



ICARP

INTEGRATED CLIMATE ADAPTATION & RESILIENCY PROGRAM

Technical Advisory Council Quarterly Meeting Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2022 | Zoom Video Conference | 9:30 AM – 4:00 PM

Public Agenda: <https://opr.ca.gov/meetings/tac/2022-07-18/>

Meeting slides: https://opr.ca.gov/meetings/tac/2022-07-18/docs/20220718-TAC_PPT_Q2.pdf

Item 1 | Welcome and Roll Call

Chair Sam Assefa introduced the meeting with a land acknowledgement and noted that Sacramento, CA is on ancestral Nisenan Tribal Land. He 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: California Fifth Climate Change Assessment Overview
- Item 6: Citizen Advisory Committee: Community Development Block Grant – Mitigation
- Item 7: Workshop: State Resilience Funding Opportunities
- Item 8: General Public Comment
- Item 9: Closing and Meeting Adjourned

Technical Advisory Council (TAC) Members Present (19):

Jacob Alvarez, City of Coachella

Sam Assefa (Chair), Governor's Office of Planning & Research (OPR)

Karalee Browne, Institute for Local Government

Nathan Bengtsson, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)

Shereen D'Souza, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)

Laura Engeman, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Jana Ganion, Blue Lake Rancheria

Jason Greenspan, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Arima Kozina (substitute for Virginia Jameson), California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)

David Loya, City of Arcata

Sona Mohnot, Greenlining Institute

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

Leah Fisher (Substitute for Darwin Moosavi), California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)

Enrique Huerta (Substitute for Jonathan Parfrey), Climate Resolve

Mark Starr, California Department of Public Health (CDPH)/California Health & Human Services Agency (CalHHS)

John Wentworth, Town of Mammoth Lakes

Brian Strong, City and County of San Francisco

Gloria Walton, The Solutions Project

Veronica Beaty, California Coalition for Rural Housing

Absent (5):

Amanda Hansen, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)

Wilma Wooten, County of San Diego

Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy

Grant Davis, Sonoma County Water Agency

Andrea Ouse, City of West Sacramento

Item 2 | Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

Public Comment

No comment.

Action

John Wentworth moved to approve March 25th meeting minutes, and Brian Strong seconds.

The TAC voted to approve TAC meeting minutes from March 25, 2022, with 17 ayes and 0 noes.

Jacob Alvarez, Karalee Browne, Nathan Bengtsson, Jana Ganion, Jason Greenspan, Sam Assefa, David Loya, Shereen D'Souza, Sona Mohot, Leah Fisher, Enrique Huerta, Mark Starr, Brian Strong, Brian Strong, Laura Engeman, and Gloria Walton voted to approve.

Minutes approved.

Item 3 | State Agency Report Out

Shereen D'Souza provided an update from the California Environmental Protection Agency. She summarized how State Water Boards are working towards a 15 percent water reduction target as compared to 2020 levels and that statewide water use in May 2022 was 3.1 percent lower than May 2020. She explained that preliminary data from June 2022 show that reductions are 7.2 percent below June 2020. She added that cutbacks fall short of goals, while drought deepens following the driest winter on record in over 100 years. She said that leaders are driving the message that cutbacks are necessary.

Ryan Ojakian of the Capital Region Climate Readiness Collaborative expressed the need to be mindful about water needs for the urban tree canopy. He explained that Greater Sacramento lost 8 percent of urban tree canopy during last drought.

Shereen D'Souza responded that Water Boards are trying to highlight water savings of urban tree canopies versus grass turf, and that grass turf is on its way out.

Mark Starr provided an update for the California Health and Human Services Agency/Department of Public Health. Starr focused on three budget items. First, he announced \$280 million of one-time funding to Department of Health Care Access and Information to train up to 25,000 community health workers. Second, he announced \$25 million for Department of Community Services and Development for the low-income weatherization program on multifamily properties, which provides low-income households with solar panels and energy efficiency upgrades. Third, he announced \$10 million for a syndromic surveillance system for climate related health conditions, which is an earlier encounter with a patient than hospitalization. He explained that this would provide the State more rapid information to quickly respond to emerging public health concerns.

Jana Ganion expressed the importance of coordinating with tribal emergency management in ongoing syndromic surveillance implementation.

Lori Nezhura provided an update for the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES). Nezhura announced the kickoff for the Climate Working Group which is working to incorporate climate into the state's emergency preparedness work. She then announced last week's kickoff of the \$100 million PrepareCA program and announced awards for the \$15 million [JumpStart](#) set aside. She explained that PrepareCA funds are designed to help vulnerable communities unlock federal matching funds for hazard mitigation projects. She explained that the \$15 million in JumpStart funds help eligible communities jumpstart their development and implementation of resilience planning, while the remaining \$85 million will be used for to cover local match for communities applying for federal Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funding.

