

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Subject	Project Evaluation Subcommittee Meeting #2 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	April 6, 2021
Facilitator	Dr. Carl Hershner	Time	10:00am – 11:30am
Location	WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/j/e5xqo	Scribe	Ashley Samonisky

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
Project Evaluation Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors			
1.	Dr. Carl Hershner – Chair	Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	Y
2.	Kristin Owen – Vice Chair	Henrico County	Y
3.	Joshua Saks - Staff	Deputy Secretary of Natural Resources	Y
4.	Shannon Alexander	Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission	Y
5.	Kevin DuBois	Navy Region Mid Atlantic Chesapeake Bay Program	Y
6.	Whitney Katchmark	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Y
7.	Keith Lockwood, Chief	United States Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
8.	Catherine C. McGhee	Virginia Transportation Research Council	N
9.	Dr. Karen McGlathery	Environmental Resilience Institute at the University of Virginia	Y
10.	Randy Owen	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	N
11.	Ben Nettleton	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Y
12.	Mary Carson Stiff	Wetlands Watch	Y
13.	William “Skip” Stiles, Jr.	Wetlands Watch	Y
14.	Erin Sutton	Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Y
15.	Dr. Robert S. Young	Western Carolina University	Y
16.	Kimberly Cain	Diversity Equity and Inclusion's office	N
Scheduled Speakers			
17.	Elizabeth Andrews	Virginia Coastal Policy Center at William & Mary Law School	Y
18.	Tanya Denckla Cobb	University of Virginia, Director, Institute for Engagement & Negotiation	Y
19.	Carolyn Heaps	Graduate Student	Y
20.	Mark Garrett	Graduate Student	Y
21.	Bryce Ballard	Graduate Student	Y
22.	Abram Gagnon	Graduate Student	Y
Designated Alternates			
23.			
Subcommittee Advisors			
24.			
Other Participants			
25.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
26.	Alec Brebner	Crater PDC	Y
Consultant Support			
27.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y
28.	Caroline Whitehead	Dewberry	Y
29.	Jessica Fleck	Dewberry	Y
30.	Deepa Srinivasan	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y
31.	Ashley Samonisky	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Introduction	Dr. Hershner provided a welcome and introduction to the meeting and stated there was only one presentation for today's meeting (attached slides).
2.	Welcome and Chapter 1289 Reading	Dr. Hershner read the required Chapter 1289 notice and asked roll call to be taken. He also noted that IT related questions should be sent to Joshua Saks Phone: 804-690-5673.
3.	Roll Call and Quorum Affirmation	Joshua Saks read roll call and a quorum was established before moving forward. Dr. Hershner asked for a motion to continue electronically. It was moved and seconded. A motion was passed to continue the meeting electronically.
4.	Meeting Guidelines	Dr. Hershner read through meeting etiquette and presentation guidelines. He then invited Ann Phillips to provide an introductory statement. Ann introduced the Dewberry Team and provided an overview of Dewberry's support as minute takers for the Subcommittee and TAC meetings and their role as lead on outreach and stakeholder engagement efforts.
5.	RAFT Presentation	<p>Elizabeth Andrews provided an introduction on colleagues and students working on the RAFT project. She stressed that this tool is still under development and is not a finished product. The RAFT Team are presenting today in hopes of receiving feedback on the tool and its output product.</p> <p>Tanya Denckla Cobb provided an introduction and welcome and explained how excited the RAFT Team is to present to this Subcommittee while the tool is still in development in order to receive feedback. This project is an 18-month process developed in response to needs for localities to have assistance and support for their efforts to become more resilient. The process is composed of three steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Step 1 – Initial rounds (4-5 months) of scoring were undertaken independently by the Virginia Coastal Policy Center. • Step 2 - Working closely with the Planning Commission to develop a workshop for community leaders. • Step 3 – RAFT team works closely with localities to find ways to help implement their action checklist. This could be networking and finding people to accomplish these projects, or coordinating with our centers to do mapping, analyses, etc. . <p>The key is working with the localities throughout the process.</p> <p>Admiral Philips presented the Master Plan Framework to the PDCs in November and December of 2020, after which one of the locals approached Admiral Phillips asking for a specific tool or process the Commonwealth would like the localities to use. Admiral Philips reached out to the RAFT Team asking about any tools available. The decision was made to develop a Virginia-specific tool, to prioritize resilience projects.</p> <p>Elizabeth asked participants to make notes, ask questions, and provide feedback to the Team, if possible. The goal being for this tool to be determined by the Subcommittee to be useful to the CFPF Program. There will also be a guide provided with the tool to further support this tool.</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Student – Carolyn Heaps – Introduced the Development Team and the PREP tool (slides attached).</p> <p>Student – Abram Gagnon – Provided overview of the physical structure of how the tool would function, once finalized (slides attached).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q - Carl Hershner – At what point will you be able to share what sections are in the tool? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A – Carolyn Heaps - We hope to have it out to locality staff to review in the next two weeks. We want them to review it as a beta test. May 14th is the latest for graduate students’ support on the tool, as the semester ends for students. ○ Elizabeth stated that the team will continue to develop and improve this through future iterations. Another concern under consideration is where to house this tool. ○ Carl – The sooner you can share it, to gather the questions localities may have, the better we will be able to consider the tool for use by the Project Evaluation Subcommittee. We are currently trying to find metrics to support the Five Guiding Principles in the Framework. The goal is to move to a consistent process using the PREP, or some other tool, and to identify certain information the Project Evaluation Subcommittee could recommend to the TAC for project criteria under the Master Plan. This tool could be a two-way street as for that task. This Subcommittee ends in May, so we would need something to present to the TAC as soon as possible, and this is ideal.
6.	Wrap up and Q&A	<p>Dr. Hershner opened the floor to questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q - Rob Young – This whole concept seems to be based on having a good vulnerability assessment. To have a common view of the vulnerability and assets to be protected in each community. There also needs to be the same understanding of the work that goes into a vulnerability assessment, and what that entails. I work with many counties and they all have a variety of definitions of this. In some localities, it means just looking at their dFIRMs (these are very problematic in some places), and others simply look at SLOSH models or inundation layers, but this is not enough. More guidance is needed for what a vulnerability assessment should include. Virginia should endorse one uniform process so metrics can be compared from one locality/county to another. Decision makers can also have a uniform way to determine the vulnerability of various assets. For instance, we need to understand the exposure, and the sensitivity of that structure (age, elevations, etc.). Many localities do not have the capability to do this. How do we get these vulnerability assessments to interface with this tool? We need a uniform way to do this, that also helps the locals that do not have the capacity. This will take funding. Another question is that the tools Eligibility Categories did not include vulnerability. This needs to be a critical factor for funding. It was not mentioned in the slideshow at all for prioritization factors. I want to see

