

Attachment A

Community Resilience Centers (CRC) Summary of Public Engagement and Impact on Final Guidelines

Summary of engagement

The CRC Round 2 public comment period took place from Sept. 29, 2025 – Jan. 2, 2026. The California Strategic Growth Council (SGC) coordinated the public engagement processes of the CRC Program and Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Program to increase efficiency and decrease engagement fatigue among prospective applicants.

During the public comment period, SGC sought feedback on the Draft Guidelines from previous applicants, prospective applicants, grantees, and other members of the public. SGC hosted large group input sessions open to the public; small, tailored focus group discussions on specific components of the Draft Guidelines; and presentations to relevant groups.

Staff conducted outreach via email, social media, state and external networks, presentations, and individual outreach. Staff invited members of the public to share their feedback via an online form, email, or attendance at an input session or focus group.

Specific opportunities for engagement included:

Four Statewide Community Input Sessions

- Two sessions for all communities
 - First session: 127 registrants, 108 attendees
 - Second session: 151 registrants, 121 attendees
- One session for Tribal communities (39 registrants, 17 attendees)
- One session for rural and under-resourced unincorporated communities (87 registrants, 77 attendees)

Five Focus Group Sessions

- One session on the application process (eight attendees)
- One session on topics relevant to Tribal applicants (seven attendees)
- One session on topics relevant to rural communities and disadvantaged unincorporated communities (12 attendees)
- One session focused on the TCC Program (seven attendees)
- One session focused on the CRC Program (seven attendees)

Impact on Final Guidelines

CRC and TCC received public comment submissions via an online input form and emailed letters, as well as numerous comments shared in focus groups and individual meetings. CRC received 41 form submissions and 12 emailed letters and TCC received 29 form submissions and 6 emailed letters. 19 additional form submissions applied to both the TCC and CRC programs.

In addition to public comments, CRC staff made changes based on learnings from Round 1, language set forth per statute AB 211 and the Climate Bond, research on key topics, funding limitations, and feedback from priority communities. Forthcoming program materials, including the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and application materials and templates, will address additional questions and feedback.

These sections are organized in tables by topic according to the restructured CRC Round 2 Final Guidelines, complete with a high-level summary of input, including feedback and rationale, and the CRC team action proposed in Final Guidelines.

Table 1: Section 1: Introduction

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Funding Amounts and Award Ranges	Award types were updated to make more funding available for Implementation Grants in Round 2. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 will offer two grant types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Grants • Implementation Grants Project Development Grants will not be available. Instead, Implementation Grants will fund a “Pre-Development” phase that will support Lead Grantees’ project readiness before implementation. SGC retains the right to make partial awards.
Program Objectives	Round 2 Final Guidelines now specify program objectives that were not in Round 1 Guidelines. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 core program objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund community resilience centers that reflect geographic diversity • Advance neighborhood response to and recovery from climate emergencies • Encourage meaningful collaboration between residents, community groups, and local agencies • Reduce health risks from climate extremes • Prioritize under resourced communities across California

Priority Communities and Priority Populations	Round 2 Final Guidelines now align with legislative definitions. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 expands the definition of priority communities to include disadvantaged communities (DACs) and severely disadvantaged communities (SDACs) as identified in the Climate Bond.
Funding Priorities	Public comments requested support for Tribal, rural, unincorporated, and under-resourced populations who are disproportionately impacted by climate extremes. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines have detailed funding priorities for the program. To support these priorities, the Program has adapted scoring criteria and will provide Technical Assistance to support priority communities. The SGC will prioritize awarding funds to projects that benefit under-resourced, low-income, and Tribal communities across the State, as well as considering geographic diversity.

