

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program  
Technical Advisory Council  
Visioning and Principles Workgroup

Meeting Notes

August 10, 2017

10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members: Mike Antos, Jason Greenspan (alternate for Darin Chidsey), Bruce Riordan, Jana Ganion, Alex Leumer (alternate for Louis Blumberg); John Blue (alternate for Ashley Conrad-Saydah

3. INTRODUCTION

Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

This workgroup is working to develop an adaptation vision, including principles, definitions and implementation actions with corresponding metrics. This is the third meeting of the Vision and Principles Workgroup. Any outcomes from the workgroup's discussion will be brought to, and publicly discussed at, the Council's next quarterly meeting (September 15, 2017).

At the last workgroup meeting, council members provided in depth feedback on the vision and principles that were also commented on and reworked from the June 16<sup>th</sup> quarterly meeting. The first goal for this meeting is to approve any final revisions to the vision and principles and vote on whether these should be adopted by the full council at the September 15<sup>th</sup> quarterly meeting. The next goal is to discuss and gather feedback on the presented implementation and metrics concepts.

4. VISION AND PRINCIPLES

Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

Discussion Question 1: Do these changes reflect all of the suggestions made at the July 18 workgroup meeting? Are there any additional changes to make before bringing this to the Council in September?

Mike Antos: I notice that the language is inconsistent between the first paragraph and the characteristic bullets beneath. "All people and communities can" versus the language above that says "All Californians *will*." This does not seem parallel. Change to say "All Californians thrive in the face of a.." and "The state's most vulnerable communities *are* prioritized.."

Bruce Riordan: I agree with that. Let's change the tense throughout.

Jason Greenspan: Think that the vision statement is strong now. I like the words withstand and thrive. I would wordsmith the second sentence by taking out the word “proactive” because it seems repetitive.

Bruce Riordan: I agree.

Bruce Riordan: Another wording change: I think the phrase changing average conditions is a bit wonky and may be confusing.

Jana Ganion: Maybe replace the words with “changing daily conditions and extreme events”. This describes the difference between typical versus extreme events.

Nuin-Tara Key: We will work to change that. Perhaps “gradual changes”

Bruce Riordan: We should also change the language “Consideration of climate change adaptation and mitigation” because it is a weak statement. Take out the words “consideration” and “part of”

Discussion Question 2: Are there general comments on the principles? Is the language in Principle 3 clear?

Bruce Riordan: I am worried that there are too many principles. I see the first three as being important but the rest weigh it down. I am concerned that if we have too many principles they become vague.

Nuin-Tara Key: This was discussed at the July Workgroup meeting. The workgroup made the recommendation during the last call to keep the 7 principles that are here. The group said they felt 7 was still a manageable amount as they still fit on one page.

Jana Ganion: Yes, we did discuss that. Each of these are fairly critical and distinct from each other. We also looked hard at how we could consolidate them. It’s only half a page of content. If people do not get down to reading number 6 or 7, they can at least read the blue bolded words.

Mike Antos: These are all really great, but I wonder if we could make it a two-step process. Heighten the purpose and then include a slightly longer paragraph explaining what it means.

Nuin-Tara Key: That is an option. Some of the work to develop implementation metrics/goals could complement these principles. Floating that as another thing to consider in context of the principles as well.

Mike Antos: We should also title the list principles.

Bruce Riordan: I like Mike’s idea of the short bold statement and then more to explain it. Then people could read the bold words.

Jana Ganion: I like the shorter bullet points. I think the concern would be that people would not read the other paragraph. These are concise sentences. I like the bold words too.

John Blue: From a procedural standpoint, we spent a lot of time wordsmithing these at the last meeting. These have gone through the grinder quite a bit, and I'm not sure we have the time to do all of that again.

Nuin-Tara Key: Mike and Bruce, if these stay as they are rather than moving towards your idea, how strongly do you feel about that given the other comments?

Mike Antos: I am fine sticking to this format. I would like to edit #4. The bolded words being part of second sentence is confusing. It should be earlier in the principle. I would also urge us to get each principle down to one sentence.

Jana Ganion: I think that is a great idea. We should move "avoid maladaptation" to the front.

John Blue: The first sentence in #4 seems overarching.

Mike Antos: The first sentences of principles 4, 5 and 7 all talk about temporal scales. Maybe we are hitting that idea too many times. We should condense these by taking the temporal reference out of 4 and 5 and make it stronger in 7.

John Blue: I agree. The first sentence in principle 4 could be consolidated into principle 5 or 7.

Mike Antos: Discussion of the most vulnerable in principle 7 could be removed since that is covered in principle 2.

Nuin-Tara Key: We discussed having this brought throughout the principles.

Jason Greenspan: I think it is more powerful to say it once. That goes for all of the principles.

Bruce Riordan: I generally agree with Jason. It is in the vision and in the characteristic bullets. Strengthening principle 2 would make that stand out.