Leah Fisher provided an update for the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) and the Department of Transportation (CalTrans). First, Fisher flagged that CalTrans is hiring climate adaptation staff. Second, she provided an update on new programs. First, she announced a \$50

million one-time transportation climate adaptation planning grant program that builds on prior SB 1 adaptation planning grant funds. She said that eligibility is extended to local/regional agencies, tribes, and other public entities and that projects range from vulnerability assessments, evacuation planning, and technical feasibility studies. She added that Caltrans is rolling the funding under the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program such that climate adaptation will be a standalone category in this program. She explained that the program will have a 10 percent tribal set-aside and that 50 percent must go to underserved communities. She then announced that requests for proposal will come in September. Second, Fisher announced \$150 million for coastal adaptation projects administered by the California Transportation Commission meant to complement federal Department of Transportation PROTECT grants. Third, Fisher announced \$200 million in federal transportation funds that CalTrans must use to advance climate adaptation planning into project pipelines, which the Legislature authorized to augment federal PROTECT grants as formula dollars.

Jason Greenspan responded that it was helpful to have a preview of what's coming through the Sustainable Planning Grant Program. He asked how robust the nexus to transportation needs to be with the adaptation funding.

Leah Fisher answered that the trailer bill on the \$50 million calls transportation a co-benefit and that projects that mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and advance climate adaptation would score best.

Arima Kozina provided an update for the Department of Food & Agriculture. First, she announced incentive programs for climate smart agricultural practices that have multiple ecosystem services benefits from watershed restoration to erosion mitigation, including \$85 million for Healthy Soils Program and \$15 million for the Pollinator Habitat Program. She also announced that CDFA received funding for dairy research and development programs to reduce methane emissions and develop programs that have beneficial reuse for dairy. Second, she announced funding for technical assistance programs, including \$23 million for the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Program, as well as funding for the State Water Efficiency & Enhancement Program. She also announced research funding for methane reduction and sustainable pest management. Third, she announced funding for sustainable food systems, including money for refrigerators in low-income neighborhoods.

Chair Assefa provided an OPR budget update. He announced the creation of new Office of Community Partnerships and Strategic Communications, which will work with community organizations and ethnic media for coordinated communications on the state's most pressing issues, many of them climate issues such as extreme heat. Next, he announced that ICARP will launch a Community Resilience & Heat Program this year and that ICARP will solicit input from the TAC on needs this program can address. Third, he announced that the Adaptation Planning Grant Program received an additional \$10 million and that ICARP expects to make first awards this fall. He also announced that the Regional Resilience Planning Grant received \$125 million. He finally provided a brief update on Strategic Growth Council program funding, including \$165 million for the Transformative Climate Communities Program, \$25 million for the Community Resilience Centers Program, and \$10 million for the Regional Climate Collaborative Program.

John Wentworth asked how State funds can be used in communities that are heavy with federal landscapes.

Staff responded that they will follow up with further information.

Public Comment

No comment.

Action

No action.

Item 4 | ICARP Programmatic Updates

Sloane Viola announced two new staff: Brandon Harrell, Senior Planner, Adaptation Planning Grants Program and Kristyn Vega-Payne, Associate Planner, Regional Resilience Grant Program. She then provided an update on TAC Priority Areas, including actionable research and resilience metrics; decision support tools and guidance; building partnerships and leveraging resources; funding and financing; and climate equity and vulnerable communities. She provided an update that the Adaptation Clearinghouse now has 990 resources; that ICARP staff will release the Plan Alignment Guide for beta testing this fall; and that ICARP staff hosted a workshop on long-term recovery plans and frameworks as part of the Wildfire Recovery Peer Learning Network. Finally, she explained that the ICARP Vulnerable Communities Platform is delayed due to staff turnover, but it is still an ICARP priority and the project will resume once the position is filled again.

The ICARP Staff Report is included on the July 18, 2022 TAC meeting web page:

https://opr.ca.gov/meetings/tac/2022-07-18/docs/20220718-Item4_ICARP_Staff_Report_TAC_Q2_2022.pdf

Public Comment

No comment.

Action

No action.

Item 5 | California Fifth Climate Change Assessment Overview

Neil Matouka delivered a previously recorded presentation on the work plan for the California Fifth Climate Change Assessment. SB 1320 (Stern, 2020) designated OPR as the coordinator of the Climate Change Assessment, and this Assessment builds on previous Assessment. His presentation provided details on the organization and timeline of the Assessment process. He highlighted the public engagement aspects of the Assessment, in particular consultation with California tribes. He explained that the California Energy Commission will continue to provide the data on which the rest of the report will be built and that OPR will lead research on non-energy topics. He explained that the Assessment will continue to include a statewide assessment, regional reports, and technical reports.

Chair Assefa expressed that ICARP is particularly excited to highlight tribal climate knowledge in what has historically been a Western-dominated science field.

Jana Ganion responded that the Fourth Climate Assessment was a learning opportunity and was the first time that tribes were coordinated with. She applauded the Fifth Assessment team that this Assessment has more robust tribal engagement and that it is crucially important for tribal knowledge to be collected as frontline communities are dealing with the climate crisis.

Public Comment

No comment.

Action

No action.

