



Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program Technical Advisory Council Quarterly Meeting

Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2021 | Zoom Video Conference | 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Item 1 | Welcome and Roll Call

Present: Jacob Alvarez, Nathan Bengsston, Karalee Browne, Lori Nezhura (Alternate for Christina Curry), Shereen D'Souza, Laura Engeman, Jana Ganion, Jason Greenspan, Amanda Hansen, Nuin-Tara Key, David Loya, Sona Mohnot, Darwin Moosavi, Andrea Ouse, Jonathan Parfrey, Michelle Passero, Linda Helland, Mark Starr, Brian Strong, Gloria Walton, John Wentworth, Jo-Ann Julien (Alternate for Wilma Wooten)

Absent: Grant Davis, Dan McDonald

Item 2 | Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

DISCUSSION

Nuin-Tara Key opened discussion for review of draft meeting minutes from the [6/11/2021](#) and [8/19/2021](#) meetings.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ACTION

Approve the ICARP Technical Advisory Council draft meeting minutes from [6/11/2021](#) and [8/19/2021](#).

Motion: Brian Strong

Second: Jana Ganion

Aye: Jacob Alvarez, Nathan Bengsston, Karalee Browne, Lori Nezhura (Alternate for Christina Curry), Shereen D'Souza, Laura Engeman (6/11/2021), Jana Ganion, Jason Greenspan, Amanda Hansen, Nuin-Tara Key, David Loya, Sona Mohnot, Darwin Moosavi, Andrea Ouse, Jonathan Parfrey, Michelle Passero (6/11/2021), Linda Helland, Mark Starr, Brian Strong, Gloria Walton, John Wentworth, Jo-Ann Julien (Alternate for Wilma Wooten)

Abstain: Laura Engeman (8/19/2021), Michelle Passero (8/19/2021)

Item 3 | State Agency Report Outs

State partners provided updates on key adaptation priorities.

Amanda Hansen (CA Natural Resources Agency, CNRA):

- CNRA is focusing on planning in order to implement the proposed 2021 budget funding quickly to build out the program infrastructure. The proposed budget is moving forward with significant funding for climate resilience, including wildfire and forest resilience, immediate drought needs and long term water resilience, extreme heat, sea-level rise, community resilience, nature-based solutions, carbon neutrality, and sustainable agriculture.

Lori Nezhura (Governor's Office of Emergency Services, CalOES):

- The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recently released a Notice of Funds Available (NOFA) in August for the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) [programs](#), with combined available funds of \$1.16 billion nationally. Each state is guaranteed \$1 million, and the rest is competitive. Information is available about past funded projects in the state. For FY22 CalOES will be conducting informational webinars to support applications to these programs.
- Co-hosted a pilot climate adaptation planning training with FEMA for emergency managers, which CalOES will build upon for more California-specific trainings.
- Currently updating the State Hazard Mitigation Plan and soliciting interagency engagement.
- Recently conducted tribal visits in San Diego region: discussion insights included community engagement for vegetation management activities; concern about Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS), grid resiliency, and backup energy generators; and the finding that tribes are using the 2020 Adaptation Planning Guide for hazard mitigation planning.

Shereen D'Souza (CA Environmental Protection Agency, CalEPA):

- Joins as new CalEPA Deputy Secretary for Climate and Intergovernmental Relations; excited about California's leadership role and the budget's focus on climate adaptation, equity, and environmental justice.
- The State Water Board is monitoring progress towards the 15% urban water use reduction mandated by [EO N-10-21](#), and recently released a report on state water rights and climate projections. The Board is working closely with CalRecycle on co-digestion funding, regulations, and stakeholder engagement for wastewater treatment plants to advance GHG benefits, grid resilience and energy independence.
- The Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) is working to better understand climate change and health outcomes intersections, and are updating the *Indicators of Climate Change* report. They are developing an

analysis of statewide fire hazard and capacity, scientific guidance on extreme heat, and adaptation strategies, with a focus on vulnerable populations.

- The Department of Pesticide Regulation, in light of drought and extreme heat, is examining how sustainable management of pesticides can be advanced more quickly via a working group and advance notification tool, recognizing that with climate change, pesticide use will shift, and communities nearby may experience impacts.

