Subject	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #5 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	June 22, 2021
Facilitator	Matthew J. Strickler - Chair	Time	1:00 pm – 4:30 pm
Location	WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/i/hly56	Scribe	Emily Sokol

	Invitees/Attendees				
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?		
	Technical Advisory Committee Members - Appointed and Invited (Alternates in Parentheses)				
1.	Matthew J. Strickler	Chair, Secretary of Natural Resources and Chief Resilience Officer	Y		
2.	Rear Admiral Ann C. Phillips, USN(Retired)	Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection	Y		
3.	Dr. Janice Underwood	Chief Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Officer (Kimberly Cain)			
4.	Carlos Rivero	Chief Data Officer			
5.	Clyde Cristman	Director, Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y		
6.	Curtis Brown	State Coordinator, Virginia Department of Emergency Management (Erin Sutton)			
7.	Erik Johnston	Director, Department of Housing and Community Development (Traci Munyan)			
8.	Stephanie L. Hamlett	Executive Director, Virginia Resources Authority (Shawn Crumlish)			
9.	David K. Paylor	Director, Department of Environmental Quality	Υ		
10.	Catherine C. McGhee	Director, Research and Innovation, Virginia Transportation Research Council	Y		
11.	Steve Bowman	Commissioner, Virginia Marine Resources Commission (Ben Nettleton)			
12.	Emily Steinhilber	Coordinator, Commonwealth Center for Recurrent Flooding Resiliency at Old Dominion University	Y		
13.	Dr. Mark Luckenbach	Associate Dean for Research and Advisory Services, Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	Y		
14.	Elizabeth Andrews	Director, Virginia Coastal Policy Center at William & Mary Law School	Υ		
15.	Dr. Robert Weiss	Director, Center for Coastal Studies at Virginia Tech			
16.	Dr. Karen McGlathery	Director, Environmental Resilience Institute at the University of Virginia, Norfolk District			
17.	Colonel Patrick V. Kinsman	Commander, United States Army Corps of Engineers	Y		
18.	Dr. Troy Hartley	Director, Virginia Sea Grant	Y		
19.	Robert A. Crum, Jr.	Executive Director, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (Whitney Katchmark)	Y		
20.	Martha Heeter	Executive Director, Plan RVA (Richmond Regional Planning District Commission) (Sarah Stewart)			
21.	Robert W. Lazaro	Executive Director, Northern Virginia Regional Commission (Norm Goulet)			
22.	Jerry W. Davis	Executive Director, Northern Neck Planning District Commission (John Bateman)	Y		
23.	Elaine Meil	Executive Director, Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission	Y		
24.	Lewis L. Lawrence, III	Executive Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Υ		
25.	Alec Brebner	Executive Director, Crater Planning District Commission (Jay Ruffa)			
26.	Kate Gibson	Acting Director GWRC (Denise Nelson)			
27.	Dr. Robert S. Young	Geology Professor, Program Director for the Study of Developed Shorelines, Western Carolina University	Y		
28.	Mary-Carson Stiff	Wetlands Watch Policy Director, Wetlands Watch	Y		
29.	Ashley Montgomery	Associate Designers, Hanbury	Y		

	Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?	
30.	Dr. Carl Hershner	Emeritus Professor of Marine Science, Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	Y	
31.	Jill Bieri	Director of Virginia Coast Reserve, The Nature Conservancy	Y	
32.	Kristin Owen	Floodplain & Dam Safety Manager at Henrico County, Henrico County	Y	
33.	Dr. Jessica	Director, Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience at Old Dominion	Υ	
	Whitehead	University		
34.	Dr. Stephen Moret	President & CEO, Virginia Economic Development Partnership (Jason El Koubi)		
35.	Georgie Márquez	Principal, Andre Marquez Architects		
36.	Sara Dunnigan	Deputy Director, GO Virginia and Economic Development, Department of Housing and Community Development	Y	
37.	Eric Letsinger	CEO, Quantified Ventures		
38.	Capt. Samson Stevens	USCG Sector Commander Hampton Roads		
39.	Scott Spencer	Office of Economic Adjustment, Department of Defense	Υ	
40.	Rear Admiral Charles Rock	Commander Navy Region Mid Atlantic (Joe Howell)		
41.	Rear Admiral Craig Quigley (Retired)	US Navy, CEO, Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance	Y	
42.	Mr. Reggie Tupponce	Tribal Administrator, The Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe	Y	
43.	Capt. Tom Crabbs	USCG (Retired), Military Liaison, Office of the Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs	Y	
44.	Chris Swanson	Resilience Director, VDOT Secretary of Transportation	Y	
		Scheduled Speakers		
45.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Υ	
46.	Dan Medina	Dewberry	Υ	
47.	Johanna Greenspan- Johnston	Dewberry	Υ	
48.	Mathew Mampara	Dewberry	Y	
49.	Alaurah Moss	Dewberry	Y	
50.	Ashley Samonisky	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y	
		Designated Alternates		
51.	Kimberly Cain	Special Assistant for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Y	
52.	Traci Munyan	Program Administrative Manager, Dept of Housing and Community Development	Y	
53.	Kyle Flanders	Policy Planning Specialist, Dept. of Housing and Community Development		
54.	Lee Hutchinson	Resiliency Program Analyst, Dept of Housing and Community Development	Y	
55.	Shawn Crumlish	Director of Financial Services, Virginia Resources Authority	Y	
56.	Peter D'Alema	Director of Program Management, Virginia Resources Authority		
57.	Erin Sutton	Chief Deputy, Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Y	
58.	Robbie Coates	Grants Division Director, Virginia Department of Emergency Management		
59.	Loren Gonzalez	Communications, Outreach, and Engagement Manager for the Office of the Chief Data Officer		
60.	Whitney Katchmark	Principal Water Resources Engineer, Hampton Roads PDC	Υ	
61.	Sarah Stewart	Planning Manager, Plan RVA (Richmond Regional PDC)	Υ	
62.	Corey Miles	Coastal Resources Program Manager, Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Y	

	Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?	