Item 6: Citizen Advisory Committee: Community Development Block Grant – Mitigation/Disaster Recovery

As part of the California Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) Citizen Advisory Committee, in which the TAC provides a public engagement and oversight role for federal hazard mitigation funds, Maziar Movassaghi, Chief Disaster Recovery Officer at HCD, provided an update on the 2017/2018 Community Development Block Grant – Mitigation (CDBG-MIT) Program funds and 2020 Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR) funds. He started his presentation explaining that California has two different allocations from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in response to 2017/2018 and 2020 wildfires, respectively, that target a mix of wildfire-impacted California counties, some low- and high-capacity. He explained that each bucket of funding came with its own rules and regulations and that while CDBG-DR funds must have a specific connection to the disaster declaration, CDBG-MIT does not have to relate to the disaster.

Movassaghi explained that when HCD issued a series of Notice of Intents (NOI) for infrastructure needs for the 2017/2018 CDBG-MIT funds, they knew that locals were interested in a wide range of projects that are outside of HCD's wheelhouse, such as water and sewer laterals and roads. He explained that HCD coordinated with a range of state partners, including OPR, CAL FIRE, Cal OES, Caltrans, and State Water Boards. He said that HCD received 121 Notices of Interest totaling \$1.3 billion, \$1 billion more than available in funding. He explained that this funding shortage is fundamentally a CDBG-DR formula allocation issue, because HUD and FEMA see wildfires as an insurable event, insured homes (even if underinsured) are not included in the disaster allocation, which results in allocations far below need. He said that because of this funding shortage, leveraging other funds is important. He also provided an update that HUD's new direction in hazard mitigation programs is to see land use as important to resilience as infrastructure.

Movassaghi then provided an update on the 2020 CDBG-DR Mitigation Set-Aside. He explained that Congress decided to make Mitigation a 15 percent set-aside within CDBG-DR. He said that California received \$230 million total for CDBG-DR, including \$201 million for disaster recovery, and \$30 million set aside for Mitigation. He said that the HCD analysis of 2020 unmet needs totals over \$1.3 billion, forcing them to have difficult conversations about funding priorities. He explained that these unmet needs figures come from property-level inspections. He then explained that HCD decided to do two programs with its 2020 CDBG-DR Mitigation Programs: \$21 million for owner-occupied recovery

(OOR) and \$8 million for the multifamily housing program (MHP). He explained that a lot of the populations are very low-income and elderly, so there is concern about ongoing maintenance of defensible space.

John Wentworth asked to what extent this work was coordinated with the Wildfire & Forest Resilience Task Force. He posited that it is critical for disaster recovery and hazard mitigation to be integrated into forest and wildfire resilience task force work. He said that the level of alienation of communities destroyed by wildfires on public lands is getting extreme and added that federal agencies finding it impossible to house recovery and resilience workers in these communities due to lack of housing supply.

Clay Kerchof of OPR responded that ICARP coordinates between the State's hazard mitigation disaster recovery, and wildfire and forest resilience work, providing updates in the Fire-Adapted Communities Working Group.

David Loya asked a question about the split between the owner-occupied rehabilitation and multifamily housing programs, which to him seemed that imbalance between these two programs could have equity implications. Councilmember Loya also sought clarification on whether the Citizen Advisory Committee had no role to play in the next allocation.

Movassaghi responded that HUD requirements for the next allocation do not include a Citizen Advisory Committee, and that the desire to align goes beyond the HUD requirements for the Citizen Advisory Committee. HCD is relying heavily on the Office of the State Fire Marshall to inform its mitigation guidelines and help make sure they are plugging in the same guidelines to align programs and funding.

Brian Strong said that the mitigation set-aside of CDBG-DR is great if it means that money flows more quickly. He asked if HCD has targets about how quickly we can get funds on the ground, and if HCD has performance standards for what they expect the funds to do. He asked if there any considerations around relocation.

Movassaghi responded that speed is critical. He said HCD is incorporating these funds into existing HCD housing programs to avoid setting up new processes. He said HCD is working with the Office of the State Fire Marshall and the Institute for Building and Home Safety (IBHS) on guidelines. For the relocation question, he said that CDBG-DR will have a homebuyer assistance program, which would allow disaster impacted individuals to purchase in a lower risk area.

Enrique Huerta commented that the focus of these funds is on wildfire, but in much of California, extreme heat is a growing climate hazard concern. He asked if these funds could be used on extreme heat.

Movassaghi responded that the answer is technically yes, if extreme heat is in the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, but that there are limited funds, so eligible jurisdictions should have tempered expectations.

Clay Kerchof asked how can CDBG-DR funds incentivize long-term recovery plans.

Movassaghi said HCD wants to help communities identify the highest and best uses of CDBG-DR funds. He said that property level mitigation is not eligible for most resources. He

said that HCD is working with Plumas County to develop that comprehensive recovery plan and that in 2019 the Town of Paradise made a great recovery plan to make them more effective in their recovery.