Darwin Moosavi (California State Transportation Agency, CalSTA):

- CalSTA recently finalized and adopted the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure ([CAPTI](#)), which implements [EO N-19-19](#). CalSTA is implementing the plan by first examining project prioritization principles for discretionary program funding, and specific actions, particularly CalTrans resilience work.
- CalTrans is developing a departmental climate action plan broader than infrastructure investment pieces, and will later seek ICARP TAC input.
- CalTrans has been heavily impacted by current climate impacts: wildfires and route closures, including travel impacts to public and supply chain issues.

Mark Starr (CA Health and Human Services, CHHS):

- The climate change budget investment includes \$25 million for the farm work and long-term weatherization program administered by the Department of Community Services and Development, and an additional \$14 million for that program's multifamily component for low-income populations.
- The Climate Change and Health Equity Section at CDPH (CHESS) is working with the Sacramento Municipal Air Quality District and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association to update the [Draft GHG Handbook](#), now open to public comment, for analyzing GHG reductions, assessing vulnerability, and advancing health and equity. This handbook helps local agencies identify strategies and projects to advance adaptation and equity in local planning efforts.
- CHESS recently worked with CARB on incorporating climate change and health vulnerability indicators into the cap-and-trade fourth investment plan, which will help funders monitor health and environmental justice objectives in projects serving disadvantaged communities. Also collaborated with the Southern California Association of Governments to systematize equity technical assistance efforts, held a focus group for health departments on climate change health impact planning, and provided input on a national tribal resilience effort to advance data for tribal adaptation planning.
- Advancing a multi-departmental effort to address drought impacts, including identifying drought risks and mitigation actions, and preparing contingency plans. This includes monitoring social service needs, extreme heat impacts, access and functional needs, healthcare facilities, funding programs like MediCal, elderly population impacts, infectious diseases, and chronic impacts.

Nuin-Tara Key (Governor's Office of Planning and Research, OPR):

- Specific pending budget items directly related to OPR and ICARP includes funds for building capacity to do long term planning, while balancing the need for immediate action: 1) Scaling vulnerable communities platform and developing other resources for using climate projection data, and support for local planning and implementation. This will also support OPR in aligning state efforts for usage of projection data and science and guidance; 2) \$25 million over three years to fund local, regional and tribal adaptation planning efforts; 3) A new regional climate resilience planning and implementation program.
- OPR will come to the Council for partnership while developing these programs.
- An ICARP extreme heat package will be funded next year, following the release of the extreme heat framework, and an extreme heat grant program.
- Funding for the 5th CA climate assessment will allow ICARP to implement SB 1320 and continue to drive investment in science informed policymaking.

DISCUSSION

Jo-Ann Julien: Thrilled with budget and priorities, appreciate it at the local level to know dedicated funding is available to do the work at the nexus of climate change and public health.

Jonathan Parfrey: What is OPR's internal capacity and structure to manage this influx?

Nuin-Tara Key: Much of this has been planned long in advance; but ICARP will still need to hire additional staff. The regional program will take some additional thought and time to scope and build out.

Jonathan Parfrey: Will the draft Extreme Heat Framework be brought before us?

Nuin-Tara Key: We held 3 public workshops this summer to understand the needs. When we pull the framework together we will share it in the coming months.

Amanda Hansen: We are focused on where the gaps are, how to address them, and how to integrate them with ongoing actions. We've been compiling ideas from the public workshops and state agencies, and will hopefully have a set of near term discrete actions for agencies to advance.

Jonathan Parfrey: We're hoping the next few budgets will have funding for extreme heat. We're considering moving legislation to more clearly guide and define the process, and will be in conversation with you as this develops. We're also excited about the SGC programs that were funded such as the resilience centers and the SB 1072 climate justice community collaboratives, distinct from the ARCCA collaboratives. It would be nice if there could be a name change to distinguish between all the different collaborative programs. Any additional information on these would be welcome.

Nuin-Tara Key: We will work with SGC to share updates as these programs, and the Transformative Climate Communities Program, as they come on board.

Brian Strong: There are going to be a lot of expectations on how we plan for this 3.7 billion and spend it. It would be helpful for a future meeting to go into more of the

details of implementation and how we can coordinate and communicate what is happening. On the regional part, it's important to take our time, since every region is different; please use us to help navigate this work. I'd like more information from FEMA on the BRIC and HMGP program; local agencies are frustrated with FEMA on the cost-benefits requirements and other aspects around eligibility and need that don't align well in California. We'd like to know if staff changes at CalOES such as grant specialists might happen to support the influx of Federal funds.

