

Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI)
Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program (ICARP)
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

August 7, 2026

SUMMARY

TAC Members Present:

- Abby Edwards, LCI
- Alex Ghenis, Accessible Climate Strategies
- Kim Clark, Southern California Association of Governments
- Clare Winterton, The Solutions Project¹
- John Wentworth, Town of Mammoth Lakes
- Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy
- Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve
- Nathan Bengsston, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
- Robyn Fennig, California Office of Emergency Services (OES)
- Amanda Hansen, California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA)
- Nina Bingham, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)²
- Amanda Mattes, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA)³
- David Loya, City of Arcata
- Denise Kadara, Allensworth Progressive Association
- Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
- Chuck Striplen, Sonoma County Planning Commission/Resources Legacy Fund
- Jasneet Sharma, County of San Mateo
- Julia Kingsley, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)
- Roberto Carlos Torres, City and County of San Francisco
- Bennae Calac, Onoo Po Strategies

TAC Members Absent:

- Molly Oshun, Sonoma County Water Agency
- Jacob Alvarez, City of Coachella
- Nayamin Martínez, Central California Environmental Justice Network
- Linda Helland, California Department of Public Health

Roll Call & Housekeeping

Sam Magill, Sacramento State University College of Continuing Education, discussed meeting logistics for in person and online attendees. Sierra Woodruff, LCI conducted a roll call. With 19 members present at the time of roll call, a quorum was reached, and the meeting was called to order. Note that David Loya joined following approval of the May 29, 2026, meeting minutes.

¹ Alternate for Gloria Walton, The Solutions Project

² Alternate for Virginia Jameson, CDFA

³ Alternate for Sarah Izant, CalEPA

Following introductions and roll call, Abby Edwards, TAC Chair, reviewed the meeting agenda.

Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes

Edwards led discussion and approval of the May 29, 2026, TAC meeting minutes. After a brief introduction, the following conversation was recorded:

- No comments recorded

Public Comment

None.

John Wentworth made a motion to approve the May 29, 2026, meeting minutes. TAC Vice Chair Kim Clark seconded. With 17 ayes, 0 notes, and 1 abstention, the minutes were approved.

Aye: Abby Edwards, Nathan Bengsston, Kim Clark, Alexis Ghenis, Amanda Hansen, Amanda Mattes, Nina Bingham, Denise Kadara, Julia Kingsley, Robyn Fennig Jonathan Parfrey, Michelle Passero, Roberto Carlos Torres, Clare Winterton, John Wentworth, Chuck Striplen, Jasneet Sharma

No: None.

Abstain: Bennae Calac

TAC Member Report Out

Edwards let TAC member report outs and introduced new TAC member Bennae Calac. Calac serves as a commissioner on the Native American Heritage Commission and is a member of the Payómkawichum (also known as the Luiseño Pala Band of Mission Indians) and encouraged the TAC to consider the appointment of additional members from Tribal communities. Following the introduction to Calac, Edwards noted that long-time TAC member David Loya will be leaving the TAC and City of Arcata for new opportunities and thanked him for his service. Additional updates included:

- Alex Ghenis noted Accessible Climate Strategies launched a beta version of its Disability and Climate Resource Library. The Library includes academic articles and resources related to disability and climate change, available online at www.library.accessibleclimate.com.
- Amanda Hansen noted there are a number of activities underway at CNRA related to adaptation and resilience. CNRA is hosting a series of nature-based solutions summits focused on building health and resilience of California organized by landscape type (forests, coasts, deserts, etc.). Additional information can be found [online](#). CNRA will also partner with a wide range of organization the 30x30 Summit, hosted at the California Academy of Sciences in San Francisco on September 29. Information is available [here](#). Finally, CNRA is partnered with a number of organizations on the [Resilient California Summit](#) October 20-22 at the Sacramento Convention Center.
- Nathan Bengsston reported PG&E will complete the 2027 Climate Adaptation and Vulnerability Report. For the first time, the report includes a specific municipal engagement track; Bengsston encouraged TAC members representing municipalities to participate. Information on past assessments is available [here](#). The report will also include a Tribal Engagement component, run by Reno Franklin and Denise Shemenski.
- Nina Bingham reported that the [CalHeatScore](#) tool has a new API feature allowing local governments and nonprofits to access key risk data at the zip code level.

