



# Resilience Coordination Working Group

*Meeting Summary May 31, 2023*

## **Opening Remarks**

Matthew Wells, Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR)

## **Welcome & Working Group Charge and Workplan Review**

Presented by the Performance Management Group (PMG)

This Working Group is being established by the Chief Resilience Officer in furtherance of Governor Youngkin's goal of addressing challenges related to flooding and resilience, and in the spirit of engaging collaboratively with the General Assembly on this important issue. The Working Group will have the following purposes:

- To consider and assess strategies and policies for the Commonwealth to improve intergovernmental and interagency coordination; and
- To maximize the procurement of federal and private funding opportunities in planning for and implementing flood resilience throughout the Commonwealth.

Facilitators from PMG restated the working group scope of work and plan/schedule for the remaining work including opportunities for all members to review drafts of the report recommendations before it is finalized. It was highlighted that all proposed recommendations within the final report will continue to be developed and reviewed by the working group during monthly meetings.

## **Information Sharing: Working Group Draft Recommendations**

Presented by PMG

Draft recommendations for improving resiliency planning and coordination in Virginia were shared based on prior working group meeting discussions and background research conducted by PMG with ongoing direction and guidance from the steering

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

committee and working group members. These draft recommendations were sent to working group members for advance review on Friday, May 26th along with additional peer state information. Draft recommendations were grouped by themes emerging from ongoing working group discussions. These themes were referenced as “Observations 1, 2, and 3”. Based on working group feedback, observations were reprioritized from the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting to encourage productive discussion.

### **Observation 1: Resiliency Coordinating Structure and Entity**

There is currently no single coordinating entity to support resilience efforts across state agencies, academia, localities, nonprofit organizations, private sector, and community members.

*Proposed recommendations reviewed by the Working Group:*

- A. Combine the Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection with the Chief Resiliency Officer and provide resources to establish a dedicated, staffed office reporting directly to the Governor for managing and coordinating flood resiliency efforts across the Commonwealth. Place Chief Resilience Officer position outside of the Governor’s Cabinet but still reporting to the Governor as a political appointee.
- B. Direct agencies to each create a Resiliency Coordinator position to ensure continuity during administration turnover coordinated by the Chief Resilience Officer.
- C. Establish an interagency working group - led by the Chief Resilience Officer and consisting of state agency and local government officials as well as academic and university partners - to support interagency coordination and planning for resiliency efforts.

### **Observation 2: Locality Readiness for Resiliency**

The ability of localities to support resiliency planning varies widely across Virginia.

*Proposed recommendations reviewed by the Working Group:*

- A. Establish “grant circuit rider(s)/ombudsman” positions for identifying, applying for, and managing resiliency-related grants for localities.
- B. Explore state support opportunities for the use of RAFT by localities, especially the self-assessment component.

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

- C. Establish state goals, metrics, and best practices to define what effective locality readiness for flood resilience should look like.

*Ancillary recommendations for the working group to consider:*

- D. Ensure that state agencies have internal clarity/review of flood resilience opportunities and challenges that will then trickle down through their technical assistance and grants programs.
- E. Authorize state resiliency programs to administer a set percentage of funds to awardees upfront to alleviate burden of 100% reimbursement for program activities and improvements.
- F. Conduct vulnerability assessments at the state and local levels to determine needs and inform planning.

### Observation 3: Resiliency Data and Resources

The ability of localities to support resiliency planning varies widely across Virginia.

*Proposed recommendations reviewed by the Working Group:*

- A. Leverage the Virginia Office of Data Governance and Analytics as a clearinghouse of data needed for resiliency planning.
- B. Conduct a periodic survey of state agencies to identify their data needs including what data is required to be used and what data is available for use.
- C. Establish a working group consisting of knowledgeable representatives from the organizations participating in the Resilience Coordination Working Group and TAC and informed by the results of an agency survey of resiliency to identify and address data needs and availability.

After reviewing as a large group, working group members were divided into three small groups to discuss each draft recommendation using the following questions to guide conversation:

1. Do the recommendations adequately address the observations?
  - a. Is the language clear?
2. What action is required to allow these changes to occur?
3. Who is responsible for implementing these changes?

