



ICARP

INTEGRATED CLIMATE ADAPTATION & RESILIENCY PROGRAM

Technical Advisory Council Quarterly Meeting Meeting Minutes

March 29, 2024 | Rosenfeld Hearing Room 1516 9th St. Sacramento, CA 95814 | 9:30 AM – 12:30 PM

[Agenda](#)

Item 1 | Welcome and Roll Call

Chair Saharnaz Mirzazad introduced the meeting.

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: Draft 2023 ICARP Impact Report
- Item 6: Vulnerable Communities Definition
- Item 7: Regional Resilience Grant Program Update
- Item 9: General Public Comment
- Item 10: Closing & Adjourn

Technical Advisory Council (TAC) Members Present (18):

Jacob Alvarez, Coachella Valley Association of Governments (Virtual)

Veronica Beaty, California Coalition for Rural Housing

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

Alex Ghenis, Sustain Our Abilities

Allison Brooks, Bay Area Regional Collaborative

Kim Clark, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

Grant Davis, Sonoma County Water Agency

Jenn Phillips, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)

Sarah Izant, California Environmental Protection Agency

Nina Bingham, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)

David Loya, City of Arcata

Will Madrigal, Jr, Climate Science Alliance (virtual)

Nayamin Martinez, Central California Environmental Justice Network

Saharnaz Mirzazad (Chair), Governor's Office of Planning & Research (OPR)

Darwin Moosavi, California State Transportation Agency

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

Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve

Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy (Virtual)

Rohan Radhakrishna, California Department of Public Health (CDPH)/California Health & Human Services Agency (CalHHS)

Roberto Carlos Torres, Institute for Local Government

John Wentworth, Town of Mammoth Lakes

Absent (4):

Denise Kadara, Allensworth Progressive Association

Sona Mohnot, Greenlining Institute

Gloria Walton, The Solutions Project

Lori Nezhura, California Office of Emergency Services

Item 2 | Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

Public Comment

None.

Action

Nathan Bengtsson moved to approve the November 14, 2023, meeting minutes, with a second from Saharnaz Mirzazad.

The TAC voted to approve TAC meeting minutes with 15 ayes, 0 noes, and 3 abstain.

Aye: Veronica Beaty, Nathan Bengtsson, Allison Brooks, Kim Clark, Grant Davis, Alex Ghenis, Jenn Phillips, Nina Bingham, David Loya, Abby Jackson, Jonathan Parfrey, Rohan Radhakrishna, Roberto Carlos Torres, Gloria Walton, John Wentworth

Abstain: Sarah Izant, Will Jr. Madrigal, and Nayamin Martinez

Minutes approved.

Item 3 | State Agency Report Out

Jenn Phillips of the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) shared that the agency will be releasing a draft update to the California Climate Adaptation Strategy soon with hopes of finalizing an update by Fall 2024. CNRA in partnership with OPR will be conducting outreach and public engagement workshops across the state. The agency is looking to align workshops with other public workshops, such as ones through California's Fifth Climate Change Assessment. Phillips also shared that CNRA has several upcoming funding announcements from several research grants. More information on these funding announcements can be found on the California Fifth Climate Change Assessment page. Additionally, though the California Climate Adaptation Strategy, CRNA will report annually on its implementation progress. The 2023 progress report for what we have been doing so far to implement and drive on the current climate adaptation strategy will be released soon. Updates can be found on the CNRA website and OPR website. Last week, CNRA hosted its first ever equity summit which was a big success. One resource, the "equity year in review" tracks how CNRA, across all of its boards, conservancies, and offices are embedding equity into the work we are doing. Additionally, Ocean Protection Council will release statewide sea-level rise guidance soon. BCDC and the Coastal Commission are working to advance sea level rise planning. Specifically, they are working to provide guidance to coastal jurisdictions that are now mandated to develop sea level rise plans. BCDC and the Coastal Commission will provide guidance to jurisdictions later this year. BCDC is doing this through its development of its regional shoreline adaptation plan. There are several different sea level rise planning and guidance across our coastal management agencies. Lastly, Phillips shared that the agency is continuing to advance their 30 by 30 goals of conserving 30% of land by 2030. An annual progress report on this will be shared later this year.

Jonathan Parfrey asked if the State Heat Action Plan is being considered for its next version?

Phillips responded yes, CNRA is working with ICARP staff to begin planning an update that is due by 2026.

Nayamin Martinez asked if there will be in-person workshops for the California Adaptation Strategy update.

Phillips responded that there will be a mixture of in-person and virtual workshops for the California Adaptation Strategy update. There will be 3

workshops in Central, Northern, and Southern California. We are working with OPR to figure out the logistics for these meetings.

Martinez responded that the workshops in the Central Valley should be after hours to reach vulnerable communities and there should be translators available for non-English speakers.

Phillips thanked Martinez for the feedback.

Rohan Radhakrishna of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) shared that in mid-April, there will be National Integrated Health Information System meeting. This meeting is tailored for governments, as well as community partners. There's a lot of virtual events with the goal of reducing risk across multiple time scales and geographical scales with the impact of heat. The theme for the three-day conference is building equitable community and human resilience. The California Air Resources Board, the California Department of Public Health, and the Climate Action team will focus on extreme heat resources that including many state agencies are participating in this conference. This is a great opportunity for updated guidance and resources on extreme heat. Radhakrishna shared links for CDPH's extreme heat landing page which has new and updated guidance ahead of the heat season. These resources include materials for local health departments, schools, and for pets. Additionally, Radhakrishna shared that there is a heat and summer safety communications toolkit that's been shared with partners. This information includes updates regarding funding and programmatic updates. The Department of Healthcare Access and Information is looking at reducing energy use efficiency decarbonization and ensuring climate resilience for healthcare facilities. This will be supported by a waiver from the federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services to be able to have onsite energy generation and battery storage. In the Environmental Health Investigations branch, there is a Wildfire Smoke and Air Pollution Health Burden Mapping Dashboard. Radhakrishna shared that this is an exciting dashboard that partners can use to get more specific and informed decision making. Through the Center for Healthcare Quality and Payment Reform, the program received \$1.5 million over 3 years to help educate our long-term care facilities to protect residents from extreme heat. Individuals in these facilities based on their medical vulnerability have unique health risks. There are about 12,000 facilities across the state. He also mentioned that CDPH is working with tribal partners and Lake County on a partnership called, "Charm," the Climate Health Adaptation and Resiliency Mobilization project is in partnership with the public health institute to bring together community stakeholders to look at the measures and responses to extreme heat including harmful algal blooms. Furthermore, there'll be a two-day tabletop workshop in May, and we're continuing to work with five tribes across the state to improve climate and health data tools and surveying tribal members on climate and health challenges. Radhakrishna concluded by sharing that CDPH in partnership with OPR and the Department of Insurance will continue to support Assembly Bill 2238, developing a health ranking and warning system.

Kim Clark asked, "Can you speak more about the implementation measures for cooling? It sounded like it was more focused on infrastructure funding, and you mentioned tree planting."

Radhriskhna responded that through the Department of Social Services, the Community Care and Licensing team was given \$8.5 million over 3 years to help protect childcare, adult care, respite care, and foster care facilities from extreme heat. This funding will support over 60,000 facilities across our state. Before the summer, the department will be distributing educational and guidance materials and eventually looking to fund direct mitigation measures, such as window films, tree planting, weatherization, and other cooling mechanisms based on equity criteria within the Department of Public Health.

Nina Bingham of the California Department of Food and Agriculture shared that the Department plans to outline existing efforts they are working on to build resilience against climate change for agriculture in California. The Department will focus on information gathering and plans to reach out to state partners to talk about opportunities for alignment and overlap.

Abby Jackson from the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) shared that they have now finalized a State Climate Resilience Improvement Plan (SCRIPT) as part of the new Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative Efficient and Cost Saving Transportation Program. The Protect Program is a federal program, created by the Infrastructure Investments and Jobs Act in 2021. Caltrans received federal approval for our SCRIPT for transportation in early 2024. This is an optional component of the protect program that can reduce the state and local cost share of certain identified protect eligible products projects from 20% to 10%. The SCRIPT summarizes and highlights the breadth of existing climate adaptation policies full of guidance and activities and that have positioned Caltrans and its partners to take a systemic approach to making immediate and long-range investments to improve the resilience of the multimodal transportation system. Jackson thanked everyone who contributed to the draft SCRIPT. The next Climate Adaptation Planning Grants as part of the Senate Bill 198 enacted in the 23-24 State Budget, the Climate Adaptation Planning Program Planning Grants Program provides \$50 million to support tribal, local, and regional identification of transportation related climate vulnerabilities for the development of climate adaptation plans, as well as project level climate adaptation planning by identify adaptation projects and strategies for transportation infrastructure. In the past, Caltrans awarded 3 cycles of SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grants, the new cycle will build off the successful SB 1 program and to further advance transportation adaptation funding. Caltrans has completed one CPG funding cycle with a combined award of 18.2 million and we'll be announcing awards for its second funding cycle in the summer of 2024. The 2025 vulnerability and risk assessment, the 2019 Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment is currently being updated to incorporate the most recent California climate data and the 2025 vulnerability risk and vulnerability and risk assessment data. Jackson added that they will combine the analysis of vulnerable segments of the state's transportation system with associated risk metrics. She shared it's exciting to see the updated strategic priorities for Caltrans be reflected. The analysis will also incorporate multimodal consideration, such as transit rail and active transportation and it will identify funding needs, and advance and accelerate Caltrans adaptation planning and implementation of climate resilience projects statewide. Jackson concluded by highlighting

a local project, Caltrans completed construction of the Gleason Beach Realignment Project, along a rural stretch of coastal Highway 1 in North Central California. This project realigned nearly 1 mile of roadway spanning Scotty Creek Bridge using primarily through the State Highway Operations Protection Program (SHOPP) funding is already underway.