- Wentworth provided an update on California’s Joint Strategy for Sustainable Active Recreation and Wildfire Resilience. 11 jurisdictions have adopted the [strategy](#) to date.
- Julia Kingsley commented Caltrans has finalized its [Caltrans Vulnerability Risk Assessment](#).
- Fennig said CalOES is actively deployed to assist wildfire response in neighboring states and noted CalOES may call on TAC members with expertise in wildfire recovery to meet virtually with officials in these jurisdictions.

ICARP Programmatic Updates and Subcommittee Report

Sierra Woodruff, LCI, provide updates on ICARP workstreams, including:

- The [website](#) for California’s 5th Climate Change Assessment (5th Assessment) will be updated in August and September to feature final published research products, with regional webinars scheduled for September and October to share information across the state.
- The 5th Assessment will be featured at the upcoming Resilient California Summit. The scholarship window and early bird registration are open through August 21st.
- The Climate Services team released a beta version of the Climate Data Viewer, an interactive mapping and data access tool to help explore how climate hazards are projected to change across the state.
- The team is accepting applications for the Climate Ready Cohort through August 19th: the Cohort is a 10-month training program offered by LCI for municipal and Tribal staff or community-based organizations (CBOs) interested in creating their own climate vulnerability assessments. Further information is available [online](#).
- LCI is working closely with CNRA and the Governor’s office to release the 2026 Extreme Heat Action Plan.
- Round 2 of the Extreme Heat and Resilience Grant Program (RGP) guidelines were published on June 16th; grantees will be prioritized using the Vulnerable Communities Platform (VCP) to identify vulnerable populations. Pre-applications are required as part of a two-phase approach to give applicants feedback early in the process so they can decide whether to invest the time and resources on a full application. One-on-one technical assistance sessions and workshops may be available; visit [here](#) for more information.
- The Extreme Heat and Community Resilience program has also received funding through the Aliso Canyon Recovery Account to fund local assistance projects with several communities in Los Angeles County and will work with Climate Resolve to conduct outreach and engagement to inform program guidelines and application materials.

Following Woodruff’s updates, Wentworth provided information on the TAC Funding and Finance Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is charged with guiding a report that summarizes TAC discussions on adaptation funding and finance in 2026. This report seeks to capture lessons learned, provide leadership on challenges and opportunities for adaptation financing, and chart a shared roadmap for state, local, and regional government audiences. A final draft of the report is expected in mid-November 2026. Subcommittee members include Wentworth, Melissa Boudrye, Clark, Edwards, Jasneet Sharma, Michelle Passero, and Jonathan Parfrey.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the updates provided above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Jonathan Parfrey asked if the Subcommittee has looked at the City of Portland’s clean energy surcharge, and whether a similar process could be applied in California.
 - Edwards confirmed the TAC can look at it.
- Bingham noted CDFA is looking at how to compensate producers for implementing climate smart practices, beginning with monitoring, reporting, and verification efforts. Meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Expanding Pathways to Compensate Producers Climate-Smart Agriculture Adoption are open to the public and recorded and can be shared with the Subcommittee for lessons learned.
- Chuck Striplen asked if the Subcommittee is doing a gap analysis of perspectives missing from the report.
 - Wentworth confirmed this type of analysis will be conducted. The TAC will play an important role in helping identify potentially missing perspectives.
- TAC members expressed their support for the Climate Data Viewer. Hansen added any recommendations the TAC has to ensure projections are put directly in the hands of the people who need them are welcome.
- Calac noted the State’s Tribal Consultation Guidelines haven’t been updated since 2005 and asked if it would be updated.
 - ICARP and the TAC were established in 2015. LCI recently hired a Tribal Liaison to assist with Tribal engagement and will also rely heavily on CNRA’s existing policy. Additional follow-up should be held with TAC Tribal members to ensure their perspectives are addressed.
 - The SB18 Tribal Consultation Guidelines & Toolkit are being updated as part of LCI’s Planning Guide Updates, more information is available [here](#). The Tribal Consultation Guidelines and Toolkit will be developed in collaboration with our Planning Tribal Advisory Group (PTAG).
- Loya expressed his thanks for the opportunity to serve on the TAC since 2018.

