

Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program  
Technical Advisory Council

Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
August 10, 2017  
10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

1. Welcome – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

2. Roll Call – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Mike Antos, Kit Batten, Louise Bedsworth, Louis Blumberg, Danielle Bergstrom, Keali'i Bright, Ashley Conrad-Saydah, Tina Curry, Karalee Browne, Sona Mohnot, Andrea Ouse, Jonathan Parfrey, Tapan Pathak, Brian Strong, Kate White

3. Approval of draft minutes ([9/15/17 meeting](#)) – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Mike Antos: Page 12 includes a comment about the water foundation creating a sewer water management profile tool but it should say “sustainable” management profile tool.

**ACTION**

Louise Bedsworth proposed the adoption of the September meeting minutes, including the proposed amendment from Mike Antos.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

Motion: Mike Antos

Seconded: Jonathan Parfrey

All: Aye

4. Executive Order B-30-15 TAG Guidance – Louise Bedsworth, Chair

Louise Bedsworth [presented](#) on the recently released “[Planning and Investing for a Resilience California: A Guidebook for State Agencies](#)”.

EO B-30-15 required OPR to convene a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to create guidance for state agencies to include climate change considerations in all planning and investment decisions. Many elements in the Executive Order are also captured in SB 246, which created this council. Roughly 50 members made up the TAG which met from March 2016-January 2017. The TAG included Workgroups for Scenarios, Community Development, Equity, Infrastructure, and Metrics.

Kit Batten: PG&E recently submitted a filing about safety risk under the CPUC [Risk Assessment and Safety Advisory \(RASA\)](#) Section. One of the risks we cover is risks based on climate change. We used this TAG guidance to inform that assessment, especially the guidance on which emissions scenarios to use.

Brian Strong: Does this mean you are following this guidance for all new infrastructure?

Kit Batten: We used this for our risk assessment for safety. We are planning to integrate this with existing processes such as design standards, cost benefit analyses, etc. We are also developing a suite of visualizations around climate impacts for the communities we serve. All of this information is in the RAMP filing, which is publicly available on our site.

Brian Strong: I have a question about the guidance around project lifetime considerations. This seems easy to understand but not easy to put into practice. For example, pumps in buildings themselves must be replaced before the lifetime of the building itself. This is a challenge when we are implementing sea level rise guidance into capital planning.

Jonathan Parfrey: I have concerns about implementation of this guidance at state agencies. What is OPR's current capacity to provide technical assistance to agencies? Would you identify that as a current gap?

Louise Bedsworth: The Government Operations Agency requires all state agencies and departments that own and operate facilities to complete Sustainability Roadmaps. This year, we asked them a series of questions based on the TAG guidance to walk them through a mini vulnerability assessment. We worked with the Government Operations Agency to provide data to all departments that own and operate facilities, making the analysis easier for them. We provided assistance through the Green Buildings Working Group and by reviewing the Sustainability Roadmaps. As we get into specific projects, there are gaps in the level of assistance we can provide.

Jonathan: Have you presented to the Climate Action Team and Sub Climate Action Teams on this guidance?

Louise Bedsworth: We have not done that yet since we released the guidance recently.

Louis Blumberg: Do you have a roll out strategy for the document aside from the Sustainability Roadmaps?

Louise Bedsworth: Our focus with this document is state agencies, and we worked with the Department of Technology to pull relevant data for the Roadmaps.

Keali'i Bright: How will this guidance influence how state agencies go through their capital outlay processes with Department of Finance (DOF)? Will this guidance influence that?

Louise: We have been trying to do that through the Five Year Infrastructure Plan (5YIP), which is a compilation of infrastructure investments over the next five years. We have been trying to figure out how to incorporate this guidance into budget change process. It's still a work in progress.

Louis Blumberg: If the director of DOF sent this out, that should start the integration of that into budget change proposal (BCP) process.

Jonathan Parfrey: Because this document is the result of an executive order, will there be follow-up from the governor?