Saharnaz Mirzazad asked if the federal funding from IIJA will be able to fill the funding gaps that the state is facing to finance local transportation infrastructure projects.

Jackson responded that she would take the question back to CalSTA.

Nathan Bengston asked when the new Vulnerability Assessment will be available?

Abby Jackson shared that it is called the 2025 Vulnerability and Risk Assessment. We will have some sort of engagement process coming up and we will keep the TAC informed.

Alex Ghenis asked what is Caltrans doing, if anything to encourage mode shifting in its adaptation gaps?

Abby Jackson responded that more information is available on what Caltrans is doing. She shared that doesn't have a good update on that program but that the program emphasizes adaptation and resilience. She concluded that she would take the question back to Caltrans to get more insight.

Sarah Izant from the California Environmental Protection Agency shared that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment is continuing the on-going participation with the State Water Resources Control Board. She shared that staff have compiled a list of recycled water projects that hold the potential to deliver additional recycled water by 2030 and no later than 2040. The board also created a recycled water strike team, so there's work ongoing in that area. The desalinization staff released to the Seawater Desalinization Interagency group a final Seawater Desalinization Sighting and Streamlining Report that expedites permitting. They have also been coordinating with the Department of Water Resources to identify planned brackish groundwater desalinization facilities that could provide potable water. She shared that there are various efforts going on regarding brackish groundwater desalinization. She expressed that she is happy to connect with the relevant subject matter experts at the State Water Resources Control Board. Izant concluded by sharing that the water board is considering proposed regulations around urban water conservation that if adopted would reduce urban water use per capita which would increase the state drought resilience.

Saharnaz Mirzazad of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) shared that OPR is preparing operational guidelines for the Council that will be shared before the next meeting to address changes to Bagley-Keene and conflicts. New changes to Bagley-Keene have gone into effect that authorize some remote attendance options. We are going to be instituting some operational procedures for implementing those to assure that we can be flexible and fair to the council members and can assure a quorum at a single location. Again, these procedures will be used in advance of hearings to identify staff that need to attend

remotely so appropriate noticing can be accomplished under the law and so that we can assure a quorum is present at a single location. We will also remind remote participants of the rules for such attendance, which includes the requirement to be present on screen during the entire meeting and to disclose whether there are any other adults in the room with them.

We will set timelines for electing remote participation so that OPR can coordinate the technical needs for the meeting to accommodate remote attendance and remote public participation in advance of the meeting. Following our quarter 1 meeting we will be sending out a survey to TAC members to coordinate schedules for the year. More to come on this. Next, we are going to be instituting some operational changes to avoid any actual or potential conflict of interest issues moving forward. Here are some tools and tactics we will be utilizing. For one-on-one issues we recommend reach-out to us to help navigate the conflict-of-interest issue.

1. Training: We will provide a Section 1090 training at the beginning of each calendar year to staff and council members, and as needed for all new members, so that we can all remain mindful of the considerations that can lead to conflict and how to avoid it.
2. Council Binder: We will create an electronic binder for council members so that each council member can have direct access to reference materials.
3. Procedures: We will be adopting procedures for the review of any grant materials, including program materials, to reduce the potential for conflict. They will include:
 1. Any time grant materials are presented to the council – at any stage of the grant development – moving forward we will have a premeeting with each council member to ascertain whether any member has a direct or indirect interest in the potential or actual grant.
 2. Where council members present a direct or indirect interest in a potential or actual grant award:
Where any council member has a direct or indirect interest in a potential or actual grant award, the council as a whole cannot participate in the “making” of the contract in any way. This means they cannot even comment on things in their official capacity. Having an interested council member with a direct or indirect interest abstain will not fix the problem.
 3. Where council members present only a remote interest* in a potential grant:
Where any council member has a remote interest in a potential or actual grant, the council as a whole can participate in the “making” of the contract so long as the council member with the interest declares the interest and abstains from participation. The council member can abstain by stepping out of the meeting for the duration of the discussion. This means that the council generally can provide advice and feedback on the proposed or draft grantmaking development, terms, etc.

Please note that direct, indirect, and remote have a special meaning under section 1090, rather than their ordinary meaning. Chair Mirzazad shared that OPR can provide details during the training. We appreciate your patience with us as we build out trainings and support for these issues moving forward.

On Friday, January 12, 2024, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in partnership with Climate Resolve hosted Climate Resilience Nexus 2024 (CRN 2024). This event aimed at accelerating a Resilient California for all. Held at the California Air Resources Board Southern California Headquarters in Riverside, CA. The event brought together over 200 attendees that included tribes, local governments, community-based organizations and climate professionals. We had an outstanding Morning Plenary that included the Mayor of Riverside, regional leaders, and federal representatives including Alexis Pelosi from HUD and Samantha Medlock from FEMA. We had four afternoon breakouts to allow participants to do a deeper dive into important aspects of climate resilience work. The Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Track was co-designed with Climate Resolve and the Office of Community Partnerships and Strategic Communications, The Research Track featured the 5th Assessment and work on tribal research, The Resources and Tools track featured the VCP and featured our partnership with ESRI and the Funding and Finance Track was co-designed with Shalini Vjahalla and PreCollective.

Some key takeaways from the event were focused on resilience priorities: It's not just about bouncing forward; it's about recognizing what challenges we're facing upfront. Participants noted that disadvantaged communities are facing multiple social challenges, including lack of affordable housing, language barriers, limited access to technology, job scarcity, and inadequate education. Our climate resilience work need to better reconized and support interconneted social challenges. Another challenge that was mentioned was disparities in disaster relief: Accessing disaster relief can be an uphill battle, particularly for communities already struggling. Disparities persist in accessing both federal and state funds, leaving many reliant on overwhelmed non-profits for support. Information gaps were mentioned as a major challenge. Understanding climate vulnerability is crucial but challenging. Despite the wealth of available information, communities, especially those with limited resources, struggle to grasp and utilize it effectively. Investing in environmental leadership within underserved communities is vital for long-term resilience. By cultivating leaders who understand community-specific challenges, we can pave the way for meaningful change. We received feedback that OPR has a role to play in developing climate leadership and the climate workforce. It was powerful to hear the challenges that we need to face to improve our climate resilience efforts. Throughout the course of the symposium, participants brought to the forefront their priorities for climate resilience. We also received input on the best roles for OPR to play in addressing these priorities. On this slide, you can see some of the key areas where people feel that OPR can play to support climate resilience in California. Attendees highlighted the urgent need for coordinated action and support to ensure California's resilience in the face of climate challenges, underscoring the critical role of partnerships and community-centered approaches in building a sustainable future for all. Chair Mirzazad concluded by sharing a brief video highlighting the CRN event.

John Wentworth shared that these issues for conflict issues are for elected officials. When the TAC was originally set up, we didn't anticipate these issues. The way the TAC was structured, we would not be getting anywhere near this. I would appreciate a follow up conversation with your legal team to discuss this further. We are bringing things into the TAC that are in no way getting us near these conflict of issue concerns.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Wenworth for his remarks.

Allison Brooks shared if there are concerns with public interest, we should be able to discuss it openly rather than individually.

John Wentworth agreed and shared that a lot of Council members are advocates and working in the space. We were told that it would not be a problem to advocate and support this work. Now we are being told legal advice that contradicts this. It will be critically important for staff to clarify all of this for TAC Council members to understand where the lines are if we are getting involved in projects for our communities. I come from rural areas, where we wear different hats.

Brooks thanked Wentworth for his clarification.

Chair Mirzazad responded that there will be more clarity going forward.

Abby Jackson shared that at the Interagency Equity Advisory Committee, they are having their lawyers come in and do a training on Bagley Keene, ethics, and conflict of interest matters. This might be something to consider since we are recently back from COVID.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Jackson for her comments.

Johnathan Parfrey shared that Office of Environmental Health Hazard and Assessment (OEHHA) Standards Board decision to set an indoor air temperature for the workplace. We brought up Bagley Keene given its timeliness. It would be potentially interesting to invite CalOES Standard Board or Administration Action to discuss how this standard was established or rejected. We do not know what standard transpired and what its implications are.

Chair Mirzazad shared that OPR's legal counsel will be present at the future TAC meeting to answer questions.

Public Comment

None.

Action

None.

Item 4 | ICARP Programmatic Updates

Abby Edwards provided an update on ICARP's programmatic efforts. She started by introducing several new members of the ICARP team. First, she introduced Moiz Ryhdan, Moiz holds a BS in Health Care Administration from Sacramento State University and has extensive experience across multiple departments within the State of California. His roles included managing collaborative partnerships, ensuring timely completion of programmatic and fiscal reports, and overseeing grant deliverable contract timelines. Additionally, he provided fiscal advisory services, ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements and

offering technical assistance to local health departments and community-based organizations. Moiz's expertise also extends to contract administration, where he established monitoring systems for federal funds and managed various contracts aligned with organizational needs.