TAC Vice Chair

Edwards led a discussion on the nomination and confirmation of a TAC Vice Chair. The role of Vice Chair, currently served by Clark, is to assist with TAC facilitation in the absence of the Chair, guide TAC discussions, and provide continuity of leadership. Vice Chair Clark offered to continue serving in this role for 2027, pending confirmation by the TAC. TAC members were highly supportive of Clark continuing in this role.

Public Comment

None.

Edwards made a motion for the nomination of Clark as Vice Chair. Kadara seconded. With 18 ayes, 0 notes, and 1 abstention, the minutes were approved.

Aye: Abby Edwards, Nathan Bengsston, Alexis Ghenis, Amanda Hansen, Amanda Mattes, Nina Bingham, Denise Kadara, Julia Kingsley, Robyn Fennig, Jonathan Parfrey, Michelle Passero, Roberto Carlos Torres, Clare Winterton, John Wentworth, Chuck Striplen, Jasneet Sharma, David Loya

No: None.

Abstain: Kim Clark

Climate Resilience Districts

Edwards introduced Nuin-Tara Key, California Forward, to discuss the potential for Climate Resilience Districts (Districts) to provide durable governance and funding for climate adaptation. The Districts are intended to provide proactive resilience planning and dedicated funding streams to address concerns before disasters occur, as opposed to a reactive model focused on recovery after disasters.

Through the Resilience District Incubator, pilot communities in California are mapping out options for District creation using a five-step process:

1. Identify community ambitions/needs
2. Conduct diagnostic work
3. Build scenarios
4. Stress test scenarios
5. Develop a roadmap for future District implementation

Key takeaways from community outreach to date include:

- Moving from a project-by-project approach to a *portfolio* of long-term investments can be challenging for individual communities
- Making the internal case for investment requires portfolio prioritization
- A common implementation framework is needed to provide shared guidance, technical assistance, and tools to translate statutory authority into actionable finance models
- Districts allow long-term investment strategies to advance an evolving portfolio over time

James Cameron and Tanya Narath, Sonoma County Transportation and Climate Authorities (SCTCA), provided a presentation on California's first District: the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA). SB 8 (2022) provided the authority to establish Districts.

SCTCA is comprised of 9 Sonoma County cities and the Board of Supervisors, with support from local agencies such as Sonoma Water, the Sonoma Agricultural and Open Space District, Sonoma Clean Power, and others. The mission of SCTCA is to equitably plan, prioritize, coordinate, and fund and implement climate transportation solutions; it is used to lead regional collaboration, support multi-jurisdictional funding efforts, and advocate for Sonoma County as the State and federal levels.

A majority of RCPA funding comes from member contributions, with additional assistance from the Bay Area Regional Energy Network and a small number of grants. Potential future funding strategies include parcel/sales taxes, or general obligation/revenue bonds, but limited public support (short of the 2/3 vote needed to approve a new tax) creates challenges for long-term financing. Tax increment financing through the Enhanced Infrastructure Finance District (EIFD) is not currently available for RCPA. Sustainable, long-term funding remains a challenge that needs to be addressed, but RCPA believes a regional approach like Districts create a stronger case for investment over individual jurisdictions competing for limited funds.

Anne Crealock, Marin Wildfire Prevention Authority (MWPA), provided a presentation on Marin's efforts to enhance wildfire resilience in the county. MWPA is funded through local Measure C, passed by voters in 2020 and provides funds for cross-jurisdictional projects, defensible space evaluations and home hardening, and community-level wildfire prevention/mitigation efforts. To address community concerns prior to the passage of Measure C, MWPA met with community members to identify major issues. As a result, the Measure C parcel tax includes a 10-year sunset clause instead of a permanent sales tax increase.

