

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

<b>Subject</b>	Project Evaluation Subcommittee Meeting #5 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	<b>Date</b>	June 17, 2021
<b>Facilitator</b>	Dr. Carl Hershner	<b>Time</b>	10:00 am – 12:00 pm
<b>Location</b>	WebEx - <a href="https://governor.virginia.gov/j/4o481">https://governor.virginia.gov/j/4o481</a>	<b>Scribe</b>	Emily Sokol

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
<b>Project Evaluation Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors</b>			
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 Advisor	Deputy Secretary of Natural Resources	Y
4.	Kevin DuBois	Navy Region Mid Atlantic Chesapeake Bay Program	Y
5.	Whitney Katchmark	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Y
6.	Elain Meil	ANPDC	
7.	Keith Lockwood, Chief	United States Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
8.	Catherine C. McGhee	Virginia Transportation Research Council	
9.	Dr. Karen McGlathery	Environmental Resilience Institute at the University of Virginia	Y
10.	Randy Owen	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	
11.	Ben Nettleton	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Y
12.	Mary-Carson Stiff	Wetlands Watch	Y
13.	William “Skip” Stiles, Jr.	Wetlands Watch	
14.	Erin Sutton	Virginia Department of Emergency Management	
15.	Dr. Robert S. Young	Western Carolina University	
16.	Kimberly Cain	Diversity Equity and Inclusion’s office	Y
<b>Scheduled Speakers</b>			
<b>Designated Alternates</b>			
<b>Subcommittee Advisors</b>			
17.	Shurui Zhang	Commonwealth Coastal and Marine Policy Fellow	Y
18.	Emily Steinhilber	EDF	
<b>Other Participants</b>			
19.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
20.	Connor Winstead	DCR	Y
21.	Matt Dalon	DCR	Y
22.	Jason Powell		Y
23.	Chris Stone		Y
24.	Elizabeth Schell		Y
25.	Margaret Rockwell		Y
26.	Sam Jasinski		Y
27.	Keith Cannady		Y
<b>Consultant Support</b>			
28.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y
29.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y
30.	Johanna Greenspan-Johnston	Dewberry	Y
31.	Dan Medina	Dewberry	Y

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

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
32.	Alaurah Moss	Dewberry	Y

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Introduction and Roll Call	<p>Dr. Carl Hershner welcomed all attendees to the meeting, took roll, and established that a quorum was present.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner called the meeting to order at 10:08 am and read the required Section 1289 language. He asked public attendees to ask questions using the chat box function and advised that Joshua Saks would moderate the chat. If there are any connectivity issues, please contact Joshua Saks at 804-690-5673.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner asked for a motion to proceed with the meeting virtually. Kristin Owen motioned, and Kevin Du Bois seconded. Dr. Hershner conducted the voice vote, and the motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Concern was expressed by multiple Subcommittee members in the chat about which document was being reviewed and if it had been shared with the group. Dr. Hershner and Josh asked if there were any Subcommittee members who had not received the latest drafts of the VACMP Prioritization Framework and the Impact Assessment Methodology. Multiple members expressed that they had not received one or both documents. Kristin announced that they had been distributed in separate emails, one with the recently distributed agenda. Members acknowledged they received those emails. Emily Sokol was asked to compile all the documents and resend them to the Subcommittee members, which was done during the meeting.</p>
2.	Discussion of VACMP Prioritization Framework and Impact Assessment Methodology	<p><b>DISCUSSION OF THE PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK</b></p> <p>Dr. Hershner: We are not expecting anyone to critique the documents in great detail, as some have only been provided to us recently; however, we are tasked with providing feedback on items that will need continued improvement going forward. As we all know, we are on an impossible deadline, but there is a commitment to continual revision and improvement. Today, we are asking for feedback on the VACMP Prioritization Framework and the Impact Assessment Methodology, how to improve future iterations, and items that the Subcommittee should look into to provide more detailed responses. We will begin with the Prioritization Framework. Our previous discussion of this document was limited. Does anyone have any input on this Framework or the criteria under the four factors? Does the Dewberry team have any information they would like to provide to frame the discussion?</p> <p>Brian Batten: Since the last time we spoke with this Subcommittee, we have revised the document. If it would be helpful, Alaurah Moss prepared a few slides to illustrate what changes were made based on the feedback you provided in the past meeting.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner: Yes, a presentation would be helpful to frame the discussion.</p> <p>Dr. Hershner turned the floor over to Alaurah Moss, who verified with Matt Dalon that the Subcommittee had been provided with the revised report dated June 2, 2021. In</p>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>the chat, Kristin assured that they were discussing the Task 5 document, which was dated June 2. There is also a Task 4 document dated June 11, 2021, to be discussed after the Prioritization Framework. Alaurah Moss provided a short presentation reflecting the updates to the Prioritization Framework that the Dewberry team made based on the Subcommittee’s feedback, responding to Subcommittee questions throughout (See Attached Slides).</p> <p>Update 1: Changes to the Classification Schema</p> <p>Discussion Point- Whitney Katchmark: If a city was trying to develop a project at the parcel-level, which set of criteria would that fall under?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: We envisioned that falling under capacity building; programs, plans, and policies; and parcel-level flood adaptation program.