Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q2 Meeting Minutes

Subject	TAC Project Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting 2024-Q2	Date	05/17/2024
Chair	Marcus Thornton, Deputy Chief Data Officer Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	Time – START/ADJOURN	10:00am / 11:48am
Location	Virtual	Scribe	Sarah Jackson VCU CPP

Committee Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? V = Virtual
Chief Data Officer Deputy Chief Data Officer **Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)**	Ken Pfeil, Chair [Marcus Thornton], Co-Chair	V [V]
Coastal Planner **Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission**	Kellen Singleton	
Flood Planning Director **American Flood Coalition**	Jack Krolikowski	V
Executive Director [Director of Environment, Economic Development, & Housing] **Crater Planning District Commission (Crater PDC)**	Jay Ellington [Andrew Franzyshen]	[V]
Chief Resilience Officer [Principal Water Resources Engineer] **Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)**	Ben McFarlane [Whitney Katchmark]	V [V]
Environmental Planner **Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC)**	Brianna Heath	V
Planning Manager, Environment Program [Resilience Planner] **Plan RVA (PlanRVA)**	Sarah Stewart [Eli Podyma]	[V]
Director [Chief Deputy Director] **Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)**	Matt Wells [Andrew Smith]	
Environmental Division Director [Assistant Division Director] **Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)**	Chris Swanson [Christopher Berg]	V [V]
Commissioner [Director of Coastal Policy, Restoration and Resilience] [Chief of Habitat Management] **Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VRMC)**	Jamie Green [Rachel Peabody] [Randy Owen]	
Chief Development and Public Affairs Officer [Director of Environmental Policy and Compliance] **Virginia Port Authority (VPA)**	Cathie Vick [Scott Whitehurst]	[V]

Committee Members		
Title **[Alternate Title]** **Organization (Abbreviation)**	**Name** **[Alternate Name]**	**Attended?** **V = Virtual**
Executive Director [Policy Program Director] **Wetlands Watch (Wetlands Watch)**	Mary-Carson Stiff [Ian Blair]	[V]
Asst. Provost for Coastal Resilience/Director **W&M Virginia Coastal Resilience Collaborative (VCRC)**	Thomas Ruppert	V

Members of the Public		
Name	**Attended? V = Virtual**	**Speak During Public Comments?**
Kit Friedman (Crater PDC)	V	
Daniel Proctor	V	
Anna Salzberg	V	
Emily Steinhilber	V	
Grace Rogers	V	
Maria Mutec	V	
Jefferson Flood	V	Yes

TAC Staff and Consultants		
Name	**Title (Organization Abbreviation)**	**Attended? V = Virtual**
Matt Dalon	Resilience Planning Program Manager, DCR	V
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro	Resilience Planner, DCR	V
Arthur Kay	Resilience Planner, DCR	V
Sarah Jackson	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	V
Wheeler Wood	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	V
Brian Batten	Consultant, Dewberry	V
Caitlin Morris	Consultant, Launch	V
Linda Warren	Consultant, Launch	V
Cece Atkinson	Consultant, Launch	V
Rebekah Cazares	Consultant, Launch	V
Ashley Hall	Consultant, Stantec	V
Morgan Abbett	Consultant, Launch	V
Danielle Curri	Consultant, Stantec	V
Christina Hurley	Consultant, Stantec	V

Reference Links	
Item	**Link**
Meeting Agenda	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/20240517-tac-project-prioritization-subcommittee-agenda.pdf
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slides	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/20240517-proj-prioritization-meeting-materials.pdf
Video Recording of the Meeting	To be provided with final minutes.

Agenda Item	Minutes
1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions	Marcus Thornton (Co-Chair) called the meeting to order at 10:01 am. Wheeler Wood (CPP) called the roll. A motion was made to adopt the agenda and the motion was seconded. Another motion was made to adopt the meeting minutes, and multiple members seconded the motion.
2. Subcommittee Overview	Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro (DCR) reviewed the purpose of the subcommittee. She also reviewed the purpose of the CRMP which is to create a flood hazard exposure model, flood hazard impact assessment, planned resilience actions, and more. She stated that the subcommittee's goals are to inform the outreach plan for the CRMP and generate recommendations for future planning. Ms. Heaps-Pecaro noted that the subcommittee will begin developing recommendations during today's meeting. General Updates: DCR hired Stantec/Launch consultants to help with report design, production, and stakeholder engagement. Dewberry will continue to advise on flood hazard data. The AECOM Team is supporting the public outreach campaign for VA flood protection master plan and helping with outreach to underserved communities.
3. Old Business	Ms. Heaps-Pecaro providing the following updates on Old Business topics: a) Impact Assessment Updates • Reviewed impact assessment process: Dewberry has compiled a base asset database and methodology. • Final draft has been shared with the subcommittee; comments and feedback were received and reviewed by DCR. • Stantec is starting to work on data review and story development and will complete this in September. a) Planned Resilience Actions Analysis Update • The user portal to update projects and initiatives is live; working with Stantec to review summary of the data and provide data entry support through July. • Once data is in place, the analysis process will begin and be released in the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer. • Outline summary for Phase II plan: will include inventory summary and gaps and opportunities analysis – areas with no plans that are at high flood risk as well as opportunities for coordination based on geographic proximity and action type. Stantec initial review and Summary, Christina Hurley, • Started review of Coastal Resilience Web Explorer to understand trends in project data. Total 681 projects – 516 submitted during Phase I, plus an additional 165 approved submissions since Phase I.

