

DRAFT Recommendations of the Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Contents

Q3 Subcommittee Recommendations Process	1
Draft Subcommittee Recommendations.....	2
Outreach and Coordination Subcommittee Draft Recommendations	2
Project Prioritization Subcommittee Draft Recommendations.....	3
Funding Draft Subcommittee Draft Recommendations.....	4
Research, Data, and Innovation Subcommittee Draft Recommendations.....	5

Q3 Subcommittee Recommendations Process

During the Q3 TAC subcommittee meetings, members reviewed the top 10 recommendations for their group, based on the survey conducted after the Q2 meeting. Through collaboration, members refined these down to 5 high priority recommendations by either combining similar items or keeping them as they were. Following the Q3 meetings, members received worksheets containing draft revised versions of the 5 priority recommendations, including the responsible party and purpose for each recommendation. Members were asked to review the worksheets and send DCR any requested revisions.

This handout summarizes the priority recommendations from each subcommittee including feedback received. The number in parentheses after each recommendation indicates the number of comments DCR received from subcommittee members after the Q3 subcommittee meeting and prior to the Q3 TAC meeting.

During the Q4 subcommittee meetings, all subcommittee and TAC member comments will be presented for discussion and development of the final recommendation text for voting.

Draft Subcommittee Recommendations

Outreach and Coordination Subcommittee Draft Recommendations

O-a: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should develop and maintain a comprehensive list of available funding resources which can be leveraged to sustainably support uptake and implementation of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan, Phase II. (0)

O-b: The administration should advocate for and provide resources to state legislators on the necessity of continued and increased flood resilience funding using project prioritization and evidence of project readiness. (2)

O-c: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should increase coordination with and support to potential end-users of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan, such as local governments. This may include providing accessible and straightforward webinars and tutorials of available tools and providing customized technical support to develop locally specific project prioritization using the plan. (1)

O-d: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning or the Flood Resilience Advisory Committee should develop a strategy to increase use of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan by intended plan end-users, including local governments. The strategy should seek to bridge recognized capacity constraints that prevent plan uptake and should clearly define roles for state agencies to support resilience champions. (0)

O-e: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should identify the populations and communities at greatest flood risk, and coordinate with local governments to reach them with tailored outreach and clear and consistent messaging. (0)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee Draft Recommendations

P-a: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should incorporate scientifically sound, professionally accepted, forward-looking data into future iterations of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan for all components of flood risk (e.g. hazard, exposure, vulnerability), including not only sea-level rise and precipitation frequency, but also projected growth, demographic changes, planned infrastructure improvements, and other relevant factors. (2)

P-b: State agencies should establish a sustainable and sufficient funding source to implement the Coastal Resilience Master Plan and should consider more directly connecting the Community Flood Preparedness Fund to the Coastal Resilience Master Plan. (2)

P-c: State agencies should coordinate efforts to develop, maintain, and enhance accessible, region-wide, non-sensitive datasets needed to assess flood impacts. A single agency should be identified as the convening entity and should invite participation from political subdivisions, academia and non-governmental organizations in coordination efforts. (1)

P-d: State agencies should establish programs to engage with and support local governments and planning district commissions, with an emphasis on areas identified by the Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan, Phase II as being at high flood risk and without flood resilience projects or initiatives. Involved agencies may include DCR, VDEM, and DHCD and where appropriate, state agencies should involve regional institutions of higher education in engagement efforts. (2)

P-e: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should work with the Flood Resilience Advisory Committee to establish a coordinated framework to operationalize the Coastal Resilience Master Plan at local, regional, and state scales. The framework should be informed by data and needs assessments and should define success and set clear long-term goals, to be measured on regular, near-term timespans. (3)

Funding Subcommittee Draft Recommendations

F-a: State agencies should provide financial tools and reports to local governments, state legislators, and other official entities that clearly demonstrate the immediate and mid-term costs of inaction to address flood resilience. (1)

F-b: The economic development community should ensure that businesses, government officials, citizens, and other stakeholders are aware of the economic benefits of local development with water, as well as support for developing and exporting Virginia-based flood resilience solutions to an emerging global market. (2)

F-c: The Interagency Resilience Management Team should monitor and share existing and available flood resilience financial (funding and financing) resources to support local, regional, and state-wide initiatives. (2)

F-d: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should identify the different financial needs specific to the private sector and to the public sector. (0)

F-e: State agencies should monitor and evaluate the success of the state's funding, including appropriations and grant and loan programs, to address short-term and long-term challenges and consider additional financial mechanisms that may be needed to address longer-term challenges, such as strategic relocation, saltwater intrusion into public drinking water systems, and infrastructure abandonment. (1)

Research, Data, and Innovation Subcommittee Draft Recommendations

R-a: State agencies and the Commonwealth’s research universities should coordinate the collection and sharing of quantitative and qualitative flood resilience data, data production efforts, and inventories of data usage in decision-making applications across state agencies, planning district commissions, and the Commonwealth’s research universities. (2)

R-b: The DCR Office of Resilience Planning and other state agencies should determine and adopt programmatic responsibility for acquiring, developing, processing, analyzing, updating, and managing critical (*temporal*) flood resilience data needs to support ongoing planning and decision-making. (2)

R-c: The Flood Resilience Advisory Committee should define resilience success, while the Commonwealth’s research universities should identify and develop indicators and monitoring methods to assess the performance of resilience projects, with key and relevant stakeholders (entities, NGOs, etc.). The indicators should be based on Virginia-centric data and address ecological, infrastructure, social, economic, cultural, and environmental justice performance. (2)

R-d: DCR’s Office of Resilience Planning should engage with local government stakeholders to understand local obstacles and gaps in state-level programs and develop a statewide strategy that leverages co-production of innovative state level solutions to meet local needs. (1)

R-e: The Commonwealth’s research universities should convene to evaluate the performance of existing and innovative nature-based solutions for water quantity and water quality protections through use-inspired collaborations with public (including other universities) and private partners, and establish working groups to track progress, adapt approaches, and identify funding sources for continued collaborative efforts. (3)