

Guidelines Section	Topic	Source of Comment	Public Comment	SGC Response
1. Program Overview	Misc	Form Submission	Please clarify whether the federal administration's ongoing budget cuts could potentially impact the availability of either funding stream [TCC and CRC]. If possible, then please provide information regarding the ratio of applicants to awardees in previous funding periods.	Funding for TCC Round 6 is through California's Proposition 4 and is not related to the federal administration budget cuts. TCC has had varying ratios of applicants to awardees. Over the past five rounds, TCC has awarded 54% of implementation applications, 40% of project development applications and 39% of planning applications.
1. Program Overview	Grant Structure	Form Submission	Consider putting aside 10% for grants of a lesser amount, so that TCC funds can be distributed to more grantees.	The NOFA will define the funding maximums per grant type. An applicant may request a smaller amount than the maximum and it will not affect the application's competitiveness.
1. Program Overview	Grant Structure	Form Submission	On page 12, the example description for IGs should be clear that the Implementation grant also covers pre-development and not only construction. It would also be useful to have a paragraph on what phases of the process are not covered by the Implementation Grant (such as community engagement), and refer to the Planning and or Development grants.	We have updated the example description on page 12 to include clarification on eligible and ineligible activities.
1. Program Overview	Grant Structure	Form Submission	All proposals should could consider extreme heat. The proposal should evaluate to what extent the project will protect community members during an extreme heat event.	While we are not requiring all proposals to include an extreme heat analysis, the guidelines identify extreme heat as a key consideration under the Climate Adaptation and Resilience Transformative Element and within the Health and Well Being strategy. Applicants are encouraged to address extreme heat where it is relevant to their project and community needs, as this is an increasingly important climate risk.
1. Program Overview	Templates and Tools	Form Submission	GHG/co-benefits: Publish required quantification methods/tools and baselines before NOFA.	Quantification of GHG/co-benefits is not a required component of Round 6. Applicants must narratively describe how their projects will reduce GHGs and provide public health benefits.
10. Application Requirements	CEQA	Form Submission	Would be helpful to clarify that CEQA doesn't apply to projects on federally-recognized Tribal land. Language makes it sound like it might.	Added clarification in CEQA section.
10. Application Requirements	Leverage Funding	Letter	Under application requirements for Implementation Grants, there is a requirement for "Work plans and Budgets for each Project and Plan (except for Grant Evaluation)." I understand there is a Leverage worksheet. Does this take the place of the work plan for the Leverage Transformative Element? Or must you complete both?	This change has been made in 10.13 Leverage Funding.

10. Application Requirements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	<p>Leverage—Explicitly count land value, staff time, fee waivers, childcare/transportation for engagement; provide a 1-page template. Allow leverage secured during pre-dev (and recent pre-app) with straightforward documentation.</p> <p>Readiness/CEQA: Provide a readiness checklist; allow tiering/streamlining plans at application when appropriate.</p>	<p>Some of the items suggested are already included as in-kind donations: "In-kind goods and services, such as staff time allocated to TCC Projects, Plans, or grant administration: The provision of meals, transportation, or childcare for an eligible community event, may be accepted as eligible sources of leverage if they are adequately defined and documented. They will be subject to review by the State the Pre-Development Phase."</p> <p>At this time, we are not adding land value as a form of explicit leverage funding. Land acquisition for a TCC Project is eligible if it fits the other leverage funding requirements.</p>
10. Application Requirements	Management Capacity	Form Submission	Revise the language in Section 10 so that applicants and co-applicants must demonstrate experience equivalent to the specific sub-scope of work for which they are responsible, rather than requiring experience across the full project scope regardless of role.	It is our intention to have the demonstrated experience for the Lead Applicant and Co-Applicants to match the scope and size of the Projects/Plans being proposed. We have updated language in Section 10.9 Management Capacity under Implementation Grants to reflect this intention.
10. Application Requirements	Project Area	Form Submission	Recommend increasing the rural project area from 10 to at least 15 square miles to better respond to the needs of rural communities.	TCC has increased the maximum Project Area size for rural project areas to 15 continuous square miles, and will consider exceptions to exceed 15 square miles on a case-by-case basis. Details on how to request an exception will be provided with the application instructions.
10. Application Requirements	Scoring	Letter	I understand the suggestion that Lead Applicant and all Co-Applicants be present to participate in the interview so that all aspects of a project can be addressed. However, having (likely) 8+ participants in an interview and a 45-minute total interview time does not feel compatible unless answers to questions have been written out and prepared beforehand, and the applicants have coordinated who speaks when. I would suggest lengthening the time of the interview or making it very clear who SGC would like to respond to questions during the interview.	TCC will provide interview questions to applicants 72 hours in advance, allowing teams to prepare responses and coordinate who will speak. While Co-Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend, they are not required to respond to questions.
10. Application Requirements	Site Control	Form Submission	I recommend that the guidelines be changed so that the applicant could demonstrate site-control within one year of award or that a memorandum of agreement be adopted within one year of award guaranteeing project elements be continued for a minimum of 30 years or the expected lifespan of infrastructure improvements.	No change made. Site control is a critical component for project feasibility. For applicants who don't have site control formally secured, see # 8 which says they may provide "Other forms of site control that give SGC assurance (equivalent to 1-7 above) that the applicant will be able to complete the Project in a timely manner and in accordance with all the requirements of the TCC Program." This may include a letter of commitment or draft MOU. If applicants do not have site control secured, a Project Development Grant may be more appropriate.

10. Application Requirements	Site Control	Form Submission	Revise the language of section 10 so that applicants and co-applicants must demonstrate experience equivalent to the sub-scope they are responsible for in the application. Change the guidelines so that the applicant can demonstrate site-control within one year of award or that a memorandum of agreement be adopted within one year of award guaranteeing project elements be continued for a minimum of 30 years or the expected lifespan of infrastructure improvements.	Because site control currently states "Other forms of site control that give SGC assurance (equivalent to 1-7 above) that the applicant will be able to complete the Project in a timely manner and in accordance with all the requirements of the TCC Program," we have not implemented any changes to Section 10.14 Site Control.  Additionally, we are not implementing the suggested guidance on operations and maintenance plan, as we have learned each project and each community needs to have a specific plan tailored to their needs and capabilities.
10. Application Requirements	Site Control	Letter	For rural, tribal, or under-resourced communities, obtaining full ownership before grant approval is often a significant barrier. We strongly urge SGC to permit conditional site control (e.g., lease agreements, memorandum of understanding, shared-use agreements, letters of intent) at the time of application — with final control secured later — to allow qualified applicants to proceed without prohibitive delay or risk.	Because site control currently states "Other forms of site control that give SGC assurance (equivalent to 1-7 above) that the applicant will be able to complete the Project in a timely manner and in accordance with all the requirements of the TCC Program," we have not implemented any changes to Section 10.14 Site Control.
10. Application Requirements	Templates and Tools	Form Submission	Please indicate whether application material templates will be provided to applicants, such as the workplan and budget.	Application materials will include templates of the workplan and budget. Other templates will be provided with some being resources rather than requirements.
10. Application Requirements	Tribal Access	Form Submission	In the Project Development Grants application requirement, this could be onerous for Tribes: "Submit documentation of having successfully implemented a similar project within the last 10 years. This could be in the form of annual reports, project close-out reports, or other similar documents."  Pages 107-108: How should a Tribe demonstrate Site Control? None of the listed forms of site control sound like they apply to Tribal applicants.	We have revised language in both sections.
11. Grant Administration and Program Expectations	Advance Pay	Form Submission	Please provide examples of circumstances where advance pay is acceptable, as well as any limits/maximum totals.	Detailed information on Advance Pay eligibility, policy, and process is available upon request. All awardees will receive this information after award.
11. Grant Administration and Program Expectations	Grant Structure	Form Submission	Reduce reporting burden. We understand that bond and other statutory requirements necessitate robust reporting, but we also know that a tremendous amount of work goes into reporting from all involved. It would be helpful if there is any way to reduce the reporting requirements, make it simpler, less frequent, offer templates or examples, and/or indicate that support will be provided along the way to ensure the most effective and efficient process.	We plan to share final guidance after awards are made, but we will be reducing some deliverables frequency and changing the scope of work.

