

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Subject	TAC 2024 Q2 Meeting	Date	06/18/2024
Chair	DCR Director Matt Wells	Time – START/ADJOURN	9:00am-11:20am
Location	Virtual	Scribe	Addie Alexander (CPP)

TAC Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? Y = Virtual
Coastal Planner Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission (A-NPDC)	Kellen Singleton	
Flood Planning Director American Flood Coalition (AFC)	Jack Krolikowski	Y
Chief Chickahominy Indian Tribe	Chief Stephen Adkins	
Chief Chickahominy Tribe Eastern Division	Chief Gerald A. Stewart	
Executive Director [Director of Environment, Economic Development, & Housing] Crater Planning District Commission (Crater PDC)	Jay Ellington [Andrew Franzysen]	[Y]
Executive Director Fort Monroe Authority	Glen Oder	Y
Executive Director [Deputy Director] George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC)	Charles P. Boyles, II [Kate Gibson]	
Chief Resilience Officer [Principal Water Resources Engineer] Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)	Ben McFarlane [Whitney Katchmark]	[Y]
Executive Director [Deputy Director] Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission (MPPDC)	Lewis L. Lawrence, III [Curtis Smith]	Y [Y]
Chief Monacan Indian Nation	Chief Kenneth Branham	
Environmental Program Coordinator Nansemond Indian Nation	Cameron Bruce	
Environmental Planner Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC)	Brianna Heath	Y
Director of Environment and Resiliency Planning [Coastal Zone Program Manager] Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC)	Norm Goulet [Rebecca Murphy]	
Chief Data Officer Deputy Chief Data Officer Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	Ken Pfeil [Marcus Thornton]	[Y]

TAC Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? Y = Virtual
Chief Diversity, Opportunity, and Inclusion Officer [Deputy Chief Diversity Officer] Office of Diversity, Opportunity and Inclusion (ODOI)	Martin Brown [Michael Perez]	[Y]
Director of the Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience [Director of Applied Projects, CCRFR] Old Dominion University – Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience (ODU ICAR)	Dr. Jessica Whitehead [Carol Considine]	Y [Y]
Chief Pamunkey Indian Tribe	Chief Robert Gray	
Planning Manager, Environment Program [Resilience Planner] PlanRVA	Sarah Stewart [Eli Podyma]	[Y]
Chief Rappahannock Indian Tribe	Chief G Anne Richardson	
Secretary and Chief Resilience Officer Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources (SNHR)	Travis Voyles	Y
Director, Volgenau Virginia Coastal Reserve The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Jill Bieri	
Commander Deputy Chief, Water Resources Division U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District (USACE)	Colonel Brian P. Hallberg [Greggory Williams]	[Y]
Director of the Environmental Institute University of Virginia, Environmental Institute (UVA – EI)	Dr. Karen McGlathery	
Tribal Administrator Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe	Reggie Tupponce	
Executive Vice President, Public Policy and Government Relations [Vice President for Public Policy and Legislative Affairs] Virginia Chamber of Commerce	Keith Martin [Kristin Burhop] [Ethan Betterton]	[Y] [Y]
Director Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)	Matthew Wells	[Y]
Director, Grant Management and Recovery Division [State Hazard Mitigation Officer] Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM)	Robert Coates [Debra Messmer]	Y
Chief Deputy [Manager of the Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection] Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	Alexander Samms [Dave Davis]	Y
Assistant Director Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)	William Curtis Lee Hutchinson	[Y]

TAC Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? Y = Virtual
Environmental Division Director [Assistant Division Director] Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	Chris Swanson [Christopher Berg]	[Y]
Senior Vice President Governmental Relations [Legislative Specialist, Governmental Relations] Virginia Farm Bureau (VAFB)	Martha Moore [Katelyn Rose Jordan]	[Y]
Associate Dean for Research and Advisory Services [Associate Director for Advisory Services] [Marine Scientist Supervisor] Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS)	Dr. Mark Luckenbach [Lyle Varnell] [Molly Mitchell]	Y [Y]
President & CEO Virginia Manufacturers Association (VMA)	Brett Vassey	
Commissioner [Director of Coastal Policy, Restoration and Resilience] [Chief of Habitat Management] [Environmental Specialist] Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC)	Jamie Green [Rachael Peabody] [Randy Owen] [Khadijah Payne]	Y [Y] [Y]
[Director of Environmental Policy and Compliance] Virginia Port Authority (VPA)	[Scott Whitehurst]	[Y]
Executive Director [Director of Program Management] Virginia Resources Authority (VRA)	Shawn Crumlish [Peter D'Alema]	Y [Y]
Director Virginia Sea Grant	Dr. Troy Hartley	Y
Director of the Center for Coastal Studies Virginia Tech – Center for Coastal Studies (VT – CCS)	Dr. Wendy Stout	Y
Acting Director Virginia Transportation Research Council (VTRC)	G. Michael Fitch, Ph.D.	[Y]
Executive Director [Policy Program Director] Wetlands Watch	Mary-Carson Stiff [Ian Blair]	[Y]
Asst. Provost for Coastal Resilience/Director W&M Virginia Coastal Resilience Collaborative (VCRC)	Thomas Ruppert	Y

TAC Advisors		
Name	Title Organization (Abbreviation)	Attended? Y = Virtual
Joseph Howell	Regional Community Plans & Liaison Officer Navy Region Mid-Atlantic (Navy)	Y

TAC Staff		
Name	Title (Organization Abbreviation)	Attended? Y = Virtual
Andrew Smith	Chief Deputy Director, DCR	Y
Darryl Glover	Deputy Agency Director of DSFPM/SWC, DCR	Y
Matt Dalon	Resilience Planning Program Manager, DCR	Y
Arthur Kay	Lead Mapping & Data Analyst, DCR	Y
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro	Resilience Planning Program Coordinator, DCR	Y
Wheeler Wood	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	Y
Linda Warren	Consultant, Launch! Consulting	Y
Rebekah Cazares	Consultant, Launch! Consulting	Y
Ashley Hall	Consultant, Stantec	Y
Daniel Proctor	Consultant, Stantec	Y

Members Of The Public Requesting To Speak During Public Comments
Name
None

Reference Links	
Item	Link
Meeting Agenda	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q2-tac-agenda.pdf
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slide	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q2-tac-handouts.pdf
Video Recording of the Meeting	
Additional Links:	

Agenda Item	Minutes
<p>1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Introductions</p>	<p>Director Matt Wells (DCR) started the call at 9:00 a.m. and roll was taken by having people post their names and organizations in the chat.</p> <p>Secretary Travis Voyles officially started the meeting and announced that this will be the last meeting where the CRO and Secretary are in the lead. According to Delegate Hernandez’s HB1458 from the previous General Assembly session, the management of the TAC will formally transition to DCR starting in the new fiscal year.</p> <p>Mat Wells asked that anyone who wants to speak use the chat or raise hand feature.</p>
<p>2. Adoption of Meeting Agenda</p>	<p>Director Wells (DCR) asked members to move to adopt the agenda. Mark Luckenbach (VIMS) moved to adopt the agenda and Peter D’Alema (VRA) and Troy Hartley (Virginia Sea Grant) seconded it and all members approved by voice vote.</p>
<p>3. Adoption of Meeting Minutes from March 13th, 2024</p>	<p>Director Wells then asked about the adoption of the minutes. Lewie Lawrence (MPPDC) moved to adopt the minutes. Andrew Franzysen (Crater PDC) seconded and all members approved by voice vote.</p>
<p>4. Reports from DCR</p>	<p>Matt Dalon (DCR) announced a third member of the DCR Office of Resilience Planning, Arthur Kay, will be helping with planning, data management, and data sharing.</p> <p>Director Wells shared a legislative update, focused on the new bill related to the Chief Resilience Officer (CRO) position (HB 1458). Outcomes of the bill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Restructures the Chief Resilience Officer (CRO) position into a broader resilience role. CRO will serve as “the hub” of a “hub and spoke model” to better coordinate the existing roles of the different agencies working on resilience ● Position will fall under the Secretary of Natural Resources ● Funding for the position was included in the final budget, along with two additional personnel to establish an Office of Commonwealth Resilience ● DCR will be part of an interagency resilience management team with the goal of agencies talking to each other ● Bill will sunset the TAC next February, after the CRMP is complete, and establish a statewide flood resilience advisory committee made up of state agencies and stakeholders ● DCR will take ownership of the coastal and statewide TACs ● Bill also codifies administrative transparency initiatives related to the community flood preparedness fund and the resilient Virginia revolving fund

Matt Dalon (DCR) shared updates on consulting teams. They are currently contracting with 4 consulting teams, supporting different efforts. The following firms are working on coastal resilience:

- Dewberry
 - helping with the web explorer and data
- Stantec/ Launch! Team
 - leading discussions on recommendations
 - responsible for final report design and production, including data review
- AECOM
 - public outreach, especially to underserved communities
 - they will be doing all of the outreach for the coastal and statewide plan, for the sake of consistent public-facing products

Matt Dalon further shared an update on the progress of the CRMP with the key components being

- What type of flooding is relevant?
- Where is the flooding?
- What are the planned resilience actions?
- What are the financial needs?
- What are the TAC recommendations?