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Josh: From my recollection, when I look at master plans from other states like Texas and Louisiana, they mostly consist of flood resilience projects, as represented by the tree on the left, rather than capacity building and planning projects, as represented by the tree on the right. From my sense of master plans, they tend to emphasize these flood resilience projects. Can someone speak to this and why there is, what seems like, an equal emphasis on capacity building programs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr. Hershner: From the beginning, there has been a concern that capacity building projects might not be properly incorporated into the master plan, but that they heavily align with the goals of the master plan. We need a way to address planning projects, technical projects, and capacity building projects.</li> <li>- Brian: What we are trying to accommodate is that, though we did not want to identify a parcel-level project as a project within the master plan because of its small size, we wanted it to be represented as a programmatic item within the capacity building side. We are trying to demonstrate the difference between programmatic and flood resilience engineering efforts.</li> <li>- Josh: It just seems a bit overcomplicated and confusing to me.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I do not find it confusing. That was indeed the intent- to address the needs of these areas and provide a way to evaluate their projects effectively.</li> <li>- Brian: Yes, how do we bring equity to the efforts being proposed by the State in this plan? That is the question that the capacity building and planning section is designed to address.</li> <li>- Alaurah: The intent is that projects assigned to these two groups will not be compared to each other. Projects within the same large category will be compared to each other, but these two categories stand alone.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: That was the recommendation that we made at the last meeting.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: You could almost have two documents- one traditional document with a list of shovel-ready projects, and another that addresses the many regions of the state that do not have shovel-ready projects because they need more resources towards evaluation. I think it is appropriate to have both groupings.</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mary-Carson Stiff (in chat): To Josh's point- is the difference between establishing a new buyout program v. executing specific buyouts through conservation?</li> <li>- Mary-Carson (in chat): I am not surprised by the need for additional staff in every resourced jurisdiction in the coastal zone.</li> </ul> <p>Update 2: Revised Workflow for Evaluating Project Implementability</p> <p>No comments</p> <p>Update 3: Additional Definitions Provided within Each Criteria</p> <p>No comments</p> <p>Update 4: Created Additive Score to Specify Future Condition Scenarios</p> <p>Q- Matt Dalon: Was this update reflected in the June 2, 2021 revised document?</p> <p>A- Alaurah: No, it was not.</p> <p>Update 5: Created Additive Score for Coastal Hazard Risk Reduction to Specify Future Risks to be Considered</p> <p>The Subcommittee discussed the need to incorporate projects that address geomorphic changes as hazards, such as coastal erosion. This has been identified as an area that will require further development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr. Karen McGlathery: Projects that are focused on reducing coastal erosion do not address coastal flooding but finding a way to incorporate those projects into this plan will be important.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: The challenge is identifying data that can quantitatively characterize the risk of geomorphic change moving forward.</li> <li>- Brian: This is one aspect that we are looking to characterize through the outreach surveys and charrettes. We are asking for self-characterization of these changes.</li> <li>- Alaurah: Yes, it is because of these data gaps that we are hoping to make this a self-evaluation aspect through the outreach meeting charrettes.</li> <li>- Kevin Du Bois: I believe VIMS has a contract to look at marsh migration models. You might want to reach out to them to incorporate this information into the impact assessment.</li> <li>- Alaurah: We have contacted VIMS to use their dataset once it becomes available to replace the dataset we are currently using.</li> <li>- Mary-Carson Stiff (in chat): Kevin, this issue came up during Dewberry's presentation in the Best Practices Subcommittee meeting, and we provided the Dewberry team with some feedback.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I always have a knee-jerk reaction to asking people to characterize their own risk because it is almost always self-serving. There</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>should be a call for evidence, rather than just individual perception, if those characterizations are going to be incorporated into the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whitney: I agree that evidence would be nice to have, but it is hard to do with this short time frame.</li> <li>- Kristin: Agreed. And what do we consider proof? A picture?</li> <li>- Kevin (in chat): Good point Carl- otherwise how would we qualify the reporting?</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Kristin: I think it would be helpful to expand terms like coastal erosion to shoreline erosion, to include our non-coastal communities. I also had a question about severe rainfall amounts. Are you expecting that severe rainfall amounts would always fall under stormwater flooding? Where I am at, we do not always get a storm surge, but we do get intense rainfall. If you could provide some clarification on that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: That is a good point. Adding extreme rainfall flooding as an individual category might be more inclusive.</li> <li>- Brian: It could also fall under general stormwater pluvial flooding. The category captures it right now, but the wording can be changed to better reflect the intention. There is wordsmithing to do, so it is nice to get this feedback. Since we are putting these together rather quickly, we do not always have the time to look at specific items from different angles, so this is helpful.</li> </ul> <p>Update 6: Specifying Timeline for Acceptable Protection- Requesting Design Life from Project Owner (Optional)</p> <p>Q- Matt: Is this update addressing whether the project is focused on current or future flood issues?</p> <p>A- Alaurah: No, this is to dive into the co-benefits that the project will provide. We initially proposed a radius around the project footprint to show how far those benefits would extend.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Mary-Carson: I am not sure that the co-benefit approach is capturing the intention of my initial concerns. I was thinking about how the regulatory changes are changing our shorelines. My thinking was that, with the regulatory changes, the standard is to ensure that the project meets future conditions for the life of the project. It would be a metric, rather than does the project protect assets into the future or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: I see. Does the Resilient Design Criteria address your concerns more accurately?</li> <li>- Mary-Carson: Yes.</li> </ul> <p>Update 7: Updated Project Classification Schema to Identify the Approach for both Flood Mitigation and Natural Resource Enhancement</p> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner: I have tried to work through this issue from the perspective of a project that identifies current land as an asset, and how exactly this is</p>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>characterized and scored. As protecting natural assets is one of the goals of the master plan, I do think it needs to be appropriately addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: That would come into play as one of the co-benefit criteria- “the project protects natural assets that are vulnerable to coastal flooding.”</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: Okay, but it is not just marshes and their flood mitigation capacity that is the objective. Natural assets can be considered a critical asset based on the services they provide. For example, marshes provide carbon sequestration, water purification, erosion control, habitats, etc. A project that looks to maintain these ecosystem services in the future is what I am speaking to. I have not been able to reason my way through the scoring and determine how these types of projects would fare.</li> <li>- Whitney: The metric currently is just a yes/no. Either the project has nature-based design elements and protects these natural assets, or they do not. Or is there more detail to your change in Criteria 1B?</li> <li>- Alaurah: No, there have not been additional changes to 1B. We could expand this metric to incorporate more ecosystem services provided.</li> <li>- Mary-Carson: I would caution against linking it to some of the layers in Conserve VA, primarily regarding the floodplain layer because it will not link to or show you all parts of the coastal zone where nature-based approaches could benefit because so much of the urban communities are missing from that layer. I thought this section needed to be more fleshed out, and I am unsure that the Commonwealth’s priorities are fully being addressed. On your previous slide, it said the recommendation would only be listed under nature-based approaches. However, there are other projects that can incorporate nature-based elements. You might miss opportunities for combined approaches.</li> <li>- Josh: I would be happy to get in touch with some representatives at Conserve VA. They could provide a presentation and have a discussion with us.</li> <li>- Dan Medina: Mary-Carson, what other projects might we be missing? Do you have any examples?</li> <li>- Mary-Carson: I understand that nature-based approaches will score better, but if you are talking about a point difference, it is up to you all how it would shake out. Are there other approaches included in the framework that are combination approaches?</li> <li>- Alaurah: I understand. We do have the hybrid solution project type that would address combined approaches. Their project would still get points.</li> <li>- Mary-Carson: Okay, great.</li> <li>- Matt: For Criteria 1B, maybe we could have three choices: a nature-based approach, an approach with some nature-based elements, and an approach without nature-based elements.</li> <li>- Alaurah: That is a good suggestion.</li> <li>- Josh: I do not think it is quite that simple.</li> <li>- Alaurah: I understand that we want to go somewhere more complex in the future, but I just do not know if we can get there right now based on the quantitative data available to us.</li> <li>- Dan: We need to be mindful that sometimes simpler is better.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: That is a good point- this is only a start.</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner: Have you tried to game your own system and find out if the system realistically puts an emphasis on nature-based approaches, or what types of projects tend to score highly?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: Once we receive some projects, we will test and reiterate the framework. The scores can be changed once we have some test projects.</li> <li>- Kristin: What is the timeline for getting test projects? This is an overall quick timeline, so you might want to make up some examples to run through the framework, because most of the localities do not have projects or are not in a place to come up with specific project ideas, unless it is capacity building.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Ann Phillips: It is coming soon to a PDC near you. Within the next few days, we will put out a call for projects.