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

4. What are the metrics for success for each change?

### Large Group Discussion

After one hour of small group work, members reconvened as a larger group to report their feedback on the proposed recommendations. The working group's large discussion and remaining questions for each draft recommendation are summarized below.

#### *Observation 1: Coordinating Structure and Entity*

- A.
  - i. There was a shared sentiment among the group that a resilience office led by the Chief Resilience Officer (CRO) would help streamline resiliency efforts across the Commonwealth. The office could be organized using a hub and spoke model, with the CRO positioned at the center (hub) to distribute resilience information and direction out to the state agencies (spokes). If a new structure is formed, the group discussed a need to develop a transition between the existing structure and proposed structure, but no recommendations were made. There was a desire to gain a greater baseline knowledge of what agencies are already doing in the realm of resiliency coordination and planning, how they are being funded, and what support is needed at the local level. The Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investments housed with the Secretary of Transportation's Office was cited as an example for a coordinating structure for resiliency efforts.
  - ii. Many members agreed that the CRO position should not be in the cabinetry due to concerns of durability over changing administrations.
  - ii. It was also proposed that portions of the Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection's duties could be redistributed to other roles within the resilience office.
  - iv. Members expressed the need for the functions of this office to be clearly defined. These functions could include long-range state planning, alignment of existing resiliency work among agencies, communication and coordination at both state and local levels, as well as funding coordination.
  - v. The working group also noted the need for a resilience office to produce and deliver a State of Resiliency report. It was proposed that state agencies could be encouraged to include resilience in their strategic plans.
  - vi. Members appeared to feel strongly that the Commonwealth should explicitly define the meaning of "resilience" either by developing a state-specific definition or adopt existing language used by other states with a glossary of related terms. This led to a discussion of the importance of expanding resilience efforts beyond

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

the scope of flooding to include all relevant hazards. Member suggested that a clear definition of resilience that included a description of related hazards would help align efforts around coordination and planning. Additionally, it was suggested that categorization of resilience-related hazards could be used for resource distribution, funding, and evaluation purposes.

### *Remaining Questions:*

- How much authority should be given to CRO to enact proposed changes?
  - What, if anything, would the new resilience office or structure implement?
  - What responsibilities from the Special Assistant should stay with the CROs office?
  - What baseline requirements for the new resilience coordination structure should be codified into law?
- B. i. Members reported on the need for the Resiliency Coordinator positions to support interagency communication by integrating common language and practices for resilience work across agencies. This role could also build relationships with non-governmental organizations.

### *Remaining Questions:*

- What resilience roles or positions already exist in agencies?
  - Which agencies would need a resilience coordination position?
- C. i. Should an interagency working group be formed, members cited the need for state agencies, local government, and academic partners to be represented. It was noted that Resilience Coordinators could represent state agencies as a member of the working group to support interagency collaboration and coordination.

### *Remaining Questions:*

- How should the business sector be involved?
- How should public, government, and academic stakeholders be involved?

### *Observation 2: Locality Readiness for Resiliency*

- A. i. It was agreed that the function of the grants position(s) would be to bring more resiliency funding in the state by assisting localities with grant funding procurement and grant readiness. Members clarified that this role would not push the workload down to localities but instead help build capacity. To accomplish this goal, it was suggested that the grants position(s) could work closely with or be embedded within the Planning District Commissions. The Virginia CZM program's grants were cited as one potential example to look at for a model;

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

VDCR will follow up with this program for more details on their approach. It was proposed that this position would focus specifically on localities with limited capabilities. Strong knowledge of federal grants and data as well as financial expertise would be required for this position. Director Wells (VDCR) will be connecting with officials in South Carolina to learn about an existing position with similar duties.

### *Remaining Questions:*

- Should this position extend beyond grants support?
  - Are there localities that would need a management function?
  - Should this be organized as regional positions?
  - Instead of staff position(s), could the state contract with an entity that could be leveraged only as needed?
- B. i. Members expressed that RAFT was merely one potential option to support localities but that self-assessment is not necessarily the best strategy for all localities. It was suggested that the draft recommendation be revised to be:  
“Explore state opportunities for the use of RAFT and similar programs and tools, including self-assessment and other resources.”
- C. i. There was strong agreement among members to remove “flood” from this proposed recommendation in order to broaden the scope of resilience coordination and planning. If a new resiliency structure be established that centralizes resources under the CRO, it was suggested that a baseline for readiness could be developed from those resources.

