



## **Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program Technical Advisory Council Quarterly Meeting**

### **Meeting Minutes**

March 25, 2022 | Zoom Video Conference | 9:30 AM – 2:30 PM

Public Agenda: <https://opr.ca.gov/meetings/tac/2022-03-25/>

#### **Item 1 | Welcome and Roll Call**

Chair Nuin-Tara Key introduced the meeting with a land acknowledgement and noted that Sacramento, CA is on ancestral Nisenan Tribal Land. She remarked that a land acknowledgement is a formal statement that recognizes and respects Native Americans as traditional stewards of this land and the enduring relationship that exists between Native American tribes and their traditional territories.

#### **Today's agenda:**

- Item 1: Welcome & Roll Call
- Item 2: Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes
- Item 3: State Agency Report Out
- Item 4: ICARP Programmatic Updates
- Item 5: Approval of Draft Impact Report & 2022 Workplan
- Item 6: Discussion of the Resilience Metrics White Paper
- Item 7: Discussion of the Science Advisory Group
- Item 8: Workshop - Adaptation Planning Grants program
- Item 9: General Public Comment
- Item 10: Close out

#### **Technical Advisory Council (TAC) Members Present (21):**

Jacob Alvarez, City of Coachella  
Karalee Browne, Institute for Local Government  
Nathan Bengtsson, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)  
Grant Davis, Sonoma County Water Agency  
Laura Engeman, Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
Jana Ganion, Blue Lake Rancheria  
Jason Greenspan, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)  
Amanda Hansen, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)  
Nuin-Tara Key (Chair), Governor's Office of Planning & Research (OPR)  
David Loya, City of Arcata  
Shereen D'Souza, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)  
Sona Mohnot, Greenlining Institute  
Darwin Moosavi, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)  
Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve  
Mark Starr, California Department of Public Health (CDPH)/California Health & Human Services Agency (CalHHS)  
John Wentworth, Town of Mammoth Lakes

Andrea Ouse, City of West Sacramento  
Brian Strong, City and County of San Francisco  
Gloria Walton, The Solutions Project  
JR DeLaRosa (substitute for Lori Nezhura), Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CalOES)  
Veronica Beaty, California Coalition for Rural Housing  
Virginia Jameson, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)

**Absent (2):**

Wilma Wooten, County of San Diego  
Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy

Chair Key introduced new members Virginia Jameson and Veronica Beaty.

Virginia Jameson noted that there is limited arable land on earth and that in its role California needs to use working lands sustainably and adapt them to climate impacts. CDFA is working to make land more productive, use less water, and reduce emissions from agriculture.

Veronica Beaty noted that she stepped into the resiliency space because affordable housing stock is increasingly threatened by wildfires. She also noted her work with tribal communities.

**Others present:**

Kathleen Schaefer, Center for Catastrophic Risk Management  
Deirdre DesJardins, physicist and climate adaptation researcher in California water sector  
Warner Chabot, San Francisco Estuary Institute  
Michael Germeraad, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)  
Devin Middlebrook, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)  
Eliot Hurwitz, Seigler Springs Community Redevelopment Association

**Item 2 | Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Public Comment**

No comment.

**Action**

The TAC voted to approve TAC meeting minutes from [12/10/2021](#) and [1/31/2022](#), with 17 approving and 4 abstaining.

Jacob Alvarez, Karalee Browne, Nathan Bengtsson, Jana Ganion, Jason Greenspan, Amanda Hansen, Nuin-Tara Key, David Loya, Shereen D'Souza, Sona Mohot, Darwin Mossavi, Jonathan Parfrey\*, Mark Starr, Grant Davis, Laura Engeman, JR DeLaRosa, and Gloria Walton voted to approve.

Veronica Beaty, Virginia Jameson, Andrea Ouse, and Brian Strong\*\* abstained.

\*Jonathan Parfrey approved pending correction of a comment attributed to him.

\*\*Brian Strong made a correction to the minutes that he was in attendance at both the 12/10 and 1/31 meetings.

*Minutes approved.*

## Item 3 | State Agency Report Out

### TAC Agency updates

Darwin Moosavi provided an update from CalSTA. He focused on how CalSTA will incorporate climate adaptation and resilience into state funding and how it will make itself competitive for federal infrastructure funding. CalSTA was still awaiting guidance from the Federal Highway Administration on what the PROTECT grant program will look like and cannot get started until they have federal guidance; and therefore, their sub working group on adaptation and resilience had not kicked off yet.

John Wentworth stated that he is currently chair of his local transportation commission in Mammoth Lakes and wanted to understand if the state is creating origination and destination data to show how Californians are moving throughout the State. He noted there are enormous flows of humans to recreation areas and that these factors should inform funding guidelines and priorities.

