

**THE DRAFT SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE
PORTSMOUTH-CHESAPEAKE JOINT LAND USE STUDY POLICY COMMITTEE
June 17, 2021**

1. Call to Order

The Portsmouth-Chesapeake Joint Land Use Study Policy Committee meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Robert Crum, HRPDC Executive Director. Mr. Crum noted that, pursuant to the declared state of emergency in the Commonwealth of Virginia in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and to protect the public health and safety of the committee members, staff, and the general public, the meeting was held electronically via WebEx. Mr. Crum noted that the meeting notice, agenda, and related information was published on the HRPDC website. He also noted that the meeting was being recorded and livestreamed via YouTube. Members of the public were invited to submit comments via phone or email in advance of the meeting. Mr. Crum stated that the meeting was required to complete essential business on behalf of the region and the Joint Land Use Study project.

2. Welcome & Introductions

Mr. Crum asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. The following members of the Policy Committee were in attendance:

Robert Crum, HRPDC
Shannon Glover, Portsmouth
COL Patrick Kinsman, U.S. Army
CAPT Tres Meek, U.S. Navy
CAPT Todd Nichols, U.S. Navy
Chris Price, Chesapeake
Rick West, Chesapeake

Others in Attendance:

Brian Ballard, U.S. Navy
Keith Cannady, HRPDC
Tom Crabbs, Military Liaison for the Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs
CAPT Don Dasher, U.S. Navy
Michelle Hamor, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Joe Howell, U.S. Navy
Brian Joyner, Moffatt & Nichol
Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC
Benjamin McFarlane, HRPDC
Stephanie Mertig, AECOM
Ann Phillips, Special Assistant to the Governor for Coastal Adaptation and Protection
Season Roberts, The Miles Agency
Jason Scarborough, U.S. Navy
Andrea Sweigart, AECOM
Jay Sweat, Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation
Brian Swets, Portsmouth
Mark Woodward, Chesapeake

3. Approval/Modification of Agenda

Mr. Crum asked if there were any proposed changes to the agenda. There were none. Mr. Price from Chesapeake made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. West seconded the motion. Mr. Crum asked if there were any objections to proceeding with the agenda as presented. Since there were no objections or proposed changes to the agenda, the committee did not object, and the agenda was approved.

4. Public Comments

Mr. Crum asked if any attendees wished to make a public comment. There were no public comments.

5. Study Background

Mr. McFarlane noted that the Portsmouth-Chesapeake JLUS project has been underway for several years and that working on the project with meeting restrictions due to the pandemic has been challenging. He noted that participation from the technical staff from the Navy and the cities has been excellent and extensive. The virtual public meeting in March 2021 was very well attended, with approximately 40 members of the general public in attendance. He also mentioned that there will be another virtual meeting in the next few weeks, and that the project team has developed some innovative online outreach tools to share information on the project. He provided a brief summary of the project's current status. The AECOM team recently completed a revised draft of the study that incorporated comments from the technical committee. The revised draft document has been delivered to the HRPDC and will be uploaded to the HRPDC website for public review and comment. He asked if the committee had any comments or questions about the memo that was distributed with the agenda. There were no comments or questions.

Mr. Crum echoed Mr. McFarlane's appreciation of the technical committee's participation.

6. Study Draft Recommendations

Ms. Sweigart presented an overview of the project and the draft plan recommendations. The project is currently at the end of the final phase, which covers plan completion and adoption. The team hopes to get comments back from the Navy, the localities, and the general public during this phase to help finalize the study. Ms. Sweigart summarized the key issues considered by the study, which include parking, mobility options, roadway flooding, access, redevelopment opportunities, and coordination and communication. The technical committee developed seven goals to address those issues:

- Future flooding impacts to the transportation network are mitigated
- Military installation resilience is strengthened
- Access to Navy installations is maintained and expanded
- Neighborhoods surrounding the installations are enhanced
- Redevelopment and reuse of land improve the local economy

- Policies and regulations manage growth and prevent conflicts
- Navy and locality relationships are strengthened

The draft plan includes over seventy recommendations divided between actions and policies. Actions include strategies such as parking, multimodal, access, land use and development, flood mitigation, and utility. Policies and practices include strategies related to coordination and outreach, advocacy, development policies and regulations, and technology and data. The plan includes separate sections for the different types of recommendations.

Recommended actions were evaluated based on a set of fourteen criteria developed by the AECOM team and the technical committee to assess how well the actions would address the study's goals. The scoring emphasized criteria related to supporting the DOD mission and addressing economic resilience by applying a multiplier to those scores. The thirty-six actions were grouped into four tiers based on scores. Tier 1 actions include the development of comprehensive flood mitigation and stormwater management strategies for four critical corridors that directly support the installations. Tier 2 actions include several related to flood mitigation, transportation, parking, and coordination for Enhanced Use Lease opportunities. Tier 3 actions address redevelopment opportunities, parking, installation access, and flood risk/vulnerability. Ms. Sweigart also highlighted several of the recommended policies and practices related to coordination, resiliency, and data sharing.

