

## Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Funding Q1 2024 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

<b>Subject</b>	TAC Funding Subcommittee Meeting 2024-Q1	<b>Date</b>	02/01/23
<b>Chair</b>	Shawn Crumlish, VRA	<b>Time – START/ADJOURN</b>	10:03am/11:20am
<b>Location</b>	Bank of America Building 3rd Floor Conference Room 1111 East Main St. Richmond, VA 23219 Zoom	<b>Scribe</b>	Sarah Jackson VCU CPP

### Subcommittee Members

Last Name	First Name	Agency / Title	Attended? [V = Virtual]
<b>Crumlish</b>	Shawn	Chair, Executive Director, VRA [Co-Chair] [Director of Program Management]	Y
<b>[D'Alema]</b>	[Peter]		[Y]
<b>Curtis</b>	William	Assistant Director of DHCD	Y
<b>Katchmark</b>	Whitney	Principal Water Resources Engineer, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission [Chief Resilience Officer]	
<b>[McFarlane]</b>	[Ben]		[V]
<b>Lawrence</b>	Lewis	Executive Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission [Deputy Director]	
<b>[Smith]</b>	[Curtis]		[Y]
<b>Burhop</b>	Kristin	Vice President for Public Policy and Legislative Affairs, Virginia Chamber of Commerce [Executive Vice President, Public Policy and Government Relations]	
<b>[Martin]</b>	[Keith]		
<b>Wells</b>	Matthew	Director, Virginia DCR [Deputy Director]	
<b>[Smith]</b>	[Andrew]		
<b>Coates</b>	Robert	Director, Grant Management and Recovery Division, Virginia Department of Emergency Management [Deputy Director Grants Management and Recovery]	V
<b>[Messmer]</b>	[Debra]		
<b>Swanson</b>	Chris	Environmental Division Director, Virginia Department of Transportation [Assistant Division Director]	
<b>[Berg]</b>	[Christopher]		[V]
<b>Green</b>	Jamie	Commissioner, Virginia Marine Resources Commission [Director of Coastal Policy, Restoration and Resilience] [Chief of Habitat Management]	
<b>[Peabody]</b>	[Rachael]		[V]
<b>[Owen]</b>	[Randy]		
<b>Hartley</b>	Troy	Director, Virginia Sea Grant	Y

**Committee Staff Support / Presenters**

Last Name	First Name	Agency / Title	Virtual
Dalon	Matt	Office of Resilience Planning, Program Manager Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y
Heaps-Pecaro	Carolyn	Office of Resilience Planning, Resilience Planner Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y
Jackson	Sarah	VCU-CPP	V
Wood	Wheeler	VCU-CPP	Y

Reference Links	
Item	Link
Meeting Agenda	<a href="https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q1-tac-funding-subcommittee-agenda.pdf">https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q1-tac-funding-subcommittee-agenda.pdf</a>
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slides	<a href="https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q1-funding-presentation-handouts2.pdf">https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q1-funding-presentation-handouts2.pdf</a>
Video Recording of the Meeting	<a href="https://youtu.be/B1uTHqTyaqk">https://youtu.be/B1uTHqTyaqk</a>

Agenda Item	Minutes
<b>1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions</b>	Chair Shawn Crumlish (VRA) called the meeting to order at 10:03am and Wheeler Wood (CPP) updated the roll based on those in attendance. Mr. Crumlish reviewed the agenda. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the agenda. Mr. Crumlish then presented the minutes from the Q4 Funding subcommittee meeting on November 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2023 for review and a motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes.
<b>2. DCR Presentation</b>	<p>Mr. Crumlish reviewed the TAC Funding subcommittee charge and objectives as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informing quantification of financial need for flood resilience to provide actionable data for state, regions, and localities and help direct appropriations for resilience.</li> <li>• Identify and examine financial tools and processes that are suited and/or needed to implement flood resilience.</li> <li>• Identify challenges/opportunities to implement financial tools.</li> <li>• Developing recommendations for future planning that includes what is needed moving forward in reference to funding and financing resilience efforts.</li> </ul> <p>Matt Dalon (DCR) presented the Funding Subcommittee’s efforts based on previous discussions and the subcommittee scope and objectives. These included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building the Financial Baseline</li> <li>• Making the Financial Case</li> <li>• Document Opportunities for State Support</li> <li>• Providing Guidance and Information</li> </ul>

