



Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program

Technical Advisory Council

February 6, 2020
Meeting Minutes

Governor's Office of Planning and Research Room 202
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95812
2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Item 1 | Welcome

Item 2 | Roll Call

Item 3 | 2020 Priorities

Nuin-Tara Key:

- Governor's Office purposed budget for 2020-2021 contains an integrated climate budget proposal that totals approximately \$12.5 billion.
 1. There is a big push toward an integrated, interagency approach when dealing with climate solutions.
 2. How do we extend our existing funding in order to focus our efforts together?
 3. Looking to make the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program move toward an integrated approach to climate as well. This can be achieved through integrating mitigation and adaptation efforts in order to expand to more wide-reaching climate goals. This type of integration would allow more work to be accomplished across silos.
 4. There is a need to better understand the goals and objectives that we are working toward. This can be accomplished by creating metrics that can be used across sectors in a manner to help integrate adaptation.

Amanda Hansen:

- It is Important that we all bring our best ideas and collaboration to the climate situation in order to reach these integrated climate goals.

Jonathan Parfrey:

- Curious to hear more about the \$7M in the current Budget Change Proposal for ICARP?

Nuin-Tara Key:

- The budget change proposal was submitted jointly by Office of Planning and Research (OPR), Strategic Growth Council (SGC), California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), California Energy Commission (CEC). The \$7M that Jonathan Parfrey is asking about is part of a larger budget proposal for the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) of \$25M to support resilience, adaptation, technical assistance, and ICARP. The following are different aspects covered by the budget change proposal.
 1. The resilience aspect involves the Fifth California Climate Change Assessment which is an interagency approach to compile data and develop the original research to drive climate adaptation and mitigation efforts.
 2. The adaptation aspect involves the SGC's Regional Climate Collaboratives Program, SB 1072, which supports local capacity building, and technical assistance and regional collaboration efforts, especially in under resourced communities.
 3. The Technical Assistance aspect involves Regional Climate Collaboratives Program expanding on the California Climate Investment program to assist under-resourced communities' access to funding in order to promote climate equity.
 4. The ICARP aspect involves expanding functions within ICARP's statutory role.
 - ICARP's adaptation and resilience scope and scale is currently much larger than the current resources can keep up with, and the budget change proposal requests more funding.
 - New funding for ICARP would be directed toward a new program that establishes regional resilience coordinators and would allow direct funding for coordinators to help regions across the state drive resilient outcomes at a local level. These regional resilience coordinators would be a work group of ICARP.
 - Resources would also be directed at the formation of a state level science advisory group in order to have consistent scientific information to help state and local policy implementation. This TAC is not a scientific body and we are trying to determine how to meet the scientific need so a

science advisory group would be used as a work group within ICARP.

- Resources would also go toward developing actionable metrics and outcomes as well as a platform for locals to better understand climate vulnerabilities especially when thinking about vulnerable communities and how we meet the actionable aspect of these metrics.

Jonathan Parfrey – Would this platform be a type of CalEnviroScreen for adaptation?

- Nuin-Tara Key – In general terms yes, it would be a public facing flexible tool to understand vulnerabilities.

Heather Rock – What is the process for all of this to come to fruition?

- Nuin-Tara Key – It has been submitted as a budget proposal and it still needs to go through the budget process with the legislature. We will have a better idea in May once the May revise comes out, but the final decision will not be concrete until the end of June when the budget process is finalized.

Jennifer Phillips – The priorities are back up (on the PowerPoint), and now we are going to go through our 2020 priorities one-by-one and allow everyone to voice their opinions on each item. Starting with resilience metrics, we would like to hear how this stacks up against other priorities you would like the group to focus on over the next year. We will start in the room and then go to the phone.

Priorities topic 1: Resilience Metrics and Measurable Outcomes

John Blue – The key to all our work is metrics. We have a decent understanding of risk, but we need targets to solidify adaptation efforts. We also need to ensure that everyone uses the same metrics across the board.

Amanda Hansen – I second that, however this is hard to do and that is why it has not been done. But I do agree that we need to get something out there, it does not need to be perfect and we can improve it over time. That is what we did with mitigation.

Michelle Passero – Some metrics are easier than others to define and there are proxies out there that could potentially be used for resilience. There

could be an integration of adaptation metrics with existing mitigation metrics, and then sort out which metrics could best be used by both.

Eugene Shy (public member, CalTrans) – Resilience in transportation may involve different metrics because the sector deals with several other factors such as transportation shock. Resilience should be considered at a higher level and not narrowed down in our own sectors.

