

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

Subject	TAC Project Prioritization Subcommittee Meeting 2024-Q4	Date	10/08/2024
Chair	Jessie Bailey (alternate), Acting Director of Communications Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	Time – START / ADJOURN	9:00am / 11:28am
Location	Virtual	Scribe	Grady Hart

Committee Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended?
Chief Data Officer [Deputy Chief Data Officer] [Director Data Protection and Governance] [Acting Director of Communications] Office of Data Governance and Analytics (ODGA)	Ken Pfeil, Chair [Marcus Thornton], Co-Chair [Chris Burroughs] [Jessi Bailey]	[Y]
Director of Planning Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission	Anne Doyle	Y
Flood Planning Director [Strategy Program Analyst] American Flood Coalition	Jack Krolikowski [Catie Malone]	[Y]
Executive Director [Director of Environment, Economic Development, & Housing] [Environmental / Resilience Planner] Crater Planning District Commission (Crater PDC)	Jay Ellington [Andrew Franzysen] [Kit Friedman]	[Y] [Y]
Chief Resilience Officer [Principal Water Resources Engineer] Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)	Ben McFarlane [Whitney Katchmark]	Y
Environmental Planner Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC)	Brianna Heath	
Planning Manager, Environment Program [Resilience Planner] Plan RVA (PlanRVA)	Sarah Stewart [Eli Podyma]	Y [Y]
Environmental Division Director [Assistant Division Director] Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	Chris Swanson [Christopher Berg]	
[Director of Coastal Policy, Restoration and Resilience] Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VRMC)	[Rachel Peabody]	
[Director of Environmental Policy and Compliance] Virginia Port Authority (VPA)	[Scott Whitehurst]	[Y]

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes**

Committee Members		
Title [Alternate Title] Organization (Abbreviation)	Name [Alternate Name]	Attended?
Executive Director [Policy Program Director] Wetlands Watch (Wetlands Watch)	Mary-Carson Stiff [Ian Blair]	[Y]
Asst. Provost for Coastal Resilience/Director W&M Virginia Coastal Resilience Collaborative (VCRC)	Thomas Ruppert	Y

Name	Speak During Public Comments?	Notes
None		

TAC Staff/Consultants		
Name	Title (Organization Abbreviation)	Attended?
Andrew Smith	DCR Chief Deputy Director	Y
Matt Dalon	Resilience Planning Program Manager, DCR	Y
Carolyn Heaps-Pecaro	Resilience Planning Program Coordinator, DCR	Y
Jeff Flood	DEQ	Y
Wheeler Wood	Consultant, VCU Center for Public Policy (CPP)	Y
Gabrielle Rosario	Virginia Sea Grant Commonwealth Fellow, DCR	Y
Linda Warren	Launch! Consulting	Y
Sidney Huffman	Launch! Consulting	Y
Sarah Girard	Launch! Consulting	Y

Reference Links	
Item	Link
Meeting Agenda	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/20241008-tac-project-prioritization-subcommittee-agenda.pdf
Meeting Handouts/Presentation Slides	https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/crmp/meeting/document/2024q4-pp-meeting-materials.pdf
Video Recording of the Meeting	Link to video will be provided with final meeting minutes.

Agenda Item	Minutes
1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions	Jessi Bailey (ODGA) called the meeting to order at 9am and Wheeler Wood (CPP) called the roll.

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

<p>2. Adoption of agenda and Q3 meeting minutes</p>	<p>It was moved to adopt the minutes and agenda and both were adopted unanimously</p>
<p>3. Subcommittee Overview</p>	<p>Impact Assessment Updates The meeting began with an overview of the current status of key components under development, starting with the Impact Assessment Updates. The members were provided a brief update on the progress of the impact assessment and its integration into the Coastal Resilience Plan, noting that they were in the final stages of product design and delivery.</p> <p>Current Timeline: The process is in the final phase, focused on designing and delivering the final product. Efforts include communicating key data and stories for both the plan and the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer, which is being updated.</p> <p>Collaboration with Contractors: Contractors Dewberry and Stantec are collaborating on hazard exposure and impacts information. This information has been partially shared with the public through webinars in September, which aimed to raise awareness and generate interest before the plan's December release.</p> <p>Key Findings from Public Webinars: Flooding: An increase in coastal and rainfall-driven flooding has been identified. Riverine flooding is not forecasted in this plan but current conditions are noted. Planning Scenarios: The team is analyzing five planning scenarios, from baseline (present-day conditions) to the far future high scenario, representing a conservative estimate of flooding impacts by the end of the century.</p> <p>Asset Category Takeaways: Findings across asset categories intersecting with flood hazard data were discussed. Several past meetings have covered these categories in detail.</p> <p>Key Findings: Hampton Roads is the most exposed region in terms of coastal flooding. Rainfall-driven flooding is most pronounced in Northern Virginia. Total road length and building exposure to flooding were highlighted. Natural infrastructure findings focused on land cover exposed to flooding and the permanent inundation of natural areas, with acreage quantified and economic values calculated using FMAS BCA calculators.</p> <p>The floor was opened for any questions or comments about the status of the impact assessment portion of the plan.</p> <p>Planned Resilience Actions Analysis Updates</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee

2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

The next topic of discussion was the Planned Resilience Actions Analysis, which is in the final stages of development. This section focused on the progress of summarizing resilience projects and initiatives to be featured both in the final PDF report and on the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer.

Status of Web Explorer and Final Report:

Dewberry has been contracted to update the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer, which is currently in progress.

The summary of findings was presented during a public webinar last month, offering key data on resilience actions across planning districts.

Projects and Initiatives Overview:

The analysis includes both the number of projects and initiatives and their associated costs across each Planning District Commission.

Variation in Project Size:

Projects vary significantly in size, ranging from multiple-site projects to smaller, single-site efforts such as individual stormwater infrastructure improvements. The analysis highlights the diversity in project costs and the types of hazards each project addresses.

Key Findings from the Database:

Stormwater Flooding: The majority of projects in the Web Explorer are focused on addressing stormwater flooding.

Structural Projects: More than half of the projects across most categories, except for shoreline erosion, are structural in nature.

Shoreline Erosion: Living shorelines are prevalent in the inventory for addressing shoreline erosion.

Examples of Projects and Initiatives:

Specific projects and initiatives are showcased in small case studies within the plan, providing detailed examples of the variety of actions taken.

One example includes a project related to real-time flood monitoring and roadway monitoring systems designed to prevent vehicles from driving through flooded roadways, a feature seen in multiple PDC regions.

Another key initiative is the **Resilience Adaptation Feasibility Tool (RAFT)**, which is also included as part of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan.

Recommendations

An overview of the recommendations development was provided with the purpose of the meeting to finalize the development of high-priority recommendations for mitigating severe and repetitive flooding in Virginia's Coastal region. These recommendations are intended to guide actions over the next 1-4 years, either as immediate actions or process improvements for the next Coastal Resilience Plan, due in five years.

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee

2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

Five recommendations were previously developed and discussed at earlier meetings, including the September full TAC meeting. Today's focus is on refining the language to ensure consensus among subcommittee members before the final vote.

Recommendations finalized in today's meeting will move forward to the full Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on November 13 for a final vote. All recommendations, including those not approved by the TAC, will appear in an appendix to the Coastal Resilience Plan.

Linda Warren introduced the specific process for the meeting, emphasizing the goal to refine wording on five recommendations. Each would be discussed for approximately 20 minutes, though the fifth recommendation might require more time. Any unresolved issues would be revisited for further discussion before voting commenced.

The document outlining each recommendation, including suggested changes, was shared on the screen. Participants were encouraged to refer to their own copies for additional context during the discussion.

Recommendation P-a: Incorporating forward-looking data into future iterations of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan. This includes flood risks such as sea level rise, precipitation frequency, and other relevant factors.

Discussion:

There was debate around the inclusion of "precipitation frequency" alone, with several members suggesting adding terms like "precipitation intensity, duration, and frequency" to capture the full range of flood-related risks (IDF curve). This was proposed to ensure comprehensive risk modeling.

There was consensus that adding "riverine flooding" should also be considered, as it represents a significant flood risk in parts of the coastal zone.

The mention of "projected growth and demographic changes" was challenged, with suggestions to simplify the language to "population change," reflecting clearer terminology.

Linda asked if the committee should incorporate "riverine" along with other types of flooding in the discussion. She opened the floor for additional input regarding the framing of flood hazard and risk.

A member pointed out that while the emphasis has been on changing flooding conditions, a holistic view is critical. Rather than narrowly focusing on "riverine,"

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee

2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

"coastal," or "rainfall-driven" flooding, it's essential to recognize broader environmental changes—population, economic, and infrastructure changes—affecting flood risk. This led to the consensus that the language needed to capture the broader picture of both flood hazard and risk.

There was a brief technical discussion on IDF (Intensity-Duration-Frequency) curves, questioning whether climate change has altered their shape or simply shifted them. While no definitive answer was available, members agreed to simplify the language to ensure clarity without losing technical depth.

