

Subject	Norfolk + Virginia Beach JLUS Technical Committee Meeting Notes
Date	30 November 2018
Location	723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320
Attendees	See Attached Sign In Sheets
Prepared	23 December 2018
Prepared by	AECOM

On November 30th, 2018, a meeting was held with the Technical Committee members of the Norfolk and Virginia Beach Joint Land Use Study (JLUS). The purpose of the meeting was to review and confirm the list of projects/studies/conversations, evaluate “readiness factors,” discuss “other strategies”, and go over the proposed public review processes. A copy of the meeting sign-in sheet is attached to these meeting notes.

These meeting notes are provided as a summary of the discussion held during the meeting and are organized by topic area.

Update from the HRPDC

- The HRPDC provided a brief update on activities related to funding and state-level initiatives that align with the JLUS:
 - The Defense Access Roads program can be targeted to support projects that address roadway flooding. The new Defense Communities Infrastructure Program will be available to help fund projects that address community infrastructure that serves the military. The focus is on hard infrastructure. The program is not yet funded.
 - The Governor’s Military Advisory Council is proactively preparing to target funding. They reached out to the Commanders of several installations to obtain their top projects that would potentially be eligible for this program.
 - The Governor appointed Ann Phillips the Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection. This position is responsible for leading and developing a state wide plan for coastal flooding and adaptation.
 - The HRPDC passed a resolution to consider sea level rise (SLR) in policy planning. The resolution set forth SLR scenarios of 1.5’ (out to 2050), 3.0’ (2050 to 2080), and 4.5’ (beyond 2080).

Progress Since the June Workshop

- AECOM explained how the initial Sub Area project list had been simplified into “Projects, Studies, and Conversations.” AECOM asked for confirmation from Technical Committee members of the overall Projects/Studies/Conversations list.

- Ben McFarlane with HRPDC clarified what is meant by “Conversations,” noting that the JLUS would be recommending a separate implementation project for those, as they require further discussion.
- Mercedes Holland with JEB Little Creek-Fort Story said that she disagreed with the rating for Project #3, Pretty Lake Storm Surge Barrier, and noted that the Navy had submitted a letter to Greg Williamson with USACE saying they were concerned about the impact the project would have on installation readiness. She noted that JEB Little Creek recently acquired 6 new vessels that would be along piers where the barrier would be placed. The concern is that the draft depth is about 6 inches, so if additional sedimentation accrues, that would be an issue, and therefore, the Navy has requested that a sedimentation study be done.
- Brian Joyner with Moffatt and Nichol noted that additional studies were recommended by the Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management Study (CSRMS) for the Pretty Lake Storm Surge Barrier project to determine potential impacts.
- Michelle Hamor with USACE offered to share 10% design details for the project from the CSRMS with the group. She noted that project #8, Willoughby Spit dune raising, and project #10, Floodwall on Willoughby Bay shoreline, were no longer in the CSRMS recommended plan. She requested that, if these projects are kept on the JLUS project list, the references to USACE be removed. Ben McFarlane confirmed that the USACE references on those projects will be removed.
- After some additional discussion about the project among Technical Committee members, Ben McFarlane proposed a follow-up call with the city of Virginia Beach, the U.S. Navy, and USACE to discuss the details of the Pretty Lake Storm Surge Barrier project, as there appeared to be general confusion (and uncertainty of the benefits to the Navy) among the group as to the scope and details of the project.
- Brian Ballard brought up the “Project Lead” column shown in the project matrix in the meeting packet, and noted that he wasn’t sure about the Navy’s role in the some of the projects. AECOM responded that the project lead column is incomplete and has not yet been a focus of their effort; AECOM wants to confirm the project/study/conversation list prior to discussing further details about project leads, partners, etc.
- Kyle Spencer with the City of Norfolk questioned calling the proposed Hampton Boulevard improvements a “complete street” project. AECOM was considering changing “complete street” to “comprehensive flood mitigation & stormwater management strategy.”
- Kyle Spencer said that he would prefer that, and noted that the project may have “complete street” elements, but was not strictly a “complete street.”

Project Readiness Factors

- AECOM discussed the proposed “project readiness factors,” to be used to determine implementation readiness for projects and studies, as well as informing potential phasing.
- Ben McFarlane noted that these readiness factors would help to identify which funding streams should be sought for construction/planning/design of the proposed projects, and would inform larger discussions with the General Assembly about implementation.
- Michelle Hamor asked whether it might make sense to add a step in the readiness factor matrix differentiating when plans/studies are funded versus projects.
- Greg Johnson with the City of Virginia Beach asked that AECOM follow up with him to confirm which Nimmo Parkway projects are currently active.
- Michael King with the Navy asked for clarification on how the Elizabeth River Trail Extension prevents flooding. There was discussion among the committee about the benefits of the

project, and it was agreed that the project would provide alternate means of transportation to and from NSN and NSA Hampton Roads, and was proposed in response to issues of traffic congestion, not flooding per se.

- Richard Broad with the City of Norfolk noted that the project would move forward, regardless of whether or not it was included with the JLUS.
- Mercedes Holland and Brian Ballard both questioned how the projects were weighted to consider military readiness.
- Ben McFarlane reminded the Technical Committee that project weighting for DoD readiness was discussed extensively during the June Workshop.
- Whitney Katchmark with HRPDC noted that the details and limitations of each project can be further elaborated on in the JLUS report. She also noted that the “readiness factors” for studies will need to be different than those for projects.
- Kyle Spencer asked: if a project is contingent upon a plan/study, would it be possible to rank that study higher, to determine order of priority?
- Ben McFarlane asked the committee to give feedback to HRPDC/AECOM about potential relationships between projects and studies. He also noted that master plans and studies may need to be differentiated going forward.
- Mercedes Holland noted that the readiness factors were not representing Navy priorities, and said that the flooding on Amphibious Drive was their top concern.
- Ben McFarlane noted that the study is constrained by OEA funding, and that the JLUS is designed to identify issues in the community that impact the base, and it is therefore inappropriate for this study to recommend projects that are completely within the installations. He also noted that the JLUS is constrained by how much specific/technical information is currently available, and that the rankings coming out of the study are a “first cut.”
- Brian Ballard also noted that studying Shore Drive flooding at Gate 1 was a higher priority for the Navy than “Study options for stormwater improvements to Glenwood neighborhood and Captain Slade Cutter Park.”
- There was general consensus among the Technical Committee that they wanted to see more details about each project/study. The Navy representatives agreed that they would like to revisit the scoring/weighting of the projects/studies, particularly in terms of military readiness factors.
- Ben McFarlane noted that, if there are fundamental disagreements among the committee about how projects are scored, the HRPDC would need to request additional time from OEA for the project.
- Andrea Sweigart noted that, moving forward, the localities and the Navy will need to reconvene to discuss the JLUS report review process and public engagement, since there was not enough time during this meeting to cover those topics.
- Ben indicated that HRPDC will follow up with the timeline for briefing city councils, and will be requesting additional feedback from committee members on the issues discussed at the meeting. He noted that the HRPDC can travel to installations, etc. to get additional feedback if necessary.