63.	Normand Goulet	Director, Division of Environmental and Resiliency Planning, Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Y	
64.	Denise Nelson	Environmental Engineer, George Washington Regional Commission	Y	
65.	John Bateman	Regional Planner, Northern Neck Planning District Commission		
66.	Curtis Smith	Deputy Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Y	
67.	Jay Ruffa	Director of Planning & GIS, Crater Planning District Commission	Y	
68.	Randy Owen	Deputy Chief of Habitat, Virginia Marine Resources Commission		
69.	Richard Klein	Civil Works Program Manager, USACE, Norfolk District		
70.	Keith Lockwood	Chief, Water Resources Division, USACE, Norfolk District	Υ	
71.	Tom Emerick	Chief Counsel, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y	
72.	William "Skip" Stiles Jr	Executive Director, Wetlands Watch	Υ	
73.	Scott Miller	Principle and planner, Hanbury		
74.	Carol Considine	Program Head, Flooding and the Built Environment, Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience at Old Dominion University	Y	
75.	Jason El Koubi	Executive Vice President, The Virginia Economic Development Partnership	Υ	
76.	Kevin DuBois	Commander Navy Region Mid Atlantic Chesapeake Bay Program		
77.	Joe Howell	Commander Navy Region Mid Atlantic Regional Community Plans & Liaison Officer	Y	
78.	Ben Nettleton	Virginia Marine Resources Commission	Υ	
		Subcommittee Staff Advisors		
79.	Shurui Zhang	Commonwealth Coastal and Marine Policy Fellow	Υ	
80.	Shep Moon	Coastal Planner, Virginia CZM Program	Υ	
81.	Joshua Saks	Deputy Secretary of Natural Resources	Y	
82.	Jefferson Flood	Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program	Y	
83.	Katie Sallee	Confidential Assistant to the Secretary of Natural Resources	Y	
84.	Meryem Karad	Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources	Υ	
85.	Laura McKay	Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program	Y	
		Other Participants		
86.	Connor Winstead	DCR	Y	
87.	Matt Dalon	DCR	Y	
88.	Ellen Bolen	SNR	Υ	
89.	Elizabeth Schell		Υ	
90.	Megan Melinat	Director, Division of Preservation Incentives at Virginia Department of Historic Resources	Y	
91.	Matt Lott	Emergency Manager, Virginia Department of Transportation	Υ	
92.	Matt Jones	Virginia Management Fellow	Υ	
93.	Russ Baxter	Deputy Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y	
94.	Keith Cannady	Deputy Executive Director, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Υ	
95.	Lauren Landis	Hampton Roads Field Coordinator, Chesapeake Climate Action Network	Υ	
96.	Cirse Gonzalez	NOAA	Υ	
97.	Sam Jasinski		Υ	
98.	Sarah Henshaw		Υ	
99.	Tucker Wayne	Governor's Fellow	Υ	
100.	Stan Sedwick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Υ	
101.	Greg Grootendorst	Chief Economist, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission Consultant Support	Y	
102.	Jerry Sparks	Dewberry	Υ	

	Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?	
103.	Hugh Roberts	The Water Institute of the Gulf	Υ	
104.	Deepa Srinivasan	Vision Planning and Consulting	Υ	
105.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Υ	

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
1.	Introduction	Secretary Matthew Strickler called the TAC Meeting to order and provided a brief overview of today's meeting agenda. He asked for attendees to submit questions to the chat box and advised Katie Sallee will be moderating the chat. Secretary Strickler read the required Section 1289 verbiage and asked Rear Admiral Ann Phillips to take roll. Rear Admiral Phillips called roll and advised that a quorum is present. Secretary Strickler asked for a motion to continue the meeting virtually. The motion was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.		
		Secretary Strickler asked everyone to stay muted unless presenting. After presentations, committee members can be unmuted for discussion by raising their hands. Staff will assist with recognizing attendees who have questions or comments. Members of the public will be allowed to ask question through chat box only by those who signed up in advance. This will take place during the last 20 minutes of the meeting.		
