

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program

Adaptation Planning Grant Program

Round 2 Program Guidelines

FY 2023 - 2024



Contents

Contents	2
Adaptation Planning Grant Program Summary	4
1. Program Overview	5
1.1. Navigating these Guidelines	5
1.2. Program Summary	5
1.3. Funding Availability	5
1.4. Program Goals & Vision for Equity	6
1.5. Program Timeline	7
2. Program Eligibility and Application	8
2.1. Applicant Eligibility	8
2.2. Project Eligibility	9
2.3. Eligible and Ineligible Costs	13
2.4. Funding Targets and Prioritization	15
2.5. Core Project Components	18
2.6. Application	21
2.7. Application Scoring	24
3. Grant Administration	30
3.1. Grant Management	30
3.2. Advanced Pay	31
3.3. Errors	33
3.4. Modification or Withdrawal of Proposal	33
3.5. Immaterial Defect	33
3.6. Responsibilities and Grant Agreement	33
3.7. No Agreement Until Signed or Approved	34
3.8. Reporting Templates and Forms	34
3.9. Confidential Information	34
4. Appendix	34
Appendix A. Relevant State Laws	34
Appendix B. California Climate Adaptation Strategy Regions	37
Appendix C. Tips for a Successful Adaptation Planning Grant	39
Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources	39
Appendix E. Application Scoring Criteria	43
Appendix F. State Planning Priorities	52



Appendix G. Post Award APGP Activities 52
Appendix H. Grant Agreement 54
Appendix I. Glossary..... 54
Appendix J: ICARP Grants Mapping Tool 59



Adaptation Planning Grant Program Summary

What is climate adaptation?

Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment. Adaptation to climate change refers to adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.

What is the Adaptation Planning Grant Program (APGP) and what does it fund?

APGP funds climate adaptation planning that addresses cross-sector issues intersecting with multiple climate risks. The program cultivates an inclusive and flexible funding program that removes obstacles for diverse applicants, while emphasizing the needs of vulnerable communities. It strengthens statewide resilience by providing technical assistance, fostering collaborative learning, and promoting equitable decision-making. Ultimately the program strives to address historical disparities and ensure broad community access to the associated benefits.

Who informed the development of APGP?

Over 1,095 individuals from 563 organizations – including state, regional, and federal agencies, local governments, California Native American Tribes, Community-Based Organizations and advocacy groups, informed the development of APGP. The engagement process involved convenings, listening sessions, focus groups, informant interviews, and public workshops. APGP staff also conducted 45 debrief interviews and collected 18 survey responses from unawarded applicants, to gather valuable feedback, ensuring continued responsiveness to statewide needs and expectations.

Who is eligible to apply?

Local Public Entities, California Native American Tribes, Community-Based Organizations, and Academic Institutions.

What is the award amount?

The funding range for APGP planning projects is between \$100,000 and \$650,000.

How do you apply?

- **Step 1:** Submit a [Pre-Application Interest Form](#). Applicants complete the form via Microsoft Forms between February 15, 2024, to May 6, 2024.
- **Step 2:** Submit the Main Application Form on Submittable. The main application form is only available for applicants who have completed the [Pre-Application Interest Form](#). Applications are due via Submittable before 5:00 p.m. PT on May 20, 2024.

Who was funded in Round 1?

Round 1 funded 14 projects in total. Visit the [APGP Round 1 Grantees webpage](#).



For more information – visit the [APGP website](#) and sign up for the [APGP email list](#)

1. Program Overview

1.1. Navigating these Guidelines

The following guidelines govern Round 2 of the Adaptation Planning Grant Program (APGP). These Guidelines are a step-by-step guide for learning more about, applying for, and participating in APGP.

1.2. Program Summary

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR), through the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program (ICARP), received funding for APGP through the State's 2021-2022 Budget [[Senate Bill \(SB\) 170 \(Skinner, 2021\)](#)], which funded ambitious measures to build climate adaptation and resilience through planning, research, capacity building, restoration, and sustainable infrastructure. APGP advances ICARP's statutory mission to develop a cohesive, equitable, and integrated response to the impacts of climate change through direct funding support for local, regional, and tribal adaptation planning across California [([SB 246 \(Wieckowski, 2015\)](#))]. APGP funds integrated climate planning activities throughout the State.

For an overview of current state laws associated with climate adaptation and resilience refer to [Appendix B. Relevant State Laws](#).

OPR, through ICARP, administers the APGP and received funding in Fiscal Years (FY) 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 to implement the program through the provision of grants and staff support. Applications can request between \$100,000 and \$650,000 in total state funding for planning projects spanning twenty-four months.

The program will be administered in three rounds. Below is the anticipated funding available for each round:

- Round 1 (FY 22-23): \$8,000,000 – [View Awards Here](#)
- Round 2 (FY 23-24): \$9,500,000
- Round 3 (FY 24-25): \$4,500,000 (TBD)

1.3. Funding Availability

OPR will award \$9,500,000 million in FY 2023-24 to implement the program through the provision of grants, staff support, and third-party technical assistance. Grant awards will cover 24 months. The application submission period is February 16 - May 20, 2024.

- The minimum grant award is \$100,000
- The maximum grant award amount is \$650,000

Awarded projects should be completed no later than 24 months after the start of the grant agreement. The anticipated grant agreement start date is Jan. 1, 2025. The period of grant fund availability spans approximately 24 months for grant project activities after the grant



agreement is executed and OPR issues a Notice to Proceed. Refer to [Section 1.5. Program Timeline](#) for details regarding the anticipated grant project start and expiration dates. Award Amount Applicants have the flexibility to request the amount of funding needed to carry out the work described in their project proposal for the two-year grant term. Requests should fall within the range of \$100,000 to \$650,000.

1.4. Program Goals & Vision for Equity

In 2018, the ICARP Technical Advisory Council (TAC) defined vulnerable communities as those that “experience heightened risk and increased sensitivity to climate change and have less capacity and fewer resources to cope with, adapt to, or recover from climate impacts. These disproportionate effects are caused by physical (built and environmental), social, political, and/or economic factor(s), which are exacerbated by climate impacts. These factors include, but are not limited to, race, class, sexual orientation and identification, national origin, and income inequality.”

APGP’s approach to building statewide resilience is twofold: first, by prioritizing funding, capacity building resources, and equitable decision-making power for vulnerable communities by to address their unique policy, systems, and environmental challenges they face and second, through integrated climate adaptation planning that addresses cross-sector issues intersecting multiple climate risks. The strategy to prioritize California’s most vulnerable communities starts with a flexible and inclusive program that actively removes obstacles in the grant application process and provides technical assistance tailored to unique circumstances of vulnerable communities. Simultaneously, the program emphasizes equitable decision-making, and acknowledges the specific needs, strengths, and assets of vulnerable communities. Ultimately, APGA strives to redress the enduring effects of historical marginalization and disinvestment and ensure broad community access to the associated benefits of climate adaptation.

The key priorities and goals of ICARP’s APGA are to:

- **Enhance Accessibility and Diversity:** Minimize barriers for applicants and ensure that both applicants and awardees represent a broad spectrum of geographic, economic, and demographic diversity, driving the program's core mission of inclusivity.
- **Prioritize Vulnerable Communities:** Prioritize the unique needs of vulnerable communities, including addressing historic and continuing marginalization and systemic oppression through policy, systems, and environmental changes as a means to increase community resilience. This includes emphasizing an all-risk approach to adaptation planning and encouraging community preparedness for and responding to the multitude of cascading and compounding impacts associated with climate change.
- **Emphasize Integrated Infrastructure Planning:** Place a strong emphasis on the integration of social and physical infrastructure planning. This involves addressing cross-sector issues that intersect with various climate risks, such as transportation, public health, economic stability, housing, natural resource management, hazard mitigation, public infrastructure, and healthy food access, among others, to prepare communities for the health, social, economic, environmental, and other multifaceted impacts of climate change.



- **Integrate Financing Strategies for Resilience:** Emphasize planning for long-term funding and finance strategies to sustain community-wide resilience.
- **Build Community Capacity for Resilience:** Enhance statewide capacity for adaptation and resiliency planning through the provision of technical support, the facilitation of peer-to-peer learning, the establishment of communities of practice, and the promotion of information sharing, empowering communities with knowledge and resources to bolster their ability to adapt effectively to climate change.
- **Elevate Equity in the Planning Process:** Prioritize fair access to community investment benefits and privileges, ensuring that all communities participate have equitable engagement and shared decision-making power in planning processes and benefit from climate resilience efforts. The program directs funding to disadvantaged communities and elevates projects that address historical disparities for a more equitable future.

1.5. Program Timeline

The proposed timeline below is subject to change. The most up-to-date timeline can be found on the [APGP website](#).

Milestones	Dates
ICARP Grant Pre-Application Interest Form, Solicitation Release & Final Guideline Launch	February 16, 2024
Priority Deadline for Application Technical Assistance (refer to Section 2.6. Technical Assistance (TA) for more information)	March 18, 2024
Deadline for submitting Pre-Application Interest Forms (refer to Section 2.6. Application Process for more information)	May 6, 2024
Deadline for submitting Main Application Forms by 5:00 p.m (refer to Section 2.6 Application Process for more information)	May 20, 2024
Anticipated Notice of Recommended Awards Posting Date	June 29, 2024
Anticipated Start Date	December 1, 2024
Anticipated End Date	January 31, 2027
Invoice Deadline	January 31, 2027



2. Program Eligibility and Application

2.1. Applicant Eligibility

Lead Applicants

Eligible Applicants may include, but are not limited to:

Local Public Entities *Local public entities mentioned below applying for projects in their constituencies should partner with one or more community-based organizations.*

- Cities
- Counties
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Joint Powers Authorities
- Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
- Regional Climate Protection Authorities
- Councils of Governments
- Congestion Management Agencies
- Groundwater Sustainability Agencies
- Climate Resilience Districts
- School Districts
- Special Districts (e.g., resource conservation districts, harbor districts, health care districts)
- Local or Regional Public Authorities
- Local or Regional Public Agencies
- Political subdivisions other than those mentioned above

California Native American Tribes (Tribes) *Tribes are not required to partner with a public entity or other Co-Applicants, nor required to submit any justification related to Co-Applicant partnerships or lack thereof.*

- Federally recognized Native American tribes
- Non-federally recognized tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004 (Pub. Resources Code, § 21073).

Community-based Organizations *Community-based organizations should partner with a local public entity or Tribe as listed above to ensure that planning efforts funded can ultimately be implemented by local, regional, or tribal entities.*

- Non-governmental organizations
- 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations
- Philanthropic organizations
- Foundations
- Legal entities such as organizations, collaboratives, networks, and projects that are fiscally sponsored by a non-profit or academic institutions and authorized and empowered to enter contracts and hold funds



Academic Institutions *Academic Institutions should partner with at least one local public entity or Tribe and at least one community-based organization as listed above.*

- Academic Institutions include individual public California institutions of higher education (e.g., universities, community colleges, etc.).

Ineligible Applicants

The following entities are not eligible applicants.

- State Agencies
 - This restriction applies to all regional conservancies, councils, and commissions listed on the [State Agency Listing](#)
- Federal Agencies
- For-Profit Entities
- Individual Community Members

Note: For-profit and individual community members can be subcontracted to provide research or other services. All ineligible applicants can provide letters of support.

2.2. Project Eligibility

Examples of Eligible and Ineligible Planning Activities

The following examples of eligible adaptation planning activities derive from feedback provided throughout APGP engagement and are structured around the [California Adaptation Planning Guide \(2020\)](#), which outlines a step-by-step process broken into four planning phases that communities can use to plan for climate change. The guide is designed to be flexible and responsive to community needs and includes summaries of statewide guidance, resources, examples, and tools throughout each phase. Additionally, equity and community engagement are integrated throughout all phases and should be considered for all proposed activities.

Eligible activities must fit into one or more of the four phases included below, as defined by the California Adaptation Planning Guide. While the following eligible activities are outlined in phases, eligible project activities can occur at any stage of this planning framework. This list includes just some examples of eligible activities and is not comprehensive.

Note, there are no specific funding allocations related to these four-phases.

PHASE 1: EXPLORE, DEFINE, AND INITIATE

Adaptation planning efforts should start with Phase 1, or a scoping phase. Scoping activities, such as the examples below, can help establish the basic aspects of the planning effort, the issues it could address, and who might be involved. Making these decisions at the beginning of the process helps ensure that the planning effort will be thorough, integrated, and equitable.

- Identification of goals, objectives, and scope of work for an adaptation planning activity or set of activities through community visioning and engagement activities.
- Development of educational resources, training, technical assistance and other capacity-building resources for decision-makers, planners, and community members



to provide the knowledge and resources necessary for preparing and/or contributing to a useful and meaningful planning product or suite of products.

- Design or enhancement of a community outreach and engagement approach that promotes and is expected to result in innovative and meaningful program(s) and/or practice(s) built upon the input and expertise of diverse interested parties, including public entity staff, community-based organizations, workforce development boards, and groups currently experiencing or projected to experience a disproportionate burden of climate-related health, social, economic, and environmental impacts, including individuals or groups experiencing historic and current marginalization, disinvestment and oppression.
- Mobilizing volunteer efforts, Cal Volunteers [programs](#), or other community service programs in support of other planning activities.
- Creation or enhancement of collaboratives, working groups, public-private partnerships, and advisory bodies – with equitable representation of populations facing historic and continuing marginalization and disinvestment - to establish equitable, shared decision-making processes and build community capacity for participating in an adaptation and hazard mitigation planning activity or set of activities through community visioning and engagement activities.
- Identification of goals, objectives, and scope of work for a climate adaptation planning activity, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), or set of climate and community resilience planning activities through community visioning and engagement activities.
- Identification of one or more funding or financing sources to complement current or future activities, such as the following federal funding programs: [FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance Program](#) (HMGP), [Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities](#) (BRIC), [Flood Mitigation Assistance](#) (FMA), Fire Management Assistance Grant (FMAG), and [HUD's Community Development Block Grant Mitigation](#) (CDBG-MIT) program. For State programs, explore these [Resilience Funding Summary Charts](#).

