

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program Technical Advisory Council

California Energy Commission Art Rosenfeld Hearing Room

1516 9th St Sacramento, CA

March 27th, 2017

10:30am – 3:30pm

The first Technical Advisory Council (TAC) meeting minutes provides a high-level summary that includes goals of the enabling legislation (Senate Bill 246), requirements for public process, and potential topics that the TAC members may work on in the coming months. TAC members have wide-ranging perspectives and occupy various roles in local, regional, and state governmental entities, non-profit organizations, utilities, and philanthropic organizations. Action items emerged, including:

Adoption of the proposed charter, with the following amendments:

1. Bring 1) equity and environmental justice, and 2) Climate Integration (cross-cutting objectives in legislation) up into the opening scope language
2. Add a placeholder for the TAC's "Vision and principles" (the TAC will work to develop this at subsequent meetings)
3. OPR will follow up with a list of sectors called out in the enabling legislation (SB246) so TAC members can self-identify areas of expertise; these will be added to the TAC website along with existing member bios and photos

Voting on adoption of TAC 2017 work plan and any actions to implement on topics presented and discussed:

1. The TAC will develop an adaptation "vision" that articulates aspirational goals, principles, and definitions.
 - o OPR will follow up with the TAC about forming a work group on this topic.
2. The TAC will develop a set (number to be determined) of "case study plus" products that demonstrate the value and economic or financial value of investing in adaptation efforts. Targeted audience and goal for this work product are still to be determined, but it should tie into and support the vision (item 1 above).
 - o OPR will follow up with the TAC about forming a work group on this topic.
3. The TAC will engage in the Ocean Protection Council's Sea Level Rise (SLR) Guidance update. As a first step, the TAC has requested a briefing on the OPC's science update and will then discuss how to engage further in the guidance document process.
 - o OPR will work with the OPC to provide an overview of the high-level findings of the OPC Science Advisory Team Working Group.

1. Welcome – Ken Alex, OPR (2:49)

Ken Alex, Senior Adviser to Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Director of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, Chair of the Strategic Growth Council

Roll Call: Mike Antos, Kit Batten, Louise Bedsworth, Danielle Bergstrom, Louis Blumberg, Keali’i Bright, Michael Carroll, Jason Greenspan (alternate for Darin Chidsey), Ashley Conrad-Saydah, Tina Curry, Maureen Frank, Jana Ganion, Martin Gonzalez, Sekita Grant, Betsy Hammer (alternate for Cara Martinson), Andrea Ouse, Tapan Pathak, Bruce Riordan, Brian Strong, Gloria Walton, Kate White.

Director Alex acknowledged the leadership on integrating climate adaptation and resiliency from Senator Wieckowski’s office through Senate Bill 246 (2015). SB 246 underscores the importance and immediacy of issues that the Technical Advisory Council (TAC) will deal with. In California, we take climate change seriously and no one knows that more than local governments who deal with the effects on a daily basis. California needs to have local governments working with the State. Governor Brown has made this one of his priorities.

When we think of California’s threat to the over 900 miles of coastline, the changes in snowpack, challenges of drought and flood, we see that the TAC’s role is very essential.

Director Alex raised the following questions:

- What should the State be doing?
- What should we know about the challenges at the local level?

Director Alex noted his interest in knowing what the TAC members priorities what are:

- What are the short-term challenges that rise to TAC’s attention?
- What can we say are particularly statewide issues?
- What are appropriate to be categorized at the regional and local levels?

Director Alex also raised the following questions as areas he’s like to see the TAC take on in the coming year:

- How do we fund what is a very profound set of challenges?
- Are there financing opportunities that we need to think about?
- How do we integrate all of this into state, regional and local decision-making?

Director Alex noted these are steep challenges in the world of climate and very pleased to have you here. Wish you best of luck with these efforts.

2. Louise Bedsworth, Chair (7:50)

Louise Bedsworth, Deputy Director at the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research

Louise Bedsworth: The intention of the TAC is to have a two-way street of communication and coordination between the State and those who work at the local and regional levels.

TAC meetings fall under the public meetings laws pursuant to the [Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act](#)

Public meeting participants are welcome to sign-up to receive electronic updates for the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program, including the TAC. During the meetings, the public may provide public comment on all items.

There is also a general public comment time allotted at the end of the meeting should a public member wish to raise another topic.

Public Comment:

No public comments received by OPR staff.