Louise: It's possible. That falls within executive privilege

Nuin-Tara Key: We are going to talk more about the Sustainability Roadmaps during our next agenda item. We are also planning to have the Government Operations Agency at our next meeting to report on the Sustainability Roadmaps.

Louis Blumberg: I'm curious to know more about the Adaptation Clearinghouse OPR is developing. How will this guidance document being linked to that? The risk matrix in the document is very valuable. Could that be highlighted in the Clearinghouse?

Louise Bedsworth: There is a placeholder for the Clearinghouse on the OPR page right now. We are working with UC Berkeley right now to build the Clearinghouse website. Users will be able to sort by impact, topic, region and others, and will include case studies, etc. The March meeting will be a good opportunity to get your feedback early on in the beta site testing.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

### **5. Incorporating Vulnerability Definition into TAC Vision and Principles and Public Sector Implementation Actions – Nuin-Tara Key, OPR**

Nuin-Tara Key reviewed the Council's direction from the last meeting and outlined this agenda item.

Nuin-Tara Key: At the last quarterly meeting, the Council adopted a vision and principles contingent upon spending more time discussing how we want to define vulnerability in the context of the adaptation vision and principles. In addition to this definition, the Council is continuing to work on identifying implementation actions and metrics for public agencies that would help us work towards the vision and principles. I will give a quick framing on how the council could approach defining vulnerability. Then, Sona will give a presentation on the Climate Justice Working Group's "[Advancing Climate Justice in California: Guiding Principles and Recommendations for Policy and Funding Decisions, August 2017](#)". After this, I will present a proposed approach for the implementation actions and metrics.

#### Defining Vulnerability

Nuin-Tara Key: We propose separating physical and social vulnerabilities. We should focus on social vulnerabilities since there are already other tools that look at physical vulnerabilities. This [memo](#) provides a few existing definitions of each and highlight how state statute defines vulnerability relative to social/physical factors. We want to link to Cal-adapt and other tools but want to recognize that these tools do not address social dimensions of adaptation and resiliency. It is important to note, that OPR currently does not have the capacity to develop a tool to implement this definition, but what comes from this Council could inform other state agency efforts in the future.

[Advancing Climate Justice in California presentation](#)

Sona Mohnot: The Climate Justice Working Group (CJWG) was brought together to provide input on the Safeguarding California Update. The CJWG developed a series of principles and recommendations to advance equity including definitions.

**DISCUSSION**

Kit Batten: Is the definition of frontline communities meant to be broader than climate change impacts?

Sona Mohnot: This definition on its own is more general, but we should bring in the definition of climate justice.

Jonathan Parfrey: Exposure and adaptive capacity were not included as part of the definition. Is there a reason?

Sona Mohnot: We go into more detail about these things in the document itself. Those just aren't included in the summary I provided in my presentation.

Kit Batten: The CJWG recommendations focus on regional approaches. Is there a reason for this?

Sona Mohnot: Yes, this was done purposefully as we believe that is an appropriate level to work from.

Brian Strong: San Francisco struggles with migration of vulnerable communities. How do we address displacement when we might need to pull back due to rising sea levels?

Sona Mohnot: When we provided comments to Safeguarding, we addressed some of these more specific issues. All comments for Safeguarding are also in the CJWG report.

Keali'i Bright: When we release Safeguarding, we will have a climate justice chapter.

Jonathan Parfrey: How responsive was CRNA to your comments? Is the CJWG involved in SB 1000 or the Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) roll out?

Sona Mohnot: CRNA was very receptive to our comments. They were very present in meetings and provided contacts for the agency lead for each sector chapter. The working group has dissolved. It was a one-year commitment. We are looking for opportunities to pull the group together again.

Danielle Bergstrom: Does the longer document have recommendations on economic transitions?

Sona Mohnot: Yes, all sectors have a component on economic development.