Darwin Moosavi responded that CalSTA is procuring big data analytics to inform all aspects of work.

Nathan Bengtsson asked if CalSTA had a sense of how successful they will be at securing competitive funding and if they were partnering with FEMA to match funds. He expressed that PG&E is a willing private partner to help match different funding sources to projects.

Darwin Moosavi responded that California is set up well to receive competitive funding, even though this amount of competitive grant funding is new. He noted that the right partnership, mechanisms, and authorities are necessary.

Brian Strong asked if CalSTA knew when it would issue federal grant NOFOs.

Darwin Moosavi responded that it depends on the program, since funding is staggered. DOT is undergoing the rulemaking process now and that the volume of grants is the biggest bottleneck. Some formula funds have already been delivered to the states and CalSTA is working to get those funds out to local agencies through traditional formulas and programs. He added that discretionary NOFOs could come out in late spring and early summer.

Amanda Hansen provided an update from CNRA. She flagged that last year's State budget committed record funding for nature-based climate solutions and that CNRA is working to deploy those funds as quickly as possible. She noted that the water year that ended September 30, 2021 was the second driest on record and that subsequently all counties are under a drought declaration. She announced that new statewide plans are forthcoming. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy is being finalized through public comment and the IPPC report called for a transition from incremental to transformation climate adaptation approaches. The California Climate Smart Natural and Working Lands Strategy will help California protect natural/working lands and achieve climate stabilization. She said the Extreme Action Plan will move forward with urgency and that she appreciates the partnership across many agencies to get this done. CNRA is finishing the 30x30 Strategy on how to conserve 30 percent of lands to protect biodiversity and climate benefits of nature. For the first time, CARB has modeled the role of natural/working lands in long-term climate stabilization and found that they play a major role.

Veronica Beaty asked when the Extreme Heat Action Plan release date is expected.

Amanda Hansen responded that there is a draft link on the CNRA website and that the final draft will be released this spring.

Grant Davis commended the Department of Water Resources for the \$180 million in grants that have come out. He said that many of those grants came through North Coast Resource Partnership and that great work got funded that would not have happened without initial state investment, all of which is needed in going into third year of drought.

Jason Greenspan asked whether the CARB modeling of natural/working land benefits was done at macro or micro scale.

Amanda Hansen responded she does not know but that the modeling was organized by different landscapes that sequester carbon differently.

Shereen D'Souza discussed the State Water Resources Control Board's actions related to drought and wildfire. Water boards throughout the state are asking residents to reduce outdoor water use, and the state Water Board is establishing water loss standards expected to reduce water losses by 35 percent. Several agencies are engaging in vegetation treatment to reduce fuel loads in forested areas, which could result in discharges that require water board permitting. Water boards are working on streamlining permitting, with the goal of letting vegetation management happen while protecting watersheds. She then discussed how CalEPA is working on updating SB 535 disadvantaged communities designation, which primarily applies to designations under greenhouse gas reduction fund programs for climate mitigation, but this designation is used by many different programs. CalEPA wants to include federally recognized tribes as disadvantaged communities. Tribes have felt excluded because of data gaps, which hinder environmental assessments in tribal areas. This is something that CARB is working on in their Scoping Plan update. She concluded that natural and working lands will play an important role in achieving carbon neutrality by 2045 and that these activities have strong co-benefits.

Jana Ganion commented that she is excited to hear about structure for tribal nations and conveyed support for work on this, especially from the North Coast.

Mark Starr provided several climate health updates. He started with news that the Centers for Disease Control had expected \$100 million for climate program, but Congress cut it in the final version of the appropriations package. The CDC was going to expand climate and health work as well as funding to locals and tribes. He continued with announcements of new funding items in the State Budget Request, which included \$25 million for community health organizations for climate resilience health plans and \$10 million for syndromic surveillance. He also announced a \$300 million one-time funding proposal for Department of Health Care Access and Information to train public health workers, including health impacts of climate change. The proposal also included \$25 million for the Department of Community Services and Development for energy upgrades in low-income households, like energy efficient heat pumps, and a \$12 million proposal for racial equity activities and to create a dashboard of indicators. He said the Office of Climate Health Equity continues to provide statewide input on new state funding resources and programs.

Jonathan Parfrey responded that Climate Resolve is extremely interested in worker health safety in climate impacts. Within the next two weeks, they will be publishing a report on effects of extreme heat and wildfire smoke on worker safety.