11. Grant Administration and Program Expectations	Grant Structure	Form Submission	Reporting guidelines and subsequent disbursement of funds may need to be clarified for the project development process. For example, major CIP projects often lag in expenditures during the soft costs phase but see expenditures rapidly increase during construction. Will disbursement timeframes and guidelines take these considerations into account?	We will not be changing the reimbursement process. Advance pay is available to eligible organizations.
11. Grant Administration and Program Expectations	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	Clarify braiding of state/federal/local dollars and in-kind rules; define non-duplication standards.	We have reviewed the section to better clarify acceptable uses, and that supplantation or duplication of funds are ineligible.
12. Technical Assistance	Application TA	Form Submission	Please make technical assistance available for disinvested communities, particularly community and immigrant-lead organizations.	TCC staff will consider how to incorporate this feedback in future rounds.
12. Technical Assistance	Application TA	Form Submission	<p>I support making Application Technical Assistance available to all Tribal and unincorporated applicants for all grant types. I think TA will be essential as a LOT will need to happen in pre-dev phase for IGs. I have some concern that it will take longer than anticipated to secure leverage funding, complete all the requirements to begin implementation phase, etc and so the timeline for the actual implementation will end up being shortened or groups awarded may not end up being able to complete the project.</p> <p>Types of TA that would be beneficial: Sample budgets, workplans, governance agreement language. Assistance with questions related to disadvantaged unincorporated communities and multi-jurisdictional projects. A dedicated TA provider for application period and pre-dev phase if an impl. grant is awarded.</p>	Suggestion captured in Round 6 updates.
12. Technical Assistance	Application TA	Form Submission	We recommend providing more outlets for technical assistance to help communities in Disadvantaged Unincorporated Areas to learn about opportunities and create successful applications for the TCC program.	Suggestion captured in Round 6 updates.
12. Technical Assistance	Implementation TA	Letter	We recommend expanding TA to support: organizational capacity building, governance development, fiscal management, long-term operations/maintenance planning, and community engagement facilitation. Rural and tribal applicants — including small CBOs, tribal governments, and community service districts — often lack the infrastructure and internal capacity to manage complex, multi-strategy TCC grants without upfront support. Additionally, SGC should consider integrating a peer-learning network or cohort model for rural/unincorporated and tribal jurisdictions to share knowledge, lessons learned, and best practices — improving equity across applicants with varying baseline capacities.	We will consider this recommendation as we search for an Implementation TA provider, but TA provider capacity and SGC budget constraints may present a barrier in implementing this feedback.

12. Technical Assistance	Application TA	Letter	We recommend prioritizing providing technical assistance through the application process across all grant types and including a checklist for all application types to make applying more accessible to all parties. Technical assistance through the application process should include, but is not limited to, budget development support, guidance on navigating the application portal, clarification on eligibility requirements, and review of application to ensure all required documents are included.	TCC staff will release application guidance resources when applications open. Resources will include Application Requirements checklist, pre-recorded videos on application topics, and templates.
2. California Native American Tribes	Collaborative Governance Structure	Letter	Tribes should be able to satisfy collaborative governance requirements through existing governing bodies and their own community engagement processes. Collaborative Governance Requirements can dilute Tribal sovereignty. While the TCC allows for modifications, there is still a default language for multi-governance structures.	Tribes who are applying without Co-Applicants are allowed to utilize existing governing bodies and their own community engagement processes. Tribes who are applying with other Co-Applicants must have a Collaborative Governance Structure and Collaborative Governance Agreement to ensure the terms of the relationships are clear and adequately protect the Tribe's interests. See Section 3.2, subheading "Tribal Applicants."
2. California Native American Tribes	Tribal Access	Letter	Within the Tribal Funding Goal, favoring a number of Tribal projects means unpredictable access to Tribes. While there is intent to fund a Tribal project, the number of one project per section must not be the maximum of possible awards for Tribes. SGC should keep the Tribal funding goal with clear language there is room for more to be selected that meet program eligibility and readiness requirements.	The Draft Guidelines did not include a cap on the number of awards to Tribes, but rather a potential cap on the number of awards made as a result of the Tribal Funding Goal. We have added language clarifying that there is not a cap on the awards made to Tribes.
2. California Native American Tribes	Tribal Access	Letter	Make Tribal data sovereignty protections mandatory by including the following language, "...Tribal data and Traditional Ecological Knowledge shall not be required for public reporting, evaluation, or deliverables unless expressly approved in writing by the Tribe."	We have revised our Guidelines language and intend to have conversations with Tribal grantees about how to protect their data. It is not the intention of SGC to collect data beyond what is required for invoicing, deliverables, and progress reports.
2. California Native American Tribes	Tribal Access	Letter	Add a clause that requires Tribal notification. For example, "For projects located on or directly affecting Tribal land, cultural resources, or Tribal members, applicants shall demonstrate Tribal consultation or consent, as determined by the affected Tribe."	SGC is not currently equipped to implement this requirement. Instead, we have expanded our language in the Guidelines and added a narrative question.
2. California Native American Tribes	Tribal Access	Focus Group	The Tribal led/owned nonprofit definition would be excluding a tribal consortia. The clause "Nonprofit will need to receive formal endorsement..." is not respecting the fact that a Tribal nonprofit has independent authority and raises questions for why they need endorsement. For a consortium of Tribes, it will be very cumbersome to obtain the approval from all Tribes.	It is TCC's intention for the Tribal Funding Goal and Priority Points to go to applications led by individual Tribes, optionally with other Tribal Co-Applicants. Granting Tribally owned nonprofits the same eligibility is intended to allow Tribes greater administrative options (such as a federally recognized Tribe being able to accept advance pay via a nonprofit they control without having to sign a Limited Waiver of Sovereign Immunity). If you have questions about eligibility of an application from a Tribal consortium, please work with the technical assistance providers and SGC staff during the application process.

