

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

Subject	Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee Meeting #8 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	Date	September 22, 2021
Facilitator	Tom Crabbs	Time	1:00pm – 3:00pm
Location	723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320 WebEx - https://governor.virginia.gov/j1akjd	Scribe	Emily Sokol

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 (V)
4.	Elaine Meil	Executive Director, Accomack-Norhampton PDC	
5.	Kevin Du Bois	DoD Chesapeake Bay Program Coordinator	Y
6.	Tom Emerick	District Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
7.	Dr. Stephen Moret	President & CEO, The Virginia Economic Development Partnership	
8.	David K. Paylor	Director, VA Dept. of Environmental Quality	
9.	Craig Quigley	Rear Admiral (Retired), US Navy, CEO, Hampton Roads Military & Federal Facilities Alliance	Y
10.	Dr. Jessica Whitehead	Executive Director, Institute for Coastal Adaptation & Resilience	
11.	Dillon Taylor	Chief of Staff & Senior Counsel, Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Y (V)
12.	Samson Stevens	Capt., Sector Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Hampton Roads	
Scheduled Speakers			
Subcommittee Advisors			
13.	Laura Rogers	Project Manager, NASA Langley Research Center	
14.	Patrick Taylor	Climate Research Scientist, NASA Langley Research Center	
15.	Matt Lott	Emergency Manager, Virginia Department of Transportation	
16.	Doug Beaver	City of Norfolk	
17.	Bruce Sturk	City of Hampton	
18.	Scott Spencer	Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation	
Designated Alternates			
19.	Sharon Baxter	Alternate for David K. Paylor, VA Dept. of Environmental Quality	
20.	Rick Dwyer	Alternate for Craig Quigley, Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance	
21.	Jason El Koubi	Alternate for Dr. Stephen Moret, The Virginia Economic Development Partnership	Y (V)
22.	Erin Sutton	Alternate for Dillon Taylor, VDEM	
23.	Matt Donaldson	Alternate for Tom Emerick, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	
24.	Jessica Steelman	Alternate for Elaine Meil, Accomack-Norhampton PDC	
Other Participants			
25.	Connor Winstead	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y (V)
26.	Matt Jones	Virginia Management Fellow	Y (V)
27.	Emily Gore	NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic	Y (V)
28.	Susan Lang	NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic	Y

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

Invitees/Attendees			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
Consultant Support			
29.	Dr. Brian Batten	Dewberry	Y (V)
30.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y (V)

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome/FOIA Preamble/Roll Call	<p>Tom Crabbs welcomed all attendees to the meeting. He then called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm and read the FOIA preamble and other required language. He asked public attendees to ask questions through the chat box and advised that Jeff Flood would be moderating the chat. If there are connectivity issues, please call 703-994-8781 for assistance.</p> <p>Mr. Flood took roll and advised that a quorum was not present. He advised the Subcommittee that the meeting could continue but no motions could be voted on, as established by the General Assembly's recent guidance.</p>
2.	Chair Updates – Timeline for Dewberry Deliverables	<p>Mr. Crabbs: As a Subcommittee, our goal for this meeting is to shape the final product that we will deliver to be incorporated into the Master Plan. I would like to walk you through the brief that I provided to the TAC, but first I would like to open the floor to Dr. Brian Batten or anyone from Dewberry team to provide an update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Batten: We have delivered the 90% draft of the CRMP to the State and are currently waiting on comments to be submitted by the end of the week. We are working on intermediate revisions, as well as on other deliverables that are outstanding, such as the web application, the finance alignment piece, and other technical parts of the study. We are looking forward to next TAC meeting and getting feedback from the Subcommittees. There have also been underserved community outreach meetings conducted, mainly in Hampton Roads. We are also receiving feedback on the impact assessment for incorporation into the full draft. - Mr. Crabbs then repeated Dr. Batten's statement to ask for clarification that the Subcommittee still has the opportunity to provide Dewberry with feedback within the next week or before the next TAC meeting. Dr. Batten confirmed that this was correct. - Kevin Du Bois: What part of the current version of the Master Plan deals with the work that our Subcommittee has done? Is there something that we should be providing comment on? For the Project Evaluation Subcommittee, we were provided like 50 pages of documents, so clearly that information is intended to be part of the Master Plan document. To my knowledge, I have not seen any content that addresses what we have been discussing in the Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee. I just want to ensure that I am not missing anything so far. If this is due in a week or two, we need to make sure that we provide comments on time. - Dr. Batten: At present, there is nothing in the Master Plan document that summarizes the work of the Subcommittees. Once we get further information from the Subcommittees regarding recommendations, we will be discussing how to incorporate that into the Master Plan. I will defer to the State on that decision. <p>Mr. Crabbs: Has a date been determined for the next TAC meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Flood: I know they are planning for the meeting to take place sometime during the first two weeks of October, but a specific date has not yet been established.