3. ICARP Overview – Nuin-Tara Key, OPR (11:20)

Nuin-Tara Key, Resiliency Program Manager at the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research

Presentation:

There are two main pieces to the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program: (1) Climate Adaptation Clearinghouse and (2) the Technical Advisory Council

First, through the Adaptation Clearinghouse, OPR is looking to support a community of practice around adaptation and resiliency across the state. The Clearinghouse will help support local implementation of adaptation efforts by providing resources in the following areas:

1. Science and Research, with a link to Cal-Adapt
2. Policy guidance and decision-support tools, including connections to the Adaptation Planning Guide and other state-wide policy guidance
3. Case Studies that highlight local implementation actions across the state

The second component to the program is the Technical Advisory Council. From OPR’s perspective, in the short term looking to the council to help guide local adaptation implementation efforts that:

1. Balance immediate needs with long-term goals
2. Support policy alignment between state and locals
3. Identify early, key leverage points
4. Identify strategies to institutionalize adaptation and resilience in existing work programs

ICARP TAC Discussion (17:50):

Sekita Grant: clarifying question- SB 246 includes a number of priorities. One of them is to advance equity and environmental justice. Where does this apply?

Nuin-Tara Key: In OPR’s view, equity and environmental justice would be present throughout all of the work that touches on climate adaptation.

Sekita Grant: This should not be siloed. Ms. Grant wants to make sure it is integrated throughout the work and sees the council serving a role to help ensure this happens.

Louis Blumberg: The legislation uses the word ‘support’. Council is here to ‘support’ and that’s a broad word and that should be discussed more fully. Mr. Blumberg also raised the Executive Order B-30-15’s Technical Advisory Group (a working group convened by OPR last year to help implement Governor Brown’s Executive Order on climate adaptation as it relates to State agency’s plans and investments). Mr. Blumberg advocated to the group that ICARP, or the TAC, not reinvent the wheel and remember that the TAC is not starting from scratch.

Michael Carroll: Can you please circulate the members' contacts and those of the staff involved including their roles?

OPR Staff: Yes.

Public Comment:

No public comments received by OPR staff.

4. Technical Advisory Council Charter and Bagley-Keene – Louise Bedsworth, Chair (22:18)

Louise Bedsworth, Deputy Director at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research

TAC members were given an overview of the proposed Charter, with time to recommend edits.

- The Charter names Louise Bedsworth as Chair with an option to create a vice-chair
- Members are appointed for 1 year terms
- 4 meetings per year
- Meetings where council members are deliberating on topics under the Council's jurisdiction triggers Bagley-Keene requirements
- With TAC representation across local and regional governments, tribal governments and state agencies, OPR staff would like to hold meetings in rotating locations across the state and would work with other Councilmembers to accomplish this
- Minutes prepared at every meeting and shared for approval for the next meeting
- OPR was appropriated funding to assist with travel to meetings. TAC members are responsible for requesting this reimbursement.
- When voting – seek to get consensus where we can. Otherwise, majority vote.

ICARP TAC Discussion:

Mike Antos: Can we bring the two objectives: 1) equity and environmental justice and 2) Integration up into scope?

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Do we have expertise areas filled or are additional members needed?

Louise Bedsworth: OPR staff feels that they are generally covered. Membership wasn't assigned by specific seats but staff worked to make sure that the key sectors in SB246 are covered. If, as a council, we feel that there is an area not represented we can consider additional appointments. OPR worked to balance sectors and area expertise with size.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Thinking about recycling and waste management because it touches on other sectors, and not sure we have that area covered.

Louise Bedsworth: Would be good for everyone to look at the list of sectors in SB246 and self-assign themselves specific roles or areas. Our current website include TAC member names and bios, but we can add these "sectors" as a follow-up.

Bruce Riordan: Climate adaptation suffers from a lot of what we're going to do but not to what end. On the climate mitigation side, we have strong and aspirational goals. On climate adaptation, we're doing a bunch of things without a sense of where we're going. That's a problem for our work and for other people to join in. It is tougher for us to quantify, but maybe it could just be a vision like California is #1 on adaptation or has the best climate adaptation system.

Sekita Grant: I like calling out more working meetings. If it's more than 2 committee members, that seems very low. And if there are sub-groups, does that apply?

Louise Bedsworth: Yes. There are ways to deal with it and raises some logistical challenges; we would need to notify public and publicly accessible. But, OPR can help to manage the logistics and this shouldn't be seen as a barrier to setting up working groups or sub-committees.

Martin Gonzalez: What is OPR's working definition of coordination in this context?

Louise Bedsworth: It is aligning state, local and regional activities and utilizing the concept of a two-way street. Learning what is happening on the ground and using it to inform what the state is doing and vice versa. Facilitating more work on the ground with who ultimately manages those projects. We also think of this as 'dot-connecting'.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: OPR has the coordinating title because OPR works on a wide range of issues and can convene this kind of holistic conversation.

Tapan Pathak: Documenting positive impacts of programs for adaptation is critical and necessary to make this work operational.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Many of us are aspirational (thinking of the resiliency goals). It goes by to the questions OPR Director Ken Alex raised at the beginning of the meeting: What is the low-hanging fruit that we can accomplish in a year? What are the long-term goals/strategies?

Louise Bedsworth: We don't have similar targets to AB 32, but this is something that this group could define. What could this look like?