Edwards then introduced Daniel Pamintuan, who serves as the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program's (ICARP) Grant Administration Analyst. Prior to joining OPR, Daniel worked at California Exposition & State Fair where he coordinated interim events and managed the annual State Fair's food vendors. Prior to his work in an entertainment agency, he was a Student Assistant at the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) in the Center for Healthcare Quality Unit (CHCQ) where he researched consultative data from skilled nursing facilities, general acute care hospitals, hospices, and the media. Daniel takes immense pride in the city of Sacramento, where he was born and raised. He attended California State University, Sacramento, earning his B.A. in Economics.

And lastly, Miguel Navarrete is a Special Projects Assistant. Miguel brings valuable experience as an intern with Development Services Department with the City of Coachella where he helped develop ADU guidelines for the community and a pioneer program that offers residents an 8-week program to learn about city functions.

Edwards then provided comprehensive updates on programmatic efforts across all the ICARP TAC priorities, which are listed here for reference. First, I'll highlight some items that support our Building Partnerships and Leveraging Resources priority with an update on the Community Development Block Grant – Mitigation program. ICARP Staff consulted with colleagues at the Department of Housing and Community Development to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership over the past couple of years. Because the agenda items for CDBG-MIT rarely resulted in public feedback on the program, we mutually concluded that the partnership had unfortunately not lived up to its full potential. Additionally, federal program requirements no longer require a public body to provide input into the program. This prompted Staff to re-visit and re-evaluate the Memorandum of Understanding, ultimately deciding that dissolving the MOU would be in ICARP's best interest to devote Council time to other topics. Staff are committed to maintaining a close relationship with HCD and this program specifically and will identify strategic opportunities to engage the Council on post-disaster housing recovery.

Additionally, our Climate Services Team has begun developing a new Adaptation Help Desk for the Adaptation Clearinghouse, which will connect users with technical assistance resources and other state technical assistance and adaptation resources. This responds to a need identified in the Adaptation Clearinghouse's User Needs Assessment for on-demand, real-time support from adaptation professionals to help low-capacity users access and apply the resources and information they need for adaptation planning. We look forward to unveiling this feature and highlighting it at a future meeting! If any Councilmembers are interested in contributing more to this effort, please get in touch with Staff.

We have several exciting highlights from our Funding and Financing priority. Our FEMA Cooperative Technical Partners grant is supporting our work on a Tribal User Needs Assessment to understand Tribes' resiliency planning needs. ICARP has partnered with the

California Indian Environmental Alliance to lead outreach and engagement for this effort and have created a survey to gather information on Tribal communities' challenges with resilience planning efforts. ICARP is recruiting for an Assistant Planner to support this portfolio.

Additionally, two of our investment programs have open funding opportunities our participants may be interested in. The Extreme Heat and Community Resilience program will accept applications until April 23rd. This program is available to local governments, nonprofits, Tribes, to support community resilience measures to prepare for extreme heat, such as heat action plans, shade structures, reflectance, cooling, and more. Edwards concluded by sharing that the Adaptation Planning Grant Program will accept applications for Round 2 through May 20th, 2024. This program supports local governments and tribes working in partnership with nonprofits, or community organizations to undertake resiliency planning efforts for their community.

Nayamin Martinez asked if the technical assistance under the Help Desk is that only for public entities, such as cities and counties or is that available to community-based organizations and non-profits?

Edwards responded that it would be available to everyone.

Nathan Bengsston asked a follow up question. Do we have staff to support the Help Desk?

Edwards responded that the ICARP's Climate Services team has been building this out and that. The team conducted a User Needs Assessment for the Adaptation Clearinghouse to identify needs and this Help Desk is responsive to it. It would be managed in-house.

Chair Mirzazad added that OPR has made a few changes to the structure of the ICARP team. OPR received funding for two extra positions last year to support the Council on different topical areas. These positions have now been moved to the Climate Services team to broaden this subject area and will also be supported by other funding.

Nathan Bengsston shared that this is exciting, and he can send a lot of people OPR's way.

Veronica Beaty shared that they are excited to hear more about the resources that will be built out on the Adaptation Clearinghouse and expressed that their team was working with technical assistance communities applying to the Strategic Growth Council's Regional Climate Collaboratives (RCC) Program, but funding was cut to Round 2. Beaty shared that they were providing technical assistance to a lot of great community organizations proposed great projects, so they have been scrambling to point them to other funding opportunities. Beaty expressed that they are excited to use this resource and that they are happy to share user data if that is useful.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Veronica for their comment. Mirzazad shared that OPR has a responsibility to put out information on federal grants. Mirzazad mentioned that OPR has a

staff member that works directly with federal grants. Mirzazad mentioned that OPR is working on putting a contract out to support low-capacity communities and community-based organizations identify funding opportunities. Mirzazad shared that she is looking forward to collaborating with TAC Councilmembers on this effort. Mirzazad also shared that OPR's General Plan Guidelines will be released this week. This has been a huge undertaking for OPR, and it also includes updating the Climate Action Technical Advisory in the General Plan that has been in development with close partnership with the California Air Resources Control Board. Mirzazad shared OPR is excited about this as the Safety Element include the Climate Adaptation and Resiliency section. The Tribal Advisory guidance will also be updated in this process, and it has not been updated in 20 years. OPR is working on this in close partnership with Secretary Snider She welcomed feedback and comments from TAC members.

Jonathan Parfrey asked if OPR can provide an update the State's proposed budget.

Chair Mirzazad responded that OPR does not have final numbers for the budget, and we will know more by May revise. Mirzazad shared that Governor's budget proposal included cuts to the Adaptation Planning Grant Program and the Regional Resilience Grant Program, as well as the Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Grant Program. The Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Program will be moved from the General Fund to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). Mirzazad shared that it's been a difficult budget year, but the Governor's Office is working closely with State legislators to identify how to make the best use of the available funding and how to make the funds most impactful through collaboration and opportunities to spread the dollars the farthest. She emphasized that across the administration, the state is working on how to access federal funds and best position California communities to get access to those funds. Mirzazad mentioned that OPR is looking at out-of-the-box strategies, including leading the judicial streamlining for all infrastructure projects, which was part of the last infrastructure package. She expressed that she would love to disseminate this opportunity. Mirzazad stated if there were projects in your community that would qualify for situational streamlining to please take advantage of this program. Mirzazad also shared that OPR is looking at communities that we've already invested in and understand that resilience goes beyond the funding we can offer. She shared that she's been attending the Governor's Military Council and had an opportunity to learn more about the Department of Defense. She highlighted that the Department of Defense has a funding through a resilience grant program under the DLP portfolio on infrastructure for communities that have space. She emphasized that several California communities have military bases and expressed her interest in learning more about these funding opportunities. Mirzazad mentioned that the Department of Defense is looking for close partnerships with disadvantaged communities and looking closer at disadvantaged criteria in other grant programs. Mirzazad mentioned that there is so much progress occurring at the federal administration and it's an opportunity to position OPR to take advantage of what funding opportunities are out there.

Jonathan Parfrey responded and thanked Chair Mirzazad for her comments and shared that he understands it's a difficult budget year for the State.

Public Comment

Michelle Passero asked if the Adaptation Clearinghouse includes climate more broadly so information provided can advance integrated solutions and also connect people to multiple funding sources?

Chair Mirzazad thanked Passero for their question.

Louis Blumberg asked if there will be a discussion item on OPR's work with the California Office of Emergency Services to pursue FEMA grants for climate resilience.

Abby Edwards responded that OPR, through a FEMA Cooperative Technical Partners grant is conducting a Tribal User Needs Assessment to better understand the tribal climate resilience planning landscape. This workstream is in partnership with a tribal serving organization, the California Indian Environmental Alliance.

Action

None.

Item 5 | Draft 2023 ICARP Impact Report

Ben McMahan, provided a high-level overview of the Draft 2023 ICARP Impact Report. This report is an opportunity to take a step back and consider the following question, what is the value and impact of our work? And how would we assess that? The impact report offers the number of opportunities can. How can we do that? The first opportunity this report offers is an opportunity for level setting and thinking about education and climate resilience. How can we provide education on climate and community resilience. The Resilience 101 section focuses on bringing new resilience advocates into the field and offers a level setting of where we stand. The report also helps centralized our overall vision for ICARP and it really helps us communicate our goals and priorities and to tell the story of the vision that we're all working towards. It's a synthesis across the programs. The report also gives some opportunity to uplift and reinforce some of ICARP's leadership in the climate and resilience space. And how we might export some of those access this other spaces? This could be the ICARP governance structure. This could be how we do our work, or really another example is how we're embedding equity across these processes and outcomes. This is an opportunity to just share out learnings. It's also a nice opportunity for us to celebrate accomplishments and milestones and to look ahead to identify opportunities and areas for growth overall. Overall, the report is a valuable opportunity to tell the story of ICARP in a cohesive way and to help us promote our work and get some additional buy in across that portfolio of work that we're doing now.