Public Comment

No comment

Action

No action

Item 7: Resilience Funding Opportunities Workshop

Item 7a: State Grants Portal

Shivani Bose-Varela of the California State Library presented on how to query grant opportunities and review grant analytics on the California Grants Portal (grants.ca.gov). She demonstrated how entities seeking grants can query grants by deadline, grant name, eligible entities, match funding requirements, and awarding entity.

Chair Assefa asked about the feedback from users and communities the Library has received on the portal.

Shivani Bose-Varela noted that feedback has been generally positive, and that while the portal is intuitive for most users, they've added a lot of tips for using keyword search features of the tool based on that feedback.

David Loya commented that the local governments that he works with may not have time to look for grants, so a tool like this could simplify the process and expand the possibilities for those jurisdictions. He additionally sought confirmation that the grantmaking entity uploaded the information.

Shivani Bose-Varela confirmed that the responsible state entity manages the grant information.

Chair Assefa asked about language access.

Bose-Varela explained that the site has language options.

Natalie Hernandez (substitute for Jonathan Parfrey) asked if there is an online tutorial.

Bose-Varela responds that the State Library is working on it.

Public Comment

No comment.

Item 7b: Resilience Funding & Financing Gantt Chart

Sloane Viola presented on the Resilience Funding & Financing Gantt Chart, which includes numerous programs authorized in the fiscal year 2021-2022 Climate Package. She thanked ICARP staff and interagency program managers who provided and organized information on the included programs. She explained that the Gantt Chart was informed by the State Grants Portal, program websites, program managers, and the Interagency Resilience Working Group. She added a caveat that not all grants have the same degree of detail on their anticipated timelines. She said some early takeaways are that funding availability is generally consistent throughout the year; there is variability in programmatic processes; many programs having rolling grant review; and there is eligibility across different sectors. The Gantt Chart is available on the TAC meetings web page:

https://opr.ca.gov/meetings/tac/2022-07-18/docs/20220718-Gantt_Chart_Universal.pdf

Viola then asked the TAC three questions: 1) how useful will this resource be to your organization and stakeholders; 2) what information isn't available that would have been helpful; and 3) what are other ways that the state can communicate about funding opportunities?

Veronica Beaty commented that the Gantt Chart will be useful for the stakeholders. She asked if there is different in uptake for programs that are rolling versus individual application processes.

Sloane Viola responded that she will circle back at next meeting.

Natalie Hernandez from Climate Resolve said that many of their stakeholders are interested in programs that offer advance pay or do not require match funding. She asked if the chart could be updated to include a column on this information.

Viola responded that future iterations of this work can include information like that.

Karalee Browne praised the Gantt Chart as a phenomenal resource and that will be extremely useful for local partners. She said she keeps hearing that it's getting harder for local partners to apply for grants. She said that as much advance notification that local staff can get to apply for these grants would be helpful.

Mark Starr commented that CalHHS/CDPH will add its programs to the chart as programs emerge and complemented the resource generally.

Public Comment

No comment.

Item 7c: Regional Resilience Grant Program

Part 1 – TAC Discussion

Dolores Barajas, Program Manager for the Regional Resilience Grant Program, introduced discussion. She explained that OPR received \$250 million in the 2021-2022 Climate Budget that will support local, regional, and tribal climate resilience solutions and support regional capacity building,

planning, and project implementation. She said round 1 of funding will invest \$25 million, of which \$12.5 million will support regional climate adaptation planning and action plans. She explained that key program priorities are to support regional projects aligned with ICARP priorities that reduce climate risks from wildfire, sea level rise, drought, flood, increasing temperatures, and extreme heat events. She said the program will support projects or actions that address the greatest climate risks in the region, particularly in the most vulnerable communities.

Barajas explained the workshop goals would be to solicit input on how funding can support local, regional, and tribal resilience gaps, needs, and opportunities to achieve regional-scale resilience solutions. She then posed a series of discussion questions for the TAC.

Barajas asked: how can this program define a region to accomplish regional-scale climate resilience solutions?

John Wentworth insisted that the program not create new regional boundaries. He explained that the Community Economic Resilience Fund (CERF) regions were already created and that the program should look to existing regional definitions. He argued that there will be a lot of overlap between the economic and climate regions.

Chair Assefa said that meeting multiple needs across diverse regions is one of the State's greatest challenges. He explained that economic regions are different from climate regions.

Mark Starr seconded John Wentworth's comments.

Jason Greenspan advocated directing funds towards existing regional entities that are already working together and to incentivize existing regional entities to work together (e.g., two Metropolitan Planning Organizations collaborating).

David Loya echoed what John stated. He said that self-organizing should be emphasized with climate impacts. He said that regional entities could be pulled in multiple directions if the regions are different. He emphasized using MPOs and regional Councils of Government, and to allow local governments to self-organize.

Sona Mohnot asked how the Vulnerable Communities Platform (VCP) would be leveraged to inform grant regions.

Sloane Viola responded that the VCP would be closer to neighborhood scale, so it could help entities explore within regions and identify communities most vulnerable to climate hazards. The VCP is in early stages of development.

