Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan

Technical Advisory Committee – Project Identification Subcommittee

Subject	Project Identification Subcommittee Meeting #5 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	June 22, 2021
Facilitator	Lewis L. Lawrence	Time	10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location	WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/i/xynuj	Scribe	Emily Sokol

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
Project Identification Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors			
1.	Lewis L. Lawrence – Co-Chair	Executive Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Y
2.	Carol Considine – Vice Chair	Program Head, Flooding and the Built Environment, Institute for Coastal Adaptation and Resilience at Old Dominion University	Y
3.	Shep Moon - Staff	Coastal Planner, Virginia Coastal Zone Management Programs	Y
4.	Jill Bieri	Director of Virginia Coast Reserve, The Nature Conservancy	Y
5.	Alec Brebner	Executive Director, Crater Planning District Commission	
6.	Clyde Cristman	Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	
7.	Shawn Crumlish	Director of Financial Services, Virginia Resources Authority	Y
8.	Martha Heeter	Executive Director, Plan RVA (Richmond Regional Planning District Commission	Y
9.	Traci Munyan	Program Administrative Manager, Dept. of Housing and Community Development	Y
10.	Normand Goulet	Director, Division of Environmental and Resiliency Planning, Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Y
11.	Dr. Mark Luckenbach	Associate Dean for Research and Advisory Services, Virginia Institute of Marine Science at William & Mary	Y
12.	Georgie Márquez	Principle, Andre Márquez Architects	
13.	Carlos Rivero	Chief Data Officer, CDO	
Scheduled Speakers			
14.	Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y
15.	Alaurah Moss	Dewberry	Y
16.	Dan Medina	Dewberry	Y
17.	John Paine		Y
Designated Alternates			
18.	Curt Smith – Co-Chair	Deputy Director, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission	Y
19.	Russ Baxter	Deputy Director, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation	Y
20.	Sarah Stewart	Planning Manager, Plan RVA	Y
21.	Jay Ruffa	Crater PDC	Y
Other Participants			
22.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
23.	Connor Winstead	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
24.	Matt Dalon	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
25.	Shurui Zhang		Y
26.	Nick Meade		Y
27.	Reed Terry		Y
28.	Whitney Katchmark		Y
29.	Ellen Bolen		Y
30.	Mitchell Smiley		Y
31.	Elizabeth Schell		Y

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

#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
	Invitees/Attendees		
32.	Grace Tucker		Y
33.	Emily Steinhilber		Y
34.	Keith Cannady		Y
	Consultant Support		
35.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y

#	Agenda Item	Minutes
	Agenda/Minutes	
1.	Welcome/FOIA Preamble/Roll Call	Lewis Lawrence welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Subcommittee Members, those serving as designated alternates, Subcommittee Advisors, and guest speakers. Lewis then called the meeting to order at 10:05 am and read the Section 1289 required language. Lewis asked Shep Moon to take roll, and Shep advised that a quorum was present. Lewis advised that only panelists will be unmuted for discussion and public participants can ask questions through the chat and will be called upon at the end of the meeting, during the public comment period. If there are connectivity issues or a disruption occurs, please contact staff at 804-698-4297. Lewis asked for a motion to proceed with the meeting virtually. Carol Considine motioned, and the motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
2.	Chair Updates and Old Business	Lewis recognized that there were no new Subcommittee members to be introduced. He opened the floor to the Dewberry team to provide updates regarding efforts introduced in the last meeting. Brian Batten announced that Dewberry's primary task for the meeting was to debrief the Subcommittee on changes that they made to the Project Identification Schema in response to feedback provided by the Subcommittee and the Commonwealth, as well as provide an overview of the data call.
3.	Project Database Structure Update - Dewberry	Dan Medina presented the changes that Dewberry made to the Project Identification Schema based on the Subcommittee's comments (See Attached Slides). The first comment that was addressed concerned the articulation of the benefits of participating in the data call. Within the data call survey, introductory language was added to communicate how the information will be used, why it is needed, what level of information the project owners or submitters will need to provide, what project information should be provided before July 9th, and where submitters can seek guidance for additional background and definitions. The goal is to make it easy for entities to contribute data. The second comment posed by the Subcommittee was the need to cover projects that do not fit neatly into the project types and subtypes identified in the Schema. In response, Dewberry added an "Other" group, as well as other project subtypes suggested by the Subcommittee, including stream restoration, parcel-level flood adaptation program, green infrastructure, pluvial measures, and drainage improvement. Dan then opened the floor to the Subcommittee for questions, comments, and discussion. Discussion Point- Rear Admiral Ann Phillips: Based on current considerations being discussed by the Commonwealth, we are unsure about whether we want to score and

