

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Funding Q3 Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Subject	TAC Funding Subcommittee Meeting 2024-Q3	Date	08/15/2024
Chair	Shawn Crumlish, VRA	Time – START/ADJOURN	10:00am / 11:57am
Location	Virtual	Scribe	Addie Alexander / VCU CPP

Subcommittee Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended? Y = In Person / V = Virtual
Executive Director [Director of Program Management] Virginia Resources Authority (VRA)	Shawn Crumlish, Chair [Peter D'Alema], Co-Chair	Y [Y]
Chief Resilience Officer [Principal Water Resources Engineer] Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)	Ben McFarlane [Whitney Katchmark]	V [Y]
Executive Director [Deputy Director] Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission (MPPDC)	Lewis L. Lawrence, III [Curtis Smith]	Y [Y]
Director, Grant Management and Recovery Division [State Hazard Mitigation Officer] Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM)	Robert Coates [Debra Messmer]	Y
Executive Vice President, Public Policy and Government Relations [Vice President for Public Policy and Legislative Affairs, Virginia Chamber of Commerce] [Director of Public Policy] Virginia Chamber of Commerce (VA Chamber of Commerce)	Keith Martin [Kristin Burhop] [Ethan Betterton]	[V]
Assistant Director Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (VDHCD)	William Curtis	[V]
Environmental Division Director [Assistant Division Director] Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	Chris Swanson [Christopher Berg]	
Environmental Specialist Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VRMC)	Claire Gorman	V
Director Virginia Sea Grant (Sea Grant)	Troy Hartley	Y

Members of the Public		
Name	Attended? Y = In Person / V = Virtual	Speak During Public Comments?
Anna Salzberg	V	

Launch / Stantec	
Name	Attended? Y = In Person / V = Virtual
Linda Warren (L)	Y
Cece Atkinson (L)	V
Rebekah Cazares (L)	Y
Sidney Huffman (L)	V
Sarah Girard (L)	Y

TAC Staff		
Name	Title (Organization Abbreviation)	Attended? Y = In Person / V = Virtual
Matt Dalon	Resilience Planning Program Manager, DCR	Y
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro	Resilience Planning Program Coordinator, DCR	Y
Arthur Kay	Lead Mapping & Data Analyst, DCR	Y
Adelaide Alexander	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	V
Wheeler Wood	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	Y
Ellie Plisko	DCR/VCU Wilder Fellow	Y

Reference Links	
Item	Link
Meeting Agenda	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q3-tac-funding-subcommittee-agenda.pdf
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slides	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q3-funding-handout1.pdf
Video Recording of the Meeting	

Agenda Item	Minutes
<p>1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions</p>	<p>Shawn Crumlish (Chair, VRA) called the meeting to order at 10:02am. Wheeler Wood (CPP) called the roll. Matt Dalon (DCR) introduced the group to the new Wilder Fellow, Ellie, who will be working with DCR to identify how to provide more capacity and support to local governments. Lewie Lawrence (MPPD) made a motion to adopt the agenda and Troy Hartley (Sea Grant) seconded it. Then Lewie made a motion to adopt the minutes from the last subcommittee meeting and Troy seconded.</p>
<p>2. DCR Presentation</p>	<p>Matt shared a brief orientation to the CRMP Phase II. The purpose of the plan is to support PDCs and localities with an understanding of flooding, impacts, and future impacts to facilitate evidence-based solutions. DCR is also working to collect projects and initiatives. The plan will be delivered through a PDF document and web explorer.</p> <p>The Funding Subcommittee is focused on financial objectives, figuring out how much funding is needed, identifying financial tools and processes relevant to flood response, identifying challenges to using the tools, and developing recommendations for future planning.</p> <p>The bulk of the current meeting will be spent on this subcommittee’s recommendations.</p> <p>Update on the financial impact assessment: DCR has been working with Dewberry and Stantec; they have completed the assessment and data summary. Stantec has been working on how to present the data in a compelling way. The draft document is in process and will be done by the end of the year.</p> <p>Phase II will add pluvial to coastal flooding data/ impact assessment. Ecosystem service losses will also be included, as well as regional economic impacts by PDC and local real estate revenue impacts. The funding database is getting updated with current funding opportunities.</p> <p>Lewie had a question about why this was not put to the Department of Tax or Revenue. Matt said that in the recommendation discussion, responsible parties will be identified and discussed.</p> <p>Whitney Katchmark (HRPDC) asked how to prioritize/ make recommendations about these things that are already happening. Matt responded that the members should discuss what actions they recommend should continue, what should be changed, etc.</p>
<p>3. Old Business</p>	<p>Matt reviewed the purpose of the meeting, which is to review the current set of recommendations and whittle them down to 5. He shared that the recommendations should include the objectives and who is responsible. He also reviewed the timeline. At the next TAC meeting, all subcommittees will present</p>

