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

Subject	TAC PP Subcommittee Meeting 2023-Q2	Date	08/17/23
Chair	Ken Pfeil, Chief Data Officer, OGDA	Time – START/ADJOURN	10:00am/11:45am
Location	VITA 7325 Beaufont Springs Drive Richmond, VA 23225	Scribe	Gina Barber VCU CPP

Subcommittee Members

Last Name	First Name	Agency	In Person	Virtual
Berg	Christopher	Virginia Department of Transportation		
Ellington	Jay	Crater Planning District Commission	V	
Green	Jamie	Virginia Marine Resources Commission		
Heath	Brianna	Northern Neck Planning District Commission	v	
Katchmark	Whitney	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	V	
Keller	Nicole	PlanRVA		V
Krolikowski	Jack	American Flood Coalition		٧
McFarlane	Ben	Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	v	
Owen	Randy	Virginia Marine Resources Commission		
Peabody	Rachael	Virginia Marine Resources Commission		v
Pfeil	Ken	OGDA	V	

Virginia Coastal Resilience TAC Project Prioritization Subcommittee

Last Name	First Name	Agency	In Person	Virtual
Podyma	Eli	PlanRVA		V
Smith	Andrew	DCR	V	
Steelman	Jessica	Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission		
Stewart	Sarah	PlanRVA	V	
Stiff	Mary-Carson	Wetlands Watch	V	
Swanson	Chris	Virginia Department of Transportation	V	
Thornton	Marcus	OGDA	V	
Vick	Cathie	Virginia Port Authority		
Wells	Matthew	DCR		
Whitehurst	Scott	Virginia Port Authority		V

DCR Staff and Other Participants

Last Name	First Name	Agency	In Person	Virtual
Dalon	Matt	DCR	V	
Heaps-Pecaro	Carolyn	DCR	V	
Geiger	Stu	Dewberry	V	
Greenspan Johnston	Johanna	Dewberry	V	
Barber	Gina	Center for Public Policy VCU	V	
Wood	Wheeler	Center for Public Policy VCU	V	

Reference Links			
Item	Link		
Meeting Agenda	https://townhall.virginia.gov/L/GetFile.cfm?File=meeting\49\38416\Agen da_DCR_new_v1.pdf		
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slides	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/proj- prioritization-tac-subcommittee-guidance.pdf		
Video Recording of the Meeting	https://youtu.be/eTBWbR4L67Q		

Ag	enda Item	Minutes		
1.	Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions 10:00 am	Chair Ken Pfeil called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. Roll Call was completed and members introduced themselves.		
2.	Presentation by DCR 10:05 am	 Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro presented the below topics to the Subcommittee. Additional details are provided in the meeting material. A. Coastal Resilience Master Plan Phase II Overview a. DCR is required by the Code of Virginia to update the CRMP Phase I by December 2024. b. This Subcommittee's recommendations for future resilience projects will be needed for the CRMP Phase II. c. Two major deliverables of the CRMP Phase II are an updated Coastal Resilience Web Explorer and a PDF Document Plan. d. There is a plan to conduct outreach and engagement to get feedback on the two major deliverables. B. Flood Hazard Risk Assessment Crosswalk from the CRMP Phase I Impact Assessment and the Status of Flood Resilience Report a. This Subcommittee will be asked to provide recommendations on the critical infrastructure categories used in CRMP Phase II. b. DCR is required to include natural infrastructure. 		
		 c. Community resources are not included in the draft list of categories presented to the Subcommittee because it is not required for the Status of Flood Resilience Report. 		

d	This Subcommittee will be asked to make recommendations for
	future resilience planning projects.
C. CRM	Phase II Risk Assessment Data Inputs
a.	This Subcommittee will be asked for their recommendations on the potential updates, including:
	 Aligning critical infrastructure categories with COV-CIP working group.
	ii. Reframing natural infrastructure categories and datasets to align with state agency programs.
	iii. Updating community resources data with new Census Bureau products.
	 iv. Updating community context data to align with new CDC SVI social vulnerability data, or another social vulnerability product.
D. Plann	ed Resilience Actions
a.	The Coastal Resilience Web Explorer User Portal will be launched September 2023.
	 The Portal will allow localities, planning district commissions, and others to submit information to DCR about resilience projects around the Commonwealth.
	ii. This information would be available for view in the Portal.
	iii. Ms. Heaps-Pecaro noted that DCR is not proposing to conduct prioritization nor commit to funding these projects added to the Portal.
E. Subco	mmittee Objectives
a.	Inform and support the flood hazard risk assessment.
	 Specifically: the asset data inputs; the approach to quantifying the vulnerability of assets; and impact assessment outputs needed to support decision-making, coordination, and collaboration.
b	Inform and support the identification of planned resilience actions.
	 Specifically, identify shared themes, and gap trends between projects and initiatives submitted to the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer User Portal.