[Learn more about Phase 1](#). Review Phase 1 resources in [Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#).

PHASE 2: ASSESS VULNERABILITY

Phase 2 includes vulnerability and risk assessment activities that help to identify and characterize the climate hazards and other climate effects a community faces. Phase 2 dives deeper into the planning process, creating a more comprehensive assessment of vulnerability to climate change effects, while helping users align their vulnerability studies with the latest state and federal resources and requirements.

- Development of a climate vulnerability assessment or suite of assessments that identify and characterize the climate hazards and other climate effects a community and/or place faces. This includes identification of exposure and sensitivity to climate hazards, assessment of potential impact, including potential health outcomes and adaptive capacity, and then identification of vulnerability to climate impacts, including social conditions. If a public entity is a lead Applicant, the Applicant should review all requirements implemented by SB 379 (Jackson, 2015) and SB 1035 (Jackson, 2018) (codified at [Government Code section 65302](#), subdivisions (g)(4) and (g)(6)) to ensure compliance with these statutes. A Health Impact Assessment



framework can be included in this suite of assessments and assess the risks associated with potential health impacts of climate change, and to provide decision-makers with information that can facilitate the development of an adaptation plan that effectively moderates or avoids potential health impacts.

- Development of a risk assessment that includes information on previous occurrences of hazard events and the probability of future hazard events, and an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on a community, including impact on health outcomes, housing and mobile homes, and critical infrastructure.
- Community engagement and collaboration with diverse interested parties to identify neighborhood strengths, assets, and climate change effects (e.g., participatory asset mapping, storytelling timelines, and community-based participatory research), and incorporation of these community-driven identifications into a vulnerability assessment or suite of assessments.
- Execution of studies and analyses (e.g., analysis of fiscal impacts) that inform a community's efforts to address the impacts of climate change.
- Development of a FEMA-approved Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) to quantify the future risk reduction benefits of a hazard mitigation project.

[Learn more about Phase 2.](#) Review Phase 2 resources in [Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#).

PHASE 3: DEFINE ADAPTATION FRAMEWORK AND STRATEGIES

Phase 3 activities prepare and solidify the community's adaptation framework, which identifies specific policies and implementable strategies for adapting to climate change, thus making the community more resilient.

- Preparation, adoption, and implementation of a general plan or general plan element(s) that incorporate(s) climate risk, aligned with Government Code section 65302, subdivision (g)(4).
- Preparation and adoption of another plan or suite of plans that incorporate climate risk (e.g., community plans, specific plans, corridor plans, community health improvement plans).
- Preparation, adoption, and implementation of climate action and/or adaptation plan.
- Preparation, adoption, and implementation of a mitigation strategy that identifies a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and potential projects to reduce the effects of natural hazards, with an emphasis on protecting human health and preventing exacerbation of existing health, social and economic inequities. Community engagement to identify strategies and actions responsive to local climate risks.
- Incorporation of shared data, vision, strategies, and processes across suites of plans to promote alignment and integration.

[Learn more about Phase 3.](#) Review Phase 3 resources in [Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#).

PHASE 4: IMPLEMENT, MONITOR, EVALUATE, AND ADJUST

Phase 4 activities use the adaptation framework to prepare an implementation program that puts adaptation strategies into action.



- Preparation of an action plan, or funding plan to put a strategy or set of strategies into action.
- Preparation of federal implementation grant applications or other similar grant funding opportunities.
- Preparation of a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) to be eligible for FEMA hazard mitigation assistance funding.
- Incorporation of the most recently updated LHMP into a General Plan Safety Element. Assembly Bill (AB) 2140 (2006) (codified at [Government Code, §§ 65302.6](#) and [8685.9](#)) allows jurisdictions to be eligible to apply for state funding to cover the local match (6.25%) of FEMA Public Assistance (PA) costs for recovery activities after hazard events, if the local jurisdiction incorporates their LHMP into the Safety Element of their General Plan.
- Complete application development for another State or Federal climate resilient infrastructure or hazard mitigation funding program.
- Creation of a monitoring program to track future strategy implementation, and establishment of an accompanying evaluation process to assess how long the strategy(ies) and accompanying vulnerability assessment(s) will serve the community.
- Evaluation, updating, and streamlining of various policies and codes currently enforced by local departments (e.g., public works, health and safety, fire, water, parks, and open space, etc.) to incorporate climate risk and resilience.
- Identifying and preparing project sites for implementation of a community adaptation strategy or set of strategies, including site identification, feasibility studies, and planning for project readiness.
- Community engagement, collaboration, and co-ownership activities in support of any of the above.

[Learn more about Phase 4.](#) Review Phase 4 resources in [Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#).

Ineligible Activities

Some activities, tasks, project components, etc. are not eligible under this grant program. If an application has any of the following elements, it will be disqualified.

- Implementation of construction projects, including:
 - Direct and indirect construction costs
 - Initiation documents
 - Engineering plans and design specification work
 - Capital costs or maintenance costs
- Legislative lobbying and lawsuits
- Environmental studies, documents or other activities conducted to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

2.3. Eligible and Ineligible Costs

Eligible Costs

The list below provides eligible costs using grant funds. Applicants should ensure that costs proposed in the project budget are eligible for funding. Costs deemed ineligible in the application review process will be removed and the project's recommended total award will be adjusted accordingly.

- **Staff Costs:** Grant recipients, subgrantees, and their contractors' staff costs, including salary at an hourly rate, benefits, taxes, and leave. Staff may be full- or part-time employees. If Applicants wish to use grant funds to pay for interns, fellows, or other positions that are not on an organization's payroll, these costs should be classified in the budget as a direct cost via a consultant contract.
- **Program Meeting/Workshop Attendance:** Applicants are recommended to hold a minimum of 3% of their total project budget to participate in program meetings and workshops, including regular check-in meetings, peer-to-peer learning sessions, and virtual technical assistance events.
- **Travel Costs:** Travel reimbursements should adhere to the State rates and conditions established on the [CalHR website](#), except for "incidentals" and out-of-state travel, which will not be reimbursable under this grant.
- **Language and Information Access:** Personnel or subcontractor costs associated with translation, interpretation, or web design services for meetings, digital content, or printed materials.
- **Evaluation Activities:** Personnel or subcontractor costs associated with the evaluation of project activities and report development.
- **Engagement, Outreach, Education, and Training:** Costs related to the development and administration of engagement, outreach, education, and training activities under the grant, including, but not limited to:
 - Materials developed for outreach events, training, and other grant activities.
 - Access to proprietary data or research materials to conduct research, market, and feasibility studies, compiling and analyzing community needs-related information studies, and access proprietary data.
 - Facilitation of meetings.
 - Marketing and advertisements.
 - Community participant compensation that is an exchange of payment for services rendered in the development of outreach or work products, and appropriately documented with deliverables such as sign-in sheets or written surveys. Subcontractors and consultants should be qualified to provide services. It is the responsibility of the lead Applicant to comply with all applicable laws.

- Transportation stipends and provision of transportation services for community residents, such as a vanpool.
- Rental costs of equipment, facilities, or venues.
- Provision of childcare or dependent-care services for community residents at project sponsored events.
- Food and refreshments that are determined to be an integral part of the event. Examples of activities where it would be appropriate to approve food purchases would include a design charrette held in the evening, where the meal is consumed as part of the event and replaces a meal otherwise missed by attending the event.
- **New Partnerships:** Applicants may set aside grant funds from the budget to account for new Partners added during the grant term (refer to [Section 2.5. Co-Applicants & Partnership](#) for more information on partnerships).
- **Indirect Administrative Costs:** May account for up to 20% of the total APGP award. Costs incurred by the recipient to administer the grant, or costs incurred by subgrantees to perform the tasks necessary to fulfill the deliverables outlined in these guidelines. Administrative costs include, but are not limited to:
 - Prorated general liability, workers' compensation (may be included in payroll), and automotive insurance.
 - Personnel costs associated with administrative, supervisory, legal, and executive staff.
 - Personnel costs associated with support units, including clerical support, and housekeeping.
 - Operating expenses and equipment costs not included as part of direct project costs (functions such as accounting, budgeting, audits, business services, information technology, web design services, janitorial; and rent, utilities, supplies, etc.).

Ineligible Costs

Grant funds may not be used for the following costs and are not reimbursable:

- Indirect costs in excess of 20% of the awarded APGP funds
- Costs that occur outside of the grant agreement term
- Direct lobbying
- Office furniture purchases, or other capital expenditures
- Acquisition of vehicles or shuttle programs
- Organizational membership fees
- The following costs associated with community engagement and outreach:
 - Direct cash benefits or subsidies to participants are ineligible. However, participants can be compensated for services rendered (Refer to [Section 2.3. Eligible and Ineligible Costs](#) for more information).
 - Alcoholic refreshments



- Participant incentives, such as door prizes, which are unrelated to specific community work
- General meetings that do not specifically discuss or advance implementation of the APGP Project
- All ineligible activities (refer to [Section 2.2. Ineligible Activities](#) for more information).

2.4. Funding Targets and Prioritization

Funding Targets

APGP recognizes that climate change disproportionately affects vulnerable and under-resourced communities. To address this, the program is committed to ensuring an equitable distribution of funds through specific funding targets. These funding targets intend to allocate a portion of APGP funding to support California Native American Tribes, Disadvantaged Communities (DACs), and Small and Rural Communities.

- Despite the history of violence, exploitation, discrimination, and dispossession, California Native American tribes continue to steward, manage, and live interdependently with the lands, waters, and natural resources that now make up the State of California. APGP recognizes this truth and the crucial leadership role that tribes play in enhancing the state's climate adaptation potential. APGP respects the sovereignty of California Native American Tribes and their decisions regarding engagement with the program. The APGP team is actively working to ensure funds are accessible and can effectively support tribal-led climate adaptation and resilience projects.
- California's Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) are the subject of historical and ongoing environmental injustices which severely impact the adaptive capacity and overall health of those communities. AB 535 defines DACs as areas most affected by pollution and the people most vulnerable to its effects, based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazards criteria.
- California's Small and Rural Communities often face unique climate adaptation challenges. These communities often experience heightened physical isolation from critical infrastructure and services, increased dependence on natural resources, and economic diversification challenges, to name a few.

Unless otherwise specified, projects from these target groups must meet all APGP grant application requirements. If the number of applications falls short of eligibility requirements, OPR reserves the right to waive or adjust the funding targets. While these funding targets are a priority, the APGP does not exclusively prioritize projects from California Native American Tribes, DACs, and Small and Rural Communities.

Note: APGP staff will prioritize proposals from targeted communities for Application Technical Assistance (refer to [Section 2.6. Technical Assistance \(TA\)](#), as these communities typically face more barriers to access and less capacity to apply for competitive grant programs.

CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES



APGP aims to allocate funding to three, or more, qualifying projects led by California Native American Tribes, eligible entities having co-ownership with a California Native American Tribe, or eligible entities led by a California Native American Tribe. This funding target prioritizes a portion of APGA funding for tribal entities and is designed with maximum flexibility to meet the needs of California Native American Tribes and tribal communities in their climate adaptation process.

DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC)

APGP intends to award four or more qualifying projects that directly benefit disadvantaged communities by ensuring that at least 51% of the project area is comprised of disadvantaged communities using the ICARP Grants Mapping Tool (refer to [Appendix J](#) for more information).

In order to showcase that your project meets this criterion, follow these instructions:

- **Step 1:** Open the [ICARP Grants Mapping Tool](#).
- **Step 2:** Check the box next to any relevant layer from the Layers List menu that says “DAC” in the name.
- **Step 3:** Click on the “Search” icon in top left corner of the mapping pane then type in the location of your project area. A drop-down menu will appear with a list of options. Select the option that best represents your project area. The map will then pinpoint your location and a “Search Result” box will appear with the name of your project area.
- **Step 4:** Below the Layers List menu on the left, you will see a “DAC Percentage” menu. Select the chart that matches your selected layer from the Layers List.
- **Step 5:** Click the checkbox that says, “Use spatial filter to limit features.”
- **Step 6:** Select the “Only features intersecting a user-defined area.” icon.
- **Step 7:** Choose the “Freehand Polygon” tool.
- **Step 8:** Utilize the “Freehand Polygon” tool to draw a line around your project’s geographic boundary. Initiate the polygon by pressing down and releasing upon completion. Then click “Apply”. When selecting a specific census tract, hover over the tract without the need to trace its entirety. If adjustments are necessary, double-click on the highlighted area to remove the select. Ensure the select window remains open while drawing the boundary.
- **Step 9:** Once your boundary has been selected, you should see a “DAC” pie chart on the layers pane. The blue represents census tracts that are DAC, and the orange represents census tracts that are not DAC. If your project’s geographical boundary is over 51% DAC, your project meets the criteria for the DAC funding target.
- **Step 10:** Click on the “Print” icon within the mapping pane to download a PDF image of your Map results. For the Layout, select “MAP_ONLY”. For the format, select “JPG”. Then click “Print”. An image of your map will save to your computer. You will attach this JPG image when filling out your [Pre-Application Interest Form](#) and Main Application on Submittable.



SMALL AND RURAL COMMUNITIES

The APGP intends to award three, or more, qualifying projects to small and rural communities by identifying communities situated 100% outside of contiguous urban areas, with populations fewer than 75,000, and designated as low-income per [Assembly Bill \(AB\) 1550](#) using the ICARP Grants Mapping Tool (refer to [Appendix J](#) for more information).

