



Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program

Technical Advisory Council
ICARP Report Workgroup

October 30, 2019
2:00-3:30 PM
Meeting Notes

Item 1 | Welcome

Nuin-Tara Key: Thank you for joining this Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program Technical Advisory Council Workgroup Meeting. As a reminder, council members who are not in a public location can only participate as members of the public. We will have opportunity for council discussion and public comment on each agenda item.

When I say the name of the public location, please say your name and let me know if there are members of the public present. To those who are not at a public location, you can participate in the conversation, but you will not be able to vote.

Item 2 | Roll Call

Present: John Wentworth, Brian Strong, Michelle Passero, Jana Ganion, Jacob Alvarez, David Loya, Solange Gould, Nuin-Tara Key.

Not Present: Craig Adelman, Karalee Brown, Jason Greenspan, Tom Collishaw, Tina Curry, Laura Engeman, Amanda Hansen, Sona Mohnot, Darwin Moosavi, Andrea Ouse, Elizabeth Rhoades, Gloria Walton.

Members of the Public: Kathleen Ave, Heather Rock, Jonathan Parfrey

Item 3 | Introduction

Discussion:

Nuin-Tara Key: Thank you for joining the meeting. The purpose of this meeting to focus on what we've been talking about over the course of our quarterly meetings this year. Over the last few meetings, members have discussed the idea of an ICARP Annual Report. Today, Jenn will outline the report and ask for your feedback. This will be the TAC's first annual report. The value of this report is threefold: first, it is a document to show where we have been. It can illustrate the Council's existing work to create a resiliency framework for the state. Second, it can serve as a foundation for work moving forward. It will help inform the administration's future efforts around adaptation and resiliency. Third, it will succinctly communicate the value of ICARP and the value of the council. I will now open this for public comment, then dive into the meat of the discussion.

Jennifer Phillips presented the October 30th Workgroup PowerPoint, which included information on the current structure, content, and objectives for the ICARP Report.

Brian Strong: Is there a draft report?

Nuin-Tara Key: There is a draft outline.

David Loya: It sounds like we have less than half of the council members, there is a whole lot of brainpower we are missing.

Nuin-Tara Key: We have 12 members present. Today we are trying to get people together to discuss the possibility of a report. If the council doesn't think it is ready on December 6th, we are prepared to go back to the drawing board. The December timeline accommodates the end of the first year of the administration, recognizing that appointments are made at the calendar year. The council is not bound to this expedited timeline. We would rather have the full council support than do it quickly.

Jenn Phillips: This yearly report timeline came from a comment at the first TAC meeting of 2020. The TAC anticipated the upcoming turnover and wanted to have a product at the end of the first year of the administration. This change was response to TAC feedback at June and March meetings.

Solange Gould: Are you asking for feedback on the outline report?

Nuin-Tara Key: We are asking for feedback on the timeline first, then we will discuss the report.

Solange Gould: Got it, thank you.

David Loya: The timeline looks good.

Nuin-Tara Key: Are there questions or comments from the public?

Anne-Flore Dwyer, Eco Sense Designs: I see you are putting a draft together in November. Is there a way for the public to review the draft?

Nuin-Tara Key: The draft will be published on the council website as part of the agenda. Since this is programmatic and not policy recommendations, we will not have a schedule for public review aside from the meetings. The public will define see report in December meeting and can provide comment.

Jonathan Parfrey: The timeline looks fine.

Public Comment: None

Item 4 | Report Scoping

Discussion:

Jonathan Parfrey: This makes sense. The things I didn't see listed on the presentation, Annie mentioned later. I want to make sure that there is still a focus on finance because you did a lot of work on that. I like the idea of having testimonials from TAC members. I think we should reference LHMPs. LHMPs are offered in reference to SB 379, and we can also acknowledge Adaptation Plans. In the opening, it would be helpful to talk about the state landscape and other programs in the state. What lane do OPR and ICARP occupy? What is the difference between OPR, Natural Resources, and Air Resources Board? I think the target for this report is legislators and their staff. Maybe you're not allowed to say it, but as a member of the TAC I can say: legislators are a great audience. I could see them turning to this document for budget allocations or additional legislation going forward. Our other audience is anyone who is working on adaptation in the state.

John Wentworth: I need to leave, so I will interject quickly. This looks good. Please keep it as visual as possible for ease of consumption. I'd also highlight outside resources that you brought to the meetings. For example, the insurance folks. By showing all the speakers we have had, we can show that we are a well-rounded group that takes in resources from groups beyond ICARP to heighten our lane and our pretense in the lane we are in.

Nuin-Tara Key: Are there other ideas?