The largest share of funding across all categories is vegetation management, accounting for 39% of the overall budget. Home evaluations to enhance fire resilience and community outreach to educate the public on wildfire risk is a core mission of MWPA as well. A regional approach allows small communities such as Sleepy Hollow (who may only provide 1% of overall revenue) to participate in larger, cross-jurisdictional projects such as a 38-mile shaded fuel break. Moreover, the regional approach allows small jurisdictions to utilize technical assistance and planning resources they may not otherwise have access to; this allows areas with low population numbers but significant land area to mitigate risks that could impact higher population areas.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the presentations above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Clark asked how data sharing within MWPA impacts project prioritization?
 - As an example, MWPA reviewed 50 wildfire incidents where civilian fatalities occurred. The results were incorporated into a modeling effort to assess roadways in Marin, map out risks, and inform vegetation management efforts across jurisdictions. GIS mapping efforts also allow citizens to see where Measure C dollars are being spent to link data to on-the-ground action.
- Bengsston asked if any lessons learned exist for net risk value analysis to get investment now for problems in the future.
 - California Forward is working to translate the wealth of information available on climate risk into readily digestible communication on *understanding* that risk to pilot communities. This communication will allow financing partners and government entities to understand climate change isn't an external risk: it is fundamentals to overall governmental budget stability.
- Parfrey asked if polling questions in Sonoma County may have impacted support for a potential parcel or sales tax to fund RCPA.
 - The questions were designed to be as explicit as possible about wildfire risk, flooding, and other potential disasters. Sonoma County already has a high sales tax, which likely impacted voter sentiment.
- Parfrey asked if the Measure C sunset clause could impact future revenue, or if MWPA feels confident it will be able to secure the 2/3 majority to pass additional funding measures after it expires.
 - MWPA currently feels confident it can secure 2/3 support for future measures. One key effort is working to become as visible as possible in communities and communicate information/outreach using the most accessible language possible. Communicating successes such as the impact of shaded fuel breaks in controlling recent ignitions is a major part of that messaging.
- Parey asked if the revenue breakdown was included in Measure C when it was on the ballot.
 - MWPA worked to include the revenue breakdown in the ballot measure.
- Parfrey asked if California Forward is focused on climate risk generally, or specific issues like seismic risk.
 - California Forward is focused on climate risks to drive specific investment for things like wildfire resilience. Seismic risk definitely exists, but we believe communities have a better understanding of what measures need to be taken for seismic resilience.
- Julia Kingsley asked how SCTCA works with partner agencies to prioritize projects for limited State funding.