We have an opportunity to articulate a vision that has equity and climate justice principles at the heart of it. Don't want to assume that we think about equity or environmental justice the same way
Coordination: for SCOPE, we are networks with other groups like CCEC and CEJA (CBOs who have these principles centric to their models). We should utilize our networks to bring back information here.

Gloria Walton: We have an opportunity to articulate a vision that has equity and climate justice principles at the heart of it. I also do not think we all view climate justice or equity the same or adaptation and resiliency the same way. So I think there is an opportunity to equalize knowledge about vocabulary that is core to the TAC. In terms of coordination, SCOPE is networked with the California Climate Equity Coalition and California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA), who serve as networks for community based organizations (CBOs) who have principles that are central to this model. We have a shared responsibility to utilize the networks we all have to bring back information here and vice versa. This gets at the two-way street idea that Louise was discussing. bring back to our own networks.

Bagley-Keene Discussion

Sandy Goldberg, General Counsel at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research: Ms. Goldberg reported to the TAC that they can have conversations about the topics but cannot have conversations with certain members and go to other members so that they are never meeting with majority at one time to convince them and form a consensus around an issue that the Council will be addressing.

Kit Batten: If four of us meet about climate adaptation but not about the agenda items of the TAC, is that okay?

Sandy Goldberg: Yes.

Gloria Walton: What I am hearing is that we cannot organize the vote.

Sandy Goldberg: That is correct, but the rules are not limited to upcoming voting decisions.

Jana Ganion: Does this apply to electronic communications as well?

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes.

Andrea Ouse: And these communications would be discoverable on both private/personal devices.

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes.

Sekita Grant: If there is a sub-working group working on rural issues and 4-5 of Councilmembers meet with other experts about an informational opportunity, is that ok?

Sandy: Informational purposes and general adaptation, that's okay.

Mike Antos: Who has the responsibility to comply with Bagley-Keene?

Nuin-Tara Key: OPR is responsible for notifying/putting agendas and materials on the TAC website. TAC members are responsible for managing their personal communications within the context of Bagley-Keene requirements.

Louise Bedsworth and Nuin-Tara Key: Please contact us for any questions that come up in your other work.

Public Comment:

No public comments received by OPR staff.

TAC Action

- Adoption of the proposed charter, with the following amendments:
 4. Bring 1) equity and environmental justice, and 2) Climate Integration (cross-cutting objectives in legislation) up into the opening scope language
 5. Add a placeholder for the TAC's "Vision and principles" (the TAC will work to develop this at subsequent meetings)

6. OPR will follow up with a list of sectors called out in the enabling legislation (SB246) so TAC members can self-identifying areas of expertise; these will be added to the TAC website along with existing member bios and photos

Motion: Brian Strong
Seconded: Mike Antos
All: Aye

5. State Adaptation & Resilience Efforts (54:40)

Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Louise Bedsworth gave an overview of how this council and the ICARP program more generally fits into the space of adaptation and resilience efforts going on at the state level.

To begin, Louise Bedsworth gave an overview of Safeguarding California, the State's adaptation strategy.

- Lead by CRNA
- Plan that was last updated in 2014 and looks across 10 sectors
- Overview of climate risks and corresponding actions that are currently underway or planned to address those risks
- EO B-30-15 required every sector to develop an implementation action plan. CRNA is tracking progress on these plans.
- AB 1482 requires an update to Safeguarding every 3 years. Update currently taking place. Public review draft available in spring 2017.
- Serves as a guiding document but also as a concept for the state's operations as well as local actions.

Other current pieces of climate adaptation:

- Fourth Climate Change Assessment – looking at climate impacts and planning for changes across sectors
- CalAdapt update
- Finalizing EO B-30-15 Technical Advisory Group (TAG) document
- Sustainability roadmaps
- General Plan Guidelines
- CivicSpark

ICARP spans across these activities and across scales.

SB 246 Technical Advisory Council opportunities and goals

- Establish a two-way street for coordination and communication
- Identify key points of connection across state, local, and regional actions – both barriers and opportunities
- Provide a venue for engagement on important topics

ICARP Clearinghouse – another bridging opportunity (discussed in detail by Nuin-Tara Key, agenda item #3).

ICARP TAC Discussion:

Mike Antos: Have any of these plans you mentioned turned into a concrete success somewhere in the state that can help sort out that path from planning to execution?

Louise Bedsworth: Yes, a number of examples. One of which is a number of State agencies, in partnership with local government secured a HUD grant for Tuolumne County.

Kit Batten: Given all this great work, are there definitions of success that we can use as a starting point?

Keali'i Bright: How to define success is a challenge in Safeguarding California and recognize a need for an un-siloed effort to accomplish climate adaptation programs to meet larger goals. Still, there are ongoing processes and we have to balance between siloed and un-siloed efforts

Kit Batten: I understand that situation; similar context when I was at USAID at the federal level. We were trying to define success of resilience. One way we measured was through stakeholders and tailoring definitions to each sector. Suggest looking to other governments that may have already tried to address this issue of measuring resilience.