For big picture, the 2023 Impact report follows a similar structure to previous years. The executive summary was translated into Spanish last year at the suggestion of the Council. And this year, we will do that again. The report also kicks off with the introduction and our

Resilience 101 to set the stage and really do some level setting for the baseline information around climate resilience that grounds our work. The narrative case study provides a deep dive into a process of the how we work, and this lets us take a closer look at the how and the why of our work. This lets us consider how we might encourage this as a model for future work. For example, are there ways we can take this a case study to scale? And we started doing this with last year's report, and I'll highlight this year's focus. The report includes a recap of last year's accomplishments and what we hope to do in 2024. It's great to include a look back at our activities. This allows us to set an aspirational tone for how we see the program in our work evolving and growing.

Next, I want to turn to our narrative case study and just give a quick overview of how this encapsulates the larger ICARP program as an example of our cross cutting. So this year's case study section differs a little from last year because it focuses on a unifying goal that is supported across all of our teams. While last year's case study was a collection of several smaller case studies, such as our grant program rollout, the 5th Assessment Research Topics, and the release of our Plan Alignment Guides update this year. Our case study explores how ICARP can model meaningful engagement and capacity building through several different approaches across our programs. The examples from across our team supports this example. Our grant program staff go above and beyond to support applicants and support a wide range of needs. We have a new Climate Services functions that are responsive to community needs and gaps and prioritize their input and perspective. The Fifth Assessment's in-person engagement throughout the state last year documented a cross section of inputs from across the state. And even the TAC – this Council is another way that ICARP brings diverse perspectives to shape resilience policy and programs. Big picture, this emphasizes how ICARP is oriented towards Empowering Climate Resilience Through Meaningful Engagement, Technical Assistance, and Capacity Building.

First are some stats on the Adaptation Clearinghouse. Last year, we had over 17,800 visitors in 2023 and most of these visitors were from academic institutions, nonprofits, CBOs, and local governments. Tribes, regional governments, and the federal government were among the least represented. This shows us areas where we are connecting as well as areas, we can be more intentional in reaching out and supporting resilience and adaptation work. A good portion of the users are affiliated with organizations that have a statewide scope, and the relatively high fraction of users from outside of California is really an interesting sign of the how we're exporting some of California's climate and adaptation leadership. All in, this is just one way to look at these data, but it gives us some perspective on who we are connecting with, and where we can grow.

A few notable examples show that ICARP teams did a lot of outreach and engagement in 2023, and we wanted to highlight the large numbers of people participating in our Council meetings and workshops, with 259 attendees across the 4 meetings. The Fifth assessment workshops had over 400 participants in 9 in person workshops, and 3 virtual workshops, and the Regional Resilience Grant Program engaged with over 780 organizations as part of their ongoing support for outreach on the program and supporting applicants and their submissions. Last year was also the first time we offered grant funding, and those opportunities were heavily over-subscribed. Overall, applicants across the different funding

programs sought between 5 and 8 times the funding available! Just shows the incredible need for these programs and the support they provide across California. Taking a step back, these points underscore the importance of the work we are doing at ICARP. The level of engagement and the interest in these programs show that communities have substantial interest in advancing resilience, and ICARP clearly plays an important role in supporting this work. That concludes my quick overview. Just a note that any feedback we receive from Councilmembers today will be reflected in the final Impact Report, which we anticipate will be available in Q2 or early Q3. As we prepare the final design, we'd love to showcase quotes from Councilmembers throughout the Report. Please reach out to provide a quote if you are interested. I'll hand things back to the Chair but am happy to take any questions from the Council. Nathan Bengsston thanked McMahan for the report and asked if OPR is tracking implementable projects or is ICARP focusing the support they are providing?

McMahan asked Bengsston what he means by implementable projects?

Bengsston responded by saying for example how many Adaptation Planning grants were awarded and how many projects will result in shovel hitting the ground next year. I understand that it might not be that fast.

McMahan handed it to Abby Edwards.

Abby Edwards responded that last year APGP awarded 14 planning grants in Round 1 so projects are just underway, but the next step is thinking about implementation projects. For Round 2, grantees will be working on deliverables that include an implementation plan to think about operationalizing these adaptation plans. Edwards shared that Dolores Barajas will be speaking on the Regional Resilience Grant Program that has both planning and implementation funding.

Bengsston thanked Edwards for this report out and said that it is important to show people how it works and how difficult the process is. He said that showing people how the money was acquired can help it feel more real for people.

McMahan followed up by sharing the ICARP Impact Report can eventually focus on an evaluation of impact to think about the long-term investment of the funding stream.

Chair Mirzazad added that ICARP has a third-party evaluator looking at the impact of our ICARP Grant Programs. Earlier this year, ICARP released an evaluation report for the Regional Resilience Grant Program, as required by statute. We can look into this and think about incorporating this into the Impact Report. The Regional Resilience Grant Program and the Adaptation Planning Grant Program both share the same evaluator.

Bengsston followed up by sharing that he would go back and review the 2023 Impact Report to provide more clear recommendations.

John Wentworth asked if it is possible to review a draft of the report in its graphic form. He shared that there's a lot of stuff that would be helpful because a lot of these things might be seen out of context. He shared that he doesn't know what the deadline, but it would be

helpful. Wentworth also asked what is the TAC's role in the Impact Report? The report seems to be a report on the entire ICARP program. He shared that there are grants and money going out, and it seems that we have some work to do to resolve our role in the program. Are we approving things? Are we providing feedback and comment?

Chair Mirzazad thanked Wentworth for his questions and shared that ICARP staff will talk to OPR Legal Counsel. Chair Mirzazad shared that last year Council members took a vote on the Draft 2022 Impact Report.

Wentworth responded that in the past, the TAC was providing technical assistance and guidance on policy recommendations and now we have grant programs and money going out. I think it's an important transition and ICARP is doing important work. We need to do a little more thinking about what the role of TAC is and how it is all working.

Chair Mirzazad asked OPR Legal Counsel if Council members are commenting on the Draft 2023 Impact Report would create a conflict of interest.

Jennifer Holman asked what the question is.

Wentworth said this is not a legal question. The question is focused on the TAC and our role. That as TAC Council members we need to understand what our roles are and how can we provide input going forward. If it is not going to hold up the process, it would be helpful to see a draft of the report in a graphic format. It would be helpful to provide context in terms of the text and graphics.

Chair Mirzazad followed up by clarifying the legal question for Holman is having the Draft 2023 Impact Report as an action item going to have any conflict of interest for Council members.

Holman responded that she does not know the full context of the report but does not think it would be.

Jonathan Parfrey shared that in the previous administration, this body, the TAC suggested that OPR create an ICARP Impact Report to demonstrate its value add to legislators and other interested audiences. I am not sure if you recall this, John Wentworth. It was not a policy recommendation; it was a suggestion to maintain public relations about the work OPR is doing.

Wentworth responded that is correct, but we are getting into other spaces. We should do a gut check and make sure we are not getting into places that we shouldn't be.

David Loya shared that we are not approving or authorizing any funding here. We are just responding to the report and making comments. I am not feeling conflicted here.

Ben McMahan responded that ICARP staff would share the draft report in its final design format with TAC Councilmembers for review and input.

Abby Edwards responded that ICARP staff will do their best to include TAC Council members into the design process and get their feedback. You are all agreeing on telling our story and are we hitting the mark right. Edwards shared that last year ICARP incorporated feedback from TAC Councilmembers on equity. This feedback was really helpful, and staff worked on making these changes throughout the report and got it approved.

Jen Phillips asked if we should provide written or verbal feedback.

Edwards responded that this is the space to provide either feedback or OPR will incorporate written feedback as well.

Jen Phillips shared that in the past we have talked about updating ICARP's Planning and Investment Guidebook. She asked about the proposed guidebook on Aligning State Climate Resilience Funding Programs with Federal Hazard Mitigation Assistance Programs and expressed interest in learning how TAC members could be engaged in this effort.

Abby Edwards responded that this is part of OPR's Cooperative Technical Partners grant portfolio and is a FEMA deliverable. ICARP staff will report on progress to the guidebook over the next year.

Roberto Carlos Torres thanked ICARP staff for the Impact Report to detail all the different efforts OPR is leading. The Impact Report is an educational document, language is important, especially as we are talking about climate resilience and equity. Torres flagged that in the introduction under the "What is Climate Resilience?" The last paragraph on page 5, starts off with developing impactful climate solution. Climate adaptation solutions requires targeted policy and investments that reduce vulnerability. It then goes on to talk about how it can redress historical inequities and things like that nature. I would almost like to see that paragraph include that it it's required to address historical inequity because it's not just about how it could do that because we are focusing on the problem now. Our communities have been left behind for quite a while and while we're talking about climate equity, we have to be intentional of redressing that historical inequity. So while it can do that, it's a requirement to do that. I'd like to kind of see that incorporated into that paragraph to just state very clearly that it is something that has to be done and can't just be an afterthought. I really liked the case study on page 13 and how it really talks about the funding numbers, particularly for RRGF Round One, specifically that 86% went to what the report is calling disadvantaged communities. I'm wondering if that's because it's looking at communities defined by SB535 as disadvantaged communities or if that's just terminology that we're using, and if it were, I would like to see that shifted. I think in this Impact Report, we define vulnerable communities and that kind of is all-encompassing, so if that's what we're using as the term, I'd like to see that carried throughout. Often times, our communities don't identify as disadvantaged. I grew up in San Francisco, moved to the Richmond, CA which is an environmental justice community. I didn't know I was disadvantaged until moving up. And starting to get into policy, what we refer to these communities as is important. And so that's why you hear often in San Diego, we call it "communities of concern", but we also hear frontline communities or priority populations. I think those terms are a lot more positive. "Communities of Concern" for us definitely is a community first terminology.

