Subject	TAC Project Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting 2024-Q3	Date	08/07/2024
Chair	Marcus Thornton (co-chair), Deputy Chief Data Officer	Time – 1:00pm /	
	Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	START/ADJOURN	2:49pm
Location	Training Room 7325	Scribe	Addie
	Beaufont Springs Drive		Alexander
	Richmond, VA 23225		VCU CPP

Committee Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? Y = In Person V = Virtual
Chief Data Officer [Deputy Chief Data Officer] Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	Ken Pfeil, Chair [Marcus Thornton], Co- Chair	[Y]
Coastal Planner Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission	Kellen Singleton	Y
Flood Planning Director [Strategy Program Analyst] American Flood Coalition	Jack Krolikowski [Catie Malone]	[V]
Executive Director [Director of Environment, Economic Development, & Housing] [Environmental / Resilience Planner] Crater Planning District Commission (Crater PDC)	Jay Ellington [Andrew Franzyshen] [Kit Friedman]	[Y]
Chief Resilience Officer [Principal Water Resources Engineer] Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)	Ben McFarlane [Whitney Katchmark]	Y
Environmental Planner Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC)	Brianna Heath	[V]
Planning Manager, Environment Program [Resilience Planner] Plan RVA (PlanRVA)	Sarah Stewart [Eli Podyma]	[Y]
Director [Chief Deputy Director] Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)	Matt Wells [Andrew Smith]	[Y]
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]	[V]

Committee Members		
Title [Alternate Title]  Organization (Abbreviation)  [Alternate Name]		Attended? Y = In Person V = Virtual
[Director of Environmental Policy and Compliance] Virginia Port Authority (VPA)	[Scott Whitehurst]	[V]
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	

Members of the Public		
Name	Attended? Y = Virtual	Speak During Public Comments?
M. Moore	V	
Adam Gold	V	
Grace Rogers	V	Y

TAC Staff/Consultants		
Name	Title (Organization Abbreviation)	Attended? Y = In Person / V = Virtual
Will Isenberg	Environmental Specialist II, Virginia DEQ	Υ
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro	Resilience Planning Program Coordinator, DCR	Υ
Arthur Kay	Lead Mapping & Data Analyst, DCR	Υ
Adelaide Alexander	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	V
Wheeler Wood	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	Υ
Linda Warren	Consultant, Launch	Υ
Cece Atkinson	Consultant, Launch	V
Rebekah Cazares	Consultant, Launch	Υ
Ezra Warren	Consultant, Launch	V
Myra Woerdeman	Consultant, Launch	V
Sidney Huffman	Consultant, Launch	Υ

Reference Links		
Item	Link	
Meeting Agenda	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/20240807-tac-	
	project-prioritization-subcommittee-agenda.pdf	
Meeting Handouts/Presentation	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/20240807-pp-	
Slides	meeting-handouts.pdf	
Video Recording of the Meeting	A link to the recording will be provided with the final minutes.	

Δσ	Agenda Item Minutes		
	Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions	Subcommittee Chair Marcus Thornton (ODGA) called the meeting to order at 1pm and Wheeler Wood (CPP) called the roll.	
2.	Adoption of agenda and Q2 meeting minutes	It was moved to adopt the minutes and agenda, seconded by Ben McFarlane (HRPDC) and Kit Friedman (Crater PDC), respectively, and both were adopted unanimously.	
3.	Subcommittee Overview	Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro (DCR Staff) reviewed the CRMP, Phase II and the timeline for completing and updating the plan, as well as the responsibilities of the Project Prioritization Subcommittee. These responsibilities include informing risk assessment and supporting identification of planned resilience actions, ultimately creating recommendations for future planning.  This is the second to last meeting before the plan is released in December.	
4.	Old Business – Impact Assessment Updates and Planned Resilience Actions Updates	DCR staff provided an update on elements of the CRMP Phase II relevant to the subcommittee's work:  Impact assessment: DCR reviewed the overall timeline for the impact assessment development. Consultant Stantec is currently working on analyzing data and should have analysis available in September.  Planned resilience actions analysis: DCR reviewed the overall timeline for the analysis. Consultant Stantec is currently working on analyzing data and plans to have analysis complete by first draft plan.	
5.	Old Business – Recommendations Development	DCR provided reminders about the recommendations development process and purpose, and provided suggested criteria for members to use when prioritizing the recommendations.  Linda Warren (Launch!) reviewed the top 10 recommendations based on the recent survey. She introduced the three stations set up to discuss the different themes	

that emerged. The current goal is to reduce 10 recommendations to 5 and not to wordsmith. Members were asked to add descriptions for each recommendation, and add additional feedback/comments (e.g. ideas to bring it to life, hesitations, etc.). It was noted some recommendations could be combined, especially those at the same station.

Subcommittee members in person visited the three stations around the room to further develop and prioritize the recommendations, while the Launch team led the virtual group through a similar facilitated discussion for each recommendations.