		If anyone has any questions or there are any interruptions in the meeting, please call 804-663-7489 or email katie.sallee@governor.virginia.gov .		
2.	Electronic Meeting Policy Update	Rear Admiral Phillips first thanked all members for their attendance, as well as their participation in the meetings with the Dewberry Team over the past few weeks. She advised the Committee that the Governor's state of emergency executive order that permitted the virtual meetings is set to expire on June 30th. Based on FOIA statue, the TAC and its Subcommittees are not permitted to meet virtually going forward. While the topic may be addressed in the special session this summer, the TAC will have to transition for the time being. Since the TAC has only met virtually, Secretary Strickler and Rear Admiral Phillips recognize that this may be a difficult transition for some. Rear Admiral Phillips shared the "Policy Concerning Electronic Participation in Public Meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee," which outlines the policy regulations proposed by the Office of the Secretary. A quorum must be achieved in-person in one meeting location. The proposed statute allows Subcommittee members to participate from remote locations under certain circumstances, as long as the quorum is met at the location. Rear Admiral Phillips opened the floor for comments by the Committee members.		
		Comment- Elizabeth Andrews: When we adopt this policy, registering for meetings ahead of time and ensuring that a quorum will be present will be very important.		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		Discussion Point- Clyde Cristman: Could you clarify the policy regarding virtual attendance? If someone attended two meetings virtually during the year, does that mean they would be required to attend in-person for the rest of the year?		
		 Secretary Strickler: Yes, that is how I interpret that statement. Meetings held up until this point do not count, so we start at zero going into the next meeting. Mary-Carson Stiff: Should we assume that this applies to the Working Groups as well? Secretary Strickler: Yes 		
		Discussion Point- Emily Steinhilber: Can you discuss how public participation will		
		continue? Will public participation only be allowed in-person?		
		 Secretary Strickler: We have had virtual public comment for meetings prior to the pandemic, so we will likely have options for both virtual and in-person public comment. 		
		Discussion Point- Lewis Lawrence: Can a Subcommittee Chair require that all Subcommittee members attend meetings in-person?		
		 Secretary Strickler: We have not discussed the implications of having Subcommittee Chairs respond differently or instill their own restrictions. We will have to discuss this more in-depth offline. Mr. Lawrence: We will need to have the technological capacity to broadcast the meetings virtually. Rear Admiral Phillips: While we are still working through the nuances, it is likely that we would run the remote portion of the meeting on WebEx, the same as is done currently. However, a quorum would have to be physically present, and the WebEx would be broadcasted from that location to ensure that all Subcommittee members' voices can be heard through the broadcast. 		
		Secretary Strickler: Rather than do a lengthy roll call, I will ask if there are any objections from Committee members to the adoption of this policy by the TAC. Are there any objections to the adoption of this policy?		
		Comment- Dr. Robert Young: What does this mean for individuals who are on multiple Subcommittees and the TAC? How does this work logistically for those who are spread across the state or live in another state?		
		 Secretary Strickler: That is one of the biggest challenges. One of the good things is that it is not cumulative- you have a separate count for each Subcommittee and the TAC. While it will still be difficult for folks like you, this is what we have to work with currently. I was hoping we would have more flexibility going forward; however, the Governor's Office believes that the General Assembly first needs to weigh in on this issue. 		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		 Dr. Young: We will likely need to coordinate meeting times so that multiple can occur on the same day in the same location. This would make travel more feasible. Secretary Strickler: That is a great idea. There are ways to get work done without triggering FOIA, such as by maintaining strict email protocols. I am hopeful that we can think of creative ways to move forward and not lose momentum. We know that this is inconvenient for many, but it is the best that we have right now. 		
		No objections were made to the adoption of the policy. The policy was adopted.		
		Discussion Point- Kristin Owen: I have a question and a comment, rather than an objection. This transition will likely be very difficult, especially considering the short turnaround times we have currently been experiencing with providing feedback to Dewberry's recent products. It will be really important that we have consistent communication between the TAC and Subcommittees since we will not have meetings that we can just pop into. If we need to participate virtually more than what is allowed in the policy, could someone participate virtually and just not be counted as a voting member? Could that work for individuals who live farther away?		
		 Secretary Strickler: That is a great question. We have not yet received anything information that would address that possibility. However, we can run it by the legal team and let you know. Rear Admiral Phillips: We have not asked them for anything with that level of fidelity yet. Secretary Strickler: There is nothing preventing anyone from the public from participating virtually, so my inclination would be that this is allowed. However, the Subcommittee member would be subject to the same restrictions as public participants. 		