	<p>Mr. Dalon then shared that the next full TAC meeting will be in March 2024. During this next quarter, the Committee will start focusing on future plans with recommendations to be included in the Phase II plan document. At that time, DCR will also have an update on the financial assessment that is underway. Mr. Dalon also shared that a consulting contractor will be onboard to facilitate discussion. He then discussed findings and key takeaways from DCR’s peer state review of resilience plans.</p>
<p><b>4. Old Business</b></p>	<p>Peer State Review of Resilience Plans Financial Selections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The “Flood Resilience Checklist for State Planners” prepared by the State Resilience Partnership was cited as a useful tool to better prepare states for flooding and sea level rise. Key highlights from this list included identifying dedicated funding, ensuring low-capacity communities can access state funding, highlighting co-benefits of projects, linking projects to accountable entities and funding sources, and using metrics tied to desired strategic outcomes rather than outputs.</li> <li>• Funding measures used in the Urban Institute Report looked at the relationship between Dillon’s Rule and Home Rule states. Across all reports, there was a large emphasis on grants and federal funds as a source of implementation. Peer states reviewed by DCR were selected due to each having flood-specific resilience plans.</li> <li>• Louisiana stood out as an implementation agency whereas, in Virginia, large-scale projects are implemented by localities and not at the state level. Louisiana has also secured large amounts of federal funding, totaling \$21.4 billion since 2007. Their resilience plan also included expected average annual loss due to flooding with no action taken. While Virginia will include this measure in Phase I, Louisiana also shows how the plan will reduce risk – e.g. <i>How are we buying down the risk?</i> Virginia could consider quantifying risk reduction in a similar way for Phase I. Additionally, Louisiana’s plan breaks down restoration projects vs. risk reduction projects in the planning budget.</li> <li>• Texas has successfully leveraged state dollars to implement resilience plans, with the Texas Coastal Resiliency Master Plan showing the state plan value and cost of flooding. The plan also includes a funding program design guide, similar to what is available through DCR’s Coastal Web Explorer. Compared to Virginia, the Texas plan includes more socioeconomic data in the report, moving beyond annualized losses and providing context for how flooding impacts at a larger scale. Virginia could also consider including more of these benefit metrics such as economic and environmental risks and impacts – e.g., <i>how does flooding affect the economy, environment, and people?</i></li> <li>• It was noted that Florida’s resilience plan has established and categorized their districts as management, drainage, flood control, and regional water supply districts. This approach may help with funding requests and could be considered by Virginia.</li> </ul> <p>For Virginia context, Mr. Dalon provided a brief overview of the CRMP Phase I measures. These included the Total Average Annualized Loss (combined residential,</p>

commercial, etc.) which is available by region. Without action, this estimated value exceeds \$5 million and includes the cost of local government projects and initiatives. It was noted that the Middle Peninsula represents the largest flood resilience efforts of all regions. A special recognition was given to the Department of Environmental Quality's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) program. This program has been in place the longest and has been critical in moving Planning District Commissions forward in their great work.

The presentation raised the following questions:

- Troy Hartley (Virginia Sea Grant) asked about the process for gathering methodologies. He stated it will be important to measure both direct and indirect impacts of flooding. He noted that Texas, Louisiana, and Florida all have different contexts due to their geography. Mr. Hartley asked if DCR had examined any state that has a similar incremental hazard, such as wildfires in the west. Mr. Dalon responded that it will be important to identify and examine financial tools and processes that are suited and/or needed to implement flood resilience and to identify challenges and opportunities in implementing financial tools.
- Curtis Smith (Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission) said he didn't see where the cost estimates for needs showed a breakdown of public vs. private property. He expressed that if Virginia is to expand needs assessment, capturing the needs of private property will be very important. Mr. Dalon replied that data will be available at the parcel level to figure out public vs. private property impacts and they will make sure to look at this. Mr. Smith added that there needs to be some thought as to what can be studied in the future – for example, the impacts of these losses as a result of natural hazards with regards to impacts on local government tax base. He noted that impacts on local property taxes and ability for local governments to provide services is another important measure to include. Mr. Dalon replied that DCR can cover this topic in the end-user survey. For the moment, the goal is to identify different use cases and what needs to be presented in the plan.
- Ben McFarlane (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission) asked about the level of effort required to implement methodologies found in the peer state plans and that data is currently available to be able to calculate them. He asked whether the information being put into the project database is capturing this information and commented that it doesn't seem like it does. He added that he'd also like to know more about which of these state plans have interest in shoreline projects as Virginia should be assessing high and low-water mean needs in its assessment. He said that Florida and Texas don't have the same local role in projects as Virginia does and should consider this in funding recommendations. Mr. Dalon replied that those impacts are harder to quantify but can be discussed more in the next quarter.