The committee agreed to shorten the recommendation to encompass "all components of flood hazard and flood risk," striking out detailed descriptions that may detract from the broader intent. Sidney was tasked with editing the document accordingly.

The final statement will simply refer to "flood hazard and flood risk," with a period, and the rest of the paragraph will be deleted.

One member asked for clarification regarding the difference between "hazard" and "risk." They emphasized that in the context of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan, "risk" encapsulates hazard, exposure, and vulnerability, often quantified in terms of financial losses. Therefore, it was suggested that the term "flood risk" is sufficient without needing to explicitly state "hazard."

The committee agreed to consolidate the language further by using just "flood risk," which inherently includes hazard. This simplification was supported unanimously.

Thomas raised concerns about the subcommittee's recommendations not explicitly addressing "project prioritization," which he felt was a critical oversight. He suggested looking to the language used in Hampton's Resilience Project as a potential model and explored the possibility of integrating prioritization principles into Recommendation P-e.

Other members agreed that prioritization should be more clearly addressed. Carolyn also reminded The Committee that guiding principles from Virginia's resilience efforts are already embedded in the recommendation framework, which could provide a foundation for addressing prioritization.

Members debated the use of "professionally accepted data" vs. "best available science" in defining the standards for the data used in future iterations of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan. While some supported "professionally accepted" to ensure rigor, others argued that "best available science" might be more encompassing and align better with existing language in other resilience documents. After further discussion, the committee agreed to use "best available

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee

2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

science" to maintain consistency with other guiding documents while allowing room for future scientific advancements that might not yet be fully vetted by the professional community.

The subcommittee discussed the importance of ensuring that the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Office of Resilience Planning incorporates the best available science into future iterations of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan, particularly in relation to flood risk. There was a consensus that the recommendation needed to go beyond simply using current conditions and consider how things could change in the future. For example, infrastructure standards should reflect anticipated conditions, such as future flood levels, to avoid under-investment in resilience measures.

There was a debate over whether this language was too general. Some members felt that using "best available science" would naturally include future projections, while others thought the language needed to explicitly mention "anticipated future conditions." The Committee also recognized that reiterating existing codified principles from Virginia's resilience planning may limit the recommendation's specificity, and there was some discussion about whether it was necessary to expand the language to include aspects not covered in current plans, such as riverine flooding projections or demographic and infrastructure changes.

Recommendation P-b: Aligning funding sources with the Coastal Resilience Master Plan.

Discussion:

Concerns were raised about whether the subcommittee should specifically reference the Community Flood Preparedness Fund (CFPF) or keep the language more general. Members agreed that funding streams are subject to change over time, and it might be more prudent to avoid calling out specific funds. Instead, they emphasized the need for a sustainable and flexible funding source that would remain relevant regardless of future administrative changes.

There was also a debate over whether to use the word "sufficient" to describe the funding, with some members expressing discomfort, noting that "sufficient" is hard to define and that resilience funding needs are often unpredictable. Alternative terms like "appropriate" and "dedicated" were suggested. After considering these options, the committee agreed that "sufficient" and "sustainable" were important to keep in the language, along with the concept of "dedicated" funding.

The final wording for the recommendation became "The Commonwealth should establish sufficient funding and a dedicated, sustainable funding source to implement the Coastal Resilience Master Plan." This language was approved by the subcommittee, though a few members, including Thomas, remained slightly

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Project Prioritization Subcommittee

2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

uncomfortable with the term "sufficient." However, there was broad agreement that the language adequately captured the intent of the recommendation.

The conversation focused on the terms "sufficient" vs. "appropriate" funding. While the distinction was not explicitly clarified, participants agreed on using the term "dedicated and sustainable" funding. A consensus was reached to remove the Commonwealth Flood Protection Fund (CFPF) from specific mention in this context.

Recommendation P-c: Accessible, Region-wide, Non-sensitive Data Sets

Discussion:

There were discussions around the term "non-sensitive" data. Several members interpreted it differently, with some focusing on Homeland Security concerns, while others considered personally identifiable information (PII).

It was clarified that the Coastal Resilience Master Plan (CRMP) uses sensitive data, such as historic resources data, which cannot be publicly released to prevent disturbance.

Agreement was reached to replace "accessible, region-wide, non-sensitive" with "appropriate" or "necessary" data, ensuring flexibility while avoiding confusion.

The Committee considered the wording and eventually settled on "appropriate data sets" needed to assess flood impacts.