Something to just consider as you're putting reports on here as well as just in the future, let's define it. Let's move away from calling them disadvantaged communities and instead use more empowering language. For the funding and fundraising portion, I'd love to see a call out just like we did for the case studies of how much funding is going to our communities of concern versus other communities. As you're listing stuff out, you could do it in the call remarks or just in the narrative itself, noting how much is going to under resourced communities would be a fantastic call out. One thing on the climate equity and vulnerable community section, for the 2024 work plan, it shows that the community engagement partnership pilot is going to start taking form in 2024. You have in here that the pilot will have a focus in a community and then expand statewide. It doesn't actually say what the community is. There's a bracket that says area, so I don't know if that's because that's still in development or consideration, but some more information on that would be great. Lastly, I think one thing that needs to change for the impact report is in your work plans for 2024 is that the climate equity and vulnerable community section is your smallest section. I think we're doing ourselves a little bit of a disservice in having it be that way just because I know that there's a lot of work going on here. We heard from several different state agencies that are really leaning in on climate equity work. We should look into how we are measuring and integrating climate equity into the work that we're doing and what that actually means and what the impacts are is really important. Torres concluded that he knows that it's integrated throughout, and he really applauds the work ICARP is doing, but it is to see that it's the smallest section kind of in the Impact Report. I'm hoping we can revisit that in the future and definitely make it as robust as it is for the work that we are doing.

Allison Brooks asked when did the 2023 Draft Impact Report go out? She shared that she just received the report this morning but was not able to provide comments on it. Brooks added that the value of climate resilience and adaptation is interdisciplinary, and she appreciates the appendices sections. She shared that it is helpful to understand how different state agencies are integrating climate adaptation and resiliency into their work. She concluded by sharing that she sees this evolving, specifically through her work with Caltrans District 4. She highlighted a successful meeting where state transportation agencies are trying to integrate resilience when thinking about investments in transportation and how difficult it is to do interdisciplinary work. She shared that highlighting the value of everyone coming together and try to solve this challenge is important. She also echoed remarks made by Chair Mirzazad about how we can create resources creatively and equitably to do interdisciplinary work is a huge value of ICARP.

Ben McMahan apologized for the logistical confusion and shared that there will still be a few more months to review and provide comments. This is only the draft report, and the final report will be ready between Q2 or Q3.

Chair Mirzazad asked if any other members had not received the 2023 Draft Impact Report.

Jenn Phillips asked if there is an update on the Science Advisory Group.

Ben McMahan shared that ICARP is exploring a workstream focus on the Science Advisory Group and will have more updates on this at the next TAC meeting.

John Wentworth shared that it would be helpful in the report for the state to define terminology used for financial and budget justification. Wentworth shared that in his community, they are currently going through the California Jobs First effort. He shared that 90% of the land in three counties is either managed by the Federal Government or Los Angeles County of Water and Power. The term, disadvantaged does not mean anything to us as a rural community. He shared that they have significant land tenure issues. He shared that they were advised by the state that they could create a definition to disinvested. Disinvested does not have any legal financial or budget meaning to it. When the state is dealing with these terms, disadvantaged has financial and budget implications. There are other ways to get to the point you are talking about. It is important for all communities that are struggling to access state and federal grant programs to understand which terms have a financial implication and what terms do not. That is the type of comments I would include in my comments.

David Loya shared that he understands Wentworth's point and that it makes sense for grants to be described this way. He shared that Roberto made a compelling argument for how we are describing it in this report. There should be language in this report when we are talking about the impact of the program and retain the disadvantaged communities language for the grants if it is required.

Nayamin Martinez shared that she thinks the word disadvantaged is okay for financial purposes, but for many of us who have been described it we do not appreciate it and we are looking to stay away from it.

Roberto Torres shared that he would be okay with going with vulnerable communities with the Draft 2023 Impact Report, but it warrants a larger discussion in the future.

Chair Mirzazad clarified that this is a motion for the draft version of the Impact Report and these comments would be incorporated in the final version.

Jonathan Parfrey asked if TAC Council members need to vote on the Draft 2023 Impact Report?

Chair Mirzazad responded yes, we need to vote on this draft.

Parfrey shared that he has never voted on a draft before.

John Wentworth suggested that we do not move to approve the draft and table it for the next meeting until the Council members are able to review the draft.

Chair Mirzazad clarified is the motion not to move on this item at this point?

Wentworth responded yes, I am suggesting we motion to table this item.

Jonathan Parfrey shared that this was a fruitful conversation, and he appreciated this conversation. He shared that these comments were so impactful, and it should be incorporated into the draft before voting on it.

Abby Edwards thanked the Council members for their thoughtful comments, but expressed that vote is still necessary. Edwards asked Jennifer Holman, OPR Legal Counsel for confirmation.

Jennifer Holman shared that Council members still need to vote on the motions presented to them.

John Wentworth clarified that the motion is to table this draft until a future meeting.

Holman responded yes that is fine, but a motion and vote must be taken.

Roberto Carlos Torres shared that he agrees with Parfrey's point that this is a draft and we should not need to vote on it. He shared that he understands that since it is an agenda item we will need to. I am not sure that tabling it will do what I like to see. I would like to see the final impact report. This will influence my vote. I rather us have a conversation on finalizing the ultimate report.

Jennifer Holman asked if this an amendment to the motion.

Chair Mirzazad asked Torres if we should move forward and bring back the comments for the final version?

Torres shared that the draft is inconsequential. I would like to see the final with comments and graphics. I would like to vote on the final version.

Nathan Bengsston asked if we do not vote on the draft today does that impeded ICARP staffs' ability to complete the work?

Chair Mirzazad asked OPR Legal Counsel for guidance.

Jennifer Holman shared that she does not believe so.

Allison Brooks shared that this seems like a process question. This is an informational item so TAC Council members are aware of the draft and the final version will be brought back for Council member approval. She shared that we are in this situation because the Draft Impact Report is labeled with an action item.

Chair Mirzazad shared that in the past TAC Council members have always voted on the draft. She shared that if there is a desire to change the process, we can do that going forward.

Robert Carlos Torres shared that he may have messed up the process. He appreciated ICARP staff bringing forth the draft 2023 Impact Report and provide comments. However, he does not think it is typical to vote on a draft. In the future, we should have it as an informational item and vote on the final report. He shared that there was a secondary motion to table the draft. He shared that we should decline to approve the draft and what we will get back is a final version with the comments and graphics.

Alexi Genis asked for a timeline to provide written feedback.

Abby Edwards shared that we would get back to TAC Council members with a timeline.

Jonathan Parfrey shared that his understanding is that we are going back to the original motion. It is the sense to many of us that we are voting no to vote on the original motion.

Abby Edwards responded yes, with the understanding and agreement on our end that we are absorbing a lot of this feedback and will share an updated draft with you all. At a future meeting, we will share a final impact report for you to weigh in and provide us feedback and approve a final draft.

Chair Mirzazad shared that ICARP staff will provide TAC Council members with a public comment period.

Kim Clark asked if this report will be released for public comment.

Abby Edwards said no.

Public Comment

Michelle Passero from The Nature Conservancy asked in regard to the grant programs, is there information being collected just on the accessibility and ease of use of the grant program by community members and organizations? Through the research we have done, we know that some of the barriers are just the ability to apply for some of these funding sources, many are fragmented. This would be useful information to collect and even report on and could also dovetail with the Adaptation Clearinghouse.

Abby Edwards shared that the ICARP Grants Program is working with a third-party evaluator, CLEE to review the program and past grantees.

Action

Roberto Carlos Torres motioned to approve the Draft Impact 2023 Report and John Wentworth seconded the motion. The action item does not pass.

Ayes: Saharnaz Mirzazad

Nay: Allison Brooks, Veronica Beaty, Clark, Davis, Nathan Bengston, Alex Genis, Jennifer Phillips, Sarah Izant, David Loya, Nayamin Martinez, Jonathan Parfey, Rohan, Roberto Carlos Torres, John Wentworth

Abstain: Bingham, Jackson, Passero

Item 6 | Vulnerable Communities Definition

Ankitha Doddanari, ICARP Staff lead for engagement and outreach for the [Vulnerable Communities Platform \(VCP\)](#) provided an update on the project.

In April of 2018, the TAC adopted the following definition of climate vulnerability to guide actions to advance equity:

Climate vulnerability describes the degree to which natural, built, and human systems are at risk of exposure to climate change impacts. Vulnerable communities experience heightened risk and increased sensitivity to climate change and have less capacity and fewer resources to cope with, adapt to, or recover from climate impacts. These disproportionate effects are caused by physical (built and environmental), social, political, and/ or economic factor(s), which are exacerbated by climate impacts. These factors include, but are not limited to, race, class, sexual orientation and identification, national origin, and income inequality.

At the November 2023 TAC meeting, the Council brought to staff attention that disability is not explicitly identified as a factor that can result in disproportionate impact from climate change. Lack of emergency planning focused on people with disabilities, specific healthcare needs, and other social and economic risk factors associated with physical and mental disabilities can result in people with disabilities experiencing difficulties in coping with, adapting to, and recovering from climate impacts. Although disability data will be included on the platform as an indicator of climate vulnerability on the Vulnerable Communities Platform currently being developed by OPR staff. Several Councilmembers recommended that staff make a minor modification to the vulnerable communities' definition to include disability.

