

# Project Evaluation Subcommittee

May 18, 2021 – 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM

## *Meeting Agenda*

- **Introduction**
  - **Roll Call**
  - **FOIA preliminaries**
- Brief discussion of comments on previous Dewberry questions and PREP tool
- Discussion of new VACMP Prioritization Framework
- Public Comments

# TAC Project Evaluation subcommittee

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Dr. Carl Hershner (Chair)	VIMS
Kristen Owen (Vice Chair)	Henrico County
Kimberly Cain	Governor's Office
Elaine Meil	ANPDC
Kevin DuBois	CNRMA
Whitney Katchmark	HRPDC
Keith Lockwood	USACE
Dr. Cathy McGhee	VTRC
Dr. Karen McGlathery	UVA
Randy Owen/Ben Nettleton	VMRC
Mary-Carson Stiff/Skip Stiles	Wetlands Watch
Erin Sutton	VDEM
Dr. Rob Young	Western Carolina University

I would like to call this virtual meeting of the Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework Technical Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Project Evaluation to order.

Generally, public bodies are prohibited from meeting electronically under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). However, emergency language approved by the Governor and General Assembly allows us to move forward with certain restrictions that I will outline in a moment.

We want to allow for participation by Subcommittee members, staff, and members of the public who wish to comment. However, it is essential that we are able to manage the conversation effectively.

The meeting will be open for Subcommittee comment at any time. For those members of the public who wish to make a comment, we ask that you please do so in the chat box. Josh Saks will be monitoring the chat box and let us know when someone has submitted a comment. We will address your comments as time allows.

**I have to read a lengthy introduction for our virtual meeting. This is long, but is required to be read aloud under Chapter 1289 for all electronic meetings:**

Chapter 1289 of the 2020 Acts of Assembly includes language addressing the ability of public bodies to conduct electronic meetings without the need for a quorum being present in a single physical location.

This language was submitted as an amendment by the Governor and approved by the General Assembly at their April 22, 2020 reconvened Session. The Governor subsequently signed the Budget Bill and the Bill was effective as of July 1, 2020.

The Bill allows public bodies to hold Electronic Meetings when the Governor has declared a state of emergency pursuant to § 44-146.17 if:

“(i) the nature of the declared emergency makes it impracticable or unsafe for the public body or governing board to assemble in a single location;

(ii) the purpose of the meeting is to discuss or transact the business statutorily required or necessary to continue operations of the public body...and the discharge of its lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities...” § 4-0.01(g).

The Budget Bill also has language regarding recordings and transcriptions of Electronic Meetings. Please be advised that this meeting **is being recorded. This recording will be available to the public through the SNR website. The comments in the chat room will also be preserved as a public record. Official minutes of this meeting will be drafted and posted in accordance with regular procedures. The minutes will also include the type of electronic communication means by which this meeting is being held, WebEx.**

The Budget Bill does not allow the Subcommittee to hold an Electronic Meeting to discuss or transact business for simply any purpose. Rather, we may do so as long as the agenda items that we plan to take up are: (a) statutorily required or (b) necessary to continue operations and discharge lawful purposes, duties and responsibilities.

It is the Subcommittee's responsibility to determine whether "the nature of the declared emergency makes it impracticable or unsafe for the public body or governing board to assemble in a single location."

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will ask for a motion for the Subcommittee to make this determination. If that motion fails, this electronic meeting will end at that point.

The Budget Bill requires compliance with the provisions of § 2.2-3708.2. Therefore, in accordance with § 2.2-3708.2.D.2, we must include a telephone number that may be used to notify us of any interruption in the telephonic or video broadcast of the meeting.

In the event that a disruption occurs, participants should contact Josh by phone or text at:

**804-690-5673**

Additionally, if there is an interruption in the broadcast, the meeting must be suspended until public access is restored.

Those provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act not addressed by the Budget Bill remain in effect.

Before we continue with the business portion of the meeting, I will call the roll for **Subcommittee members and staff. Other participants will be recorded through the chat window.** If you are participating by phone and your name is not called, please call or text Josh at **804-690-5673**. In addition, if at any time you lose connection and are unable to reconnect, please contact Josh at the same number.

**I will now ask a Subcommittee member to request the following motion:**

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:**

The Technical Advisory Subcommittee for Project Evaluation certifies that the nature of the declared COVID-19 emergency makes it impracticable or unsafe for the Subcommittee to assemble in a single location and further that the agenda items to be taken up at this meeting are necessary to continue operations and discharge lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities of the Subcommittee.