- One major component to project prioritization included citizens committees to review transportation-specific project investments prior to going to the SCTCA board for action.
- Ghenis asked if MWPA has front-loaded any costs related to defensible space evaluations.
 - MWPA uses a “house-out” approach by starting with direct risks to the built environment; individual jurisdictions also contribute funding for this effort. 20% of the overall budget for MWPA goes directly to defensible space evaluation; this was specific in Measure C.
- Calac asked if Sonoma included any Tribes in regional joint powers authorities (JPAs). Tribes have unique sovereignty issues related to transportation and roadway access. Tribes and Tribal organizations have expressed interest in joining with California communities on tax credits and develop mutually beneficial agreements in this space.
 - Edwards noted specific follow-up is warranted on Tribal sovereignty and partnership issues.
- Wentworth asked if any of the projects presented above touch federal lands.
 - MWPA activities are adjacent to federal lands.
- Wentworth asked if rural jurisdictions and rural access to Proposition 4 funding have been included in investment portfolio discussions at California Forward. Cross-jurisdictional risks may be a good place to start as projects are prioritized.
 - California Forward hasn’t looked specifically at Proposition 4 issues: it is focused on working directly with jurisdictions, but cross-jurisdictional discussions may be warranted.
- Jasneet Sharma noted it could be beneficial for state leadership to provide funding for Districts, as opposed to starting conversations around interest identification and local funding. Additional local taxes are not possible in all parts of the state. This is particularly true in unincorporated communities within counties. Additionally, there is a need for Districts to address multiple climate threats: there are areas where sea level rise *and* wildfire risk are both major issues, but the work to address them is very different.
 - Regarding interest identification vs. funding identification, California Forward is looking at lessons learned in Connecticut: the Connecticut Green Bank has done pre-development work to identify where and how local revenues can be accessed. Once you get to the project implementation phase, the money already exists to fund some of the efforts. Revolving funds to generate sustainable funding streams have also been considered: by establishing zero interest loan programs, funding can be rolled out as it is repaid on an ongoing basis. Taxes are currently not on the table in many localities.
- Robyn Fennig asked if outreach has focused more on challenges or opportunities and benefits.
 - California Forward is using a “low-hanging fruit” approach to identify projects that can be implemented without significant barriers such as complex CEQA or NEPA processes. Figuring out ways to streamline planning processes with multiple agencies will be a significant benefit for future Districts. California Forward uses a similar approach to move from barriers to actionable solutions as quickly as possible.
- Loya suggested securing early seed funding for District formation could be useful.
- Winterton asked how the District concept involved CBOs.
 - SCTCA works closely with CBOs to partner in the development of resiliency centers and assist them with grant applications.
 - MWPA conducts outreach and education to CBOs working with non-English speaking communities and working families who might not be otherwise engaged in climate resilience discussions. It also partners with organizations like local Fire Safe councils to serve as liaisons to communities who don’t regularly participate in standard meetings.
- Bingham asked if California Forward has worked with insurance providers on resilience measures to lower rates.

- California Forward has partnered with the insurance industry and involves insurers directly in advisory councils.
- MWPA has also worked to connect homeowners currently on the FAIR plan with private insurers to develop a “wish list” of items that would allow lower rates with private companies.
- Passero asked how nature-based solutions are incorporated into District discussions.
 - California Forward seeks to incorporate nature-based solutions for climate resiliency and would like to follow up with The Nature Conservancy for more information.
- Kadara encouraged all District teams and presenters to engage with communities of color and Tribes to include them in discussions.

Block Grants and Regional Coordination

Brian Newman-Lindsay, California Department of Conservation, provided a presentation on regional forest and fire capacity (RFFC) achieving impacts through block grants. The RFFC program is a noncompetitive block grant program to provide capacity building for landscape-level wildfire resilience. Grants are available to areas with high or very high wildfire risk as determined by CalFire’s Fire Hazard Severity Zone mapping, and have four primary goals:

1. Invest in place-based practitioners and organizations.
2. Support the development and implementation of efficient local and regional project pipelines.
3. Strengthen resilient networks and collaborative systems.
4. Provide direct and meaningful benefits to priority populations.

To date, the RFFC has supported the development of more than 800 priority projects and established more than 200 permanent positions to further these goals. The initial \$80 million grant investment has led to more than \$500 million of leverage across all grantees. This success has been attributed to three principles:

1. Target outcomes, not activities. By developing broad objectives in grant agreements, staff can work with grantees to develop a menu of activities (as opposed to prescribed actions) that fit within the objectives. This model provides the flexibility needed to modify activities to meet the objectives, instead of listing them as specific deliverables.
2. Support programs, not projects. Funding doesn’t translate into success solely based on the implementation of shovel-ready projects: the underlying infrastructure such as personnel, facilities and equipment, and contracts must also be addressed.
3. Work at effective scales. Block grants allow grantees to identify the time, space, authorities, and scopes needed to implement meaningful adaptation and resilience programs.

Combined, these principles provide flexibility for creativity, leverage strengths of all involved, and empower grantees to create effective programs that work in their communities. However, they do create increased workloads for project management, require effective communication, and require funding agencies to share power.