Table 2: Section 2: California Native American Tribes

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Tribal Access	Public comments requested greater flexibility and recognition of Tribal sovereignty. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines, and minor updates were made to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines contain greater flexibility for Lead Applicants who are California Native American Tribes or Tribally owned nonprofits. The CRC Program is dedicated to respecting Tribal sovereign status throughout every stage of program development.
Tribal Access	Public comments requested that the CRC program better define Tribally led /owned non-profits. The changes were made from Round 2 Draft Guidelines to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	Staff are now using an adapted version of the California Natural Resources Agency definition for Tribally owned non-profits.
Tribal Sovereignty	Round 2 Final Guidelines were updated to accommodate public comment for a greater recognition of Tribal sovereignty.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines strengthens language around protecting data sovereignty and modifying program requirements in recognition of Tribal sovereignty.
Tribal Notification	In agreement with best practices, Round 2 Final Guidelines have established a	CRC Program staff will notify California Native American Tribes on the Native American Heritage

	new process to notify Tribes of applications received in their region. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Commission contact list of applications received in their region.
--	--	---

Table 3: Section 3: Eligibility

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Eligible Applicants	The Climate Bond required updates to eligible Lead Applicants and Partners. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Staff clarified eligible Lead Applicants and Partners based on statutory language. Private shareholder corporations are ineligible.
Partners	To better support community resilience and based on Round 1 experienced, Staff have updated Partner requirements at application. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 Final Guidelines updated the number of Partners required for each application: one Partner is required for Planning Grant applicants, and two Partners are required for Implementation Grant applicants.
Eligible Project Area	There were many public comments for Implementation Grants to fund multiple sites with multiple owners in a single proposal, creating a networked approach. The changes were made from Round 2 Draft Guidelines to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Final Guidelines allow for Implementation Grants’ Project Area to fund Partner Sites. Partner Sites are sites that are managed by Applicants that offer programming and services that advance resilience within the community. Eligible costs include programs and services and minor infrastructure upgrades.
Collaborative Governance Agreement (CGA)	Public comments highlighted Round 1 partnership requirements at application placed an undue burden on under-resourced communities and many requested a template and additional guidance for applicants to develop partnerships. Changes have been made throughout the process from Round 1 to	Round 2 Final Guidelines has reduced requirements for the Collaborative Governance Agreement (CGA) (formerly named the “Partnership Agreement”) to reduce barriers for applicants. Implementation Grant applicants will be required to complete a CGA worksheet at application. If awarded, Lead Grantee and Partners will use the procedures outline in the worksheet to develop a fully executed CGA by the end of the Pre-Development Phase. Tribal applicants do not need Partners in certain

	Round 2 Final Guidelines to support partnerships.	situations but are required to notify surrounding Tribes of their project and, if desired by all parties, engage in consent-based collaboration.
--	---	--

Table 4: Section 4: Planning Grants

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Planning Grant Timeline	Public comments requested clarity on both the application and grant timeline for Planning Grants. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines, and minor updates were made to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Final Guidelines have defined three Planning Grant phases and details Planning Grant requirements during the grant term.
Eligible Planning Grant Activities	Based on needs of Round 1 Planning Grantees, eligible activities were clarified. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Updates new Planning Grant eligible activities to include site investigation and reconnaissance activities such as soil sampling and cultural resource surveys; updates descriptions of capacity building and programming activities as eligible activities.

Table 5: Section 5: Implementation Grants

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Pre-Development Phase	Small nonprofits, and rural, and unincorporated communities expressed concerns about meeting project readiness requirements. To alleviate this concern, Staff included a Pre-Development Phase. The changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	The Implementation Grant process was modified in Round 2 Final Guidelines to include a funded Pre-Development Phase. The intent of the Pre-Development Phase is to: a) reduce the burden of applying and engaging in the competitive award process, and b) provide more funding and support for pre-development activities.
Post Award Consultation (PAC) Process	Based on experience with Round 1 Grantees, Staff included more details on the grant award process for potential applicants. The changes were made from	The post-award consultation (PAC) process between the SGC and awarded applicants is used to execute the Grant Agreement. In Round 1, the PAC process ranged from six months to one year. The PAC process in Round 2 will be three to six months in Round 2.

	Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	
Project Area Requirements	Based on experience with Round 1 Grantees, Staff included more requirements and details when Project Areas cross one or more jurisdictional boundaries. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines, and minor updates were made to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	For Applicants with a Project Area crossing one or more jurisdictional boundaries, the Lead Applicant must submit a letter of commitment from all relevant parties who have jurisdiction over the Project Area. If awarded, the Grantee may need to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the involvement of the various jurisdictions.

Table 6: Section 6: Program Costs

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Cost Categories and Caps	Round 2 Final Guidelines now align with the Climate Bond and Federal norms in regard to Indirect Costs. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines, and minor updates were made to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	Indirect costs to be 15% of the total grant award, from 12% in Round 1; clarifies travel expenses, community engagement and outreach expenses (communication materials, consultation services, public awareness supplies), event-related costs (venues, facilitators), and childcare expenses for community residents during community engagement events.
Partner Sites	Changes were made from Round 2 Draft Guidelines to Round 2 Final Guidelines.	Minor capital costs for Partner Sites are capped at 8% of total grant award. Funded programming or services must be complimentary and in coordination with Main CRC facility.
Ineligible Costs	Round 2 Final Guidelines have updated ineligible costs based on experiences with Round 1 Grantees and best practices. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines clarify ineligible food and refreshment costs, door prize costs, cash subsidies, sponsorships costs, and real estate commission-based.

Table 7: Section 7: Program Requirements

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Leverage Funding	Public comments submitted on the Draft Round 2 Guidelines	Applicants are not required to secure leverage funding. Applicants who choose to include

	requested increased flexibility for leverage funding in Round 2.	leverage funding in their total project cost must submit evidence of committed leverage funding consistent with Appendix J: Leverage Funding. Leverage funding will be reviewed at threshold.
Operations & Maintenance Plans	Public comments requested that applicants who demonstrate committed operations and maintenance funds earn a higher Financial Feasibility score. Staff took these comments into consideration when developing scoring.	In Round 2, Implementation Grant applicants must answer narrative questions about their operations and maintenance plan at time of application instead of submitting a draft operations and maintenance plan at application. Narrative questions will include questions about anticipated funding sources for operations and maintenance. Grantees must complete a draft operations and maintenance plan by end of the Pre-Development Phase, which accommodates potential changes to the proposed campus amenities, services, and programs.
Site Control and Readiness	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated Site Control and Readiness requirements. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines clarifies and updates Implementation Grant requirements, distinguishing Application Requirements from Pre-Development Requirements.
Applicant Capacity	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated Applicant Capacity sections. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Clarifies requirements that each Lead Applicant and Partner must provide a letter of commitment, and that Lead Applicants must answer narrative questions related to management and financial capacity, at time of application.
Long-term Use	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated Long-term Use sections. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Updates the forms of documentation required of Implementation Grantees who utilize leased facilities. Grantees must provide a signed and executed Memorandum of Unrecorded Grant Agreement (MOUGA) <u>or</u> a Notice of Unrecorded Grant Agreement, by the second year of the Grant Agreement.
Community Engagement	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated Community Engagement sections. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Implementation Grant applicants must submit a summary of community engagement to date and proposed engagement activities, rather than a community engagement plan; Grantees must instead complete the community engagement plan by the end of the Pre-Development Phase.

Table 8: Section 8: Application and Scoring

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Scoring	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated Scoring for Round 2 applications. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Guidelines have updated scoring criteria and points for both Planning and Implementation Grants
Project Feasibility	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated when project feasibility will be assessed in the scoring phase. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Only top-scoring CRC Implementation Grant applicants will be scored on Project Feasibility. These applicants will also be interviewed.
Tribal Funding Goals	Round 2 Final Guidelines updated CRC Tribal Funding Goals. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	SGC intends to award at least one Planning Grant and one Implementation Grant to an eligible application from a California Native American Tribe or a Tribally owned nonprofit (collectively referred to as Tribal applicants).
Priority Points	Round 2 Final Guidelines updated priority points (formally “additional points” in Round 1) to incentivize projects representing prioritized communities. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Eligible applications representing Tribal applicants, under-resourced communities (including DACs and SDACs as defined by the Climate Bond), under-resourced rural and/or unincorporated communities, or previous SGC or LCI grantees will receive additional points if they meet certain requirements.