He noted these will be shared through the plan and the web explorer

- The CRMP is due by the end of the calendar year. Matt Dalon and Carolyn (DCR) shared the following updates on plan progress:
 - Major Sources of Flooding
 - improvement from Phase I; Phase II includes pluvial and fluvial flooding for the first time. This was identified as a gap in Phase I.
 - all of those sources of flooding are combined into planning scenarios across two time horizons and two risk tolerances.
 - pluvial flood hazard data has been modeled throughout the region, and are available for download through the Open Data Portal and can be applied to other planning efforts.
 - DCR is creating a use case guide, a living document/guide and can be added to as additional applications for the data become clear.
 - Impact Assessment
 - Dewberry is currently running the assessment, alongside Stantec who will take the outputs to summarize and add narrative
 - the project prioritization subcommittee and TAC will receive updates at their next meeting
 - Financial Information Included in the Plan

- Phase II will include average annualized loss, which will include pluvial flooding, but not fluvial due to data limitations
- ecosystem loss will also be included, including what the ecosystem benefit losses will be
- regional economic impacts
- local real estate tax impacts
- contextual information, like local economic capacities based on local stress indices
- larger ecosystem service baseline benefits
- planned resilience actions, and dollar figures for these projects
- Additional Updates for Phase II
 - DCR is updating the funding database
 - DCR is mapping focal areas that exist through funding opportunities
 - Rachael (VMRC) asked about the changing values of ecosystems, and the importance of looking at change, not just loss because as ecosystems change, they also confer new benefits.
- Planned Resilience Actions Analysis
 - DCR is working with Stantec to decide where to focus on data quality improvements and is now working on data improvements, including adding more data
 - 681 entries in the Web Explorer
 - more than three-quarters of the projects there are from Phase I
 - PDCs and local governments made a majority of the submissions, so getting more information from state agencies and universities is a goal
 - a majority of projects address stormwater flooding
 - most initiatives have multiple purposes. Funding capacity, ecosystem resilience, and economic resilience are the least common.
 - data improvements underway:
 - ensure that data is complete
 - consolidating duplicates
 - expand information on cost to summarize the financial need
 - many projects are currently designated “other;” reclassify if possible
 - improve the accuracy of spatial and benefit information
- Stakeholder Outreach and Engagement
 - Locality Meetings
 - DCR has hosted workshops with high-risk and lower-engagement localities to understand

	<p>challenges and current projects. Two meetings are complete and two more are planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Community Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DCR has identified areas based on work with AECOM, focused on areas that meet CFPF’s definition of “underserved” and are also at greatest flood risk. For those areas, they then looked at which ones have extensive flood resilience engagement underway, and based outreach methods on that (either a partner approach or by reaching out to CBOs in areas that don’t already have extensive flood resilience engagement). ● Lewie (MPPDC) suggested that DCR talk with PDCs in rural communities about where low-income communities are. The Census Tract level misses a lot of low-income areas that are masked by wealthier people living on the water. Census Block Group or zip code could be used instead to get a more accurate picture. ● It was asked which FEMA metrics were used <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carolyn responded that they used coastal flooding, as well as losses based on a few factors; she can send the exact methodology in writing. ● Another TAC member emphasized what Lewie brought up, and shared skepticism of NRI data, and seconded the idea of mapping at the zip code level. ● Molly (VIMS) shared that in the Northern Neck they worked with localities to identify the communities that need the most help, and suggested that as an approach. ● DCR is interested in feedback on the “working list of community meetings” if members have insights on specific areas ■ Public Outreach Campaign with AECOM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The goal is to reach the general public through public webinars, the flood story map, and public comment period <p>The meeting was opened to TAC members for discussion on the material presented and no members offered additional feedback.</p>
<p>5. Reports from TAC Subcommittees</p>	<p>Linda Warren (Launch!) shared an update on the subcommittee recommendations development process. The recommendations can be actions to implement in the next 4 years or planning process improvements. The audience could be state government, PDCs, local governments, and/or others. Each recommendation is an action and should identify the intended audience in general terms.</p>

This has been a collaborative process during subcommittee meetings. This is the plan to create recommendations:

- Q2: initial brainstorms and review overlaps and gaps
- Q3: prioritize and revise
- Q4: finalize and vote by subcommittees and the entire TAC

In May, subcommittees created “raw recommendations,” which the Launch! team categorized into themes to help organize people’s thoughts.