Staff propose the following modified definition (as indicated with the bolded text) of vulnerable communities for adoption by the TAC to address this concern:

*Climate vulnerability describes the degree to which natural, built, and human systems are at risk of exposure to climate change impacts. Vulnerable communities experience heightened risk and increased sensitivity to climate change and have less capacity and fewer resources to cope with, adapt to, or recover from climate impacts. These disproportionate effects are caused by physical (built and environmental), social, political, and/ or economic factor(s), which are exacerbated by climate impacts. These factors include, but are not limited to, race, class, sexual orientation and identification, national origin, income inequality, **and disability**.*

Alex Ghenis made a motion to accept the new vulnerable communities' definition, while striking the "and" before income and inequality. There are several "ands" in that definition.

John Wentworth asked a technical question for staff. He mentioned that the the TAC adopted the language for "vulnerable communities" in 218. He asked staff if they can share the degree at which this language has been propagated out to other state agencies and if it's been included in any legislation. Furthermore, he asked if the TAC does vote to make this change, how will staff follow through to make sure that the changed language is propagated out into all the places where it may exist?

Doddanari responded that she doesn't have a specific answer to what other documents the current definition currently exists in but will follow up.

Wentworth responded that the motion would include this and that he wants to be assured that the definition is codified and if it is legislation that it doesn't sit on a website but gets shared out.

Mirzazad thanked Wentworth for his question and said that OPR will follow up.

Jonathan Parafey thanked staff for this update. He responded to Wentworth's question by sharing that the vulnerable communities definition is used by other agencies. He stated that it is arguably, one of the key most important things that we do as the TAC, updating this definition. In that spirit, I do see an oversight and that has to do with "gender." There are vulnerabilities that are particular to women that I've seen a number of excellent reports that characterized this. If not at this meeting, but at a future time he asked OPR staff to potentially include the concept of gender related to this definition.

Mirzazad thanked Parafey for his comments.

Sarah Izant shared a technical clarification to the definition. Izant shared that there is not an "and" before "income inequality" in the materials TAC members have in front of them.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Izant for pointing this out.

Kim Clark thanked the ICARP team their work on this item. They shared that this item was raised as another item by Councilmember Ghenis. They appreciated seeing the significance of this and that this meaningful. Clark seconded Jonathan's motion of including "gender" not just for women but for the transgender community as well.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Clark for their comments.

Roberto Torres asked if they are able to add "gender" to the definition.

Chair Mirzazad responded that at this time the only changes that can be made are to the word "disability."

John Wentworth asked why the council cannot make additional changes. Wentworth expressed that if the council is voting on something, why can't they provide the appropriate language and make an amendment.

Chair Mirzazad responded that she would like to get legal counsel on this to make sure we are using the right terms.

Wentworth asked, just to be clear the TAC could propose additional language, OPR could take it back to legal, and then we could move forward with an amendment?

Johnathan Parafey responded that to be clear this is a friendly amendment to include "gender."

Nathan Bengsston shared that he is supportive of the motions that have been offered. He mentioned that it's been 5-6 years of ICARP and it's probably time for a refresh on some of the mentioned concepts. Bengsston shared that it would be helpful to have a future meeting on how we discuss the terms "exposure" and

“sensitivity” as the way it is currently written is out of step with how he understands its usage. He shared the intent of the words would remain the same but they are being used would be changed.

Chair Mirzazad asked what Bengsston’s suggestion would be?

Bengsston responded that it is not accurate to say, “vulnerable communities experience heightened risk.” Rather we should say vulnerable communities are at a greater risk to climate change because of their increased sensitivity which is a result of many of these disproportionate effects.” He concluded that linking up the relationships in the right way is a great way to bring clarity to how this all works.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Bengsston for his feedback.

David Loya shared that if he remembers correctly this item has been an agenda item for 3-4 meetings in a row. There was a lot of workshopping and collaboration on building out the language itself. Then in the last meeting, when we were done workshopping it, we just adopted at that time. He shared that he would be interested in seeing these amendments and the ability to have that production in real time. Maybe setting aside more time to workshop this a little bit and have a broader discussion and then the ability, at that meeting to adopt it. Then at that time if legal counsel is ready at that time to accept these changes.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Loya for his comments.

Kim Clark clarified their previous comments and affirmed support.

Alex Ghenis shared that the inclusion of “gender” and “gender identity” could be an adjustment to sexual orientation and identification. Ghenis also mentioned that age is not included in this definition. He mentioned a statistic that he references is that “75% of the fatalities in the Paradise Fire were seniors.” He mentioned in all of his work, age has always come up as an exceptional vulnerability.

Allison Brooks shared that it sounds like many of the members of the TAC are expressing an interest in being actively engaged in helping develop language and materials and having ample time to do that and activating our role in the way we all want to meaningfully engage in this work because we all believe it's really important. Maybe we don't want the legal person to rain on our parade all the time. How do we set up a process maybe in the future to have more fruitful conversation about some of these items on our agenda.

Chair Mirzazad responded that she wants to make sure that we are not violating the Bagley Keene Act. We will get back to you on that. She shared that she wants to make sure that if we are offering a workshop, it would be a public meeting and the parameters would be discussed publicly, including the definition of vulnerable communities. Mirzazad concluded that more information will follow.

Roberto Carlos Torres shared that they are new the TAC. Maybe we could create a subcommittee who could work on this process.

Rohan Radhakrishna shared that he wanted to offer support for the inclusion of disability and mentioned the need for specificity around physical as well as mental disability. The pre-existing impact of mental health in our state is tremendous, Specific definitions and notions such as “cognitive ability” should be included. We're just seeing the emerging research of the compounding effects of climate change on existing mental conditions and unique contributions to mental health. I just want to specify within disability, that it's inclusive both physical as well as mental health. In our Climate Change and Health Indicators Vulnerability Visualization Tool, we distinguish them and have them as separate categories but just wanted to make sure that both were included in our understanding of the concept of disability. He also added that from the Department of Health and the Health and Human Services Agencies perspective, I want to offer our support of some of the other categorizations that were mentioned, including a broad view of gender for future consideration including expression as well as transgender status. We house the Gender Health Equity section and the Transgender Gender Nonconforming and Intersex Fund within our department and focus on resources for those specific populations would be happy to partner around a lot of definitions and best practices with that population. Age is another one, we have an entire Department of Aging. Coming back from the Climate Resolve conference in Riverside, we heard very compelling national speakers around the unique exposures and the risks of our aging population. We want to consider that as well as linguistic isolation, the Paradise fires were mentioned earlier in aging populations, and if you look at Sonoma it wasn't just older adults but also those who are linguistically isolated, who perished disproportionately. In summary, I support ongoing partnership for inclusion of additional categories and wanted to specify physical as well as mental disabilities.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Radhakrishna for his comments.

Michelle Passero asked about a separate definition for ecosystems and wildlife. She pointed out that this definition is focused on human communities, which is important, but that a separate definitions for wildlife and ecosystems would be beneficial so that natural systems and human communities are not conflated.

Action

Alex Ghenis motioned to accept the Vulnerable Communities definition and Nathan seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the new Vulnerable Communities definition passes with 17 Ayes, 0 Noes, and 0 Abstains.

Aye: Saharnaz Mirzazad, Veronica Beaty, Nathan Bengtsson, Allison Brooks, Kim Clark, Grant Davis, Alex Ghenis, Jenn Phillips, Nina Bingham, David Loya, Abby Jackson, Jonathan Parfrey, Rohan Radhakrishna, Roberto Carlos Torres, Gloria Walton, John Wentworth

Item 7 | Regional Resilience Grant Program Update

Dolores Barajas provided an update on the ICARP Regional Resilience Planning Grant Program (RRGP) helps fill local, regional, and tribal needs and supports a pipeline of regional scale climate resilient projects, by providing communities the funding needed to identify climate resilience priorities, build capacity, and implement projects in response to the greatest climate risks in a region. While the impacts of climate change are not confined to jurisdictional boundaries, RRGF is designed to support collaborative projects that align with the scale of climate impacts.

Planning grants will engage their communities in studying and determining how to address climate risks in their region, while implementation grants will fund physical projects and programs that directly protect communities from climate impacts. RRGF centers around the following priorities: support regional projects aligned with ICARP priorities that improve regional climate resilience and reduce climate risks from wildfire, sea level rise, drought, flood, increasing temperatures, and extreme heat events, support projects or actions that address the greatest climate risks in the region, particularly in the most vulnerable communities address gaps in climate resilience funding by supporting sustainable and cohesive climate-resilience projects, and support equitable outcomes. Barajas went on to mention that these goals were made possible through legislative language and informed through a robust engagement process, RRGF includes funding set asides. RRGF includes goals to invest at least 51% of funding for Disadvantaged Communities and at least 10% for California Native American Tribes. She also mentioned that the TAC provides invaluable feedback during the draft guidelines phase. Furthermore, RRGF plans to maintain geographical diversity by making awards in each of the 9 California adaptation regions. RRGF partnered with the Center for Law, Energy and the Environment (CLEE) at UC Berkeley's School of Law to develop a program engagement evaluation report. This report is a requirement by the 2021 budget language to report to the legislature and provide feedback on how to improve the program.