Develop recommendations for future planning (all subcommittees)
c. Develop recommendations for future planning (all subcommittees)
i. This includes, but is not limited to:
 Develop objective protocols for evaluating and prioritizing identified project needs for the Coastal Region.
 Develop a process and objective protocols for evaluating and prioritizing resilience actions. (Consider separate evaluation protocols for critical human, built, and natural infrastructure needs.)
F. Role of Subcommittee Advisors
a. The Subcommittee Chair may recommend to the TAC Chair that specific advisors be appointed to the Subcommittee.
 Advisors may participate in Subcommittee meeting discussions and are non-voting members.
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro led the Subcommittee members in the following discussion.
G. Flood Hazard Risk Assessment Crosswalk on slide 8
 Ms. Heaps-Pecaro confirmed that this Subcommittee would advise on identification of the natural infrastructure categories. The categories listed are pre-defined by DCR (ConserveVirginia), but DCR is considering using different categories. The human and built infrastructure topics are aligned to the work VDEM is currently doing.
H. Subcommittee Objectives Clarifications from Ms. Heaps-Pecaro:
 a. Under the recommendations for future planning, DCR recommends the Subcommittee set goals under each area of analysis for what the Subcommittee thinks the Commonwealth should be working towards for a coastal resilient future. From there, the Subcommittee could recommend how future projects are prioritized to meet those goals.
b. There are known gaps in the resilience projects included in CRMP Phase I. DCR is proposing to use the User Portal to allow localities and PDCs to share those projects on an ongoing basis with a well- publicized deadline for submitting projects to this Subcommittee for consideration. The Subcommittee would review these projects for themes and gaps starting in Q2 2024.

	c. The goal of this Subcommittee is to identify the themes and gaps from the User Portal data and then use those themes to help inform recommendations to DCR for how to prioritize projects for future plans.
	d. DCR will share the project data submitted in the User Portal to this Subcommittee without prioritizing, scoring, or ranking the projects.
	e. DCR is not proposing to prioritize projects in the Phase II of the CRMP.
	f. There are projects from CRMP Phase I that have been inventoried but not prioritized. This Subcommittee discussed prioritization in the CRMP Phase I process, which produced a schema for how projects could be prioritized.
	g. A possible role for this Subcommittee and use for the CRMP Phase II is supporting the regionalization of planning efforts through the identification of commonalities and opportunities for localities and PDCs to work together.
	 The Subcommittee Objectives on slide 11 will be updated to include the identification of goals and metrics before the prioritization of projects for future planning.
	i. Discussions on recommendations for future planning can include considerations of what the Commonwealth wants the CRMP to be used for and how we can make the CRMP a useful tool for those desired actions.
	j. A member noted that selecting outputs for the risk assessment in CRMP Phase II would also ideally be informed by goals.
I. Oth	er Questions about the Objectives on slide 11
	a. How recommendations will be implemented:
	 The recommendations will be made to DCR as they work on the next CRMP update. They will review them to design that update process.
	 There is a need to track progress on those recommendations to ensure we are being successful.
	b. The incentive to submit projects to the User Portal:
	 The incentive for participation is a barrier to overcome. The Outreach Subcommittee will also be discussing opportunities to overcome this barrier. Feedback from this

		Subcommittee on how the project inventory from Phase I
		has been useful would be appreciated by DCR Staff.
	ii.	DCR is exploring if the User Portal will have the capability to connect projects to funding sources that are listed in the Portal.
	iii.	DCR thinks there is an opportunity to connect prioritized projects through future iterations of the CRMP to funding. However, DCR is not proposing to prioritize projects in CRMP Phase II and cannot commit that future plans will do this.
	iv.	The current scope of work on the User Portal includes editing and updating the database. Then, cross walking new projects with new funding sources.
J. Role of	Advisor	rs
a.	VDEM y	was suggested as an advisor to the Subcommittee.
b.	Advisor	rs are subject to FOIA.
		nmittee has the option to invite people as guest speakers to c meetings. This is a different role than an advisor invited to ctings.
	-	oup discussed possibly inviting localities to be advisors to the nmittee.
	withou were o priority frequen should resilien state fo there is plannin	air tabled this discussion because the group could not vote t knowing who the possible individuals were and if they pen to participating. Some members of the group feel a may be to hear from localities we haven't heard from as ntly. Other members of the group feel the Subcommittee also hear from localities that have advanced in their ace planning and whether setting goals and metrics from the or the coastal region is helpful. The group recognized that s great disparity between the level of flood resilience and among localities. Some localities who went through the rocess may be a helpful addition.
	wetland from V advisor discuss	l infrastructure experts (including from VIMS, Molly Mitchell, ds migration, sea level rise impacts), and floodplains experts FMA to speak to relevant issues. Not necessarily as an but to participate in meetings where specific areas of ion are established. Water quality experts are also important r Ches Bay Commission).