To qualify your project as a Small and Rural Community, follow these instructions:

- **Step 1:** Open the [ICARP Grants Mapping Tool](#).
- **Step 2:** Click the checkbox that says “Small and Rural Communities (APGP Only)” from the Layer List on the left side.
- **Step 3:** Click on the “Search” icon within the mapping pane then type in the name of the location of your proposed project. A drop-down menu will appear with a list of options. Select the option that best represents your project area. The map will then pinpoint your location and a “Search Result” box will appear with the name of your project area.
- **Step 4:** Below the Layers List menu on the left, you will see a Charts menu. Select the "Small and Rural Communities (APGP Only)" chart.
- **Step 5:** Click the checkbox that says, “Use spatial filter to limit features.”
- **Step 6:** Select the “Only features intersecting a user-defined area.” icon.
- **Step 7:** Choose the “Freehand Polygon” tool.
- **Step 8:** Utilize the “Freehand Polygon” tool to draw a line around your project’s geographic boundary. Initiate the polygon by pressing down and releasing upon completion. Then click “Apply”. When selecting a specific census tract, hover over the tract without the need to trace its entirety. If adjustments are necessary, double-click on the highlighted area to remove the select. Ensure the select window remains open while drawing the boundary.
- **Step 9:** Once your boundary has been selected, you should see a “Small and Rural” pie chart on the layers pane. The yellow represents census tracts that are Small and Rural Communities, and the purple represents census tracts that are not Small and Rural Communities. If your project’s geographical boundary is 100% Small and Rural Communities, then your project meets the criteria for the Small and Rural Communities funding target.
- **Step 10:** Click on the “Print” icon within the mapping pane to download a PDF image of your Map results. For the Layout, select "MAP_ONLY". For the format, select "JPG". Then click "Print". An image of your map will save to your computer. You will attach this JPG image when filling out your [Pre-Application Interest Form](#) and Main Application on Submittable.

REGIONAL DIVERSITY

While the APGP provides applicants the flexibility to self-identify the geographic focus and partnership structure of their projects, to achieve regional diversity, APGP intends to fund at least one qualifying project from each of the nine geographic regions defined by the California Climate Adaptation Strategy (refer to [Appendix B. California Climate Adaptation Strategy Regions](#) for more information).



2.5. Core Project Components

All applications should include the following core project components in their projects. These components consist of partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, plan alignment, and integrated financing strategies.

Co-Applicants & Partnership

To be eligible for APGP, the Lead Applicant must partner with at least one Co-Applicant unless a justification is submitted. Partnering with more than one Co-Applicant is encouraged. Together, the Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant(s) partners are collectively referred to as "Applicants." In the application's narrative section, Applicants must detail the partnership structure and the roles and responsibilities of each of the Applicants.

PUBLIC ENTITIES PARTNERSHIPS

If the Lead Applicant is a public agency, they must partner with at least one [community-based organization](#) or California Native American Tribe.

Requirements

- Public entities should partner with community-based organizations or tribe to ensure that planning efforts prioritize the needs of vulnerable communities.
- Strong and diverse partnerships should include groups with unique strengths and community-informed approaches, demonstrating a track record of effectively engaging communities.
- Community partnership should identify key interest groups and potential partners early in the application and development process, using established community engagement methods like participatory budgeting or the formation of an advisory board.

Justification

- If establishing a community partnership is not feasible, Applicants should provide a written explanation as to why partnership isn't feasible and/or a plan describing how they will engage with the community and create partnership opportunities (refer to [Section 2.7. Community Partnership](#) for more information).

COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION PARTNERSHIPS

If the Lead Applicant is a community-based organization, they must partner with at least one public entity or California Native American Tribe.

Requirements

- Community-based organizations should partner with a local public entity or Tribe to ensure that planning efforts funded can ultimately be implemented by local, regional, or tribal entities.

Justifications



- If it is not feasible to obtain public entity or tribal support, community-based organization Applicants should explain why partnering with a public entity or tribe is not possible (refer to [Section 2.7. Community Partnership](#) for more information).

ACADEMIC INSTITUTION PARTNERSHIPS

If the Lead Applicant is an academic institution, they must partner with at least one public entity or California Native American Tribe and one community-based organization.

Requirements

- Academic Institutions should partner with a local public entity or Tribe to ensure that planning efforts funded can ultimately be implemented by local, regional, or tribal entities.
- Academic Institutions should also partner with a community-based organization to ensure that planning efforts prioritize the needs of vulnerable communities.

Justifications

- If it is not feasible to obtain public entity or tribal support, academic institution Applicants should explain why partnering with a public entity or tribe is not possible.
- If establishing a community partnership is not feasible, Applicants should provide a written explanation and a plan describing how they will engage with the community and create partnership opportunities (refer to [Section 2.7. Community Partnership](#) for more information).

CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE PARTNERSHIPS

Tribes are exempt from the requirements to partner with a public entity or other Co-Applicants and are not required to submit a justification to demonstrate that such a partnership is not feasible.

LIMITED WAIVERS OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

OPR acknowledges the sovereignty of Federally recognized Tribes. Federally recognized Tribes serving in the role of Lead or Co-Applicant will not be required to submit a limited waiver of sovereign immunity to OPR.

Prioritization of Vulnerable Communities

All Applicants should consider and address how the project will serve members of Vulnerable Communities, including Access and Functional Needs Communities (AFN), tribal communities, rural communities, and Disadvantaged Communities. These disparities arise from physical (built and environmental), social, political, and/ or economic factor(s), which are exacerbated by climate impacts. These factors include, but are not limited to race, class, sexual orientation and identification, national origin, and income inequality.

While not an exhaustive list, the provided tools and data can be used to identify climate vulnerable communities. Recognizing that no single tool is can comprehensively identify all vulnerable communities, each Applicant is encouraged to use a combination of tools from the list below to identify their unique, vulnerable communities.



- [CalEnviroScreen 4.0 \(CES\)](#) – CalEnviroScreen can be used to describe the disadvantaged communities based on historic pollution exposure and socio-economic indicators within the physical scope of the proposed project.
- [California Healthy Places Index \(HPI\)](#) – The Healthy Places Index is a dataset and online tool that maps local factors that predict life expectancy and compares community conditions across the State. The HPI combines community characteristics, like access, to healthcare, housing, education, and more, into a single indexed score. Higher HPI scores represent healthier communities. Applicants can also reference the [California Healthy Places Index Extreme Heat Addition](#).
- [Climate Change & Health Vulnerability Indicators for California \(CCHVI\)](#) – The CCHVI tool can be used by local health partners and planners to identify people and places that are more susceptible to adverse health impacts associated with climate change, specifically extreme heat, wildfire, sea level rise, drought, and poor air quality.
- [Access and Functional Needs \(AFN\) Web Map](#) – Can be used to assist emergency managers and planners to identify Access and Functional Needs Communities.
- The Social Vulnerability Scores from the [Federal Emergency Management Agency's \(FEMA\) National Risk Index](#) –The [Social Vulnerability Scores](#) can be used to determine susceptibility of social groups to adverse impacts from current and historic natural hazards for each United States county and Census tract.
- [Climate and Environmental Justice Screening Tool](#) – CEJST can be used to identify disadvantaged communities that meet the Justice40 Initiative. The tool uses eight indicators of burden through census tract data: climate change, energy, health, housing, legacy pollution, transportation, water and wastewater, and workforce development.

Refer to [Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#) for additional guidance and resources.

Plan Alignment

Plan alignment is one of the most effective strategies to accelerate the development and implementation of holistic and effective resilience plans and processes. For State information on plan alignment best practices, guidance, and examples, applicants can reference OPR's [Climate Resilience Plan Alignment Toolkit](#). Information in the Toolkit is useful for developing collaborative and cross-jurisdictional proposals. Applicants will have the opportunity to demonstrate that their proposed projects are consistent with relevant local, regional, or statewide plans, use the best available science, and foster an aligned, collaborative planning approach. An Applicant should demonstrate this consistency by describing the proposed project's alignment with existing, relevant plans and how the proposed project incorporates best available science in the application narrative.

ALIGNMENT WITH EXISTING LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATEWIDE PLANS

Applicants may reference various plans when developing their proposals, including the [California Climate Adaptation Strategy](#), the California [Extreme Heat Action Plan](#), the [State Hazard Mitigation Plan](#), other state plans, city or county general plans, local hazard mitigation plans, climate action plans, tribal-led plans, integrated regional water management plans, or other local plans. As a starting point, applicants can use the [ResilientCA Adaptation Planning map](#) to search for relevant city and county plans, and the



[Adaptation Clearinghouse](#) to search for other adaptation efforts and resources by location, climate impact or topic.

Note that planning projects may also include efforts to revise land use plans consistent with the jurisdiction's goals and policies. Plans should also consider any anticipated growth in population or density in the communities the proposed project or plan will serve, including accounting for population growth due to planned housing development. If an Applicant does not demonstrate consistency with a jurisdiction's goals and policies, and its proposed project does not include an effort to update the goals and policies to remedy that inconsistency, the Applicant should explain the reasons in the application. The Applicant should also explain how its proposed project is still consistent with the goals and priorities of the APGP.

ALIGNMENT WITH THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE AND INFORMATION

For alignment with the best available science Applicants can reference data, findings, projections, and models within the most current [California Climate Change Assessments](#), [CalAdapt](#), and other resources referenced in [Appendix E. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources](#). Tribal communities are encouraged to use Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge(s). If applicants reference sources other than those listed above, such as local studies, applicants should describe how/why those sources demonstrate the best available science and why APGP listed sources do not apply.

Integrated Financing Strategies for Climate Resilience

To ensure the sustainability of these projects, it is imperative to integrate state or federal infrastructure grant alignment and/or financing solutions into the core of adaptation planning projects. By strategically linking climate adaptation planning with state or federal infrastructure grants or longer-term financing solutions, communities can tap into essential financial resources to sustain their resilience efforts.

Incorporating these goals into the planning process enables communities to access crucial financial support, enhancing their capacity to implement innovative solutions that address the evolving challenges posed by a changing climate. By integrating financing solutions into climate adaptation planning, communities can unlock sustainable funding mechanisms that extend beyond the initial project phases.

Applicants are encouraged to refer to external resources when developing their proposals, such as: [Fourth Climate Change Assessment - Climate Adaptation Finance and Investment in California](#), [Adaptation Finance Challenges: Characteristic Patterns Facing California Local Governments and Ways to Overcome Them](#) and [Paying for Climate Adaptation in California: A Primer for Practitioners](#).

2.6. Application

Application Process

Planning grants will be evaluated and awarded through a competitive process. The APGP will use a two-phased application process for all Applicants. Applications will be submitted electronically on Submittable and ICARP staff will provide additional information about the application process with the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and Application materials.



PHASE 1: PRE-APPLICATION INTEREST FORM

February 16, 2024, staff will release a [Pre-Application Interest Form](#) which constitutes the first phase of the application process. Prospective Applicants, comprised of a Lead Applicant and/or Co-Applicant(s), are required to complete the Form to indicate their intent to apply to the program and gain access to Submittable, an online application platform. Completed Forms will be accepted on a rolling basis from February 16, 2024 – May 6, 2024. Completing the Form allows prospective Applicants to provide a broad overview of their proposed project, contact information, estimated budget, and request for Application Technical Assistance. APGP staff strongly encourage Applicants to fill out the form as soon as they are able and anticipate the form will take approximately 30 minutes to fill out. Pre-Application Interest Forms are not scored. .

PHASE 2: MAIN APPLICATION

The main application and application materials will be released via Submittable, an online application platform, to all prospective Applicants who completed the Phase 1: [Pre-Application Interest Form](#). All application materials are due by **5:00 p.m. (PT), May 20, 2024**. All applications and submitted materials are subject to the Public Records Act (Gov. Code, § 7920.000 et seq.) requirements and certain information may be publicly disclosed pursuant to those requirements.

Below is a summary of the Main Application components to be submitted on Submittable:

- Project Vision and Description Narrative
- Community Need and Adaptive Capacity Narrative
- Co-Benefits Narrative
- Community Partnership Narrative
- Workplan containing clear timelines, discrete tasks, and detailed deliverables.
- Budget containing sufficient detail, broken down by task and line item.
- Letters of Support
 - One letter of support from each Co-Applicant on the project.
 - Up to five letters of support from the local, and/or regional communities, CBOs, elected officials, and appointed leaders. These letters can include community partnership justification and approval, budget justification and approval, etc.

APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS

APGP staff will first evaluate applications to ensure that they are both eligible and complete. Ineligible or incomplete applications will not proceed to the next step in the review process.

Applications that are found to be eligible and complete will proceed to scoring. The staff and an interagency review panel will evaluate applications using the scoring criteria below. Applicants will receive a single score out of 90 points. Top scoring applicants will be invited to a finalist interview scored out of 10 points. APGP staff will recommend awards based on these scores. Thereafter, OPR will make final awards.

Application Support

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

To aid the development of competitive Proposals, APGP will provide application TA to eligible Applicants through a third-party provider ([Civix](#)). Depending on the volume of



interest received, OPR will prioritize applicants from Funding Target communities, such as California Native American Tribes, Disadvantaged Communities (DAC), and Small and Rural Communities, based on the volume of interest received. Additionally, consideration will be given to the applicant's capacity for proposal development (refer to [Section 2.4. Funding Targets](#) for more information). Applicants interested in being considered for Application TA should submit the [Pre-Application Interest Form](#) as soon as possible and by March 18, 2024 to be considered for priority technical assistance. Technical assistance requests will be accepted on a rolling basis after this time.

Application TA activities during the application development process may include, but are not limited to:

- Clarifying guidance about requirements and guidelines during application development
- Frameworks, tools, and templates for APGP Applicant use in proposals
- Direct application assistance, including answering specific TA questions, review of proposed application responses, and partnership support

APGP and the TA provider will work collaboratively with Applicants to determine the scope, scale, and timeline of direct Application TA available to those prioritized for assistance. Applicants prioritized and selected for TA will be notified by OPR.

Please note that receiving Application TA does not guarantee that an Applicant will be awarded an APGP grant.

APPLICATION WEBINARS

Application webinars will be available via the internet (Zoom) and phone call. Dates, times, and locations will be announced and listed on the [APGP webpage](#). Staff will post recordings of all general audience webinars on the APGP webpage.