JR DeLaRosa (standing in for Lori Nezhura) began with an update that the State Hazard Mitigation Plan update is in full force and many at the TAC are involved in or aware of the process. The SHMP is updated every five years and that the next update will be released in 2023. He then announced that LISTOS grants will be released to support organizations throughout the state with key social vulnerability factors, particularly those in areas with moderate/high risk for natural disasters. These grants aim to create community disaster preparedness and mitigation capacity. He then announced that FEMA is doing a national climate adaptation exercise to validate national preparedness, evaluate

existing capabilities, and provide coordination. The team is creating a California climate adaptation course for emergency managers. He then said that the Adaptation Planning Guide might need to be updated. The Extreme Temperature Response Plan and State Emergency Response Plan, which are procedural roadmaps for emergency events, are with executive leadership for review.

Karalee Browne congratulated Cal OES for two awesome grant programs – the HMGP Match and JumpStart programs. She said that these really address low-capacity communities and help them get caught up on their hazard mitigation planning.

Nathan Bengtsson commented that PG&E is putting together capability metrics that measure their performance through different climate hazards and would like to connect with CalOES.

Brian Strong asked what the changes to the SHMP would be. He is excited for the Jump Start program but is disappointed in how they defined earthquake vulnerability, because it left many seismically vulnerable communities ineligible. He said that while some vulnerable urban communities that are exposed to shaking and liquefaction were not eligible, some areas that don't have the same density and with less seismic hazard exposure were deemed eligible.

JR DeLaRosa responded that CalOES is putting more of an emphasis on the hazards and that the Fire Hazard, Pandemic, and Cyberterrorism groups have been particularly active. He said that he sees a larger role for climate change in the Plan.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that OPR and CalOES are working in partnership to ensure alignment on how the SHMP focuses on climate adaptation.

Virginia Jameson announced a second round of the Healthy Refrigeration Grant Program, which funds refrigeration in corner stores and food donation programs to better stock perishable foods, at \$20 million for this over two years. She then announced \$15 million for the Pollinator Habitat Program, which provides block grants for farmers to establish pollinator friendly habitat. She also announced \$17 million in Conservation Planning Grants to help ranchers and farmers with conservation plans and actions. Finally, she announced a new Sustainably Grown Cannabis Program, which would certify that growers use environmentally friendly practices to create an environmentally sustainable cannabis market.

Nuin-Tara Key announced that OPR is hosting a federal funding webinar series, which will provide technical assistance for pre-project planning. She then announced that the Community Economic and Resilience Fund (CERF) just released first draft of planning phase guidelines for public comment and that the timeline for the program has been extended. The team will draft second round of guidelines for additional public comment in mid-April. She then announced that OPR's Military Affairs team had secured a Department of Defense grant to conduct resilience analysis at the Sierra Army Depot. Finally, she noted that earlier this year, the Strategic Growth Council submitted the state transportation assessment report to the Legislature in response to AB 285. The report analyzed alignment of state/regional transportation plans with climate mitigation goals.

Jonathan Parfrey asked how much climate resilience or mitigation will be associated with CERF dollars.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that CERF aims to position communities to be ready to create climate resilient and carbon neutral economies. She added that another alignment opportunity is between CERF and the Regional Resilience Planning Grant opportunity.

John Wentworth asked if the CERF boundaries were locked in place. He sought confirmation that the reason for the extension of guidelines has to do with the \$600 million in CERF funding shifting from a federal source (American Rescue Plan Act) to the State's General Fund, so now it is not on federal expenditure deadline. He then expressed that he hopes that state is starting to look at ecosystem services valuations. The Sierras are producing \$90 billion per year in carbon sequestration and water quality benefits. Rural spaces are creating a lot of solutions on how to scale ecosystem valuations to the state level.

### **Public Comment**

Deirdre DesJardins said that the UN Disaster Risk Reduction Office has a framework for disaster risk reduction and that one of their focuses is simulation and forecasting. She explained that in 2012, they sent to Department of Water Resources a simulation that predicted the California drought. A major issue is that state climatologists have no climate precipitation runoff forecasts. The State's runoff forecasts are based on historic record, but the climate is changing too fast. The State needs to move to a physics-based model such as that used by California-Nevada Forecast Center. She said that she asked modelers in British Columbia what it means for California, and they predict that California will see catastrophic flooding.

Water Chabot asked a question regarding updating criteria and mapping at Cal EPA.

Shereen D'Souza responded that the new designation came out last October and that now it is in final stages. She added that the final document is accessible on the CalEPA website.

Kathleen Schaefer explained that local officials have a request for more statewide unified actionable data for flood risk. She asked if Cal OES or DWR are considering funding something like ArcStorm 2.0 as part of the SHMP update.

JR DeLaRosa said he will pass the question along to get an answer.

### **Action**

No action.