Nuin-Tara presented discussion questions:

1. Does the Council support the staff recommendation to focus on “social vulnerability”?
2. Are there components of the Climate Justice Working Group definition that should be incorporated into the TAC’s definition of vulnerability?
3. Does the Council have feedback or modifications to the proposed next steps?

Louis Blumberg: I am struggling with the structure. It would be valuable to focus on the social part of vulnerability but I don’t want to lose the physical and natural system parts.

Kit Batten: Identifying gaps in tools is useful, but I want to point out that infrastructure was not separated in this presentation. Infrastructure in vulnerable communities is weaker. Not sure it is useful to separate these out.

Louise Bedsworth: One way to think about this would be to tease out underlying community and physical risks. Community is both physical and social. Maybe it’s ‘community’ and ‘changing climate conditions’ rather than ‘social’ and ‘physical’ vulnerabilities.

Kit Batten: I wonder too if there is a way to address this in exposure and sensitivity questions.

Karalee Browne: Changing social conditions and economic disruptions are social rather than physical.

Mike Antos: Social determinants of health could be extracted from that approach. Part of what we produce should be how these two are connected.

Louise Bedsworth: For this agenda item, we want to lay out important next steps to take on this vulnerability piece. We agreed that we wanted to have more conversation. Is there a group of people that would want to work on this before March?

Louis Blumberg: Where do you see this definition being pulled into the framework we built? Will there be a set of definitions?

Louise Bedsworth: This can inform what we are tracking. Definition would be part of vision and principles and then be incorporated into metrics.

Nuin-Tara Key: Yes, the framework will include an expanded definition of vulnerability and outline implementation actions and metrics. It will all be in one document or body of work.

Jonathan Parfrey: Have you examined IPCCs vulnerability framework? Why was this not sufficient?

Louise Bedsworth: It wasn’t rejected but we are trying to figure out how to make our definition more actionable. It needs to align with California needs specifically as well as our implementation metrics. We can still use the same language/terminology for consistency if that is important.

Kit Batten: From our last meeting, it's important to make sure that communities see themselves in the language we use.

Louise Bedsworth: Are there folks that would want to work on this between now and March?

Jonathan, Kit, and Sona volunteered.

Nuin-Tara: All Council members will be invited to join the working group.

#### **ACTION**

Louise Bedsworth: The Workgroup will work to further the conversation about vulnerability, managing physical and social aspects while also keeping in mind creating an actionable definition. The Workgroup will present this definition to the Council at the next quarterly meeting in 2018.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

Motion: Brian

Seconded: Kit

All: Aye

#### Implementation actions

Nuin-Tara reviewed the staff [memo](#) on implementation actions, which are meant to establish a baseline for future tracking.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Louis Blumberg: This is a good start. Are the Sustainability Roadmaps the sole State metric you are proposing at this time? I don't see how funding is incorporated into this. Can we add another metric for state grant proposals that include and consider climate change?

Nuin-Tara Key: Sustainability roadmaps did ask questions around funding and incorporating climate considerations into funding streams. It did not go out to all agencies, but it is a starting point. We hope that these agencies would connect with these programs. This would give us a partial look at how state funding addresses climate change. The main challenge is our capacity to survey all grant program managers through a separate initiative from the Sustainability Roadmaps.

Louis Blumberg: Agencies could be directed to disclose to OPR what grant programs they have and the degree to which they have climate change folded into that. This feels incomplete right now to build a baseline.

Jonathan Parfrey: Yes, it is in EO B-30-15.

Louis Blumberg: In the metrics, you may also want to include percent compliance with the Roadmaps. I also want to bring up climate impacts again. I understand this is a slippery slope, but think it would be important to at least include things like wildfire.

Jonathan Parfrey: On the subject of implementation of the Executive Order, I suggest tracking the number of projects that have used the climate analysis from the TAG guidance per agency. On the subject of regional metrics, I would like to see an OPR or SGC approved body of regional groups. ARCCA is an existing regional collaborative.