- A breakdown of project types shows approximately 31% Capacity Initiatives, 43% Structural, 7% Natural and Nature-Based, Hybrid 16%, and Other 3% - e.g., high water mark programs, etc.
- When projects are broken into subtypes, the vast majority were identified as Drainage Improvement, Other, and Green Infrastructure.
- Users were asked to consider hazards addressed through the projects. Responses showed that approximately one third of projects addressed more than one coastal hazard, with the majority addressing stormwater flooding followed by storm surge flooding.
- For Purpose & Need initiatives, most responses indicated that initiatives are serving multiple purposes and needs. Community resilience, planning capacity, and adaptation options also received higher scores.
- Trends in cost information entered by users by project subtype showed the median price point per project type. The hybrid project subtypes tended to be more expensive (removed outliers in this category); structural projects and nature-based solutions were similar in anticipated cost; capacity initiatives were much lower than projected (this includes resilience plans and other planning activities).
- Looked at the distribution of projects by locality – highest concentration Hampton Roads/Eastern Shore area (197). Distribution by watershed shows a large concentration around the Chesapeake Bay and Eastern Shore areas. Responses showed a lower number of projects between the Chesapeake Bay and Richmond area. In some areas, the number of projects mirrors the PDC boundaries.
- Looked at High-Risk Flood Areas with low project and initiative counts (less than 270,000 acres). Areas were considered high flood risk if by 2080 there was a projected 10% or greater annual exceedance of flooding. Identified areas included areas along rivers such as the James, York, Rappahannock, & Potomac River.
- Despite having similar flood risk, Portsmouth had a lower number of projects than Norfolk; Downtown West Point, Gloucester, and Poquoson all had no projects identified despite being prone to flood risk.
- Opportunities exist for data improvement– want to address missing cost data, identify and remove duplicate projects, and improve spatial data quality.
- Opportunities for Additional analysis – Considering social vulnerabilities in assessment, potential opportunities for project coordination, and scale of benefits assessment.
- Next Steps will be to continue addressing comments from DRC and TAC. Stantec will finalize the data quality improvement plan while conducting technical assistance and data improvement.

Subcommittee Discussion:
- Thomas Ruppert (VCRC) asked how closely the project type numbers reflect reality or whether there are many unreported projects out there. Ms. Heaps-Pecaro replied they are still working to create a more accurate count. For example, the Middle Peninsula recorded "Fight the Flood" as a

	single project when it is actually several projects. She noted that DCR is aware of some of these gaps and is working to fill them through community engagement and outreach efforts.
	• Mr. Ruppert asked a follow-up question about the Cost by Project subtype. He asked whether this was of value as presented. If the project is not linked to impact, he said, then why are we comparing costs? It is difficult to know how to compare these. Ms. Hurley replied that this issue is something Stantec can look at in the future. Right now, they just presented overall trends. She said this can be considered during data quality improvement efforts as Stantec and DCR work with localities to make sure cost data is appropriate and comparative across a scale of benefits.
4. New Business	Recommendations Development
	• Ms. Heaps-Pecaro introduced the purpose of recommendations to be developed by this subcommittee. These include identifying opportunities to improve the mitigation of severe and repetitive flooding in the coastal region. She said DCR is aiming to have 3-5 recommendations per subcommittee that can be presented at the Quarterly TAC Meeting.
	• She reviewed the schedule for recommendations development, highlighting that the final recommendations will be voted on by subcommittee members in Q4 2024 Full TA. However, the recommendations will be presented to all members in advance of the final quarterly meeting. She briefly shared the relevant background materials and information that will help guide and inform recommendations
	○ Phase I TAC Recommendations
	○ End-User Survey Results
	○ Subcommittee Objectives
	Linda Warren (Launch! Consulting) introduced the Recommendation Development activities. She shared that she will present draft themes for individual brainstorming of recommendations under each theme before setting up breakout room discussions. A large group discussion of recommendations will follow the breakout room discussions. After this meeting, Launch! Consulting will send out a short survey to help prioritize the recommendation themes generated from this meeting.
	Ms. Warren said that recommendation topics should focus on: - Assessing the impacts of flooding - Inventorying and analyzing existing flooding resilience actions
	Draft Recommendation themes should include: - Driving Toward Outcomes - Supplying Actional Impact Data - Identifying Flood Resilience Needs
	Members were asked if these themes were accurate or complete. This question prompted the following responses: • Chris Swanson (VDOT) said that he liked the themes presented but wondered if there should be an order. He suggested that Supplying