	<p>where they're at, and then at the next subcommittee meeting this group will wordsmith and take a final vote on 5 recommendations. These meetings have already been scheduled and should be on your calendars.</p> <p>The initial 30 recommendations generated by this subcommittee were sent out via survey to the group, which prioritized 10 of those 30. The recommendations need to align with the purpose of the CRMP, the CRMP principles, and should also take into account urgency, impact, and feasibility.</p> <p>Troy shared that some of the recommendations will be related to how to measure human elements and ecosystem elements. This is good progress from the last plan. Some will be able to be converted into economic measures, and some won't.</p> <p>Lewie suggested there should be a recommendation about the governor issuing an executive order to hold responsible parties accountable to recommendations. Matt responded that implementation is a big issue, but the group isn't there yet. Lewie reiterated that there needs to be a plan to make sure that the recommendations are actually enacted.</p>
<p>4. Subcommittee Recommendations</p>	<p>Linda reviewed the process for refining recommendations. This meeting is not about wordsmithing, which will happen in Q4. Rather, today is about picking the top 5 recommendations by concept. There will be a vote at the end of this meeting if the group is not able to come to consensus on 5. The 7 members in the room can choose any station to start. Each station has 2-4 recommendations. They are grouped by theme where possible. The two members online will move at their own pace through the recommendations.</p> <p>Members should put a check mark or alternative suggestion by each "responsible party," and should add bullet points for each recommendation to help explain what the recommendation is all about. There is an additional comment section to add thoughts on how important the recommendation is, or whether it could be combined with another recommendation.</p> <p>Troy asked about including strategies for how to be more competitive for funding. How would that be added to recommendations? Linda responded that it doesn't matter, as long as it gets added, but that would probably be best added as a bullet point.</p> <p>Any thoughts that don't totally fit with this process can be added to the parking lot. Matt added that, in terms of responsible parties, DCR added their agency to recommendations where they thought they should be responsible. Other recommendations may best be assigned to DCR but it could be a different office.</p> <p>Members started the process of reviewing/ prioritizing recommendations.</p> <p>After 30 minutes the group joined back together. The in-person group felt that a few of the recommendations could be dropped, and a few could be consolidated.</p>

	<p>Arthur Kay (DCR) reported that the in-person group felt that 1, 8, and 9 were important and could nest together, while 2 was less important/ feasible.</p> <p>Linda asked the group about combining 1, 8, and 9. Lewie said that that really depends on how it is structured as a recommendation that brings together these different ideas. Some people online said we could get rid of some of these. Cece said that the online group felt that 8 and 9 don't seem feasible. Ben McFarlane (HRPDC) has concerns with the ability to differentiate impacts of flooding on real estate values compared with everything else that goes into assessing real estate, given that there is no proven or demonstrated model. So this would be a lower priority, and possibly more of a research question. Linda added that you could add this idea as part of the description of a recommendation, rather than standing alone. Lewie added that real estate tax is the primary revenue generator in rural areas. Without attending to that, this recommendation could be a tax on the poor. It is easier to assess the impact of flooding on real estate value in this type of community. Ben responded that this point is critically important, but he just has questions about feasibility, and asked Troy if he's seen anything through his academic work about how this is being done at the academic level. In the past, he has found this to be really hard to do.</p> <p>A member suggested that keeping it simple is a good thing. 8 and 9 are related, but 1 should stay as its own recommendation. Whitney suggested that the group could look at trends in real estate values.</p> <p>Troy commented that there is a lot of comparing apples and oranges here. Context is important: rural, urban, poor, rich, etc., as well as local, regional, state. It's important to acknowledge who the responsible parties are.</p> <p>Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro (DCR) shared that the subcommittee's responsibility is to recommend action at the different scales, and they should let DCR know what their priorities are in terms of those questions of level and scale.</p> <p>Linda asked about how to approach number 2. A member said it's important to promote and share the data that exists because there is a data reporting tool that local governments already use, but it's only as good as the data entered.</p> <p>Lewie said that there is a way to enter information about flood impacts, but there is a lack of awareness about what resources are available or why it's important to track, leading to many localities choosing not to track.</p> <p>Linda asked if any other recommendations could be combined. The virtual group thought 4 and 10 could be combined. Cece said that the virtual group suggested a revision to combine the two and shared that language.</p> <p>Matt shared that 4 is about determining what's available broadly at all levels, while 10 is about evaluation of state funding sources. Curtis Smith (MPPDC) said that it's very important to understand where funding is having the biggest impact so the TAC can make informed recommendations to the General Assembly, while 4 is very</p>
--	---