# TAC Project Evaluation subcommittee

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Dr. Carl Hershner (Chair)	VIMS
Kristen Owen (Vice Chair)	Henrico County
Kimberly Cain	Governor's Office
Elaine Meil	ANPDC
Kevin DuBois	CNRMA
Whitney Katchmark	HRPDC
Keith Lockwood	USACE
Dr. Cathy McGhee	VTRC
Dr. Karen McGlathery	UVA
Randy Owen/Ben Nettleton	VMRC
Mary-Carson Stiff/Skip Stiles	Wetlands Watch
Erin Sutton	VDEM
Dr. Rob Young	Western Carolina University

## **Subcommittee Chair/Vice Chair:**

I want to explain further how we will handle participation by Committee/Subcommittee members, staff, and the public.

- Everyone, except the individual presenting materials for an agenda item, will be muted.
- Once the presentation is completed, the Subcommittee Members, and only Subcommittee members, will be unmuted for discussion, and may indicate their desire to comment by “raising their hand” or commenting in the chat box.
- Josh will assist me with ensuring Subcommittee members are recognized when they have questions or comments.
- Members of the public will be able to ask questions and provide input by utilizing the chat box function. As time allows, we will respond to those questions and comments in the chat function.
- Public Comment will be taken during the last portion of the meeting from those who signed up in advance.

We will now proceed with the business of the Subcommittee as outlined in the agenda.

# Project Evaluation Subcommittee

May 18, 2021 – 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM

## *Meeting Agenda*

- Introduction
  - Roll Call
  - FOIA preliminaries
- **Brief discussion of comments on previous Dewberry questions and PREP tool**
- Discussion of new VACMP Prioritization Framework
- Public Comments

## ***Response to Dewberry questions:***

*Guiding Principles of the CRMP*

**if they are accompanied by clear definitions to make them explicit**

*Should relative project rankings be performed at a statewide or regional scale?*

**qualifying projects for consideration based on their conformance with the guiding principles will probably be rigorous enough**

*Should funding have an a priori split among project types or solutions?*

**little rationale for preferring one type of engineering project or nature-based project  
*a priori***

*How should the plan prioritize investments for communities that have historically suffered from a lack of investment to address social and economic inequity?*

**lack of consensus on what and where these inequities exist**

## ***Response to Dewberry questions (continued):***

*Should project with measurable benefits to traditional communities receive increased priority?*

**requires some explanation/definition of what “support” might be and what would constitute “benefits”**

*Is it “fundable” and/or “implementable?”*

**separate from the evaluation of a projects conformance with the guiding principles**

*Scale and time horizon:*

- *Should benefits be weighted based on local, basin, or regional outcome?*  
**seems to defy effective measurement**
- *Should funding be evenly spread across near and long term? Focused on near-term?*  
**requires a strategy for discounting costs and benefits**

***Response to Dewberry questions (continued):***

*Protection of critical facilities: should projects with measurable benefits to critical and essential facilities receive increased priority?*

**depends on the definitions of “critical and essential.”**

*Should the plan account for recent or projected future population and land use change?*

**ensure project benefits are not potentially reduced by either over some practical future**

# Comments on PREP tool self-assessment

- Indicated **support for the concept** of a self-assessment
- Expressed **concern for the connection** between the PREP tool and project evaluation criteria being used for the Community Flood Preparedness Fund and the Coastal Resilience Master Plan
- Noted that as currently constructed, the PREP tool offers a **very “forgiving” pathway through self-assessment.**
- Natural Resources Protections: identified concern for the **failure to address preservation of natural resource capital** through proactive efforts.
- Social Equity. Here the **question of definitions** is central to meaningful responses.

# Project Evaluation Subcommittee

May 18, 2021 – 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM

## *Meeting Agenda*

- Introduction
  - Roll Call
  - FOIA preliminaries
- Brief discussion of comments on previous Dewberry questions and PREP tool
- **Discussion of new VACMP Prioritization Framework**
- Public Comments

# Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan

## Draft Prioritization Framework

Factor 1. Resilient Design

Factor 2. Extent of Benefits

Factor 3. Equity

Factor 4. Implementability

Factors	Criteria
<p><b>Factor 1: Resilient Design</b></p>  <p>Incorporate forward looking, resilient design principles.</p>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <p>1.A. The project is sustainable in the face of changing environmental conditions due to climate change.</p> <p>1.B. The project incorporates nature-based approaches, wherever practicable.</p>
<p><b>Factor 2: Extent of Benefits</b></p>  <p>Maximizes benefits for the social, built and natural environment while minimizing adverse impacts on communities or the environment.</p>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <p>2.A. The project reduces flood risks due to sea level rise, tidal flooding, coastal storms, and/or compound flooding.</p> <p>2.B. The project utilizes community and regional-scale planning to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>2.C. The project protects built infrastructure critical for national security, public health and safety, or the economy.</p> <p>2.D. The project protects and/or enhances natural systems critical for flood protection, water quality improvement, or habitat.</p>
<p><b>Factor 3: Equity</b></p>  <p>Provides social or economic benefits to disadvantaged communities.</p>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <p>3.A. The project provides benefits to communities that have historically suffered from lack of investment to address social and economic inequity.</p> <p>3.B. The project provides benefits to communities identified as having high social vulnerability to coastal flood impacts.</p>
<p><b>Factor 4: Implementability</b></p>  <p>Is fundable and implementable.</p>	<p><b>Criteria:</b></p> <p>4.A. The project is likely to secure funding for implementation.</p> <p>4.B. The community or project owner has capacity to implement the project.</p> <p>4.C. The project has a reasonable implementation timeframe of five to seven years once funding is secured.</p>

# Factor 1. Resilient Design

- **1.A.** The project is sustainable in the face of changing environmental conditions due to climate change.
- **1.B.** The project incorporates nature-based approaches, wherever practicable.

# Factor 1. Resilient Design

- **1.A.** The project is sustainable in the face of changing environmental conditions due to climate change.
  - Specify sea level rise and time frame
  - Specify change in precipitation IDF and time frame
- **1.B.** The project incorporates nature-based approaches, wherever practicable.
  - Identify approaches for both flood mitigation and natural resource enhancement

## Factor 2. Extent of Benefits

- **2.A.** The project reduces flood risks due to sea level rise, tidal flooding, coastal storms, and/or compound flooding.
- **2.B.** The project utilizes community and regional-scale planning to the maximum extent possible.
- **2.C.** The project protects built infrastructure critical for national security, public health and safety, or the economy.
- **2.D.** The project protects and/or enhances natural systems critical for flood protection, water quality improvement, or habitat.

# Factor 2. Extent of Benefits

- **2.A.** The project reduces flood risks due to sea level rise, tidal flooding, coastal storms, and/or compound flooding.
  - Specify future risks to be considered (occurrence probabilities)
- **2.B.** The project utilizes community and regional-scale planning to the maximum extent possible.
  - Identify what constitute community and regional scale planning, and threshold for usage
- **2.C.** The project protects built infrastructure critical for national security, public health and safety, or the economy.
  - Identify “critical infrastructure in each category
- **2.D.** The project protects and/or enhances natural systems critical for flood protection, water quality improvement, or habitat.
  - Specify time line for acceptable protection and/or enhancement

## Factor 3. Equity

- **3.A.** The project provides benefits to communities that have historically suffered from lack of investment to address social and economic equity.
- **3.B.** The project provides benefits to communities identified as having high social vulnerability to coastal flood impacts.

# Factor 3. Equity

- **3.A.** The project provides benefits to communities that have historically suffered from lack of investment to address social and economic equity.
  - Define “social” and “economic” equities
  - Explain documentation of historic lack of investment
- **3.B.** The project provides benefits to communities identified as having high social vulnerability to coastal flood impacts.
  - Specify determination of high social vulnerability to coastal flood impacts
  - Specify acceptable “benefits”

## Factor 4. Implementability

- **4.A.** The project is likely to secure funding for implementation.
- **4.B.** The community or project owner has capacity to implement the project.
- **4.C.** The project has a reasonable implementation timeframe of five to seven years once funding is secured.

# Factor 4. Implementability

- **4.A.** The project is likely to secure funding for implementation.
  - How is this to be determined?
- **4.B.** The community or project owner has capacity to implement the project.
  - How is this to be determined?
  - Would seem to disadvantage small and rural localities.
- **4.C.** The project has a reasonable implementation timeframe of five to seven years once funding is secured.

# Project Evaluation Subcommittee

May 18, 2021 – 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM

## *Meeting Agenda*

- Introduction
  - Roll Call
  - FOIA preliminaries
- Brief discussion of comments on previous Dewberry questions and PREP tool
- Discussion of new VACRMP Prioritization Framework
- **Public Comments**