Actionable Impact Data should inform the other two themes. Ms. Warren replied that hierarchy will come later when subcommittee members vote.

- Andrew Franzyshen (Crater PDC) said he is most concerned with implementation.
- Thomas Ruppert (VCRC) noted that survey feedback suggested that the scoring of projects places a premium on those that address only current flood risks. He asked whether we want to take into account temporal aspects when looking at recommendations and projects. Ms. Heaps-Pecaro asked Mr. Ruppert and others to keep this in mind during breakout group discussions.
- Brianna Heath (NNPDC) agreed with the recommendation themes listed.
- Ben McFarlane (HRPDC) said it was unclear who was doing the actions and who owned the outcomes. He added that these questions must be a central part of the conversation – *who do we expect to be using the data and how?*

Ms. Warren thanked the group for their feedback and reviewed additional questions to consider for each recommendation theme. She also provided example recommendations.

Subcommittee Discussion:

- Jack Krolikowski (AFC) said the group should ensure that recommendations balance process metrics with outcomes.
- Marcus Thornton (Co-Chair, ODGA) reminded the group about the importance of key stakeholder buy-in.
- Eli Podyma (Plan RVA) agreed that data must be accessible in a way that localities can best implement recommendations.
- Thomas Ruppert (VCRC) emphasized the need to account for temporal aspects to be clear of the period and scale of a particular project that is being evaluated.
- Chris Swanson (VDOT) said that local and state decision-making should also drive the need; if there is a need that doesn't necessarily mean resources have to be provided it should be up to the desires of the local communities.
- Scott Whitehurst (Port of VA) said the themes seem to align well with what subcommittees have discussed.
- Whitney Katchmark (HRPDC) – should look at this as capacity building being different from construction projects.
- Ian Blair (Wetlands Watch) said he would like to see how the social vulnerability index can be included in needs.

Ms. Warren provided additional guidance on forming recommendations and then assigned subcommittee members and members of the public to breakout rooms by theme. Members returned from breakout rooms after 35 minutes to share their discussions and proposed recommendations.

Full list of draft recommendations discussion items:
Driving Toward Outcomes:

- Balance PROCESS metrics with OUTCOME metrics – Design outcomes and how they are determined.
- Take temporal aspects into account when developing clear plan purpose and goals. Clarify what the timespan is, expected to help short-term, mid-term, long-term? And what does that do to our costs and investments long-term?
- Frequency, magnitude – Strategize with tracking
- Use the CFPF to implement the CRMP
- Develop an initial needs assessment like wastewater or Ag and a process to annually update it – an element of the plan.
- Include mention of path-dependency as an issue that can cause future challenges in adaptation due to actions taken right now to address current problems. As an example, think of the so called "levee effect" whereby research has demonstrated that in many instances, development of structural protections has often led to greater future losses in "protected" areas when the infrastructure is overwhelmed. This results because the perceived safety offered by infrastructure increases development and investment, all of which suffers when the infrastructure is overwhelmed. And infrastructure is often overwhelmed as we typically build, at most, to a 1% annual chance event, which itself is an arbitrary standard, not a safety standard.
- In my view, the scale of the CRMP is too large to have a useful implementation plan, unless that plan is focused on policy or programmatic changes. The level of geography at which on-the-ground implementation will be done is mostly within individual jurisdictions. It's unclear how the CRMP supports that work.
- having a few detailed alternatives, possibly a low-cost, med-cost, and high-cost alternative so localities aren't being bombarded with expensive and int ensive projects that they need to do without the capacity and funding to do them. Recognizing that even a small step is a step makes seeking outcomes a lot less overwhelming for our more stressed localities.
- It's still problematic that the CRMP and the Community Flood Preparedness Fund are not directly connected. Using the CFPF to implement the CRMP or the VFPMP would go a long way towards getting buy-in.