APGP staff will provide support to individual applicants through office hours and email. Refer to [Section 2.6. Application](#) for more information on how applicants can ask staff for help in the process.

Questions

Direct questions to ICARP staff through the contact information listed below:

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program (ICARP)
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: [\(916\) 758-0597](tel:(916)758-0597)
E-mail: icarp.grants@opr.ca.gov

Applicants may ask questions during application webinars or submit written questions via mail or electronic mail. APGP staff will offer drop-in technical assistance office hours and the opportunity to meet 1:1 to discuss application questions throughout the entire application period. Technical assistance will be limited to questions about the guidelines and application process; staff will not be able to answer questions regarding the competitiveness of any applicant or a proposed project. ICARP will respond to all questions,



including all questions raised in office hours and 1:1 meetings, with a high-level question-and-answer document that will be posted on the APGP webpage and shared with all Pre-Application Interest Form respondents and announce the release of this document through ICARP e-blasts. Any verbal communication with ICARP staff concerning this solicitation is not binding on the State and will in no way alter a specification, term, or condition of the solicitation. Therefore, all program-related questions should be directed in writing to assigned ICARP staff using the contact information above.

2.7. Application Scoring

Completed applications will be scored based on review of six categories including:

Application Component	Total Points Possible
Project Vision and Description	15
Community Need and Adaptive Capacity	30
Co-Benefits	10
Partnership	20
Workplan and Budget	15
Finalist Interview	10
Total	100

The following scoring criteria will be applied to completed applications. APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score each category based on a list of questions. Project proposals will be awarded points based on both the number of elements addressed, as well as the extent to which each element is incorporated into the project's planning activities.

Project Vision & Description

Up to 15 points

Instructions: Present a comprehensive project overview that encompasses key program components including partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, plan alignment, and integrated financing strategies (refer to [Section 2.5. Core Project Components](#) for more information). Describe the key elements and deliverables of this project. Provide an overview of how the project responds to the unique challenges confronted by the community in the context of climate adaptation. Explain how the proposed project integrates with existing local or regional adaptation efforts and encourages cross-sector collaboration to address multiple climate hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities simultaneously. Clearly articulate how the project not only builds on but also complements or fills gaps within ongoing initiatives related to climate adaptation in the region. If there are pertinent local or regional adaptation plans or projects, reference those and elaborate on the specific relationships and contributions your project brings to these existing efforts. If the project aims to address gaps in local or regional planning, provide a clear description of the identified gap and articulate how the project is designed to bridge it.

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score the Project Description & Vision section based on their ability to answer the following questions:



1. How clear is the description of the project's key elements and deliverables, and to what extent does it provide a comprehensive overview, including key program components such as partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, and plan alignment? (7 points)
2. How does the proposed project specifically align with and address the climate adaptation goals and priorities of the local area, ensuring a response to the unique challenges faced by the community? (4 points)
3. How does the proposed project build on, complement, or fill gaps from other local or regional adaptation efforts? If there are local or regional adaptation plans or projects relevant to the proposed project, does the applicant describe how the project relates to them? If the project is filling a gap in local or regional planning, does the applicant describe this gap? (4 points)

Refer to [Appendix E. Project Vision & Description](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question. Refer to [Appendix C. Tips for a Successful Adaptation Planning Grant](#) for tips to successful application.

Community Need & Adaptive Capacity

Up to 30 points

Instructions: Describe any existing information about vulnerable communities in the proposed project area, how they have been involved in the project to date, and how the project will address their current and future needs. Describe known or likely impacts and vulnerabilities from climate change; existing inequities, marginalization, exclusion, or disinvestment within the community; hazards faced in the past, the overall planning approach and process, and how the proposed cross-sector planning project will expand on existing knowledge and fill information gaps on climate change vulnerability, impacts, and/or adaptation solutions and build community resilience to multiple climate change-related hazards or impacts. *Background information and resources in [Section 2.5. Prioritization of Vulnerable Communities](#) and [Appendix E. Community Need & Adaptive Capacity](#) of the guidelines can support applicants in answering this section.*

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score the Community Need & Adaptive Capacity section based on their ability to answer the following questions:

1. Is your project a funding target? (6 points)
2. Does the response provide a detailed account of existing information pertaining to vulnerable communities within the proposed project area, explain the extent of their involvement in the project (refer to [Section 2.5. Prioritization of Vulnerable Communities](#))? (8 points)
3. Does the response describe known or anticipated climate change impacts and vulnerabilities, considering past hazards faced, including climate-related displacement and involuntary migration? Does it include the use of local/regional climate data, best scientific information, local knowledge, or traditional ecological knowledge? Alternatively, if such data is unavailable, does the response explain how it will be gathered during the planning process? (8 points)



4. Does the response outline the proposed planning approach, how the proposed project will address the unique needs of vulnerable communities, enhance their [adaptive capacity](#), and advance adaptation solutions? (8 points)

Refer to [Appendix E. Community Need & Adaptive Capacity](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.

Co-Benefits

Up to 10 points

Instructions: Describe how the proposed project will prioritize strategies and outcomes that provide direct and measurable climate change adaptation co-benefits especially for the benefit of vulnerable communities such as social equity, health and daily living condition improvements, air quality enhancements, water resource protection and quality enhancement, nature-based solutions, and greenhouse gas emissions mitigation. Include a description of how the project will address existing social, health, economic and/or racial inequities and provides multiple benefits across sectors and climate issues. Applicants are encouraged to think systematically about the interconnectedness of the climate impacts facing their community, existing social, health, economic, and racial inequities within their community, and adaptive capacity across all neighborhoods and populations.

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score the co-benefits section based on their ability to answer the following question:

1. How does the proposed project prioritize strategies to enhance climate and community resilience across multiple sectors, particularly in communities with a history of disinvestment and marginalization? (5 points)
2. In what ways does the project showcase a comprehensive understanding of the interconnected nature of climate impacts, detailing broader benefits to enhance daily living conditions and community resilience for groups facing health, economic, and racial inequities? (5 points)

Refer to [Appendix E. Co-Benefits](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.

Community Partnership

Up to 20 points

OPTION 1 – PROPOSED PARTNERSHIP

Instructions: Describe the organizations involved in the project partnership, including each organization's mission, who they have historically served, and their specific roles and responsibilities in the project. These can include community leaders, California Native American Tribes or tribal-serving organizations, labor unions, non-profits, faith-based groups, community-based organizations, academics, economic development institutions, workforce development groups, businesses, representatives from local School District, Community College District, local health departments, community health workers, health equity advocates, and others. Describe the partnership structure and how the partners will work together, equitable, shared governance and decision-making approaches informing

the partnership, and why this specific group of organizations is well suited to carry out the proposed planning activities, such as examples of community support. Include details on previous history working together if applicable; if this is an emerging partnership, share what aspects of this new partnership will set the group up for success.

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score the Community Partnership section based on their ability to answer the following questions:

1. Is the partnership structure diverse in its representation of residents and key interested parties, demonstrating broad, inclusive, and equitable community engagement and does the partnership structure reflect community-led decision-making practices? (5 points)
2. Do the partnership and letters of commitment collectively exhibit robust community support for the proposed project? (5 points)
3. Do the members of the partnership possess proven track records, strengths, and approaches that ensure the effective and community-centered implementation of the proposed project? (5 points)
4. Do the Applicants demonstrate readiness and capacity to manage grants, coordinate diverse partners, and fulfill fiscal and project management responsibilities within the specified timeframe and budget? (5 points)

Refer to [Appendix E. Community Partnership](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.

OPTION 2 – JUSTIFICATION FOR LACK OF PARTNERSHIP

Instructions: While Applicants are strongly encouraged to include robust, diverse, multi-sector partnerships, this is not always possible for communities. In such instances, the Applicant should explain in this section why a partnership is not feasible at this time and/or outline in their application a plan to engage with and build partnership opportunities. For the plan to engage with and build partnerships, Applicants are encouraged to consider similar elements as outlined in [Option 1 - Proposed Partnership](#).

If you are a public entity, your answer should explain how you will engage with the community to create partnership opportunities.

If you are a community-based organization, your answer should explain why partnership with a local public entity or tribe is not feasible and/or how you will engage with a public entity and/or tribes to create partnership opportunities.

If you are an academic institution, your answer should explain how you will engage with a public entity, tribe, or community-based organizations to create partnership opportunities.

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score this section based on their ability to answer the following questions:

1. Does the justification effectively communicate the reasons behind the current infeasibility of establishing a partnership? Is there a clear and compelling explanation provided in this section? (5 points)
2. Is the plan to engage with and build partnership opportunities or broader support for the project well-structured, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the



proposed budget? Does the budget allocation align with the outlined engagement strategies? (5 points)

3. Does the justification and engagement description demonstrate a profound understanding of community needs and priorities, emphasizing a community-centered approach? Are the proposed strategies tailored to address specific community challenges and enhance resilience? (5 points)
4. Does the Applicant provide compelling evidence of proactive efforts or initiatives to engage with the community despite the absence of a formal partnership? Are there clear indications of the Applicant's commitment to community involvement and collaboration? (5 points)

Refer to [Appendix E. Option 2- Justification for Lack of Partnership](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.

Workplan and Budget

15 points

Instructions: The applicant should provide a workplan that includes a comprehensive list of proposed tasks that correspond to the required program components including partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, plan alignment, and integrated financing strategies (refer to [Section 2.5: Core Program Components](#)), optional program activities, and a timeline for completion of key tasks and deliverables, and the partners involved in implementing each task.

The budget table should provide reviewers with a clear understanding of how the applicants have allocated time and funding resources to various elements of the workplan. The budget should allocate resources across entities within the partnership to lead or support on specific tasks that reflect their strengths and experience. The budget should strike a balance between programmatic and staff costs and direct expenses to ensure effective project implementation.

APGP Staff and Interagency Panel Reviewers will score this section based on their ability to answer the following questions:

1. Does the applicant provide a comprehensive workplan that includes a description of proposed tasks, subtasks, and associated required and optional program activities; a timeline for completion of key tasks and deliverables; and partners involved in implementing each task and subtask? Does the workplan provide a sufficient description of how tasks will advance the [APGP Core Project Components](#). Does the workbook include a feasible timeline for completion of key tasks and deliverables? (8 points)
2. Does the budget demonstrate meaningful costs that are well-aligned with the workplan and correspond to project objectives and AGRP goals. Is sufficient funding allocated to ensure effective implementation? Does the proposed budget demonstrate an equitable allocate resources across entities within the proposed partnership to lead or support specific activities that reflect their strengths and experience? (7 points)



Refer to [Appendix E. Workplan and Budget](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.

Finalist Interview

10 points

Top scoring Applicants after the internal and Interagency Review will be invited to a finalist interview with OPR staff. These interviews enable reviewers to ask clarifying questions and dig deeper into the applicant's proposals. Applicants will receive up to 10 additional points from the interview portion in addition to the 90 base points available from the submitted application components. Applicants should include as many project partners as possible in the interview to demonstrate the strength and diversity of leadership within the partnerships. Interview responses will be assessed to the degree applicants' responses:

1. Present a clear vision of the projects proposed tasks and meaningful approach to climate adaptation. *(4 points)*
2. Articulates how the proposed workplan aligns with the core program components and APGP Goals. *(3 points)*
3. Demonstrates strength and diversity of the partnership and a vision for the role of each partner. *(3 points)*

Refer to [Appendix E. Finalist Interview](#) to review the scoring criteria associated with each question.



3. Grant Administration

3.1. Grant Management

Match Funding and Cost Sharing

No match funding is required. The APGP wishes to fund viable projects. Applications that provide matching funds will not increase their chances of getting funded. The APGP funding may be used to provide the required match funding to release other funding or grant opportunities. If additional funding is needed in addition to the APGP funding for the project to be executed, details must be provided in the budget and work plan, including the likely timeline for securing the additional funding. Additional funding should be included and referenced in letters of support from project partners and local community organizations.

Partnership Agreements

All lead applicants and co-applicants will need to enter into a written partnership agreement and provide a copy of the signed partnership agreement to OPR prior to finalizing the grant agreement. Applicants should describe their partners and the expected roles in the application. The partnership agreement should at a minimum: 1) outline the respective roles and obligations of the lead applicant and the co-applicant(s) throughout the grant term to implement the project, 2) include commitments from the lead applicant and the co-applicant(s) that they will implement their respective obligations, 3) require co-applicants to retain and provide documentation of actions taken related to the project to the lead applicant, and 4) include information about how the partners will make decisions and resolve disputes.

OPR will provide a partnership agreement template to assist applicants with the partnership agreement, though use of the template is not required.

Review Process and Grant Agreements

All project proposals submitted for the 2024 Adaptation Planning Grant Program (APGP) will be reviewed by the APGP Interagency Review Panel and administrative staff, who will review applications for eligibility, content, submission of proper documentation, meeting technical criteria, overall relationship to statewide planning efforts, and compliance with state planning requirements. Applications will be evaluated based on how well they describe the project, justify the need for the project and APGP funding, reflect the program evaluation criteria, and articulate a concrete Work Plan and project timeline.

APGP staff encourages those public entities that have not yet conducted climate resilience planning in their jurisdiction to apply, as well as those who are further ahead. Projects that reach vulnerable communities and meet multiple criteria will be evaluated favorably.

Interagency review panel recommendations will be presented to the ICARP leadership for their consideration. APGP staff will make a final determination on all grants in the Spring 2023.

The Grant Agreement is considered fully executed once it is signed by OPR's authorized signatory; this is when work can commence. Grantees cannot request reimbursement for any costs incurred or work completed before grant execution.



OPR, through its programs, is dedicated to transparency and compliance with state auditing requirements and applicable records retention/disclosure rules. Applicants should expect that grant agreements will reflect consistency with these standards and ensure compliance with applicable rules and requirements.