Mike Antos: Nuin-Tara, you use the word urgent. That word should also be incorporated.

Nuin-Tara: What about the language in Principle 3?

Kit Batten [via prior email]: Change the principle to say, "Prioritize actions that utilize natural and green infrastructure solutions TO enhance and protect natural resources. Focus ON ACTIONS THAT ENHANCE natural system functions, services, and quality AND THAT REDUCE RISK, including but not limited to ACTIONS THAT IMPROVE water and food security, habitat for fish and wildlife, coastal resources, recreation and jobs."

Mike Antos: Use the word "use" not "utilize". We should include the idea of natural and green infrastructure solutions in *urban* environments.

Bruce Riordan: I like the addition of the word “to”. I also believe we should add a reference to urban environments. I like Kit’s edits because this was lacking a description of *why* it was important.

Alex Leumer: I do not have objections to the line edits. I would suggest once more looking back at SB 379 and AB 1482 language.

Nuin-Tara Key: Louis recommended that we look at 1482 and 379 to reflect the last list of things. We looked at those and tried to figure out how to bring the definition in. I think there is an opportunity to incorporate the “why”. We will look back into this.

Mike Antos: What about including a reference to human health?

Alex Leumer: I agree with that.

Public comment:

Meredith Miller: I also support adding human health and well-being to principle 3. I have a larger comment on principle 2. Throughout you talk about vulnerable communities, but principle 2 references disadvantaged communities. This gets associated with CalEnviroScreen, which does not really take into consideration adaptation.

Nuin-Tara Key: We did not have a conversation about needing to have that word instead of vulnerable.

Mike Antos: A high school student recently stated at a local meeting that the words “disadvantaged communities” was mean. I agree.

Meredith: Yes, the word vulnerable has the same effect.

Mike Antos: What about stating “protect those most vulnerable” or those “impacted by vulnerability”

Meredith: You could say, “Explicitly include communities that are disproportionately vulnerable to climate impacts”

Mike Antos: We could also reference low income or overburdened communities.

Jack Leibster: Do we have a definition for all of these terms? How are these determined? CalEnviroScreen is limiting. Not all problems are environmental or pollution problems.

Jelena Hartman: The vision statement is very strong and I like some of the edits that were suggested. However, while the vision paragraph talks about *thriving*, the third bullet characteristic references “critical services” which implies meeting the bare minimum. Maybe remove word critical and include the full range of services.

In addition, in looking at principle 3, I suggest removing the words “actions that utilize”. Say, “prioritize natural and green infrastructure solutions”. This would make it cleaner.

In principle 4, say, “account for” instead of “take into consideration”. The first sentence in principle 4 also goes with principle 5. I suggest looking at the main messages for 4, 5, 6, and 7 to reorganize.

**ACTION:** OPR staff will make revisions based on this feedback and bring vision and principles statements for adoption at September meeting.

All: Aye

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS AND METRICS

Greta Soos, OPR

Mike Antos: prioritizing “actions” is used in vision. Maybe we should use that word to describe these metrics.

Jason Greenspan: I appreciate the placeholder for regional planning. Perhaps we could link that to the role of regional governments in sustainability planning through SB 375 performance monitoring or sustainable community strategies. New or enhanced governance structures is a loaded term.

Mike Antos: Maybe we should measure the capacity of regional governments. Those without capacity could be focused on.

Nuin-Tara Key: We also need to talk about how we define vulnerable communities.

Mike Antos: The Pacific Institute published a study about 5 years ago about climate change and social vulnerability. Maybe we could look to that.

Bruce Riordan: I think these are all important. We need to work on these more but they will be very helpful if we can structure them correctly.

### Public comment:

Meredith Miller: As a representative of CDPH would like to echo that. In this concept of adaptation, CDPH put together a suite of indicators that have a section on social vulnerability. It is not organized into an easy index but it could be used for this process, and CDPH would like to be involved in this process. For right now, we think the best tool is the [Health Disadvantage Index](#), which overlaps a lot with your proposed indicators.

Jack Liebster: Could you elaborate on the components in that index? Does it take into account income and wealth?

Meredith: Yes, it considers income and wealth, education, race, age, social isolation, linguistic isolation, and more.

Jack Liebster: Mobility is an important factor in extreme events. Hopefully that is included.

Meredith Miller: We are working with the developers of this tool to put climate risks into the tool like air quality, wildfire, sea level rise, tree canopy, air conditioning, public transit access, etc. Those will be on their mapping tool this fall.

Nuin-Tara Key: That could inform our impacts discussion

Jack Liebster: A comment on one of the concept metrics: More parking lots should be shaded but not just by trees. We should not exclude investments in solar, which generates clean energy as well.

**ACTION:** OPR staff will take the feedback and comments received and work to bring this to the full council for discussion at the September 15 meeting to talk about types of actions and metrics.

All: Aye

General Public Comment:

OPR staff received no public comment.