Karen Gaffney, North Coast Resource Partnership (NCRP), provide a presentation on regional partnerships for long-term, multi-benefit outcomes. The NCRP covers roughly 17% of California and consists of Tribal lands and 7 geographically and politically diverse North Coast counties. Leadership is comprised of 35 Tribes and all 7 counties using a co-equal leadership model, held together by an MOU supported by thousands of partners. Over three years of meetings with over 500 entities, the NCRP has developed a shared set of priorities and strategies for the region, many of which are now being implemented. This blueprint incorporates key data such as LiDAR datasets, traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and local expertise for the identification and implementation of strategic actions and projects. To date, over \$3 billion of projects

have been identified; long-term, sustainable funding through the development of finance plans, JPAs, low-interest loan programs, and other mechanisms will be necessary for fully funding all project needs. Climate collaboratives can play a significant role in developing this type of stable financing.

Campbell Ingram, Delta Conservancy, provided an overview of the Conservancy's role coordinating state funding for local Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta communities. Specific roles include economic development, climate resilience, agricultural sustainability, outdoor recreation, watershed and ecosystem health, Tribal collaboration, and reducing wildfire risk. It is also a key agency for preserving up to 80,000 acres of Delta lands to maintain ecosystem viability, re-wetting 50,000 acres of wetlands to reverse subsidence, and managing invasive species like the golden mussel that threaten the State's water supply. To secure the significant funding needed for these priorities, the Conservancy is conducting outreach to tell the story of the Delta's significance in clear, concise language for community members, statewide audiences, and legislators/funding entities. Block grants are also available for crop conversion from row crops to rice to help with subsidence and implement nature-based solutions.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the updates provided above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Bengsston asked the presenters if there are any interesting case studies from block grant programs seeking to provide the space for flexible solutions.
 - The Department of Conservation conducts regular outreach to grantees to manage their expectations in the face of shifting state priorities. Tying all activities back to the overall objective of reducing wildfire risk is helpful.
- Bengsston asked how block grant programs are bringing stakeholders into technical analysis discussions at the beginning of a process. [PG&E] has often found a disconnect between applied climate science/engineering analysis and lived experience of stakeholders.
 - NCRP conducts workshops once a year with its spatial analysis team and community members to better understand what data would be useful for project implementation teams.
- Sharma asked how the Department of Conservation decided to pursue the block grant mechanism.
 - The Department of Conservation worked with leadership at CNRA to utilize existing successful block grant models from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy when it was clear a more top-down, traditional grant approach was not as useful. Startup pilot projects were conducted to determine the efficacy of block grants and scaled up.
- Sharma asked how NCRP maintains its list of prioritized projects.
 - NCRP worked with its leadership council to develop overarching priorities: get projects on the ground as quickly as possible and be fair and equitable with fund distribution. Project lists are routinely developed through online application platforms and shared broadly.
- Calac noted there are ongoing conversations in Tribal communities around the definition of "wildland" vs. "Tribal wildland;" the distinction likely has implications for Tribal [access]. Calac also stressed the importance of determining *which* Tribes are consulted with for all grants and projects. Finally, Calac commented that many block grant opportunities are avoided by Tribes because they don't have the capacity to apply or don't understand the parameters of the grant requirements.
 - Regarding block grant structure and Tribal consultation, the Department of Consultation includes a requirement for every grantee to check in regularly with Tribes. Staff also ask each grantee what they're doing to coordinate with Tribes monthly. Calac expressed appreciation for that model.

- Wentworth asked how all presenting agencies address overlaps between their geography, jurisdictional and Tribal boundaries, and natural systems.
 - The Department of Conservation has an underlying principle that “landscapes” are not defined in a single way: the definition must be adaptable to the on-the-ground physical and community conditions.
 - NCRP based its “landscape” region on watershed boundaries originally. It is imperfect because the fire shed is much larger, but we have stuck to watershed boundaries for now.
 - The Conservancy is focused on the geographic and legally defined Delta region, but we coordinate with surrounding regions regularly. AB 2216 currently seeks to expand our boundaries.
- Striplen expressed support for the NCRP; it is the only Tribally co-governed group of its size. It has significant political differences across all members but serves as a model why other regions in the state could do.
- Fennig expressed support for the regional approach because disasters do not respect geographic boundaries and asked how competing priorities are adjudicated in groups like the NCRP.
 - The NCRP leadership council has an expressed desire to address very challenging issues like genocide. For big issues like the Klamath Dam Removal, members of the council have had to respectfully disagree. Projects only move forward if they have funding and meet state NCRP priorities. This process protects us and ensures all project awards are fair and equitable.