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: At the next TAC meeting, I will be relaying, in finalized form, what we want included in the Master Plan from our Subcommittee. <p>Mr. Crabbs: The last TAC meeting was on September 2nd. I want to provide you a brief description of what I presented to the TAC, which included our purpose statement, the lines of effort that we have been working on- the line of effort that is highlighted in green reflects what we have already provided, which was the list of JLUS studies that Kevin Du Bois compiled. I took what Mr. Du Bois provided to me and delivered it to Dewberry via the TAC meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Du Bois: From what I understood at the TAC meeting, [Dr.] Carl [Hershner] said that he did not see these projects on the priority list that has all of the projects from the data call. Were those projects not included? - Whitney Katchmark: We received follow-up questions from Dewberry on the Norfolk study. Some of them projects made it on the list, but some of them were shifted to capacity building. - Mr. Du Bois: I only submitted Navy projects, not all of the DoD projects, which is why you would have seen the Norfolk-Virginia Beach project and not the others. How do we know if all of the DoD projects are being considered? - Ms. Katchmark: Did they submit the projects through the online form? - Mr. Du Bois: Maybe there was miscommunication. Joe Howell did not feel comfortable advocating for projects outside of the Navy, so I believe only the Navy projects were submitted. There seems to be this disconnect, which is what I told Tom, so I made a list of all DoD projects and gave it to Tom to ensure that all of the projects were included. Tom gave the list of projects to Dewberry through the TAC, but have they been added to the list? That is my concern- that all of those projects have not been added. One of the big concerns is that if a project has not been entered soon enough or was misrepresented on the online form, that the projects may not receive funding. If the only document they have is this preliminary assessment, which is the only way projects can be funded, all of those projects will not have the opportunity to receive funding through statewide funding. - Ms. Katchmark: That is actually not a part of the criteria. You just have to get enough points in the CFPF [Community Flood Preparedness Fund] grant manual to receive funding. - Mr. Du Bois: I am still uncomfortable with the idea that these projects may not be represented in the Master Plan. - Mr. Crabbs: Is there anyone from Dewberry who can confirm if that list of projects has been included? - Mr. Du Bois: If it was not entered through the portal, is it not on the list? - Dr. Batten: I am not recollecting the information. If you let me know what specific projects you are referring to, I can reach out to some of my scientists while you are talking and get an answer to verify if they are listed. - Mr. Du Bois: There were a number of capacity building projects, including Fort Pickett, Quantico, Fort AP Hill, Fort Lee, Dahlgren Naval Support Facility, Defense Supply Center Richmond, Camp Perry, and a few more. - Dr. Batten: I will check right now and hopefully get a response for you by the end of the meeting.