A broader discussion ensued about who should coordinate these efforts. It was agreed that the Chief Resilience Officer (CRO) should coordinate efforts, but a single agency should be identified as the convening entity.

The term "broad participation" was added to ensure inclusivity in the coordination efforts, avoiding the need to list specific entities, which could unintentionally leave out key participants.

Recommendation P-d: State agencies should establish programs to engage with and support local governments and planning district commissions

Discussion:

The wording around regional institutions and the term "regional" was revisited, with The Committee noting that each state agency has a different definition of

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

	<p>"regional." There was agreement to keep the phrasing flexible to accommodate diverse interpretations.</p> <p>The Code of Virginia was referenced to confirm the CRO’s responsibilities. The Committee agreed that while the CRO is already tasked with coordinating resilience efforts broadly, this recommendation would emphasize the specific role in coordinating data sets for flood impact assessments.</p> <p>It was noted that prioritizing specific projects is challenging, and none of the recommendations from the subcommittee laid out specific criteria for prioritization. The Committee emphasized the need for clarity on who is responsible for deciding priorities at different levels of government, highlighting that local governments currently hold the authority to act and fund projects.</p> <p>Recommendation P-e: DCR Office of Resilience Planning working alongside the Flood Resilience Advisory Committee to establish a coordinated framework.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>There was a consensus that the prioritization process should not be rushed and should include input from localities once the Coastal Resilience Office (CRO) is established. The Committee discussed the importance of avoiding specificity in project prioritization at this stage, suggesting that the Commonwealth should identify criteria as part of the recommendation and consider the types of factors to be included in these criteria.</p>
<p>4. Public Comment</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>5. New Business</p>	<p>Voting on Subcommittee Recommendations</p> <p>The following recommendations were voted on by the members of the subcommittee present at the meeting. All passed with unanimous support. The purpose was not included in the vote.</p> <p>[P-a] The DCR Office of Resilience Planning should incorporate best available science into future iterations of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan for all components of flood risk to support appropriate project prioritization. Purpose: Enhance informed decision-making for flood resilience.</p> <p>[P-b] The Commonwealth should establish sufficient funding to implement the Coastal Resilience Master Plan and a dedicated, sustainable source for this funding. Purpose: Improve buy-in for the Coastal Resilience Master Plan.</p> <p>[P-c] The Chief Resilience Officer should coordinate state agencies to develop, maintain, and enhance appropriate datasets needed to assess flood impacts. The Chief Resilience Officer should invite broad participation from key stakeholders in</p>

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

	<p>coordination efforts. Purpose: Minimize duplication of efforts, streamline communications, and effectively mobilize our collective capacity.</p> <p>[P-d] State agencies should establish programs to engage with and support local governments and planning district commissions, with an emphasis on communities with 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. Purpose: Understand and address the factors preventing flood resilience action by local governments.</p> <p>[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 integrate data and needs assessments with Coastal Resilience Master Plan principles to develop success metrics and set clear short-, mid-, and long-term goals, to be measured on regular, near-term timespans. Purpose: Establish a structure to connect the state’s coastal flood resilience findings to informed and coordinated action that minimizes adverse impacts and maximizes long-term benefits.</p>
<p>6. Action Items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution of Recommendations: The DCR will distribute all final recommendations from the subcommittee and other subcommittees before the November 13 TAC meeting. ● Voting Process: During the November 13 meeting, TAC members will vote on whether the recommendations should be included in the Coastal Resilience Master Plan. Members will cast votes of yes, no, or abstain for each recommendation. ● Review Recommendations: Members are encouraged to review the recommendations from other subcommittees and discuss them within their organizations prior to the TAC meeting to be prepared for the vote. ● Upcoming Meetings: Two more subcommittee meetings on research data and innovation, and funding, will take place on October 10. The final TAC meeting is scheduled for November 13
<p>7. Adjourn</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 11:28am</p>

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 flood.resilience@dcr.virginia.gov

Virginia Coastal Resilience Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Project Prioritization Subcommittee
2024 Q4 Meeting Minutes

Voting Record

Item	Motion	Second	Full Committee
Agenda	Scott Whitehurst	Multiple	Unanimous Yes
Minutes	Anne Doyle	Scott Whitehurst	Unanimous Yes

Recommendations Vote

What organization are you representing?:	P-a:	P-b:	P-c:	P-d:	P-e:
Wetlands Watch	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
Virginia Port Authority	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
Crater Planning District Commission	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
American Flood Coalition	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
Office of Data Governance and Analytics	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
PlanRVA	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
William & Mary - Virginia Coastal Resilience Collaborative	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support

DRAFT