## **Item 4 | ICARP Programmatic Updates**

### **Discussion**

Nuin-Tara Key provided ICARP staffing updates, including introducing Ravneet Kaur as an Executive Fellow; Neil Matouka as the Program Manager for the Fifth Climate Change Assessment; Patricia Kennedy as the Tribal Research Program Manager for the Fifth Climate Assessment; Elea Becker Lowe as Senior Planner on the Fifth Climate Assessment; Dolores Barajas as the Program Manager for the Regional Resilience Planning and Implementation Grants; Nicole Hernandez as an Associate Planner on the Climate Services team; and Abby Edwards as the Program Manager for the Adaptation Planning Grants.

Sloane Viola provided an ICARP Staff update and a brief overview of major accomplishments and milestones. She reported that the Adaptation Planning Guide is the most popular area of the Adaptation Clearinghouse website, followed by the RAP-Map, while the Search Page has seen a 38 percent decline in visitors compared to the rest of the site. She then reported that the Resilience Planning and Insurance Working Group will resume meetings in 2022. Work under the FEMA CTP 2020 would conclude at the end of the month and that Cal OES received a record number of

proposals for HMGP, demonstrating the successful partnership between OPR, FEMA, and CalOES to build local awareness and technical assistance for federal funding streams. ICARP staff are initiating work under the new CTP grant agreement. She then reported that the Administration released a draft of the Extreme Heat Action Plan and conducted two listening sessions to solicit public comment. The final Extreme Heat Action Plan is imminent. She concluded that across the Extreme Heat Action Plan and Climate Adaptation Strategy, ICARP and CNRA successfully engaged hundreds of stakeholders.

Nathan Bengtsson asked how interest in the Adaptation Clearing house is changing.

Nikki Caravelli responded that the Adaptation Planning Guide update and RAP-MAP drove most of the site view increases.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that ICARP will be doing some engagement across existing stakeholders who do not see themselves as adaptation professionals.

Jonathan Parfey said that it would be great to see a Gantt chart to see how these myriad workstreams are unfolding.

Nuin-Tara Key said ICARP is currently mapping out pieces of the Fifth Assessment, which has an important interagency approach. ICARP is working across different agencies to map this out and is, per SB 1320, on a five-year timeline for the Assessment. She said that ICARP is coordinating it with other grant program timelines.

John Wentworth seconded support for a Gantt chart.

### **Public Comment**

No comment.

### **Action**

No action.

## **Item 5 | 2021 Impact Report and 2022 Work Plan**

### **Discussion**

Sloane Viola presented a high-level overview of the draft Impact Report and Workplan to the TAC. The Draft Impact Report captured ICARP's role in coordinating and aligning resilience efforts in California. The context-setting introduction emphasizes the importance of climate equity in ICARP's work and that the remaining chapters of the workplan present accomplishments and planned efforts organized by TAC priorities. The workplan included a detailed overview of activities planned for 2022. She said that staff will incorporate any feedback from TAC members into a final draft. The next steps include soliciting quotes from TAC members to populate the report and formatting a final draft for publication.

Nuin-Tara Key commented that the report reflects the growing importance and capacity of ICARP.

Jason Greenspan asked how the TAC will continue to engage with the CDBG-MIT Citizen Advisory Committee, noting that it is critical to be strategic with limited recovery resources.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that last year HCD and ICARP signed an MOU to establish the TAC as the Citizen Advisory Committee. She said that this MOU leverages the TAC as a space to receive public input and comment and provide guidance. ICARP and HCD will continue implementing this program in 2022.

David Loya commented that this seems like an ambitious work plan and that he likes the balance between actionable programs and planning work. He questioned how climate equity work is organized in the report, since climate equity is embedded in all ICARP work.

Nuin-Tara Key expressed that all of the work is cross-cutting but that it has to be organized somehow. ICARP's core responsibility is to drive on equitable climate adaptation outcomes. She added that she sees all of the OPR grant funding programs as opportunities to contribute towards those outcomes.

Amanda Hansen clarified that the work reflected in workplan highlights what comes through the TAC and what ICARP is driving on. She said that a lot more climate resilience work going on at State is not reflected in ICARP work plan. CNRA had a lot of public input on the plans that she discussed in the CNRA update on how all of these plans work and fit together. She continued that in addition to Gantt chart that ICARP staff is working on, she would also like to see descriptions of how all of the state's efforts fits together. She said that the work plan looks great and that she looks forward to supporting it.

### **Public Comment**

Deidre DesJardins commented on major flooding issues in the San Joaquin Valley.

Kathleen Schaefer asked if CDBG-MIT/DR funds can be used for flooding projects.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that ICARP is working to support community planning for multi-benefit projects that address multiple climate impacts.

### **Action**

Approve the ICARP 2021 Impact Report and 2022 Work Plan.

