



Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program

Technical Advisory Council

October 12, 2018
Meeting Minutes

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
2375 Northside Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92108
10:00 AM – 3:30 PM

Item 1 | Welcome

Item 2 | Roll Call

Present: Jason Greenspan, Tracey Frost, Joey Wraithwall (alternate for Keali'i Bright), Sona Mohnot, Kathleen Ave, David Loya, Nuin-Tara Key, Jonathan Parfrey, Bruce Riordan, Andrea Ouse, John Wentworth, Tina Curry, John Blue (alternate for Ashley Conrad-Saydah), Brian Strong, Karalee Brown, Kit Batten.

Absent: Craig Adelman, Danielle Bergstrom, Louis Blumberg, Jana Ganion, Solage Gould, Elizabeth Rhoades, Gloria Walton

Item 3 | Approval of draft minutes (6/29/18)

DISCUSSION: Review of draft meeting minutes from June 29, 2018 meeting

Brian Strong: I would like to make edits to some of my quoted language on page 5 in the third paragraph down. I would like it to say:

“We tend to not fund community engagement as much as **we should**. A lot of what we learned in San Francisco is **how to integrate** pilot programs into existing projects as leverage. What is next step for RBD? Is the committee going to keep moving?”

ACTION: Voting to approval draft meeting minutes from June 29, 2018 meeting

Motion: Bruce Riordan

Second: Brian Strong

Aye: All

Abstain: Kit Batten

Item 4 | Presentation of ICARP Adaptation Evaluation Framework and Pilot Application to the State Sustainability Roadmaps

DISCUSSION: Presentation by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on the pilot application of the ICARP Adaptation Evaluation Framework to the Sustainability Roadmaps.

John Blue: It should be noted that the Adaptation Chapters were an addition to another set of chapters that were already happening as part of the Sustainability Roadmaps. We tried to make the adaptation chapter a bit less challenging because we were already pushing departments to work hard on the other components of the Sustainability Roadmap plans. For most departments, this was the first time thinking about climate adaptation. This really increased awareness and education in departments because department executives are required to sign the roadmaps.

John Wentworth: I see that all of the dots on the map represent facilities, but is there discussion of landscape scale solutions, especially between state and federal agencies?

Nuin-Tara Key: This document is not the place for that conversation given the scope of the evaluation. The landscape scale conversations happen through Safeguarding California and other efforts. This is more discrete because it is focused only on the Sustainability Roadmap chapters which are focused on facilities operations.

Joey Wraithwall: Yes, but there are some departments that have started landscape scale solutions such as USFS. To add to John Blue's point, for many departments this was also the first time facilities managers were talking to the planning folks. While the Executive Order B-30-15 spurred the integration of adaptation into planning and investment and into the Roadmaps, AB 2800 also codifies a broader application across state agencies.

Johnathan Parfrey: It is in statute that agencies should consider climate, but it is not in statute that OPR and other agencies should provide this assessment and technical assistance. It seems as though there is an opportunity for this to be codified in statute.

Nuin-Tara Key: This is also why we are coupling this effort with the Safeguarding California Implementation Report, which is required by statute.

Jonathan Parfrey: Have staff at the agencies performed seismic resilience assessments?

Tina Curry: Cal OES has looked at state government vulnerabilities to earthquakes. This assessment exists but it is not an ongoing effort.

Joey Wraithwall: California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment includes a report that looks at seismic vulnerabilities.

Nuin-Tara Key: Seismic vulnerabilities would be a good thing to include in the next template for the adaptation chapters.

Jonathan Parfrey: This looks at impacts to physical infrastructure of state buildings. Is there opportunity to look at how state buildings can help public at large?

Nuin-Tara Key: We started conversation about this, but could go further. Many departments only have office buildings that do not interact with the public, but some of the roadmaps do mention broader community benefits that can be provided by facilities even if they aren't publicly accessible (for example, some facilities identified the broader community benefit of tree planting to mitigate urban heat island)

Brian Strong: Do you have any findings in the report around collaboration between departments doing this work? Can we also put these roadmaps up so that they are easily publicly accessible, potentially through a searchable database? This way, departments could more easily share their work and learn what others are doing, this could also help incentivize keeping information up to date..

Nuin-Tara Key: The roadmaps are published online and will be updated every two years. The database idea is something we can explore, but we don't currently have the capacity or resources to build something like this.

Jason Greenspan: I am curious about how state's public higher education system is doing. It seems like this level of planning, analysis and tracking would be valuable there as well. I would be curious to know if that could be included. Perhaps this could be a model for them.

David Loya: CSU's are doing hazard mitigation planning. Also, this is encouraging to see. Even though some of the department efforts are ad hoc or a first time attempt this is a great step. This type of effort is helpful as a model for other entities to use, including local governments. For example, it could be a model or tool for resource strapped communities to use. I wonder if this type of process could also help identify the types of policy or legal changes that are needed to support successful implementation.