3. Eligibility	Applicant Eligibility	Letter	We support having a public agency as the Lead Applicant for all grant types. To ensure the Grant is community-driven, we recommend requiring that at least one of the co-applicants in all application types be a Community-based organization or a non-profit that is community focused and directly engages with community members in the project area. This should apply to all grant types except for Tribal.	We strongly encourage partnerships with community-based organizations to ensure projects remain community driven and there is scoring criteria to this effect for all grant types. However, adopting this as a requirement could create barriers for applicants in areas with limited organizational capacity and reduce flexibility for diverse project types across the state. The Lead Applicant does not need to be a public agency.
3. Eligibility	Collaborative Governance Structure	Form Submission	<p>The requirement to have a Collaborative Governance Structure fully formed before submitting the grant application raises some concerns. Specifically: Would funding be available to support community-based organizations and residents during the development process prior to submitting the grant? This process can be time consuming. There is a list of eligible pre-development costs on page 66 of the draft TCC guidelines to which this could be added. Should the requirement for a fully executed agreement remain, the grant application period should be extended to allow time for attorneys to review the agreement, raise concerns, and ensure they are satisfactorily addressed by the applicants. Some ideas to consider that might help with this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•For the application, SGC could require all applicants to sign an agreement that recognizes they will have to create a formal Collaborative Governance Structure should the grant be awarded.</li> <li>•SGC could provide a template Collaborative Governance Structure agreement and potentially require only key portion(s) to be submitted with the grant application (e.g., roles and responsibilities).</li> <li>•SGC could facilitate a phased application with an initial screen of applicants, then require those invited to round 2 to submit some portion of the Collaborative Governance Structure to create more certainty for applicants who are putting the time in for this.</li> <li>•SGC should build time into the process between selecting applicants and executing the contract with the State during which applicants would develop the Collaborative Governance Structure for awarded applicants only.</li> </ul>	Round 6 Guidelines lessens upfront the Collaborative Governance Structure application requirements. Applicants will no longer need to submit a completed Collaborative Governance Agreement, but will instead submit a simplified Collaborative Governance worksheet with the application, and will only be required to turn the worksheet into a complete Agreement if awarded. Additionally, if awarded applicants will have 90 days after the grant is executed to finalize the Collaborative Governance Agreement. Until the Collaborative Governance Agreement is finalized the worksheet will govern the Collaborative.
3. Eligibility	Rural and Unincorporated Community Access	Form Submission	Increase the rural project area to a minimum of 15 square miles to better respond to the needs of rural communities.	TCC has increased the maximum Project Area size for rural project areas to 15 continuous square miles, and will consider exceptions to exceed 15 square miles on a case-by-case basis. Details on how to request an exception will be provided with the application instructions.
3. Eligibility	Rural and Unincorporated Community Access	Form Submission	Please clarify whether a county with 2 incorporated cities and the rest of the county is unincorporated can apply just as a Lead unincorporated applicant or if both incorporated cities would need to apply with us (page 21).	The County may apply as the Lead Applicant. If the Project Area includes both unincorporated and incorporated area, then the City of the incorporated area should be included as a Co-applicant or if not a Co-applicant must submit a Letter of Support.

3. Eligibility	Rural and Unincorporated Community Access	Form Submission	<p>Throughout the state there are deed-restricted affordable housing developments that disproportionately serve the most marginalized members of our society. The State of California policy, driven by decades of Governors both Republican and Democrat, in funding housing for these Disadvantaged populations is that the deed-restricted affordable housing they fund must be built in places with abundant social services (groceries, doctors, government offices) within easy walking distance, and be served with rapid transit stops (e.g. every 15 minutes) within easy walking distance.</p> <p>If TCC only funds projects within mapped Disadvantaged Communities, the funding is not able to serve identified, vetted, truly Disadvantaged populations in apartment complexes designed for them. Other agencies that serve Disadvantaged Communities with similar funding--LIWP, SOMAH, etc.--have adopted the policy that their funding serves all Disadvantaged Communities, and that deed-restricted affordable housing is a Disadvantaged Community (it's right there in the name), regardless of where they are built.</p> <p>Could the Strategic Growth Council consider adopting a similar policy to better reach the Disadvantaged populations in our state with your funds?</p>	TCC uses the entire Project Area to determine eligibility, not one particular location or project site within a Project Area, as the funding is intended to serve a community scale.
3. Eligibility	Project Area	Focus Group	Increase the current 5 square mile target area to 7.5 square mile eligibility area. This could potentially ensure more eligible households in any given community.	The 5 sq. mile limit only applies for Implementation Grants who are in urban Project Areas. TCC has not received other feedback and justifiable needs to increase that limit. A smaller Project Area in urban areas is intended to target and maximize investments in localized communities.
3. Eligibility	Project Area	Form Submission	Please indicate whether there is a maximum number of awards allocated for each mutual aid region.	Although TCC will prioritize geographic diversity, the Guidelines do not mention California Office of Emergency Services Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Regions.
3. Eligibility	Project Area	Form Submission	Contra Costa County is home to four refineries, two power plants, and other large industrial facilities, and unincorporated communities located near these communities have high CalEnviroScreen scores. The County urges the State to prioritize funds for communities located near large industrial facilities, especially refineries. There is sometimes a tendency to try to geographically disperse funds. We respectfully submit that the emphasis should be on providing funding for communities that are located in the shadow of heavy industry and bear a historic, disproportionate burden of health, economic, and environmental impacts.	TCC recognizes that many communities share a disproportionate burden of health, economic, and environmental impacts stemming from various sources. TCC prioritizes geographic diversity but does not have a funding goal to ensure it. The application review process considers the selected community holistically, as Project Area selection is not a scored component of the TCC application. It is our intention to award applicants who demonstrate strong involvement of community members in the proposal development, have diverse and representative collaborators, and whose projects are prepared to directly address community needs.