3.	TAC-Related Updates	Secretary Strickler first introduced a new member of their team, Ellen Bolen, who will be serving as the Senior Advisor to the Secretary. He then opened the floor to Rear Admiral Phillips to provide TAC-related updates. Rear Admiral Phillips first expressed thanks to Aaron Puritz, Katie Sallee, and the Subcommittee Staff Advisors for their hard work. She announced that two fellows have been brought on to the project. Update on predictive IDF modeling: nearing final peer review with hopes that it will be released in the coming weeks, and the TAC will be updated when it is released. Update on scheduling of charrettes: Ashley Samonisky is currently in the process of scheduling these sessions with the planning district directors to ensure that they are scheduled for the most convenient and effective time. Update on Project ID data call: the data call survey will be distributed soon after final edits. The data call will be the path for prioritizing projects in the context of what the State is most interested in working towards and funding, as well as what it would like to promote for federal funding opportunities. Though it will be a lot of work, it is vital for the future of the Commonwealth and achieving the objectives of the master plan. Update on the master plan project webpage: The webpage has been completed and can be found on the SNR website. It will soon be populated with the outreach and charrette meeting		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		schedule and will house documents produced by Dewberry. You will also begin to see more public outreach products, such as social media posts.		
4.	Dewberry Team Presentation, Review, and Discussion	Rear Admiral Phillips introduced the four topics being addressed in Dewberry's presentation for the meeting and turned the floor over to Brian Batten and the rest of the Dewberry team. (See Attached Slides) Built / Natural Infrastructure Impact Assessment: Presented by Mat Mampara Discussion Point- Laura McKay: When you look at impacts to natural infrastructure, will you look at loss of beach habitats? - Alaurah Moss: Mat Mampara had mentioned NOAA habitat modeling, which does include unconsolidated shoreline, or beach habitat. However, it does not accurately predict beach retreat. It would require more complicated methodology, incorporating aspects like sediment budget. We hope to account for beach habitat loss later but will not be able to include it right now due to the short timeline. - Ms. McKay: I just wanted to stress the importance of habitat loss, and I wonder, since Jill Bieri is on this call, if The Nature Conservancy has any data that could inform your efforts. - Jill Bieri: Thank you, Laura. We do have a coastal resiliency tool that is quite complicated and brings together two different models. It focuses on Atlantic-facing beachlines. We can discuss if that tool might provide information that is necessary to you all. Discussion Point- Dr. Mark Luckenbach: I want to reiterate their comments regarding the importance of beach habitats. It is an extremely dynamic issue, as it is not just about the loss of beach fronts, but also collapsing wetlands and other habitats. This is not an issue that can be addressed by the November deadline. Will there be an opportunity to update using new Census 2020 data? - Mr. Mampara: The framework we have employed allows for update with new ACS data as it becomes available. From a format packaging standpoint, its incorporation will depend on how different it is compared to previous products. We have designed our approach with that update in mind. We have heard that they are aiming for a September release. Reggie Tupponce: I have a concern about how narrowly tri		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		 and next steps of engaging tribal representatives. We look forward to engaging you in further discussion about how to best do this. Mr. Tupponce: If we identify an asset that is culturally significant and it becomes public record, it is almost immediately put at risk of disturbance or theft. The last thing we want is for our culturally significant assets to be public knowledge. It is very complicated, but I am sure that my tribe and many others would be happy to engage with you and work out a solution. Mr. Mampara: We have had an initial discussion about controlling dissemination of sensitive data but are definitely interested in discussing that with you further. 		
		Discussion Point- Dr. Jessica Whitehead: You have DoD installations listed as a data layer, but the Federal Installations Subcommittee has expanded and started thinking about the number of different agencies that have investments in the Commonwealth. Are there plans to incorporate agency installations as part of the analysis? - Mr. Mampara: Our sources for those facilities has been the DHS HIFLD dataset. That has provided a consistent source of asset types, following CISA taxonomy. But it has significant limitations regarding spatial accuracy. From a positional accuracy and key susceptibility attribution standpoint, we are datapoorer than we would like to be. In the case of facilities, I would suggest we have some point data covering those assets, but if there are ways of working with the Federal Installations Subcommittee to identify attribute-rich representations of those assets, we would like to incorporate that. - Johanna Greenspan-Johnston: Using the CISA definitions, we split up includes DoD facilities and government facilities. With that, we have focused on state government facilities, but that could be expanded in the future to federal sites. - Dr. Luckenbach: VIMS has very detailed risks associated with NASA Langley assets. - Mr. Mampara: We can take that discussion offline to evaluate data restrictions.		
		Discussion Point- Dr. Young: This feedback was provided to Dewberry already in the Subcommittee meetings, but I want to raise the issue again. The impact analysis, because of time constraints will not include an analysis of shoreline change. I do hope we find a way to address that as soon as possible, though I know it might be in the next iteration. Long-term shoreline change may be the guiding force in decision-making for many parts of the state. People are worried about land loss in some areas more than flooding, and hard structure protection against erosion can be a major cause of habitat loss. It is very important to consider managing both hazard and habitat loss. We will not be able to address that problem at this stage, but it is critical to come back to it. - Mr. Batten: We fully agree with you that it is often the predominant risk for communities. It is a key area that we will need to focus on in the future, and time limitations have restricted our ability to address it in this iteration. In this iteration, our plan is to capture coastal erosion through VIMS data on Statewide coastal erosion rates, as well as narratively. We just do not have a visual representation through quantitative data.		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		- Dr. Young: I understand. I just wanted to make sure everyone is aware of this gap in the iteration.		