- Research, Data, and Innovation Subcommittee
 - Topic areas included determining how to support local efforts, how to define success, and how to improve future collaboration
- Project Prioritization Subcommittee
 - Topic areas included driving towards outcomes (e.g. looking long-term, developing metrics), supplying actionable impact data (e.g. coordinating within agencies, utilizing the information we have), and identifying flood resilience needs (e.g. developing a need assessment, and supporting localities to identify their needs).
- Funding Subcommittee
 - Common topic areas included tracking real estate, leveraging financial data, establishing flood resilience metrics, making the financial case, and identifying impacts on private and public property. Documenting opportunities for state support was another major theme.
- Outreach and Coordination Subcommittee
 - 4 common topic areas, with some overlap, like identifying funding opportunities, coordinating activities, implementing meaningful engagement, and building trust and relationships.

Linda then asked all members discuss areas of overlap and which ones should be assigned to another subcommittee.

- Starting with the RDI committee slide, Jess (ICAR), a member of the research subcommittee responded that A.1.2 and A.3.2. need to stay in the RDI subcommittee. They are different than the outreach approach because they involve systematically researching and drawing conclusions. Outreach, at least in the way it's been done so far, involves pushing information out, rather than establishing a two-way exchange. Systematic documentation is critically needed to feed up nationally.
 - Linda reiterated that there is a different approach to this goal from a research perspective, instead of through outreach
 - Mark (VIMS) agrees that this should stay within RDI, particularly A.1.2. as lessons learned from other states need to be a deep dive
 - Jess (ICAR) added that there is a need for a standard of co-production of research to ensure that research is not conducted that never results in a use case. For example, the Nature Based

	<p>Design Forum said that the tools they've developed through their research are not being used in decision-making, which is a huge missed opportunity. We need to set a national standard to ensure that the research actually gets used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Thomas (VCRC) added that he agrees with Jess, though he thinks it could be an Outreach and Coordination Committee goal, and that the subcommittees should be working together. We haven't historically done a good job of integrating outreach and research.○ Troy (Virginia Sea Grant) observed that the co-production of knowledge and community engagement is bubbling up in the RDI recommendations, and asked if this proposal from Launch! would mean adding 3 recommendations to the O&C committee, when they have their own goals, and can only have around 5.○ Linda clarified that the recommendation would be "A" so just 1 rather than 3.○ Lewie (MPPDC) shared that there are things that need to be researched that aren't being researched because of a lack of funding.○ Jess (ICAR) added that moving toward research that gets used includes a social science, scientific, and service component. <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Linda suggested that instead of thinking about this conversation as moving goals from one subcommittee to another, a better question could be, where is there overlap that necessitates coordination between two or more subcommittees?● A member brought up the processes the group is following where one component is finishing the recommendations and plan by December when the implementation begins. He suggested not worrying about which bin to put these recommendations in at this point of the process● Matt (DCR) shared that we have over 120 discrete recommendations. These will not disappear; they remain part of the public record. Now the work is to figure out which recommendations are most impactful and urgent. So the goal here is to get to 3-5 most critical goals per subcommittee. Based on limited time, it could be useful to assign topics to one subcommittee or another, so both subcommittees aren't discussing similar topics. members are also welcome to attend other subcommittee meetings to help develop the recommendations they are most interested in.● Matt Wells (DCR) reiterated that need narrow the list down to a manageable number of recommendations by the end of the year (only 2 more meetings). If the recommendations are too numerous, they may not be actionable.● Troy summarized that now we are trying to create thematic lists and categorize them; it may be worth keeping the whole list so that researchers
--	--

