

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

Meeting Notes

July 18, 2017

11:30 AM – 1:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

2. ROLL CALL

Louis Blumberg, John Blue (alternate for Ashley Conrad-Saydah), Tina Curry, Steve Sanders (alternate for Martin Gonzalez), Jana Ganion, Kit Batten, Andrea Ouse

Public participants: Alexandra Leumer (TNC)

3. INTRODUCTION

Nuin-Tara Key, OPR

Nuin-Tara Key: The goal of this meeting is to refine the vision and principles language for the workgroup’s final consideration at the August meeting, working towards the full TAC’s adoption at the September quarterly TAC meeting. Assuming this goal is met, the August 10 workgroup meeting will focus on identifying a series of implementation actions and corresponding measurable targets. We can also begin to discuss these implementation actions as they relate to the vision today. These both will be presented to the full Council for discussion at the September TAC meeting.

4. VISION AND PRINCIPLES

Greta Soos, OPR

a. Review of updated “vision and principle” document

Greta Soos gave an overview of the [revised vision and principles document](#), which responded to the direction of the Council at the June 16 quarterly meeting. The discussion questions in this document were used to guide the following discussion.

b. Open discussion on vision and principles

VISION

Kit Batten: I want to bring up the past discussions we have had about bringing in quantitative measures into the vision up front, similar to state mitigation goals.

Discussion Question 1: In both versions, the second sentence includes the language, “the most innovative state in the union.” Do we want to include this statement? How is this measured or defined?

Kit Batten: California just extended Cap and Trade – I would say that we are a leader. With regard to this statement, we should also discuss what the TAC wants to do with these statements and get feedback from GO about what the demand is.

Steve Sanders: I like to believe this statement, but it is not true across the board. It seems self-congratulatory, which can be distancing. I like the spirit/idea. Is there a way to clarify what we are being innovative about and who is being innovative? All Californians? The State government?

Tina Curry: Tweak to say that we will *lead* with innovation.

John Blue: I agree, it's hyperbolic. Say we *will* be innovative

Andrea Ouse: Yes, this will capture the spirit of innovation.

Jana: Perhaps say, "Long recognized as a leader in climate change, the state will continue to lead with innovation"

Louis Blumberg: We should add language around promoting both adaptation and mitigation and developing an integrated comprehensive program to address climate change. That is one of the main goals of ICARP.

Jana Ganion: Perhaps say "leading with innovation in climate action and greenhouse gas reduction"

Discussion Question 2: In both versions, the first characteristic uses the language "so that they cannot simply survive climate-related events, but thrive despite and after these events." Is this something we want to include (specifically, the word survive)?

Jana Ganion: Replace the word survive with 'withstand'.

Andrea Ouse: I agree

Kit Batten: Shorten text in people and communities characteristic so we aren't repeating text from the above vision statement.

Louise Bedsworth: I agree. Shorten for consistency.

Louis Blumberg: I do not have a problem with the length. I also agree with saying withstand and thrive.

Kit Batten: Say withstand "and" thrive, not "but". This changes it to a positive statement.

Steve Sanders: I agree. Remove the words "despite." Say "can withstand" rather than "cannot."

Kit Batten: Add "all" to beginning of the people and communities characteristic.

Louis Blumberg: I am okay with shortening it but want to make sure we are highlighting the importance of focusing on our most vulnerable communities. Equity is critically important. That part of the statement should be kept.

Discussion Question 3: In version 2, is it important to include the additional sentence, “Working across all levels of governance, the State will be prepared for not only changing average conditions, but also punctuated extreme events”?

Steve Sanders: That strikes me as two statements.

Louise Bedsworth: We should also use the word “government” not “governance.” I also don’t know that most people will know what “punctuated” extreme events are, and think that we are experiencing prolonged extreme conditions more than punctuated ones (eg, wildfire and drought).

Kit Batten: Separate the two statements with “and”

Tina Curry: Why bring in the word government?

Nuin-Tara Key: We have gone back and forth with the audience for this, and the direction from the full council has been that the vision should provide context for a broader audience than just government (or public sector) stakeholders. However, during TAC and vision and principles workgroup conversations, we continue to return to a public sector focus for the vision statement. We would like to get clarity from the workgroup on the direction to take for this and how to balance these two perspectives.

Kit Batten: This brings me back to a point I have stressed before: we will need another level of governance to meet our adaptation needs. I would like to keep that word in for that reason.

Steve Sanders: We could say “Working across all levels of government, the people of California will be prepared” ...

Kit Batten: Does that involve non-California based private sector entities? Those are also important.

Nuin-Tara Key: We will keep the reference to government in the statement. We will also take the suggestion to add “people” and “private sector” (including non-California based) in. We will also separate the two statements.

Louis Blumberg: This gets back to point about metrics. One of the statements I sent in from our previous vision and principles workgroup was “Consideration of climate change becomes standard business practice at all levels of government.” We need to get at who is prepared/preparing for climate risk. This statement can also set up the opportunity to list metrics after vision statement. (Eg. X number of cities and counties have amended their GP/HMP to include climate risk reduction.)

Steve Sanders: However this statement is reworded, I like the idea of “working across”. Keep that in.

Nuin-Tara Key guided this part of the discussion to talk about implementation metrics.