Adaptation Planning Guide

Annika Bracher, OES, led a presentation of the Adaptation Planning Guide (APG). The APG serves as a local-level resource for local entities to conduct natural hazard mitigation and climate adaptation planning. The first APG was developed in 2012, with subsequent updates occurring in 2020 and 2026 as a collaborative effort between OES, CNRA, and LCI (formerly the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research). It is a step-by-step guide to climate adaptation planning, intended to support updates to county general plan safety elements for SB 379 compliance. The 2026 APG shifts from a sector-based framing to an outcomes-based approach and includes specific guidance on funding, finance, and project implementation. The current update also includes 15 unique case studies and expands geographically to include the entire state; previous iterations focused primarily on coastal cities and inland deserts.

The APG uses a four-phased approach to planning, including:

1. Scoping (define, assess, and initiate the process)
2. Assess vulnerabilities and climate hazards
3. Develop an adaptation framework and strategies to address hazards
4. Implement, monitor, evaluate, and adjust strategies

The 2026 APG will be released in late 2026.

Following the APG presentation, Hannah Mize and Ron Garcia, City of San Fernando, presented lessons learned from San Fernando’s Climate Action and Resilience Plan (CARP) and related general plan updates. The planning project included three core elements, including the CARP, general plan updates, and a CEQA categorical exemption. This effort builds on previous planning projects aimed at increasing resilience, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and updating city policies to better address future climate risks.

Stakeholder engagement was conducted at each phase in the process to ensure the development of equity-centered strategies and consisted of “walkshops” to meet community members in the field, pop-up events, workshops, and a survey. An advisory group was assembled with 8 community members to further guide the

process. This group also co-wrote the “equity guardrail” section of the plan(s) and provided feedback on the final version. Critically, the advisory group process included stipends for community participation; compensation helped drive participation and ensure consistent representation throughout the effort. Key guardrails developed by the group included:

- Fair and inclusive access to resources and opportunities
- Sustain city revenue and a vibrant downtown
- Maintain or increase cultural resilience and community sustainability
- Create neighborhood investment that safeguards housing stability
- Develop safe, healthy, and connected communities

For specific strategies to be included in the final plan(s), they had to stay within these guardrails. For example, a strategy that says “electrify buildings” would not work without providing economic support, clear investment, etc. Instead, the strategy to electrify buildings requires 30% of existing residential buildings to shift from natural gas to electricity *and* provide funding for electrification in historically marginalized communities first. The guardrails were integrated into final strategies through consistency reviews during measure and action development, creating alignment with community input, and evaluating benefits to vulnerable/historically underserved populations.

Discussion

Edwards led a discussion session with TAC members on the updates provided above. The input and questions received are as follows; chair/staff responses are provided below as sub-bullets:

- Sharma noted a major difference between the 2020 APG and the current update is the emphasis on lived experience. Outreach is key to this; Sharma asked what percentage of the overall budget in San Fernando was specifically used for engagement activities.
 - Additional follow up was needed to determine the specific number; Sharma encouraged similar projects to include a substantial budget line for engagement as high as 30% or more. Utilizing community-led (rather than city-led) outreach can be useful as well- community members may be more effective at connecting with fellow residents than city staff.
 - Edwards noted that some APG grants included up to 42% of the budget for outreach.
- Parfrey acknowledged the challenges with engaging vulnerable communities. Stipends and compensation are important for maintaining consistent community participation.
 - In San Fernando, community leaders who received stipends were able to reach fellow residents; staff would never communicate with such as people at the local laundromat.
- Kadara expressed support for the San Fernando model to meet people where they are and provide compensation whenever possible. In Allensworth, a Community Action Committee was formed specifically to provide stipends. It shows community members have a direct stake in a process.
- Roberto Carlos Torres commented a similar process was used in San Diego to help guide engagement from the beginning of its Climate Action Plan. Torres asked how engagement in San Fernando will continue now that plans have been developed and strategies move towards implementation.
 - Utilizing the community advisory group in perpetuity would be very beneficial for strategy implementation, but budgets are limited. Future iterations of plans could include continued support for engagement as a core strategy.
 - The 2026 APG includes a specific recommendation to continue outreach and engagement with the same partners who help develop local plans during implementation.