	<p>can use these points to justify their work to a funder. Perhaps the group could have recommendation themes and also a more detailed list of recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Linda clarified that right now they are using topic areas, but the report will include specific recommendations, rather than broad themes.● Jess suggested that plans that are successful in other states, that are getting executed, are states where someone is a clearly-identified champion. If these are themes, multiple entities may need to be responsible. Can we clarify who will be responsible for implementing these recommendations?● Linda replied that that can be part of this process. Then she asked everyone to look at the slides to respond and asked about A.2.6 specifically.● Mark responded that he is neutral on this point, but again, this ties to funding. No other members of the RDI committee had strong feelings about that, so Linda shared it's possible for that to move to the project prioritization subcommittee.● Next the group looked at the "Areas of Overlap" slide for the Project Prioritization subcommittee:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ian (Wetlands Watch) shared that this committee will need to connect with the funding subcommittee○ Whitney (HRPDC) said she thinks these could be moved, but it depends on what the funding group can take on given the goal of 3-5 recommendations per group○ Lewie (MPPD) shared that this process gets more and more complicated because none of these committees can implement anything○ A member asked if the Outreach and Coordination committee is interested in taking that on.<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Matt Dalon added that these are areas of overlap; so if there is a suggestion to move a topic, it's because both committees brought up this point and the goal is to group them under one subcommittee or another.■ A member asked that facilitators attend to the potential loss of the original intent of the recommendation if it moves to another subcommittee.● For the funding slide, there is a suggestion to move several goals to the Project Prioritization Committee, and another to the Outreach and Coordination committee● For outreach and coordination, two goals could move to the Funding Committee.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Linda shared that Launch! plans to share a survey with the TAC to prioritize raw recommendations within each subcommittee. From there, Launch! will refine recommendations to have a starting point for the Q3 meetings. They will continue sharing all recommendations with everyone, as they have done for this meeting.
<p><i>Meeting Break</i></p>	<p>Matt Dalon resumed the meeting after 10 minutes and asked folks to share their thoughts. He mentioned that each subcommittee was also sent their list of recommendations, and had the opportunity to add, edit, or revise recommendations from their subcommittee.</p>
<p>6. New Business</p>	<p>Matt Dalon provided a CRMP Plan Products update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● plan document (PDF): a top-level document that will be of similar size if not shorter than the Phase I document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the purpose is to present information on problems and solutions as a compelling story <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ this includes highlighting existing efforts ○ audiences include PDCs, localities, and state agencies, the primary actors for implementation ○ desired results are to increase coordination across levels of government and implement resilience projects and initiatives. This includes increasing political will and educating decision-makers. ○ Key elements were reviewed earlier, which will be included in the plan along with recommendations. ○ organization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ executive summary and intro upfront ■ the biggest shift is splitting the plan into a statewide section and a section with regional profiles. Matt reviewed more in detail what these sections will cover. ○ Brianna (NNPDC) shared that this flow makes sense ○ Another member shared that areas in PDCs that aren't included as part of flood impact should be added ○ Matt responded that the emphasis is on the entire coastal region, and includes all aspects of the region through pluvial and fluvial flooding, so all localities within relevant PDCs will be included. Impacts will be summarized at the town level. ○ Lewie (MPPDC) suggested that this plan leans into health and public well-being, which gets at the core of why local government exists. ○ Another member asked if flood response activities will be reported to connect back to hazard mitigation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Matt Dalon replied that this will be linked to what’s in the projects and initiatives database; this question gets to understanding capacities and capabilities. That data isn’t readily available at scale, though that is an identified need that DCR will attempt to pull in where possible. ● web explorer: more information and detail at different scales, complementary to the plan document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ more flexibility because users can pan to different areas ○ key purpose is to share and highlight data that we have available for planning purposes. ○ another goal is to understand what other groups have done as well as help coordinate aligned efforts going on in different places ○ supporting data-informed decision-making ○ includes the same elements as the PDF plan, but will include mapped and graphical data. Working to improve the user experience. ○ scalable areas of interest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ex. mapping will be possible at the town and watershed level, which can help with regional collaboration ● data: this won't be published but will be available for use by others <p>TAC and subcommittee schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Matt Dalon shared the remaining subcommittee and full TAC meetings. In-person attendance is highly encouraged, though remote participation is allowed. If you aren’t able to attend in person but plan to attend virtually, notify the chair and DCR staff at least a week in advance so the facilitation process can be adjusted. <p>TAC member discussion and updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sean (VRA) shared that the Board of Directors authorized a small line of credit program that will allow PDCs or towns a small amount of cash flow relief, though it does bear interest. This will be available on a first come first serve basis, and there is about \$5 million available, with lines of credit limited to \$500,000. Details are available on VRA’s website. This is intended to address an issue that the finding subcommittee has discussed: implementation of federal funding is difficult for small government entities when they have to wait for reimbursement because they have to shoulder the cost of the up-front payments.
<p>7. Public Comment</p>	<p>No public comment</p>
<p>8. Adjourn</p>	<p>Members voted to adjourn and Matt Dalon (DCR) closed the meeting at 11:20am.</p>

Voting Records

Adoption of Agenda: Motion: Mark Luckenbach. Second: Peter D’Alema and Troy Hartley. Vote: All in favor, None opposed

Adoption of Minutes from Q1 TAC Meeting: Motion: Lewie Lawrence. Second: Andrew Franzysen. Vote: All in favor, None opposed

Adjournment: Motion: Troy Hartley. Second: multiple members. Vote: All in favor, None opposed

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

DRAFT