g. Virtual participation options for the TAC meetings will be brought up for a vote at the September meeting. The TAC will consider expanding the 60-mile rule and adding all virtual meeting options.
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro presented the below topics to the Subcommittee. Additional details are provided in the meeting PowerPoint.
K. Flood Hazard Risk Assessment Outputs
a. Categories included in the Phase I risk assessment are consistent with the categories listed on slide 8.
 Maps on slides 17-19 show the impacts across different categories and the vulnerability of assets.
c. Information is framed in the context of different regions. Maps are combining narrative information on where different assets existed as well as data on expected impacts over different time periods.
d. The Coastal Resilience Web Explorer has information on the impacts, community resources, natural infrastructure, etc. The tabular data is available for download. Metrics used to understand the impacts for these assets are available. All of these details are also available in Appendix E of the CRMP Phase I.
L. Coastal Resilience Web Explorer Usage:
a. Averaging 380 visits per month in 2023.
b. Do not know who is using the data, which data they are using, and how they are using the data.
 c. This Subcommittee is being asked to determine what the outputs for Phase II should look like.
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro led the Subcommittee members in the following discussion.
M. Discussion on the outputs of the Flood Hazard Risk Assessment included:
a. The duration and frequency that an asset will be flooded.
 b. The build back problem experienced when the waters recede. Currently, assets labeled at risk are lumped together. Localities cannot distinguish residential buildings, hospitals, etc.

С.	Site specific flood data that is not already captured in the viewer,
	for example, due to stormwater flooding.
d.	Information to determine where limits to maintenance exist due to costs resulting from repairing after flooding occurs.
e.	Helping to identify limitations for public protection under different scenarios. Ex., HRPDC noted that they are considering hurricanes "things should operate normally under certain scenarios" but beyond that, there will not be public protection. That threshold is hard to define.
f.	Clear definitions in the assessment are needed – what is critical? What threshold is "impassible" for a roadway. Want to reflect realistic picture, rather than an optimistic picture. Helping to define tipping points for infrastructure; where new assets should not be built, where the costs are anticipated to outweigh the benefits.
g.	Information that helps localities/individuals make decisions. For example, next steps that could be considered depending on which impact area an asset is in. Go beyond risk assessment to provide guidance on how to take action based on the findings. How can we better interpret the results for end-users?
	i. The purpose of working with other agencies that own/regulate critical infrastructure through VDEM's critical infrastructure working group is to get to more in-depth analysis on the vulnerability and approach to management for these assets. The purpose of this plan is to provide data that these other agencies/actors may need so that they can do their own more detailed assessment, and to facilitate the process of investigating flood risk, identify commonalities across the region that the state can provide resources to address.
h.	Decision-making for long-range planning; the assessment should not just focus on where flooding is now, but where it is expected to be. For example, informing the state's capital investment decisions. Need some way to incorporate information into a benefit-cost analysis for policies. VDOT is doing this but it is taking a long time and a significant investment of resources.
i.	Any state agencies in a position similar to VDOT (asset owners) would benefit from this type of analysis. Consistent set of scenarios, metrics, analysis to inform agencies' approach to flooding and forward-looking action. Agencies talking to each other and using collaboration in decision making.