- Bengsston said the APG reflects significant learning across state government and emphasizes the importance of community outreach. PG&E's Climate Adaptation and Vulnerability Assessment (CAVA) dedicates over 60% of the overall budget for community engagement. A significant portion of this funding is for direct payment for five advisory groups.
- Ghenis noted while the APG includes measures to ensure accessibility to meetings through the use of American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation or accessible materials for screen readers for the visually impaired, the disability community includes many sub-constituencies. Outreach to independent living centers, lighthouse centers for the blind, local united spinal groups, etc. you would pull in multiple different voices and other sets of concerns not represented in the planning process.
 - The APG team offered to reach out directly to TAC member Ghenis for additional suggestions.

General Public Comment

Michael McCormick, Farallon Strategies, provided the following public comment:

- I've been involved in prior processes to develop the APG. One of the things we struggled with the most was avoiding the laundry list of resources and instead trying to figure out how to identify and curate the most effective resources. There's so many of us that work at the local level; if we just have a list, it can be very challenging to navigate. A set of preferred resources could help address that.
- Changing hats, I'll discuss the [Bay Area Climate Adaptation Network](#). With a National Science Foundation grant, we are now a technical assistance provider focused primarily on CBOs and nonprofits. Last year, LCI came with other technical assistance providers to the Bay Adapt Summit. This year, we will hold another summit on November 9th. Visit [baycanadapt.org](#) for more information.
- Additionally, the [Central Coast Climate Collaborative](#) is hosting a regional climate resilience symposium on December 9th in Santa Cruz.

Laura O'Connor, Allensworth Progressive Association provided the following public comment:

- I have done work over the last 8 years with various agencies on climate-related work including the APG. Today I'm here to support both state climate funding and grant programs and the Allensworth Progressive Association, which I am honored to serve as an advisor [on]. The team has been notified they're in the top 15 qualified candidates for a TCC implementation grant, but the eligibility requirements and relevant documentation do not necessarily match up. The Allensworth Progressive Association has applied for the community microgrid grant and qualifies under all of the eligibility requirements, but because they're not in a Tier 2 or 3 fire hazard district and do not experience power safety shutoffs, they do not have the required documents to finalize grant application submittal. The interpretation of this is twofold: one, the grant prioritizes one type of climate threat, regarding electricity distribution and related fire over other threats that are equally problematic such as prolonged extreme heat as well as flooding; two, this requirement excludes the majority of the Central Valley entirely. These discrepancies in documentation requirements should be addressed as soon as possible.

Tekoah Kadar, Allensworth Progressive Association, provided the following public comment:

- Thank you for allowing me to speak. I am Tekoah Kadara, I'm the Associate Executive Director of the Allensworth Progressive Association, and I just wanted to follow, Lora O'Connor's comments. You

know, when you consider wildfire and the humans that are in danger, the animals that are in danger, the ecosystem that is in danger. We have both floods and fires in Allensworth and most recently, last Christmas Eve, we lost a 4-year-old little girl in our community. We've had 4 or 5 fires in the past 2 years in Allensworth.

Edwards thanked members of the public for their comment and offered to follow up with the Strategic Growth Council to get additional clarity on grant documentation requirements.

Edwards encouraged all participants to attend the Resilient California Summit October 20-22; the next TAC meeting will be held on October 23 in Sacramento.

ADJOURN