

Revised Regional Resilience/Climate Adaptation Advocacy Principles

Revised: April 13, 2021

The principles below are substantially revised from what was presented in March based on feedback from the Bay Area Climate Adaptation Legislative Working Group. The principles are intended to guide staff's advocacy as it relates to the range of climate adaptation bills and proposals pending in the Legislature in the 2021-2022 state legislative session. They are a broad statement of policy priorities. Recommendations on specific bills will be brought to the Joint MTC/ABAG Legislation Committee in the coming months.

1. **Build on Existing Regional Planning Processes and Authorities:** State law should ensure that regional climate adaptation plans are developed by a multi-stakeholder process managed and led by public agencies that are accustomed to tackling complex regional planning processes. Councils of government (COGs) and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) should be identified as potential agencies to serve in this role in partnership with other key stakeholders. Additionally, the geographic scope of regional climate adaptation networks should cover the entirety of a single region and there should not be multiple regional climate networks within a given region.
2. **Center Equity:** Equity should be a core consideration identified in legislation related to climate adaptation planning and any climate adaptation bond proposals. Many of the communities most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change lack the resources to engage in the critical planning work and local capacity building that is needed on the front end, not to mention the capital funds to construct the projects. To remedy this, equity must be centered as a factor for determining what stakeholders are included in the planning and prioritization process. Furthermore, a regional approach to climate adaptation planning and funding can help ensure that vulnerability assessments are conducted throughout the region, particularly in the most vulnerable communities often at the frontlines of risk.
3. **Define Appropriate Roles for Local, Regional and State Agencies:** Effective planning and implementation requires clarity about agency roles and responsibilities at all levels of government to avoid conflicts and duplication of effort while optimizing the use of taxpayer funds. The Legislature should provide clear direction regarding local, regional, and state government roles in adaptation planning, and build on areas where each level of government already has some level of authority and responsibility. At the same time, the Legislature should provide clear guidance for the important roles to be played by regional adaptation collaboratives, non-profits, community organizations, and academic institutions. Outside the legislative process, the Bay Area needs to identify the roles and responsibilities of the various local and regional agencies that have a stake in, and authority related to, climate adaptation.
4. **Support Engagement with and Provide Support for Nongovernmental Agencies Involved in Climate Adaptation:** Many nongovernmental entities in the Bay Area and statewide are making significant contributions to climate adaptation research, community engagement and planning. The establishment of regional climate networks in state law should encourage and support the public-private-nonprofit collaboration that is already underway in most regions of the state. While new planning responsibilities should reside with public agencies, nongovernmental organizations can make significant contributions to

climate adaptation education, research and technological innovation, as well as convening stakeholders. Accordingly, nongovernmental agencies should be eligible to receive funding from new state or federal grant programs for these purposes and their work should be coordinated with that of local and regional agencies.

5. Support a Local/Regional/State Partnership Approach and Secure New Funding:

Successful climate adaptation planning and implementation will depend on action at both the local and regional levels with guidance – and where possible, funding – provided by the state and federal government. This is analogous to housing planning, where the state requires regions to develop an overarching methodology for growth that achieves specific goals but leaves it up to regions to work out the details of a regional strategy and to local jurisdictions to identify specific sites and make the zoning changes needed.

The following factors should be considered in the development of any new climate adaptation funding program(s):

- Funding is needed as soon as possible to begin the necessary local and regional planning work to identify, prioritize, and design a pipeline of climate adaptation projects that are ready to receive capital funding.
- Funding should be identified to support the entire lifecycle of a project: planning, design, engineering, permitting, construction, and monitoring. Where possible, funding program eligibility and timing guidelines should be designed to encourage projects to advance rapidly from one phase to the next.
- One-time funds can help jump start this effort in FY 2021-22, such as through a state climate resilience bond or federal stimulus funding, but to institutionalize resilience and fully integrate it into long-range local and regional planning, additional ongoing resources will be needed.
- To ensure that *all* regions and local jurisdictions statewide have adequate funding to conduct this work, the state should augment local and regional planning funding for this purpose. Additionally, a share of new climate adaptation capital funding should be distributed directly to regional climate networks to support cross-jurisdictional needs that are identified in regional climate adaptation plans.