctic Ocean safety, security, and stewardship. In fact, safety, security, and stewardship is a theme that we use within the Coast Guard, but it's really the components of maritime governance.

When you look at the Arctic, when you look down from the Pole, which is a view of the earth that not too many people look at. What you see is the predominant feature is an ocean. Now, a lot of it is covered by ice. In fact, there are certain times of the year where it's all covered with ice, but it's opening up. There are new maritime routes that are developing, and it's interesting, it's exciting, and I think it's going to change the world in the way we conduct commerce over time.

But once again, a maritime environment, and the first responsibility of a maritime nation is to provide for the safety and security of mariners and ships that will approach its shores and have to transit, have rescue capability, aid navigation, other things in order to assure safety of navigation.

Navigation and maritime trade contributes to prosperity of a country. Maritime trade and commerce will contribute to the prosperity of Alaska and the Arctic. It's already happening in other portions of the Arctic, and we need to be prepared for it as we go along.

We're heavy on the emphasis on Arctic Ocean safety, security, and stewardship. Hopefully everybody has read some of the details of those programs. We're going to emphasize search and rescue and exercising the search and rescue agreement. We're going to emphasize exercising the Marine Oil Spill Preparation and Response Agreement that was executed by the Arctic Circle countries, and then a number of other projects within that that we'll move forward.

The second category is improving the economic and living conditions of the people of the north: A series of projects that go from renewable energy all the way to

a review of telecommunication capabilities within the Arctic.

The third is adapting to climate change. Very important. We're not going to cure climate change within the Arctic Council, but we need to draw attention to the effects of climate change and also come up with ways to mitigate and adapt to it to hopefully protect the environment of the Arctic to demonstrate to the rest of the world that what goes on in the rest of the world affects the Arctic and what's happening in the Arctic affects the rest of the world.

The people in Boston, Massachusetts, and people in Washington, D.C. in fact, probably don't need to be reminded that some of those changes that are occurring are drastically changing our weather patterns, and I'm not sure that we can change that in the short term at least, but we need to be about the business of thinking how we can do that and also helping people that do live within that environment to adapt to it.

We lump those things together in that order and then set about that process that I talked about, listening to people. First and foremost, the most important place to go to was Alaska. Last August, our team went up to Alaska, and we met with a full range of people starting, first of all, with our Alaskan natives in various venues. We met with environmental groups, other NGOs, the oil industry, Alaskan legislators, and everything in-between.

We took their input, went back to Washington, refined our program a little bit, and then sent it up to Secretary Kerry for his, at least, conceptual approval.

Having received his conceptual approval, we took the program back to Alaska. It coincided with an event that's called Week In the Arctic, and we went up there and did listening sessions in (inaudible) We went to Nome Kotzebue and Barrow and did additional listening sessions, brought that back, and further refined our program.

Now, we had projected that I wasn't going to speak publicly about the

program until we had done those listening sessions, and I can't remember the exact date, but there was an event that Heather Conley at CSIS had scheduled which was passing the torch between Canada and the United States and that was to be my first opportunity to speak publicly about our Arctic Council program until I was asked by other leadership to speak at another event, the Center for American Progress, on the day before the CSIS event.

I use those as markers. For those of you who are familiar with Center for American Progress, they have an environmental focus. When I spoke to them afterwards, they said, Admiral, you've got it. You've recognized the importance of the climate. You recognize the importance of the environment. You're a little strong on that security and safety stuff on the other side, but its okay. It looks like a balanced program.

I went to CSIS the next day and spoke to them, and they said, you've got it. You've got that security stuff, the Arctic Ocean, safety, and everything else. You're a little strong on the climate change and environment, but it's a good, balanced program.

I figured, okay, we hit the sweet spot. We're doing good here. That has followed through across the board as we've gone around and spoken to groups. The next step was to take it internationally.

It coincided at that time with something called Arctic Circle. The Arctic Circle event was being held in Reykjavik, Iceland. That's the first time I met ambassador Gearheart when I was there in Reykjavik, and it was my first opportunity to speak publicly in front of a large group. Talk about interest in the Arctic: 1300 people from 39 countries in Reykjavik, Iceland, in really lousy weather. No offense, sir. (Laughter) It was rainy; it was cold; it was blowing 40 knots. We were walking into a headwind from the hotel, but it was very invigorating and certainly helped to get me even more excited about this program and also gave me the opportunity to do a lot of bilateral meetings with folks that

had come in.