Louise Blumberg: I have the same question about Local Hazard Mitigation Plans. How do we track the quality of the plans? Tracking the number of SB 379 compliant plans is great but tracking the quality would be better.

Tina Curry: I'm trying to understand what lens we are trying to use here. Are we discussing the tracking mechanism or what we are actually tracking?

Nuin-Tara Key: We are talking about both today. The goal is to track the local action (what) and we propose trying to use existing mechanisms to track this (how). As a starting point, we are working to figure out the processes we could use without trying to get too far into quality evaluation at this point – recognizing this is our ultimate goal. We also need to keep our timeline in mind as well as we approach the end of this administration.

Louise Bedsworth: Would OES have the capacity to track LHMPs, both quantity and quality, Tina?

Tina Curry: The jurisdictions we fund are required to address climate change in their LHMPs.

Brian Strong: This is another unfunded mandate from this state meaning that it might not go very far. It would be good to get to the quality factor by tracking strategies.

Nuin-Tara Key: ARB has a tool that tracks climate action plan strategies. We could work with them to incorporate that information, where relevant to adaptation efforts.

Mike Antos: It might be useful to have the Water Foundation come talk about this. They measure sustainability by measuring stress and then measuring management response. We are talking about implementation actions, but plans are not implementation actions. We should be weary of that.

Keali'i Bright: I'm not sure how the sustainability roadmaps capture all of our grant programs. Guideline approval processes are an easy place to require this.

Karalee Brown: These two local metrics aren't going to fully describe the good work that local jurisdictions are doing across the state.

Kit Batten: From my experience working for federal agencies, a basic quantitative tracking of SB 379 and EO B-30-15 alone signals change in the way we are doing business. While it is not tracking quality, it can be a strong signal. Also, who is the "validator" of these plans and who is responsible for rolling up metrics and analyzing what direction we are going in? It would be good if there were a way to require reporting and to automate it as much as possible.

The Institute for Local Government has awards for resilience.

I would also like to support Mike's maturity model idea and reiterate usefulness of ARCCA alongside MPOs.

Andrea Ouse: From the local perspective, it is hard for small and medium-size jurisdictions to produce measurable results with funding and knowledge gaps. There is a missing educational step, especially for decision makers. We should be thinking about raising the level of education and integrating these concepts so that communities, appointed officials, and elected officials are provided the funding necessary to implement.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: I like the idea of a maturity model as well. Those of us that are appointed and work on climate in state agencies will be gone at the turn of the administration. We should focus on education and make sure to not make people feel guilty about something they don't understand. Tracking is almost premature. We should be tracking those who understand what the end goal is. ARCCA/MPOs are good, but there are more partnerships at varying degrees of education that should be involved.

Louise Bedsworth: Maybe we should think about tracking the "two-way street" between state and local agencies, such as holding state accountable to make sure resources are available. The General Plan Guidelines outreach strategy is a relationship based metric. We don't have that at the state level but we could be tracking those in the process/transaction side (capacity building). Maybe we should step back and talk about how we could see progress on these.

Danielle Bergstrom: I also like the idea of using a maturity model. Notice that none of the SB1 planning grants went to the San Joaquin Valley due to low capacity. Just going to locals and educating/talking to them about this doesn't take a lot of funding. How do we start building nontraditional partnerships?

Brian Strong: Identifying who is tracking and keeping data is important, otherwise it won't happen. NYC has done a lot of work in this area by developing committees dedicated to tracking progress/outcomes.

Kit Batten: The private sector has been reporting on sustainability and greenhouse gas emissions for a while. There is now a move afoot to start reporting on climate resilience as well – still in its infancy. We should consider learning from the private sector. A couple of the organizations that run these kind of certification around metrics programs are: Dow Jones Sustainability Index, Ceres, and the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP).

Andrea Ouse: One of the most effective ways to encourage locals to implement on a short timeframe is to implement more punitive measures. One of the most effective requirements that has been implemented locally is stormwater pollution programs. They are implemented because the SWRCB penalizes cities for not maintaining this. While it's not the nicest language, it is effective to locals.