Table 9: Section 9: Grant Administration

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Post-Award Consultation Process	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated the grant award process. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 Final Guidelines have a new section that describes the Post-Award Consultation (PAC) Process, the role of this process, Lead Grantees, and SGC staff.

Reporting Requirements	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have clarified the reporting process for all grant types. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 Final Guidelines clarify reporting requirements during the grant administration process; all Lead Grantees are required to submit regular progress reports and final reports; Implementation Grantees are required to submit additional annual reports, equipment inventory records, leverage funding reports, and indicator tracking (evaluation) reports.
Implementation Grant Evaluation	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff have updated the Implementation Grant Evaluation process. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 Final Guidelines specify that SGC will work with each awarded Tribe and their evaluation Technical Assistance provider to reach a mutually agreeable evaluation plan that protects confidentiality of Tribal data and Traditional Ecological Knowledge.

Table 10: Section 10: Technical Assistance

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Technical Assistance (TA) Availability	Staff will prioritize eligible applicants for Technical Assistance due to limited funding. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	Round 2 prioritizes Tribal applicants for Technical Assistance (TA). Tribal applicants include CA Native American Tribes and Tribally-owned nonprofits. TA availability for other applicants will depend on TA provider capacity.
Grant Phases	Round 2 Final Guidelines clarify support provided throughout the Grant Term. Changes were made from Round 1 to Round 2 Draft Guidelines.	CRC Round 2 Final Guidelines offers additional clarity on Technical Assistance support provided from application through the end of the Grant Term.

Table 11: Appendices

Topic	Feedback or Rationale	CRC Team Proposal for R2 Final Guidelines
Appendix A: Terms and definitions	Public comment requested clarity on language and common terms.	Appendix A defines additional words and adds clarity to definitions.
Appendix B: Collaborative Governance Requirements	Public comments requested more resources to support Collaborative Governance and MOU requirements. Additional	In Appendix B, a new CGA worksheet will support applicants as they develop a draft CGA (formerly known as a Partnership Agreement) that meets all the requirements outlined in Appendix B. A

	comments requested more flexibility and clarity regarding requirements for Tribal applicants.	new CGA worksheet for Tribes was also created. Additional details added to clarify requirements for Tribal Applicants and when modifications to the Collaborative Governance Agreement (CGA) apply.
Appendix C: Community Engagement	Public comments asked for more information and additional best practices for community engagement.	Appendix B expands on best practices for community engagement and provides more direction for applicants and grantees.
Appendix D: Program Requirements Overview	Public comments wanted more clarity on application requirements and elements compared to grant term requirements and elements.	Appendix D is a new appendix outlining application and grant requirements by grant type.
Appendix F: Site Control	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff expanded on Site Control requirements.	Appendix F expands on how applicants and grantees can demonstrate site control.
Appendix I: Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff clarified Memorandum of Understanding requirements.	Appendix I contains additional requirements for planning or project areas that cross multiple-jurisdictions.
Appendix K: Post-Award Consultation Process and Policies – Planning Grants	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff detailed the grant award process for Planning Grants.	Appendix K expands on Post-Award Consultation process for Planning Grants so applicants can have more informed expectations of the process leading up to signing a grant agreement.
Appendix L: Post-Award Consultation Process and Policies – Implementation Grants	Based on learnings from Round 1 and best practices, Staff detailed the grant award process for Implementation Grants.	Appendix L expands on Post-Award Consultation process for Implementation Grants so applicants can have more informed expectations of the process leading up to signing a grant agreement.