We refined the program once again, did another briefing to Secretary Kerry, and then recently, just about a month ago, I went on another trip to go to the rest of the Nordic countries. We started out in Sweden, went to Norway where we went up to Tromso for an event that's called Arctic Frontiers, once again, another opportunity to speak to a large group, another group of about 1300 or so people from 39 or 40 countries, senior representatives from around the world, and once again an opportunity to talk about our U.S. program.

From Norway, we went to Copenhagen. Met with not only the Danes, but the Greenlanders as well to get their perspective. Went from there to Finland, and not only did we meet in Helsinki with a full range of activities, but we also traveled north to meet with the Sami Parliament to meet with one of our permanent observers in the Arctic Council.

Then most importantly we finished up that trip by going to Moscow, and I'll talk a little bit more about that in just a moment, but a very productive meeting. It was the first senior-level meeting of a U.S. representative in Moscow since the imposition of the sanctions, so it was a significant event not just for the Arctic Council, but I think for the United States as well. I'd be happy to entertain questions on that when we get into it.

There's been an awful lot of listening that's going on, and what I would say is it's broken down into a couple of themes, the first theme being this theme of balance, finding the sweet spot, and as I've said, I've spoken to an awful lot of groups similar to this, diverse groups. Brookings tends to have a very balanced view of things, more centrist, so perhaps this program resonates. We've tried to make it a balanced program to try to reflect all the needs that are going on up there.

But the second comment that I get most constantly when I brief this to

groups, to the press, and in particular to the other seven countries is almost the immediate response is, wow, that's rather ambitious. It is. I will lay claim to our United States program probably being the most forward-leaning, most ambitious program that's ever been proposed during a chairmanship of the Arctic Council, and I think that's the way it should be.

Leadership, part of leadership, is setting the bar high, setting goals, and then measuring progress towards those goals, and that's what we intend to do during our chairmanship. While everybody else says that it's a rather ambitious program, there's one dissenter. Every time I brief this to Secretary Kerry, he says, are you sure we're doing enough? Can we do more? Perhaps we've found the sweet spot there as well.

The third thing that comes up frequently, in fact came up in the session this morning, is why doesn't the United States support the Arctic Economic Council? The Arctic Economic Council, or the AEC as it's referred to, was one of Canada's initiatives, and I think a very good initiative. The focus of the Arctic Council since its inception has been environmental protection and sustainable development. We have plenty of representation on the environmental protection side.

If we want sustainable development, it seems to me we need to cut in industry. We need to let industry know what the standards are. We need responsible, sustainable development within the Arctic. The Arctic Economic Council, I believe, is setup to facilitate that.

Now, I think where this misperception occurs about the United States not supporting the Arctic Economic Council is we had some disagreements on exactly how we ought to employ our participation in it. I would say now that I've had a chance to dissect it because of all this feedback about this perception of us not supporting it, I've had a chance to get into it a little bit.

What I've really found is with eight countries you've really got eight different approaches, just like you've got eight different forms of government literally as you look across it. For our form of government in the United States, the United States government does not own industries. Now, some of the industries that are represented within the AEC from other countries are at least partially or wholly owned by the state. There's a state interest in having those countries in there to be able to develop things within the Arctic.

We took a different approach, first of all, because of our culture. Once again, our government does not own industries. Secondly, if we start getting too close with industry you start running into federal advisory committee rules that have to be complied with. Our choice, whether you like it or don't like, early on was to turn this over to the Chamber of Commerce in Alaska, and the chamber of commerce selected three Alaskan companies to be our representatives to the AEC, and the AEC has only just had its first meeting.

I think there are going to be some disputes on how the AEC should be used. There will be questions about how we employ it. There will be questions about how much influence should it have on Arctic Council activities, should it have a different status from our observer groups; I don't know. But what I'm saying is it's still a work in progress. The United States fully embraces it, and we will continue it. We thank Canada for starting it, but there's more to come on that.

The next thing that came up most frequently is are we going to talk to Russia. I'll just leave it at that. Obviously I was sent to Moscow. We're talking with Russia, and it's very important to what we do. Everything within the Arctic Council is done by consensus. One country can break consensus, and then we don't take on a project. It's very important to keep Russia in the fold not just for the Arctic Council but for

other things going on in the world.