		Discussion Point- Whitney Katchmark: The new approach to downscaling Census data seems interesting. As soon as you can make it available, it would be helpful for locality staff to check things and make sure that it rings true. What data source are you using to measure County GDP? Are you changing the approach to Ecosystem Services context compared to the Task 4 report dated 6/11/21? - Mr. Mampara: If the TAC and Subcommittees feel strongly that even broaching a valuation of ecosystem services is not well-advised, then we will take that into account. We do not intend to use it for a comparative measure but wanted to include it because it is a straightforward measure that can potentially provide context. - Ms. Greenspan-Johnston: The US Bureau of Economic Analysis was the first database used to calculate County GDP, also County and PDC databases		
		 are being used narratively. We are collecting data to pull together the narrative and address GDP and economics more holistically. We have started to look at the Fiscal Stress Index and are looking to make changes and incorporate it once we gain an understanding of it. Carl Hershner (in chat): On behalf of the Project Evaluation Subcommittee, I wish to offer that we feel STRONGLY about the potential for misuse of the economic valuation information for ecosystem services. 		
		Secretary Strickler: We hear loud and clear the folks interested in more than just wetlands, as far as natural ecosystem impacts go. We totally understand their importance and the various levels of fidelity within the data. Mr. Tupponce, we hear your concerns loud and clear and will continue to communicate with you how tribal interests will be represented in the master plan. Julie Langan and her team are actively engaged in conversations about making sure we are protecting while not advertising cultural assets. We are hiring a coastal and underwater archeologist who can also help us with identifying these assets.		
		Elizabeth Andrew (in chat): I want to echo Mr. Tupponce's comments - I sent in comments after the last Studies Subcommittee meeting about my concern that cultural sites for all of the Tribes were not included. It sounds like Dewberry plans to approach the Tribes individually for feedback - thank you. But the concern re: releasing location of these sites is important; the VA FOIA has an exception for site-specific info on "significant historic and archaeological sites" - but "significant" is subjective and some of these sites are not yet recognized as historic sites.		
		Project Identification Criteria: Presented by Dan Medina		
		Discussion Point- Ms. McKay: Will you be able to transport the information already in the database that CZM funded Wetlands Watch to do? Will you be able to input that information into your database? - Mr. Medina: We have extracted all valuable information from the database. The plan is to submit this tool along with the spreadsheet, showing what we currently have and asking recipients to fill in the missing sections in the tool.		

Agenda/Minutes			
# Agenda Item	Minutes		
	Discussion Point- Ms. Katchmark: Is there more text in the form that explains matching. It seems it would be confusing to ask a locality what the funding match is unless they already have funding. At that point, they would likely already be developed. - Mr. Medina: We are not necessarily thinking that this will be an accurate number, but more likely a qualitative description. It is more about the ability to secure a potential funding match. - Ms. Moss: That is also an optional field. - Lewis Lawrence: Is that only related to municipally owned projects for the match question? - Mr. Medina: No, as we said, we are really looking for this field to be qualitative and an estimate of a project's ability to secure a funding match.		
	Project Evaluation Approach: Presented by Alaurah Moss		
	Discussion Point- Dr. Luckenbach: I am interested to know where in the evaluation process the technical likelihood of success of the project is being taken into account. Does the project have a high probability of succeeding? Where does that get evaluated- right before implementation? - Ms. Moss: Initially, we entertained the idea of a cost-benefit analysis, but most projects will not have that information. To truly determine flood risk reduction benefits would require more detailed modeling. Right now, we are asking the project owner for that information, but at some point, we will need more robust info about implementability.		
	Discussion Point- Mr. Lawrence: Who are we prioritizing these projects for? What is important to local governments may not be important to the Commonwealth. I am worried that when this prioritization process is applied, we will not know whose interests are being prioritized. - Secretary Strickler: My office, Dewberry, and the TAC are going through this process to ask localities and PDCs what is important to them, for broader consideration. The universe of projects we will be looking at are those important to localities. The State's role is to work with you all to identify, of those projects, which are important to localities and provide benefits or align with the goals of the master plan. - Mr. Lawrence: That is very helpful to recognize, and I don't think it has been stated before. That will go a long way of addressing concerns. - Secretary Strickler: The idea that we would be putting out this data call and taking it at face value, without any cross-checking, is disconcerting. What, if any, level of quality assurance and quality control is going to be built into the project evaluation process? - Ms. Moss: I showed a metric earlier on what coastal hazards are being addressed by the project. We did not want to exclude projects, so yes there are limited verifications built into the process currently. - Mr. Batten: The plan is that, as we work through draft prioritization process, we will be able to provide the information and metrics by which it was evaluated in a transparent way and work from there as we finalize prioritization.		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		 Dr. Hershner: One of the things we brought up in the Project Evaluation Subcommittee is that this initial iteration of project consideration is limited to what is being submitted by contributors and does not define the universe of need or risk throughout the coastal zone. Until the State can better define cumulative, comprehensive needs and better identify its priorities, we will be limited. What we do not want to do is only respond to locally perceived needs. That is one of the reasons why our current problems exist in insufficiently addressing climate resilience. We need to not perpetuate the mistakes that have gotten us to this point. Secretary Strickler: Great point. 		