Laura Engeman: It would be great to have a conversation for ideas on aligning TAC priorities and these funding programs. There are a lot of experimental ideas that ICARP has initiated like the insurance work group, pre-mitigation spending, vulnerability and equity investments; we should think about how funds could be more narrowly focused and not too broad. We have a strong idea already of the needs and alignment issues. OPR will need capacity and there will be a flurry at the local level to apply, and it's important to provide clarity so applicants can strategically invest their time and efforts. I'm curious about the 5th assessment priorities and framework: will there be an emphasis on regional downscaled climate science? How does it fit with these other investments? What are the science priorities? How can the science be applied to support action at the local and regional level?

Nuin-Tara Key: The Assessment is well scoped and planned, and will build on the successes of the previous assessments, such as the regional and topical reports. The big picture goal is to sequence different pieces to accelerate science to action, including building the right tools, and translating the science into information and resources that are usable. We also want to build engagement through every step of the process, leverage the assessment to drive answers to major questions, drive primary research, and support action. There will be a continued focus on stronger tribal research partnerships and a tribal research grant program.

Laura Engeman: I am very interested in being involved in all of that and am willing to have a special meeting of ICARP to discuss many of these budget items.

Michelle Passero: I would support a near term interim meeting to provide input on these different opportunities. Do you have a sense of timing and goals for rolling these out?

Nuin-Tara Key: No answer on the timing yet, we will be working on this.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None received.

Item 4 | ICARP Updates

Juliette Finzi-Hart introduced the new [ICARP Staff Report](#) format for providing staff programmatic updates, and provided brief update remarks on:

- Resilience Metrics Development through the State Adaptation Strategy
- The State Adaptation Clearinghouse
- Community Planning and Capacity Building Recovery Support Function (CBCB-RSF)
- Technical Assistance for Integrated Planning
- FEMA Cooperative Technical Partners (CTP) and Feasibility Study projects
- Department of Insurance Climate-Safe Insurance Working Group Partnership
- Prop 84 Wildfire Recovery and Resiliency Grants
- Future ICARP TAC Impact Report and 2022 Visioning.

Lisa Hu provided an overview of the ICARP Vulnerable Communities Platform, provided updates on progress and next steps, and opened the virtual floor for discussion on the initial buildout and potential future listening sessions.

DISCUSSION

Sona Mohnot: Regarding different use cases, and building on the work defining vulnerable communities, it will be helpful to have metrics and standards and more specificity around how we define vulnerability for programs and guidelines. It would be helpful to be able to show community-based partners what climate risk looks like in communities, provide technical support to understand the science and the socioeconomic factors that can exacerbate a communities' vulnerabilities to climate risks. There are so many current grant programs that have resilience components, so this tool can be helpful for state agencies that already have grant programs to incorporate and prioritize vulnerability, such as the Transformative Climate Communities Program and the future Community Resilience Hubs program.

Mark Starr: In SB 1320, health doesn't appear there, but welfare does, so use cases specific and deliberate around health vulnerability to climate change impacts would be useful. Our experience with the pandemic has shown us the value of focusing on and identifying vulnerable communities for the pandemic response, so it might be good to build on those learnings.

Nathan Bengtsson: Since there may be many other platforms, it will be valuable to consolidate these other sources,. For example, there's a CDPH tool that provides relative ranking information which is useful when we don't have targets or hard metrics yet.

Lisa Hu: Yes, many tools and fragmentation exist. Our intention is to consolidate state data sources and avoid replication. We are trying to fill a very specific gap in helping communities access currently segmented information by overlaying and integrating climate projection data on top of the other datasets. We are also in conversation with OEHHA and CalEnviroScreen 4.0. We're not interested in

an indexed approach to rank or score communities' vulnerability; though there may be various indices within the tool.

Andrea Ouse: West Sacramento has vulnerable communities that warrant trust improvement; this was discovered through the public health emergency and the need to improve vaccination rates. On the ground perspectives are important for the process of designing listening sessions itself, in addition to during the sessions, since we're finding significant distrust in many of these communities, and this will need to be addressed to obtain information.

Lisa Hu: Glad to hear the comment about trust. Our intention is a community centered process, based in ground truthing, ensuring the platform is actionable, and usable in diverse local contexts. We'll need partnerships to get as much input as possible to be successful, especially to bridge trust gaps.

Nuin-Tara Key: As we proceed we will likely consult the TAC for input on engagement.

