

MEETING NOTES

Attendees - Online; Virtual Meeting

Kate Gibson, Deputy Director, GWRC
Alexa Boggs, Disaster Response and Recovery Officer, VDEM
Liz Adams, All Hazards Planner, VDEM
Colin Noyes, All Hazards Planner, VDEM
Tyler Gelles, Senior Stormwater Manager, City of Fredericksburg
Jack McGovern, Battalion Chief, City of Fredericksburg
Matthew Decatur, Long Range Planner, Spotsylvania County
Jacob Pastwik, Long Range Planner, Spotsylvania County
Steve Lynd, Battalion Chief/Deputy Emergency Manager, King George County
Monique Dina, Emergency Management Planner, King George County
Steven L. Nelson, Director, Emergency Management, Rappahannock Tribe
Michael Zehner, Environmental Programs Director, The Berkley Group
Luke Peters, Environmental Planner, The Berkley Group
Nadya Syazsa, Intern, The Berkley Group

Not in Attendance

Lindsay Edwards, Environmental Planner, The Berkley Group
Jason R. Loftus, Fire-EMS Chief, Caroline County
Matthew Embrey, Division Chief, EM & Logistics, Spotsylvania County
Allyson Finchum, Town Manager, Town of Bowling Green and Town of Port Royal
Jay Cullinan, Fire Chief, Spotsylvania County
Roger Sutherland, Assistant Chief, Stafford County

Welcome & Agenda Review

Michael Zehner welcomed everyone to the meeting. Luke Peters reviewed attendance for the meeting. Mr. Zehner reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

Project Status Update; Review of Tasks & Timelines

Local In-Kind Match Time Tracking

Mr. Zehner and Kate Gibson discussed local in-kind match time tracking needs. PMT members were requested to report time from when the project began (April 21) to June

30th. PMT members asked about calculating fringe and were encouraged to coordinate with their respective HR/finance offices, or refer to their paystubs and determine hourly rate accordingly. Mrs. Gibson indicated that starting July 1st reporting will be on a monthly basis

Review of Completed Tasks and Timeline

Mr. Zehner reviewed the completed tasks and timeline through Project Week 9, as follows:

- Held 1st PMT meeting
- Finished draft of Public Education and Engagement Plan
- GWRC sent out press release (picked up by the Fredericksburg Today)
- BG: Assessing current Plan

Pending Tasks; Chapter Reviews/Input and Public Engagement Activities; Minimum Stakeholder Engagement Requirements

Mr. Zehner reviewed pending tasks and activities, as follows:

- Chapter Reviews - Ch. 1-3, 6; NFIP Surveys
 - Question on the 'Global Changes' section, regarding demographic updates? – BG will take care of this update; however, the following may be needed from localities:
 - Chapter 1 - break down for each community profile, what updates should BG add (historic information/anecdotes, images?); but overall, Chapter 1-3 should not need much input from localities.
 - Chapter 6 - updates on regional capabilities (e.g., GWRC, FAMPO) , community-specific capabilities (flood management, planning processes, local organizations, etc.).
- Chapter 7 - for mitigation strategies, will discuss in more detail later in the meeting.
- Local updates on public engagement – BG asking for screenshots of materials posted or planned to be posted to document local efforts to reach out to stakeholders and the public:
 - *Spotsylvania County*: Social media post – linking to GWRC page to inquire comments on the Plan draft (already received 1!)

- *King George County*: In the process of building information regarding the HMP into the website – linking GWRC's Facebook page (NEW) onto the site to facilitate access of King George's residents
 - *BG*: Draft a social media post for GWRC, to also be disseminated to localities to post to the public
 - *City of Fredericksburg*: Contacting the *PIO* to coordinate approach of public engagement
 - *Jacob Pastwik (Spotsylvania County)*: Newspaper advertisement through GWRC? No (as it is not a requirement), though there was a press release already sent out. Another press release may be sent out when the public survey is sent out, and we can figure out the best way to notify the public when the draft plan is ready for review (which may be a legal advertisement if that is the PMT's preference).
- Minimum stakeholder engagement requirements

Mr. Zehner review the minimum stakeholder engagement requirements, as follows:

- Those in the EM fields; engage with staff, as well as other agencies who have authority to regulate development
- Engage neighboring communities, businesses, non-profit organizations, academia (e.g., University of Mary Washington, MW Hospital, Germanna Community College)
- *Liz Adams*: "...in engaging neighboring jurisdictions, the last plan we invited their representatives to a stakeholder meeting"; "...create a master list of all stakeholders"
- *Kate Gibson*: "...contact those who might be considered stakeholders, and if they are not the best person, to ask them for contact to those best suited"
- *Alexa Boggs*: "*Liz and I will work on creating a plan to engage stakeholders*"