John Wentworth supported the idea to engage MPOs and COGs. He said that program should invest in existing partnerships.

Jana Ganion said that it is easier when the recipe is half-baked, although she supports self-organizing entities. She said that without guideposts of what regions are and contain, then there can be tension between regions. She said that disadvantaged communities and tribal nations should be represented in regional entities. She said that regions identified in the Fourth Climate Assessment should be a geographic scale to look at. She finally said that matching these funds with Cap-and-Trade resources is important.

Natalie Hernandez asked about how nonprofits will be considered and whether there will be advance payment or inclusion of smaller community organizations.

Dolores Barajas said we need to hear more about how to incorporate community organizations into regional partnerships. She said that the legislative language includes governments, but it does not exclude non-governmental entities.

Dolores Barajas asked: what types of regional partnerships can support achieving these solutions?

Laura Engeman recommended to consult with other grant program managers whose timelines are a little ahead, because there are a lot of overlapping grants. She recommended to think about how this can be aligned with the Cutting Green Tape initiative. She said communities trying to push resilience projects on the ground require cross-jurisdictional collaboration and that the permitting is a huge barrier.

John Wentworth commented that the Wildfire & Forest Resilience Task Force is wrestling with the same cross-jurisdictional boundaries. He recommended connecting with the Department of Conservation and learn from their experience with the Regional Forest & Fire Capacity Program.

Leah Fisher built on Laura's comments. She said that many State entities already have a regional presence that can provide support in permitting.

Laura Engeman said another big factor at the regional level are districts. She said turnover at regional districts (such as from Caltrans or State Parks) is really high, so supporting in capacity building and professional development at the district level would be helpful.

Jana Ganion added that in a carbon life cycle project, they are looking at county and tribal boundaries. She recommended thinking about all of the jurisdictions, not just local governments.

Dolores Barajas asked: how the program can sequence the 3 major activities (planning, capacity building, project implementation) over 3 funding cycles to support cohesive projects?

John Wentworth said OPR should start with the geographic region definitions and not change them after the first cycle. He said that the CERF boundaries were a blunt instrument, and that they didn't cover all bases in his region, but that the State was unequivocal that it wouldn't change them. He said that without clear boundaries then it would not be possible to build momentum.

Karalee Browne offered that making the train go a little bit slower would be appreciated by the grantees. She said that local partners have to strategize a lot to figure how to apply. She applauds program like Transformative Climate Communities having multiple funding rounds. She said that the communities that need the money most need more time to come up with their plans. She said that local governments and community-based organizations are overwhelmed.

Natalie Hernandez agreed with Karalee.

Public Comment

Anna Friedman from Resilient Cities Catalyst referenced the recommendations of a report, Climate Crossroads: California's Readiness to Act on Climate Resilience, from the California Resilience Partnership: <https://www.rcc.city/california-climate-crossroads>. She said the report includes six core recommendations to make grants more accessible, effective, flexible, and equitable.

Allison Brooks from the Bay Area Regional Collaborative said that they are grappling with the different climate impact scales and how implementation plays out on the ground in communities. She recommended thinking of regional planning to support local capacity building and implementation. She explained that the Bay Area has strong regional entities. She said that a lot of times a region is about how federal and state funding flows to a place, which is a way to understand who has the capacity to administer large flows of funds.

Mary Cousins of the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies noted that many of the regional partners of these are special districts, and encouraged the program to not only think big, but also think small.

Toto Vu-Duc of City of Watsonville recommended that OPR be intentional about equitable distribution of funds to smaller communities. She said that smaller jurisdictions need more time to put their plans and projects together.

Part 2 – Breakout Rooms

Dolores Barajas directed attendees to breakout rooms for further discussion. The breakout room questions included:

- How can this program define capacity building to fill gaps in climate resilience funding?
- Where are the gaps in climate resilience funding and how might we structure the program to align with other programs?
- What are existing barriers to accessing similar funding programs? How can the grant program address these barriers (i.e., technical assistance)?
- While this program may issue grants both competitively and on a formula basis, what should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides?

The notes from each breakout room are listed below.

Breakout room 1:

While this program may issue grants both competitively and on a formula basis, what should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides?

Ryan Ojakian said he would like to see a competitive formula, multi-benefits, and see program dollars go as far as possible.

David Loya wondered if competitive grants will only support those with most capacity, so would like to see a set-aside for entities with less capacity.

Laila Atalla from the City of Sacramento would like to see a combination of competitive and formula funding to encourage multi-benefit projects and ensure access. He also cautioned against being too tied to SB 375 disadvantaged communities because many don't qualify even if they have adaptation needs.

Jana Ganion wishes under-resourced local governments had capacity and funding for a role. She said rural and tribal communities have leaders who become experts on certain funding opportunities but not generalists, and for this reason, formula funding is worth considering.

How can this program define capacity building to fill gaps in climate resilience funding?