</li> <li>- Kevin: If I recall correctly, the Army Corps of Engineers vulnerability analysis included a number of what we consider hard projects, but also included some environmental components, like offshore oyster reefs. Taking a few of those examples may be a good test of what Josh was talking about, so that the green elements do not rank the project high when they perform a minor contribution to the project overall, when considering what the master plan is promoting.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: The concern this raises is- can existing natural features be considered critical structures? If that is the case, the value of nature-based approaches is not just judged on the ability to provide flood mitigation, because most do not. That is my interest and concern for how scoring plays out in this system.</li> <li>- Mary-Carson (in chat): Agreed.</li> <li>- Alaurah: Are you suggesting that we use the existing landscape?</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: This is a reasonable concern. When we posit projects that should be considered in the master plan and think about how they will fare in this system, we need an equitable mix of what we are doing for existing gray and green infrastructure. I do not know if this will work the way we want it to.</li> <li>- Kevin: I think it boils down to how do we evaluate two alternatives: preservation vs. erecting hard projects.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: That is one way to look at it. My fear is that, as it rolls out, one thing any project manager will look at is how to manage their score to increase their probability of funding. We want to make sure these projects are prioritizing both green and gray infrastructure.</li> <li>- Brian: We have an iterative draft. Once we apply the framework to evaluate projects, we will have a better idea of what changes to make. We will get an insight into some of the challenges as we parse through the responses to our data call.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: It is critical that, in rolling this out to the initial group, it is clear to them that the scoring scheme is still under development.</li> <li>- Matt: We will have raw scores in addition to a weighting scheme. We can determine how well the raw scores align with the goals of the master plan and see where weightings need to be adjusted to further align with goals.</li> <li>- Brian: And we will communicate any adjustments to the weighting scheme.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: Yes, communication will need to be a priority so that everyone is on the same page and project managers know what framework and system they are trying to align with.</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Josh: Do we have a similar rubric for dealing with capacity as we do with the project side?</li> <li>- Alaurah: Yes, that can be found in the June 2, 2021 document</li> <li>- Kevin (in chat): My understanding from the Federal Partners Subcommittee is that, in addition to the PDCs, federal partners will also get the data call for projects to occur (cooperatively) outside the fence line. Is that correct?</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips (in chat): Kevin, yes and we have asked the Federal Partnerships Subcommittee about how to best do that and to whom we make the ask.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Whitney: I have a question about the June 2<sup>nd</sup> document. Is there an explanation on how you will draw the extent of benefits polygon?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alaurah: There is an explanation of that methodology in the document. We wanted to ask project owners for that information originally, but we realize that that will be challenging. We are proposing an automated approach based on the project type. We welcome feedback on that approach. It is an alternative approach to determining the radius around a project. We hope to receive project footprints and use that to create a buffer around the project. When we get to the charrettes, we hope to have interactive mapping exercises so that project owners can learn to identify buffers around their projects.</li> <li>- Whitney: Okay, I have never seen a table like this before, so I am having a hard time analyzing it.</li> <li>- Alaurah: We do have a description as to how we made these choices; however, they are not included in the document. I think receiving the project footprint from the owner is the best option.</li> <li>- Dan: We have used similar methodologies in other projects, but we have to ensure that they make sense to the reader.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner: That is one of the areas that we will continue to be very interested in- how this methodology plays out regarding the evaluation of diverse projects. Going forward, we will provide input on the project evaluation end, and there are several areas that require additional development. In the near term, we would like to have a role, particularly in testing this methodology. What is our role in this process?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: We are working on that process. We want, as the methodology is applied and we identify what is and is not working, to bring this information back to the Subcommittee so you can evaluate our suggested changes and provide feedback.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: To echo Brian's comments, this is an iterative process. As we collect projects in the database and run them through the evaluation system, we will make adjustments. As we work with the PDCs and continue engagement with localities, we will make adjustments and bring them back to the Subcommittee.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I hope that, going forward, we will be given more time to prepare our feedback for you prior to meetings. We are struggling to provide input, as we only receive documents a few days in advance. Maybe providing us with periodic updates as the process is progressing so that we can provide meaningful feedback? We understand that the short timeline makes this a difficult task. I am not expecting you to solve that problem as we sit here, but</li> </ul>