Nuin-Tara Key: This is a first step in us understanding what those kinds of strategies/policies should be, we hope to tease out more of those recommendations as this process moves forward.

Kit Batten: Will this report be updated every two years?

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes. Although this tracking report isn't required by legislation, that is our goal.

Kit Batten: Given that it took a year for departments to complete the first time around, maybe it would make sense to invite governments to learn from each other. The leading departments here are so different. Peer to peer learning would be good.

Karalee Browne: Does the report track who is and isn't a part of the Sustainability Roadmaps?

Greta Soos: Yes, this is outlined in the report.

Karalee Browne: I do believe that EO B-30-15 and these Adaptation Chapters were a catalyst because while processes like this can be cumbersome at first, it leads to further development.

John Blue: Executive Order B-18-12 (which started the Sustainability Roadmaps process as a whole) has a due date (2018). I wouldn't be surprised if there was another executive order established soon. We should think about what this should look like.

Bruce Riordan: Should we be worried about change in OPR staff and this ongoing tracking?

Nuin-Tara Key: With ICARP being established through legislation (SB 246), the program will continue. Our goal was to figure out what we could do in these first two years to lay the foundation for this work to be continued on in a new administration. There is dedicated FTE to keep the program going. While the enabling legislation did not call out this level of programmatic detail on the roadmaps, it is the hope that introducing staggered terms for the Council can also help ensure continuity —the council can help establish priorities around continuing this reporting.

Joey Wraithwall: With respect to David's comment, the code that was made for this process (that was used to pull data from Cal-Adapt for all facilities) is not available for local governments. Office of Technology could do this, but it would need to be a directive from a high executive. We could think about whether this would be helpful.

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes. We used the Cal-Adapt API, so anyone could do it. It just takes an extra step/staff capacity.

John Blue: This type of work does take capacity. We have staff dedicated to helping agencies do their GHG emissions inventories. That is the kind of effort that this should take. However, staff turns over a lot in agencies that do this.

Nuin-Tara Key: We will tease out some more key findings from this conversation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Liz Grassi: It should be noted that the Sustainability Roadmaps only cover departments in the executive branch.

Item 5 | SB1 Adaptation Planning Grants Update

DISCUSSION: Presentation by Caltrans to update on SB1 adaptation planning grant program, including an overview of rounds 1 and 2 and timeline for round 3; update on Caltrans and ICARP partnership; lessons learned and insight on local needs and challenges.

Bruce Riordan: Could you please provide an update on the Caltrans vulnerability assessments?

Tracey Frost: District 4 is done. The remaining assessments and release times are as follows:

- District 2 – Redding and District 6 – Fresno Vulnerability Assessments will soon go public. They are downstairs in our PIO to be released any time.
- District 7 – Los Angeles, District 8 – San Bernardino, District 11 – San Diego and District 12 – Orange County are in the Final Draft phase where they are reviewing for final edits and sharing with stakeholders for feedback.
- District 3 – Marysville, District 9 – Bishop and District 10 – Stockton are the next round of draft Vulnerability assessments that should be ready for initial District review sometime in December/early January with final drafts ready for final edits and sharing with stakeholders for feedback anticipated in early spring 2019

- District 1 – Eureka, and District 5 – San Luis Obispo will be the last districts toward the end of 2019 because they are still collecting data with USGS.

All will have a summary report, technical report, and online viewer tools.

John Wentworth: We received an SB 1 grant, but people don't know where that money comes from. Our community would never have engaged without this. If prop 6 were to pass what would happen to these grants?

Tracey: Funds for planning grants will be safe because they are funded by public transportation account money. However, the adaptation planning grant was a one-time fund, so after this third round the grant program will close out. The goal is to integrate adaptation into other programs, but this won't be the primary focus.

Jonathan Parfrey: Is there an LA region contact for these funds? Local governments can be good conveners for engagement in the Caltrans Vulnerability Assessments.

Tracey Frost: I can put you into contact with someone. We definitely ask for local input. Coordination is necessary to achieve resilience. As drafts are coming out, we can help share that information through the ICARP list serve as well.

Jonathan Parfrey: What assumptions are used for the sea level rise data?

Nuin-Tara Key: The Coastal Commission is currently working to align their guidance with the Ocean Protection Council's, so if Caltrans is engaging with them then they are using best science. They do use high emissions.

John Blue: For the interactive mapping tools, did Caltrans develop proprietary maps or are they off the shelf? I'm looking for higher resolution maps of this.

Tracey Frost: We can coordinate and share this with you.

Brian Strong: Will Caltrans be following up assessments with strategies?

Tracey Frost: We will be making recommendations through adaptation plans and will include case studies for each stressor type. These plans will include some cost benefit analysis and will tie into asset management plans.