### *Remaining Questions:*

- Who defines the goals and metrics?
  - Are the goals and metrics used for enforcement, or for strategic planning?
  - If enforcement, what does enforcement look like and is it needed to establish baseline readiness?
  - Would readiness be a prerequisite for funding from the state?
- F. i. There was some hesitancy among the members to conduct a vulnerability assessment before understanding how the data will be used, by whom, and for what purposes. It was noted that categorizing resilience efforts by hazard type would help frame data needs.

*Recommendations 2.D-E were not discussed due to time constraints.*

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

### Observation 3: Resiliency Data and Resources

- ii. Some members felt that a Business Analyst position may be needed to manage state and federal resilience data aligned with funding. This position would translate data into practice, assess data needs across agencies, and determine data usability. This position could be coordinated by the suggested CRO.
- A. i. There was concern that the Virginia Office of Data Governance and Analytics may not be the right fit to use as a clearinghouse for resiliency data. Several members wanted more discussion time on this topic to learn perspectives on a centralized data source from academic partners, and to examine the role/model of the Chief Data Officer within the Secretary of Administration.
- B. i. Members seemed to agree that a periodic survey could provide a baseline of what data already exists and what is needed. This would also highlight current funding streams. The task of conducting the survey would be a deliverable for the CRO office.

*Recommendation 3.D was not discussed due to time constraints.*

### Information Sharing: Flood Resilience Planning the Commonwealth of Virginia

Presented by Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro, VDCR

Director Wells (VDCR) asked the working group members to consider strategies for increasing alignment between the multi-level resilience plans, as well as suggestions for ensuring the plans meet resiliency needs throughout the Commonwealth. Ms. Heaps-Pecaro then presented on the existing code requirements for flood resilience planning, VDCR's flood resilience outlook for the future, and potential challenges and opportunities with alignment of the Flood Protection Master Plan and Coastal Resilience Master Plan. The presentation concluded with the following discussion questions posed to the working group members:

1. How will the proposed multi-level resilience plans meet your needs? Do you foresee any gaps or challenges with this approach?
2. Who should be involved in the development of the plans, and who is responsible for implementing the plans?
3. How can we build accountability for implementing the plans?

4. Should elements of the plans continue to be defined in code? If so, how?

## **Large Group Discussion**

### *Resilience Plans*

1. How will the proposed multi-level resilience plans meet your needs? Do you foresee any gaps or challenges with this approach?
  - i. There was agreement that the plans must be flexible enough to adapt to evolving situations. The American Society of Civil Engineers recent announcement to change the building code to prohibit building within 100-year floodplain was cited as an example of this kind of adaptability.
  - ii. It was mentioned that there must be increased consideration for how private sector factors, such as economic development and finance, will impact these plans.
  - iii. Several members identified the challenge and need to work across jurisdictional boundaries to get the greatest impact and maximize co-benefits, in addition to allowing for innovation.
  - iv. Working group members unanimously agreed that in order for any resilience plan to be impactful, it must be tied to funding. Furthermore, incentives must be clearly defined as far as loans or funding awarded in advance. Additionally, it was stressed that plans must be true planning documents and not just a priority list.
  - v. Members shared that stronger metrics are needed to align with plan priorities and track success.
  - vi. There was some discussion that the differing goals and priorities of urban and regional communities are not always separated in regional plans.
  - vii. The group also expressed concern surrounding “meeting fatigue” with multiple plans.
  - viii. The recommendation was made to pursue the creation of multiple regional plans, expanding beyond only the Coastal Resilience Master Plan to cover the remainder of the state with a similarly scoped planning document.
  - ix. Regarding the topic of regional plans, it was suggested that the watershed approached used to support the statutory requirement for



## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

- the statewide plan would be beneficial. The suggestion to categorize regions by hazards was discussed again.
- x. Natural resource valuation was cited as an area of continued need. It was suggested that the state should continue to think about how water quantity and quality are related goals.
  - xi. Members stated that there remains a benefit to quantifying total financial need when it comes to flood resilience and a desire to do so for the whole state.
2. Who should be involved in the development of the plans, and who is responsible for implementing the plans?
- i. It was agreed that cross-sector representation was key for development, ranging from financial and insurance industries, to agriculture, housing, maritime, military, academic, and nongovernmental organizations.
    - a. Some members felt that additional private sector participation was a particular area of need.
  - ii. Some members suggested that after the Coastal Technical Advisory Committee fulfills its statutory requirement, it should be re-scoped to have more statewide representation or possibly include a series of regional bodies.
  - iii. Concern was identified for meeting fatigue when there are multiple different planning efforts potentially engaging the same audiences.
  - iv. There was a strong sentiment that the state should allow localities to relay their resilience priorities, as it is difficult to determine what is considered to be “critical infrastructure” across varying regions.
3. How can we build accountability for implementing the plans?
- i. Members stressed that the need for accountability can’t prohibit action and innovation, and projects must be designed as “safe to fail”.
4. Should elements of the plans continue to be defined in code? If so, how?
- i. There was a need to determine what elements of plan should be in code versus regulation or policy. It was felt that the basic framework and directive should be in legislation, along with a baseline for funding.
  - ii. It was agreed that any elements defined in code must be kept broad and focus on outcomes rather than output.

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

*Meeting Summary May 31, 2023*

- iii. A suggestion was made to have a minimum of one point of accountability per administration defined in code

### **Public Comment**

After the group discussions, one member of the public offered public comment.

Bob Kerr, Wetlands Studies and Solutions Virginia Beach

Mr. Kerr commended the working group members for the efforts and encouraged them to turn challenges into opportunities. Actions need funding, whether for urban or rural communities, the Commonwealth has to find a way to get funding at a greater level. Mr. Kerr referenced the history of the Federal Highway System, noting that the infrastructure we use today was only made possible because the government started to think at a larger level in the 1960s. He reinforced the urgency of flood resilience work by stating that planning without action is useless, as we are running out of time.

### **Next Steps**

PMG will send post-meeting materials, including the two presentations and handouts, as well as potential inter-session work to the working group members. The next Resilience Coordination Working Group meeting will be June 27<sup>th</sup> at the Patrick Henry Building in Richmond (1111 E Broad Street).

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 1:55pm.

## RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

### Working Group Members and Alternates in Attendance

Organization	Workgroup Representative	Alternate
Center for Coastal Studies, VT	Wendy Stout	
Chesapeake Bay Commission	Adrienne Kotula	
Chesapeake Bay Foundation	Jay Ford	
Clark Nexsen	Chris Stone	
Environmental Defense Foundation	Emily Steinhilber	
Hampton Roads PDC	Whitney Katchmark	
Home Builders Association of Virginia		Speaker Pollard
Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience, ODU	Jessica Whitehead	Carol Considine
Institute for Engagement & Negotiation, UVA	Tanya Denckla Cobb	
Middle Peninsula PDC	Lewis Lawrence	
Port of Virginia		Scott Whitehurst
Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources	Travis Voyles	
Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs		Jordan Stewart
The Nature Conservancy	Nikki Rovner	
Treasurer of Virginia	Brian Parker	
Virginia Association of Counties	Joe Lerch	
Virginia Association of Soil and Water Districts	Robert Pickett	
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Matthew Wells	
Virginia Department of Energy	David Hawkins	
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality	Sharon Baxter	
Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development	Bill Curtis	
Virginia Department of Transportation		Chris Swanson
Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources	Becky Gwynn	
Virginia Economic Development Partnership	Angie Jenkins	
Virginia Farm Bureau		Katelyn Jordan
Virginia Institute of Marine Science	Mark Luckenbach	
Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Jamie Green	Rachael Peabody
Virginia PACE Authority	Abby Johnson	
Virginia Resources Authority	Shawn Crumlish	

# RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

Meeting Summary May 31, 2023

<b>Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation Working Group Staff</b>
Darryl Glover
Matthew Dalon
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro

<b>VCU Performance Management Group Facilitators</b>
Gina Barber
Sarah Jackson
Wheeler Wood