The next to the last thing that's repeated frequently is we are excited about United States leadership, and I like that. One of the things that's most gratifying to me as an American is when I've traveled overseas either as the commandant of the Coast Guard or in this position, it's the respect that he United States gets wherever we go. It's the looking to us for leadership wherever we go.

I can be at an event here in Washington, and I'm seated all the way in the back of the room. If I go to Tromso, Norway, or Reykjavik, Iceland, they give me a seat of honor up front, and when I step up there, regardless of where we are in the program, people stop and they listen, and it's not because it's Papp; it's because it's the United States. That's particularly gratifying.

The last item I'll bring up here is along with that, being excited about United States leadership, they question out commitment. They want to know, are you really committed to the Arctic? Fortunately, or unfortunately, what they look at is commitment of resources.

One of the questions I frequently get is, you guys can't even guy an icebreaker. Are you really committed to the Arctic if you can't buy an icebreaker? Yet the Russians have more than two dozen, China is building an icebreaker, South Korea is building an icebreaker, other countries are building icebreakers, and I don't want to say I'm focusing just on icebreakers; there are other infrastructure needs as well. But we need to be about the business of committing some resources.

I'm very hopeful that the recent executive order signed by the President, which brings all the agencies together with an Arctic Executive Steering Committee, is going to lead to setting some priorities which will hopefully lead to committing some resources as well to the needs in the Arctic.

With that, I think I'll finish right there because I'm really excited about getting into your questions. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. EBINGER: While you're getting mic'ed up, Admiral, if I might just raise the first question, and I don't mean it to be controversial, but I think it's an important question.

Despite the grandiose plan that you have outlined that the government has for our chairmanship of the Arctic Council, there are a number of what seem to be crisscrossing signals coming out of this administration, particularly if you're an Alaskan resident. We're all concerned about the TAP Pipeline's capacity dropping rapidly and the need to find additional oil reserves to have that vital national asset continue to operate. Yet, we've just recently seen the administration take large swaths of Alaska out of any consideration for future oil development at least in ANWR and the coastal plain.

Do you think that we really do have a coherence in -- and I'm really saying Washington, not blaming the administration, but do you think we really have any coherence in the country on whether we really see Alaska as a land of opportunity and abundance for the future of the nation or the other view is maybe close it off and make it all a national park?

MR. PAPP: I'll admit in certainly speaking and listening, most importantly, to Alaskans as recently as last week -- Senator Lisa Murkowski and Senator Maria Cantwell held a hearing last week on the day that the government was shut down before the Energy Committee and the Senate. I think Senator Murkowski couldn't bear the possibility of shutting down a hearing on the Arctic on a day that it was snowing in Washington, D.C.

We're getting attention to it, and there were Alaskans on the panel with me, and they brought up those same concerns. I guess what I would say is part of our

challenge is raising the visibility of the Arctic. As we sit here right in this spot, we are 3500 miles from Barrow, Alaska, the northernmost point of the United States, right there in the center of the Arctic. Three thousand five hundred miles and a lot of Canada in-between.

There's not a connection between the American people and the Artic. We only have 50,000 Americans who live above the Arctic Circle in Northern Alaska. Now, I think most Alaskans, the rest of the state, also have a connection to the Arctic, they understand it, but it's not a large population.

Someone mentioned earlier this morning -- in fact I meant to comment on it. I think it was one of our Coast Guard officers that was in the earlier meeting talked about us being a maritime nation. I've had a hard time over the years trying to convince people we're a maritime nation much less an Arctic nation as well. Yet we are, and we've got responsibilities as a nation.

It's only been recently with the opening of the waters that we've developed all the centers. That's why we're so excited about this. There's a changing climate, it's opening up waters, and there are needs there, but they are new needs. They're new starts, and anything in Washington that's a new start is very difficult to sell. In terms of resourcing, we all know the pressures that have been on the federal budget over the last decade or so, so it's hard to get those new things in there.