		Discussion Point- Mary-Carson Stiff: It is confusing that prioritization for the master plan project identification process does not mirror that of the Community Flood Preparedness Fund. I know the two efforts are separate, and that has been articulated. However, it is important to note that there are two separate prioritization and evaluation processes happening, and the CMP projects that are identified are intended to be funded by the flood fund, so I worry that there might be an instance in which the project ID process is inconsistent with the flood fund prioritization in the manual. - Secretary Strickler: Our intent is to align these processes. We had the money and desire to get the Community Flood Preparedness Fund out before the first iteration, and we have done that with some apparent gaps. We intend for them to be fully aligned in later iterations. They will not be the same as this is still in draft, but we do fully intend for them to be aligned in the future.		
		Outreach / Engagement/ Charrette Update: Presented by Ashley Samonisky		
		Discussion Point- Ms. Owen: For the outreach tasks completed in June and July, prior to coordinating with localities, are you planning to coordinate with PIOs? The localities need to be a driving force in sharing information about the master plan and ways of getting involved. When PDCs coordinate with localities, they do not always coordinate with appropriate local staff. I am curious if you have done any coordination for that. It will take a lot of effort to disseminate this information, but we have substantial networks with local staff in addition to those in PDCs. - Ms. Samonisky: We have been provided local contacts by the State, as well as Subcommittee members, to which we are currently in the process of reaching out.		
		 Ms. Owen: Are these local contacts PIOs? Rear Admiral Phillips: That I am unsure of. We have been provided contacts and have also researched further contacts as well. We are always open to receiving contact information from you all to guide our efforts as well. Ms. Stewart: We typically do not send out highly technical information to localities. However, when disseminating information to locality staff, it is with the goal in mind that the information is being distributed throughout the locality. Ms. Owen: When the PDCs send out this information, that message needs to 		
		be there. Will the survey come from the PDCs to the localities? If you are not planning to coordinate with local governments until August, you might be		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		missing out on an entire perspective and will have difficulty receiving feedback from the public within the short timeframe. - Ms. Samonisky: The surveys will be out prior to the meetings in July and August. The intent is that responses to the surveys will help guide the narrative of those meetings. - Rear Admiral Phillips: This is a topic to be discussed by the Outreach Subcommittee tomorrow. - Mr. Goulet: If you are communicating directly with the localities, please CC the PDC contacts. If you are speaking to the wrong person or they need help, we will not know unless we are included in the conversation. Discussion Point- Ms. Stiff (in chat): The documents that we received as part of our meeting packet are the social media posts and the one-pager referenced earlier in the presentation? Will we be able to view the toolkit prior to distribution? Are all the		
		outreach materials being reviewed by the Outreach Subcommittee prior to "going live"? - Ashley: The centralized stakeholder survey is only to be completed in a professional capacity. There is not a public mailing list, but it will be disseminated at the lowest level.		
		Discussion Point- Jay Ford (in chat): Who is the responsible party for the underserved population meetings? And if those meetings are held throughout August how could those comments be meaningfully incorporated into the draft plan? - Mr. Batten: Those meetings give us adequate time to provide the information to the team drafting the document. - Ms. Samonisky: We will be coordinating with the NGOs to set up locations for meetings for underserved communities and disseminating information through all of our strategic partners. - Secretary Strickler: If Chesapeake Bay wants to host some of these meetings, we would be grateful to have them do that.		
		M. Moore (in chat): If you are trying to reach residents in a tidal flood area, I'm a resident in a tidal flood area. You can add me to the list.		
		Ms. Moss (in chat): Clarification on the ecosystem services – in accordance with feedback received from the Project Eval Subcommittee, we will NOT be providing any sort of valuation information on ecosystem services. Rather, we will narratively describe how changes and loss of habitat can affect provisioning of ecosystem services. - Ms. Katchmark (in chat): Thanks, Alaurah		
5.	Subcommittee Updates, Additional Discussion, and Questions	Project Identification Subcommittee – Lewis Lawrence Dan Medina did a great job explaining the Crosswalk. I have nothing else to add.		
		Project Evaluation Subcommittee - Dr. Carl Hershner Our Subcommittee has been deeply engaged with Dewberry. We have been pleased by their efforts. We have identified needs for future considerations and concerns about		

	Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes	
		outcomes that will result from existing first iteration protocols. We anticipate that, as this rolls forward, we will have the opportunity to engage more productively in implementing ideas for future improvement in the project evaluation process. We have been collecting ideas over these iterative discussions about subjects for future work. Our current concern is how our Subcommittee is going to stay productively engaged as this rolls out. Communication to the PDCs that this is just a first effort to be improved upon going forward is very important. We have been discussing 2 elements of this process: 1) we request that there be some effort to evolve in the short-term and engage us in the planning of the next iteration; 2) you are in an administration that is trying to create positive outcomes in remaining months, but how do we transition this effort into something that is sustainable in the future over different political administrations. We have been very specific in our comments to Dewberry, and they have been very responsive. We are satisfied with their work and anxious to see how the Subcommittee process will continue going forward with in-person meetings. - Secretary Strickler: The nature of the iterative process and improvement of the plan going forward is a top priority. I would hope that we continue to have this TAC in the future to continue work with the Secretary's office. We are trying to ensure that the master plan will live on as we look towards future iterations and changing political situations. We want recommendations of all kinds from the Subcommittees. We envision that future meetings will tee up recommendations for improvement, and we are planning a chapter in the master plan will describe long-term recommendations and next steps that are being prepared.	