Louise Bedsworth: We can adopt this initial framework but place a caveat and think through how we build it out more robustly. We could also start with something else and make this more nuanced.



Kit Batten: We want to do more work and adopt something at a later date.

**ACTION**

Louise Bedsworth: As next steps, we will reconvene the working group that helped develop this framework to build out something more robust and with more context.

Nuin-Tara: All Council members will be invited to join the working group.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

Motion: Kit Batten

Second: Andrea Ouse

All: Aye

**6. Ocean Protection Council Sea-Level Rise Guidance – Deborah Halberstadt, OPC**

Deborah Halberstadt, Executive Director of the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) presented the upcoming sea level rise guidance, which has been distributed for public comment and will be brought to the Ocean Protection Council for adoption in January.

This guidance provides a step-by-step approach to evaluate the projections provided in the accompanying report that synthesizes the best available science (which was released in April) and includes preferred coastal adaptation approaches. The current guidance from 2013 relies on scenario-based projections whereas this updated guidance uses a probabilistic approach to projections that are directly tied to a range of emissions scenarios, which OPC finds to be a better methodology for setting policy in California. In addition to this probabilistic approach, we included a high emissions scenario names H++. This gives decision makers a range of scenarios to think through. Our guidance of evaluating impacts was aligned with the guidance provided in the EO B-30-15 TAG Guidance document that Louise presented this morning. It also provides an explanation of the strengths and limitations of many sea level rise viewer tools.

The deadline for public comment on this document is December 15.

**DISCUSSION**

Mike Antos: I work mostly with inland folks. Does this document provide a narrative that this will pose a problem to everyone?

Deborah Halberstadt: This document doesn't address the Delta, but we point out that that will need to be updated in the next document.

Tapan Pathak: The UC Cooperative extension could be a good partner for outreach for this document.

Brian Strong: How regularly are you updating this document?

Deborah Halberstadt: Every 3-5 years.

Louis Blumberg: Does OPC provide a list of grant programs/financing available to achieve this work?

Deborah Halberstadt: This will be included in the developing Adaptation Clearinghouse. We are trying to figure out how we can support financing framework/mechanisms to help with this (such as revolving loan funds for DACs).

Louis Blumberg: The integration of this guidance with the TAG guidance reinforces the notion of integrating the coastal work with the rest of the local work such as 379 updates. How do you plan to roll this out? Will there be any direction to state agencies?

Deborah Halberstadt: Once the Council approves the document, we will begin roll out to state and locals. We have worked very closely with coastal agencies already. They reviewed all of the drafts, so it shouldn't be too difficult to incorporate this into what they are already working on. We will also held workshops with local governments, tribes, etc.

Andrea Ouse: Will this be integrated into the California Building Code updates?

Keali'i Bright: AB 2800 established the Climate Safe Infrastructure Working Group, which will be having its first meeting in January. This group is charged with bridging the divide between science and planning/design processes.

Andrea Ouse: Is ABAG integrating this into flood maps?

Deborah Halberstadt: Not yet, but our hope is yes.

Brian Strong: Is there differentiation between coastal and bay area/more inland sea level rise?

Deborah Halberstadt: We only use the tide gauge to inform each location. This is where our tool guidance is helpful.

Keali'i Bright: There is Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) funding for coastal agencies. It would be a good idea to coordinate and incorporate workshops for this guidance for the grantees.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

#### **7. SGC Draft Research Investment Plan – Louise Bedsworth, OPR, Elizabeth Grassi, SGC**

Louise Bedsworth gave a presentation on the Draft SGC Research Investment Plan, whose comment period is open until December 15.

Because the program is GGRF funded, it focuses on reduction of GHGs and benefit to low income or disadvantaged communities. The program is open to applicants from the University of California, California State University, federally-funded national laboratories, and private, non-profit colleges and universities. Program goals and priority research areas can be found in the Draft plan [here](#).

## DISCUSSION

Elizabeth Grassi: There is a lot of capacity and need for research in the state. We have received feedback from our workshops that the program needs to be more specific so that folks can feel more secure in applying. We have also received feedback that folks want more academic rigor in how we score application.

Tapan Pathak: These research projects are required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? How is this possible?

Louise Bedsworth: They will reduce greenhouse gas emissions programmatically, not directly.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: The language we use is that they must 'facilitate' greenhouse gas reductions. We don't anticipate quantifying emissions reductions as part of the guidelines for this funding program. We are planning a public workshop to talk about guidelines for this and other GGRF programs that don't have direct emissions reductions. Applications need to avoid tangential relationships between projects and emissions reductions. The more direct the better.

Louise Bedsworth: This is also challenging with adaptation and resilience, which are both called out in the legislation language.

Brian Strong: Should we make some of these goals requirements?

Louise Bedsworth: That is a good question especially around engagement. We would appreciate ideas on how to incorporate engagement.

Mike Antos: We should focus on outcomes of the research rather than the process itself and try to build knowledge and partnerships as much as possible. Engagement should be an outcome, not just a process. I would also recommend that this work include students, which helps to build capacity. Could we give some of this funding to students to present their work?

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Funding students for travel would be too tangential. That would only work as overhead for a larger thing. We need to be careful not to put the program at risk.

Jonathan Parfrey: There are some atmospheric cooling strategies (cool paving/roofs) that technically contribute to GHG emissions but are adaptation strategies. Also, there is a potential political benefit to having some of the projects finish in one year.

Louise Bedsworth: Yes, there are a number of low hanging fruit projects with tangible outcomes that could be completed sooner.

Louis Blumberg: The language for eligible applications should be clarified. Can nonprofits be included at least as partners?

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: Please submit comments you have on the program formally so that we can incorporate them.

Karalee Browne: Institute for Local Government (ILG) will be submitting comments in collaboration with CSAC and LCC. We would like to see more projects with a direct correlation between research and emissions reductions. We would also like to see the research that is completed getting out into the world and how it will be applicable and useable.

Louise Bedsworth: We have also been thinking about how SGC could make these results available. Administrative funding is available. We could bring in translation services, a technical editor, create memos, etc. These are just some thoughts on how to make the resulting research outputs available.

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: For those who use this science in government, making this research into tools would be helpful.

Karalee Browne: Yes, the translation of research into tools or other useable formats is important.

Kit Batten: I have some comments on the review panel and outcomes of this. CEC, through its EPIC program, have built their research program to focus on what utilities need, but the utilities were left out of the process and are not on the review panel. Thus, some awards went to a university for research that we already did. The intended users of this research should be included on the review panel in some way.

Sona Mohnot: Greenlining is also submitting comments on the Research Investment Plan. We would appreciate more guidance on metrics for meaningful engagement and would like to echo the idea of making research very accessible to the nonacademic world as well. One of requirements is benefiting low-income or DACs. With other GGRF programs it's easier to see benefit to DACs but I'm curious how to gauge how a research project would benefit a low-income community.

Louise Bedsworth: We don't have an excellent answer. There will be some projects with a very close tie to DACs but we would like thoughts and ideas on this as well.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

#### **8. Senate Bill 1 Adaptation Planning Grant and ICARP Coordination – *Bridget Driller on behalf of Julia Biggar, Caltrans***

Bridget Driller presented to the Council on the SB 1 on behalf of Julia Biggar.

CTC voted and approved a list of 21 awardees. Caltrans will be issuing second call for projects in January. The interagency working group that developed grant guide envisioned a three-pronged approach to coordination with TAC

1. ICARP support to grant awardees
  - Grantees can ask for TAC Workgroup support or request being on the agenda for a quarterly meeting.
2. 2 Case studies for ICARP Adaptation Clearinghouse
3. Caltrans progress reports to ICARP TAC
  - Caltrans staff provide updates minimum twice a year

#### Discussion Questions

1. Are there additional suggestions on how to provide Technical Assistance (voluntary) to grant awardees?
2. What type of information would be helpful to receive from the Caltrans reports?

#### DISCUSSION

Ashley Conrad-Saydah: How adaptation is being implemented at Caltrans as an agency. What is the understanding at the agency of what is needed by these applicants?

Bridget Driller: We do incorporate adaptation functionally. Vulnerability assessments are being conducted for each of 12 districts that will be completed within the next year. Following this, we will develop adaptation work plans. We also have office of sustainability that is department wide.

Kate White: The sustainability team is focused on organization wide systems change for Caltrans to make sure department is doing everything it can to reduce GHG emissions and plan for changing climate.

Keali'i Bright: The Safeguarding transportation chapter includes a menu of things Caltrans is doing and plans on doing.

Nuin-Tara Key: Each district was involved in the grant review process. District staff may have not been exposed to any climate adaptation work before that. We held workshops for them as a primer for adaptation. This was seen as an opportunity to build capacity with district staff.

Karalee Browne: It would be helpful to see summaries on how this money is being spent as soon as possible. There are some obvious potential cohorts in this list of awardees. Perhaps we could form groups based on region or technical assistance they might need and have a TAC member adopt one of these groups.

Andrea Ouse: I would like to see feedback from grant recipients on reporting requirements and invoicing. Even if a 100,000 grant, if they are spending much of their time invoicing, this can be a larger burden to some communities.

Danielle Bergstrom: I don't see any grantees from SJV on the list. Was there a lack of applicants?

Bridget Driller: There were no applicants from District 10.

Jonathan Parfrey: Will this application change much in the next round?

Bridget Driller: No, the grant guide will not have substantive changes; we may make small edits to clarify points we've received questions on.

Sona Mohnot: Is there a post-application survey to get a sense from applicants about how the application process was?

Bridget Driller: We haven't done a survey but we do offer non-award teleconferences for anyone who requests them. It's been such an accelerated timeline that we were just trying to get the program out the door. The third cycle will be easier to improve the process on.

Keali'i Bright: What was the conversation like when you presented these for award at the California Transportation Commission?

Bridget Driller: It was easy (it was live streamed, in case anyone is interested).

Kate White: I like the idea of having grantees come to the TAC to circle back on what is happening with some of these leading projects.

Jonathan Parfrey: Technical assistance from this Council would be very high level. Perhaps OPR could create some kind of list of research facilities and NGOs that do have some grounding in resilience in planning for the awardees where they might be able to receive that information. ARCCA could help form this list.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

#### **9. 2018 Appointments – Louise Bedsworth, Chair**

Louise Bedsworth provided the Council with information about the appointments process for 2018.

Louise: We would like to have staggered appointments for continuity on the Council. Please email Nuin-Tara to let her know whether or not you are interested in continuing on the council. If folks have thoughts on how this year went, voices that were missing, ideas on how to make this more effective, how the workgroup process went, etc., please email Nuin-Tara or you can make comments now.

Louis Blumberg: Have any Council members joined midway through this year?

Louise Bedsworth: No. One person left. Another was replaced from the same organization.

Kit Batten: It's good to look at composition. I think there were diverse perspectives around the table this year. I would encourage you to continue to ensure that tribal perspectives and the private sector are represented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

(No Public comment was received by OPR staff).

**10. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Michael McCormick: I have some edits to make to the notes from September clarifying language around the General Plan Guidelines and SB 379 Presentation on OPR's statutory authority more precisely.

Louise Bedsworth: Propose reopening agenda item 3 (adoption of the minutes) to incorporate these clarifying point into the approved September 15, 2017 minutes).

Jonathan Parfrey motioned to open notes for Michael's changes

Andrea seconded

All: Aye

Jonathan motioned to close the notes with the proposed changes

Kate seconded

All: Aye

**11. MEETING ADJOURNED**