

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee

Subject	Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee Federal Funding Opportunities Work Group Meeting #1 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	July 28, 2021
Facilitator	Tom Crabbs	Time	2:00pm – 4:00pm
Location	723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320 WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/i/euk4k Recording: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Lp7jLlo9v4	Scribe	Jeff Flood

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
Federal Installations Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors			
1.	Tom Crabbs	Chair - Captain, USCG (retired), Military Liaison, Office of the Secretary of Veterans & Defense Affairs;	Y
2.	Whitney Katchmark	Vice Chair - Principal Water Resources Engineer, Hampton Roads PDC	Y
3.	Jeff Flood - Staff	Coastal Planner, VA Coastal Zone Management Program	Y
4.	Kevin Du Bois	DoD Chesapeake Bay Program Coordinator, NAVFACSYSCOM MID-ATLANTIC, N45R	Y
5.	Tom Emerick	District Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
6.	Matt Donaldson	Assistant District Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District (Alternate for Tom Emerick)	Y

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome/FOIA Preamble/Roll Call	<p>Mr. Crabbs called the meeting to order at 2:13pm and read the FOIA preamble and other required language. He asked that any public attendees to ask questions through the chat box and if there are connectivity issues, please call 703-994-8781 for assistance. Mr. Crabbs then called for a voice vote of Members and Alternates present to proceed with the meeting. Mr. Flood called the roll and the vote passed unanimously in favor of proceeding.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs stated that the purpose of the Work Group meeting was to expand and refine the draft “Crosswalk” flow chart created by Mr. Du Bois and discussed at the July 14, 2021 SC meeting to be ready for FIP SC review.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois noted that the exact steps would need to be confirmed by DoD contacts, Mr. Crabbs provided a brief overview of the diagram, and Mr. Du Bois discussed the steps (see flow chart attachment):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Community applies to Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation (OLDCC) for grant to fund a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), also referred to as a Compatibility Use Study. 2) OLDCC provides funding for JLUS. 3) JLUS is a baseline requirement for qualifying for Readiness & Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) program funds. <p>4a) REPI Challenge is line item from annual REPI funding, has been used by Yorktown Naval Weapons Station (NWS) and NWS Earle (NJ) to develop a regional climate resilience strategy.</p> <p>4b) REPI can also fund such a strategy. Locality or state must be a partner.</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>4c) REPI can fund a Sentinel Landscapes designation e.g. Federal funds to incentivize private landowners to engage in conservation activities that support military mission (but not including land acquisitions or easements). Examples of funded activities include: Virginia Security Corridor Sentinel Landscapes such as flight paths – keeping land in agricultural use to preserve night mission training light levels vs. allowing for brightly lit development to take place.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs noted that thus far the conversation would indicate that a JLUS is the linchpin and foundation for cooperation between the local community and DoD, but not all Federal projects and funding due to it being a requirement or REPI funding.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois noted that the DoD or another Federal agency can't apply together for OLDCC funding for a JLUS, only the locality can.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs noted that the state could provide funding and capacity to Planning District Commissions (PDC's) outside HRPDC, where locality capacity for grant application is strong. We should draw an arrow in the flow chart connecting the state to JLUS for the purposes of funding support. Dewberry to assist in refining the final schematic.</p> <p>Mr. Emerick: What lands could a JLUS encompass?</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois: Has typically been city-sized localities, but could include a full county.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark replied that in the JLUS application, one lists areas desired for the study, usually trying to capture major transportation corridors as these are jointly used by the local community and support the military installation. Don't have to do whole county or city just areas adjacent to Federal installations.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs added that the environmental threats to critical infrastructure determine the location of the JLUS.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark noted that HRPDC had proposed a JLUS capturing the entire Southside of Hampton Roads in the study area, but that the Navy had requested that they divide it into two separate JLUS, one for Norfolk-Virginia Beach and one for Portsmouth-Chesapeake. Speed of the executing the study vs. a comprehensive inventory are competing goals. Ms. Katchmark also added that at JLUS can include taking a project design to up to 35%.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark then asked what the maximum funding amount was for a REPI grant and what will they allow you to accomplish?</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois replied that while he's not sure about REPI, REPI Challenge funds may be used for actual project construction. However, REPI Challenge funding criteria appear to favor more innovative solutions than REPI, which tends to fund more traditional solutions to [sea level rise] encroachments such as buying land. While Challenge funds tend to place more emphasis on green infrastructure, they're not limited to that.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark asked if REPI funds can be spent inside and "outside the fence line" e.g. in surrounding community in support of a military base. Mr. Crabbs and Mr. Du Bois felt that this was the case, but that the group needs to get full confirmation.</p> <p>Referencing the Crosswalk flow chart, Ms. Katchmark asked that the group develop a structure for each of the steps indicated by arrows, noting that the lack of clarity on what an applicant must do to secure funding oftentimes leads to great ideas stalling out.</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Mr. Du Bois added that a locality could apply for funding alone and not worry about complications from partnering with Federal entities, but that this would require significantly more money from the locality since it would represent a missed opportunity to secure Federal match for a JLUS. Mr. Crabbs noted that the process is indeed locality-driven and that if they had sufficient funding, could very wells solve everything on their own, but that would take “winning the lottery”.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois stressed that from DoD’s perspective, partnering with localities is not only good for their installations, but that investing in resiliency measures via funded projects is also good for the local economy. DoD remains a key regional economic driver.