Hazard Identification Recap

Mr. Zehner presented the hazards included in the current plan, along with the hazards to be included in the updated plan. Hazards to be added include pandemic/infectious agent, civil disturbance, impaired waterways, and technological hazards (cybersecurity risk, aging infrastructure, hazmat, bio-

hazards, and industrial accidents). Mr. Zehner read a public comment received encouraging consideration of a failure or accident or attack on the North Anna Nuclear Facility, an accident or attack on any of the regional military installations, and the limitations posed by current weak transportation infrastructure -- i.e. there is no real N/S evacuation alternative to the I-95/US-1 corridor. Mr. Zehner acknowledged that the PMT was considering at least all of these but any hazard associated with military installations.

Mr. Zehner asked if there were other hazards that should be considered, and asked for thoughts on how to address military installations; Mr. Zehner asked Liz Adams and Alexa Boggs for any input with regard to the level of engagement to drafting the mitigation plan with military installations in terms of emergency management and hazard mitigation.

Ms. Adams: "Not sure about local capabilities...often they (the military installations) may come up with their own mitigation plan; pooling resources between localities and military sites (she is currently working an ongoing project)"

Mr. Zehner suggested that they could recognize installations as assets, although leave vulnerability and risk assessment to those separate plans and acknowledge those plans and processes.

Ms. Boggs asked what the requirements are to respond to the individual, noting that military installations seem to have their own responsibility and should do their own due diligence.

Steve Lynd indicated that previous plans had focused on natural hazards, and asked whether other hazards should be included. Mr. Zehner referenced the input from the previous PMT meeting, where members were supportive of including non-natural hazards. Ms. Gibson referenced that the PMT had concluded that these additional hazards should at least be identified so the information can be contained, with perhaps additional work to be done in the future given the shorter project timeline.

With respect to impaired waterways, Mr. Zehner asked whether this concerned impacts to recreational uses or drinking water. Members of the PMT indicated both drinking water issues as well as harmful algae bloom situations – toxicity to animals and humans (referencing Lake Anna specifically).

Evaluate/Update Original Mitigation Goals and Strategies

Mitigation Strategy Requirements

Mr. Zehner reviewed the minimum mitigation strategy requirements, referencing that the current plan includes the requisite content, but that updates are necessary. Mr. Zehner reviewed the current mitigation goals, and noted, as follows, that some of the language of the goals may need to be updated since they were taken directly from the State's plan:

- Goal 1 - change to just "eliminate long-term risks"
- Goal 2 - "Commonwealth may be more appropriate for State plans" – remove entirely
- Goal 3 - relate more to regional and local level as opposed to state and university
- Goal 4 – Likely sufficient as written.

Members of the PMT provided feedback and support for the changes. Ms. Adams indicated that referencing universities may be good to include.

With respect to the Action Plan, Mr. Zehner indicated that BG would be referring to the 2021 Annual Report in terms of actions completed, but that local representatives would need to provide further updates in terms of completed actions, those that they wanted to carry into the new plan, anything that was no longer relevant – and the reasons why – and any new actions. Mr. Zehner suggested that representatives could provide those changes by July 8, 2022.

Next Steps

Mr. Zehner reviewed next steps, specifically discussing the public survey and draft that had been circulated to the PMT. Mr. Zehner discussed the intent of the survey, noting that it is as much a public education tool as anything else. Mr. Zehner provided a general overview of the survey questions. PMT members were generally in favor of the questions prepared with some refinements. The PMT members agreed that it was only necessary to ask for zip code information, and not actual addresses. PMT members agreed that questions specific to flooding hazards were important.

Mr. Zehner asked the PMT members for their opinion about questions concerning people's opinions about what local governments are or are not doing. PMT members were supportive of asking questions geared to identifying solutions, not necessarily focusing on performance or lack thereof.

Mr. Zehner indicated that the goal would be to have the survey ready to release at the end of the week of June 27, 2022, and that messaging for press releases and social media posts would be prepared for GWRC and local use. The goal would be to run the survey for 3 weeks to help inform plan drafting.

Mr. Zehner indicated that, based on the timeline, the 3rd PMT meeting would be in Week 12, the week of July 11, 2022, and that they would circulate an email for availability. The goal of this 3rd meeting would be to review the status and discuss draft Chapters 1-3 and 6, and potentially Chapter 7.

Mr. Zehner referenced a comment from the previous meeting regarding the potential of an in-person public meeting. Mr. Zehner suggested that this be scheduled following development of the plan due to limitations with the shortened project timeline.

Adjourn

With no other comments or business, the PMT meeting adjourned at approximately 3:05p.