Barajas shared that the four evaluation goals include: Program Reach, Alignment with Program Goals, Program Accessibility, and Project Outcomes. CLEE staff focused evaluation of RRGF's Program Development, Request for Proposals, and Application and Review. Throughout the program lifecycle, over 780 organizations engaged with RRGF. The level of engagement varied by the stage of the program. Across all stages of engagement, organizations in the Bay Area followed by the Los Angeles area were the most engaged. The least engaged were the San Diego and Inland Desert Region. Local governments comprised the largest share of entities engaged, followed by non-profits. Barajas shared that during Stage 1, there 8 listening sessions, 6 draft guideline workshops and a survey. These workshops were attended by over 550 people. During Stage 2, which comprised of the Intent to Apply survey, RRGF received 176 responses. This informed the next stage. Technical Assistance was offered to eligible entities in Stage 3 and through 13 Office Hour sessions. There were 41 responses to RRGF's request for help and office hours were attended by nearly 300 people.

RRGP received 83 applications, supported by 226 applicants requesting \$106 million in total funding. 64% of the awarded applicants were for planning projects, with 53 applications and \$30,251,488.19 in requested funding. 36% of the awarded applicants were for implementation projects, with 30 applicants and \$76,395,881.49 in requested funding. Barajas shared that the highest number of applications were from the Bay Area and Los Angeles area. The lowest number of applications was from the Inland Desert region, with only 4 applications. This is also the only region without an implementation project application. Public entities made up 60% of lead applicants, community-based organizations made up 40% of co-applicants, Tribal governments and affiliated entities made up 3% of lead applicants and 17 of co-applicants. These numbers are largely influenced by RRGPs partnership requirements and funding set-asides. She went on to share those 43 applications qualified for the DAC set-aside and 20 Tribe, 17 co-applicants and 3 lead applicants.

RRGP applications were reviewed by 32 different interagency panel members, including 17 different state agencies. The Regional Resilience Grant Program has invested \$21.7 million in planning and implementation projects led by partnerships made up of local, regional, tribal governments, non-profits, and academic institutions. RRGPs supports regions in advancing resilience through planning and project implementation. The program focuses on addressing a range of climate-related challenges, including wildfires, sea-level rise, droughts, floods, and extreme heat events. RRGPs supports projects or actions that address the greatest climate risks in the region, particularly in the most vulnerable communities.

Implementation Grant Awardees

Regional Cohesive Fire Strategy for Evacuation Preparedness and Wildfire Resilience

The project focuses on addressing wildfire hazards by educating residents, maintaining defensible spaces, and safeguarding evacuation routes for high-risk communities.

- Greater San Diego - \$1,588,838
- Lead: County of San Diego
- Partners: City of San Diego, Fire Safe Council of San Diego County

Los Angeles Regional Collaborative: Heat Education, Ambassadors, and Training (LARC-HEAT)

This project aims to combat extreme heat through a comprehensive Heat Ambassador initiative, focusing on educating and protecting heat-vulnerable communities.

- Greater Los Angeles – \$2,999,999
- Lead: University of California, Los Angeles/Los Angeles Regional Collaborative
- Partners: Fernandño Tataviám Band of Mission Indians, Rising Communities, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health

Energy-Resilient Fire Services in High-Threat Communities

The project will install energy-resilience infrastructure for fire stations in high-risk areas, ensuring continuous emergency response in remote and vulnerable communities.

- North Coast – \$3,000,000
- Lead: Redwood Coast Energy Authority
- Partners: Yurok Tribe Fire Department, Karuk Tribe Department of Natural Resources, Hoopa Fire Department, and others

Cultural Fire & Land Stewardship for Wildfire & Climate Resilience

The project aims to restore indigenous practices and enhance wildfire protection on ancestral lands by forming stewardship crews, conducting vegetation management, and raising awareness.

- Sierra Nevada, Bay Area - \$2,989,995
- Lead: Tamien Nation
- Partner: North Fork Mono Tribe

Le Grand Community Water Program

Addressing drought and flood risks, the project implements sustainable groundwater management practices, including new well construction, irrigation canal connections, and community education programs.

- San Joaquin Valley - \$3,000,000
- Lead: Le Grand Athlone Water District
- Partners: Le Grand Community Services District, Socio-Environmental Education Network (SEEN)

Kó:dom Hybísín (“Land Stewardship”)

The project addresses wildfire, extreme heat, and drought hazards through land stewardship, using cultural fire to reduce fuel loads and cultivate climate-resilient vegetation.

- Sacramento Valley, Sierra Nevada - \$1,931,410
- Lead: Mechoopda Indian Tribe of Chico Rancheria
- Partners: Berry Creek Rancheria of Tyme Maidu Indians of California, California State University Chico, Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve

Planning Grant Awardees

Mendocino, Lake, Sonoma Tribal Resilience Initiative on Air Quality and Drought (MLS-TRIAD)

This project addresses drought, air quality, and climate change concerns through equitable planning, monitoring networks, water quality evaluation, and continuous improvement tracking.

- North Coast - \$657,415
- Lead: Public Health Institute
- Partners: Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians, Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians

North Coast Regional Climate Resilience Plan

Prioritizing vulnerable communities, this project focuses on addressing multiple climate risks, forging diverse partnerships, and strengthening community capacity through planning, data integration, and stakeholder engagement.

- North Coast, Bay Area, Sierra Nevada - \$650,000
- Lead: County of Humboldt/North Coast Resource Partnership
- Partners: Watershed Research and Training Center, Sonoma Water

Paradise Regional Wildfire Resilience Implementation Plan

Building on previous modeling work, this project develops an implementation plan, including regional governance structures and cost-benefit analyses, to create regional wildfire buffer zones.

- Sacramento Valley, Sierra Nevada - \$570,533
- Lead: Paradise Recreation and Park District
- Partners: Town of Paradise, Rural Community Assistance Corporation, Camp Fire Collaborative

Santa Ana River Watershed Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plan

Addressing climate risks like drought, wildfire, and flooding, this project develops multi-benefit strategies for the entire watershed and provides resources to pursue implementation funding.

- Greater Los Angeles, Inland Desert - \$644,190
- Lead: Santa Ana River Watershed Project Authority
- Partners: The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Inland Southern California Climate Collaborative

Yolo County Regional Resilience Collaborative

This project aims to build the region's first collaborative structure, engage vulnerable communities to identify shared climate priorities, establish a governance structure, and develop a funding strategy.

- Sacramento Valley - \$598,420
- Lead: County of Yolo
- Partners: Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, City of Davis, City of Woodland, University of California, Davis, and others

Monterey Bay Adaptation and Resilience Implementation and Funding Roadmap

This project develops funding and implementation plans for priority adaptation goals, particularly addressing underserved and vulnerable communities.

- Central Coast - \$649,335
- Lead: City of Watsonville
- Partners: City of Santa Cruz, CivicWell, Ecology Action, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Regeneración of Pajaro Valley

Coachella Valley Regional Water Resilience Plan

Addressing structural barriers to clean water access, preparing for droughts, improving infrastructure resilience, and aligning regional plans with state water management objectives.

- Inland Desert - \$649,335
- Lead: Coachella Valley Water District
- Partners: Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Pueblo Unido Community Development Corporation

Solano Bayshore Resiliency Project

Involving diverse stakeholders, this project creates a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Analysis and Action Plan, emphasizing nature-based solutions and community engagement to address climate hazards affecting vulnerable communities.

- Bay Area - \$601,113
- Lead: Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District
- Partners: City of Suisun City, Greenbelt Alliance, Solano Resource Conservation District

Climate Resiliency through Regional Water Recharge in the San Joaquin Valley

This project addresses drought and flooding by planning for sustainable use of surface and groundwater, educating rural communities, and establishing a collaborative response team for effective floodwater management, ensuring vulnerable communities are prioritized.

- San Joaquin Valley - \$568,888
- Lead: California State University, Fresno Foundation - California Water Institute
- Partners: Self-Help Enterprises, North Kings Groundwater Sustainability Agency, Madera County Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Building Climate Resilience in the Central Sierra Region

This project will develop a climate collaborative and create a Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plan that embeds indigenous knowledge, prioritizes vulnerable populations, and enhances regional readiness for multiple climate risks.

- Sierra Nevada - \$650,000
- Lead: County of Nevada
- Partners: Town of Truckee, Nevada City Rancheria Nisenan Tribe, Truckee Tahoe Airport District, Truckee Donner Public Utility District, Sierra Business Council

Barajas concluded by discussing recommendations outlined by CLEE. The RRGPEvaluation Report highlighted that the RRGPEfills a unique niche due to its focus on collaborative and regional projects. RRGPEexperiences similar challenges as other state funding programs, presenting an opportunity to improve the program. Barajas shared that the CLEE memo outlined several areas for improvement. First to foster increased engagement in inland areas of the state with community-based organizations and regional governments. Second, continue to provide technical assistance with regions with low engagement, and lastly report of progress with indicators and report on program and funding goals. The memo also

outlined the effectiveness of regional resilience planning. First to prioritize funding for multi-risk and multi-jurisdictional projects. Second, synchronize program timelines and support all phase of project development from planning through implementation, and lastly sustain ongoing funding for resilience grant programs.