In terms of policy decisions, I think that part of our program is a very active and strong and robust public diplomacy effort which we hope will raise the awareness of the American people. There are going to be significant meetings that are going to be held in Alaska. There will be some meetings held here in Washington, D.C. We hope to bring senior leaders from around the world, including some of our own senior leadership from Washington, some of the seal experts, and bring them to Alaska and

teach them a little bit about it so that we can raise that awareness.

Then and only then, I think, will people take into consideration the full range of opinions and issues when they make policy decisions that affect the country broadly like that.

MR. EBINGER: Thank you. We'll go to the floor. There are some roaming mics. If you wait to get a mic, and also if you'll please identify yourself and please ask a question. We have one in the very back of the room.

MS. SANDLER: Hi, my name is Marideth Sandler with Sandler Trade LLC. I was the State of Alaska representative within the U.S. delegation to the Arctic Council from 1995 to 2002, and in fact (inaudible) the last time the U.S. head of the chairmanship and did all the things that you described.

For one, Admiral, I appreciate what you said very much. I'm a 10-year resident of Alaska. I've worked for Alaskan governor Tony Knowles for seven years, and he would say to me with a little nudge to my back, if not for Alaska, the United States would not be in the Arctic Council or need an Artic policy.

Clearly it's evolved, and this room is incredible that so many people are here, but my question is I appreciate the listening, but where are the Alaskans, the Alaskan governor's office, in the policymaking part of this? Not just to be listened to, but to be an integral representative ongoing to the delegation, to the Arctic Council, to what you're talking about. An honest-to-god policymaker who has an equal voice with all the -- as we would say from Alaska, all the feds. Thanks very much.

MR. PAPP: Obviously, as you referred to it as the listening and I referred to as the listening, that's consultation in a more formal term, and we will keep that consultation going. I see the Alaskan legislatures here in Washington on a very frequent basis, and I'll (inaudible) our two senators and Representative Young. Every

time we get Alaskans in here, they generally stop by the State Department and spend some time with me.

I've not had a chance to get back up there to Alaska, but I think we can understand with all the preparations we've had going on with the Arctic Council, which is an international body as you know, I'm speaking for the rest of the room. I don't mean to be condescending towards you, but I want to make sure everybody else understands. We're focused on international issues. It's not within our portfolio to be dealing with domestic issues.

The domestic issues are the responsibility of other departments within our government, and as I said, heart of our program is this public diplomacy effort which, in my heart, I hope will raise the awareness of the American people. We're using the Arctic Council chairmanship as a means to get to the goal that I've advocated for at least the last 4 or 5 years that we need to start investing in some of the infrastructure up in Alaska.

The consultation will continue to go on. We have brought an Alaskan native on to act as a chief of staff to Ambassador Balton. Nikoosh Carlo just worked within the Alaska Arctic Policy Commission and developing that. She's providing great input to us. We've been trying to setup a panel of experts to consult with Alaskan natives. We're trying to find the right device for doing that, the right contract or whatever it might be, to make a more formal arrangement between us and doing some consulting with Alaskan natives.

At the end of the day, where do we put Alaskans into this organization? Once again, it's an international thing that is a federal function. We appreciate the input. They sit in on the Artic Policy Group and that will continue. How do we more formally involve them? I know Craig Fleener is coming up to the administerial, the new governor's

representative for the Arctic, and we will continue to engage as much as we can.

MR. EBINGER: Thank you. In the middle?

MS. SHOBOFKINE: My name is Sylvia Shobofkine from the Polish embassy. Just two questions: First referring to cooperation with Russia. Could you expand more? You said you had quite productive talks there, so if you could just say something more, and along this line isn't the increased Russian military activity bothering you at all? That's the first question, and the second, if you could expand on the icebreakers. What's your opinion on what the development should be? There was news another day about possible international cooperation in having U.S. icebreaking capability, and what's, according to you, the minimum level the U.S. should have? Thank you.

MR. PAPP: Great. Okay, Russia. One of the things that the United States is deeply appreciative of is that the other Artic countries have stood shoulder-to-shoulder together in terms of their opposition to the unlawful incursions in the Ukraine and Russia's violation of Ukraine's sovereignty. They have all adopted the sanctions and have supported the sanctions, and we as a country are grateful for that.

But one thing that we're also in agreement on, as I mentioned, is the seven other Arctic countries, the United States and the other six, minus Russia, all believe that, for the good of the Arctic, for the environment, and other important issues, we need to keep Russia in the fold and keep communications open. We are all committed to that.