	<p>simple. Lewie said it's important to differentiate between grants and loans. Whitney said there was a discussion about putting 4 and 7 together, but she doesn't feel strongly about combining them. Curtis felt that 7 and 10 are more closely related. Troy asked for clarity on what 4 is adding that isn't already done. Lewie responded that political will is what's missing, not the tools or funding sources. Linda summarized that it sounds like these should remain separate.</p> <p>Matt reported that the economic development goals 3 and 5 should remain separate. The online group thought 5 was a lower priority.</p> <p>Carolyn shared that part of the role for resilience planning should be to explain governance tools and funding sources and how they apply to the CRMP. Online folks felt that number 5 was interesting but not as important.</p> <p>Lewie said that he disagrees; 5 discusses high-level financial tools that communities need access to.</p> <p>Linda summarized where the group is in the process so far. The group has agreed to combine recommendations 8 and 9, but no others. The group will now need to vote for their top 5 to move forward to wordsmith more/ fill out in the future. Everyone has stickers to put them on their top 5. Subcommittee members online should put in the chat their top 5 choices for recommendations. Matt asked that for organizations that have more than one person in the meeting, there should only be one vote per organization. Lewie asked why there is a cap on the number of recommendations.</p> <p>The results of the voting process were: #10 received 6 votes, #s1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 got 4 votes, and the rest received 3 votes. This means 6 recommendations rose to the top. Matt mentioned that number 7 was also considered in the O&C committee, and that moved to the top 5. So if that one doesn't come out of this subcommittee, it will move forward anyway. A member said that 7 is closely related to 10. Bill added that he was in the committee meeting yesterday, and that he feels that 7 is very important and is different from 10. Linda suggested that there be communication between the two subcommittees about this recommendation. Lewie commented that there is a difference of perspective amongst people around the table. There are things that are important to different communities depending on where they are on the journey. Everyone who is dealing with the problem is coming from a different perspective, which informs how they related to the tools and money. Shawn suggested that the concepts of 8 and 9 could be incorporated into 1. Matt suggested that the group talk about that at the next subcommittee meeting. Whitney reminded the group that one of the guiding principles is to consider what is feasible. 1 still feels less feasible, while 8 and 9 feel achievable. Shawn added that he tried to prioritize actionable goals, but that wasn't reflected in the top 5 recommendations that emerged from the voting. Troy reflected on the wisdom of nesting some of the de-prioritized goals under the related goals that are in the top 5. Whitney added that number 6 could be added under number 1. Lewie</p>
--	---

	<p>questioned whether the financial needs in 6 are referring to revenue needs, or needs for funding coming in. Whitney said there is a lack of clarity about how the problems will be addressed, and that it's difficult to make these decisions quickly. Linda asked if each recommendation could include a description of how urban and rural areas will be implicated differently to address some of the challenges members are identifying. Whitney added that recommendations shouldn't be too vague; the recommendations should include specific, actionable things.</p> <p>Linda suggested that they could package the top 5, include a list of which recommendations that were deprioritized, and that they can facilitate a group conversation with the other subcommittee. That information will be provided to the subcommittee, and at the next meeting members can talk with each other and bring wording and thoughts to make sure these recommendations are fleshed out and well-worded. Matt reminded the group that the full TAC meeting is in one month, at which point all subcommittees will report out their recommendations and where they are.</p>
5. Public Comment	None
6. Subcommittee Member Discussion	None
7. Action items and scheduling	September 18, 10-1: Full TAC October 10, 10-12: Next funding subcommittee meeting November 13, 10-1: Full TAC then plan released at the end of the year
8. Adjourn	Sean Crumlish adjourned the meeting at 11:57

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

Top 5 Funding Recommendations: 1, 3, 4, 6, & 10

Recommendation 7 will be discussed with the O&C subcommittee in Full TAC Meeting

Recommendation (1)_C.2.1.a: Develop financial tools and reports to more clearly explain the immediate and mid-term cost of doing nothing at the local level.

Recommendation (3)_C.2.2.c: Ensure businesses, government officials, citizens and other stakeholders are aware of the financial opportunity from economic development potential of innovative resilience and adaptation technologies, products, services and designs created in Virginia and sold to an emerging global market.

Recommendation (4)_C.3.1.a: Determine what the existing and available funding resources are.

Recommendation (6)_C.1.2.a: Identify specific financial needs for private and public projects.

Recommendation (10)_C.3.1.b: Evaluate existing state grant funds such as the Flood Fund which primarily supports short term projects and maybe should be looking longer-term. Consider additional funding mechanisms that may be needed for longer-term challenges, e.g., strategic relocation, saltwater intrusion into public drinking water systems, infrastructure abandonment, etc.

Recommendation (7)_C.2.2.b: Make the case to state legislators using project prioritization and project readiness.