#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		prioritize capacity building projects. We want to know what is needed regarding these projects. However, within the context of moving forward and prioritizing projects, we do not know if we would like to score and prioritize all of these capacity building and planning project types in the first round of evaluation. Some of the project types in the capacity building schema, however, are of interest for prioritization. Therefore, we need to consider if these subtypes will need to be moved into the flood resilience project schema, or how we would otherwise like to go about restructuring the schema to address this consideration. Discussion Point- Normand Goulet: I am concerned that, based on this schema, the coastal localities are going to be solely prioritized. If so, a large portion of Virginia is going to be left behind in the prioritization process. - Rear Admiral Phillips: The focus of this first effort is on coastal adaptation and protection, mainly because we do not have time to evaluate and measure pluvial hazards in the current time frame. There are projects that may not be prioritized in this first effort because the completion of the impact assessment for coastal regions was a primary task for the first iteration. There is a coastal focus, but we do not want to leave out projects and may decide to include some that we are currently wary of prioritizing, based on the information we receive in response to the data call. We need to know how many of these projects exist and where. Also, it is within Dewberry's scope to analyze pluvial hazards in the future. Additionally, we want your help developing language for the master plan that will be inclusive of non-coastal PDCs. Discussion Point- Lewis: Could you clarify the statement in the survey's introductory language that states, "please complete this survey by July 9 for your most important projects?" You are asking that the contributor identify their most important projects; however, the projects that they think are most important may not align with the Commonwealth's priorities or those demonstrated by the prioritization framework. There will likely be a gap between their perception of importance and the prioritization framework. - Rear Admiral Phillips: That gap will always exist. We are trying to close this gap by increasing the amount of reliable data available on these projects. We reserve the right to modify the evaluation criteria in the future, as the first round of projects to be evaluated will likely shape our perspective. Some PDCs have many projects that will be of interest, while others may have no projects prepared at this time. It is also important for us to understand the localities' priorities in this process, so this gap can also provide further knowledge. - Dan: This appears to be a staging issue. We are asking project owners to provide information on all of their projects by the end of July, while only asking them to submit their high-priority projects by July 9th. - Normand: I am looking at the calendar. We are already late into June and July 4th is quickly approaching. I do not see a lot of projects getting submitted prior to July 9th. - Rear Admiral Phillips: The challenge is that we are trying to get as much completed as possible in this short time frame. We might have to push back the deadline by a week, but that will continue to condense our timeline. It has taken longer than we previously thought it would to develop the data call, so the timeline for feedback has gotten shorter and shorter. If needed, we will extend the date.

Agenda/Minutes		
#	**Agenda Item**	**Minutes**
		- Normand: Another challenge is that I have requested data calls from my localities three times recently. With each subsequent data call, I get less and less feedback. Burnout is a major concern when it comes to requesting information. Additionally, timing may pose a problem. We are asking for responses by July 9th. Our PDC meets this Thursday, and we will not meet again until the end of July.
		- Sarah Stewart: I am trying to think of ways to avoid bombarding localities with information requests. I am assuming that this data collection process will continue in future years, as we have discussed this as an iterative process. There needs to be a way for us to get data out of this process in a way that localities are not asked for project information by multiple different sources in largely the same format going forward.
		- Lewis: The person responding to the survey will have to determine if they believe submitting data is a priority. Them not answering the data call is an answer in and of itself. The timeline is what it is. The first iteration may yield little fruit, but future iterations may yield more in the future.
		- Normand: The problem there is that it depends on whom the question is being posed to- staffers or boards and supervisors.
		- Lewis: Yes, that is a good question. From what perspective do you want this data call answered? That is likely a question for Rear Admiral Phillips.
		- Rear Admiral Phillips: This data call is not being restricted to a single perspective. We will simply take what we can in this initial cut. Policy is also a critical aspect in this process. We will fill in the gaps moving forward, after the initial call.
		- Alaurah Moss: The initial intent was to provide a list of projects collected from existing databases, broken down by PDCs, with the data call. In doing so, contributors could at least copy and paste existing information and fill in information gaps. Eventually, the data could potentially live in an application where the project owners could edit their responses.
		- Sarah: When you send out the data call, will you be sending out a companion spreadsheet?
		- Alaurah: Yes, that is the intent.
		- Rear Admiral Phillips: I have drafted an email with a spreadsheet containing data from the Coastal Zone Management database. HRPDC has their own data call update, so we are trying to pull together information to align our efforts. Dan addressed the introductory language inserted to communicate the importance of the data call. The Commonwealth is drafting additional language to further make the case of its importance.
		- Sarah: We are currently constructing a Plan RVA resilience database. To avoid having locality staff complete multiple similar data calls, we should coordinate these efforts.
		- Rear Admiral Phillips: Our goal is to create a living database that can be added to over time. How do we build this database to support coordination and collaboration?