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs added that the initial funding application starts with a problem that is shared by multiple levels of government and that there might also be a Department of Interior process similar to a JLUS. Need to include non-DoD entities in the process.</p> <p>Mr. Emerick noted that the USACE’s Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Study (an future studies) was characterized by several elements: limited ability to incorporate Federal installations into the Study, the USACE’s ability to do civil works projects on Federal property, but only if part of the USACE’s mission (severe limiting factor), and the need for Congress to change laws and guidance governing the USACE’s civil works authority.</p> <p>Mr. Donaldson added that with respect to the flow chart, the USACE compliments each of the elements, but is required to partner with a local sponsor for each. He also noted that the USACE can include an analysis of how protecting a given Federal installation would help the surrounding locality, but that funds cannot be used for construction of a project on a non-Federal property. Mr. Emerick also noted that timing for funding cycles is an issue.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs and Ms. Katchmark noted that including Federal installations in a cost-benefit analysis by the USACE would likely make the expenditure more justified. However, Mr. Emerick said that it was doubtful that the USACE could do a standalone cost-benefit analysis for a Federal installation then incorporate it into a larger study.</p> <p>Mr. Flood asked if nearshore habitat restoration such as oyster reef installation in the Lynnhaven River are or could be included in USACE risk assessments to which Mr. Donaldson stated that nature-based solutions can’t be included in storm risk management plans, but could be added considerations if located near an existing civil works project. No standalone assessment of nature-based solutions.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark suggested that nature-based solutions could incorporated into Technical Studies done by the USACE on behalf of a locality or the locality could work directly with the DoD on incorporation. Mr. Donaldson said that the same restrictions apply to the those scopes of study since they’re subject to the requirements of a Water Resource Comprehensive Study.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark: given these restrictions, what else can we do apart from pursuing legislative changes?</p> <p>Mr. Donaldson: The USACE can work with other agencies in planning and coordination, but can’t spend their appropriated funds on others’ projects. Mr. Du Bois added that this restriction also applies to Federal entities attempting to exceed their Congressionally—appropriated authorities by going after other Federal funding sources – one agency can’t use another’s money since separately appropriated. In addition, DoD budgets are set</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>until 2024. Need to find ways to better align Federal budget cycles, but for now planning must look to 2025.</p> <p>Looking back at the flow chart, Mr. Du Bois suggested putting the USCE to the right of the diagram, along with other non-DoD entities such as the Department of Agriculture (USDA). Could also create three stacked horizontal flow charts: Funding, Planning, and Project/Construction.</p> <p>Pivoting back to the nature-based solutions discussion earlier, Mr. Du Bois noted that legislative changes might be required to allow such practices vs. just engineered components. Mr. Donaldson noted that ecosystem restoration projects the USACE currently undertake are reactive and maintenance-oriented instead of proactive habitat creation. Dune creation in Norfolk was not new habitat creation since it was part of a Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRМ) mandate, focus was on maintaining an existing asset.</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark noted that the Work Group should look at all Federal programs listed in the diagram and rearrange the flow chart to reflect each process. Noted that currently the locality and the state are in a weird location as they are both potential applicants for funding and funding sources. Mr. Flood suggested that “Community” be changed to “Locality” but Mr. Donaldson noted that this entity could also be an NGO. Mr. Flood then proposed that the name become “Local Applicant Seeking Federal Funds” which was supported by the Work Group. This entity would then be directed to three separate paths of funding options, reflected by three tiers stacked horizontally: USACE, OLDCC, and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).</p> <p>Ms. Katchmark added that first steps for OLDCC and the others would need to be added as well as finding out what else OLDCC funds can be used for. Mr. Crabbs agreed, reflecting that the flow chart should read like a menu of options and listing steps for each. Mr. Flood then suggested that the Work Group should not only do that, but add dotted lines where connections are desired, but currently aren’t possible. This will create a wish list of policy changes and visually depict gaps in the process.</p> <p>Mr. Flood then gave a brief overview of a draft flow chart (see attachment) provided by Robbie Coates and Dillon Taylor of the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) reflecting their relationship with FEMA. Mr. Flood noted that a hazard mitigation plan by localities is required for all applicable FEMA funding sources and that VDEM funds cannot be used as match for Federal funds as they are passed down from FEMA. Mr. Flood added that the request was for VDEM’s overall cycle, not to attempt to tie their program into the original Crosswalk flow chart. There are also the question of aligning FEMA funding cycles with the others discussed today.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs notes that the ultimate outcome of this effort will be to create a roadmap for a locality to proceed through three phases Study, Proposal, and Execution of planning and projects, including points of contact and resources available for each stage.</p>
2.	Public Comment Period & Next Meeting	<p>Mr. Flood checked again to see if any members of the public had joined the meeting. There were none. Mr. Flood then announced that, in keeping with the Subcommittee’s monthly schedule, the next Subcommittee meeting will be held at HRPDC in hybrid in-person and virtual format on August 18, 2021 from 1:00pm to 3:00pm. Mr. Flood added that he and Tom had approved of Dewberry offer to hold and staff a Federal Partners charrette at HRPDC at</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		10:00am-12:00pm prior to the SC meeting. Ms. Katchmark confirmed that this meeting would be accommodated. Regarding the Crosswalk diagram, Mr. Crabbs, Mr. Du Bois, and Ms. Katchmark will work on the next rendition of the flow chart offline. In particular, USACE, locality/PDC, and VDEM/FEMA elements will be added.
3.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	Mr. Crabbs thanked Ms. Katchmark and the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for hosting the Work Group and adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:00pm.

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.	Incorporate USACE, locality/PDC, and VDEM/FEMA elements into the framework developed by Kevin Du Bois.	Tom Crabbs, Whitney Katchmark, Kevin Du Bois	Prior to August 18, 2021 SC meeting

If you have any questions, please contact Jeff Flood, Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program at jefferson.flood@deq.virginia.gov.