Heather Rock – This is a high priority for my industry and the utilities have already been considering this because they have to have metrics when asking for investments. There are other entities outside the state (for example Edison Electric Institute) that we could glean information from that could be transferrable and replicable across other entities.

Karalee Browne – We are starting to see investments from various grants try to support resilience efforts. We are excited that we have created opportunities with these grants having more flexible guidelines so that local governments can be innovative when applying for those funds. I do see a need for metrics so that those funds are being invested in alignment with state priorities, so it is a high priority for me as well.

Jonathan Parfrey – We need these metrics question to be answered by the proposed science advisory group.

Nuin-Tara Key – **Given Johnathan's comment:** What does our work look like, considering our capacity? How do we keep this moving and what does our work look like over the next few months while we await the budget outcomes?

David Loya – The only way to measure progress is having measurable outcomes and determining which of those metrics would be most useful from a policy standpoint. However, of the five priorities, metrics is fourth on my list as far as priority, and last on my list as far as urgency. There is work that can be done in terms of what types of metrics would be useful from a policy standpoint; this could be useful work to do between convenings.

Dorette English – Atlanta CDC is working on metrics, Oregon is working on resilience metrics. I would like to see more sociology and psychology brought into the resilience realm.

Michelle Passero – The first steps should be determining the resources that are out there and being used and that could be brought together to form a basis for our metrics.

Amanda Hansen – We could think about urgency by looking at what the metrics would be used for and when that would be necessary. For example, if a state adaptation strategy is coming out, what would be the timeline for needing and incorporating metrics?

Nuin-Tara Key – Anything else about metrics before we move to item 2?

Priorities topic 2: Decision Support Tools and Guidance for Vulnerable Communities

Jennifer Phillips – We would like to get your thoughts on how we provide decision support tools and technical and policy guidance to the public, and especially to vulnerable communities recognizing the resource guidance we created as an Advisory Council. Given our role and charge as a TAC this is especially important. Where does it rank for all of you? What does our work look like over the next year?

Michelle Passero – Are these tools and guidelines something that already exist or is it something we would need to generate?

Nuin-Tara Key – We have the 2018 ICARP guidance which incorporates the TAC's definition of vulnerable communities, and provides high level guidance on making that definition actionable. We also crossed that with the environmental justice component of the general plan required by SB 1000. It should be noted that we need metrics in order to better understand the social equity and climate equity aspect of our work.

Michelle Passero – This is a big topic and I understand that this is one particular element of it, but I think for the metrics work this would be good and Johnathan mentioned CalEnviroScreen. If we are trying to break it into specific pieces, this might be an area where we could provide guidance and also think through how to crosswalk it.

Eugene (public member, Caltrans) – We have a number of manuals and they are being updated and we are trying to put climate change in those manuals. There are no statewide numbers or scenarios that we should be using. There needs to be a centralized location for data in order to steer all state agencies.

Jana Ganion – One of the ways that communities are vulnerable is that they do not have the capacity in their offices to understand the new decisions they are being asked to make. What tools are out there that would allow planners and decision makers to pair mitigation and adaptation in a way they can analyze specific projects or investments?

Cal-Adapt does not have a carbon footprint tool that would allow for carbon lifecycle assessments and something like that would be good for vulnerable communities and could be aimed at under resourced communities for decision making. We could also look at other resources in order to form a structure to have mitigation and adaptation occur simultaneously. This comment is more for the last discussion topic. It has also been shown to be effective to conduct climate science workshops and symposiums that pair resilience and state topics to provide fast changing data to local entities. I suggest that we reinvigorate a workshop or symposium model to occur this year.

Sona Mohnot – This is a big priority for Greenlining. A lot of work still needs to be done with vulnerable communities through the ICARP TAC and we need to be able to tie this work to metrics in order to assess our ability to track the adaptive capacities of vulnerable communities. It is important to receive input from vulnerable communities in order to understand their perspective when designing tools that are designed to assist them.

John Blue – We should provide numbers and they should be used and we should stick with them as a barometer so that local jurisdictions have a better idea about their goals. Sea level rise and stormwater are things we are looking at and we need to address. If we set numbers it would allow local entities to defer to the state when pressed about their decisions.

Dorette English – What about the indicators from OEHHA? Others have adopted those indicators such as the heat index tool. Mapping Resilience is a new report that shows tools available for community planning. I think it is difficult to define resilience for various communities across the state and various climate impacts. Also, cumulative impacts need to be considered so we can determine how the Adaptation Planning Guide fits into the conversation. Should there be something similar to the APG for state agencies? Perhaps with an emphasis on Local Hazard Mitigation Plans and Climate Action Plans?

