

RESILIENCE COORDINATION WORKING GROUP

RECOMMENDATIONS



VCU

Center for Public Policy

L. Douglas Wilder School of
Government and Public Affairs

RECOMMENDATIONS AND VOTING SUMMARY

The table below shows each recommendation and its justification, as well as the votes of “Support”, “Abstain”, and “Do Not Support” submitted by working group members in attendance at the final RCWG meeting on September 26, 2023. It should be noted that no recommendation received a “Do Not Support” vote from a working group member. Recommendations A.1, A.3, B.1, B.2, E.4, and H.1 received unanimous support with no abstaining votes.

Recommendations for Legislative Action

Legislative Action Recommendation	Justification
A. Resilience Coordinating Structure	
A.1: Adopt a “hub and spoke” model for resilience efforts in the Commonwealth, where the Chief Resilience Officer, reporting to the Governor and supported by a professionally staffed Office, serves as the “hub,” facilitating coordination and communication between agencies (“spokes”), who continue to administer their respective resilience-related programmatic, funding, and planning activities. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Establishment of a single coordinating structure to facilitate resilience coordination and communication between state agencies is consistent with peer states examined by the Working Group. The “hub and spoke” model has the benefit of leveraging existing agency structures and competencies, while improving lines of communication and coordination across agencies.
A.2: Create a new office (“Office”¹) of the Chief Resilience Officer as a dedicated, funded, and staffed Office established to support the CRO. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Provides coordinated approach to capturing federal resilience funding, aligning state agency resources, and providing necessary technical assistance that addresses gaps in local and regional needs and capacities.
A.3: Task the CRO with promoting communication, coordination, and cooperation between state agencies, the	Facilitates communication across agencies, helps maximize funding opportunities, and supports regional

¹ The new office will be named later. For purposes of this working group, the term “Office” served as a placeholder name.

Legislative Action Recommendation	Justification
federal government, local governments, other political subdivisions of the Commonwealth, and key stakeholders regarding resilience, as defined in § 10.1-603.28. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	and local government resilience efforts.
A.4: Task the CRO with producing deliverables on a regular basis to facilitate monitoring of resilience progress, adaptively manage outcomes, and transfer knowledge throughout the Commonwealth. <i>28 Support, 1 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Supports resilience planning efforts across state, regional, and local levels.
A.5: Establish an interagency resilience working group led by the CRO and consisting of Resilience Coordinators to support coordination and planning for resilience efforts, meeting not less than quarterly. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Supports interagency coordination and planning for resilience efforts.
A.6: Direct relevant agencies to each designate or create a Resilience Coordinator position/role, based on the resilience planning needs of the agency, to ensure continuity between administration turnover coordinated by the CRO. <i>26 Support, 3 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Ensures durability of resilience efforts and creates focal point for cross-agency collaboration.
B. Supporting Resilience Funding Efforts	
B.1: The CRO should be directed to take steps to maximize the availability and use of federal, state, and private funding for resilience activities. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Maximizes use of funding from all levels for resilience while supporting localities in attaining resilience funding.
B.2: The CRO should be authorized to serve, at the request of and in coordination with, an eligible funding recipient, as Virginia's non-federal sponsor or applicant for resilience related projects, depending on existing state agency activities and needs, USACE Civil	Provides additional infrastructure for state agencies to leverage and maximize federal funding opportunities.

Legislative Action Recommendation	Justification
Works Programs and other federal funding programs. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	
B.3: State resilience funds, including the Community Flood Preparedness Fund and the Resilient Virginia Revolving Fund, should be administered with appropriate oversight and transparency, perhaps through establishment of a board. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Ensures transparency and oversight of state resilience funding awards and administration.
C. Locality Readiness for Resilience	
C.1: The state should provide capacity-building support to local governments seeking to address resilience challenges. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Addresses gaps in capacity and resources across localities and regions.
C.2: The state should consider funding resilience tools and processes that will help localities and state and federally recognized Tribes advance their resilience, such as the Resilience Adaptation Feasibility Tool (RAFT). <i>24 Support, 5 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Targeted support to help localities advance their resilience.
D. Flood Resilience Planning	
D.1: Establish a new group (or re-scope the role of the Coastal Technical Advisory Committee) with appropriate statewide representation to support the development and implementation of the Virginia Flood Protection Master Plan. <i>25 Support, 4 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Ensures aligned development and implementation of the Virginia Flood Protection Master Plan.

Recommendations for Administrative Action and Future Consideration

Administrative Action Recommendation	Justification
E. Supporting Resilience Funding Efforts	
E.1: The state should evaluate creating streamlined mechanism(s) to accept and enable the use of private funding, charitable funding and/or public-private partnerships by state agencies and localities seeking to address resilience challenges. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Creates a path to accept private funds (including donations) to assist regions and localities in diversifying resilience funding sources.
E.2: The state should develop and maintain a catalog of resilience projects that can be quickly matched against grants as they become available, similar to what is available for coastal flood resilience through the Coastal Resilience Web Explorer. <i>26 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Ensures timely and effective federal grant application submissions from relevant state agencies.
E.3: The state should consider creating a “one stop shop” for business resilience to provide regulatory assistance, contractor connections, and other services to facilitate private sector resilience investments. <i>24 Support, 5 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Accurate and effective resource sharing for private sector partners to help increase investment in resilience.
E.4: When providing support to local governments, the CRO should coordinate with other agencies where appropriate for existing grants to avoid duplication of efforts. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Streamlines resilience practices and improves accessibility for private businesses and other private sector partners, leading to increased investment.
F. Locality Readiness for Resilience Planning	
F.1: The state should establish state goals, metrics, and best practices to define what effective locality readiness for resilience should look like. <i>23 Support, 6 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Enables statewide alignment around resilience planning and activities.

Administrative Action Recommendation	Justification
F.2: The state should ensure that state agencies have internal clarity/review of flood resilience opportunities and challenges that can inform technical assistance and grants programs. <i>26 Support, 3 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Enables statewide alignment around resilience planning and activities.
F.3: State resilience funding programs should be structured in a manner that provides support for start-up and up-front costs borne by local governments implementing resilience projects. <i>24 Support, 5 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Alleviates burden of 100% reimbursement for under-resourced localities.
F.4: State agencies administering resilience programs should consider structuring programs to enable localities to leverage federal dollars by subsidizing the required match. <i>25 Support, 4 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Assists localities in maximizing federal funding opportunities.
G. Flood Resilience Planning	
G.1 DCR should continue to explore ways to align the regional flood resilience master plans and the Virginia Flood Protection Master Plan. <i>27 Support, 2 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Ensures aligned development and implementation of regional and master plans.
H. Resilience Data and Resources	
H.1: The CRO should conduct a periodic survey of state agencies, regional entities, and localities to identify their coordination, planning, and funding needs as well as data needs including what data is required to be used and what data is available for use. <i>29 Support, 0 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	Identify state, local, and regional coordination, planning, funding, and data needs.
H.2: The state should establish a data mechanism for resilience planning and ensure that captured resilience data are coordinated	Leverage state agency, University, non-governmental organization,

Administrative Action Recommendation	Justification
and streamlined for ease of use by agencies and end users, perhaps by convening a data management working group. Consider opportunities to leverage the Virginia Office of Data Governance and Analytics for this purpose. <i>28 Support, 1 Abstain, 0 Do Not Support</i>	private sector partners, and end-user expertise.