3. Eligibility	Project Area	Focus Group	A density metric could help determine the maximum area; and self-identification of a project area.	<p>TCC has increased the maximum Project Area size for rural project areas to 15 continuous square miles, and will consider exceptions to exceed 15 square miles on a case-by-case basis. Details on how to request an exception will be provided with the application instructions.</p> <p>TCC will consider requesting a density metric when considering exceptions to the maximum project area.</p>
3. Eligibility	Project Area	Form Submission	<p>Project area composition: Confirm ≥51% DAC with remainder AB 1550 low-income remains eligible through final guidelines.</p> <p>Corridor contiguity: Allow corridor-style, contiguous areas that cross urban/rural tracts if composition rules are met; show example maps.</p> <p>Urban/rural size caps: For mixed geographies, allow functional contiguity or a small relief valve on the 5 mi<sup>2</sup> cap when justified.</p> <p>Local risk data: Accept vetted local heat/pollution data to qualify tracts where statewide tools understate exposure (simple pre-clearance path).</p> <p>Multi-jurisdiction: Accept a placeholder MOU at application for city-county/school collaborations, with full governance by pre-dev.</p>	<p>Yes, 51% or greater DAC areas and remainder AB 1550 low-income communities/households remains eligible.</p> <p>Project Areas shall remain continuous, even for multi-jurisdiction or mixed geography proposals. This is to maintain true to the "neighborhood-level" requirement per statute. However, TCC has increased the maximum Project Area size for rural project areas to 15 square miles, and will consider exceptions to that cap on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Local data remains accepted to establish eligibility for self-identifying disadvantaged unincorporated communities. This does not apply for incorporated areas. For mixed geographies, incorporated areas are still held to the DAC eligibility criteria as per the Guidelines.</p> <p>A Collaborative Governance worksheet signed by all parties shall replace the MOU, formerly known as the Partnership Agreement, at application. The Collaborative Governance Agreement shall be executed within 90 days of grant agreement execution. TCC will provide templates that include language that reinforce commitments on the condition of the TCC award.</p>
3. Eligibility	Project Area	Letter	Given that some rural regions comprise many small, scattered communities, a network-based "hub-and-spoke" approach — with multiple linked facilities or interventions under one TCC grant — could deliver more equitable coverage. We recommend the final Guidelines explicitly encourage such networked proposals (e.g., by providing an example or language in the "Transformative Elements" guidance) and award scoring credit to them when serving dispersed rural or tribal populations. We also urge that TCC guidelines consider more points for projects that are connected to other projects in development, in the process of being constructed or newly constructed as "leverage projects and/or funds".	<p>TCC has increased the maximum Project Area size for rural project areas to 15 continuous square miles, and will consider exceptions to exceed 15 square miles on a case-by-case basis. Details on how to request an exception will be provided with the application instructions.</p> <p>If an exception to an increased rural Project Area boundary is still not adequate, TCC may consider the hub and spoke model request on a case-by-case basis, and cannot guarantee the request will be approved or that the hub and spoke model will be more competitive than a continuous Project Area.</p>

3. Eligibility	Project Area	Form Submission	<p>Recommendation: Allow project areas to include multi-site resilience networks (e.g., food bank, cultural center, campground) as one coordinated project, even if not all sites are in one census tract.</p> <p>Rationale: True resilience requires multiple hubs across geographies (urban, rural, cultural).</p>	TCC will align Strategy 13 with the CRC Final Guidelines as it relates to multi-site resilience networks.
3. Eligibility	Templates and Tools	Form Submission	<p>Publish the exact GIS layers for urban, rural, unincorporated, DAC, AB 1550 before NOFA; if not final, post temporary proxy layers and a timeline. If definitions/maps change after scoping, allow minor boundary edits in pre-development without penalty. Where areas blend, award eligibility/priority based on the share of residents served (documented), not just applicant type.</p>	The layers will be provided within the updated TCC Mapping Tool. Minor boundary edits are allowed during the Pre-Development phase for Implementation Grantees.
3. Eligibility	Templates and Tools	Form Submission	<p>We appreciate the requirement to provide a resolution from the public agency governing board that authorizes applying for and accepting the grant, if awarded. To ensure that the resolution meets State requirements and expectations, it would be helpful if the application materials include a template resolution. This will help the public agency avoid having to go back to its governing board for approval of a revised resolution.</p>	A resolution template has been developed and distributed in the past, and TCC can do so again.
3. Eligibility	Applicant Eligibility	Form Submission	<p>The eligibility requirements for qualifying projects of a community with 80% of the county's Area Median Income (AMI) or 80% of the state's AMI often do not accurately reflect the economic reality in areas of the Sierra. In Tahoe, where the cost of living is high, many residents who have a higher AMI compared with the county's AMI are still cost-burdened. For example, to purchase a median home in the area and not be cost burdened, a household's AMI must be almost 200% of the county's AMI. Investing in community-led development and infrastructure projects in the Sierra is crucial for both supporting rural communities and providing statewide benefits. Investments in climate resilience in the Sierra benefit the entire state. Rivers originating in Sierra Nevada watersheds provide water for drinking and irrigation to over 75% of Californians, and the Sierra snowpack serves as the state's largest de facto reservoir. High-severity wildfires, a changing climate, and degraded meadows in the Sierra all threaten recreation opportunities, water supplies, air quality, and health outcomes across the state. In the 5 rounds of TCC grant awards, very few Sierra communities received TCC grants. It is imperative to consider changing the AMI requirements to include more opportunities for rural communities that would benefit from TCC projects to qualify. We encourage TCC guidelines to include the Vulnerable Communities Platform as an additional eligibility criterion. Including climate risk and biodiversity loss as a metric for climate-vulnerable communities requiring transformational projects would strengthen the project selection process and outcomes, with benefits felt across the state. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue and for considering these comments.</p>	<p>Per statute, TCC awards must include greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects that provide local economic, environmental, and health benefits to disadvantaged communities. Disadvantaged communities are defined as populations who face disproportionate pollution and socioeconomic burden. TCC added reference to the Vulnerable Communities Platform to support applicants in identifying their climate risks. The 80% AMI requirement is specific to a subset of TCC's project strategies rather than a broad programmatic eligibility criteria.</p>