Andrea Ouse: the "de-silo-ization" needs to occur with private sector/development community and for those who work at the granular level. Conversations need to happen at the ground level with those that we didn't want to/didn't think to engage before. Coming out with deliverables [basic toolbox] that we can take back to a local community. General to very specific so we can educate within our local government and other organizations.

Mike Antos: we need to stop being maladaptive. Do we have an inventory of what things are on auto-pilot? We need large institutional changes and need to do this on purpose. Budget lines, staffing you don't get shifts you need. Maybe that's the place that needs the most work.

Sekita Grant: Being inclusive in how we set goals and define things and look toward stakeholder groups who don't have a seat at the tables helps to put us on a more sustainable track and gets us broader buy in for what we are trying to accomplish. We should also focus on those who are going to get hit hardest and first by climate change.

6. Welcome –Senator Wieckowski (1:25:00)

As author of the enabling legislation, SB 246, Senator Wieckowski provided a welcome to the Technical Advisory Council.

Thank you for allowing me to speak today and thank you OPR for gathering this group and for your diversity geographically and in expertise. Local workers need good trusted information to help make their decisions. This council will make it easier for them to access this information more quickly. The Governor's Office, OPR, and legislative leaders are all behind you. We in California take climate change seriously. Regardless of what happens in Washington DC, I want everyone to know that we play an important role to help CA and the world meet our climate goals.

7. 2017 Technical Advisory Council (TAC) potential work plan elements (1:36:16)

Louise Bedsworth, Chair

The goal for the next three pieces of this agenda item is to come together with a sense of direction for our next meeting. These are topics we have brought to the table from a “state” perspective to discuss today, but leave room for other ideas as well.

a. General Plan Guidelines (1:38:45)

Presentation by the Office of Planning and Research on the 2017 General Plan Guideline update, Michael McCormick

Michael McCormick provided a high-level overview of the forthcoming General Plan Guidelines (GPG) update (anticipated release in April 2017).

OPR is the state statutory planning agency – have several obligations – General Plan Guidelines (GPG) and CEQA are two. This GPG Update (over past 5 years) has been a deep engagement activity as we have tried to identify what the 2003 guidelines did well and not so well (areas for improvement).

A General Plan is like a local government’s constitution (blueprint for future growth). Usually starts with Vision and goes from there; use community engagement/focus groups to decide the direction communities want to go. Also starts by accessing data and considering future issues, challenges and goals.

Some of the new legislative requirements covered in the 2017 GPG update:

SB 1000: Requires Environmental Justice element

SB 379: Safety element to address climate adaptation and resilience strategies

SB 375: Sustainable communities strategies

AB 2140: City and/or county adopt with its safety element a federally specified local hazard mitigation plan

General Plan data tool will be up and running with GP release in April. Intended to link local governments to the core data required for General Planning.

Vulnerability Assessment process:

- Use CalAdapt for information
- Use APG for planning

The Adaptation Clearinghouse will provide case studies on how local implementation of these new legislative requirements works in the real world.

Discussion Questions:

1. *What role should the TAC play in helping to track and communicate progress towards local implementation of existing legislation and policy?*
2. *How can the TAC support alignment of state and local policy efforts that advance local implementation?*

ICARP TAC Discussion:

Mike Antos: How do General Plans work with other plans? Are they encouraged to intake what others are thinking about/doing (for example, Urban Water Management Plans)?

Michael McCormick: Yes, in many cases this is required. General Plans are supposed to roll up all regional and local plans that are applicable to the jurisdiction into one place. Doesn't always work but is the intent. Additional guidance on interlinking in this update.

Bruce Riordan: What are barriers to implementing this type of plan?

Michael McCormick: A few things we learned from GPG outreach: local jurisdictions (1) lack technical expertise (requires consultants) (2) financing (especially in the context of overlapping and plan update timelines), (3) the day-to-day management of emergencies often gets in the way of long range planning.

Brian Strong: Does this apply to Charter Cities and General Law Cities?

Michael McCormick: General Plan Guidelines only apply to General Law Cities. We find that Charter Cities do comply but there are some deviations and, by law, that's okay.

Brian Strong: A lot of jurisdictions are moving to specific plans to get around doing large General Plan updates. Some communities have so many specific plans that consistency becomes an issue

Kit Batten: What is the difference between a General Law and a Charter City?

Michael McCormick: Charter cities are not required to follow GPGs. General law cities are established (more information [here](#))

Andrea Ouse: When are the cities compelled to update the general plan given new General Plan Guidelines?

Michael McCormick: not a firm compliance date- generally expect jurisdictions to scope their General Plans shortly after guidelines are released. Statute is already there so they must follow this still.