Nuin-Tara Key – We have to make sure that we take a flexible approach when dealing with adaptation while also providing consistency. The APG update will be integrated into the Adaptation Clearinghouse later this year. This will be a good way for the TAC to determine how we can leverage that to help meet state and local needs.

Jonathan Parfrey – We rank this strategy very highly, tied with adaptation funding and financing. Climate Resolve attempted to do an analysis regarding vulnerable communities, and we found there was not a good

tool out there, so we used a bunch of different tools. So, we really need something to help fill that gap.

Andrea Ouse – This is number two on my list as well behind adaptation funding only because it needs funding, so it is second. There is huge value in supporting technical assistance and guidance for vulnerable communities. It would be nice to have a regional approach that incorporates vulnerable communities and other communities as well. There needs to be funding for actual regional adaptation projects that are regionally focused.

John Wentworth – Finance is critical and I think that a lot of communities that are on the cusp of being able to access the financing necessary to do the work is critical. If we had not had access to the CalTrans SB1 grant we would have never gotten anything done. So this is a very high priority.

David Loya – I rank this behind funding and coordination because this is ICARP work at its core.

Michelle Passero – What would the TAC actually be involved with? How do we actually develop a tool? We do not have the capacity to develop a tool, so would we just provide guidance to help develop a tool?

Nuin-Tara Key – TAC as a body is not going to be developing a tool, but the TAC might be the venue to determine the needs for guidance or a decision support tool by figuring out what the needs are across regions and sectors, and it could also be a central location for that knowledge. This may also be the venue to connect these to the metrics so we can have building blocks for particular metrics. There may be times or space at OPR to write pieces of guidance depending on need and scale.

Priorities topic 3: Adaptation Clearinghouse Enhancements and APG Integration

Jennifer Phillips – Everything is interconnected, but in 2019 we talked about making the Adaptation Clearinghouse more available and useful. How do we make the APG and Adaptation Clearinghouse more dynamic and interactive **and a “living” update**? This item is limited by bandwidth and resources.

Nuin-Tara Key – The APG update should be completed during the spring and the timeline for the APG integration into the Adaptation Clearinghouse is through November. Integrating the APG is a near term priority due to the deadline for spending those funds.

Dorette English - What does this integration look like? How that will be visualized?

Nuin-Tara Key – Because it is not finished, I am going to be vague on the details. The APG has historically been a document that is written and then updated years later. The new goal is to make the APG interactive within the Adaptation Clearinghouse and thinking about how we can allow users to sort and find resources via the steps being laid out in the APG. We can also look at having templates or interactive components, but right now we do not know exactly what that looks like.

Jonathan Parfrey – The TAC would be a good focus group to help with the iterative process that UC is going to go through for the online version of the APG. The TAC members can use the integrated APG and send feedback through the TAC.

Michelle Passero – We should provide guidance or input to expand it or constrain it through the TAC.

David Loya – I think this is the least important of the objectives among the 5 objectives we have but could be completed this year so that is helpful for the 2020 goals.

Priorities topic 4: Funding and Financing

Jennifer Phillips – Many of you have already stated that funding and finance is a high priority for you, but what is the work involved here over the first year? Does SB 30 work fit into this?

Nuin-Tara Key - SB 30 created a climate insurance working group and we are establishing a formal partnership with them and the TAC, which will be brought forward at the next TAC meeting.

Michelle Passero – There are a number of subgroups within the SB 30 working group. The SB 30 working group could do a lot of the work and then report to the TAC and the two can work together on joint recommendations coming from the SB 30 working group and TAC to the administration.

Nuin-Tara Key – We have a formal connection between the TAC and SB 30, Jason Greenspan and Andrea Ouse are working to be that formal connection. Are there any other topics for funding beyond insurance?

Amanda Hansen – Resilience funding and how to measure benefits of nature-based solutions and how that could feed into the financial sector (insurance, bank termination of loans, credit ratings). Can the TAC look into that topic?

John Wentworth – **Governor's budget is attempting to remove silos**; can the TAC's recommendations be used to gather funding from other budgets in order to compile funds for resilience needs?

Laura Engeman – How funding and finance relate to resilience metrics is a high priority because most of what we do in within adaptation is experimental. I think one of the big challenges is looking at financing timelines, return on investment timelines and the life of the project in order to determine whether accelerated climate impacts shorten these timelines or are we okay if a project is only 50% effective because it reduces the overall cost of damages? There are many questions around reducing loss of damages and mitigating hazards. My concern about the green bond discussion is that I would love to see those bonds open up to big million dollar investments but some of the projects won't be eligible for bonds because the work has to be done on the front end to define the expectation of the projects and get everyone on board with those expectations because it will be less concrete than building a bridge and saying it has to be able to withstand a 200 or 500 year flood.