Disbursement and Accounting Funds

- The APGP is primarily a reimbursement grant program. OPR will provide the grant recipient with the necessary grant award and invoicing documents for the reimbursement process. Some applicants may qualify for a limited number of advanced payments. Refer to the Advanced Pay section below for more information on how to qualify.
- OPR will withhold the last 5% of the grant, to be paid once the State has determined that the grant terms have been fulfilled.
- The grantee cannot request reimbursement for any work completed before the execution of the grant agreement.
- Grantees may request reimbursement from OPR every quarter (every three months).
- Partners should invoice the grantee before the grantee submits an invoice to OPR.
- The grantee will be responsible for compiling all invoices, supporting documentation, and reporting materials for themselves and the partners into a single package. Once the package has been approved for payment, funds will be dispersed to the grantee.
- The grantee is responsible for dispersing payment to their partners.

3.2. Advanced Pay

Pursuant to authority granted by the legislature in 2023 (AB 590 (Hart, 2023)), State agencies administering a grant program may provide up to 25% of the total grant awards in advanced payments to grant recipients that are private, nonprofit organizations under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and meet specified requirements. Under these provisions, OPR may grant an advance payment exceeding 25% of the grant award only if OPR determines that the project requires a larger advance, and that the recipient entity provides sufficient justification and documentation for that larger advance to the administering state agency. **OPR will not be able to guarantee the availability of advanced payments to any applicant at the time of award.**

In order to be eligible for advanced pay, the recipient entity must do the following:

1. Demonstrate that the applicant's project will serve disadvantaged, low-income or under-resourced communities.
2. Provide an itemized budget for the eligible costs the advanced payment will fund, indirect or other costs needed to operate, a spending timeline, and a workplan in a template provided by OPR.
3. Submit documentation to support the need for advance payment, including a detailed description of the activities in the workplan to be funded by advanced



payments and why the advanced payments are needed. In addition, applicants will need to produce documentation that provides evidentiary support for why advanced pay is needed, which may include, but is not limited to, invoices, contracts, estimates, payroll records, and financial records.

4. Demonstrate its current status in good standing as an organization exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.
5. Deposit any funds received as an advance payment into a federally insured account that provides the ability to track interest earned and withdrawals. Any accumulated interest shall be deemed to be grant or contract moneys, subject to federal and state laws and regulations, and the recipient shall report interest earned on the advance payment to OPR. The account must be in the recipient entity's name, and not in the name of any of its directors or officers.
6. Provide procedures that the applicant will follow to minimize the amount of time that elapses between the transfer of funds and the expenditure of those funds.
7. Provide progress reports on the expenditure of advanced funds no less than on a quarterly basis, and also following the expenditure of an advanced payment, which include, at minimum, a summary of work completed and proof of expenditure. OPR will provide an advanced pay progress reporting template prior to finalizing the grant agreement.
8. Return to OPR any unused funding provided as an advance payment, but not expended within the grant or contract timeline.
9. Comply with state statutes, regulations, requirements and the terms and conditions of the state award. Advanced pay recipients may be required to obtain insurance in an amount commensurate with the assessed risk stipulated within the grant agreement.

In addition, the following procedures will be included as terms in the grant agreement for all grantees receiving advanced payments:

- In their application for advanced pay, all grantees must include a timeline that specifies a deadline by which each advanced payment will be spent. At the time of approval of the advanced payments, this timeline will be finalized between OPR and that grantee.
- If a grantee approved for advanced payment realizes that they will no longer be able to expend the advanced payment by the deadline in its advanced payment timeline, the grantee must notify OPR no later than 5 business days before the deadline. Along with this notice, the grantee must provide to OPR a description of why it is not able to expend the payment by the deadline, and the new deadline to expend the payment for OPR's approval.



- Within 10 business days of expending the advanced payment, the grantee must provide OPR with a summary of work completed, proof of expenditure, and other information requested in a reporting template to be provided by OPR.
- Grantees receiving advanced pay must provide status updates on the expenditure of advanced pay funds if an update is requested by OPR.

3.3. Errors

If a prospective Applicant encounters any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other errors in the solicitation, the Applicant should immediately notify OPR in writing and request modification or clarification of the document. Modifications or clarifications will be given by written notice to all parties who requested the solicitation, without divulging the source of the request for clarification. OPR shall not be responsible for failure to correct errors.

3.4. Modification or Withdrawal of Proposal

A prospective Applicant may, by e-mailing ICARP Adaptation Planning Grants Program staff at icarp.grants@opr.ca.gov, withdraw or modify a submitted proposal before the deadline to submit proposals. Proposals cannot be changed after that date and time. A proposal cannot be “timed” to expire on a specific date. For example, a statement such as the following is non-responsive to the solicitation: “This proposal and the cost estimate are valid for 60 days.”

3.5. Immaterial Defect

OPR may waive any immaterial defect or deviation contained in an Applicant’s proposal. The OPR waiver shall in no way modify the proposal or excuse the successful participating Applicant from full compliance.

3.6. Responsibilities and Grant Agreement

These guidelines contain instructions governing a firm quotation to be submitted by interested eligible Applicants, the format in which the technical information is to be submitted, the material to be included, eligibility information, and responsibilities. Applicants should take the responsibility to carefully read the entire solicitation, ask appropriate questions promptly, submit all responses completely by the required date and time, and make sure that all procedures of the solicitation are followed and appropriately addressed.

The content of these guidelines shall be incorporated by reference into the final agreement. OPR reserves the right to negotiate with grant recipients to modify the project work plan, the level of funding, or both. If OPR is unable to successfully negotiate and execute a funding agreement with a grant recipient, OPR, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to cancel the pending award and fund the next highest ranked eligible project.

Grant recipients that receive funding under these guidelines should provide an authorizing letter of commitment approved by their governing authority to agree with OPR and designate an authorized representative to sign. Applicants are encouraged to provide



authorizing commitment letters at the time of proposal submission, but authorization should be submitted no later than 60 days after the notice of award.

OPR will send the approved agreement, including the general Terms and Conditions and any additional terms and conditions, to the grant recipient for review, approval, and signature. Once the grant recipient signs, OPR will fully execute the agreement. Recipients are approved to begin the proposal activities only after the full execution of the agreement.

3.7. No Agreement Until Signed or Approved

No agreement between OPR and the grant recipient is in effect until the agreement is signed by the Recipient and the OPR representative. No work shall begin until an agreement has been fully executed. OPR reserves the right to modify the award documents prior to executing the agreement.

3.8. Reporting Templates and Forms

OPR will provide templates for the progress reports, work plan, budget, invoice form, reimbursement, and advanced pay request forms through the grant agreement. These documents will record the project's expenditures and assess general progress on deliverables.

3.9. Confidential Information

All applications and submitted materials are subject to the Public Records Act (PRA) (Government Code, §§ 7920.000 et. seq) requirements and certain information may be publicly disclosed pursuant to those requirements. Materials will remain confidential through the evaluation process, however, all submitted documents will become publicly available records after OPR posts the awards or the solicitation is cancelled. Materials and information submitted to OPR post-award may also be publicly disclosed. Therefore, applicants should not include any sensitive, confidential, or proprietary information, including culturally sensitive information in any of their communications with OPR, during or following the application process.

If an applicant feels it is necessary to submit confidential information to OPR, it should contact OPR prior to submitting any confidential information to discuss any options available to limit the possibility of mandatory disclosure.

4. Appendix

Appendix A. Relevant State Laws

Current state law requires that considerations for climate change and associated risk be integrated into General Plans, Climate Adaptation Plans, and Local Coastal Programs, with further incentives to integrate adaptation in Local and Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plans (LHMP/MJHMP). These plans guide the development of long-term community vision, infrastructure investments, community health and safety, emergency response and hazard mitigation, as well as economic development.



General Plans: SB 379 (Jackson, 2015), which is codified at Government Code section 65302, subdivision (g)(4), requires that local governments address climate change adaptation and resilience in the safety element of all general plans in California. Specifically, “upon the next revision of a local hazard mitigation plan, adopted in accordance with the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-390), on or after January 1, 2017, or, if a local jurisdiction has not adopted an LHMP, beginning on or before January 1, 2022, the safety element shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to address climate adaptation and resiliency strategies applicable to the city or county.” GC § 65302(g)(4) requires that the following be included in the preparation of the climate adaptation and resiliency strategy:

- A vulnerability assessment that identifies the risks that climate change poses to the local jurisdiction and the geographic areas at risk from climate change impacts, including, but not limited to, an assessment of how climate change may affect the risks associated with existing natural hazards that must be addressed in the safety element.
- Information that may be available from federal, state, regional, and local agencies that will assist in developing the vulnerability assessment and the adaptation policies and strategies required.
- A set of adaptation and resilience goals, policies, and objectives based on the information specified in the vulnerability assessment, for the protection of the community.
- A set of feasible implementation measures designed to carry out the goals, policies, and objectives identified.

Climate Adaptation Plans: SB 1035 (Jackson, 2018) further amended Government Code section 65302, subdivision (g)(6), to require that local agencies update the climate adaptation portion of the safety element at least every eight years to identify “new information relating to flood and fire hazards and climate adaptation and resiliency strategies applicable to the city or county that was not available during the previous revision of the safety element.” This update is triggered upon either the next LHMP update or the next Housing Element update, at the jurisdiction’s discretion, but not less frequently than every eight years.

Local Coastal Programs (LCPs): LCPs carry out the Coastal Act at the local level through land use and implementation strategies and provide the legal standard for new and existing development and coastal resource protection. Required Elements of LCPs include (California Coastal Act. P.R.C. Division 20 § 30000):

- Policies to implement the Coastal Act at the local level.
- Minimizing risks and maximizing coastal resource protection (public access, recreation, marine, and terrestrial resources, coastal-dependent development), including consideration of sea level rise.
- Public outreach and participation for development, updates, and amendments.
- Consistency with the Coastal Act

Local Hazard Mitigation Plans (LHMPs): As outlined in U.S. Code title 42, section 5165 and Code of Federal Regulations Title 44, section 201.6, to receive FEMA mitigation project assistance, local governments must have an LHMP that was reviewed by the State Mitigation Officer and then approved by FEMA, before November 1, 2004. LHMPs must be



revised, reviewed, and approved every five years. Federal rules direct state and local governments to develop comprehensive and integrated plans that are coordinated through appropriate state, local, and regional agencies, as well as non-governmental interest groups. Moreover, state and local governments are encouraged to consolidate the planning requirements for different mitigation plans and programs to the extent feasible and practicable.

Although the LHMP and the general plan safety element are not intended to be identical documents, State law increasingly incentivizes the integration of these plans. For example, AB 2140 (Hancock, 2006) added Government Code sections 8685.9 and 65302.6 to allow (but not require) a county or city to adopt and/or incorporate by reference its current, FEMA-approved LHMP into the general plan safety element by providing a disaster mitigation funding incentive that authorizes the State to use available California Disaster Assistance Act (Cal. Code of Regulations, title 19, Chapter 6.) funds to cover local shares of the 25% non-federal portion of grant-funded post-disaster projects.

Currently, OPR provides guidance and technical assistance to support local and regional climate adaptation and resilience planning, including through the OPR General Plan Guidelines, Cal-Adapt Enterprise, the ICARP “Defining Vulnerable Communities in the Context of Climate Adaptation” resources guide, and the State Adaptation Clearinghouse.



Appendix B. California Climate Adaptation Strategy Regions

The nine [California Climate Adaptation Strategy \(CCAS\) Regions](#) are also known as the California Fourth Climate Change Assessment Regions. These regions include the: Central Coast, Inland Deserts, Los Angeles, North Coast, Sacramento Valley, San Diego, San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, and Sierra Nevada.

Map of California Counties and Climate Adaptation Strategy Regions



Central Coast

Background

[CCAS page on the Central Coast Region](#)

Central Coast Counties

- Monterey County
- San Benito County
- San Luis Obispo County
- Santa Barbara County

- Santa Cruz County

Inland Deserts

Background

[CCAS page on the Inland Deserts Region](#)

Inland Deserts Counties

- Imperial County
- Eastern Riverside County
- eastern San Bernardino County

Los Angeles

Background

[CCAS page on the Los Angeles Region](#)

Los Angeles Counties

- Los Angeles County
- Orange County
- Ventura County
- western Riverside County
- western San Bernardino County

North Coast

Background

[CCAS page on the North Coast Region](#)

North Coast Counties

- Del Norte County
- Humboldt County
- Lake County
- Mendocino County
- Siskiyou County
- Trinity County

Sacramento Valley

Background

[CCAS page on Sacramento Valley](#)

Sacramento Valley Counties

- Butte County
- Colusa County
- Eastern Solano County
- Glenn County
- Sacramento County
- Shasta County
- Sutter County
- Tehama County
- Western Placer County
- Yolo County
- Yuba County

San Diego

Background

[CCAS page on the San Diego Region](#)

San Diego Counties

- San Diego County

San Francisco Bay Area

Background

[CCAS page on the San Francisco Bay Area](#)

Counties

- Alameda County
- Contra Costa County
- Marin County
- San Francisco County
- Western Napa County
- Western San Mateo County
- Western Santa Clara County
- Western Solano County
- Western Sonoma County

San Joaquin Valley

Background

[CCAS page on the San Joaquin Valley](#)

San Joaquin Valley Counties

- King's County
- Merced County
- San Joaquin County
- Stanislaus County
- Western Fresno County
- Western Kern County
- Western Madera County
- Western Tulare County

Sierra Nevada

Background

[CCAS page on the Sierra Nevada Region](#)

Sierra Nevada Counties

- Alpine County
- Amador County
- Calaveras County
- Eastern Fresno County
- Eastern Kern County
- Eastern Madera County
- Eastern Tulare County
- El Dorado County
- Inyo County
- Lassen County
- Mariposa County
- Modoc County
- Mono County
- Nevada County
- Placer County
- Plumas County
- Sierra County
- Tuolumne County



Appendix C. Tips for a Successful Adaptation Planning Grant

To enhance the effectiveness of your APGP application, consider the following guidance. While not exhaustive, these tips will bolster the quality and impact of your proposed project.