David Loya said watching the SGC rollout of Regional Climate Collaborative grants was helpful, since the funding comes with TA and is a great model. He said he has worked with Institute for Local Government to strengthen applications they put in, which makes under resourced communities more competitive.

Jana Ganion said even big agencies are at a starting point for this regional work and that we will not get there at the pace needed without capacity building

Where are the gaps in climate resilience funding and how might we structure the program to align with other programs?

Jana Ganion suggested funding positions in the regions to be able to do this work.

Ryan Ojakian said the Sacramento region has a funding gap in responding to hazards. He said to meet drought needs, we need to recognize there are wet and dry times.

Laila Atalla commented that there is a lot of overlap with similarly named programs across SGC, OPR and CDFA.

What are the existing barriers to accessing similar funding programs? How can the grant program address these barriers (i.e., technical assistance)?

Jana Ganion said technical assistance for the application period is helpful and that technical assistance builds in time for application process and those who truly understand program funding. She said barriers are lack of knowledge of program and how a grant program addresses it.

Troy Hightower said he is representing a private firm that works with community-based organizations that apply for Strategic Growth Council projects. He said he would be interested in helping to provide technical assistance and is familiar with guidelines. He said they are working on Transformative Climate Communities project in Fresno.

David Loya said what is needed is a combination of technical assistance and funding for staff. He offered an idea to develop a certificate program for jurisdictions to have staff members become trained in grant lingo and grant application process.

Jana Ganio liked the idea of certificate program, because it propels forward subject matter expertise. She said California needs to build capacity within regions but that it is not straightforward to pick a managing partner or fiscal sponsor for a regional project. She suggested that there be reimbursable application costs to overcome the burden of applying with risk of not being selected.

Breakout room 2:

While this program may issue grants both competitively and on a formula basis, what should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides?

Allison Brooks said that Metropolitan Planning Organizations are used to getting formula funds and that a map would be helpful to identify vulnerable communities and could make vulnerable communities competitive for other grants for local planning and implementation. She said there are lots of gaps in local planning needed to understand strategies to reduce climate risk. She said she want the program to build capacity of cities, counties, and community-based organizations to plan in order make hard decisions. She said even the Bay Area needs help with the process of planning, risk identification and how to go after grants. She asked if there are good models from outside of California. She said definitions of regions/neighborhoods/communities makes it hard to figure out how to apply for grants.

Jacob Alvarez recommended that ICARP staff look at communities who would not otherwise fund climate adaptation projects. He explained that Coachella Valley has lots of area to sprawl, and that while State incentivizes cities to grow upward, it is still easier to sprawl. He said that previously funded recipients are in highly urbanized areas where they are already building upward and in higher density. He argued not to give Coachella Valley money for excessive heat, because they are already building with excessive heat in mind. He argued that the program should instead give money for excessive heat to coastal communities that haven't historically planned on building for it and for infill development in areas that are struggling to move past sprawl. He concluded that project impacts will be maximized if we fund projects in cities that aren't already planning for new climate impacts

How can this program define capacity building to fill gaps in climate resilience funding?

Sam Assefa said OPR already has a lot of information around districts and community-based organizations that have lots of grant opportunities but not enough capacity to apply for them. He said that OPR will learn from Regional Climate Collaboratives and the Strategic Growth Council. He said that OPR can understand capacity needs, because we connect with community-based organizations and other partners on a regular basis. He said that capacity building through existing grants can be supplemented by the Regional Resilience Grant Program to fill in the current gaps for philanthropic organizations and community-based organizations.

Allison Brooks said there are already existing funding programs and that OPR should map out what types of capacity building are needed by organizations and agencies. She explained that while cities need to manage risk, community-based organizations have different needs. She asked if this program is about regional resilience and risk or about regional capacity building.

Leah Fisher commented that the Strategic Growth Council has different capacity building definition. She suggested that the program look to the RAP map ([CA Resilience Adaptation Planning map](#)), which links to existing resources to map adaptation plans across California.

Taylor Carnevale suggested that based on the feedback, the group should hone in on what "capacity building" means.

Allison Brooks responded that the people who need the capacity building are not going to apply for these funds and that they need help even getting to the application. She said the program needs a process to help low-capacity organizations get to the table. She said that current competitive grant processes continue funding high-capacity organizations.

Jacob Alvarez said that in the Coachella Valley, lots of people left government, community-based organizations, etc., because of COVID. He explained that lots of people who know the grant process don't work in Coachella Valley and that less experienced people end up sorting into Coachella Valley organizations. He said there may be low general understanding around what climate resilience is.

Where are the gaps in climate resilience funding and how might we structure the program to align with other programs?

Leah Fisher said that there is a gap in the funding for planning (in all its different forms). She explained that federal programs don't allow for planning in general and that some state funds may exclude planning as well. She said regions and communities spend a long time (10 years sometimes) to determine what funding to go after.

Allison Brooks said cities used to be able to manage complex funding sources, manage land, etc. She said moving from an idea to adaptation project requires tons of specialized knowledge and needs a project manager. She explained that adaptation projects have complex processes with lots of resources required. She inquired where the experienced project managers work.