Jacob Alvarez, Veronica Beaty, Karalee Browne, Nathan Bengtsson, Shereen D'Souza, Grant Davis, Laura Engeman, Jana Ganion, Jason Greenspan, Amanda Hansen, Virginia Jameson, Nuin-Tara Key, David Loya, Sona Mohot, Jonathan Parfrey, Mark Starr, John Wentworth, Andrea Ouse, Brian Strong, and JR De La Rosa voted to approve.

No one abstained or vetoed.

*Impact report and work plan were approved.*

## **Item 6: Resilience Metrics White Paper**

### **Discussion**

Juliette Finzi-Hart presented on ICARP's white paper that provides an overview of the work initiated in June 2020 and that has since concluded. The goals included: understanding how entities throughout California and in other states or countries are using resilience metrics; identifying how the state can measure built, natural and social resilience; and developing a process for determining

what guiding values are necessary to demonstrate resilience across the state. The deep work really kicked off in early winter of 2021 and over that year, the Group held: seven ICARP TAC Resilience Metrics Work Group public, virtual meetings; a public survey on resilience metrics efforts throughout California; interagency coordination through the Interagency Resilience Work Group; coordination with 2021 Update to the CA Climate Adaptation Strategy; and a Multi-state Resilience Metrics Workshop series co-led with the US Climate Alliance, RAND Corporation, and the World Bank. Some of the trends that emerged were that: 1) social system resilience discussion focused on building and supporting communities; 2) built systems were of course about infrastructure vulnerability, but also deep discussion on the continuity of services pending natural and climate impacts; and that 3) natural systems included considerable discussion on habitat and resource management. The report includes a full suite of indicators that we developed based on all these discussions.

Juliette Finzi-Hart then explained that the indicators will continue to serve multiple purposes, including informing the Climate Adaptation Strategy update and guiding considerations as ICARP establishes new programs. The indicators informed metrics outlined in the Adaptation Strategy. She noted that there was a widespread desire for flexible consistency.

John Wentworth said he is interested to see how the resilience metrics will get integrated into other efforts. He expressed that the state has a beautiful and complex workflow as California tries to lead the planet on climate adaptation.

Laura Engeman echoed the sentiment that this was a lot of work. She asked how TAC conversations have influenced how the State thinks about climate resilience.

Juliette Finzi-Hart responded that when the Resilience Metrics Working Group did the all-state workshop with the US Climate Alliance, they had hoped that they would be able to learn from everyone – but they were alone out at the front. It was helpful to hear what others were thinking and that everyone is trying to think about it. She said that what was interesting across TAC conversations is that there is alignment on what needs to be done.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that what was helpful through TAC conversations and Metrics Work Group were individual metrics for actions, which helped inform the Climate Adaptation Strategy. She said that because of the intersectional nature of climate adaptation and resilience, it was most helpful to have clear priorities and goals that these metrics are working towards. She added that in shifting from a sector-based approach to priorities and outcomes, this overarching framework shift allows us to understand how individual actions are contributing the goals. That this is less a reflection of those indicators, and more about the right structure to begin with.

Brian Strong encouraged the group to look outside of state, including Australia. He said the TAC needs to be thinking about how infrastructure can be transformative rather than just last a long time. The public sector needs to track the performance of resilience as soon as possible in order to justify funding for it.

### **Public Comment**

Deirdre DesJardins commented that in British Columbia, extreme events are challenging emergency management. The frequency of extreme events are far beyond what models project. She expressed that mass displacement of vulnerable populations would be a destabilizing force. She added that she strongly support comments on establishing state resilience priorities and establishing intersectional risks.

Devin Middlebrook commented that the Tahoe Region created a sustainability dashboard and will translate it into a resilience dashboard to make the tracking system more modern. He said they are

working to align regional and state goals. He said a challenge is tracking actual impacts rather than total number of projects.

### **Action**

No action.

## **Item 7: Science Advisory Group Best Practices & Recommendations**

### **Discussion**

Nicole Hernandez reported that over the last two decades, there have been several calls to convene statewide and multi-sector science advisory bodies that provide consistent climate science guidance to inform statewide climate adaptation and resilience decision making. As the state's primary hub for coordination on adaptation and resiliency, and with funding through the 2021 Climate budget, ICARP will convene a Science Advisory Group to provide actionable climate science and research to support climate adaptation planning and policy. To begin this process, ICARP took inventory of existing science advisory bodies both within and outside of California and researched the scope, make up and work of these bodies to identify best practices. She reported that the most common roles of existing science advisory bodies are to: develop climate assessments, technical reports, and guidance; translate data into actionable information; identify priority research areas; and serve as a liaison with the scientific community and policy makers.