Tapan Pathak: CalAdapt has a lot of data visualization for regional context. Are there efforts to create a decision support system?

Michael McCormick: This conversation has been happening for a while, about linking the Adaptation Planning Guide (APG) and CalAdapt. This would be ideal but there are logistical and funding challenges.

Louis Blumberg: SB 379 has provisions around Local Hazard Mitigation Plans (LHMPs). How does the General Plan intersect with the Hazard Mitigation Planning process?

Michael McCormick: Since 379 passed OPR has been working with OES to connect on that planning. 379 creates a stronger linkage between General Plans and LHMPs that incentivizes the incorporation of LHMPs into Safety Elements.

Tina: LHMPs are voluntary but many people have done them because it's a way to get federal funding for post-disaster work. We try to have them done at the county level.

Louis Blumberg: In addition, Coastal Commissions providing guidelines for coastal planning. These intersections might be a place for the TAC to focus to leverage these processes.

Jana Ganion: focus of this group is to integrate climate actions that pair mitigation and adaptation. In GPG is there discussion of this pairing?

Michael McCormick: Absolutely. EO B-30-15 was first legislation that acknowledged cobenefits. Understand that there is cost to doing both. If you focus on policies/programs that do both there are many benefits, which is outlined in Guidelines.

Danielle Bergstrom: Has the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) been integrated into the Guidelines?

Michael McCormick: SGMA is in the conservation element. We acknowledge that water is a bigger issue and are starting up guidance for an optional water element. Haven't had the capacity to do that with this update.

Jason Greenspan: Looking through lens of regional planning (SCAG has ~190 cities) 40% haven't updated their General Plans since AB 32. Wondering if guidelines could come up with template – turn into implementation.

Michael McCormick: Yes, that is our aim. To provide examples of plans and implementation – how it is working, how it's not, etc.

Martin Gonzalez: Who provides education to these cities?

Michael McCormick: One of the things we do is technical support. We have calls that come through the CEQA clearinghouse about processes to follow, interpretation of statute, who they should be talking to etc. We have a rotating call structure to address this need through the local government roundtable calls. We are also planning outreach for GP engagement. We look to organizations like ILG and those around the table to help us make those connections.

Louise Bedsworth: In the interest of time and the goal of getting to a broader discussion on the TAC's work plan, suggest moving on to the Sea Level Rise portion of the agenda item and can come back to broader discussion following this and the Financing presentation from LGC.

b. Sea Level Rise (2:15:40)

i. Presentation by the Ocean Protection Council on the forthcoming State Sea Level Rise Guidance Document Update, Jenn Ekerle

Background:

- Ocean Protection Council consists of 7 member council. Cabinet level state policy body in statute nested in CRNA
- Mission: ensure healthy, resilient, and productive ocean and coastal ecosystems
- The original SLR Guidance Document was produced in 2010 with a smaller update in 2014. Since 2012 there have been advances in science, which leads to the need for a comprehensive update.
- Purpose of the update is to summarize best available science, including ice loss contributions to sea-level rise. Also provides guidance to help state agencies in their permitting and investments with different time horizons and risk framework to understand consequences of decisions.
- Updating in collaboration with CRNA and OPR.

Update Process:

- Two-step process:
 1. Summarizing BAS including ice loss dynamics science (there is a working group on this). Integrating peer reviewed science into summary.
 2. Public engagement process. Soliciting input from local planners and state agencies. Now in process until next few months.
- OPC approval in January 2018.

Discussion Questions:

1. *How can the TAC contribute to the public outreach effort by helping inform local and state entities of the process underway, the value of stakeholder feedback, and how to participate?*
2. *How can the TAC help ensure that state and local stakeholders are aware of the opportunity to review and provide input on the SLR guidance document update, which should reflect the needs articulated during the public engagement process?*
3. *How would the TAC like to directly provide input on the current use or future needs of SLR guidance (described in question 1 above) and on the draft updated SLR guidance document itself (described in question 2)?*

ICARP TAC Discussion:

Bruce Riordan: Is OPC seeking input on science?

Jenn Ekerle: No, OPC is trying to understand if and how people are using the document right now and if there are things that could be done better to be sure that we are providing good policy guidance.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: In response to the first and second questions, this group could help with the networks we have. In addition, impacts will go inland eventually, and it would be helpful for us and communities to understand inland impacts.

Brian Strong: San Francisco is doing its own work and guidance on SLR. There is concern from SF community that the State could disrupt this. How will you take community input on your science? Is this something that will be regularly updated? What if communities have done deeper research?

Jenn Ekerle:

As it stands, this is state guidance that provides projections over a certain time scales. Right now, OPC recommends using the top 2/3 of the projections as a precautionary measure. It is unclear right now exactly what our recommendations will be in the coming guidance, but OPC is in close conversation with locals. Because science is evolving quickly we may need to update this very frequently (1-2 year intervals).