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>this defined, what should be included, and a State endorsed uniform approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carolyn – We are currently looking at vulnerability assessments. If a community has not done this, it will be our top recommendation. We agree that it would be better if the State gave guidance and potentially funding to accomplish this. While it is not currently a prioritization factor, after hearing your concerns, we should include it going forward. Thank you for the feedback. ○ Dr. Hershner – The idea of a consistent State vulnerability assessment process is wonderful, but our Subcommittee will not reach this point. This is one of many items we may want to promote to the TAC. ○ Ann – The vulnerability assessment is part of Dewberry's task. While more will need to be done, this will be a great baseline to see what exists, what is vulnerable, and where we can start. ○ Whitney –Regarding a uniform approach, there is a need for some flexibilities. Many locals work with consultants, and they develop their vulnerability assessments in their own ways, so having a formal process may not be feasible. ○ Rob - Not to be difficult, but a vulnerability assessment should be completely fact-based and objective. This is not something that incorporates priorities. It is what it is. We want to make sure that all communities are considering the same hazards and the same infrastructure sensitivities. ○ Whitney – Regarding the PDCs' role, the tool has not yet been sent to the localities for their feedback. We need to identify what kind of assistance is most needed, Do local jurisdictions need grant assistance or project management assistance? ○ Elizabeth – Again this is voluntary, not mandatory. Many localities may need the assistance to ensure they are under the umbrella of resilience, not just infrastructure. The vulnerability assessment is a separate task entirely. PREP is just to prioritize projects to submit to the Commonwealth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Q - Mary-Carson – What is the final product the locality receives when they complete the PREP tool exercise? What is the resource and how can it be used, reused, modified, etc.? If it is intended to serve as the Resilience Plan then we need to help make that link for the TAC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Abram response – Localities will receive a score for each section of the tool and what that means for them, an interpretation. The output we would like to hear from the Subcommittee is to know what this Group wants from the localities, and how would this tool best serve the locals. We request feedback from this Subcommittee. ○ Joshua – This Subcommittee is not intended to provide feedback for William & Mary products, it will only evaluate the TAC's efforts. This Subcommittee is only meant to advise the State, on State actions. ○ Carl – Agreed, but I believe the PREP tool can be a strong support to the Subcommittee and can help ensure consistency between