Laura Engeman: The summary report is excellent, thank you for putting it together.

Jacob Alvarez: In my community we try to be careful to give the right perspective and set expectations appropriately. We often describe the timeline for the plan we're seeking input on, and let them know it may take a long time for results to appear. We try to inform them of the full process so that we avoid the pitfall of making them feel like they weren't heard, and this allows us to keep going back to people for continued engagement.

Nathan Bengtsson: PG&E is in the early stages of community engagement around a substantial vulnerability assessment through the service territory. We're interested in partnering on ways to offer participants something tangible for their participation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Gurjeet Singh: I represent the Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN). I'm excited about how OPR will be engaging communities bearing the largest brunt of climate impacts. There are several communities that come to mind, including people who are low income, have language barriers, outdoor workers, the elderly, etc. The APEN report includes incarcerated, electricity dependent, transit dependent, immigrant, and refugee populations. I recommend considering populations like these that may fall through the cracks during the adaptation process.

BREAK

Item 5 | Presentation on Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) - Community Development Block Grant Mitigation (CDBG-MIT) program

Maziar Movassaghi presented on the CDBG-MIT Planning and Public Services Program and Resilient Infrastructure Program funding from the 2017 and 2018 Federal Disaster Declarations in California.

DISCUSSION

Michelle Passero: I'm part of the insurance working group and the recently released report that examines synergies and opportunities around community-based mitigation and insurance options. It would be great to follow up and have a discussion with CDI if there haven't yet been discussions.

Maziar Movassaghi: There is definitely a connection between these programs, and an opportunity for insurance to address these risks. I would love to be connected to folks at CDI.

Jason Greenspan: Is there a channel for making communities aware of this program and how they can leverage it to develop Safety Element implementation plans? How aware are they of this program? What is the status of hazard mitigation plans overall, and do jurisdictions have the opportunity through this program to update them?

Maziar Movassaghi: This was a clearly identified need for the program. Both emergency management and housing officials have applied for updates. The outreach was successful, especially because it gathered housing and emergency management folks in the same room for the first time.

Mark Starr: How do the funding match and leveraging components work?

Maziar Movassaghi: If the project is standalone, HCD will pay for 100% of planning and construction, but you have to demonstrate the ability to pay for long term operations and maintenance. For FEMA's HMGP program, we will provide the 25% match requirement for that program. Unfortunately, the implementation timelines don't match well between the two programs.

Mark Starr: Regarding impacted, distressed, and low income communities, what are your aspirations for those allocations?

Maziar Movassaghi: Since this is our first time we are going to see if we can meet the 50% target first. A majority of communities under the program areas (2017 and 2018 wildfire impacted areas) were not low income communities.

Nuin-Tara Key: Councilmembers can be leveraged to get the word out to eligible communities, especially the funding match opportunities. How do these two funding pots work together in terms of aligning funding, sequencing, and long term infrastructure resilience considerations and investments – for example could they get the infrastructure funding, and then get the housing funding for more strategic use of

these funds? Or is there too much unmet immediate housing need to allow any delay in funding?

Maziar Movassaghi: One example of that is how we broke the Resilient Infrastructure funding into two rounds, one for shovel ready projects and the other for projects for capacity building. This complements the CDBG Disaster Recovery funding, where those funded projects need to have a specific tie to a disaster; however, many of those projects needed resilient infrastructure or larger community level capacity and planning. This is why we invite applicants through a notice of intent process so that we can assist in identifying the best funding source.

We are seeing a lot of local pressure to address immense unmet housing needs immediately, which is a primary local driver for expending housing funds first and quickly, and not necessarily strategic for long term resilience. Trying to align all the needs is complicated, especially given immediate impacts from recent fires.

Nuin-Tara Key: We have to balance long term resilience with current needs.

Maziar Movassaghi: This is why it's important to encourage and incentivize jurisdictions to have a post disaster housing and recovery plan.

Jonathan Parfrey: How much has HCD been involved in the long-term recovery efforts in LA County that CalOES and OPR and others have been involved in?

Maziar Movassaghi: I am not aware, but I can inquire.

Clay Kerchof: Are you referring to the Southern California Catastrophic Earthquake Plan that CalOES is updating?

Jonathan Parfrey: No.

Lori Nezhura: We are working with LA County on a long term recovery plan, but it's a local effort that CalOES is supporting, not driving, but I can inquire.