Andrea Ouse: Is OPC working with BCDC and other regional entities?

Jenn Ekerle: Yes, OPC is coordinating with the State Coastal Climate Action Team and Dr. Susanne Moser to conduct interviews, outreach and listening sessions. We believe it would be helpful to use this group to help with that outreach and engagement.

Mike Antos: Sea level rise touches most inland CAs through the Bay Delta water supply. Is this being addressed?

Jenn Ekerle: OPC guidance will address this as well and we work with Delta Stewardship council.

Michael McCormick: The Ocean Protection Council, Office of Planning and Research, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and Delta Commission have been working together on this. There are SLR impacts that are likely to be outside of coastal zones. The coming General Plan Guidelines refers to SLR guidance document and will be updating that section as this SLR document is updated as well.

Sekita Grant: With regard to call for support and outreach, are there specific communities OPC is interested in engaging? It would also be helpful to know what impacts are coming so that we can target engagement so as to not bombard people with information. Are there stakeholder groups that are lacking in the conversation?

Jenn Ekerle: We are trying to cast as wide a net as possible to make sure people are aware and can be engaged as they want to be. The practitioner side is a big focus. We are scheduling a series of public workshops in May and June.

Bruce Riordan: This guidance could be a great case study for this group. Change in science at significant levels is something we will face in other sectors as well.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Agree with Bruce. This could be a larger goal for us, showing how to incorporate rapidly evolving information to adjust what resilient outcome looks like. (for example, we are dealing with this in forestry industry with millions of currently dead and dying trees).

Martin Gonzalez: Could you offer insight into your thinking with regard to appropriate planning space (citywide change versus regional change)?

Jenn Ekerle: Impacts can be very localized depending on topography. It depends on environment and local engagement. There will be a legal requirement to incorporate SLR in planning with nexus to the General Plan Guidelines. This will outline the planning scope to a certain extent.

Kit: What is the timeframe over which these plans are being made? How do you incorporate great uncertainty into planning? Perhaps this is something we should discuss in this council.

c. Adaptation Financing (2:35:23)

i. Presentation by Local Government Commission (LGC) on adaptation financing, Kif Scheuer

Kif Scheuer gave an overview and framing of financing specific to climate adaptation to frame a discussion for the Advisory Council. Throughout his overview, Kif references to LGC's Local Government Survey and partnership with the 4th Climate Change Assessment.

Financing adaptation is a moving target as *change is accelerating*. Any response we undertake will be challenged by variations (drought, SLR, tree mortality). This is a big financing conversation, as prioritization is a fundamentally challenging question. There are a lot of *technological and societal changes* (eg. autonomous vehicles) that also need to be considered. Need to think about these levers and the way they interact.

Preliminary results of the 4th climate assessment for financing adaptation give us tentative information mostly focused on local governments. Literature review of adaptation plans showed large variation between cities in how they implement. This speaks to the nascent sense in which communities are planning for these impacts.

Through LGC's local government survey we see that most jurisdictions are spending their adaptation efforts on figuring out where they are at and what their initial planning processes will look like. Sources of local adaptation funding: general funds, state agencies, foundation grants.

There are structural and opportunity barriers to funding. Variability in climate projections effect people's ability to invest.

Discussion Questions:

1. *What role can the TAC play in identifying and understanding critical adaptation financing needs?*
2. *How can the TAC help to identify the best opportunities to leverage existing and/or new financing and funding to yield the best adaptation benefits?*
3. *What role can the TAC play in defining essential outcomes for resiliency investments so we can help state, local, private and other decision-makers move towards a more broadly shared approach to financing adaptation?*

ICARP TAC Discussion:

Mike Antos: San Francisco is facing billions in terms of potential impacts. Where are the insurance companies? No incentives?

Brian Strong: Not much is going on there. There are bonds focusing on recapturing partial losses from insurances. Business interruption insurance is not common. Value of more secure future isn't there right now.

Mike Antos: Wouldn't big reinsurers charge you a lot if they thought you weren't protecting it??

Brian Strong: City of SF is insured. Hard to grasp what the benefit will be if there is additional protection. Lot of people talking about it but not entirely there yet. Financial mechanisms we have will need to be prioritized and projects will need multiple benefits.

Keali'i Bright: Personal insurance availability is being interrupted due to Rim fire.

Maureen Frank: Rim fire had very few household losses, mostly landscape and infrastructural/economic impacts. Homeowners are asking insurance companies for help and they're pulling out. Premiums are increased (\$5,000 to now \$20,000). People can't sell their homes.

Keali'i Bright: This situation can replicate over different policy areas.

Sekita Grant: Who were you serving through this LGC survey?

Kif Scheuer: Local government staff throughout state. We try to get a representative sample but it is skewed to coastal areas.