4. Planning Grants	Grant Structure	Letter	Given the absence or obsolescence of local climate, hazard mitigation, or general-plan frameworks in many rural or tribal regions, we recommend allowing part of Planning Grants or Project Development Grants to be used to develop or update these policy frameworks.	The current guidelines include language that provides flexibility in Section 4.2 Eligible Planning Grant Activities, that allows applicants to undertake activities related to planning and policy development.
4. Planning Grants	Grant Structure	Form Submission	Please clarify whether an agency is allowed to apply for both planning grants [from TCC and CRC] at the same time, whether for the same project or 2 different projects. Please clarify whether planning grants are required to be prerequisites for development and/or implementation grants.	Applicants are allowed to apply for both programs. TCC does not require applicants to have previously had a TCC Planning Grant to be eligible for a Project Development or Implementation Grant.
4. Planning Grants	Pre-Development Phase	Letter	To help cultivate a more prepared pool of applicants and reduce the need for extensive technical assistance, we recommend introducing a Pre-Proposal stage for all application types.	Due to the expected increase in applicants and limited staff capacity, we will not be able to have Pre-Proposals for Planning and Project Development Grant applications. However, TCC is always available through email. We are also exploring other assistance opportunities, such as staff office hours.
5. Project Development Grants	Project Eligibility	Focus Group	Remedial upgrades should be considered basic infrastructure.	Added clarification throughout the guidelines that the 10% cost allowable for water supply and wastewater infrastructure can go toward new or upgraded infrastructure/connections.
6. Implementation Grants	Grant Structure	Letter	It may take the County 2-3 months to review and execute a post-award consultation phase grant agreement and establish subawards with its partners. This needs to be considered in the overall process, timeline and expectations.	Grant management and administration is considered and built in to the overall process, timeline and expectations.
6. Implementation Grants	Pre-Development Phase	Form Submission	Do all projects need to be out of the predevelopment phase before starting any work? Some projects will be ready immediately others might take the year [within the same grant].	We have added language to Appendix E-2 to address this scenario.
6. Implementation Grants	Pre-Development Phase	Form Submission	For the Project Implementation Grant, we support adding a grant-funded Pre-Development Phase to the overall timeline. However, we are concerned that the proposed schedule, particularly for the Pre-Development Phase, may be too ambitious given the limited infrastructure and capacity in DUCs. We recommend providing greater flexibility in the Project Implementation Grant timeline for DUCs and Tribes to ensure grantees can respond to unforeseen circumstances, especially those related to essential environmental infrastructure	We have added language to Appendix E-2 to address this scenario. Please note that water supply and wastewater infrastructure (formerly referred to as basic environmental infrastructure) is not a Pre-Development Requirement and so this work can be conducted during the Implementation Phase.
6. Implementation Grants	Pre-Development Phase	Form Submission	1-year pre-development for community engagement (if covered by the grant), planning, development of construction documents, and permitting is very short.	Implementation Grants are designed for applicants who have already conducted community-based planning, have begun pre-development work on several projects identified as community priorities, and will be able to meet all Pre-Development Requirements during the first nine months of the grant term. Grantees who need additional support for planning and pre-development work should instead apply for a Project Development Grant.

7. Transformative Elements	Collaborative Governance Structure	Letter	<p>SGC should consider facilitating multi-jurisdictional and cross sector collaboration through governance flexibility. The Draft Guidelines emphasize “Collaborative Governance Structure” for eligible applicants. We recommend that the final Guidelines include model MOU templates or guidance language to help small communities partner across jurisdictions more easily.</p> <p>We also request that applications demonstrating true regional collaboration — across counties, tribes, CBOs, special districts, and service sectors (e.g., health, water, mobility) — receive additional scoring credit, reflecting the program’s goal of broad, integrative community benefit.</p>	In Round 6 the TCC Team have created several resources and templates to help applicants navigate the Collaborative Governance Structure and Collaborative Governance Agreement requirements. Instead of requiring a complete Collaborative Governance Agreement with the application, the requirement will now be to submit a Collaborative Governance Agreement worksheet. Additionally, a Collaborative Governance Agreement template and completed example Collaborative Governance Agreements will be available by the time applications open. Diversity of the Collaborative is an element that is already scored within our Guidelines.
7. Transformative Elements	Displacement Avoidance Plan	Other	<p>DAP &amp; WDEOP (from SB County) it would be a heavy commitment for their gov't to accept a policy just to APPLY for a grant. Recommends doing a worksheet that would track what policies they have in place already, and if it would be better to do more programmatic activities to meet the DAP &amp; WDEOP requirements, than policy.</p> <p>Clarify if updating existing policies would meet the requirements in these TEs.</p>	<p>We have updated Section 7.3 Displacement and Avoidance Plan, to include that updating and improving existing policies would meet the DAP requirement. Additionally, the DAP Guidelines already state that activities can be "new policies or programs," so no change was made.</p> <p>We have updated Section 7.3 Displacement Avoidance Plan to clarify what is expected at application and during the grant term.</p>
7. Transformative Elements	Displacement Avoidance Plan	Form Submission	<p>Modify the grant guidelines to acknowledge that continued grant funding is not contingent upon the adoption of any specified policy in the Displacement Avoidance Plan by an elected body. As written the guidelines could be interpreted as promising action from local elected bodies, before a public outreach and policymaking process has been undertaken.</p>	<p>We have updated Section 7.3 Displacement Avoidance Plan to clarify what is expected at application and during the grant term.</p>
7. Transformative Elements	Displacement Avoidance Plan	Form Submission	<p>The Displacement Avoidance Plan should not be required as a submittal upon application. Requiring a specific number of policies and programs is arbitrary and not realistic. Submitting a DAP would essentially compel a local government to develop and adopt policies without having gone through a public process to vet their necessity and alignment with other needs and priorities.</p> <p>Similar to other required submittals, the program could require applicants to complete a worksheet identifying existing policies and programs as well as deficiencies. We recommend changing the DAP requirements to include these sections: “Description of the policies, plans, ordinances, or programs that are already in place to avoid displacement; Identification of additional new policies or programs that could be pursued to avoid displacement among existing households and businesses within the Project Area.” This would allow our jurisdiction to thoroughly analyze our current anti-displacement policies to see if new policy is really needed to mitigate impacts our Implementation Grant may have on households and businesses.</p>	<p>Our DAP Guidelines state that they can be "new policies or programs," and we have added in the option to update existing policies or programs. Since we are allowing the option to update existing policies or programs, we are keeping the minimum number of policies/programs for residents and businesses. We have also added that an applicants can choose activities that are appropriate for their community, even if it isn't listed.</p> <p>We have updated Section 7.3 Displacement Avoidance Plan to clarify what is expected at application and during the grant term.</p>

7. Transformative Elements	Project Eligibility	Form Submission	Remove the language in Table 3 of the grant guidelines specifies that no grant funds may be allocated for climate adaption and resilience measures. Allowing climate adaptation and resilience measures that include multiple co-benefits that are of primary interest to an implementation grant such as clean air, greenhouse gas reduction, and reducing the urban heat island effect is critical to having the transformative impact this program envisions.	Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plans are a threshold requirement. No TCC funds may be allocated to the creation or development of a Plan. TCC funds climate adaptation and resilience measures and must be incorporated into the proposed projects and plans. The Final Guidelines provide clarification on this topic.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	Recommendation to change Leverage Funding requirement for Implementation Grant (Rural Communities) from 50% to 25% to fit the economic reality of rural communities. The CBO's in rural communities do not have a lot of in-house capacity to contribute to help meet that Leverage Funding requirement.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Letter	<p>Would TCC Planning or Project Development funds count as leverage if they were expended on the project in the 12 months prior to application? I do not see language in the Guidelines that excludes Round 5 funding.</p> <p>I'm confused about the requirement that standalone leverage projects be new and specific to the TCC program and application process. If the County is improving sidewalks in the Project Area leading up to a housing complex project (Strategy 1) and funds will be expended during the TCC grant period, why can't those be used as standalone leverage funds? In my reading, an unincorporated rural jurisdiction would need to pursue standalone leverage funds for: 1) projects identified during the application period/community engagement 2) projects not yet meaningfully initiated (i.e. CEQA not yet initiated) 3) projects that will secure funding within one-year of award and 4) projects that will total up to \$5 million (if the TCC grant is for \$20 million) All of that feels prohibitive for rural unincorporated communities.</p> <p>I would suggest alternatively that standalone funding for rural unincorporated jurisdictions include projects that have previously been initiated (but funds not yet fully expended) that are directly connected to TCC goals and the proposed TCC projects (i.e., a sidewalk extending to a Strategy 1 affordable housing project or Active Transportation Project within the project area that improves walkability/bikeability for low-income residents).</p>	Leverage funding does include current TCC Planning and Project Development Grants. Please note, however, that TCC will only count the amount spent up to one year before the application due date. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	Remove the 25% cap on "stand alone Leverage Projects" and allow for the full 50% leverage to be provided by "stand alone Leverage Projects.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections. However, TCC will keep the cap of stand-alone leverage projects, as we believe that lowering the required amount will increase flexibility significantly. We want to make sure that leverage funding brings in catalytic investment, a TCC core value, which is why we will maintain the cap for stand-alone leverage projects.