Jonathan Parfrey: Resilient Cities Catalyst wanted to underwrite staffing participation for OPR staff to work with CalOES on the long term recovery planning effort.

Nuin-Tara Key: We'd appreciate Councilmembers' support in getting the word out about these CDBG-MIT funds.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None received.

Item 6 | California Coastal Commission - Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea level rise planning guidance for CA coastal zone

Mary Matella, Hanna Payne and Madeline Cavalieri provided a summary of the recently released public review draft of the Commission's [planning guidance](#) for the coast, open for comments [submitted via email](#) through September 24, 2021.

DISCUSSION

Laura Engeman: The phased adaptation approach is so important, and also one of the most challenging aspects of critical infrastructure because it requires the biggest investments and longer timelines for life cycle costs. In that phased adaptation strategy approach, what insights came from state agencies about appropriate timelines for critical infrastructure, such as 50-100 year windows?

Madeline Cavalieri: We've been working with CalTrans on this for a while, and are now also working with Water Boards. The Commission takes the approach of examining both the life cycle of actual infrastructure and the 20-30 year funding cycle, as well as how long we as a society want the asset to be there, planning for the impacts over 100+ years for major infrastructure projects. We don't need to design for 100 years of sea-level rise, but it is recommended as a consideration so that we can avoid catastrophes and protect coastal natural resources.

Laura Engeman: Did you reference sea-level rise risk probabilities?

Madeline Cavalieri: We carried forward the Coastal Commission's sea-level rise guidance, referencing the Ocean Protection Council's 2018 guidance, for medium high and high risk scenarios for infrastructure.

John Wentworth: Could you speak to the of the process of identification, design, and funding for these projects, and how that lines up with the projected threats? With all the current state nature-based solutions work, such as 30 x 30, have you worked with other agencies from other landscapes on these guidelines so that communities can have a commonality of approach and terminology across the state?

Madeline Cavalieri: We've worked with state asset managers like CalTrans for decades, finding funding is always a challenge. We're often in a support role. We're excited for potential opportunities from the new budget. We have a partnering agreement with CalTrans allowing us to work closely, and they have done statewide vulnerability assessments. We know that the things that need shoreline armoring now will be the first to need it in the future. Preparing ahead will be challenging but it's more expensive to not plan ahead than to be proactive. On nature-based work, we haven't thought about it across other types of landscapes. We are starting to see the relationship between land use planning and fire risk reduction, and there are some ways to connect that to sea-level rise. With sea-level rise, there is a longer time frame for preparation and more predictable impacts compared to fire, which is more unpredictable. We haven't thought about nature-based solutions across those.

Jonathan Wentworth: It's a good exercise and role of this Council to compare notes across these efforts to optimize efforts, have common language, and align.

Mary Matella: Are you thinking about carbon sequestration or kelp beds?

Madeline Cavalieri: We've been working a lot on fire, forest health, and fuel reduction projects and the ecological sensitivity around these projects. When we talk about shoreline, nature-based solutions to address future impacts of sea level rise to wetlands, there's a paradigm shift in terms of both of those. A lot of our regulations for environmental protection refer to a static environment and restoration to a historical state, but the climate and landscape is changing. There is some crossover in that way, and we need to stay ahead of that.

John Wentworth: We could have very interesting conversations in the wildfire space on how returning to normal doesn't exist anymore, and develop a shared language for addressing these issues.

Nuin-Tara Key: You hit on a lot of the work we are launching to coordinate interagency guidance to support local action. As we're working to compile other agency efforts into the Climate Adaptation Strategy, we're seeing the need to align and work together on all their efforts. For example, we've been working with CalTrans on their transportation plan and comparing it to the OPC and OPR guidance. These conversations help us understand the priorities and needs in this space.

John Wentworth: Let's not forget our federal partners. On the coast you work with NOAA, and inland there's the USDA Forest Service and BLM, so it's good to bring them into this as well.

David Loya: Could you elaborate on the environmental justice pieces, especially in the context of these major infrastructure projects with a long lead time, such as land acquisition and infrastructure movement planning? How does your guidance address that?

Madeline Cavalieri: We're aware of how important it is that we're considering all communities when making infrastructure decisions. The guidance supports robust engagement with communities, and making sure that the benefits and burdens that are being analyzed are being fully evaluated for impacts on all populations. As we move forward, we need to understand what the impacts and benefits are going to be and equitably distribute the benefits.