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>various tools, guides, and resources. We can provide some input on what could be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q – Kevin DuBois – Since DOD is an institution entirely unto itself, should they be part of the locality, or considered a separate entity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A – Elizabeth – We have not developed a separate tool for the military. This may be a next iteration, to include the military. We want this to be as helpful as possible for everyone. • Q - Whitney Katchmark – Will this consider project on private property as well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elizabeth – As of right now, it is for public projects only, but if you think it would be more helpful to include private property projects, that could be expressly stated. ○ Kristin – I feel this would be very important as most of our projects are private. • Q – Kristin Owen – What localities have you already worked with? I would like to discuss this further as a locality. The community engagement is optional, and I understand the time crunch, but I think its worth including. If this is intended to get grant funding or towards creating a plan, then community engagement is critical. This could derail the entire process down the road. What do you envision the output being? Is it a tool we used to develop our plans? As of right now, this does not meet plan requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elizabeth – This tool supports a path towards resilience plans. Regarding community outreach, one jurisdiction’s engagement capabilities are completely different from another county or jurisdiction’s. Many do not have the capacity, and if we make it mandatory, it may stymie smaller jurisdictions. ○ Tanya – We are aware of how community engagement can be problematic, but we agree it is essential. We invite input to make the process more flexible, while remaining useful for localities. This may simply provide something for them to start with. Maybe it could be required at a later step. We have already worked with many localities – 17 communities, 3 pilot jurisdictions, 2 on the eastern shore, and 8 on the Northern Neck. We are starting with 4-6 in Middle Peninsula now. ○ Carolyn – We have not sent the tool to any locality yet, but we are hoping to work with two in the Crater PDC and local staff from the City of Portsmouth. We would love to gather feedback from Kristen. I will reach out to you, so we can have some conversations. ○ Kristin – flexibility is needed, different types of localities and communities are very different. What works for one will not work for others. • Q – Dr. Karen McGathery – I am interested in the comment about Dewberry’s tasks on the risk assessment. I would like to hear more. Also, for RAFT, does the tool focus on natural resources or only the built infrastructure?

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ann – We are setting up opportunities for Dewberry to work with Subcommittees directly and we are working through each Subcommittee now. Everyone will have chance to work with Dewberry over the coming weeks. Time constraints what they are, this vulnerability assessment will only be a first cut. ○ Carolyn – The tool looks at both green infrastructure and natural resources. ○ Rob – It is important to keep in mind green infrastructure. This is not the same as allowing the development of projects that develop or preserve natural resources. Projects from TAC and RAFT should allow full consideration of protections of natural resources (buy outs, etc.), as the use of green infrastructure is generally to protect grey infrastructure. They are not the same thing. ● Q – Mary-Carson – Is there already a streamlined "reporting" process underway for the PREP outcomes so the resulting information goes to the State and maybe the TAC? Having access to this information could help inform our goals as Subcommittee members, and others, could benefit from the info. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carolyn – There is no streamlined process, we were hoping to learn today how to support the Master Plan. How can we configure the tool to support everyone? ○ Mary-Carson – Understanding the timeline, let us discuss this with localities, as soon as possible. We could gather some initial input to assist Dewberry, and letting them go from there. ○ Josh – This may be over committing Dewberry; they have a very specific charge and we cannot veer too far off course. ○ Ann – The Project Identification Subcommittee is working on how to identify projects and this tool may be something to help them. And it can help localities build resilience, but we have to be careful about expecting too many things over the short timeline. We will not be able to get there on this timeline, so the tool/process will be iterative. ● Q - Dr. Hershner – What are the particulars of the PREP process? We understand that this is still a draft, but allowing the Subcommittee to review this will help our process and possible incorporate efforts into items we already have considered. When can this Subcommittee meet with Dewberry? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tanya – We understand that it is preferred to meet as soon as possible, and we will put our heads together to identify how soon we can deliver a preliminary draft. ○ Ann – We can schedule the Dewberry meeting as soon as a date is available. This first meeting will initially be with the Chair and Vice Chair to adhere to FOIA/COIA rules. We have a two-week window before this Subcommittee reconvenes. Please email any questions or comments on the Dewberry contract to Ann. Over the next two days we can identify potential dates to meet with Dewberry.
7.	Public Comment Period	No one registered from public to speak.

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Project Evaluation Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Dr. Hershner requested Josh to schedule a meeting for this group in two weeks – April 20th, at 10:00am for 90 minutes, to discuss any thoughts concerns.</p> <p>Elizabeth thanks the Subcommittee for the opportunity to speak. Dr. Hershner stated the Tool holds promise on helping to accelerate our efforts on this subcommittee.</p> <p>Meeting concluded at 11:23am.</p>

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.	Respond to the Google form to provide feedback – deadline is this Friday (April 9th). Link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfKqSDT_pLFt6m26EDoh_OjQuqfKkYMHILy4mCtc1ByxyOFg/viewform	PDC Staff	TBD
2.	Provide any ideas and suggestions on the PREP Tool, or if you have any questions on how the prioritization lists are considered for the Master Plan, or how to determine if Projects are eligible for funding, email them to Abram Gagnon.	Subcommittee Members	TBD
3.	Reach out to Kristin Owen (Henrico County), to discuss local engagement.	Carolyn Heaps	TBD
4.	Email questions or comments on the Dewberry tasks or contract to Ann Philips.	Subcommittee Members	TBD

If you have any questions, please contact Ashley Samonisky, Vision Planning and Consulting, at asamonisky@vision-pc.net.