7. Outreach Program and Schedule

Ms. Sweigart provided an overview of the outreach program and schedule. The original plan was altered due to the pandemic to utilize virtual outreach strategies. This has included the development of customized communications guides and toolkits for the March 3 virtual public meeting and for the upcoming meeting. These resource have been shared with Navy and locality stakeholders to help generate awareness of the project and the meeting opportunities. For the draft plan and the upcoming virtual meeting, the AECOM team has developed a virtual room that provides a more user-friendly approach that allows the public and stakeholders to easily access information related to the project, including the draft study. The room also includes fact sheets, a link to a recording of the March public meeting, a comment box, and other resources. Ms. Sweigart provided a list of important dates for the remainder of the project. The virtual room will go live on June 18. The public comment period for the draft study will be from June 18 to July 16, with a virtual public meeting scheduled for June 30. The scheduled completion date of the final study report is August 20.

8. Implementation of Study Recommendations

Mr. Crum asked if there were any comments or questions from the city policy committee members. Mr. Price stated that the report was very well organized and would provide considerable value. He asked if there would be external funding to help address the George Washington Highway flood mitigation and stormwater management recommendation and other recommended actions. Ms. Sweigart confirmed that the recommendations are high level, but that there are opportunities such as the Defense Community Infrastructure Program or Defense

Access Roads program that could be used for roadway projects. The corridor strategies could also identify phased approaches that would be more easily incorporated into local capital improvement programs. Mr. Joyner stated that the main outcome of the corridor strategies would be to identify specific improvements. Mr. Price also stated that he appreciated the HRPDC's efforts in coordinating the project and that Chesapeake would be happy to provide letters of support for projects in Portsmouth. Mr. Glover stated that Portsmouth would be reviewing all of the recommended actions to determine how best to move forward.

Mr. Crum asked Mr. McFarlane to discuss opportunities for implementation of the JLUS recommendations. Mr. McFarlane noted that once the study is finalized and accepted by the Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation that JLUS implementation grants become an option. These can provide funding for up to 30% design, but they cannot be used for construction. He noted that ongoing coordination on implementation will be critical. Mr. Crum characterized the JLUS as setting the table for future success if the localities and Navy continue to collaborate.

Mr. Crum asked for comments and questions from the federal partners. COL Kinsman noted that it will be important to integrate these efforts with other ongoing efforts, such as the Virginia Coastal Resiliency Master Plan. COL Kinsman recommended including specific recommendations, such as identifying specific sources of funding for projects. Mr. Sweat strongly encourage the localities to apply for DCIP funding and noted that the deadline for applications is July 12. Mr. Cannady noted that the study shows that flooding and sea level rise are significantly affecting the region's transportation infrastructure and that it can help inform regional transportation planning and project funding. CAPT Meek stated that he appreciated the work on the study and that it dovetails well with work the Navy is already doing to address resiliency on base. Mr. Crabbs echoed Mr. Sweat's comments about the DCIP funding. He also asked if the proposed memorandum of understanding would include the military installations. Ms. Sweigart stated that it could include the installations and that the details of such an agreement would be worked out after the study is completed. Ms. Phillips echoed the importance of the DCIP funding opportunity and encouraged the localities to keep the momentum going. She mentioned that the MOU recommendation aligns with discussions happening as part of the Coastal Resiliency Master Plan and that it is an important step for the region to consider.

Mr. Crum mentioned that last year the region included a recommendation for incorporating resiliency into SMART Scale in its most recent legislative agenda. Incorporating resilience into projects typically makes them more costly, which would penalize projects if resilience benefits are not included. The resulting legislation now requires that all transportation projects must address resilience. Ms. Phillips noted that VTRANS is currently looking into how to address that requirement and that she is working with others in VDOT on a variety of resilience efforts.

Mr. Ballard noted that DCIP is a unique funding opportunity, but that there is only \$60 million available nationwide for shovel-ready projects. He stated that the implementation funding opportunity through OLDCC would be an excellent way to help get JLUS recommendations to the point where they would be eligible for construction funding. Mr. Crum asked Ms. Sweigart and Mr. McFarlane about potential projects in the region that would be eligible for DCIP. Mr. McFarlane stated that there were likely several projects in the region that would be good

candidates, but that it would be necessary to review the federal funding opportunity and to coordinate with the localities to identify specific projects.

Mr. Crum asked if the representatives from Norfolk Naval Shipyard had any comments. CAPT Dasher stated that the shipyard team is interested in continuing coordination. CAPT Dasher will be the lead on these issues moving forward.

Mr. Sweat suggested that the group start thinking about which recommended actions and strategies should be prioritized for implementation based on timing, funding needs, and opportunity.

9. Other Matters

Mr. Crum asked for closing comments from Mr. McFarlane and Ms. Sweigart. Mr. McFarlane stated that the project team is looking forward to the virtual public meeting on June 30 and that implementation has been at the forefront of the discussions throughout the project. He noted that the revised draft study will be posted online for public and stakeholder review. The team will assess the extent and nature of public comments and relay that information to the technical committee. A final version of the study will then be completed and brought back to the policy committee for an endorsement in July or August. Ms. Sweigart echoed Mr. McFarlane's comments and stated that the AECOM team is looking forward to completing the project.

10. Adjournment

Mr. Crum thanked the policy committee and others for attending. There being no further business to come before the policy committee, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 a.m.