Mary Matella: Environmental justice is one of our key messages, and we also have model policy language for environmental justice consideration in transportation and water infrastructure.

Jana Ganion: I echo the comments about equity and justice. Did the feedback process that you've done thus far include any support for your target constituents? If not, we

recommend that. These are complicated, expensive, long term considerations; public input and education is also complicated and long term. If we want to be serious about equity and justice and bringing in marginalized communities like tribal scientists or people in academia who lack capacity to engage, we need regional support for that. This guidance builds on great work. We've seen the effectiveness of socializing it with regional roadshows. Regional deployment downscaled is part of the process, and it would be helpful if mini grants are deployed for people to engage in those events. If we want environmental justice and equity we have to support it with real funding and resources.

Madeline Cavaliere: We have an environmental justice unit separate from our statewide planning unit; we have an environmental justice policy, and are reviewing our program thoroughly to truly address that issue and highlight it in this guidance. We have a Local Coastal Program grant program that recommends funding be used to do outreach to communities, which will come out in a few months. The funding goes to local governments but can be passed to other groups like environmental justice community representatives. This particular effort has no additional funding left for additional outreach so it will require additional work and effort. This is our first public review, building on our initial outreach with state and local partners, and we're working to engage environmental justice stakeholders.

Mary Matella: Our environmental justice team would be able to provide a better response. We do have funding elsewhere for improving outreach with respect to sea-level rise planning.

Jana Ganion: Thank you both. When we want others to engage with us in complex and crucial topics, our process is to identify a budget, double it, and half of it goes to people we want to engage with. It needs to be budgeted up front, otherwise it won't happen. Many local partners and tribal partners want to engage, but aren't able to fund it alongside other requirements.

Brian Strong: There's a need for more resources for planning and the time it takes. Delays are a large driver of infrastructure costs. We need to get more support to get people engaged. We're on Phase 2 of 6 of an 8-year old plan to advance managed retreat at Ocean Beach to protect our west side water treatment plant. The upfront funding and planning is critical. How can we help our coordinating partners like the Army Corps of Engineers to consider climate change and sea level rise? Is the Commission working on that? How can we make some of the funding streams we talked about earlier available for these priorities and get the timelines to fit? Is there a way that we can build up the shovel ready project pipeline?

Madeline Cavaliere: We are working with Federal partners, many of whom are behind on addressing sea-level rise, but still making progress. Many entities see the funding available for shovel ready projects but not enough planning money, or there's a mismatch in the timeline or other aspects, which we're hoping to

address. We have planning funding coming for LCP amendments and sea level rise planning and infrastructure projects. Our criteria is going to the Commission in October, and the application period will open in November.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None received.

Item 7 | General Public Comment

Warner Chabot: I am the Executive Director of the San Francisco Estuary Institute. Regarding the state climate resilience budget allocation of \$25 million to OPR to develop a regional climate adaptation grant program and an additional \$240,000 if allocated by the legislature in future years, I'd stress that this support for local and regional government is an urgent need, and many local partners are interested in coordinating with OPR on implementing this program. There are many existing regional collaborations with local officials that lack resources who have been awaiting a program like this for years. OPR will not be starting from a blank slate. The concept of this program has been discussed through 2 years of legislative hearings, including development of direct policy language, testimony and public comment, and informal dialogue statewide; since local government and NGO officials have been working on this for two years, OPR has a solid foundation to build on. It seems like the December meeting has a packed agenda. I'd recommend you consider an interim meeting, understanding that staff has to scope and build these programs, and I suggest that you accelerate this process and not squeeze this into a packed agenda. There is substantial funding; I'm nervous about hiring being an extended multi month process and recommend you consider creative approaches to get the talent needed, such as using consultants to jumpstart this process. There are many entities like the Local Government Commission and others who would be willing to support OPR in setting up an engagement process.

Maleeka Marsden: I work for the Climate Action Campaign in San Diego. I echo Warner's comment, am glad to see AB 897 language included in this budget trailer bill, emphasize the urgency, and excited to see OPR staff up quickly to get this program standing.

Item 8 | Closing, Future Agenda Items, and Meeting Adjourned

Nuin-Tara Key: The next quarterly meeting is December 10. There are also Resilience Metrics work group meetings scheduled on October 20 and November 18, open to all Councilmembers and the public. We will consider the recommendations for an additional interim meeting.