7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	Reduce leverage funding to 30% for disadvantaged unincorporated communities.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	I recommend removing the "Leverage funding for Grant-funded projects" requirement and allowing for the full match to be provided by stand-alone leverage projects.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections. However, TCC will keep the cap of stand-alone leverage projects, as we believe that lowering the required amount will increase flexibility significantly. We want to make sure that leverage funding brings in catalytic investment, a TCC core value, which is why we will maintain the cap for stand-alone leverage projects.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	I recommend removing the existing project exclusion for the applicability of stand-alone leverage projects for applications that serve disadvantaged communities to better acknowledge the reality of sporadic funding in disadvantaged communities. I also recommend reducing the total match funding required to 25% of the award size for disadvantaged unincorporated communities.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections. However, TCC will keep the cap of stand-alone leverage projects, as we believe that lowering the required amount will increase flexibility significantly. We want to make sure that leverage funding brings in catalytic investment, a TCC core value, which is why we will maintain the cap for stand-alone leverage projects.
7. Transformative Elements	Leverage Funding	Form Submission	Recommend removing the existing project exclusion for the applicability of stand-alone leverage projects for applications that serve disadvantaged communities to better acknowledge the reality of sporadic funding in disadvantaged communities. Recommend reducing the total leverage/match funding required to 25% of the award size for disadvantaged unincorporated communities.	TCC has lowered the required amount of leverage funding for unincorporated communities to 25%. This change has been made to Section 7.6 Leverage Funding, and all other relevant sections. However, TCC will keep the cap of stand-alone leverage projects, as we believe that lowering the required amount will increase flexibility significantly. We want to make sure that leverage funding brings in catalytic investment, a TCC core value, which is why we will maintain the cap for stand-alone leverage projects.
7. Transformative Elements	Workforce Development Plan	Letter	We recommend raising the 5% budget cap for workforce development activities and economic opportunities to allow grantees to design workforce and economic opportunities tailored to the needs of their local community. Raising the budget cap for workforce development will allow grantees to build workforce programming that is intentional, strategic, and equitable. It will also help alleviate the burden of rising costs and allow grantees to train more individuals and provide them with all the tools they need to succeed in a long-term career pathway.	Wages or stipends for workforce trainees who are working on TCC-funded Projects can be included as direct Project costs. These costs would not be included in the 5% cap.

7. Transformative Elements	Workforce Development Plan	Form Submission	<p>Recommendation: Require applicants to describe how workforce programs are tied to building upgrades, not just parallel.</p> <p>Rationale: Ensures TCC projects both build hubs and train residents to maintain them, leaving skills in the community.</p>	We encourage but don't require workforce to be tied to building upgrades.
7. Transformative Elements	Workforce Development Plan	Form Submission	We would like to see programs that provide workforce readiness skills as part of building career pathways be included since these skills are often essential for long term career success.	These are currently eligible as part of broader training programs, but not on their own.
7. Transformative Elements	Workforce Development Plan	Letter	Within a workforce and economic development plan, we recommend awarding additional points to proposals with strong year-round programming (e.g., green jobs training, health outreach, youth engagement, community services) and not only capital- or one-time infrastructure. We also suggest requiring or incentivizing community governance or local oversight coupled with a plan for ongoing operations after grant completion — especially for multi-strategy, multi-year projects — to ensure long-term community benefit and sustainability.	No change made. Points are currently given for capacity, which tends to be higher when they are established and have existing programs. We recommend advisory boards and strong partnerships for WDEOP, but don't require them - which would necessitate specific use of funds.
7. Transformative Elements	Workforce Development Plan	Focus Group	Implementing the WDP could be challenging in a small rural area, especially with the idea of placing people in jobs within the project area. There is also some need for clarification between big-p Policies and smaller policies, especially since 3 years is not enough time to do larger Policy implementation.	<p>Added clarification to guidelines that in areas without existing training programs or clear career pathways to support, the WDEOP may work toward developing training programs and job placement through planning and partnership development activities.</p> <p>Training programs should support Project Area residents, but training programs or job placements may be in the broader region (and accessible to Project Area residents).</p>
8. Program Costs	Collaborative Governance Structure	Form Submission	<p>Recommendation: Dedicate a clear percentage (e.g., 10–15%) of awards for collaborative governance, backbone staff, and administrative coordination.</p> <p>Rationale: Without backbone funding, coalitions struggle to hold partnerships together over the 5–7 year TCC timeline.</p>	No change made. Staff costs are already eligible direct costs, when creating workbooks for the application TCC staff recommend factoring in staff participation in Collaborative Governance meeting in budgeting.
8. Program Costs	Grant Structure	Form Submission	Please indicate whether subcontracts must be executed by the beginning of the funding period or if there is flexibility throughout the funding period (page 70).	The Guidelines do not restrict when subcontracts have to be executed.
8. Program Costs	Grant Costs	Other	Clarify section on cost caps with data visualization	SGC staff will work to create a graphic that clarifies cost caps.
8. Program Costs	Grant Costs	Form Submission	We recommend expanding the eligible expenses for community engagement to include gas cards, especially in rural areas where community members and program implementers may need to travel longer distances and vanpool or public transit might not be accessible.	TCC attempts to cover participant compensation in other ways. Gas cards are not an eligible expense and TCC is unable to accommodate this request.