Sekita Grant: It would be good to understand who was responding and who wasn't. Communities that are more organized are likely to have more resources and understanding of science of what will be impacting their communities.

Kif Scheuer: We complemented this with a number of workshops around the state – hard to get people to come.

Sekita Grant: Encourage this group to think about how to be targeted and intentional with where we are funding. Understand what the existing economics realities are for different communities. As we think about financing, we need to think about wealth gaps, gentrification and displacement. There are opportunities to be very inclusive but if we don't do it, it could be very problematic.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: One potential 1st product we could produce is some study results/case scenarios (Weed- Rim Fire, king tide, inland flooding). This would be helpful for the Legislature.

Danielle: I would encourage one in rural farmworkers where adaptation is happening now. What are the conditions in which you adapt? Is it infrastructure/jobs? For example, San Joaquin Valley raised \$600 million for water infrastructure (flat rate so not equitable way to do it, though there were some affordability points).

Michael: There is a lack of market and financing for this issue. CDFIs are good at addressing capital gains that private markets are not. Crescent city had to rebuild their harbor (100 yr tsunami proof facility), CDFI provided \$8 million bridge loan which enabled them to make monthly payments for contractor. Encourage you to include CDFIs. Mission is to serve underserved markets. Key component of that is technical assistance. Hope that it targets disadvantaged communities and includes CDFIs.

Louise Bedsworth: Rockefeller Institutions brought CDFIs and the issue of bonding local contractors came up. That would get insurance to these contractors.

Jana Ganion: One of the difficult things is that adaptation funding is a patchwork of many different buckets. The Database of State Incentives for Renewables and Efficiency (DSIRE) serves as a clearinghouse for funding opportunities and areas. One suggestion is that we could pull together a working group to gather a number of funding sources that loosely fund adaptation and pair adaptation with mitigation.

Louis Blumberg: What else do financial markets for adaptation look like besides resilience bonds?

Kif Scheuer: Grant guidelines, layering rebates, state could create a standard playbook. Setting terms for investment strategies.

Gloria Walton: Funding and financing is the most challenging. There are many models (eg. LA's measure M). Popular thing right now is TOD bonds. Water, local returns. Guidelines pose barriers for folks that we want to be able to access these funds.

Mike Antos: On Ashley Conrad-Saydah's point about the catalog of best practices/case studies, there are things that people are doing that are adaptive that people don't know are. Good to talk about incremental costs of infrastructure that become more adaptive (better pavements for repaving, better trees for replanting, etc). Some places are better positioned for this.

Bruce Riordan: We have identified in several meetings that financing is a huge issue but no one is in charge. Who is going to take this on and what role could we play in getting someone to take it on?

Louise Bedsworth: We can do work through work groups through this council. Let's now move towards the next open discussion.

d. Open discussion on TAC 2017 work plan priorities and potential actions (3:15:26)

Louise Bedsworth: Do we want to inform the case studies idea? Our target audience could support locals but also the legislature. Can we use it to help more measure AAs happen? What does our "AB 32" of adaptation look like? We are a working body and could create a set of case studies or target principles?

Sekita Grant: Findings and opinions of this group should be active in the mitigation piece. Much of state actions have been because a pot of money is attached to it. CA will kick itself later if this group is not involved in those mitigation conversations and decisions (ARB conversations, scoping plan).

Brian Strong: The idea of case studies is good but don't want to just focus on that. Often they get put on a website and don't know if people really use them. Making case studies very targeted is very important. That requires some work from us at a committee. Also think we should look at the difference between local, regional, state and federal roles and be active on all levels.

Tapan Pathak: What are the parameters or measures for monitoring and evaluation of adaptation/resilience?

Kif Scheuer: It is difficult to ask this with surveys. Can go back and look at specific comments, but this topic is forthcoming in the 4th assessment as well.

Mike Antos: We are using resilience is a metaphor. This is also an ecological concept that involves disruption and evolution. How much would it cost if we said that in 2020, all jurisdictions with General Plans will update them?

Michael McCormick: Anyone with a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) is required to update General Plan to new standards. That should be within ~5 year period. Those without LHMPs must update their General Plan to incorporate adaptation by 2022. However, even though these are mandates, we see that many do not follow other mandates.

Mike Antos: What are the teeth of those mandates?

Michael McCormick: If you aren't complying with law you are liable to be challenged. Your policy document is at risk for being challenged.

Louise Bedsworth: SB 375 is incentives based. CEQA is streamlining incentive based.

Kate: Sustainable Communities Strategies (SB 375) are now tied to Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) and projects that move forward will only get funded if they are part of the RTP.

Danielle Bergstrom: Advocate against just focusing on plans. Plans only go so far. For example, Sustainable Community Strategies are not necessarily resulting in radical transformations in the way people are thinking about VMT and transit; it's just another way of measuring transportation in the region.