	Agenda/Minutes	
#	**Agenda Item**	**Minutes**
4.	Project Data Call – Review of Data Call Guidance and Web Application by Dewberry	Alaurah Moss provided an overview of the survey technology used for the Project Data Call. At the last Subcommittee meeting, Dewberry presented two possible platforms for the data call: an Excel spreadsheet or an online survey. Dewberry did not receive any feedback regarding the Subcommittee's platform preferences. The team found that the Excel spreadsheet platform presented some performance limitations, considering the desired information. Additionally, the online survey was found to be more accessible and easier to complete from the contributors' perspective, as the use of a spreadsheet would likely require a separate key. The survey has been tested by the team and only takes about ten minutes to complete. The information provided can also be updated in the future. There are both required and optional fields. Required fields include contributor name and contact information, project name, project owner, project description, project footprint for flood resilience projects, project scale, purpose & need, future condition considerations, subtype, project status, and total implementation cost. Optional fields include project identifier, owner classification, estimated start date, estimated completion date, information link, design life, additional cost breakdowns, cost-share requirements, application costs, permitting status, and special consideration notes. Alaurah also demonstrated where survey responses can be viewed- this tool is to confirm survey responses and allow the contributors to see a list of the projects that they submitted. Discussion Point- Normand: When you are referring to the contributor, is that the individual submitting the project or is it concerning financial contribution? - Alaurah: It is referring to the person who submitted the survey. - Normand: I would suggest using a different word instead of 'contributor,' as many might find that confusing. - Dan: Yes, that is a good point. 'Submitter' could be a good alternate, as Alaurah proposed.
5.	Project Data Call – Open Discussion	Discussion Point- Lewis: Could you talk about the timeline for when this survey will be disseminated and how you would like us to help facilitate? - Rear Admiral Phillips: The Office of the Secretary is currently taking the survey under consideration. We hope to have it wrapped up tomorrow, so the survey will hopefully be disseminated by the end of the week. The survey will be sent to the points of contact that you all identified. We really appreciate you providing those contacts. The planning districts will work with the localities to provide this information. We are interested in getting as much information back as soon as possible, though the end of July is our ~~more strict~~stricter deadline. Eventually, we will need to draw a line for what will be included in the first iteration. - Lewis: Okay, then we will stand-by for further instruction. Discussion Point- Russ Baxter: Can we be provided with a copy of the survey before it is sent out? - Lewis: Rear Admiral Phillips, can the Subcommittee members preview the survey prior to its dissemination? - Rear Admiral Phillips: We can provide the link to the survey for your review. It will be to the currently existing survey, so there will likely be some changes after the Office of the Secretary reviews it. - Russ: Yes, that is fine. We are facing current considerations regarding grant funding and need to identify existing overlaps.

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		- Normand: I would also like a chance to review the survey. It is difficult to come up with feedback on the fly like this. I could provide comments by the end of the day. - Lewis: Could the link be provided to the full Subcommittee? - Rear Admiral Phillips: Yes, but please get your feedback to us as soon as possible. Also, there will be changes to the survey, so do not forward the link to your localities, as it is a draft. Discussion Point- Rear Admiral Phillips: I have one final comment to emphasize my previous statement about the collection but not prioritization of capacity building projects. We need to identify those project types within the capacity building project schema that need to be considered for prioritization and determine how they will be restructured.
6.	Public Comment Period	No one registered for public comments, and no public comments were posed in the chat.
7.	Next Meeting Date	Lewis advised the Subcommittee that the next meeting will be on July 27, 2021, 10 am – 12 pm. Rear Admiral Phillips: As you will hear in the TAC meeting today, we will have to transition to in-person meetings beginning July 1st. There will be requirements regarding in-person participation by Subcommittee members. These requirements are to guide the Subcommittees in how this process will continue moving forward.
8.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	Lewis asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Carol Considine motioned, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 am.

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.			

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