Mr. Dalon also shared that DCR is in negotiations with multiple vendors to update the Coastal Web Explorer, as well as supporting outreach and engagement.

Mr. Dalon presented a brief overview of key End User Survey results. He noted that while providing useful information to end users is important, a key focus will be how to gather information from stakeholders while DCR is not the main implementing group. He said the End User Survey will inform how to develop plan products but DCR wants to make more decisions collectively with the right information. The End User Survey was published before the end of last year and results have now been summarized. There were 49 respondents, mostly from local government. Mr. Dalon highlighted the following key findings:

- When asked what respondents could be using but are currently not, many said “capital investment decisions.”
- When asked what types of financing have been used successfully, many respondents said federal and state grants.
- Regarding barriers, many local level respondents noted limited capacity, especially grant writers.
- For the question “What could the state do to help address barriers”, training for elected officials and more resources for evaluating grant funding were cited. Mr. Dalon noted that the plan document will highlight successes and lessons learned around the region.

The presentation raised the following questions:

- Troy Hartley (Virginia Sea Grant) said that, in addition to securing project funding, the subcommittee should also be thinking about the types of cost for each funding source. For example, grants require localities to provide the money up front whereas other projects have long-term maintenance costs. He said that there are long term implications for some of these projects. Mr. Dalon noted that this concern was reflected in the survey comments and responses as well.
- Curtis Smith (Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission) said that it comes down to political will. He shared that the Middle Peninsula has built a modular solution to leverage dollars that could serve as a model for solving the capacity issue. Mr. Dalon says we need this detailed information to put in front of decision makers so other regions can have the tools to replicate this success.
- Ben McFarlane (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission) said it is important not to just focus on where funding is now but what projects are needed yet aren’t being funded. We must understand why the funding is not there – is it a matter of proposals not being viable or a lack of funding sources? Important for this group to know. Mr. Dalon replied that this will be in Phase II as part of the storytelling.

Mr. Dalon then shifted to discuss the Subcommittee Financial Needs Survey

- Less than half responses have been received. Subcommittee members who have not yet completed the survey are strongly encouraged to do so. Multiple members of an organization can complete the survey or coordinate one response. Average survey time is 10 minutes using a Likert scale format.

<p><b>5. New Business</b></p>	<p>Mr. Dalon briefly reviewed the next steps for the subcommittee’s recommendations. He presented the schedule and reminded members that only three meetings remained to discuss recommendations. DCR may be asking for information prior to a meeting.</p> <p>The following questions and comments were raised by subcommittee members:</p> <p>Ben McFarlane (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission) noted that something we don’t have in Virginia is a direct connection between the funding programs and the planning process. He reminded the subcommittee that currently there is no funding process tied to the CRMP. He recommended that this group consider addressing this gap in their proposed recommendations.</p> <p>Curtis Smith (Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission) agreed with Mr. McFarlane. He added that the importance of insurance and problems within the industry also need to be discussed as part of the recommendations. One example he gave was the Middle Peninsula’s previously submitted proposal for piloted parametric insurance. This project would have set premiums at an affordable level with the goal of providing lessons learned to the rest of the Commonwealth. DCR rejected this proposal as it scored among the lowest. He said he was not sure why this was. He also noted that while we spend lots of time bringing together leaders to come up with solutions, not connecting plans to funding can undermine the entire process.</p> <p>Troy Hartley (Virginia Sea Grant) said that as the subcommittee talks through risks and benefits, it is important to treat resilience as a multifaceted program. Moving into a silos is not a good idea. For example, Florida’s established districts do not allow for interconnectivity and would not work well for Virginia. Mr. Dalon says that these will be issues the new CRO can tackle.</p> <p>Another comment was made about the value of parametric insurance programs.</p> <p>Troy Hartley (Virginia Sea Grant) closed the conversation by stating that there is public investment in economic development activities, which is a return on investment. Mr. Dalon agreed that many people want more information on public private investments.</p>
<p><b>6. Action Items</b></p>	<p>Prior to the next meeting, Mr. Dalon asked subcommittee members complete the survey if they have not already done so. The next Q2 meeting can be virtual and will be scheduled for the end of April or early May.</p>
<p><b>5. Public Comment</b></p>	<p>No Public Comment was offered.</p>
<p><b>7. Adjourn</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 11:20am.</p>

The purpose of these minutes is to record and preserve, to the best of our ability, the major contributors and general topics covered during this meeting. Verbatim transcription is not the intent of this document. If you have any questions, please contact [flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov](mailto:flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov)