



December 22, 2025

Anna Jane Jones, Program Manager, Community Resilience Centers
California Strategic Growth Council
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Community Resilience Centers (CRC) Program Round 2 Draft Guidelines

Dear Anna Jane Jones and SGC Staff:

The Alliance of Regional Collaboratives for Climate Adaptation welcomes the opportunity to provide comments in response to the Community Resilience Centers (CRC) Program Round 2 Draft Guidelines. Our recommendations are based on the lived experiences, research, meetings and conversations with hundreds of individuals and sites over the past several years; who have or would like to develop CRC's (also known as resilience hubs) in their communities. Our intention is that our requests will lead to a more equitable, successful and impactful implementation of the program than the current proposed guidelines; and better able to navigate the state and country's increasingly urgent climate, economic and political crises. Please see attached for prior letters submitted in consideration of the program - you'll find consistent themes reiterating ARCCA's perspective on the importance of collaborative, regional, and networked infrastructure to support regional resilience.

Our Priority Recommendation: Funding Networks of Community Resilience Centers

The bulk of our comments are focused on our strong recommendation to provide applicants with the additional option to fund networks of CRC's. Currently the guidelines stipulate that funding will support applications to fund the development of one site, with the potential to include other sites within a one mile radius and owned by the same organizations as part of this CRC designation.

We would like to address that these recommendations reflect our interpretation of [Statute AB 211](#), which originally created the Community Resilience Center program. We have carefully read AB 211 and do not see any legal barriers to include networks as part of the final guideline because the Statute does not specify the details of the grant implementation, such as parcel definitions or mileage limits for related capital investments. Instead, this requirement appears to be a programmatic detail established by the California Strategic Growth Council.

Thus our key recommendation is to broaden the application guidelines to provide applicants with the option of including multiple facilities which do not have to have the same owners, with a bigger radius of at least 10 miles. This network approach, often known as the [hub-and-spokes model](#), could look like:

- **The Full-Service Hub:** One site with off-grid energy resilience serving as the main CRC for supplies, communications and operations during both blue skies and disasters.



CAPITAL REGION
CLIMATE
READINESS
COLLABORATIVE



CENTRAL
COAST
CLIMATE
COLLABORATIVE



ISC3
Inland Southern California
Climate Collaborative



LARC



NORTH COAST RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP



Climate
Collaborative
SAN DIEGO REGION



SIERRA
CAMP



- **The Spokes:** Other nearby sites are recognized as “satellite” hubs and offer their own resilience-based programs and services, albeit on a smaller scale.
- **The support organizations:** governmental agencies, nonprofit organizations, funders and community-based organizations offering various resilience-based services and programs to the hubs and spokes during both climate disasters and blue skies. Per the proposed guidelines, these organizations would have MOU’s specifying their role and responsibility as part of this network.
- **The Network:** The organizations would both operate separately as well as collaboratively to provide programs and services during all three modes, from disaster preparedness workshops to distributing supplies and communicating during extreme weather events.

Why a Hub-Spokes network approach

A number of cities around the country, from [San Francisco](#) to [Baltimore Maryland](#) to [O’ahu Hawai’i](#), have adopted the network approach, creating infrastructure and programming to connect them, for a number of compelling reasons:

- **They respond more effectively to extreme weather events:** A network of dispersed CRCs can better serve vulnerable populations who might otherwise be challenged to reach one central hub during extreme weather. This diversity of sites can also provide programs and services based on their type, capacity and proximity to technical assistance and training programs; libraries make ideal cooling centers and often host disaster preparedness workshops, for example, while places of worship provide trusted spaces for community members, and often serve as food distribution sites during disasters.
- **They are more equitable, and serve far greater numbers of individuals:** It provides communities the ability to make their own decisions and allows for more flexibility, instead of the more prescriptive format of the current guidelines. It also provides sites who have already been doing resilience-based organizing work with the opportunity to be recognized as resilience hubs. Many sites with a smaller capacity, who might not otherwise have had the opportunity for SGC funding, could then be included as part of this network and expand their existing resilience-based services to beyond their own community members.
- **Networks encourage collaboration over competition, save money, and foster build trust and relationships:** Instead of several organizations from the same city submitting competing proposals, they save valuable staff time for organizations already stretched thin, and collaborate to submit one application together. A network approach could also reduce the need to duplicate services if they are in close proximity to each other (one neighborhood might only need one cooling center, for example); and support many shared resources and administrative responsibilities. Networks often build relationships and trust by convening on a regular basis to learn from each other and practice extreme weather scenarios together. Partnerships could include governmental agencies, nonprofit organizations, Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs), universities, and schools.



- **The Network Model is more equitable and aligned with environmental justice principles.** CRC applicants should be allowed to decide for themselves if they would like to include other sites greater than one mile of the main site as part of their network (who may or may not have the same “owner”). Some CRC applicants (especially those in rural areas) might prefer to focus on a single site, but others should be given the choice to include other sites they might be collaborating with already as part of their resilience hubs network. No one size fits all for resilience hubs, both because they are by definition community-driven, and because their priorities will vary according to their extreme weather variability.

Case Study: Resilient Eastside Initiative

As mentioned above, there are many examples around the country of resilience hubs networks. The Resilient Eastside Initiative is one such model, a network of 12 community-led climate resilience hubs across Detroit's Eastside. As mentioned in the 2022 [Kresge Foundation report](#), the Eastside Community Network is the lead convener, coordinating resource distribution and emergency protocols during emergencies. Their detailed asset mapping, for example, visually represents the specific resources, services, and capacities available at *each* hub, which allows hub leaders to know exactly where to direct residents based on their needs—for example, if one hub runs out of water or cannot provide a specific service, they can immediately refer a resident to the nearest hub that can. During blue skies, they also coordinate shared learning and collective decision-making, including regular meetings and workshops, peer-to-peer- learning to facilitate skill shares and best practices.

2025 Los Angeles Fire Case Study

In Los Angeles, for example, Boyle Heights Arts Conservatory has been developed as one of the only “official” resilience hubs. In January 2025, however, the catastrophic Eaton and Palisades fires swept through communities far away from Boyle Heights. Multiple sites closer to these neighborhoods responded in emerging pop-up hubs by serving as emergency distribution sites for food, supplies and communication. Various agencies and organizations also leveraged their existing infrastructure and responded through varying levels of support. “The network approach certainly would have been helpful during the LA. fires,” noted Climate Resolve’s Legislative Director Enrique Huerta. Resource centers sprung up organically, with giant parking lots being used to drop off supplies. There was no centralization for communications.”

Addressing the Barriers

We understand the Strategic Growth Council’s concerns about the complexities of distributing funding to a number of organizations. We therefore recommend that one organization (whether it be the central site, governmental organization or NGO serving as the umbrella network) serve to coordinate the network structure and funds. A network could also potentially be governed by an existing collaborative, such as a city’s climate action coalition.



We also understand that infrastructure costs to retrofit sites for resilience are high, and concerns that funding is spread too thin among the addition of other sites. Again, we support providing applicants with the flexibility of deciding for themselves where they would like to spend the funds, whether for infrastructure for one site or a combination of programming and instruction across multiple sites.

Other Recommendations: We also would like to share other guideline recommendations which reflect our real-world experiences and commitment to equity and impact:

Technical Assistance: We applaud the SGC's commitment to Technical Assistance for CRC applicants. We recommend working with consultants to gather and curate the plethora of already available online resources for applicants and the general public, thanks to the growing number of resilience hubs around the country. Instead of applicants and grantees spending time and money to "reinvent the wheel" or spending valuable time researching where to find these documents, they could be housed on an existing platform for shared resources like the Vulnerabilities Platform (or on the CRC webpage). These online resources could range from case studies to how-to guides about community visioning, site assessments, neighborhood mapping and other planning strategies, to low- and higher-cost infrastructure for extreme heat.

With our recommended addition of the network strategy, we recommend special TA assistance as well as specific resources for networks, including links and case studies about Baltimore, Hawai'i's and other successful networks around the country. We also recommend specific sections about community-driven planning, low-cost projects, projects focused on social cohesion through resilience-based programming, examples of partnerships, and mutual aid programs designed for resilience hubs.

Other Guideline Recommendations

- Name and acknowledge social cohesion as an important outcome for CRC's, and provide resources, case studies and best practices with existing CRC's which achieve this outcome.
- Given the limited amount of dollars for this funding round, prioritize applicants which are developing existing sites, not building new ones.
- Prioritize applications with existing or new decarbonization infrastructure, to highlight the need for both mitigation and adaptation strategies.
- Allow the flexibility during Year II to add other sites and partners, if funding allows.

Recommendations for Funding Strategies:

Lastly, in continuing to recognize the limited funding for the CRC program, we recommend aligning other SGC programs with the CRC model. The Transformative Thriving Communities, extreme heat and urban greening are all Proposition 4 funding initiatives which could highlight CRC's and other place-based resilience work as programs worthy of funding. We also recommend that TAP providers and SGC staff prioritize not only helping grantees find other sources of funding, but uplift the value of community



resilience centers and place-based resilience with funders across the state. We would like to see doors open for a greater diversity of funding for CRC's, both smaller grants for programming and larger funds for infrastructure.

Please find the following attachment below: ARCCA's January 2023 comment letter submitted in response to the Community Resilience Centers (CRC) Program Round 1 Draft Guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft CRC Program Guidelines and provide comments. We greatly appreciate your time in considering our recommendations and look forward to working in partnership with SGC staff to support the successful implementation of the CRC Program. Please do not hesitate to reach out to admin@arccacalifornia.org if you would like to discuss any of our comments further or if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Darbi Berry".

Darbi Berry
San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kaeleigh Reynolds".

Kaeleigh Reynolds
**Sierra Climate Adaptation and Mitigation
Partnership**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin Coutts".

Erin Coutts, ARCCA 2025 Chair
**Los Angeles Regional Collaborative for Climate
Action & Sustainability**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Casandre Esteve".

Casandre Esteve
Bay Area Climate Adaptation Network

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Molly Oshun".

Molly Oshun
North Coast Resource Partnership

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Em Johnson".

Em Johnson, ARCCA 2025 Vice Chair
Central Coast Climate Collaborative

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gretchen James".

Gretchen James
Capital Region Climate Readiness Collaborative