		Finance Subcommittee - Elizabeth Andrews Our Subcommittee is planning to have our next meeting on June 28th and will have Lewis as our presenter on revolving loan funds and layering grants. Eric Letsinger will answer questions on his prior presentation in April. Dewberry will be joining us to provide an update as well. In May, we had a meeting to discuss federal funding, with presentations from Robbie Coates from VDEM, Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) representatives, Jaime Simon from the REPI program, and Richard Klein from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Subcommittee has heard about existing state and federal funding. In July, we will have more presentations about raising funding for transportation. We want to have opportunities for the Subcommittee to provide input, as we are working towards developing recommendations. Question: We are aiming to provide recommendations, but not a report as I understand it. How do you want these conveyed? In July, we will talk about resilience projects of regional importance. In August, we will discuss projects of local importance. In September, we will discuss projects for private landowners. Primary goal: learning to layer different funding sources. - Secretary Strickler: In looking forward to the TAC meeting schedule, we will meet hopefully in August. After that, we will compress the meeting schedule. We will be getting close to finishing the draft final plan at that point. For August Subcommittee reports, we could receive key recommendations as part of your read-out to the full TAC. Those need to be consensus recommendations to get them in front of TAC and help inform Dewberry's work going forward.	

	Agenda/Minutes				
#	# Agenda Item Minutes				
		 Ms. Andrews: There are some recommendations that we want to discuss in a bigger way, that have a broader scope moving forward. Secretary Strickler: That conversation will be difficult until we have a framework of what the master plan looks like. The bones of this will be the identified projects, for the project-driven part of the plan. There will be other sections of the plan, such as a gaps analysis, to enhance capacity for localities that haven't been able to identify projects needed. 			
		Community Outreach Subcommittee – Ashley Montgomery The Outreach Subcommittee is meeting tomorrow and will be discussing elements that Ashley S. laid out during the presentation today. We will be reviewing the outreach toolkit and the survey before they are sent out to the communities. We are working closely with VPC and Dewberry to coordinate efforts, capture voices, and reach out to underserved communities. We will be specifically focused on that effort and will focus on how to engage communities through boots on the ground efforts. That is where we are at the moment.			
		Studies, Research, and Best Practices Subcommittee – Dr. Robert Weiss (Updates provided by Elizabeth Andrews) Feedback for Dewberry has been provided on numerous questions. The State provided a framework on providing feedback for future recommendations on the plan. Dewberry presented their impact assessment methodology, the Subcommittee provided feedback and a summary was provided to Dewberry, some of which mentioned the need elaborate on residential housing, geomorphic change, evaluating tribal lands, and adding an appendix on assumptions/uncertainties/limitations of the methodology. Research support for the Subcommittee's working groups has been achieved- four students are being led by Shurui Zhang and will help until mid-August. The socioeconomic equity working group met with Dewberry and is supportive of using the CDC Social Vulnerability Index because it uses up-to-date data and incorporates more variables than other indices. The working group suggested using a finer scale for data, and Dewberry assured that they had a hybrid plan for downscaling the data. The nature-based infrastructure working group is meeting on 6/24. The relocation handbook working group is following two tasks: background research and creation of a data sheet of relocation initiatives. Dr. Weiss has assigned different portions of the writing of the document to multiple different individuals in the Subcommittee.			
		Federal Installation Partnership Subcommittee – Capt. Thomas Crabbs We have continued monthly meetings and added multiple advisors to our Subcommittee. Our June meeting included a briefing from HRPDC on JLUS studies and how to leverage those into the future, as well as studies to be pursued. We also received a presentation from Jaime Simon of the REPI program, and we received a presentation on resilience, science, and planning from NASA representatives. We added three new lines of effort to the list we have been working on. We will be pursuing those lines of effort going forward. We are responding to Dewberry's call for existing stakeholder projects and stakeholder points of contact for summer roundtables. Our next meeting will likely be in Hampton Roads in mid-July. We are			

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		looking to close out some lines of effort soon. I am happy to report that a JLUS / REPI / Sentinel Landscapes Crosswalk was developed by Kevin Du Bois to help identify opportunities for alignment and future decision-making regarding funding. That Crosswalk can be found on the website. Virginia also submitted a phase 1 Sentinel Landscapes proposal, and it has been selected to move to phase 2 of the process. If successful, it will be called the VA Security Corridors. It will be submitted in August and responses will be in the fall. Sentinel Landscapes does not come with specific funding, but it provides and advantage in collaboration and alignment of future federal funding opportunities. It also serves to knit together standing Sentinel Landscapes in Maryland and North Carolina. If successful, it will create a continuous mid-Atlantic Sentinel Landscape, compounding future benefits.		