Following these grouped/facilitated exercises, the group reconvened for a full group discussion, with the goal of arriving at consensus on any opportunities to combine and/or refine recommendations. Elements of that discussion included:

- The virtual group shared that recommendation #4 stood out as important, and they wanted clarification on what "buy-in" means.
- DCR reported out discussion from in-person stations Observations reported included that #1 and E.1.2.a are similar; "resilience success" would need to be clarified, and that it is appropriate to distinguish that concept for state and local government. Members also talked about how that was tied to theme 1.2.a, and could be combined. It was suggested that #7 could be reworded to say "provide a framework for local and regional resilience planning."
- There is a potential to combine 9 and 2.
- It would be helpful to have "resilience success" better defined.
- Are these plans connected to funding for the CRMP?
  - There is no guidance from CRMP to localities for how to do the planning process. They are not currently directly connected.
     Making that connection could be a new recommendation from the TAC.
- #9 and #3 there is a role for this plan for state and local/ regional actors.
   #7 and #9 differ because 7 is focused on local and regional government,
   where 9 does not. If combined, emphasis on plan as a resource for state agencies may be lost.
- How does the Virginia Flood Protection Master Plan (VFPMP) factor into the CRMP?
  - They are two different plans; the VFPMP is not as place-based as the CRMP. The VFPMP will take an index approach to looking at larger geographic scales.
  - The CRMP may not be needed as a resource for state agencies if they have what they need from the VFPMP.
  - The CRMP is a state plan, developed by the state. We would lose that part of the discussion if we say this is only for local and regional actors.

#### Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Project Prioritization Subcommittee

- 2024 Q3 Meeting Minutes
- Group discussed a suggestion to combine #3 and #1.
  - #3 is more concerned with the planning process, while #1 is more about research, data and innovation committee's work, so they shouldn't be combined, but #3 could be lumped into #7.
- Group discussed recommendation #4.
  - Having two processes that cover similar things is a challenge; the goal of this recommendation is to ensure that the funding sources and planning align.
  - o The TAC could push for establishing dedicated funding.
- Group discussed recommendations #5 and #10.
  - The conversation in the virtual group was around the responsible parties and the need for more data.
  - Combine #2 and #10 to do a needs assessment that includes a needs assessment of data. That would create a large grouping, but would combine similar concepts.

The group discussed that, at the next subcommittee meeting, they should consider how the recommendations differ from those produced with the prior master plan.

The Subcommittee Chair reiterated that the process should progress, and there will need to be more specificity to these goals.

Staff reminded the subcommittee that the recommendations will appear in the plan with responsible parties. From there, implementation of recommendations is another matter that will not get hammered out now. The Office of Resilience Planning would be responsible for figuring out how to move the recommendations forward in collaboration with others.

The group agreed to move froward to the final subcommittee meeting with the recommendation groupings discussed without taking an informal vote on the recommendations at this meeting. DCR staff reminded members that voting on each recommendation individually will occur at the next meeting.

The final agreed upon list of five recommendations to continue to the Q4 Subcommittee meeting was:

- B.2.3.b: Consider forward-looking/future-conditions data for all components of flood risk (hazard, exposure, vulnerability). Examples include sea-level rise, precipitation frequency (Atlas 15, MARISA), projected growth, demographic changes, etc.
- 2. B.1.1.b: Use the CFPF to help implement the CRMP or VFPMP to improve buy-in.
- 3. B.2.2.a: Continue state inter-agency coordination efforts aimed at the development, maintenance, and enhancement of accessible region-wide

		2024 Q3 Weeting Williates
		asset datasets for non-sensitive data, and to ensure that agencies aren't duplicating efforts.
		4. B.3.3.b: If there are 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.
		5. B.1.3.a: Provide a framework for local, regional, state resilience planning.
		(Including the following concepts/elements)  a. A.4.2.a: Define what resilience success looks like.
		b. B.3.2.a: Develop an initial needs assessment for coastal flood
		resilience, like exists for wastewater or agriculture, and a process to update it as an element of the plan.
		c. B.2.1.a: Survey stakeholders to learn what they consider critical data to inform decision-making, and what data is missing.
		d. B.2.1.b: Utilize/survey flood management practice data to supplement flood hazard data for a full picture of flood risk and vulnerability.
		e. B.1.2.a: 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?
		Following this decision, the subcommittee revisited notes from the in-person discussion. A question was raised whether localities are required to have a section of their comprehensive plan dedicated to resilience? DCR staff clarified that only
		localities in the coastal region are required to address flood resilience. Online members of the public added that additional legislation recommends a resilience section but does not require them.
6.	<b>New Business</b>	No new business was shared
7.	Public Comment	Grace Rogers (Environmental Defense Fund) shared the need for tangible and clear metrics that do not currently exist and need to be set up to determine and gauge success. She urges more discussion around tangible metrics for ecosystem,
		infrastructure, community, health, social vulnerability, etc. With regards to
		connecting planning and funding, there is no incentive for localities to participate,
		and it doesn't make sense for the Commonwealth to have different sets of
		processes for the CFPF and the plan. The processes should overlap to make it easier for localities.
8.	Action Items,	DCR will take recommendations that have been discussed as well as
	Scheduling	recommendations from other subcommittees and share them with the whole TAC
		on September 18 <sup>th</sup> . Opportunity to consider how recommendations are or are not working together across subcommittees.
		ı

	The next Project Prioritization meeting will take place on October 8th, 10-12, where the group will refine and formally vote on recommendations.
	The final full TAC meeting will take place on November 13 to formally vote on all subcommittees' recommendations.
	The plan will be released by December 31, 2024.
	The subcommittee chair asked to clarify whether the subcommittee will finalize recommendations at the next subcommittee meeting. DCR staff confirmed that the plan is to create final wording, responsible parties, etc., at the next meeting.
	The subcommittee chair requested that all members come prepared to finalize things at the next meeting, especially considering that these will inform legislators.
9. Adjourn	The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:49pm

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 <a href="mailto:flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov">flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov</a>