Tip #1: Engage Technical Assistance Providers Early On

- Consult and engage Technical Assistance (TA) providers as early as possible in the application process to receive guidance on application development.
- Refer to [Section 2.5. Application Support](#) for more information and eligibility requirements for TA.

Tip #2: Integrate APGP Goals

- Refer to Section C. Program Goals for a complete list of APGP Goals and ensure alignment with your project objectives.

Tip #3: Align Across Sectors

- Align your project's planning activities and objectives across a variety of sectors, such as transportation, housing, land use planning, and public health.

Tip #4: Adopt an Equitable Planning Framework

- Integrate an Equity Checklist and Equity Resilience Indicators into your Work Plan.
- Address disaster resilience and recovery by supporting planning activities that facilitate recovery in communities affected by catastrophic climate events.
- Balance short term and long-term planning activities that advance equitable outcomes, public service availability, and access to social services.
- Center your planning framework around community-driven climate resilience.

Tip #5: Consult with your local public entity

- Consult with your local public entity for technical assistance before the application deadline. Local public entities may have resources that can help augment your application.

Tip #6: Engage with our staff

- Attend APGP Office Hours and include our staff as active partners in the application process.

Tip #7: Tailor your letters of support, petitions, and graphics

- Provide additional tailored letters of support and other media (i.e., diagrams, graphics, photographs) to enhance the application.
- If time/resources are limited, a petition format with list of supporters and specifics on how supporters will benefit from the project proposal can suffice.

Appendix D. Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources

Example Engagement Strategies

In all phases, equity is a critical component of these efforts. This could mean informing and engaging climate vulnerable populations by:

- Partnering with community-based organizations to conduct outreach (and providing stipends when available).
- Using culturally appropriate materials in relevant languages and approaching outreach in ways that are culturally familiar to the community.
- Holding events at local, frequently visited locations that are easily accessible by transit (like libraries, schools, or recreation centers).
- Doing preparation work to train community members to be ambassadors on the planning process and lead aspects of the outreach.
- Use arts, music, and storytelling to engage youth and a broader audience.
- Providing childcare services and/or kids' activities.
- Provide assistive technologies (products, equipment, and systems) to help people who may have difficulty speaking, typing, writing, remembering, pointing, seeing, hearing, or learning.

Information on how to assess adaptive capacity, and identify the climate change risks and exposures within the project, may be obtained using:

- California Adaptation Planning Guide, Step 2.3 Adaptive Capacity
<https://resilientca.org/apg/phase-2/#panel-step2-3>
- Cal-Adapt.org, an online platform that can help identify, map, and model specific climate change exposures:
<https://cal-adapt.org/>
- Climate and Health Adaptation Planning Toolkit for local data and step-by-step guidance to develop a climate change and health vulnerability assessment:
<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/CaBRACE.aspx>
- Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool for evaluation Disadvantaged Community status throughout the State.
<https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/dacs/>
- California's Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality
<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/2022-scoping-plan-documents>
- California's Climate Change Assessments
<https://climateassessment.ca.gov/>
- California Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force Regional Resource Kits
<https://wildfiretaskforce.org/regional-resource-kits-page/>
- Other tools and data resources, such as those on the State Adaptation Clearinghouse Tools and Data page and Find a Tool feature:
<https://resilientca.org/tools/find/>
- Using the results of a local or regional vulnerability assessment or action plan
- Any other locally developed projection model

Information on how to describe the impact of climate change risks and exposures on the community, particularly vulnerable populations, may be obtained using:

- CalEnviroScreen:
<https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen>



- Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index– Database to help emergency response planners and public health officials identify, map, and plan support for communities that will likely need support before, during and after a public health emergency.
[CDC Social Vulnerability Index | Resources | Community Stress Resource Center | ATSDR](#)
- Climate Change and Health Profile Reports, created by the California Department of Public Health, which present projections for county and regional climate impacts, the climate-related health risks, and local populations that could be vulnerable to climate effects in each county:
<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/ClimateHealthProfileReports.aspx>
- Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators for California (CCHVI) developed by the California Department of Public Health to better understand the people and places that are most susceptible to adverse health impacts associated with climate change. The data can be used to screen and prioritize where to focus deeper analysis and plan for public health actions to increase resilience.
<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OHE/Pages/CC-Health-Vulnerability-Indicators.aspx>
- Guide to Defining Vulnerable Communities in the Context of Climate Change:
http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20200720-Vulnerable_Communities.pdf
- California Healthy Places Index (HPI), a project of the Public Health Alliance of Southern California, the Healthy Places Index (HPI) is a powerful and easy-to-use data and policy platform created to advance health equity through open and accessible data that drive health – like education, job opportunities, clean air and water, and other indicators that are positively associated with life expectancy at birth.
<https://www.healthyplacesindex.org/>
- Mapping Resilience: A Blueprint for Thriving in the Face of Climate Disasters:
https://apen4ej.org/wpcontent/uploads/2019/07/APEN-Mapping_Resilience-Report.pdf
- Regional Opportunity Index (ROI) developed by the UC Davis Center for Regional Change
<https://regionalchange.ucdavis.edu/projects/regional-opportunity-index>
- Department of Water Resources' California Groundwater Live
<https://sgma.water.ca.gov/CalGWLlive/#groundwater>
- State Water Board's GAMA Groundwater Information System
<https://gamagroundwater.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/gamamap/public/>

Resources to identify and prioritize climate adaptation measures and projects that address anticipated climate impact can be found here:

- The 2020 Adaptation Planning Guide guides on assessing climate impacts and adaptation strategies to address them:
<https://resilientca.org/apg/>
- The State Adaptation Clearinghouse hosts a range of case studies, adaptation plans and strategy documents, and state guidance:
 - Topic Pages include sector-specific climate change background information, featured state guidance documents, example strategies from Appendix D of



the Adaptation Planning Guide (also available in the guide PDF), and a curated search function for each topic:

- www.resilientca.org/topics
- <https://www.caloes.ca.gov/HazardMitigationSite/Documents/CA-Adaptation-Planning-GuideFINAL-June-2020-Accessible.pdf#search=adaptation%20planning%20guide>
- The Climate Equity Topic page provides information on equitable planning and achieving climate equity in adaptation and resilience efforts: <https://resilientca.org/topics/climate-equity/>
- The Resilient CA Adaptation Planning Map (RAP-Map) provides links to local government adaptation planning documents: <https://resilientca.org/rap-map>
- The Case Studies page includes summaries of the processes for developing plans and projects across the State: <https://resilientca.org/case-studies/>
- California Natural Resources Agency's Expanding Nature-Based Solutions <https://resources.ca.gov/Initiatives/Expanding-Nature-Based-Solutions>

Resources on funding and financing strategies to support long-term climate adaptation and resilience at the local level can be found here:

- Climate Adaptation Finance and Investment in California: This climate adaptation finance book was developed by Jesse M. Keenan from Harvard University, in partnership with OPR, through ICARP. This book serves as a guide for asset managers, risk managers, underwriters, project managers, planners, civic advocates, and elected officials working on projects and programs that address climate change impacts. https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20181106-Keenan_Climate_Adaptation_Finance_and_Investment_in_California_2018.pdf
- Adaptation Finance Challenges: Characteristic Patterns Facing California Local Governments and Ways to Overcome Them: This report was prepared for California's Fourth Climate Change Assessment and offers feasible and effective solutions to adaptation finance challenges in California, including identification of funding and finance mechanisms and opportunities to overcome financing barriers to support local capacity building and resilience. https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-12/Governance_CCCA4-CNRA-2018-007_ada.pdf
- Paying for Climate Adaptation In California: A Primer for Practitioners: This report was prepared by AECOM in partnership with OPR and serves as a guide for practitioners to navigate California's complex funding and financing processes to plan and develop adaptation and resilience infrastructure projects. https://resourceslegacyfund.org/wp-content/uploads/Paying-for-Climate-Adaptation-in-California.pdf?utm_source=ASAP&utm_campaign=0e5c482bb5-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2018_06_14_06_26_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_390b9a48ee-0e5c482bb5-417136457&mc_cid=0e5c482bb5



Appendix E. Application Scoring Criteria

Project Vision & Description

Up to 15 points

How clear is the description of the project's key elements and deliverables, and to what extent does it provide a comprehensive overview, including key program components such as partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, and plan alignment? (7 points)

Scoring Criteria:

- **High (6-7 points):** The project description is exceptionally clear and detailed, offering a comprehensive overview of key elements and deliverables. It demonstrates a thorough understanding of program components, including partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, and plan alignment. The narrative is compelling and leaves no ambiguity.
- **Medium (3-5 points):** The project description is clear and provides a comprehensive overview of key elements and deliverables. It outlines program components, including partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, and plan alignment. Some refinements could enhance certain aspects.
- **Low (0-2 points):** The project description is minimal, lacks clarity, and offers limited information on program components, including partnerships, prioritization of vulnerable communities, and plan alignment. Significant improvements are needed for a more comprehensive overview and enhanced clarity.

How does the proposed project specifically align with and address the climate adaptation goals and priorities of the local area, ensuring a response to the unique challenges faced by the community? (4 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5 points):** The proposed project demonstrates exceptional alignment and responsiveness to the climate adaptation goals and priorities of the local jurisdiction. It comprehensively addresses unique challenges faced by the community with a clear, targeted approach.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The proposed project adequately aligns with and responds to some climate adaptation goals and priorities of the local jurisdiction. There is room for improvement in specificity and clarity regarding the response to unique challenges faced by the community.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The proposed project adequately aligns with and responds to some climate adaptation goals and priorities of the local jurisdiction. There is room for improvement in specificity and clarity regarding the response to unique challenges faced by the community.

How does the proposed project build on, complement, or fill gaps from other local or regional adaptation efforts? If there are local or regional adaptation plans or projects relevant to the proposed project, does the applicant describe how the project relates to



them? If the project is filling a gap in local or regional planning, does the applicant describe this gap? (4 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (3-4 points):** The proposed project exceptionally builds on, complements, or fills critical gaps in other local or regional adaptation efforts. It provides a comprehensive overview of relevant plans or projects, clearly articulating how the proposed project relates to them.
- **Medium (2 points):** The proposed project adequately builds on, complements, or fills some gaps in other local or regional adaptation efforts. There is room for improvement in providing more depth and clarity regarding the relationship with relevant plans or projects.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The proposed project minimally builds on, complements, or fills gaps in other local or regional adaptation efforts. There is limited depth and clarity in the relationship with relevant plans or projects, and significant improvements are needed.

Community Need & Adaptive Capacity

30 points

Is the proposed a funding target? (6 points)

- **Yes (6 points):** If the project is identified as a funding target, it receives the full score.
- **No (0 points):** If the project is not a funding target, it receives no points.

Does the response provide a detailed account of existing information pertaining to vulnerable communities within the proposed project area and explain the extent of their involvement in the project (refer to [Section 2.4. Prioritization of Vulnerable Communities](#))? (8 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (6-8 points):** The response provides a detailed and comprehensive description of vulnerable communities, including precise geographic locations, population characteristics, and key contributing factors to vulnerability. It demonstrates extensive involvement of community organizations in the project design, scoping, and objectives, showcasing a strong commitment to vulnerable communities.
- **Medium (3-5 points):** The description of vulnerable communities is adequate, offering a general understanding of their location and population characteristics. The plan to improve understanding through the planning process is mentioned but may lack some depth. Involvement of vulnerable communities is mentioned, but the description lacks depth or specificity. Some improvement is needed to enhance the level of community engagement.
- **Low (0-2 points):** The response minimally describes vulnerable communities, lacking detail on their location, population characteristics, and contributing factors to vulnerability. The plan to improve understanding through the planning process needs



significant improvement. Information on the involvement of vulnerable communities in the proposed project is minimal, with little detail on their participation in design and objective identification. Substantial improvement is necessary.

Does the response describe known or anticipated climate change impacts and vulnerabilities, considering past hazards faced, including climate-related displacement and involuntary migration? Does it include the use of local/regional climate data, best scientific information, local knowledge, or traditional ecological knowledge? Alternatively, if such data is unavailable, does the response explain how it will be gathered during the planning process? (8 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (6-8 points):** The response effectively describes the use of climate change projection data and other knowledge sources. Minor areas for improvement or additional details may be present.
- **Medium (3-5 points):** The description of using climate change projection data is adequate, providing a general understanding of the data sources. Improvement is needed to enhance the level of detail.
- **Low (0-2 points):** The response provides minimal information on the use of climate change projection data, lacking detail on knowledge sources. Substantial improvement is necessary.

Does the response outline the proposed planning approach, how the proposed project will address the unique needs of vulnerable communities, enhance their [adaptive capacity](#), and advance adaptation solutions? (8 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (6-8 points):** The response effectively describes how the proposed project will address the unique needs of vulnerable communities. Minor areas for improvement or additional details may be present.
- **Medium (3-5 points):** The plan to address the unique needs of vulnerable communities is mentioned, but the description lacks depth or specificity. Improvement is needed to enhance the level of detail.
- **Low (0-2 points):** The response provides minimal information on how the project will address the unique needs of vulnerable communities, with little detail on specific actions to enhance adaptive capacity. Substantial improvement is necessary.

Co-Benefits

10 points

How does the proposed project prioritize strategies to enhance climate and community resilience across multiple sectors, particularly in communities with a history of disinvestment and marginalization?