Barajas thanked CLEE program staff for their support developing the RRGP Evaluation Report and posed the following questions for TAC Council members. Barajas asked what type of updates should RRGP staff provide to the council and how often? Additionally, Barajas asked if Council members are interested in more touch-points, would members be interested in more briefings, site visits, etc to engage with projects as they get implemented.

Chair Mirzazad thanked Barajas for her work to implement the RRGP and shared that Round 1 awards was a huge milestone for the program. Mirzazad expressed that the grant program will fill regional resilience gaps.

Nina Bingham congratulated Barajas on awarding Round 1 grantees and expressed that the program was well executed. Bingham expressed excitement on RRGP's tribal engagement and asked if Barajas could speak more about the specific actions RRGP undertook to reach tribes. Bingham reflected that funding set asides for tribes is important and is curious about other engagement opportunities.

Barajas responded that initially, RRGP had low engagement with tribes. Establishing a 10% funding set aside for tribes allowed the program to reach more tribal communities. She added that as the program was built out, RRGP staff began to engage with other state programs and departments to do outreach on this brand new program.

Bingham thanked Barajas and shared that it sounds like the outcomes of this grant program can be informative for other departments. Bingham asked if RRGP has included in a plan to do outreach with other state departments?

Barajas responded that ICARP is looking at ways to build frameworks across all the grant programs. She mentioned that RRGP looked at lessons learned from Adaptation Planning Grant Program early on and is actively looking at lessons learned from the Extreme Heat and Community Resilience Grant Program.

Chair Mirzazad added that we would see this council as the way to communicate these outcomes and best practices. She expressed that it would great for TAC Council members to be the ambassadors of these programs to support coordination.

Veronica Beaty asked Barajas if she could share more information on the number of applicants that submitted an intent to apply versus those who ended up submitting a Main Application.

Barajas responded that RRGP saw a lot of new applications that didn't apply during the pre-application stage. She expressed that RRGP is working with CLEE to learn more about what barriers communities faced that prevented them from applying.

Beaty asked if there were any applications from the Inland area that didn't submit a Main Application but submitted an Intent to Apply form.

Barajas responded that with the Inland area, there was low engagement throughout despite engagement with local governments and legislative offices. Barajas shared that there is still a lot of work to be done.

Beaty thanked Barajas for her work and expressed that it's great to see a program exceed its tribal set aside goal.

Nayamin Martinez thanked Barajas for her work. Martinez asked if there was more information on barriers applicants encountered that may have prevented them from submitting an application. Martinez added that they spoke to a few organizations that intended on applying but they struggled with identifying a public entity, while at the same time being regional.

Barajas responded by saying definitely. The RRGP has a regional component that is a challenge for organizations or local smaller local governments that didn't necessarily have those relationships developed. It could also be challenging for communities that maybe needed more time to engage with our climate services team to talk about what are the types of projects they could be doing. More insight on the baseline, where are we at and what are some plans that we can align on. Barajas shared that a lot of work could have been done if RRGP had a technical assistance provider in Round 1. She expressed a technical assistance provider could have helped bring forth those types of applicants. The regional partnerships were definitely a challenge but at the same time we are really excited to see how so many people came together through new partnerships, and existing partnerships.

Chair Mirzazad added a few clarifying points. Mirzazad shared that the RRGP is a regional program that aims to provide funding for multi-risk projects. There are other programs within the state that could be beneficial for applicants that are looking for less of a regional plan or something that's like focused on one risk. She shared that generally speaking, the intent of the program to bring together regional partnerships.

John Wentworth shared two thoughts. For multi-jurisdictional projects, I'm thinking the California Natural Resources Agency might be interested in this. Wentworth asked if federal agency partners are eligible to apply for RRGP funding?

Barajas responded that federal partners are not eligible for this funding.

Wentworth expressed that this is tricky, especially for wildfire related projects. He mentioned the State Wildfire Task Force is working across the state, there are huge multi-jurisdictional \$1 million projects and for rural communities, this is a really critical thing. Wentworth asked Barajas if this could be addressed or not?

Barajas responded that RRGP could think about how to incorporate these unique partnerships but necessarily as a funded partner. Barajas expressed that federal agencies could be an unfunded partner through collaboration but for most of the ICARP grant programs, state and federal agencies are not eligible for funding.

Wentworth followed up by asking what about rural counties, where the risks are occurring on federal land?

Barajas shared that OPR does not have a provision on this at the moment.

Wentworth responded that he would love to talk about something that OPR can look into because all the communities in Mammoth Lakes are in federal land. Most of the wildfire risk are in federal land. Wentworth also asked if Barajas could clarify who approves the ICARP grants? He shared that it is obviously not the TAC and asked if Barajas could state for the record who is making the decision to approve the funding for these grants.

Chair Mirzazad responded that OPR makes the funding decision.

Wentworth confirmed that staff are making funding decisions.

Barajas shared that RRGP staff reviewed applications for basic eligibility and then established an interagency review panel of 32 reviewers. The panel included 17 different state agencies, including CalEPA and CalFire. The final projects were scored and recommended to OPR leadership.

Wentworth asked who makes the final funding decision?

Barajas confirmed that OPR makes the final decision.

Wentworth expressed that this is a help clarification. He expressed that the staff presentation made it appear that TAC Council members had some decision-making authority and that is not the case. He expressed that he would like to see the projects on the field. He expressed that it is important to clarify to communities on the ground that TAC Council members do not have any authority in decision making, despite being involved in the TAC. Wentworth expressed that TAC Council members did inform the draft grant guidelines.

Barajas responded that this is correct and TAC Council members provided valuable feedback on the draft guide guidelines.

Wentworth responded that it is important to make it clear what the TAC Council member roles are.

Will Madrigal shared that all of the projects look so promising. Madrigal shared that there are so many partnerships that are happening among so many different organizations especially tribal nations. Madrigal echoed that as far as touch points, each of these projects are going to be very outreach heavy on the on the front end of the project. Madrigal expressed it would be really valuable to hear some of the commonalities that are gleaned

from those outreach sessions. Madrigal shared that they would like remote presentations from the project leads, including what they learned for their particular community.

Barajas thanked Madrigal for their comments. Barajas shared that as RRGP is going through its projects, there will be a lot of peer-to-peer learning opportunities. Barajas expressed that they are already seeing some opportunities where higher capacity grantees are being able to support some of the newer, recently established partnerships with things as basic as templates for you know resolutions and a lot of technical capacity building across the program. Barajas shared that there is a lot of opportunities to incorporate this recommendation.

Nathan Bengsston thanked Barajas for the presentation and shared that RRGP had good tribal engagement. He asked if RRGP interacted with tribal councils or environmental staff?

Dolores responded that RRGP started with the Tribal Advisory Working Group, an internal OPR working group and coordinated with other state agencies working on regional grant programs.

Nathan Bengsston asked if RRGP evaluated the breadth of projects by climate hazard?

Barajas responded that RRGP did not look into this but can look into it more.

Allison Brooks asked if RRGP is a one-time funding program. Brooks expressed that it is interesting to spend a bunch of time evaluating a grant program that is only one-time funded. Brooks added that for the projects on wildfire, where does CalFire fit into this conversation? This program clearly had limited resources, but how does it relate to CalFire's budget and where are they managing resources to manage the risks.

Jenn Phillips responded that CalFire has a huge wildfire resilience project. There is a ton of work happening and ongoing coordination. Many of our conservation agencies are also doing a lot of wildfire resilience and management. They are looking holistically at the different forest practices we are putting forth in the state.

Chair Mirzazad shared that OPR participates in the Wildfire Task Force.

Dolores shared that CalFire served on the Interagency Work Group for the Regional Resilience Grant Program.

Grant Davis commended Barajas and the RRGP. Davis expressed that working on regional resilience is difficult and the state is doing a good job working across jurisdictional boundaries with bodies that don't typically work together. He shared that OPR should evaluate and document this type of work for future learnings.

Action

None.

Item 8 | General Public Comment

Will Madrigal represents three Southern California tribes and is a manager at the Climate Science Alliance, a non-profit based in San Diego County. Madrigal expressed that this is their TAC meeting. They expressed support for seeing so many comments around increasing involvement with tribal partners and their needs. Madrigal expressed looking forward to visiting these projects in person and noticed that one of the awarded projects is in San Diego County. They express that this project doesn't have a tribe listed as a partner. They asked if at one point, the TAC could explore why there is not a tribal partner, while there are several Tribal nations in San Diego County. Madrigal expressed that they are willing to work on figuring out how we can increase tribal engagement. They expressed pleasure in seeing a lot of tribes that they are familiar with being part of grants. Madrigal thanked OPR staff for their work and insight to provide more inclusivity for tribal nations to address a lot of these concerns. They concluded by expressing that bringing forth traditional ecological knowledge, new collaborations, and new partnerships are really what I'd like to see more.

Michelle Passero asked if there is there a separate definition for ecosystems and wildlife? It seems like this one is focused on human communities, which is important. A separate one would be good for wildlife and ecosystems. "Productive, agree with comments from council members. The definition has "natural systems" in the beginning but goes on to become more specific and peaks to more human communities. One idea is to consider a separate definition for natural systems, so they aren't conflated."

Louis Blumberg of Blumberg West Consulting asked will you update the council on the work with OES regarding Federal grants from FEMA?

Item 9 | Meeting Adjourned

Meeting adjourned at 12:47pm.