Jacob Alvarez said that making the application simple is necessary. He said he worked on the Transformative Climate Communities grant for 4 months and heard that many cities were dropping out. He said that the applications got so large and unwieldy they came at the expense of other projects and services. He said that consultant fees could be very high for large applications and said that one consultant was charging \$60K to write a master plan.

Breakout room 3:

While this program may issue grants both competitively and on a formula basis, what should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides?

Karalee Browne said that the Department of Housing and Community Development's SB 2 and Regional Early Action Planning grant programs did set-asides by population, which resulted in some allocations that were too low to be useful. She said the program should have a grant award floor. She then explained that some jurisdictions have challenges managing grants. She expressed that it is important to know where jurisdictions are in the process of conducting climate resilience work.

John Wentworth said that OPR needs to ensure that the program is going to be successful. He argued that while it is important to do competitive grants and formula set-asides, he asked how do we go back to taxpayers and say that we did this program, and this is what we achieved? He said that we are all investing time and effort into this program, so don't let this be a public sector pork barrel spending program. He warned not to put money in places where it won't be effective.

Karalee Browne warned that the same people will continue to be left out of climate resilience until we figure out how to help under-resourced communities staff up for resilience.

Anna Friedman said she has heard diverse kinds of capacity building challenges and that communities and regions are at different starting points. She recommended that OPR allow the program to fill unique capacity building needs and to make sure these are long-term capacity building funds in order to institutionalize capacity. She recommended that increasing allowable indirect rates could allow for funding for core institutionalized capacity.

John Wentworth said that the climate response is all hands on deck, across all sectors and that the program needs to anticipate where capacity exists that it can leverage to advance State climate programs. He said that capacity building must be designed to work with local, federal, and private entities. He offered an example that the State has no capacity to deal with ambitious fuels treatments, so it is turning to collaboratives, nonprofits, and private organizations. He said that the program needs to understand that regions will contract with a range of partners and will be dealing with multi-scalar networks.

How can this program define capacity building to fill gaps in climate resilience funding?

Nicole Wong of the Greenlining Institute said that the regional approach needs to complement the Strategic Growth Council's Regional Climate Collaboratives since they have a definition for capacity building that can be referenced. She recommended allowing for high indirect costs and urged OPR to think about how funding could help enable community engagement and technical assistance, not just during project planning but also throughout implementation and evaluation. She wanted to ensure that community engagement is an allowable cost.

Enrique Huerta commented that he was surprised at how skewed the ICARP focus has been on natural and working lands, when 95 percent of California's population lives in cities and clusters of cities. He said that whenever we discuss extreme heat, the solutions we hear are about nature-based solutions, even though climate change is also overwhelming built systems. He suggested that the program should help communities raise awareness of the full range of adaptation strategies and do more for people.

Where are the gaps in climate resilience funding and how might we structure the program to align with other programs?

Anna Friedman said that reimbursable grants are a huge barrier and that community-based organizations and environmental justice networks that are grassroots and understand what resilience needs are in vulnerable communities need sustained long-term funding to increase their impact.

John Wentworth said that the program needs to be able to engage with other state programs and that OPR staff should be tracking that. He added that right now federal and State of California policy are aligned, but that can change. He said this is important since half of the state's land area is managed by the federal government.

Toto Vu-Duc commented that small government agencies need advance payment. She added that the ICARP Climate Resilience Gantt chart doesn't capture everything and that there are many other programs out there. She commented that there isn't a single source of truth where everyone goes for climate resilience information. She also reflected on the disconnect between the grant cycles and the project implementation timelines.

Enrique Huerta commented that anytime extreme heat has been addressed, it has been a co-benefit of GHG emissions reductions; it would be good to primarily invest in extreme heat mitigation.

Karalee Browne said that local governments are seeking to optimize networks of community organizations. She said what is missing is basic educational materials that are digestible by these communities, delivered in the language and way in which they speak. She added that communities will not read a 100-page report. She understood that State program managers cannot track all the other programs but that there is a need for a stacking mechanism so that everyone easily understand how the different planning requirements interface with one another.

Rachel Couch from the California State Coastal Conservancy commented that it is very difficult to drill down to project-level focus when there are many issues being tackled all at once. She said that some stakeholders will want to hear about specific types of implementable projects, not just climate resilience and planning jargon, to bring a full range of high value projects into the program.

John Wentworth stated that OPR needs to be reflective when it transitions from being a planning to an implementation agency, since getting into implementation requires understanding realities of NEPA/CEQA and cross-jurisdictional collaboration.

What are the existing barriers to accessing similar funding programs? How can the grant program address these barriers (i.e., technical assistance)?

John Wentworth recommended consistent outreach, convening people with food/stipends, and making community engagement an event.

Karalee Browne said that accessibility of the grant form and the ability to go back and provide additional information at the direction of the program manager are important, since grant application guidelines are very complex for people who aren't regularly doing this.