		Aligning Economic Development Subcommittee - Sara Dunnigan Our Subcommittee has initiated a survey among our networks to determine the current level of alignment. We are looking to boost our responses and collate them for our next Subcommittee meeting. Our goal is to ensure economic viability of communities in the study area and better understand how these efforts could generate new economic activity around coastal resilience. We received presentations at our last meeting and will have our next meeting on June 28th virtually. Our July meeting will be in-person in Richmond. At our next meeting, we will receive presentations of case studies and best practices from other states to understand how they have increased alignment, which will inform our recommendations.		
6.	Virginia Tribal Considerations for Coastal Resilience – Reggie Tupponce	Reggie Tupponce: There are seven federally recognized tribes and four state-recognized tribes. There are big differences between the two statuses. The acknowledgment of inherent sovereignty by the federal definition puts chiefs on a status level equal to the states- equivalent to a governor or higher because the federal government has to communicate directly with the chiefs. It is important that communication is addressed to the tribal chiefs, as well as likely including another identified contact. I am working to update contact information so that you will have the most up-to-date information. The Commonwealth does not have a policy for consultation with federally recognized tribes. Federal agencies are mandated to consult with tribes. The State has been working with us on certain issues. If you bring in the Army Corps of Engineers, consultation with federally tribes is mandated. It is good to have communication early and often. With the Subcommittees, we have not been that involved, simply due to capacity. For project identification, for example, the projects identified for other special interest groups or even with localities may be different from our priorities. That is something of which we should be cognizant. This flows into evaluation- we have sacred and historical sites and great concerns over fisheries. These are some of the areas that we would like to point out. Be cognizant that tribes are there and need to be communicated with on these issues because it does pertain to us. At some point, you will likely have to work with us, so the earlier you do so, the better. I also do not speak on behalf of the other tribes because they are sovereign nations, so it is important to contact them individually. We will communicate with other tribes to raise their awareness and engage them.		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	Agenda Item	Minutes		
		 Rear Admiral Phillips: Thank you for your willingness to work with us and help us identify important points of contact. We want the tribes to be included in our data call and throughout this process. Secretary Strickler: You and other tribal leaders have a direct line to Admiral Phillips, so please let us know if you have any concerns or ideas that you would like addressed. We want to make sure we are working together to make sure your equities are considered. 		
7.	Program Updates- Secretary Strickler	VCFPF Grant Manual Release On June 4th, we released the first grant manual for the VCFPF. This will be funded with the \$18 million from the RGGI Auction. The vast majority of this money went out for the first grant round, which will close on September 3, 2021. There is an emphasis on planning and technical assistance, especially for localities without robust flood protection plans. We want localities to raise their baseline level of resources. However, we are saying yes to other projects as well. We are trying to structure it so there is not a hard stop and start. If an application/project is not funded, we want to work with the applicant for the next grant round by making modifications so that the proposal will score better. The second RGGI auction round is also complete, with about \$20 million for the VCFPF that will open in late summer. - Mr. Cristman: I want to note that we have two more Q&As coming up on July 15th 1:00-3:00 pm and August 13th. You can go on our website and register. We had one meeting on June 15th, and there is a recording if you would like to watch it. VMRC Living Shore Guidelines Late last month, new tidal wetlands and living shorelines guideline was completed- it is the first new guideline in 3 decades. We are making sure to consider climate change		
		factors when local wetlands boards are seeing projects that address disturbance to local habitats. DEQ Chesapeake Bay Protection Act Next Tuesday, the State Water Control Board will consider a new Chesapeake Bay Act regulation. It will incorporate the influence of climate change to change how we		
		approach the Chesapeake Bay Act and new language on conservation. As a result of these combined efforts, there has been a complete overhaul in Virginia coastal resource policies to make the Commonwealth more resilient to coastal hazards. Thank you all for your efforts. This puts Virginia in a more secure and strong position to adapt to and mitigate climate change impacts. Targeted Next Meeting Date We will get back to you all shortly regarding the next meeting date in August.		
8.	Public Comments	Hopefully, we nail down a date and be able to meet in-person. Secretary Strickler opened the floor to public comments. Katie Sallee advised all those signed up for public comment had left the meeting. She asked that, if anyone wanted to jump in to provide a comment, please do so at that time.		

	Agenda/Minutes			
#	# Agenda Item Minutes			
		M. Moore (in chat): I hope the virtual option for attendance will continue to be available for members of the public going forward.		
9.	Motion to Adjourn	Secretary Strickler adjourned the meeting at 4:11 pm.		

	Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date	
1.	Schedule August TAC Meeting	Chair	TBD	
2.				

If you have any questions, please contact Emily Sokol, Vision Planning and Consulting, at esokol@vision-pc.net.