8. Program Costs	Grant Costs	Letter	While the guidelines acknowledge the substantial costs required for effective community engagement, this understanding is not fully reflected in current eligible spending categories for the Project Implementation Grant. To ensure strong, sustained community engagement, SGC should authorize a minimum of 15% of each Project Implementation Grant award budget be reserved for outreach and displacement avoidance activities.	The cost cap will remain so we can focus the funding on implementation of transformative projects. If there are needs for greater community engagement, those costs can be included directly in Projects and will not influence the cost cap.
8. Program Costs	Grant Costs	Letter	We recommend increasing the allowable share of basic environmental infrastructure costs for DUCs in the application to 25%, mirroring the allowable costs for Tribal applicants.	TCC will accept requests on a case-by-case basis for increasing the allowable costs towards water supply and wastewater infrastructure for disadvantaged unincorporated community applicants.
8. Program Costs	Grant Costs	Form Submission	Recommendation: Explicitly allow TCC funds to be braided with CRC awards, clarifying that projects may combine both.  Rationale: Many communities are pursuing both programs — guidelines should state how they fit together.	Applicants are allowed to apply to both programs. Application materials will consider how applicants intend to braid funds if both applications are awarded.
9. Application Overview	Funding Goals	Form Submission	I support a funding goal for a Project Dev grant to a disadvantaged unincorporated community with priority points across all types to disadvantaged unincorporated community applicants. I recommend adding a funding goal for an IG to a disadvantaged unincorporated community.	We have updated Funding Goals to include one award for each grant type for the Tribal Funding Goal and one award for each grant type for the Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Funding Goal.
9. Application Overview	Funding Goals	Letter	We commend the inclusion of a “Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Funding Goal” under the Draft Guidelines, enabling eligibility for communities where more than 75% of the project area is unincorporated and served residents are from disadvantaged unincorporated communities. To maximize the impact of this provision, we urge SGC to clarify in the final Guidelines that the DUC Funding Goal should not just be a threshold but a prioritized scoring criterion (e.g., bonus or priority points), especially when multiple applications compete, and to ensure that the cap on total awards under the DUC Funding Goal does not become a de facto limitation preventing critical funding for rural or tribal communities.	The Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Funding Goal and Tribal Funding Goal do not function as a cap on the total number of awards that can go to those communities. We have added language to explicitly state that.  Separately from the Funding Goal, disadvantaged unincorporated communities are also eligible for priority points. See Section 9.4 for more information.
9. Application Overview	Funding Goals	Letter	The Draft TCC Guidelines state that SGC may cap the total number of awards issued under the DUC funding goal when the Notice of Funding Availability is released. Because Round 6 funding is coming from the climate bond, which requires that at least 40% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities, we recommend not imposing a cap on the number of awards available to DUC applicants to meet and exceed this statutory requirement.	The Draft Guidelines did not include a cap on the number of awards to disadvantaged unincorporated communities, but rather a potential cap on the number of awards made as a result of the Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Funding Goal. Due to updates to the Funding Goals in the Final Guidelines, the language on a potential cap is no longer relevant and has been removed.

9. Application Overview	Misc	Form Submission	<p>Please add details about the Submittable application process, including whether the platform will save draft work.</p> <p>Please add any page or word limits and formatting required for specific application components, especially the Narrative questions.</p> <p>Pages 79-80: Please consider adding priority points descriptions to Criteria Section 9. The description for all three grant types is combined, separate, and easy to overlook when reviewing the criteria.</p>	<p>Details about the Submittable application process will be provided as part of the application instructions. Applicants' work will auto-save on Submittable. Formatting requirements will be specified as part of the application.</p> <p>The Priority Points breakdown has been added to the scoring criteria description for each grant type.</p>
9. Application Overview	Scoring	Form Submission	<p>Recommendation: Adjust scoring to give higher weight to social cohesion, public health, and cultural resilience benefits, not just greenhouse gas metrics.</p> <p>Rationale: A resilience hub's true impact is in human connection and safety, which isn't fully measured by emissions data.</p>	<p>In Round 6, we have already significantly reduced the emphasis on greenhouse gas metrics compared to previous rounds by removing GHG quantification from scoring. Instead, applicants must ensure that at least one project reduces GHGs, and all that all projects reduce GHGs or provide meaningful public health benefits.</p>
9. Application Overview	Scoring	Letter	<p>Although the TCC program's objectives include health and environmental benefits alongside greenhouse gas reductions, we recommend scoring bonuses for projects that specifically address the climate-health nexus to align with TCC's overall goals of equity and environmental justice.</p>	<p>The guidelines incorporate climate and health connections throughout the Transformative Elements and Strategies to ensure these priorities are reflected in project design and evaluation. Adding separate scoring could create disproportionate weighting and reduce balance across other program goals. Applicants are encouraged to highlight these benefits in their narratives.</p>
9. Application Overview	Scoring	Form Submission	<p>Air-pollution incentive: Count county/air-district policies that apply inside the project area; publish an evidence checklist.</p>	<p>These policies vary by jurisdiction and are adopted and maintained by local agencies, therefore SGC cannot publish a comprehensive list. Applicants may reference applicable county or air district policies in their application and should provide documentation showing these policies apply to the Project Area and support air pollution reduction efforts.</p>
9. Application Overview	Scoring	Focus Group	<p>Community engagement scores may not be the appropriate tiebreaker. It is difficult to evaluate if one community is more invested in a project than another, and also difficult to evaluate engagement well. Recommends implementation capacity as a tiebreaker instead.</p>	<p>We have changed the tiebreaker criteria for Implementation Grants to the total score for the Objectives and Vision section, which includes prior community engagement as well as other factors. This approach is now consistent with Planning Grants and Project Development Grants.</p>
9. Application Overview	Templates and Tools	Form Submission	<p>Provide fill-in-the-blank templates (MOUs, leverage/commitment letters, site-control proof, CEQA/readiness checklist) at NOFA. Guarantee ≥72-hour notice, virtual access, and interpreter support for finalist interviews; publish rubric/topics upfront. Offer pre-NOFA office hours for first-time municipal leads and their CBO partners. Release scoring geographies as GeoJSON/Shapefile with a sample schema. Make the Cal OES regional balance approach explicit (method + timing).</p>	<p>Templates will be provided as part of the application materials. Although TCC will prioritize geographic diversity, the guidelines do not mention Cal OES Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Regions.</p>

Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Project Eligibility	Form Submission	<p>What does "locally sourced food" mean? Grown in CA or within a certain distance? To ensure these investments benefit CA farming communities, I believe the food should at least be grown and produced in CA, if not closer to the project area.</p> <p>For eligible costs would costs for materials and supplies that are crucial for operations be allowed for community based food distributors? For example: boxes for aggregating/transporting food, food processing equipment, refrigerated vehicles, licenses and certifications (e.g. food safety, organic certification). I recommend also allowing the following costs be applied to for the community-based food distributors or, if they are, clarifying that these costs are allowed for those project types too:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land acquisition and funding access to water for establishing and maintaining community resource centers, small scale community gardens, urban agriculture, or community farms</li> <li>- New construction or retrofit costs for community resource centers, including the cost of facilities and accompanying campus amenities</li> <li>- Costs associated with developing business plans for the startup and operations of urban farms or food cooperatives</li> </ul> <p>For strategy specific requirements on pg. 132, would this last bullet point regarding business plans and operations of urban farms or food co-ops also apply to community-based food distributors? What if they wish to establish a new facility like warehouse or processing?</p>	We have provided community based food distributors to the referenced eligible projects types for clarity. The definition of local or regional sourced food is defined in the referenced CDFA grant program (see footnote 37).
Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Project Eligibility	Form Submission	Under car sharing and mobility, is agency car sharing allowed?	No, a TCC-funded car sharing program should expand mobility access to all individuals in the broader community who otherwise would not have access to reliable transportation options. An agency car sharing would exclude Project Area residents who are not staff of the agency.
Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Community Resilience Centers	Letter	Within the "Community Resilience Centers" Strategy, we recommend clarifying that retrofitting or adaptive reuse of existing community facilities (e.g., schools, libraries, clinics, community centers) should be explicitly eligible and incentivized — especially in rural and unincorporated areas where new construction is often cost- or land-prohibitive.	CRC Guidelines govern the Community Resilience Centers Strategy, so we recommend reviewing those Guidelines for specific project examples and ideas for your grant application. Thank you for your feedback.
Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Community Resilience Centers	Form Submission	Include community resilience centers and the establishment of networks/collaboratives as suggested projects for TCC grants.	Community resilience centers and collaboratives are eligible projects for TCC grants, as listed under Strategy 12 in Appendix B. Thank you for your feedback.

Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Project Eligibility	Form Submission	TCC should support disadvantaged communities in accessing farmland and rural areas for restoration work. Sustainable, climate-friendly agriculture requires a network of biodiverse small farms, and an agricultural industry that provides good jobs and on-ramps for new, diverse worker-owners. The TCC grant is a unique opportunity for rural areas to re-design their planning to support affordable rural housing, place-making, walkability, clustered community facilities and rural, land-based business and economic development. The SGC's Agricultural Land Equity Task Force recommendations should inform TCC criteria. This will give more rural residents the opportunity to engage in climate-friendly agriculture and environmental restoration work.	TCC has strategies that can apply to farmland conversion effort, such as Strategy 7: Urban Greening or Strategy 2: Land Acquisition. Additionally, developing strategic planning efforts and preparing for long-term transformative efforts can be specifically funded by our Planning or Project Development grants.
Appendix B: TCC-funded Projects by Strategy	Community Resilience Centers	Form Submission	For community resilience centers, clarification between the emergency services expected, such as power/generators, cooling centers, transportation and crisis relief, and programmatic elements, such as public education, would be helpful. The former would require additional staffing for 24/7 services at agencies not yet equipped to operate on such terms and would be included in budget projections.	For in-depth information surrounding resilience center development, please refer to the CRC guidelines.

None	Misc	Form Submission	<p>The residents of the Berringer Creek neighborhood, an unincorporated and historically underserved area of Temecula, stand united in demanding equitable investment in our community’s fundamental infrastructure. For too long, we have been isolated by a major physical barrier—the SR-79 state highway, with its dangerous 55 mph speed limit—which actively impedes safe passage, discourages outdoor recreation, and undermines our quality of life. Our community’s needs are urgent, and they perfectly align with the mission of transformative climate and equity initiatives.</p> <p>The SR-79 corridor, spanning from Butterfield Stage Road to Anza Road, is currently a dividing line, not a connector. Establishing a safe, continuous Active Transportation route along this segment is critical. We seek a dedicated Greenway connection that integrates Berringer Creek with neighboring schools, parks, and the broader regional network. This route is essential for creating safe mobility options for children and families, and crucially, for reducing local vehicle dependency. Investing here is a direct action toward improving public health, enhancing air quality, and delivering tangible environmental benefits, making Berringer Creek a model for climate-conscious planning.</p> <p>Our community currently lacks a functional and adjacent community park space. The essential infrastructure needed to support youth recreation, community gatherings, and outdoor activity is nonexistent, creating an inequitable environment compared to surrounding areas. We are seeking immediate opportunities to develop a vital park environment that supports diverse youth recreation, accommodates community gatherings, and incorporates natural landscaping with climate-resilient design. This must include shaded areas, water-wise features, and spaces that promote ecological stewardship.</p>	TCC statutorily requires a competitive grant process, and we encourage you to reach out to the County of San Diego or other public agencies to discuss whether a TCC application is appropriate.
None	Grant Structure	Form Submission	We recommend the State expand the use of flexible block grants, rather than a competitive grant process, for local governments that demonstrate how funds will be used to meet State-identified criteria. This model has been successfully implemented in the past, including grants for Proposition 39 school energy efficiency projects and the Ocean Protection Council’s Senate Bill 1 Grant Program. Hallmarks of these programs include rolling quarterly submissions and intergovernmental collaboration, which enable jurisdictions to apply when they are ready and able to implement these priorities.	TCC is statutorily obligated to be a competitive grant. See AB2722 added to Section 1. Part 4, Section 75240 of Division 44 of the public Resources Code. "75241. (a) The council shall award competitive grants to eligible entities through an application process."
None	Site Visits	Form Submission	We recommend that the program continue to develop stronger connections to community groups through site visits and further simplifying the application and compliance processes.	We will continue to center connections to community groups and work to streamline grant processes.

None	Site Visits	Form Submission	We recommend that SGC continue to prioritize site visits as a way to build visibility of the work that local partners and community members are conducting locally. This can help ensure that SGC staff can build trust, have the context they need to support projects, and streamline communication channels in ways that reduce administrative burden on program implementers. Site visits can also help connect elected officials with the impact that is happening within their communities as a result of the TCC program and build support for ongoing investment in these projects. Site visits can also help policymakers and implementers learn from each other and scale successful models to other geographies.	While site visits are no longer a part of application and scoring, TCC will continue to conduct site visits for all grant types during the grant terms.
None	Misc	Form Submission	Work with outside funders to uplift the need to fund place-based community resilience projects like the TCC and CRC. Prioritize outreach with community foundations to establish funds which support community resilience grants for organizations with less capacity (hence, not able to apply for government grants), but still doing important work to build local community resilience.	We recognize that state grant applications are often burdensome for low-capacity applicants, and although capacity-building is not the main focus of our program, we are working where we can to build capacity among community organizations.
None	Tribal Access	Form Submission	Please consider and incorporate relevant guidance and recommendations from the Draft California Tribal Gap Analysis report which can be found at: <a href="https://caltribalgapanalysis.org/">https://caltribalgapanalysis.org/</a> . The final report will be issued later in January.	Our team appreciates the recommendations from the draft CTGA, and is including recommendations from the draft report, as well as CNRA's Draft Tribal Grant Administration Guidance, in our Round 6 Final Guidelines.
None	Misc	Focus Group	Disadvantaged community is not appreciated as a term. It puts the responsibility on the system that made them disadvantaged versus focusing on the community.	SGC acknowledges that the term disadvantaged can be recognized as a negative label. We use this term to align with our legislation and funding source. Added the additional language to section 1.5.