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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>that has been an issue throughout this process. I believe we can be more useful to you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: Thank you, and we fully understand the challenge that the timeline poses. We have had good discussions for the past few iterations, and we highly value the feedback you are providing.</li> </ul> <p>Kevin (in chat): Because this is the first time I am seeing the prioritization approach document, can we have until June 21<sup>st</sup> to provide final comments?</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</b></p> <p>Dr. Hershner: Anyone who has had the time to review the impact assessment methodology document is now welcome to provide general responses. From my own perspective, I think there are several things about which we would caution you. Clearly, what comes out of this assessment will influence the evaluation of projects, so I believe it is important that this Subcommittee be aware of its methodologies. Are there any initial comments or reactions?</p> <p>Discussion Point- Kristin: Is there a reason that National Park Service (NPS) data is being used for historic resources instead of Virginia Department of Historic Resource's (DHR's) data? My understanding is that DHR's database includes all NPS data, but it also includes state-specific resources that may not be identified on the national level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Josh: I do not know that those are sites that we want or need to protect. The history and cultural piece needs to be vetted. We should be asking for stakeholders' perspectives in this discussion. We need to have a conversation with DHR.</li> <li>- Brian: I cannot provide a direct response to that question at the moment. I would need to see if and how that data was pulled over and incorporated. I have forwarded this question along to the team to give a better description about how this decision was made.</li> <li>- Kristin: While at DCR, I had conversations with different groups about how to protect historic resources from flooding. We should not just preserve them in place, because that does not actually protect them from flooding. Having a recommendation or guidance on how to protect these resources might be helpful. Maybe this means relocating or elevating them in a way that maintains their cultural significance. We need an assessment of what resources are at risk and what options there are for protection.</li> <li>- Josh: We are not going to be able to protect all those resources. I do not think we are in the proper political position to make those decisions.</li> <li>- Kristin: I am not saying that we should be the ones to make those decisions, but maybe we should be making recommendations.</li> <li>- Brian: Yes, it is more of a State issue.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: We do want to understand the degree of vulnerability of these resources.</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Mary-Carson (in chat): Dewberry’s presentation on the methodology was given to the Best Practices Subcommittee, and it was an extremely helpful overview. Listening to the recording may be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, I do suggest that the Subcommittee members go back and watch that recording to provide a frame of reference for the IA Methodology document. It would be nice for you all to send me your feedback so that they can be consolidated and forwarded to Dewberry. Remember to CC Matt and Ann.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Dr. Hershner: Monetary evaluation of natural resources is always problematic, particularly in a construct that allows comparison between nature-based projects that are gray vs. green infrastructure. The comparison will never be equitable, as we do not have proper ways of making this evaluation. While this is a useful way to set up an analytical framework, it is only helpful when comparing between green infrastructure projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: That is one item that we proposed an approach for and want to hear feedback on from the Subcommittee. We would like further guidance. We understand those constraints, and there is concern from our team as well.</li> <li>- Alaurah: Because there is a lack of defensible research, we do not propose including those numbers as part of the impact score. Instead, we would simply like to present it narratively in the master plan. However, if the Subcommittee feels that it is best, we could not include it.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I think this is one point where less is more. I do not think that it is essential in this first round.</li> <li>- Alaurah: We could instead identify it as a point of future research in the plan.</li> <li>- Dr. McGlathery: I agree, but I do think there needs to be a note in the narrative about the co-benefits of these different projects. But we should not put a dollar value on it.</li> <li>- Alaurah: Agreed.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I think that would be appropriate. It would be consistent with the goals of the master plan.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Whitney: I saw that the assessment is using the CDC’s Social Vulnerability Index (SVI). Have you all already gone through the pros and cons of using other indices? Additionally, I did not see a metric associated with jurisdictional resources- maybe the Fiscal Stress Index could be used. Lastly, I see that there is some methodology on defining wetlands migration. You could potentially use a broad land-based layer to address this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr. McGlathery: There were a lot of updates on this front that were covered in the Best Practices Subcommittee meeting. Maybe you could briefly cover that.</li> <li>- Brian: We have completed a comparison of various social vulnerability indices.