Supplying Actionable Impact Data
- Survey stakeholders to learn what they consider critical data to inform decision-making, and what data is missing.
- Continue state inter-agency coordination efforts aimed at the development, maintenance, and enhancement of accessible region-wide asset datasets for non-sensitive data, and to ensure that agencies aren't duplicating efforts.
- Create an intuitive system to index, document, search, and analyze data using FAIR (Findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable) principles across agencies (https://internetofwater.org/valuing-data/making-public-data-fair/)

- Expand availability and use of real-time data (e.g. real-time flooding) to assist in response. Increase use of real data instead of projections and historic data.
- Create a standard going forward that is interoperable to ensure high-quality data that can be used by various agencies in the future. Potentially rework older data that is less usable.
- Utilize/survey flood management practice data to supplement flood hazard data for a full picture of flood risk and vulnerability
- Create a one-stop-shop platform to host data for all state agencies, starting with coastal resilience data
- Consider forward-looking/future-conditions data for all components of flood risk (hazard, exposure, vulnerability). Examples include SLR, precipitation frequency (Atlas 15, MARISA), projected growth, demographic changes, etc.
- Have a standard to ensure all ingested data has a process for curation, de-identification, de-duplication, and a safe and secure way to identify characteristics about all data elements. This will allow everyone to know that data has been contributed and available.
- Map data needs across the entire "supply chain". (i.e. program-wide KPIs to vulnerability assessment data to project scoring criteria) and come up with plan to fill any gaps.
- Need programs to encourage coordination and cost savings for data collection. Ex. real-time flood data from sensors

Identifying Flood Resilience Needs
- If there is no planned actions, establish state staff/consultant team program to reach out to local government to identify if they are not interested in actions or what factors (staff, funding) would support developing actions.
- Coordinate with local governments to ID flood prone areas, based on above talk to residents, design to address concerns and other stakeholders.
- Include section in final report(s) discussing outliers in responses (disproportionately high or low) and plans to address in subsequent iterations.
- Provide support to localities on developing locally specific weighting for prioritization of implementing projects utilizing CRMP data.
- Establish criteria that is multi-faceted and addresses both vulnerability and solutions that identify the greatest needs.
- Analyze historic trends of flooding to look for recent increases in flooding events and damage. This will help to identify what areas are more likely to have more immediate increased impacts with climate change.
- Integrate criteria for weighting of actions that balances need/desire for action on today's impacts with evaluation of the feasibility of long-term viability of an area. Determining "long-term viability" is clearly not an objective process, but the very difficulty of engaging in such a discussion is to engage community and thus provide learning opportunities.

	- Consider compounding hazards like SLR and coastal surge to project and estimate future conditions to identify flood resilience needs. b) Subcommittee Discussion - Morgan Abbett (Launch! Consulting) shared the Supplying Actionable Impact Data group's draft recommendations list. No members offered comment. - Rebekah Cazares (Launch! Consulting) shared the draft recommendations list from the Identifying Flood Resilience group. She highlighted item 3c) Include a section in the final report(s) discussing outliers in responses (disproportionately high or low) and plans to address them in subsequent iterations. - Cece Atkinson (Launch! Consulting) shared the Driving Towards Outcomes group's draft recommendations list. She highlighted temporal aspects and items related to project cost and overall investment as an important discussion theme. Ms. Warren thanked the group for their participation and shared that Launch! Consulting will compile these draft recommendations into a survey. Once the survey is shared with the group, subcommittee members will be asked to select the 10 "most important" draft recommendations. This will help prioritize recommendations. Launch! Consulting will plan to discuss the survey results and continue to refine recommendations during the next quarterly subcommittee meeting.
5. Public Comment	Jeff Flood, CZM, provided updates on Virginia CZM. - FY23 project this past oct to look at existing waterfront sites to do resilience assessment – looking at flood risk, sea level rise, broadband, infrastructure – input from northern neck, Hampton, eastern shore, led by the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission. Will be completed in December. - Bi-partisan infrastructure law projects are underway - CZM is currently applying for funds to do resilience work and working with the Coastal Policy Team to secure competitive funding. In the future, CZM is looking at being able to work with owners and applicants to submit.
6. Action Items	Ms. Heaps-Pecaro thanked everyone for their participation. Time was offered for questions from members. No questions were asked. She summarized the following meeting Action Items: - Draft recommendations based on break-out group work and send out surveys (Launch! Consulting) - Schedule Q3 Subcommittee meeting (DCR) The next TAC Quarterly will be held virtually on June 18th

7. Adjourn	Marcus Thornton thanked everyone for their participation, discussion, and collaboration around recommendations before adjourning the meeting.

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