Brian strong: Are ongoing maintenance issues discussed, such as heat stress on pavement?

Tracey Frost: Caltrans was awarded \$60,000 for a pilot on resiliency and durability to extreme weather. Caltrans is developing a communication plan for this to expand to all operations and maintenance. We will be updating manuals, designs, etc.

Karalee Browne: Staggering the rounds of funding would help local governments apply for them. These cycles were so close together – and with such short turnaround - it is a real challenge for local governments to get applications in.

John Wentworth: Is there an assessment of state versus federal infrastructure? I am hoping the federal roads are being addressed somewhere as well – in an effort to ensure continuity between transportation systems managed by different entities.

Tracey Frost: We are looking at this connection but the assessment is not on federal infrastructure. However, we are trying to coordinate with federal agencies.

Bruce Riordan: It is impressive how well this grant program worked. Who is advocating for something for its replacement?

Liz Grassi: These things come through the legislature. There is no power to put this type of stuff in through a BCP in the budget.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received by OPR staff.

Item 6 | Adaptation Planning Guide Update

DISCUSSION: Presentation by the Governor’s Office of Emergency Services on the Adaptation Planning Guide update process; discussion of potential TAC engagement during update process.

John Wentworth: How can we make sure to prepare for both long and short-term climate impacts (sea level rise versus wildfire)?

Tina Curry: Regardless of the impact, these are long-term decisions. That is the question - how do we package this into planning techniques that help us make decisions on both short and long-term issues? The legislation requiring CalOES to update the APG directs us to tie this to safeguarding. That is what is driving this fast schedule for the update. It means we have to put our heads together quickly.

Adam Sutkus: This is why we are excited about workshops. We want to hear from all local entities so that we do not miss any needs.

John Wentworth: How can folks engage in this over next year?

Nuin-Tara Key: Related to that question - is there a specific way that the Council would like to engage with locals?

Bruce Riordan: Yes, there are long-term issues but it would be interesting if you would consider the APG to not be a standalone document. The guide could be half the effort and the rest would be more immediately responsive. I want to avoid this being a document that sits.

Jonathan Parfrey: Yes, if there was ever a product that should be iterative and live online, this is it.

Tina Curry: We want an interactive component; we just don’t know what that looks like yet.

Jonathan Parfrey: Checklists are helpful, as well as live tools.

Nuin-Tara Key: Whatever that interactive tool looks like, it will be integrated into the Adaptation Clearinghouse.

Brian Strong: San Francisco is making a hazard and resilience tool and is struggling with the maps right now. Mapping capabilities would be very helpful to have as part of this output. We don't have good integrated maps.

Adam Sutkus: CalOES's My Hazard/ My Plan are some useful tools for this, but this is something that we are hearing a lot and recognize that it would be useful to develop something further.

Kathleen Ave: I still reference the APG even though the document is dated. There are some important things in here like the notion of distant impacts in supply chains and lifeline utility interactions. I am glad to see integration of the LHMP process. I would also suggest a community planning approach that would identify roles in the process. For example, roles could be identified for water utilities or a CBO. Giving perspectives from different slices of the community would be helpful. Outline how to best utilize the guide depending on what type of user you are, and outline what to expect from other players as well.

Kit Batten: I want to make sure this process is connected with the CPUC ruling on adaptation. We have guidance now for investor owned utilities. Workgroups will address critical services and interactions between different parts of community. One of the things the OIR (Order Instituting Rulemaking) is doing is giving guidance on scenarios to use. Kristen Ralf Douglas would be good to connect on this.

Sona Mohnot: Will you be connecting to CBOs and grassroots communities in DACs to gather input in the update process?

Adam Sutkus: We are doing some but we can always do more. We have reached out to the tribal representative in OES. We will be visiting Tulare as well. We can talk more about this and should work together to make sure this happens.

Nuin-Tara Key: I would like to propose an action for us to discuss. I propose that Cal OES comes to the ICARP TAC Quarterly meetings for updates or for workshops/engagement. I also propose a workgroup meeting to discuss other local efforts or ways to engage through networks/communities.

Kit Batten: I would also add that we get Kristen Ralph Douglas to give updates on the CPUC OIR process too.

Kathleen: Yes, I agree.

Bruce Riordan: I propose that OES comes with questions that we can help answer, too, rather than just updates.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment received my OPR staff.

Move: Kit Batten

Second: Kathleen Ave

Aye: all

Item 7 | Strategic Growth Council Climate Change Research Program

DISCUSSION: Presentation by the Strategic Growth Council on the Climate Change Research Program, including an overview of Round 1 Awards and Round 2 program focus and process.

Jonathan Parfrey: Is there no scoring benefit for adaptation elements to the proposals?

Liz Grassi: There is nothing in the scoring process that gives more points for adaptation elements. There are extra points for cobenefits to disadvantaged communities. Our external committee did go through the research investment plan, which includes adaptation.

Jonathan Parfrey: Are there additional points for proposals that have good scalability?

Liz Grassi: Projects are awarded based on a balance of both greenhouse gas reduction and the viability of the project/technology.

Bruce Riordan: It seems as though the program is looking to fund new technology, but much of the issues our most vulnerable communities face are from a lack of financing. This is more related to social science than technology.

Liz Grassi: The program funds both the research of new technologies or application of current technologies.

David Loya: I would encourage the program to partner with local governments.

Liz Grasi: Yes, we do require partnerships with local governments.

Karalee Browne: We do appreciate the requirement to partner with local governments. However, the short timeframes are making it impossible for local governments to apply. There are also funds coming out from HCD, ARB, etc, and local governments cannot keep up. A lot of proposers are asking local governments to collaborate in such a short time frame.

Liz Grassi: you are right. With the upcoming change in administration it has been a quick process to get this out, but if the program continues, we will take our time and do outreach to past applicants. We will be making sure to ask how we can do this better.

And, for those who don't know, AB 2252 requires that by 2020 we have a local assistance portal at the state library that will require applicants to register with state library before NOFAs. This will also help long term planning with grants.

Jonathan Parfrey: SGC has jurisdiction in developing guidelines around SB 1072. Could this be a topic for another ICARP TAC meeting or do you have information you could share with us from SGC?

Liz Grassi: We are getting a new staff member next week that will help us with these efforts.

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes, and as this progresses the TAC can stay engaged.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment received my OPR staff.

Item 8 | Symposium Session: Navy Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) and community partnership examples and opportunities

SPEAKERS

OPR Military Affairs Framework

❖ **Scott Morgan, Deputy Director, Governor's Office of Planning and Research**

Port of San Diego and Navy Sea Level Rise Memorandum of Agreement

❖ **Eileen Maher, Director of Environmental Conservation, Port of San Diego**

Navy Intergovernmental Support Agreements and other public-private and public-public partnership opportunities

❖ **Garth Nagel, Community Planner, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC Southwest)**

❖ **Adrian Porter, Business Financial Manager, Navy Region Southwest (N52)**

Kit Batten: What are the next steps for the Port and navy?

Eileen Maher: The Port is working on putting together plan for AB 691 (a State Lands Commission requirement). We will be incorporating this SLR information into the plan and the SLR committee will also keep what other cities are doing in mind.

Garth Nagel: The Port is updating their master plan for the first time in a number of years. This is when the Navy got pulled into this. The MOA requires that we meet on regular basis, share data that we generate, and collaborate on short, medium and long range master plans. As Eileen said, the MOA was signed in July, and we have only had one formal meeting since then. The Port has hired a consultant team and USGS is helping with some analysis. One of the questions we have is which SLR assumptions to use. I don't think that will be difficult since our data are similar.

Bruce Roldan: It is impressive how much collaboration is going on here. Have there been any considerations to not build the Navy SEALs campus you pointed out?

Garth Nagel: I am not an expert on the campus, but the SEALs have a unique mission and training requirements. They have always had their operations along that area. It is a unique environment for the training that they do. There are not supposed to be impacts to sea level rise during the lifetime of the buildings. However, they are still thinking of raising the area and are considering potential other sites.

Joey Wraithwall: I see that you are using updated design guidance (in presentation). Is that a reference to building design standards that use climate information?

Garth Nagel: There are many guidelines for planning and design of military installations. My understanding is that some of those are being updated to reflect potential impacts to climate change. This document that was released (Climate Change Installation Adaptation and Resilience) is almost entirely focused on sea level rise.

John Wentworth: Do the IGSA (Intergovernmental Support Agreement) and MOA come from a federal toolkit? Can you use these across other agencies or just the Navy?

Adrian Porter: We created an IGSA, ran it through Navy legal and it is now the standard that will be used throughout the Navy. The air force has created their own, which has been in existence for a while.

Scott Morgan: IGSA's are usually used for cross services.

Nuin-Tara Key: I think looking at inland and drought impacts would be of interest too.

Jonathan Parfrey: I am thinking about electricity and grid resilience. This strikes me as something that a military could have a partnership with a utility for.

Adrian Porter: IGSA's can only be used for use between the partners. Services cannot be sold as a commercial source.

Jonathan Parfrey: Some utilities are unique to cities so that might work.

Adrian Porter: A public university system could also work. SMUD could do this.

Kathleen Ave: Are there any infrastructure investment policies that require adaptation considerations?

Scott Morgan: The state hasn't started looking at long term infrastructure with relation to federal military facilities. As Garth showed, they have been required to look at all coastal infrastructure. This plays into future funding that is needed to support testing and training.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment received my OPR staff.

Item 10 | Meeting Adjourned