I have relayed the message that the military rhetoric, the actions by the Russians in Ukraine, are not helpful to keeping that line of communication open, yet we remain committed to doing that. I think, and I know this is Secretary Kerry's belief and the President's belief and is something that I just understand intuitively, is no situation is

made better by cutting off communications.

It's very important for us to communicate not just for those things that we want to do in the Artic, but also to help other situations as well. We are committed to maintaining that line of communication, at least as it stands right now.

Military buildup, I don't know whether you were touching on military buildup in the Artic. Clearly there's been a lot of rhetoric there as well. I was told by one Russian when I said that that rhetoric was unhelpful, they said, military people are going to be military people, and they're going to say what they say.

I'm trying very hard to make sure, either through our intelligence programs or otherwise, to find where the reality is in terms of capabilities. One person can look at what's going on in terms of what they call military buildup and rightfully say they've got an awful long border along the Arctic and if you're going to have increased maritime traffic, you should have search and rescue facilities, you should have modern airports, and other things; things that I would like to see built in Alaska as maritime activity increases.

One person's search and rescue response capabilities is another person's military buildup. I saw at least a couple of news stories when I was appointed into this job that said the United States was now going to militarize the Arctic because they've selected an admiral to be their special representative. I'm not doing a very good job if that's why I was selected.

It's hard to determine intent. Intent is always a gamble. What you need to look at is capabilities: What are they actually building. We're keeping an eye on that, but some of it is rightful, legitimate things that should be built because there's an increase in maritime traffic.

They are building icebreakers. I wish we were building icebreakers.

Last week's hearing, Senator Cantwell asked about the various studies that are out there. There's one study that calls for three U.S. heavy icebreakers and three medium. There's another one that calls for four and six.

I can't keep track of what the numbers are, and what I told Senator Cantwell was we get all wrapped up talking about how many we should have. It would seem to me we could at least come to agreement on we need at least one and we should start building it. We haven't devoted the money towards building that first icebreaker yet. I would be happy just to see us start a first icebreaker, much less all those other things.

In the absence of that, there are people that are coming forward. There are some commercial activities that would say, we'll build you an icebreaker and lease it back to the government. There are other countries that might volunteer.

Part of the Arctic Council, what we might work at, and I think as we start working our way forward in search and rescue, for instance, we want to take that search and rescue and exercise it now because no one country can provide all the resources that are necessary to take care of a major maritime disaster. Let's inventory what we have and see how we might work together better to be able to share responsibilities and share responses.

All those icebreakers are out there. Maybe there's a way for us to cooperate between the countries. I hate to go down this line of logic, but I watch the Star Trek movies, and you see on the bridge of the Enterprise a Russian, an Asian, an African American, whatever it might be. Countries came together, pooled their resources, and worked together. Wouldn't it be beautiful if, within the auspices of the Arctic Council, we could pool resources and work together cooperatively?

I think that's a worthy goal, but the United States, at the end of the day, has to do its part as well and start investing in some resources there. I'm hopeful that the

President's new executive order that delineates the responsibilities of the Arctic Executive Steering Committee will start setting those priorities and start pushing some resource proposals.

MR. EBINGER: I think we have gentleman right -- did you have a question? Lady on the middle.

MS. PREBE: Hello, my name is Linda Priebe, and I'm a partner doing federal relations and ethics in compliance at a law firm here in Washington, D.C. called Culhane Meadows. I'm also the secretary of the Norwegian American Chamber of Commerce, and before that for 14 years I was deputy general council and ethics official at the White House Office of Drug Policy.

I was very interested in your comment about the Federal Advisory Commission Act which is known as the federal version of a Government in the Sunshine Act. I presume that your comment expressed a concern, but correct me if I'm wrong, about the U.S. participation in the Artic Economic Council, potentially converting that to a U.S. federal advisory commission; is that the concern that you were raising?

MR. PAPP: That would be the concern. I'm not an expert on the FACA laws, but it has been expressed as one of those concerns as we talk to people within the State Department.

MS. PREBE: That's right, and I did a lot of FACA law when I was at White House Drug Policy. That is correct; that is a legitimate concern. But I note with the President's new executive order on interagency coordination that there is no position or representation there for nonfederal interests, and I understand that as well as far as the interagency, although I do have an idea about a way to address that.