	i. It was suggested that state agencies should have an existing
	business impact assessment completed for their operations, which may already include data on the impacts of flooding. State agencies probably have some information but that is stored differently – question is what is the conversation to get access to that info? Probably involves a lot of one-on-one conversations which could then be fed up into a dashboard.
	 Could we get an agency to come and present on their business impact assessment and how flooding is incorporated, and whether SLR is something that has been looked at?
	 The private side of impacts to economy would not be captured to business impact assessment of state agencies. The subcommittee is not clear on this but is interested in private impacts than the public impacts.
	 Are other agencies doing future impact assessments? Yes, DWR.
	iii. VFPMP is also going to be developed at the same time. The focus of that plan will be state agency policies.
fc	bata on areas for housing elevation prioritization that can be used or a whole community. Probably not possible in the web explorer; yould need to download the data to analyze it.
a ir a I. D	bility to draw an area and generate some statistics for a grant pplication might be helpful. These statistics could include critical nfrastructure, value, etc. It would be incredibly helpful to have dditional BCA information, but it is likely not possible at this scale. Pata on disruption of business during events. For example, what it osts a business owner when they can't drive to deliver things.
a	wewberry suggests that there is a lot of useful data from Phase I Iready in the plan that can be repackaged to better suit the needs f end users in Phase II. Need to know who are our target udiences and what would be most useful for them to receive?
	anson shared work VDOT is doing to better understand assets le to resilience events.
	DOT is attempting to understand what happens to the system as a whole when individual critical assets are impacted. VDOT is working with VIMS to identify network analysis that was previously

b. c.	 completed in a study several years ago. (When a road floods, the number of people who are impacted.) VDOT is considering the critical community services that are inaccessible when an asset is impassable and how long those services will be inaccessible. VDOT is collaborating with VDEM to identify what is needed to maintain critical operation of services when assets are impacted. They are also identifying critical day-to-day community services that may be needed.
d	 It is unclear at this point how this analysis will fit into the Phase II process.
e	VDOT is working on making distinctions based on nuances of intensity, duration, frequency of flooding. For example, looking at what materials should be used for roadways that are repeatedly flooded.
f.	A feedback loop between the Commonwealth and localities is needed to provide the information and analyze it on an ongoing basis. VDOT is looking to take some direction from localities on what assets they are prioritizing.
g.	VDOT agrees that interpreting flood probability maps is important and haven't yet figured that out. Looking at creating a flood depth model as opposed to a probability model; playing with different depths and looking at how the system behaves, to help inform adaptive design criteria. Once they find a depth of interest, cross- checking back against probability.
	i. There is an opportunity for the CRMP to do this (i.e. 6 inch increments to 8 feet of sea level rise), to identify where things "really start to get bad" for different assets. This also helps localities who are applying for different funding sources from funders who use different climate scenarios/SLR curve.
	ii. This will be discussed further in RDI Subcommittee.
h	It was acknowledged that VDOT is leading the charge and is going farther than this group on transportation assets, which makes sense. It may make sense for this group to take direction from what VDOT comes up with to inform decisions passed down to local governments (development standards for floodplain management).
i.	Current flooding information is recorded in residency offices. VDOT is working to bring that into a statewide database.

	O. Other Subcommittee member comments on data available in Web Explorer
	 a. Subcommittee members feel data is useful for raising the alarm and swaying decisionmakers, and for messaging in grant proposals. If everyone is already onboard, the next step is difficult.
	 b. Local governments have not been surveyed to determine if the local government assessment has been useful to them. Additional outreach in this area has been identified for future efforts.
	c. Subcommittee members shared they have used the impact assessment. The struggle comes with determining what the data actually means in a specific location. For example, the data is being plugged into scenario planning; the summaries are useful, but they need to zoom in further. Downloads of tabular data exist.
	d. The Subcommittee is being asked to share more useful ways to report information in the Web Explorer to localities that are approachable and engaging for various audiences. Learning who these audiences are is helpful in how the information is packaged.
	 e. Chair stated he will bring information on state agency critical operations and impediments to resilience events to the next Subcommittee meeting.
3. Public Comment 11:40 am	No public comment was offered.
4. Action Items 11:41 am	Identified action items are:
	 The Subcommittee will Identify recommended goals and metrics to be incorporated into future plans prior to beginning a discussion on a schema for project prioritization.
	2. Chair will bring information on state agency critical operations and how flooding is incorporated into business impact assessments to the next Subcommittee meeting.
	3. Subcommittee members will send any suggestions for advisors and presenters to the Chair and Ms. Heaps-Pecaro.
	 Subcommittee members will complete an upcoming survey on the recurring meeting day/time for the Subcommittee.
	Additional key takeaways are:
	The subcommittee expressed a desire to identify a way to hear from local governments during this process.

	 DCR will bring updated risk assessment output summary to the next meeting for additional subcommittee review and feedback.
	The topic for the Q4 2023 meeting is risk assessment outputs and inputs
5. Adjourn 11:45 am	The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.

The purpose of these minutes is to record and preserve, to the best of our ability, the major contributors and general topics covered during this meeting. Verbatim transcription is not the intent of this document. If you have any questions, please contact <u>flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov</u>