Louise Bedsworth: Taking a stab at a general sense of direction of discussion and potential next steps:

- Challenging ourselves to put out that idea of an "AB 32" equivalent for adaptation – what does that look like? What would we want to see? Don't need to take a lot of time on this but relates to a lot of other items we discussed today. Could get to SLR element, outcomes for investments.
- Packaging a story through case studies? Could wrap in other elements here: equity and EJ. Frame conversation around planning or financing.
- SLR Piece, being an opportunity to engage on an ongoing topic that is a good real-time example of something we could learn from for other sectors down the road (could pair with tree mortality).

Louis Blumberg: 'What is the AB 32 of adaptation' is something we have talked about for a long time, but we lack metrics. ARB is the regulatory body for mitigation. Without clear metrics and an entity that can issue regulations there are challenges.

Story telling is great, link with financing would be a great story with equity and integration.

Mike Antos: Don't know whether this goes with AB 32 or case studies piece, but one thing Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority does is narrate how the watershed is the right scale for managing water. This leads to the question - what can cities do? Regional counties do? State? Etc. Announcing how adaptation fits at different scales.

Kit Batten: In terms of case studies, don't want to do something that will just sit on a website. Want to talk about barriers. Maybe folks here can share an example of things you have already been through and what things worked/didn't work. Bring in partners that could weigh in real time. Might be more useful than mining for information.

Gloria Walton: With regard to "AB 32" – don't want to use this as the standard because, while it was useful for generating revenue, there were fundamental flaws. We should learn from these. There were a lot of loop holes. This brings us back to being clear about our values. Also on thinking about AB 32 metrics: flawed model. Not enough transparency with reporting.

Keali'i Bright: Agrees that SLR guidance process is an opportunity. This is good timing, and SLR impacts a lot of people. We have programs right now in place to give assistance to local jurisdictions but these don't reach all those impacted. This is a chance for us to pick at a big issue and show stakeholders how these impacts will be far reaching.

Andrea Ouse: Mining case studies from local government perspective is not helpful. These are often developed by communities that have resources.

Martin Gonzalez: Having a clear target audience for case studies would be helpful. Define resiliency and adaptation to these audiences.

Brian Strong: Common definitions are helpful.

Nuin-Tara Key: Think Ashley Conrad-Saydah was saying not to just highlight information but to convey a message around the value of taking adaptation efforts/steps in the right way. Show the benefits through an example.

Danielle Bergstrom: Thought she was talking about something to present to the legislature, about how we better integrate adaptation/mitigation and how to blend funding opportunities – case studies could help that.

Bruce Riordan: David Sedlak is a great communicator on this. He looks at CA as a place that has solved issues – 2050 looking back. This group could come together with a daft of what CA did to be resilient in 2030 or 2050. Could populate that with practical things we have been talking about.

Louis Blumberg: Back to comment this morning. Wonder about expectations for our group. Talked about ICARP as having clearinghouse and TAC. Will ICARP take actions upon which we will provide advice? How much work do you expect us to do?

Louise Bedsworth: The program is not regulatory. We don't have any authority. Primary role is to do coordination across entities across state and with local and regional governments. That is where this

group is uniquely situated to put more behind what it is that we do. We could go back to state agencies as we coordinate a funding program and say that these are the things that we think are very important.

Maureen Frank: in light of federal government, we should build a state resiliency plan for other States to look at.

Action Items:

Louise Bedsworth: Steps for next meeting.

- Agree that we want to start working on vision idea of what we want to look like in the future. What it would mean to be successful as a council and as a state.
- Start discussing something around the “case study plus” idea. Building that story in a very targeted way to a very specific audience that could tie in to the vision.
- How to take advantage of the SLR opportunity piece. Related to community engagement. How do we model this engagement and integration?

Nuin-Tara Key: In the interim between this and next meeting, propose:

- Putting together work groups or committees around three different areas to think about these in more detail to bring to next meeting.

Brian Strong: We should follow up on definitions. Also look at incremental versus long term costs and benefits. Might be more specialized but to understand the benefits of green infrastructure would be helpful.

Louise Bedsworth: Case studies and SLR can do interim work to flesh out and bring back to the group. If there are work groups that can form around any of these OPR staff can handle logistics.

ACTION:

Voting on adoption of TAC 2017 work plan and any actions to implement on topics presented and discussed:

1. Work on vision for 2050/2030 idea of what we want to look like in the future (include definitions here)
 2. Case study plus idea – build story in a targeted way to a specific audience – tie into vision
 3. SLR Piece. Modeling engagement and integration
- Putting together work committees to focus in on these

Kate White: motion

Brian Strong: seconded

All: Aye

8. General Public Comment Louise Bedsworth, Chair (3:57:03)

Kif Scheuer: Applaud work you are doing. Think about work that is not being done by others. You have a unique opportunity to ask the hard questions and look at things that haven't been looked at. Reaching further than case studies would be great.

9. Meeting Adjourned