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Mr. Crabbs: At the TAC meeting, I also discussed our avenues for “Locally Driven, Federally Shared, and State Supported” funding opportunities, including DoD, USACE, and other agencies. Our next steps as a Subcommittee include developing our roadmap for federal funding opportunities, planning, and implementation into the Master Plan. We want to deliver an outline to Dewberry for deliberation, collaboration, and incorporation. Another goal is to de-conflict and harmonize with fellow Subcommittees and refer to Dewberry as a technical lead and for graphics support. Lastly, we need to identify what the future of this Subcommittee looks like.</p>
3.	<p>Model & Guidance Document for “<i>Locally Driven, Federally-Shared, State-Supported Funding Framework</i>”</p>	<p>Mr. Crabbs: I want to make sure we have a consensus among the Subcommittee- that a primer should exist within the Master Plan that is targeted to localities and will get their attention. The primer will identify and explain possible entry and exit points for federal funding opportunities. There is a lot of work on the back end of that, but does any adjustment need to be made to the concept of that deliverable?</p> <p>None of the Subcommittee members expressed disagreement. Mr. Crabbs opened the floor to the Subcommittee to express feedback.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois: A couple of weeks ago, we were talking about developing an outline for what might be a chapter of the Master Plan. I put together a document, and I do not know if that has been shared with the Subcommittee. It does incorporate elements of the Stantec report. This is the information that should be included regarding the partnership between federal installations and localities, as well as how the State can support this process. In my mind, it would be best for Dewberry to have a full scope of what we believe should be incorporated into the Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: Agreed. Kevin, you sent that to me right before the TAC. That is an outline of recommendations that needs to be turned over to Dewberry, but I was not able to share it with the TAC at our last meeting. It has not been sent to the Subcommittee yet. - Mr. Du Bois: I will provide a brief explanation of what I have incorporated into the outline. It includes the description, purpose, and goals of the Subcommittee, as well as a list of federal installations, installation risk and vulnerability assessments, and the difference between planning projects and implementation projects. The outline also includes federal agency guidance- how DOE, USACE, EPA, and FEMA play a role in this process. What are the implementation tools that can be used in defense communities and outside of defense communities? Which funding sources are available to defense communities or other communities? The outline includes a description of the deliverables and next steps of the Subcommittee, as well as unrealized lines of effort- work to be done in the future by the Subcommittee. I offer this up to the group for their review and feedback. - Mr. Crabbs: The outline informed the brief that I gave to the TAC. Fleshing that outline out to be more informative would be ideal for incorporation into the Master plan. - Mr. Du Bois: I do not know how we tell the locality what to do without providing the outline. I do not understand how we will have that completed between now and October 15th. - Ms. Katchmark: Have you talked about whether Dewberry can help produce Chapter 6? I do not know how much more we can get done on this timeline.

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Du Bois: At the TAC meeting there was a discussion that said we could let Dewberry know that we need a placeholder in the master draft- the outline could be the placeholder that we provide by October 15th. We need to explain next steps- what needs to be accomplished. We have all had difficulty connecting these dots. The outline was my attempt- there is great insight around this table, so I would love feedback that we can incorporate to make the outline more well-rounded. We did not talk about how DOT, NOAA, NASA, and Agriculture fit into this effort. - Mr. Crabbs: I do not think that this is the time to solve all of the problems. What we have tried to do is provide a tangible roadmap. If I am a locality, why do I care to read the Master Plan? Who is going to read the entire thing? We need something to point localities to that will educate them about the process effectively. That is value added. - Mr. Du Bois: I agree, but we need to recognize what efforts were not recognized in this iteration so that they can be addressed in the future. - Ms. Katchmark: I have no problem with creating a list of next steps. I have reviewed several chapters of the Master Plan document. There are instances where it would have been nice to know exactly what needed to be done. I'm clear. I want to do it, but I do not want to do it on this timeline. - Mr. Crabbs: I think we are in a better position now. - Mr. Du Bois: I would love for this to be a more consensus document so that all of you can provide comment and feedback, crossing out what is not important and including what is. - Mr. Crabbs: So, your recommendation is to send this out to the Subcommittee and request feedback from them? - Mr. Du Bois: Yes, that would be my recommendation. <p>Discussion Point- Ms. Katchmark: Is the Finance Subcommittee producing anything else for Dewberry?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: If you heard their read-out at the TAC, that was their list of final recommendations. - Mr. Du Bois: I believe our work is very complementary to theirs and it would be helpful for us to collaborate. <p>Discussion Point- Mr. Crabbs provided a review of the Advancing Resilience for Defense Communities- A Planning Framework document. He acknowledged that it might be as simple as saying that the Subcommittee would like this document included/referenced in the Master Plan. Mr. Crabbs also identified that the document expands the list of funding sources to FEMA, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Housing and Urban Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Katchmark: But the list does not include USACE. - Mr. Crabbs: Yes, that is what I found to be missing as well. We might have a lighter path than we thought if we apply this resource. - Mr. Du Bois: Yes, it is a very valuable resource. - Ms. Katchmark: There have always been good resources that no one reads. Do we want to make this primer or just write a few recommendations that would be helpful. It is good to refer people to a helpful source, but is that enough? - Mr. Crabbs: The problem is that localities do not know where to look. - Mr. Du Bois: I mean, this report was published in May, and none of us even knew about it.