</li> <li>- Johanna Greenspan-Johnston: To answer Kristin’s question from earlier, for historic resources, we looked at both national and state databases. There was significant overlap between the two. I am having someone look into the reasoning behind our decision to use the NPS database. To answer Whitney’s question, we are using demographic attributes based on the variables used in the CDC’s SVI that have overlap with variables used in the</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>ADAPT VA Vulnerability Viewer. With that, we can statistically attribute demographic attributes to individual structures based on an approximate of the population, employing proportional allocation. In doing so, we can get more detail than with existing indices, which are at the census tract level. If we encounter project areas with a lot of land but few buildings, we can identify the population impacted to a finer level of detail and better assess social vulnerability than with the other indices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brian: This methodology also leverages the American Community Survey (ACS) data.</li> <li>- Johanna: We are recreating the index using the finest level data we can find, which is the ACS data. That provides us more flexibility moving forward.</li> <li>- Dr. McGlathery: The datasets you are using are also more recent than the ADAPT VA database. Your approach to downscaling also addresses our other concern, which was working with data at the census tract level.</li> <li>- Johanna: To the other point on jurisdictional resources/capacity, that is the piece we are looking to round out our understanding of underserved communities and how they will be defined quantitatively. There are different jurisdictions that have different levels of developing projects, planning, and funding capacity. In our surveys, we have included questions that allow responders to self-identify their own capacity, as well as actions that have been taken so far to promote coastal resilience. Using the Fiscal Stress Index is a great idea.</li> <li>- Whitney: I am more than happy to read the documentation; however, I do not feel that the methodology report provides the level of detail that you are currently describing.</li> <li>- Josh: Try page 16 of the document. It has a list that I believe we are currently discussing.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Josh: Why are we not using easier options, such as Opportunity Zones or low-income definition of communities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Johanna: Good question. I do not have the best response on those specific datasets. From a data perspective, we are setting ourselves up to collect the most information that we think we could need in the future. I appreciate that comment and we will look into it.</li> <li>- Josh: When you say that you will look into it, we are more than happy to meet and discuss these with you further. Anything we can do to help you in this process.</li> <li>- Johanna: That would be welcomed. For further conversations, I will redirect to Brian to see how that would be handled.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: We have the data for the Opportunity Zones. There are challenges with that dataset- the zones are quite large, making it difficult to drill down to finer details. The challenge with the low-income definition of communities is that they are not well-defined. This is something on which we have been working with other agencies as well. Whitney, thank you for mentioning the Fiscal Stress Index. Johanna, we will make sure that you get that data for consideration.</li> <li>- Kristin (in chat): The Fiscal Stress Index is on a city/county scale, so this presents issues when trying to score projects for towns.</li> </ul>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		Discussion Point- Dr. McGlathery: I do want to emphasize a comment that was raised in a previous Subcommittee meeting this week about the challenge of getting information on state-recognized tribes and information related to their cultural structures.
3.	Public Comment Period	Dr. Hershner asked if any public attendees had comments. Josh advised there are no registered public attendees and no comments from the chat box.
4.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	<p>Dr. Hershner presented an overarching concern regarding the lack of a comprehensive picture across the coastal zone that demonstrates how equity will be established in the evaluation of submitted projects. He emphasized that the evaluation process needs to be based in reality. Going forward, he is looking to Brian and Rear Admiral Phillips to identify how the Subcommittee will be involved as testing and initial scoring begins. The Subcommittee will stand by and wait to be asked for further feedback. Dr. Hershner asked Rear Admiral Phillips about the State’s plan for conducting meetings after June 30, 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: After June 30<sup>th</sup>, the Subcommittee meetings will be held in-person. We are still establishing guidelines in the hopes of providing more flexibility than in the past. A quorum must be present in-person, but additional Subcommittee members could potentially tune in virtually. Speakers, presenters, notetakers, and the public will likely be able to listen and make comments remotely. We are still working through the nuances and drafting requirements with guidance from the Governor’s Council.</li> <li>- Dr. Hershner: I think I speak for many who sit on multiple Subcommittees when I express concern for travelling to Richmond multiple times a month for meetings.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: Yes, you are not alone in that thought.</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Hershner declared the meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.</p>

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.	Submit additional feedback on the Prioritization Framework and Impact Assessment Methodology to Dr. Hershner. CC Rear Admiral Phillips and Matt Dalon	All	TBD

If you have any questions, please contact Emily Sokol, Vision Planning and Consulting, at [esokol@vision-pc.net](mailto:esokol@vision-pc.net).