Nicole Hernandez continued that based on this background research, the proposed vision for the ICARP Science Advisory Group is that the group will help align the state's deployment of climate science in resilience planning, policy, and investments. She proposed that the SAG be comprised of subject matter experts across California's climate impacts who have a broad range of physical and social science expertise. She posed three questions to the TAC: 1) Where are there opportunities to make sure this group supports and informs local implementation efforts? 2) Does the ICARP TAC have recommendations or examples of successful science advisory bodies? 3) How does the ICARP TAC propose supporting coordination between the Council and the Science Advisory Group?

Jana Ganion expressed that this is a fantastic idea. She offered two suggestions – first to include tribal scientists in this body to make sure that de-siloing between state and tribal science bodies is happening; and second that there are regional forums for regionalized climate data and this SAG can be a part of it.

John Wentworth commented that federal science and colliding jurisdiction and priorities is an important challenge as data starts getting down to the ground for local implementation.

Laura Engeman asked whether the SAG is looking for bridge liaisons or field experts, how it thinks about science service tools and projects, and how the State is directing people towards authoritative climate science sources.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that there is a need for a consistent space across different climate impacts and that there have been numerous calls over the years for this.

Karalee Browne asked how the group can support research on the forefront. Researchers often don't ask the right questions for local implementors. She said the climate research needs to be ground truthed to be helpful in implementation.

Mark Starr suggested that environmental and human health should be expertise areas in the group. He recommended environmental health directors and county health officers association representatives. He added that the public health sector has a lot of science advisory bodies.

David Loya said he is working with the Thriving Earth Exchange in the City of Arcata. He said they are using a different research model that gets at types of science that will address local implementation.

Virginia Jameson said that CDFA has done a great job addressing current science for fertilizers, water, efficiency, etc.

### **Public Comment**

Deirdre DesJardins expressed the need to disentangle federal/state data and science. She recommended that ICARP look at Delta Science Advisory Board, which has an interface between climate science community and policymakers. She said she strongly supports a science panel and that the need for scientists to communicate rapidly evolving climate risks cannot be emphasized enough.

### **Action**

No action.

### **Item 8: Workshop – Adaptation Planning Grants**

Abby Edwards announced that the Climate Budget included \$25 million for the ICARP Climate Adaptation and Resilience Planning Grant Program (Adaptation Planning Grant Program). She explained that this funding aims to: fill local, regional, and tribal planning needs; provide communities the resources to identify climate resilience priorities; and support the development of a pipeline of climate resilient infrastructure projects across the state. This funding will be appropriated in three rounds and that OPR anticipates administering multiple funding rounds over the next few years. The key priorities of the program are to: support equitable outcomes and wide geographic and economic diversity in applicants; support much-needed integrated infrastructure planning to achieve community resilience; help communities plan for and respond to multiple climate risks by supporting an all-risk approach; and build community planning and capacity by supporting peer to peer learning, information sharing, and publishing replicable case studies on the State Adaptation Clearinghouse. She explained that the program provides flexible funding to meet multi-sector/issue planning needs that intersect with climate risks, including but not limited to land use, transportation, housing, natural resource management, public infrastructure, and hazard mitigation issues.

Abby Edwards continued that as California experiences accelerated impacts of climate change, many communities are faced with planning for and responding to cascading and compounding impacts (e.g., flooding and landslides following wildfires, or riverine flood and sea level rise). These grants will allow communities to conduct integrated planning activities. She explained that the goals of the TAC workshop are to kick off public engagement process for the ICARP Adaptation Planning Grant Program and to solicit input on how this funding can support local, regional, and tribal adaptation planning gaps, needs, and opportunities.

### **Discussion 1**

Link to the Idea Boardz:

[https://ideaboardz.com/for/Adaptation%20Planning%20Grant%20Program%20Workshop%20\(Room%203,%20Round%201\)/4391409](https://ideaboardz.com/for/Adaptation%20Planning%20Grant%20Program%20Workshop%20(Room%203,%20Round%201)/4391409)

Question 1: What type of resilience and adaptation planning activities and needs could this program support?

Virginia Jameson said that there is a funding gap for carbon farm planning at the local/regional level. She said that the State has a healthy soils program but that there is not anything for local governments or their regional counterparts to help plan for broader expansion of carbon farm planning.

Eliot Hurwitz suggested hyperlocal integrated planning. He explained that at the state and federal levels, local means county or city, but that for things as complex as integrated climate planning, there is need to go a scale down. He said a lot of jurisdictions have area plans, which demonstrates how communities can plan and build capacity at that level of granularity. He remarked this his community was site of the 2015 Valley Fire, which was the impetus for a significant organizing effort in small population areas.