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: We should be getting this report to users who need it, so that they have access and knowledge that it exists. That would allow them to start the process. - Mr. Du Bois: We have a work product to deliver in a short period of time. The goal is to develop a primer, which will help localities. We have a short term goal of what we need to accomplish for the first draft of the Plan. Maybe the long-term goal is to create the primer. - Tom Emerick: The primer is a good idea, and we can develop the best primer in the world and also run the risk of it going on a shelf and not being used. Developing a good primer is important, but it has to be followed up with continued education so that it can be used appropriately. Many of the localities are starting from scratch. They will look at a primer that we think is awesome and may not know what to do with it. It will take some handholding. - Mr. Crabbs: That is the advocacy portion- that responsibility may reside with the State going forward. - Mr. Emerick: There is the RAFT [Resilience Adaptation Feasibility Tool] process, which is an exercise to help communities understand their vulnerabilities and develop a plan to address those vulnerabilities. I think of that as a guideline. There needs to be a Statewide force that can go out and provide that level of capacity. <p>Discussion Point- Susan Lang: I have done a lot of climate resilience planning for the Corps. With regard to prioritizing communities that need handholding, you mentioned modeling the DCAT resource online. I will talk to Mr. Du Bois, but there is a larger effort to do sea level rise modeling in a more concise way. It is important to look at who is most vulnerable first, setting priorities. I am an environmental planner. In the UFC Installation Master Plan development, there is a new requirement, as of one year ago, for an installation climate resilience plan to be in every UFC Installation Master Plan. There is a lot of debate about what that will look like. This modeling effort provides an outline moving forward. There is a new portion that requires collaboration with the local community on what they are doing to promote coastal resilience. I can send you these new requirements to help inform your efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: Is that new as of January? - Ms. Lang: It was updated Sep 20, 2020. One of my recommendations, for the future of the Subcommittee is that, in addition to the environmental business line, there should be someone from the planning business line involved in these discussions. There are so many Navy installations here. You do not want to only focus on the DoD installations, but if you do not make them front and center in some way, it is not representative. - Mr. Crabbs: Regarding DCAT [Defense Climate Assessment Tool], if I am a local community, can I use that tool and access those assessments? - Mr. Du Bois: Nobody in the public has access to those assessments. - Ms. Lang: The DCAT assessments are related to some work that NOAA has online, but DCAT also paints with a broad brush. - Mr. Crabbs: How long has DCAT been around? - Mr. Du Bois: Not long, but every installation is supposed to have a completed DCAT by Summer 2022. <p>Mr. Crabbs: What we are trying to strengthen through our work here on the Subcommittee is localities' ability to take the first steps towards pursuing federal funding opportunities. If you</p>