Brian Strong: Do we know how long this report will be?

Jenn Phillips: We are imagining that it will be 10-15 pages. We will have a topline and we will keep it visual.

Brian Strong: Fitting everything that you mentioned in your outline into one report seems ambitious. I can envision having an appendix. If it was going to be any longer, you would need an executive summary. I agree with the target being the legislature, but we also need to target local planners. We can treat this as a clearinghouse for people to get important

information in one place. It should identify those partnerships with the federal reserves and other agencies. We need to tie events at the national level with the state level and tell people why it is important. We should explain the long, challenging acronym. We should tell people why they should care about climate change.

Nuin-Tara Key: I see some themes. The first theme that I see is: understanding OPR's role and value. We need explain the state landscape, which can help local governments understand how they may leverage resources from across state agencies. The value of ICARP is bringing those threads and perspectives together.

Jacob Alvarez: I recommend including hyperlinks within the document.

David Loya: Thank you for the outline. It is very ambitious. I counted 20 bullets, which adds up to half a page per bullet. I just want to reinforce that the original concept of this report was to be a value statement that is applicable to every audience. I also think that the networks and the relationships ought to be highlighted. Using a narrative approach and the graphic approach is great. There will be a greater impact in a smaller space. Let's use the case studies to explain how vulnerable communities were brought into the engagement process to result in some program that benefitted them. Let's not just say that they are vulnerable. It would be helpful to have a list of the various resources and available science that exist in an appendix. Let's wrap in some of what we heard from the insurance, bond rating sectors, etc. We should explain that each of these things relate to each other in a networked way, not in isolation.

Jana Ganion: I have a few comments. We should discuss the state of play and emerging risks. It would be helpful to include topic areas around wildfire events and prevention strategies. We could explain how resilience to these actions reduced GHG emissions. In that way, we can pair mitigation and adaptation across the state.

Heather Rock: I agree that we should tackle wildfires. We need to think about tone. Highlighting our progress is a great idea, but our current state shows how underprepared we are. We must convey that we need ICARP because there is more to do. It is good to recognize what we have already done, but it's also good to convey that we need funding and staff beyond what we have.

Nuin-Tara Key: I want to address tone, so that's helpful.

Solange Gould: I agree that this is exciting. There are places in the outline where you use adaptation instead of resilience. Integrated climate action is one of the most important opportunities and challenges. Let's be clear about what we mean by resilience versus adaptation. I am excited to see how this could all be integrated.

We should consider including CalBRACE. I am sure you are already considering Safeguarding California. I am a broken record, but the local health offices are on the front lines of climate change. They are in a constant emergency mode, and they are facing funding issues. That could be an additional challenge to highlight.

We could consider having a case study centered on ICARP's products and the influence that ICARP has had across the state. Tulare County worked with CalBRACE for heat and water, which positioned them to get a TCC Grant. We should include metrics for tracing progress.

Nuin-Tara Key: We have had some conversations with the council about tracking progress over time. When we began the vision framework, we developed process metrics around public action on adaptation. We have not developed metrics around outcomes. We can explain the need for outcome-based goals and metrics.

Solange Gould: In the climate and health areas, we have been looking at resilience metrics because we have vulnerability metrics. We still need outcomes metrics, such as social cohesion and civic engagement.

Nuin-Tara Key: Moving forward, we can frame out the types of metrics and outcomes that could be useful in the future. For example, we could explore the right scaling we should use. We are not doing too much to develop those metrics in this report.

Kathleen Ave: My main concern is having metrics. That could be the role of this report on an ongoing basis. How is the state tracking progress on defined items to monitor disparity and progress? How many people are vulnerable? Is the number increasing, or is it stable? The report could serve as a snapshot of major issues that we uncovered in the years' worth of work, and address those in the upcoming year. I wouldn't make a big effort to summarize all the other state agencies' work. I agree with Heather: this is an opportunity to sound an alarm. The new peer reviewed data on SLR is chilling, and the wildfire situation is escalating. I see this report as a long recap infused with an assessment on challenges that remain and how we will address them.

Anne-Flore Dwyer: Thank you for this work – it is very encouraging. Someone here mentioned not being too depressing. I encourage you to try to continue instilling some sense of urgency. Not everyone feels that the urgency around this topic. I hope that policy makers and planners understand that now is the time to make the big changes. I encourage you to take that into consideration.

Nuin-Tara Key: Thank you all for the input and the insightful comments. I propose that as a follow-up to this meeting, we reach out to council members for suggestions on case studies and examples of ICARP's involvement making an impact on the ground. We are asking for testimonials from council members.

Item 5 | General Public Comment

None