Scoring Criteria:

- **High (4-5 points):** The project demonstrates a well-defined and robust prioritization of strategies to enhance climate and community resilience across multiple sectors, with a particular focus on communities with a history of disinvestment and marginalization. It provides clear evidence of comprehensive planning and targeted interventions tailored to the specific challenges faced by marginalized communities. The project considers multiple sectors and ensures a holistic approach to resilience-building.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The project adequately prioritizes strategies for climate and community resilience, but there may be areas where specificity or targeted efforts for marginalized communities could be strengthened. While there is acknowledgment of the need for resilience across multiple sectors, there may be room for improvement in providing concrete and detailed strategies tailored to communities with a history of disinvestment and marginalization.
- **Low (0-1 point):** The project minimally prioritizes strategies for climate and community resilience, with limited evidence of targeted efforts for communities facing disinvestment and marginalization. The description lacks specificity and fails to demonstrate a clear understanding of the unique challenges posed to vulnerable communities, showing a lack of commitment to addressing their specific needs.

In what ways does the project showcase a comprehensive understanding of the interconnected nature of climate impacts, detailing broader benefits to enhance daily living conditions and community resilience for groups facing health, economic, and racial inequities?**Scoring Criteria:**

- **High (4-5 points):** The project showcases a comprehensive understanding of the interconnected nature of climate impacts, providing a detailed and well-documented outline of broader benefits to enhance daily living conditions and community resilience for groups facing health, economic, and racial inequities. It demonstrates a holistic approach, recognizing and addressing the multiple facets of climate impacts and their ripple effects on vulnerable populations.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The project exhibits an understanding of the interconnected nature of climate impacts, but there may be areas where the description lacks depth or detail in outlining broader benefits for groups facing health, economic, and racial inequities. While the understanding is present, there could be improvements in clearly articulating how the project aims to address and mitigate the specific challenges faced by vulnerable groups.
- **Low (0-1 point):** The project minimally demonstrates an understanding of the interconnected nature of climate impacts, with limited evidence of addressing broader benefits for groups facing health, economic, and racial inequities. The description lacks depth, and there is a notable deficiency in outlining a comprehensive approach to improving daily living conditions and community resilience for vulnerable populations.

Community Partnership

20 points

Option 1 (*Preferred*):

Is the partnership structure diverse in its representation of residents and key interested parties, demonstrating broad, inclusive, and equitable community engagement and does the partnership structure reflect community-led decision-making practices? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5):** The partnership includes a diverse representation of residents and key partners, ensuring a broad range of perspectives and expertise, contributing significantly to the project's community-centered approach.
- **Medium (2-3):** The partnership composition has some diversity but lacks representation from key interested parties, potentially limiting the range of perspectives and approaches.
- **Low (0-1):** The partnership structure lacks diversity, with minimal representation of residents and key interested parties.

Do the partnership and letters of commitment collectively exhibit robust community support for the proposed project? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5):** The partnership and letters of commitment showcase robust community support, demonstrating a deep understanding of community needs and active endorsement from various key interested parties.
- **Medium (2-3):** The partnership and letters of commitment indicate moderate community support, with some areas that could be strengthened to better reflect widespread endorsement.
- **Low (0-1):** The partnership and letters of commitment show limited community support, with notable gaps or insufficient endorsement from key interested parties.

Do the members of the partnership possess proven track records, strengths, and approaches that ensure the effective and community-centered implementation of the proposed project? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5):** Partnership members have exemplary track records, proven strengths, and approaches that strongly align with community-centered implementation of the proposed project.
- **Medium (2-3):** Partnership members have acceptable track records, but there are noticeable gaps in their strengths and approaches that could impact effective community-centered implementation.



- **Low (0-1):** Partnership members have limited track records, and their strengths and approaches are not well-aligned with community-centered initiatives.

Does the Applicant demonstrate readiness and capacity to manage grants, coordinate diverse partners, and fulfill fiscal and project management responsibilities within the specified timeframe and budget? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5):** The Applicants exhibit exceptional readiness and capacity, demonstrating a strong ability to implement the proposed work on time and within budget. They showcase expertise in grant management, coordination, and fiscal responsibilities.
- **Medium (2-3):** The Applicants demonstrate moderate readiness and capacity, with areas that need improvement to ensure effective implementation on time and within budget. Significant enhancements are required in grant management and coordination.
- **Low (0-1):** The Applicants lack readiness and capacity, indicating a high risk of unsuccessful implementation on time and within budget. Significant improvements are needed in grant management and coordination.

OPTION 2 - JUSTIFICATION FOR LACK OF PARTNERSHIP

Does the justification effectively communicate the reasons behind the current infeasibility of establishing a partnership? Is there a clear and compelling explanation provided in this section? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5 points):** The justification effectively communicates the reasons behind the infeasibility of establishing a partnership at this time. The explanation is clear, comprehensive, and aligns with the community's specific circumstances.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The justification provides some insight into the challenges of establishing a partnership, but it may lack depth or specificity. There is room for improvement in presenting a more detailed and comprehensive explanation.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The justification minimally communicates the reasons for the lack of partnership, offering little to no insight into the challenges faced by the community. Significant improvement is necessary.

Is the plan to engage with and build partnership opportunities or broader support for the project well-structured, comprehensive, and seamlessly integrated into the proposed budget? Does the budget allocation align with the outlined engagement strategies? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:



- **High (4-5 points):** The plan to engage with and build partnership opportunities is well-structured, comprehensive, and clearly reflected in the proposed budget. It demonstrates a thoughtful approach, considering various sectors and organizations.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The plan is presented but may lack some depth or specificity. There is room for improvement in providing more detailed information, and the reflection in the budget may be limited.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The plan for engaging and building partnerships is minimal or nonexistent, lacking a clear structure and reflection in the proposed budget. Significant improvement is necessary.

Does the justification and engagement description demonstrate a profound understanding of community needs and priorities, emphasizing a community-centered approach? Are the proposed strategies tailored to address specific community challenges and enhance resilience? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5 points):** The justification and plan demonstrate a deep understanding of community needs and priorities, emphasizing a community-centered approach. The applicant shows insight into the specific needs of the community.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** The understanding of community needs is presented but may lack depth or specificity. There is room for improvement in providing more detailed information about the community's priorities.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The justification and plan minimally address community needs, offering little to no information on the priorities of the community. Significant improvement is necessary.

Does the Applicant provide compelling evidence of proactive efforts or initiatives to engage with the community despite the absence of a formal partnership? Are there clear indications of the Applicant's commitment to community involvement and collaboration? (5 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (4-5 points):** The applicant provides compelling evidence of proactive efforts or initiatives to engage with the community despite the absence of a formal partnership. There is a clear commitment to community involvement.
- **Medium (2-3 points):** Some evidence of proactive efforts is presented, but there may be gaps or limited detail. Improvement is needed to demonstrate a more proactive and comprehensive approach.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The applicant lacks substantial evidence of proactive efforts to engage with the community, indicating a need for more intentional and comprehensive initiatives. Significant improvement is necessary.



Workplan and Budget

15 points

Does the applicant provide a comprehensive workplan that includes a description of proposed tasks, subtasks, and associated required and optional program activities; a timeline for completion of key tasks and deliverables; and partners involved in implementing each task and subtask? Does the workplan provide a sufficient description of how tasks will advance the APGP Program Objectives. Does the workbook include a feasible timeline for completion of key tasks and deliverables? (8 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (6-8):** The proposed budget provides exceptionally clear and reasonable tasks and deliverables, with feasible financial projections and timelines that align seamlessly with the APGP objectives and vision. It demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of project intricacies.
- **Medium (3-5):** The proposed budget adequately outlines tasks and deliverables, with somewhat feasible financial projections and timelines. There is room for improvement in ensuring closer alignment with the APGP objectives and vision.
- **Low (0-2):** The proposed budget lacks clarity on tasks and deliverables, with financial projections and timelines that are not feasible. There is a substantial mismatch with the APGP objectives and vision.

Does the budget demonstrate meaningful costs that are well-aligned with the workplan and correspond to project objectives and APGP goals. Is sufficient funding allocated to ensure effective implementation? Does the proposed budget demonstrate an equitable allocate resources across entities within the proposed partnership to lead or support specific activities that reflect their strengths and experience? (7 points)

Scoring criteria:

- **High (5-7):** The proposed budget demonstrates an exceptional allocation of resources, effectively leveraging the strengths and experience of entities within the partnership. It ensures a well-balanced distribution that optimally contributes to project success.
- **Medium (3-4):** The proposed budget adequately allocates resources, with some alignment to the strengths and experience of entities within the partnership. There is room for improvement to ensure a more balanced distribution.
- **Low (0-2):** The proposed budget poorly allocates resources, with no consideration for the strengths and experience of entities within the partnership. There is a substantial disconnect in resource distribution.

Finalist Interview

10 points

Present a clear vision of the project's proposed tasks and meaningful approach to climate adaptation. (4 points)



Scoring criteria:

- **High (3-4 points):** The applicants exhibit profound understanding of their project during the interview, responding to questions with clarity and detail. Their answers reflect a comprehensive awareness of the proposed tasks, partners, and interested partners.
- **Medium (2 points):** The applicants exhibit understanding of the project but lack depth or specificity. The information presented in the application and interview needs improvement to enhance the level of detail and clarity of the project.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The interview reveals a lack of understanding of the project and a potentially maladaptive approach to climate adaptation.

Articulates how the proposed workplan aligns with the core program components and APGP goals. (3 points)**Scoring criteria:**

- **High (3 points):** Throughout the interview, the applicants clearly articulate how the proposed workplan aligns with the core program components and APGP goals. The alignment is detailed and well-integrated, showcasing a strong understanding of the program requirements and climate adaptation in general.
- **Medium (2 point):** Alignment the project tasks with the APGP goals is mentioned but lacks some depth or specificity in the interview. There is room for improvement in providing more detailed information.
- **Low (0-1 points):** The interview reveals minimal alignment with core program components and priorities. Significant improvement is necessary.

Demonstrates strength and diversity of the partnership and a vision for the role of each partner. (3 points)**Scoring criteria:**

- **High (3 points):** The interview showcases a deep understanding of the strength and diversity of the partnership, with a clear vision for the role of each partner. The roles are well-defined, and the diversity of expertise enhances the project's overall strength.
- **Medium (2 points):** The interview mentions the strength of and diversity of some elements of the partnership but lacks some depth or specificity. There is room for improvement in providing more detailed information.
- **Low (0-2 points):** The interview reveals a lack of strength or diversity of the partnership. Significant improvement is necessary.

Appendix F. State Planning Priorities

Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 1.5, Article 5 of the Government Code 65041.1.

The State planning priorities, which are intended to promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety in the State, including in urban, suburban, and rural communities, shall be as follows:

- (a) To promote infill development and equity by rehabilitating, maintaining, and improving existing infrastructure that supports infill development and appropriate reuse and redevelopment of previously developed, underutilized land that is presently served by transit, streets, water, sewer, and other essential services, particularly in underserved areas, and to preserving cultural and historic resources.
- (b) To protect environmental and agricultural resources by protecting, preserving, and enhancing the State's most valuable natural resources, including working landscapes such as farm, range, and forest lands, natural lands such as wetlands, watersheds, wildlife habitats, and other wildlands, recreation lands such as parks, trails, greenbelts, and other open space, and landscapes with locally unique features and areas identified by the State as a deserving special protection.
- (c) To encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that any infrastructure associated with development, other than infill development, supports new development that does all of the following:
 - (1) Uses land efficiently.
 - (2) Is built adjacent to existing developed areas to the extent consistent with the priorities specified pursuant to subdivision (b).
 - (3) Is located in an area appropriately planned for growth.
 - (4) Is served by adequate transportation and other essential utilities and services.
 - (5) Minimizes ongoing costs to the taxpayers.

Appendix G. Post Award APGP Activities

Grantees will have access to workshops throughout the grant term geared towards building short-term capacity to support grant implementation and long-term technical capacity for adaptation planning. Workshops will cover a collection of topics and resources tailored to the needs of grantees during the given stage of the grant term. Grantees are encouraged, but not required, to participate in all workshops.

Technical assistance and workshop topics include the following:

- **Peer-to-Peer Learning:** ICARP staff or partners will host quarterly peer-to-peer learning sessions. Grantees are encouraged to meet with peer jurisdictions more frequently than quarterly if helpful in advancing the work plan. Applicants should consider setting aside three to fifteen percent (3-15%) of their total budget for peer-to-peer learning and knowledge exchange through existing networks and



relationships and/or facilitated opportunities (e.g., meetings, events, roadshows, and convenings of communities of practice). Peers can range from similar groupings and organizations, such as neighboring jurisdictions, community-based organizations, and climate adaptation practitioners, to those who have not historically engaged in climate adaptation planning or practice.

- **Equitable Planning Frameworks**

- This topic includes introductory information on Equitable Community Engagement strategies and opportunities to learn directly from experts on how to conduct Community-driven Climate Resilience Planning from organizations that have developed equitable planning frameworks.
- Resources: State Adaptation Clearinghouse - Community-Driven Climate Resilience Planning: A Framework

- **Climate Adaptation 101: Visioning, Pre-planning, and Getting Started**

- This topic includes introductory information about climate adaptation planning. Learn how to refine the project motivation and scope, identify necessary teams and resources, and get started with identifying climate effects and community elements. Learn about introductory best practices and explore example projects and plans.
- Resources: California 2020 Adaptation Planning Guide and the State Adaptation Clearinghouse.

- **Introduction to Integrated Planning and Plan Alignment**

- This topic includes training on Plan Alignment, specifically resources, best practices, and frameworks for successful whole-community planning approaches and collaboration.
- Resources: ICARP Climate Resilience Plan Alignment Toolbox.

- **Climate Impacts, Vulnerability, and Risk**

- This topic includes an introduction to understanding and working with climate change impact information and conducting climate vulnerability assessments.
- Resources: Cal-Adapt Enterprise; ICARP Guide to Defining Vulnerable Communities; OPC Sea Level Rise Guidance; CDPH CalBRACE Adaptation Toolkit, CDPH Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators, and other resources.

- **Developing Equitable Climate Adaptation Strategies and Actions**

- This topic includes introductions to frameworks for developing, organizing, prioritizing, and evaluating strategies and actions, as well as examples from around the State.
- Resources: State Adaptation Clearinghouse, California Adaptation Planning Guide, OPR General Plan Guidelines, etc.