Nathan Bengtsson said the program needs to take all hazards into account, not just the most recent ones. He recommended to set up the capacity for planning and before funding implementation – to get that chain in order.

Karalee Browne said that there are grant programs that support Local Hazard Mitigation Plans and General Plans; for example, LEAP and REAP gave a lot of money for General Plan updates. She explained that locals need more money for partnership and capacity building components, such as for convenings and food, which never has funding. She explained that local governments can create these plans but that they won't work out unless communities are bought into them. She added that oftentimes local governments do not know where to start and need technical assistance to help them figure it out, especially in rural and disadvantaged communities. She said that she cannot overemphasize how far behind they are.

Mark Starr said that CDPH has funds to help community-based organizations, tribes, and communities to help write climate resilience and health plans in the Governor's Budget. He said that ICARP needs to coordinate on the Adaptation Grant and the Regional Resilience Grant programs. He added that the regional approach is important. He noted CDPH's \$25 million Public Health Regional Climate Planning proposal:

[https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2223/FY2223\\_ORG4265\\_BCP5436.pdf](https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2223/FY2223_ORG4265_BCP5436.pdf) (the link includes a list of potential activities on pp. 9-10).

Warner Chabot said that in the Bay Area's 101 cities and 9 counties, 90 percent of climate adaptation planning turns out to be land use planning and that most land use planning happens locally. He said the challenge is getting multiple jurisdictions to work together. He warned against falling into the trap of just funding projects. He recommended funding capacity building activities that allow multiple agencies to coordinate and develop shared goals.

Sona Mohnot expressed that the comments do a good job at thinking about distributive equity. She also supported comments that have been uplifting procedural equity. She asked if these funds will be connected to implementation dollars to make plans real.

Abby Edwards responded that ongoing conversations are identifying other state funding opportunities and aligning guidelines.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that ICARP has heard over the years that in order to get the right pipeline of projects that are building resilience, then the State needs to invest in foundational planning. She said that California has a lot of projects in the pipeline, but they won't necessary help build resilience.

Laura Engeman commented that this conversation is somewhat conflating capacity building and planning. She said that planning entities have taken a lot of leadership developing projects that have been remolded to fit climate resilience, but that what's lacking is reaching out to agencies that haven't been involved in the planning process. She asked how this program can provide funds for them to sit down and develop their own vision. What agencies/tribes need are their own plans to decide what their visions are. She recommended that the program focus on community engagement as opposed to project pipeline development. She concluded that academics are being tapped for local projects in a piecemeal way and that there is need for coordinated research and data that benefits more than one community.

Andrea Ouse expressed that from a local government perspective, there is a hyperlocal need for capacity building support and expertise, and then a regional need to address inequities between different local governments. She referenced how ABAG took state funding and created a bench of subject matter experts available for local governments and nonprofits to draw from if they needed expertise that wasn't in house. This helped disadvantaged local governments participate and home in on identifying their local needs using expertise that they otherwise wouldn't have been able to access.

Jonathan Parfrey expressed enthusiasm for an in-person meeting. He continued that these grants are a new area for OPR but that the Strategic Growth Council has wisely worked with Institute for Local Government, which has invaluable depth of knowledge on how to structure programs and RFPs. He then asked if OPR would make awards for jurisdictions to get into alignment with SB 379.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that there was an initial timeframe for SB 379, but that for this grant ICARP is not thinking about SB 379 compliance timelines, but rather wants there to be resources for communities to do this work over a longer period of time.

John Wentworth expressed that there is a parochial human resistance to planning, especially if there isn't an end goal. He suggested that the program give people an end goal of what they need to get done. He suggested to keep the guidelines simple.

Kathleen Schaefer requested that ICARP coordinate with sister agencies so that grants align with grants that they already have at state level, echoing some of the previous comments.

Question 2: Where are there currently resilience and adaptation planning funding gaps and how might we structure the Adaptation Planning Grant program to fill those gaps?

Laura Engeman pointed to gaps in what municipal bonds have not been funding. She said that most local governments really struggle with all of the pieces that bond funds cannot fund, including pre-planning. Communities need investments to be sustained and that recipients should develop best practices from their experiences with the program. She recommended investing in partnerships to develop better financing.

Jana Ganion commented that adaptation planning is happening, but in governmental siloes. She said that it could be so much more effective at a regional level if county, city, and tribal governments had support to roll up all of the ongoing efforts and tease out synergies. They have a little of this going on in county and city space but that tribal governments are still in their own silo and they do not have enough resources to interact with state and federal entities. Another gap is pairing climate mitigation and climate adaptation. She hoped for some flexibility that is not available under other sources of funding.