Breakout room 4:

While this program may issue grants both competitively and on a formula basis, what should the program consider when evaluating the feasibility of funding set-asides?

Michael Germeraad from ABAG/MTC said funding set asides for regional plans could be helpful. He said that ABAG/MTC is overwhelmed by all the funding opportunities that are out there and that any mechanism to set aside funds is really helpful for folks so that they can prioritize.

Michael McCormick said that community-based organization partners need to be funded in advance in active engagement. He said that when community-based organizations don't have access to support funding, they are left out of capacity building. He then recommended streamlining the grant process so communities don't have to apply to many different grants.

Natalie Hernandez asked whether all the OPR grants going to be using the same grants portal and how will folks be applying for funding.

Jason Greenspan said that it would be interesting to partner the objectives of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Department of Energy program with the Regional Resilience Grant Program and said that it sounds like the two programs will be aligned in terms of renewable energy and adaptation strategies

How can this program define capacity building to fill gaps in climate resilience funding?

Alex Klein of the CA Resilience Partnership said the definition of capacity should include people and staffing to fund people for more than 1 year to build a workforce.

Michael McCormick said unrestricted funding is critical to provide capacity for an organization. He understood that this is difficult to happen for legislative reporting, but he explained that unrestricted funding can allow a community to fund people, resources, or even hire a Civic Spark fellow.

Natalie Hernandez commented that capacity building is defined differently for different communities, but that unrestricted funding should include software, participant stipends, gift cards, and food. She said that a lot of state grants programs don't allow for these costs but if OPR can provide some funding for these unrestricted activities, it would be really helpful for many communities. She hopes that this program can be flexible in a lot of ways that other grant programs are not, in order to fill gaps.

Michael Germeraad commented that the Bay Area is talking about what it means to do regional resilience planning, including that gaps the region is trying to fill and at what scales. He said that there are organizations such as CalCOG that are trying to organize the Councils of Governments statewide, but since OPR/ICARP are leaders in the adaptation and resilience space, it might make sense for it to train the leaders in this space.

Where are the gaps in climate resilience funding and how might we structure the program to align with other programs?

Michael Germeraad said that lot of funding is specific for each type of climate impact or sector and that the OPR pot can be used for multi-impact and adaptation type. He added that there is an ability to do some multi-hazard, multi-planning which is good to prevent planning silos. He said that if we want to link grants from this program to other state agencies like Caltrans, then they could connect to other impacts covered by other grant programs.

Jason Greenspan commented that a lot of counties rely of sales tax funding to fund transportation projects, but these sales tax measures predate AB 32. He said there is an opportunity to align with local transportation authorities to ensure transportation planning can be adaptative to changes in the climate and that this could be an opportunity to align short-term priorities.

Michael McCormick commented that capacity building is something that doesn't seem to get funded. He said that there are advantages to having open and broad grant guidelines but that people want an assurance that they know what activities are eligible. He encouraged OPR to make sure the guidelines remain open and flexible and allow for loose collaborative structures.

Natalie Hernandez said that this program could be used for match funding but not to require it so that it creates an additional gap.

What are the existing barriers to accessing similar funding programs? How can the grant program address these barriers (i.e., technical assistance)?

Michael Germeraad recommended combining integrated resilience planning with other initiatives and to allow for flexibility on start date, end date and proof of product.

Natalie Hernandez urged the need for advanced pay, no match requirement, flexible and unrestricted funding for capacity building, and funding water jugs.

Michael Germeraad recommended a clean and accessible way to see what types of activities were funded and who was successful in receiving funding.

Natalie Hernandez commented that the Step grant is allowing for inflation to be taken into consideration.

Item 7d: Resilience Funding World Café

Sloane Viola introduced the Resilience Funding World Café.

Ena Lupine from the Strategic Growth Council provided an overview of Regional Climate Collaboratives Program (RCC). RCC aims to assist under-resourced communities within a region to access statewide public and other grants. She said the program has \$8.35 million with grants sized between \$500,000 and \$1.75 million. She said they have been able to do robust engagement without funding for years. She explained that RCCs build capacity by acting as a technical assistance provider that translates funding and program requirements into local context and needs. She said that RCCs serve as institutions within communities; support on grant writing and administration; and convene organizations within regions on climate issues.

Kristopher Bianchini from the Department of General Services provided an overview of State Financial Marketplace programs, including [GS \\$mart](#).

Mary Small, State Coastal Conservancy provided overview of State Coastal Conservancy grants.

Lisa Hu, Strategic Growth Council provided a review of SGC's [Community Resilience Centers \(CRC\)](#). The program provides funding for construction of facilities that can serve as community resilience centers. Listening sessions are coming up this month, and guidelines will be released in the fall.

Sloane Viola transitioned the group into breakout rooms for the World Café.

Upon return from the breakout rooms, Karalee Browne thanked all of the speakers in this resilience funding workshop today.

Chair Assefa seconded this comment and acknowledged the unprecedented budgets and number of new funding programs.

Item 8: General Public Comment

No comment.

Item 9: Closing and Meeting Adjourned