Michelle Passero – Funding, financing, and metrics must go together to utilize state resources effectively. The SB 30 processes are there; are there general metrics that can be used for this discussion?

Priorities topic 5: Coordination for Implementation and Action

Jennifer Phillips – Last priority is coordination for local implementation, what do we think about this, and what does the work look like?

Amanda Hansen – This ranks high for me; the TAC is a good forum for feedback for what works and what does not. If the state is funding programs that are not getting to the intended results, we can share that here and that can be very valuable. This will allow us to make changes, so we have better results on the ground.

Nuin-Tara Key – How do we ensure the TAC meetings can be that type of forum? How do we leverage the public meetings to move around the state for better engagement? How can we enhance that public engagement while also staying within the bounds of the Bagley-Keene Act?

Karalee Browne – This is very important to me as well. It would be good to have rotating meetings around the state, sharing stories from various sectors and local governments about what they are doing so that we can see what works in their communities.

Heather Rock – This is a high priority for us as well. The investor-owned utilities will have to do vulnerability assessments and that will involve community outreach. Investor-owned utilities are likely not the right actors for community outreach, and investor-owned utilities feel like others should be involved with this community outreach. In Riverside last year we discussed the **Governor's Regions Rise Together initiative** for a lot of the meeting. We should link this with vulnerability assessments from the state agencies and case studies to communities. ICARP can use meetings and knowledge to go across the state to convene, especially in areas that need resources and help them plan.

John Wentworth – Public landscapes and how we coordinate this program within the federal public lands discussions. We have in the past talked about exporting California climate change programs outside state authority and lands, and I am concerned if we do not start building these systems we will build geographic walls. Large parts of the state are managed by the federal government and we need to be able to coordinate and communicate with those populations and determine how to properly navigate those federally run areas. Especially in the current political climate.

Laura Engeman – Coordination to be a voice for local and regional feedback. There are a lot of challenges that are out there that may not be seen at the state level, and therefore we need to continually track that feedback. Meetings around the state will be helpful. We could identify local and regional events that could help us identify these examples. We could bring that feedback to the legislation and state leadership, not just OPR, but everyone in the TAC. How do we empower the TAC to be voices for the program to the legislature and beyond?

David Loya – This is my highest priority and highest in urgency that can be started now to really position ourselves to continue this coordination. Meetings that are more like symposia are generally better attended and expand our reach. We should bring these meetings to vulnerable communities with the lowest resources and have the state support those communities. I want to reiterate that all of these goals are really high on the list but this is most important.

Priorities Next Steps:

Nuin-Tara Key – Thank you all for your feedback, this has been extremely helpful.

Jennifer Phillips – Big thing in December we heard was how we outline the short, medium, and long-term goals. We are aiming to bring a work plan to the March meeting. Then we can have a clear path on what we will do over the next year and try to convey how these priorities intersect. We will also continue to keep this framework and track progress by producing an impact report each year.

Public Comment:

No Public Comment on the last agenda item.

Item 4 | 2020 Meeting Calendar and Appointments

Nuin-Tara Key – On the slide is the meeting dates, first one being March 13th in Sacramento, we will be sending invites shortly. The September date will likely be in October. I would like to start thinking about short/medium/long term goals in order to leverage the following meetings this year to achieve these goals.

Laura Engeman – There are issues that are Coast centric and it would be nice to dedicate at least part of a meeting to that.

Nuin-Tara Key – Appointments Updates: Made on 2-year rolling terms, so some are wrapping up their 2-year terms. We are looking at reappointments and new appointments and we will be announcing those in the next couple weeks. Those decisions are made by the OPR Director. We are looking at the group composition and identifying gaps in sectors, locations, and entity type. I want to thank everyone that is part of the TAC for all the time and commitment you have brought to our program and the tremendous value this brings to the state. Any questions on appointment process? Any public comment?

Jennifer Phillips – The ICARP Impact Report that was discussed in December will be completed soon and put on website as soon as it is designed. Please share far and wide across your networks. Thanks again for all your feedback through that process.

Item 5 | General Public Comment

No Public Comment

Jonathan Parfrey – Would like to apologize for any negative comment he has ever made about Mitt Romney.

Item 6 | Meeting Adjourned