Karalee Browne said that local governments don't have the staff to manage climate adaptation efforts. She explained that because adaptation is not required, they cannot get funding through City Council or County Supervisors for the work. In many local governments, resilience is the responsibility of a public works manager, who doesn't see the whole picture of what resilience means for that community. She also shared some best practices from the BOOST Program:

[https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/best\\_practices\\_report\\_final.pdf?1619505989](https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/best_practices_report_final.pdf?1619505989)

Warner Chabot commented that planners are hungry to collaborate with each other. He said OPR should assign staff to show good models and learn who is doing good work because OPR is in an ideal position to provide short, concise idea banks to share out.

### Question 3: Where are there opportunities to align with other state agencies to conduct more efficient stakeholder engagement?

John Wentworth recommended to break down the existing structures, given the nature of climate change, and to orient projects around policy rather than agency. He added that this group understands the limitations of doing this work through agencies.

## **Discussion 2**

Link to Idea Board:

[https://ideaboardz.com/for/Adaptation%20Planning%20Grant%20Program%20Workshop%20\(Breakout%20Room%203.%20Round%202\)%20/4391465](https://ideaboardz.com/for/Adaptation%20Planning%20Grant%20Program%20Workshop%20(Breakout%20Room%203.%20Round%202)%20/4391465)

### Question 4: How can this funding work in coordination with other state investments? What opportunities exist to align this program so recipients can leverage other dollars?

Michael Germeraad commented that given the limited funding, there will be more applicants than funding and that whatever proposals or RFPs that can be recycled would be appreciated. He recommended that the Program allow people to use applications for other programs.

Karalee Browne suggested that partnering with the Transformative Climate Communities Program would be a good idea. She said that communities that need help the most don't know it because they are so overwhelmed with everything else they do. She recommended that ICARP tap into other Technical Assistance work to know who those communities are.

Laura Engeman commented that there is a lot of interest in alternative insurance and hazard mitigation models. She is being asked a lot for case studies of projects that show how these models mitigate hazards but that templates for evaluating projects are practically nonexistent. She would like to see development of pilots where others can evaluate these projects.

John Wentworth said OPR needs to play a critical role to do matchmaking and connect dots to see what other investments can cross pollinate. OPR should be a leader in knowing where all of the funding opportunities are.

Nuin-Tara Key responded that now that OPR has more staff, it is gearing up to do this.

Jonathan Parfrey suggested bringing in nonintegrated agencies into the planning process, such as the Department of Education, for example.

Brian Strong followed up on John Wentworth's former comment and explained that the more that ICARP can link these funds to other planning requirements, the more forcefully the program can force cross-sector coordination.

Question 5: What should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides for specific issues, geographies, etc.?

Nathan Bengtsson recommended that disadvantaged communities should get funding first but that ICARP should also get communities to apply regionally as cohorts, since there can be economies of scale in this funding.

Laura Engeman explained that the burden is on funding applicants to explain what specific niche they are filling and how they are leveraging other funds. She described how SGC tried to get applicants to talk about what they're interested in, and then host a bidding workshop, so that everyone can see who is trying to do which projects. She explained this helps the funder think about how different projects and funding fit together. She encouraged ICARP to take the burden off applicants to do all this legwork.

Eliot Hurwitz encouraged ICARP to fertilize an environment of active community engagement. He suggested how the program could catalyze a community to get everyone involved in clearing flammable brush or understanding flooding mitigation.

John Wentworth commented that the Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force is thinking about block grants to get money out into field to deal with landscape-scale efforts. He added that the State does not yet have the regional capacity to do this work. He said he would rather have one grant that does 9 different things than 9 grants that do 9 different things.

Question 6: Knowing this program seeks to support under-resourced communities, what are the existing barriers to accessing similar funding programs? What do communities need to access the grant program?

Abby Edwards read from the Idea Boardz that some would like to see some advance payments and that some request reasonable reporting periods.

Laura Engeman asked ICARP to think about entities that can provide a bridge from funds to those communities because some communities need to do liability insurance. She asked ICARP to identify

the capacity builders and technical experts who can get the ball rolling, which can sometimes be community foundations, or entities CivicWell. She also suggested a pot of funding for translation services.

Nathan Bengtsson said PG&E is currently doing climate vulnerability assessment community engagement but that each time they engage, they realize they have to walk back a step. He expressed that to do authentic engagement, you need to find the movers and shakers in that community. Engagement cannot start by finding a climate adaptation person, because that rarely exists. He said that the work has to hang together and be connected to existing work.

Abby Edwards announced that ICARP will have listening sessions and guideline development in late spring, an RFP launch in summer, and then award announcements in the fall.

### **Action**

No action.

### **Item 9: General Public Comment**

No comment.

### **Item 10: Closing and Meeting Adjourned**