But regardless, my question to you is, clearly in light of the very first question that was asked you, there is a desire for people to have input to the federal

policymaking process who are not already in the loop, the insiders, whether that includes Alaska or other areas as well. Do you foresee the creation of an actual federal advisory commission for U.S. Arctic policy being created to address that need?

MR. PAPP: I have to admit right up front I have not even considered it or thought about it. I'm not going to use it as an excuse. I think I've been in the job seven months now, and while I had a very narrow and parochial interest as the commandant of the Coast Guard, I've had to broaden that out into the international portion of this and that has consumed an awful lot of what limited brain space I have.

Getting into some of those other finer details, how we refine this as we go forward, I think that's a worthy suggestion for consideration. We'll make a note of that. Certainly I could foresee it as a possibility, but I just don't know.

MR. EBINGER: On the side there.

MR. KINTISH: Eli Kintisch with Science Magazine. Admiral, the Arctic is one of the most important places in the world in terms of climate change. It's one of the most volatile regions; you mentioned this. Yet, it's very poorly instrumented for climate. I note in your remarks you didn't mention this issue. How important is it that the nations of the world improve monitoring in the Arctic, and what do you think the Arctic Council should do about that?

MR. PAPP: It is, in fact, a part of our U.S. program. We're looking at various mapping systems, sensors. We're looking at inventorying what other countries are doing and bringing them together so that we can have better observation.

It's not only just that; there's a great need for increased satellite coverage whether it's communications, observation, navigation. Most of what we've put over the decades is optimized for the middle latitudes, not optimized for the higher latitudes. That's another thing that clearly the United States can't take on all by itself, but

there's benefit to all the countries that are going to be operating in the Arctic, so that's another area that we're hopeful that we can bring people together and start investing in.

But you are absolutely right. We need better coordination of what sensors there are up there, and we're going to attempt to identify those that are needed as well and start moving towards getting them resourced.

MR. EBINGER: Back, a lady.

MS. FORN: Thanks so much for holding this event. My name's Claire Foran; I'm with National Journal.

You talked a little bit about the need to raise public awareness, and it seems like one of the big challenges with the Arctic is getting adequate funding and resources and convincing Congress, but also convincing the American public which might lead to more attention in Congress.

Can you talk a little bit more about how you can get the public to pay attention, and then I also wanted to ask if you'd heard anything back from Disney about your offer to them to perhaps use the Frozen characters as a way to educate the public?

MR. PAPP: I'm afraid my name isn't very good at Disney right now. For those of you who don't know, and I don't know how you couldn't -- actually, when you go home tonight Google 'Papp Disney Arctic.' (Laughter) The last time I checked, there's at least about 10 pages of articles there.

One of the proposals we had was a very bright young lady within my office who is a big fan of Disney, the movie Frozen. I think she can recite the entire script of the movie and sing all the songs. But she suggested we need to start teaching the youth about the Arctic, and perhaps having some public service announcements done with the Disney characters from the movie Frozen, Anna and Elsa and Sven and Olaf. I know these because I have granddaughters, and I watch the movie all the time.

(Laughter)

When I arrived in Tromso, Norway, it just so happened that Tromso was in the middle of their film festival. On that particular evening, there was an outdoor theater. There were about 300 children all bundled up, and they were watching Disney's Frozen.

I tell the story to the crowd at the Arctic Frontiers Event the next morning, the 1300 people, and I had mentioned that I had gone out to Disney in Los Angeles to meet with them, and I didn't think my marketing through very well. I said, you've taught all these kids around the world about a fantasy Arctic city in Norway, a kingdom that doesn't really exist in conditions that don't really exist.

I tell them, you need to start teaching them about the plight of the polar bear and Alaskan villages that are falling into the ocean because the permafrost is thawing, and I went on with a list of other things. I could see this guy was becoming more and more concerned, and then he said, Admiral, you might not understand. Our culture here at Disney is to project positive images and happy endings. (Laughter)

He's right, but how do you turn that into finding some happy endings for our Arctic as well? I think it can be done. We're continuing discussions with Disney, and I'm hopeful that we're going to get there. It's a very good company, and they put out a good product. I'd like to have them help us raise awareness.