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>are adjacent to an installation, it provides a great opportunity for funding, but if you do not know that it exists, then it is not helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Lang: Hopefully this initiative will have power going forward. We are using HRMFFA to show that coastal resilience is a priority. If there is no attention and coastal resilience is only being pursued internally at installations, then progress will not be made. If there is a reporting mechanism or briefing that engages the public, it is more helpful. - Ms. Katchmark: Mr. Crabbs, could you reach out to localities near installations, through your position? I feel like we are making this harder than it should be. We could draft a recommendation to reach out to localities and communicate this information. - Mr. Crabbs: That is a portion of my job- that localities have visibility on federal funding opportunities. It is great if this task resides in one person, but who is my partner in the other Secretariats- such as SNR or DCR? Where is that resilience network being built? - Ms. Katchmark: I feel like that might be outside of this Master Plan effort. Ideally yes, you would tie into a bigger framework. That is a clear recommendation- that we approach all localities that host federal installations with this opportunity, with your office to start. Every locality should pursue being a part of an Army Corps vulnerability assessment, because that is one of the first steps to accessing the bigger pot of money, for those that this process is applicable to. I think those recommendations might be enough at this point in time, instead of trying to create this exhaustive primer in such a short period of time.
4.	Public Comment Period & Next Meeting	<p>Mr. Flood yielded the floor to all public attendees and opened the floor for any additional comments.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois: The REPI [Readiness & Environmental Protection Integration Program] challenge RFP was released. It went from \$5-15 million to \$40 million available. \$25 million is specifically earmarked for climate resilience. \$15 million is still available for encroachment. In my world, everyone is scrambling because pre-proposals to apply for this funding are due November 22nd. Localities submit these proposals- this is a good example of how localities need to be made aware of these opportunities, as well as aware of the need to collaborate with installations in order to succeed. Full applications are due by March.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Lang: The last I heard, there is also still some OLDCC money available. - Mr. Du Bois: I am not surprised because people do not know of these opportunities, so money is being left on the table. We have a group that meets quarterly called the Chesapeake Bay Action Team. One of our members suggested having a Chesapeake Regional REPI work group so that we could become more expert as to how to access funding for the region, and we got crickets- no one was interested. We have 13 installations that have REPI money and continue to receive REPI money. I got a phone call from The Nature Conservancy, saying that they are going to have a meeting with Dahlgren about a REPI challenge proposal, but the lines of communication are still disjointed.

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

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>Mr. Flood announced that there will not be another Subcommittee meeting within the timeframe of information being due to Dewberry. He reported that they would find out when the next TAC meeting would occur and develop the recommendations proposed in a small group so as to not trigger FOIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: We discussed further developing the outline. We all see the value added by doing so, but whether or not we can complete it in the timeline afforded to us is the question. - Mr. Flood: Here are the recommendation concepts that were proposed during the meeting: 1) We should approach localities regarding federal funding opportunities but also have partners at the PDC level to educate folks on this process. 2) Every installation should have a CUP. 3) Every locality should work on a risk assessment as feasible with the Army Corps. We will further develop these recommendations. If we present these as is to Dewberry, should we push to have an exhibit or an outline format? - Mr. Du Bois: I think it would be helpful to send out the larger outline and the list of draft recommendations for review by the Subcommittee. We will have to trust that you encapsulate the comments provided and reflect those to Dewberry. <p>Dr. Batten: I just wanted to follow up regarding Kevin’s question at the beginning of the meeting. It does not appear that those projects are in the capacity building database. We do not have an email from you with those projects. If you could provide them to me, we will get those projects submitted into the database.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Crabbs: I submitted the projects through the TAC, but I will send them to you, thank you.
5.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	<p>Mr. Crabbs thanked Ms. Katchmark and the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for hosting the meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was proposed and seconded. Mr. Crabbs adjourned the meeting at 2:56 pm.</p>

Action Items			
#	Action Item	Owner (Organization)	Due Date
1.	Provide the Subcommittee with Mr. Du Bois’ outline, as well as the final list of recommendations (see above summary by Mr. Flood).	Subcommittee Chairs and Staff Advisor	9/28/21
2.	Provide feedback on the outline and recommendations	Subcommittee Members	10/5/21 (since the Subcommittee met, the TAC meeting has been scheduled for 10/7/21)

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