Nuin-Tara Key: Given Louis’s recommendation and the general support during today’s meeting to include a government-specific reference in the vision statement (while also balancing the goal of creating an inclusive and broad vision statement), I’d like to bring up a related point about implementation metrics. We will discuss this further during the next agenda item, but I want to raise this now for your consideration. Figuring out a single quantifiable metric is very difficult because there

isn't a single measurable metric for adaptation. Our initial thinking with the metrics was rather than having a measurable component in the vision statement itself, there would be a separate component in the framework document calling out metrics. That said, if there is support to include a specific reference to government action in the vision, then this will guide the type of implementation metrics we propose. Staff is not advocating for one approach over the other, we just want to make sure we are being intentional about what is stated in the vision statement, as this will inform the type of metrics we develop to track implementation of this vision statement.

Kit Batten: I understand the challenge that you described. We don't want to be overly prescriptive in the vision statement. Maybe we could include some language (such as 'standard business practice') in the vision statement that points to implementation and then have more details on metrics later. This will be a two-page document, so the implementation component of the metrics will not get lost.

Louis Blumberg: The way that the ICARP will be successful is by helping local and regional governments. We should include a sentence that sets us up for calling on local and regional governments to measure metrics.

Kit Batten: Can you clarify what sentence you brought up earlier, Louis?

Louis Blumberg: Yes. This comes from the document I submitted to ICARP staff the first time they requested input on the vision and principles framework. The sentence is, "Consideration of climate change will become part of standard business practice in government at all levels."

Kit Batten: You are not proposing specific metrics in that vision, correct? Is this setting up for later implementation metrics?

Louis Blumberg: Yes. Below that, I proposed metrics examples.

Louise: I like the metrics you proposed in that document. At what scale do we track these metrics? The sentiment is right; we want it (consideration of climate change) to be a part of everything we do. What do we track to know that?

Kit Batten: One way to approach this is to bring climate change considerations into all forward looking decisions versus existing assets (this is how PG&E is approaching this). We are looking at how to build new climate information into design standards for future assets and decisions. One option is for us to discuss where we want to make recommendations in terms of forward looking versus present decisions.

PRINCIPLES

Discussion Questions:

1. Do these modifications represent the comments made at the last Council discussion? Does anything else need to be added or removed?
2. In principle 3, do we want to take the approach of listing the natural system functions, "water and food security, habitat for fish and wildlife, recreation, jobs, and quality of life amenities"? If so, is anything missing?
3. For principle 4 (A or B), which describes the additional definition of maladaptation more accurately?
4. Which version (1 or 2) is preferred? If version 2 is preferred (consolidating the number of principles) can we prioritize the concepts in principle 6?

Jana Ganion: Don't combine principles 6 and 7. Add *mitigation* and adaptation actions in the last sentence of principle 6.

Tina Curry: Principles 1-3 use the word prioritize up front. Should we combine those into 1a 1b and 1c? I also like the word maladaptation but we use the word "avoid" twice. Change this.

Louise Bedsworth: I like principle 4b better. We should state something like "identify and take all opportunities to prepare for..." and not use the words "fiscal and decision making." We should also switch the order of the sentences to not use the word "avoid" twice and turn into a positive statement.

Kit Batten: I don't know if combining the first three principles would be supported by the rest of our colleagues on the Council, as we don't want to understate the importance of equity.

Louis Blumberg: Principle 3 is an equally important priority, as it is also called out in EO B-30-15. I also agree that the maladaptation principle needs more work. Maladaptation is acting without fully considering impacts and avoiding making decisions that result in unexpected negative consequences. Unanticipated mayhem is created by maladaptive actions.

Kit Batten: I want to reemphasize that the collaborative partnerships principle also points to our need for additional level of current government structures.

John Blue: I don't think we should shorten the number of principles, as they are all different and equally important.

Discussion Question 2:

Kit Batten: I am interested in Louis' perspective. Maybe having examples is helpful. Although, I'm not sure what "quality of life amenities" means.

Louis: The list is worth keeping. Add a reference to coastal resources. Quality of life amenities is difficult to understand but we should somehow describe the connection between nature and lives is important.

John Blue: I would like to keep the reference to food security. It is important to remind people that California is an agricultural state and there is a large constituency dependent on food.

Nuin-Tara Key: We will keep this list with a qualifier (stating that the list is not exhaustive), add a reference to coastal resources, and modify the language for "quality of life amenities."

Nuin-Tara: recap. We will keep version 1. Modify 3, add 4b and modify sentence order, delete avoid, keep maladaptation in principle. Taking Louis' feedback around making sure we are describing maladaptation – not acting without understanding the impacts of climate change. P6 – adding mitigation to last sentence.

Public Comment:

Alex Leumer: You should consider borrowing language from SB 379 and AB 1482 that gives list of natural infrastructure examples for inclusion in Principles 3. State that the list "can include but is not limited to ..."

ACTION:

OPR Staff will work to incorporate these comments into a final vision and principles document.

All: Aye

5. IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS AND METRICS (GOALS)

Nuin-Tara Key: With regard to implementation actions and metrics. If people have thoughts or ideas on these for the next work group meeting, please send them to us (OPR staff) by July 31.

Steve Sanders: We should include a metric around measuring collaboration across scales of government.

Kit Batten: Again, there is a need for a regional body for adaptation. Maybe we should consider a workshop for how we should do this.

Steve Sanders: I agree.

Andrea Ouse: In terms of local government needs, we mainly need political will and funding. Until there is a mechanism that communicates to locals the importance of climate adaptation with viable funding avenues, I do not know that this will be as valuable as we intend it to be.

Louis Blumberg: I will resend my previously proposed metrics. I also suggest that we look at Safeguarding California for metrics and think about utilizing a checklist.

ACTION:

Workgroup members will agree to send any ideas for implementation metrics to OPR staff by July 31st for incorporation and discussion at our next workgroup meeting on August 10th.

All: Aye

6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was received by OPR staff.