Your basic question though is how do you raise the awareness in American people, and if I had that secret I wouldn't be sitting here working for the government. I'd be out as a lobbyist or something like that. No, I'm never going to be a lobbyist. But I'd be running a media business or something.

It's hard to get bandwidth. Look at the front page of the post today and see the things that are erupting every day that draw the attention of the American people.

Yes, long term we're becoming concerned about what's happening in the Arctic either because of climate change and other things, but it's slow. There's no major, cataclysmic event that's happening, and when you have so many cataclysmic events that are drawing your attention every day, it's hard to get the bandwidth to spread it out.

We say, why isn't the White House taking this up? The White House is the hottest plate. Secretary Kerry is going to be chair of the Arctic Council, but do you think he's got the time to devote to the Arctic Council on a day-to-day basis? With dealing with Ebola, Syria, ISIS, and everything else in the world -- there's something that goes along with leadership and that's that you've got a lot on your plate. The United States is, fortunately or unfortunately, involved in an awful lot of things around the world. Therefore, the Arctic isn't a huge problem right now for anybody, so it's hard to draw that attention.

That's what I've been trying to do is how can you come up with a national imperative, something that will draw in the American people, and we're still struggling with that for a little bit, but I think we're getting closer.

MR. EBINGER: Yes, sir.

MR. RANGER: Thank you. Richard Ranger from the American Petroleum Institute.

The lady's question actually prompts a suggestion for you to consider, Admiral Papp, and that is through some resource associated with the U.S. chairmanship: A recommended reading list; something that you could develop over time with the State of Alaska, with academia. There are a lot of great books out there: Barry Lopez's *Arctic Dreams*, Willie Hensley's *Fifty Miles From Tomorrow*, and the Farley Mowat series in Canada. But I think from the standpoint of the long pull, building student interest, academic interest, public interest, I throw that out as a suggestion that could be

developed over your tenure.

MR. PAPP: Yes, and that's part of our public diplomacy program is we're using the Fulbright scholarships to gain some interest and start bringing people in. That's one of the reasons why I was really keen on trying to get Disney in there is because you've got to start with the youth. Just like anything else, one of the challenges we faced back in my previous job was getting the best of American talent, diverse American talent, into the Coast Guard Academy.

You can't start at the junior year of high school. You've really got to start marketing when they're in grade school, and we need to carry over some of these programs and perhaps introduce it in our schools or otherwise. You're absolutely right.

MR. EBINGER: Admiral, in the very near future there is one cruise line that has plans to send a ship carrying as many as 2000 people into the Arctic waters. Do we, as a nation, have the ability, if we believe this is foolhardy to regulate this kind of activity and now allow ships that aren't truly seaworthy for Arctic conditions, to proceed into our Arctic regions or should we have such rights?

MR. PAPP: We have the ability, and this is one of those things, when I was the commandant, I would bring in my lawyers and start looking at this. If a voyage is manifestly unsafe, if you could make that determination, you can terminate a voyage, yes, if it's an American flag vessel. That can be done.

Will it be done in this particular case? I'm sure that they're going to demonstrate they have the capability. I'm sure that the United States Coast Guard and other agencies in the government are going to take a good, solid look at this and say, okay, if a problem happens, how do you rescue those people?

I personally have been involved with a cruise ship that broke down, and the only way you could rescue all those people was to bring another cruise ship

alongside and transfer them. This was many years when I did this, but I think it was only about 800 people, and they had to transfer 800 people by ferries across to the other cruise ship.

Do you require them to have another cruise ship come behind them in their wake? Do you require them to have an icebreaker escort? There's a lot of things that Canada and the United States will be, and in fact are, looking at, and we'll place down as requirements on these people.

But then at the end of the day, I'm sure the United States and Canada will deploy resources and have them on standby. Those are resources that might be otherwise used for other things. Resources are limited. If you're going to do some new task, you're going to have to pull them off other tasks. You might have to send ships up there that would be down interdicting drugs and illegal migrants and take them off those duties and send them up there to make sure that you could provide for the safety of those 2000 people that are transiting the northwest passage.

MR. EBINGER: I'd like you all to join me in thanking the Admiral for his very provocative presentation. (Applause)

MR. PAPP: Thank you.

MR. EBINGER: Thank you.

MR. PAPP: Thank you.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016