- **Pathways Towards Funding and Implementing Adaptation**
 - **Planning Implementation, Funding, Monitoring, and Evaluation**
This topic covers how to prepare an implementation program, including how to identify resources, track progress, and adjust over time.
 - **Navigating Federal Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) Grant Funding Opportunities**
This topic includes information on eligibility requirements, best practices, and tips for navigating HMA funding opportunities.
 - **Navigating State Grants and Applications**
This topic includes information on eligibility requirements, best practices, and tips for navigating state funding opportunities.

Appendix H. Grant Agreement

Refer to the [APGP website](#) to view the sample Round 1 Draft APGP Grant Agreement.

Appendix I. Glossary

Academic Institutions - Individual public California institutions of higher education (e.g., universities, community colleges, etc.).

Access and Functional Needs (AFN) – Term referring to individuals who are or have: physical, developmental, or intellectual disabilities; chronic conditions or injuries; limited English proficiency; older adults; children; low-income, homeless, and/or transportation disadvantaged or public transit-dependent; and pregnant people (California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, 2022).

Adaptive Capacity - The ability of systems, institutions, humans, and other organisms to adjust to potential damage, take advantage of opportunities, or respond to consequences. Vulnerable communities have less adaptive capacity and resilience to cope with, adapt to, and recover from climate impacts. Adaptive capacity can be assessed by using publicly accessible tools.

Applicant - The lead Applicant and Co-Applicants are collectively referred to as “Applicants.”

Application, Proposed Project, or Project Proposal - A submittal comprised of responses and supporting documents to apply for the grant.

Awarded - An agency commits funding to implement projects (e.g., executed a grant agreement with a Grantee; transferred funds to another agency or program administrator).

Benefit-Cost Analysis Toolkit – The BCA is used to calculate the future risk reduction benefits of a hazard mitigation project and compares the benefits to its cost. A project is considered cost-effective when the Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) is greater than 1.0 (FEMA).

Capacity Building - The process of strengthening local coordination, leadership, knowledge, skills, expertise, and access to resources in vulnerable communities to help to develop or increase the ability of that community to independently compete for grants and



implement projects in the future. Capacity building activities include, but are not limited to, identifying and planning for needed climate change mitigation and adaptation projects in a given region and identifying the tools and resources needed to successfully access, apply for, and receive grant funding.

California Native American Tribe – California Native American Tribes include either a federally-recognized California tribal government listed on the most recent notice of the Federal Register or a non-federally recognized California tribal government on the California tribal Consultation List maintained by the California Native American Heritage Commission.

Climate Adaptation - Adjustment in natural or human systems to a new or changing environment. Adaptation to climate change refers to adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.

Climate Mitigation - A human intervention to reduce the human impact on the climate system; it includes strategies to reduce greenhouse gas sources and emissions and enhance greenhouse gas sinks.

Climate Resiliency or Climate Resilience - the capacity of any entity – an individual, a community, an organization, or a natural system – to prepare for disruptions, recover from shocks and stresses, and adapt and grow from a disruptive experience.

Climate Vulnerability – See “Vulnerable Communities” defined below.

Co-Applicant - Entities other than the lead Applicant that enter into a partnership with other organizations to apply for an Adaptation Planning Grant.

Co-Benefits - The additional benefits of policies that are implemented with a primary goal, such as climate change mitigation – acknowledging that most policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions also have other, often equally important, benefits (e.g., energy savings, economic benefits, air quality benefits, public health benefits). Also referred to as “multiple benefits” (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency).

Community-Based Organization - A public or private nonprofit organization of demonstrated effectiveness that is representative of a community or significant segments of a community and provides educational or related services to individuals in the community.

Community Engagement - The process of working collaboratively with and through groups of people affiliated by geographic proximity, special interest, or similar situations to address issues affecting the well-being of those people.

Communities of Practice - A group of people who share a common concern, a set of problems, or an interest in a topic and who come together to fulfill both individual and group goals.

Community Partnership – A group of community institutions, agencies, organizations and members who share common goals and objectives, distributed roles and responsibilities, and engage in collective decision-making processes. Individual partnership members can represent, but are not limited to, community-based organizations, public water related



agencies in their study area such as flood control, retail water agencies, water recycling agencies, groundwater management agencies, local health jurisdictions, local health departments, health equity-focused CBOs, vulnerable communities, member or representatives of disadvantaged communities, Tribes, educational institutions, local businesses, and other interested groups.

Community Resilience - The ability of communities to withstand and recover and learn from past cumulative or compounding disasters to strengthen future response and recovery efforts. This can include, but is not limited to, physical and psychological health of the population, social and economic equity and well-being of the community, effective risk communication, integration of organizations (governmental and nongovernmental) in planning, response, and recovery.

Direct Costs - Costs directly tied to the implementation of the Adaptation Planning grant, including, but not limited to personnel costs, subcontracts, equipment costs, travel expenses, etc.

Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) Funding Target – This funding target incorporates both the Disadvantaged community designations per [Senate Bill \(SB\) 535](#) and Low-income definitions per [Assembly Bill \(AB\) 1550](#). Per SB 535, the California Environmental Protection Agencies (CalEPA) defines disadvantaged communities as a designation of census tracts and physical locations used to identify the areas most affected by pollution and the people most vulnerable to its effects, based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazards criteria. AB 1550 defines low-income communities and households as the census tracts and households, respectively, that are either at or below 80 percent of the statewide median income, or at or below the threshold designated as low-income by the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) [Revised 2021 State Income Limits](#).

Encumbrance - Encumbrances are obligations of all or part of an appropriation.

Equity - Equity ensures that outcomes in the conditions of well-being are improved for marginalized groups, lifting outcomes for all. Equity is a measure of justice.

Fiscal Agent – A legal entity with legal authority, history, and capacity to administer state funds. A Fiscal Agent can make disbursements on behalf of the Applicant.

Funding Target - The APGP intends to award three (or more) planning projects from California Native American Tribes, four (or more) planning projects from Disadvantaged Communities, and three (or more) planning projects from small and rural communities. To the extent applications received are not sufficient to meet eligibility requirements, OPR reserves the right to waive or adjust these funding targets.

Grant Agreement - Arrangement between the State and grantee specifying the payment of funds to be used for grants by the State for the performance of specific Adaptation Planning Grant Program Objectives within a specific grant performance period by the grantee.

Grantee - Designated Lead Applicant that has an agreement for grant funding with the State.



Hazard Mitigation - Any action to reduce or eliminate the long-term risk to human life and property from hazards. The term is sometimes used in a stricter sense to mean cost-effective measures to reduce the potential for damage to a facility or facilities from a disaster event.

Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grant Programs – Grant funding administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to support pre- and post-disaster mitigation activities to reduce the risk of loss of life and property due to natural hazards.

Hazard Mitigation Planning – A process used by governments to identify risks, assess vulnerabilities, and develop long-term strategies for protecting people and property from the effects of future natural hazard events (FEMA FY15 Hazard Mitigation Assistance Guidance).

Historical Disparities: –In the context of these guidelines, “historical disparities” refers to discriminatory land use planning/patterns and de jure segregation that has resulted in urban and environmental injustice and that has created communities that lack access to economic and social resources and that are exposed to greater environmental burdens, such as extreme heat.

Indicators - Quantitative measures, including project-related metrics that show changes in conditions over a period of time.

Indirect Administrative Costs - May account for up to 20% of the total APGP award. Costs incurred by the recipient to administer the grant, or costs incurred by subgrantees to perform the tasks necessary to fulfill the deliverables outlined in these guidelines. Administrative costs include but are not limited to: (1) Prorated general liability, workers' compensation (may be included in payroll), and automotive insurance. (2) Personnel costs associated with administrative, supervisory, legal, and executive staff. (3) Personnel costs associated with support units, including clerical support, housekeeping. (4) Operating expenses and equipment costs not included as part of direct project costs (functions such as accounting, budgeting, audits, business services, information technology, web design services, janitorial; and rent, utilities, supplies, etc.).

Interagency Review Panel - Comprised of the Coastal Commission, Ocean Protection Council, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), Governor's Office of Planning and Research's Planning Team, Governor's Office of Planning and Research's Climate Team, Strategic Growth Council's Resilient Climate Collaboratives Program (RCC), Strategic Growth Council's Health and Equity program (HEP), California Department of Public Health (CDPH), and the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). The panel is responsible for the review of APGP guidelines and applications. This list is subject to change depending on availability.

Joint-powers Authority - A government entity, formed by a formal, legal agreement, comprised of two or more public agencies that share a common power and want to jointly implement programs, build facilities, or deliver services.



Mitigation – Any sustained action taken to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to life and property from a hazard event (FEMA FY2015 Hazard Mitigation Assistance Guidance).

Natural Hazard – An environmental phenomenon that has the potential to impact societies and the human environment.

Nonprofit Organization - Any nonprofit corporation qualified to do business in California and qualified pursuant to subdivision (c)(3) under Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Partner - Entities other than the Grantee that enter into a partnership with the Grantee and other organizations to implement Adaptation Planning grant activities. Referred to as “Co-Applicants” during the application stage.

Plan Alignment – Plan alignment is the process of leveraging connections, information, and resources to build shared language, data foundations, and processes across multiple planning efforts at any scale. The resulting products of plan alignment are:

- a suite of plans (with different scopes and purposes) that share the same data, similar underlying assumptions, aligned visions, complementary goals, strategies, and actions, and
- a shared understanding, process, and structure for multiple entities in a community or region to continue to collaborate and align efforts over the long term.

Project Area - A Project Area is a defined community chosen by applicants for their APGP project. It serves as the area of focus for the APGP project. Applicants must justify their selection by discussing relevant strategies and activities within this area. The Project Area can be located in eligible incorporated, unincorporated, or tribal areas, and its boundaries are not restricted by census tract lines. Applicants must provide a clear description and map of the Project Area, and they can use the ICARP mapping tool to determine Funding Target status.

Post-award Consultation - Prior to the execution of the grant agreement, a period where terms and conditions of the grant agreement are determined and finalized.

Program Objective - Program objectives are statements that describe the desired outcomes of the program. The Adaptation Planning Grant Program includes the following six program objectives: enhance accessibility and diversity, prioritize vulnerable communities, emphasize integrated infrastructure planning: integrate financing strategies for resilience, build community capacity for resilience, and elevate equity in the planning process.

Public Entities - Include cities, counties, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Joint Powers Authorities (JPAs), Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), and Councils of Governments (COGs), Regional Climate Protection Authorities (RCPAs), Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) school districts, special districts, public authorities, public agencies, political subdivisions, and public corporations.

Risk - The combination of an event, its likelihood, and its consequences – i.e., risk equals the probability of climate hazard multiplied by a given system’s vulnerability.



Small and Rural Communities – Communities situated outside of contiguous urban areas, with populations fewer than 75,000, and designated as low-income per [Assembly Bill \(AB\) 1550](#).

Social Vulnerability - Social vulnerability is the susceptibility of social groups to the adverse impacts of natural hazards, including disproportionate death, injury, loss, or disruption of livelihood.

Social Vulnerability Scores - Social Vulnerability score and rating represent the relative level of a community's social vulnerability compared to all other communities at the same level. A community's Social Vulnerability score is proportional to a community's risk. A higher Social Vulnerability score results in a higher Risk Index score (National Risk Index, FEMA).

Technical Assistance - The process of providing the necessary education and resources for climate change mitigation and adaptation projects for any of the following:

- Application Development
- Project development
- The successful and appropriate expenditure of grant money for the successful completion of climate change mitigation and adaptation projects.
- Post-application and project implementation assistance

Traditional Knowledges - Although it is common to refer to "traditional knowledge(s)" as individual pieces of information, this term also refers to traditional "knowledge systems" (TKs) that are deeply embedded in indigenous ways of life. These guidelines use the phrase "traditional knowledges" deliberately in plural form to emphasize that there are diverse forms of traditional knowledge and knowledge systems that must be recognized as unique to each tribe and knowledge holder because knowledges are emergent from the symbiotic relationship of indigenous peoples and places – a nature-culture nexus.

Vulnerability Assessment - Identifies who and what is exposed and sensitive to change.

Vulnerable Community - Climate vulnerability describes the degree to which natural, built, and human systems are at risk of exposure to climate change impacts. Vulnerable communities experience heightened risk and increased sensitivity to climate change and have less capacity and fewer resources to cope with, adapt to, or recover from climate impacts. These disproportionate effects are caused by physical (built and environmental), social, political, and/ or economic factor(s), which are exacerbated by climate impacts. These factors include, but are not limited to, race, class, sexual orientation and identification, national origin, and income inequality. (Pub. Resources Code, § 71340.)

Appendix J: ICARP Grants Mapping Tool

[The ICARP Grant Mapping Tool](#) uses data from three different sources, including CalEnviroScreen 4.0, Priority Populations Map, and the Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool. ICARP staff created this tool to help applicants demonstrate eligibility for APGP's DAC and small and rural funding targets.



- **CalEnviroScreen 4.0** is a screening tool developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to help identify communities with high levels of social and economic vulnerability that are also disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution (SB 535) (De Leon, Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012).
- **California Climate Change Investments Priority Populations Map** is a tool developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to identify disadvantaged communities and low-income communities as defined for California Climate Investments. The map identifies disadvantaged communities as the top 25% most impacted census tracts in CalEnviroScreen 3.0. Per AB 1550, low-income communities and households are defined as the census tracts and households, respectively, that are either at or below 80 percent of the statewide median income, or at or below the threshold designated as low-income by the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) 2016 State Income Limits (AB 1550) (Gomez, Chapter 369, Statutes of 2016).
- **Disadvantaged Communities Mapping Tool** is an interactive map developed by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to identify disadvantaged communities. The tool uses US Census American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Data: 2012–2016 data to identify DACs with an annual median household income less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual median household income.

