

**Community Resilience Panel:
Data, Metrics, & Tools (DMT) Standing Committee Meeting**

MEETING DATE: Friday, December 2, 2016

TIME: 12:00 – 2:00 PM EST

ISSUE DATE: February 1, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
Megan Clifford [Chair]	Argonne National Laboratory
Paolo Bocchini [Vice-Chair]	Lehigh University
Ting Lin [Secretary]	Marquette University
Brendan Doyle	EPA
Eleanore Hajian	DHS S&T Office of University Programs
Floyd DesChamps	The Desner Group, LLC
Frank Lavelle	ARA
Jay Raskin	Jay Raskin Architect
Keely Maxwell	EPA
Larry Altenburg	SC&A Inc
Leanne Aaby	LMI
Louis Conway	Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) Post Disaster Response Committee, Canada
Mat Heyman	Impresa Management Solution
Molly O'Donnell	Boulder County Collaborative
Richard (Dick) Wright	American Society of Civil Engineers
Wenjuan Sun	Lehigh University

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and Data, Metrics, & Tools Standing Committee

NOTES BY: Ting Lin, Marquette University

1. Welcome

Megan Clifford (Chair) called the meeting to order and thanked attendees for participating. Megan thanked Ting Lin (Secretary) for the past DMT meeting minutes and nominated Paolo Bocchini (Vice Chair) for the upcoming DMT reappointment.

Regarding the question about the impact of the recent election on the Community Resilience Panel (CRP), Megan shared Steve Cauffman (NIST)'s response: "We do not currently have any reason to believe that the results of the election will have any immediate effects on the Panel or the Community Resilience Program. Unless we receive direction from the new administration when it takes office, we will plan to continue with the work of the Panel without change."

2. Meeting Logistics

The DMT committee documents, including past meeting minutes (see “1. Meetings”) and member contributions (see “3. DMT Links & Presentations”), were shared among members via Dropbox. The folder related to this meeting is “1. Meetings\g. 02Dec2016_Telecon”.

Megan proposed a motion to approve the September 21st to 22nd Meeting Minutes that will incorporate two minor changes suggested by Mat Heyman. The committee unanimously approved (see “2-DMT Committee Meeting Minutes 9-21to22-16”).

Megan reviewed the December 2nd Meeting Agenda and proposed a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting. The committee unanimously approved the agenda (see “1-DMT Committee Meeting Agenda_12-2-16_DRAFT”).

Megan, working with Paolo and Ting, drafted the DMT committee roles and responsibilities document (see “3-DRAFT DMT Committee Roles and Responsibilities for review_12-2-16” with corresponding committee discussion in Section 3 below) for review and discussion, shared the Energy committee’s evaluation criteria (see “4-NIST Energy Subcommittee_Review Criteria” with corresponding committee discussion in Section 4 below), and identified resilience gaps via the recommendation paper drafted by Leanne Aaby with contributions from Jerry Brashear by Group C (see “5-NIST DMT Group C Portfolio Management and Decision Making_9-19-16” with corresponding committee discussion in Section 5 below).

3. Review and Discussion of DMT Committee’s Roles and Responsibilities

Megan provided an overview of the CRP mission and objectives. With that in mind, the draft roles and responsibilities document aims to clarify the DMT committee’s contributions in the two primary roles – (1) reviewer and (2) proposer – with specific responsibilities.

Mat Heyman agreed with the two roles, which were very clear to him. Since the emphasis on the Resilience Knowledge Base (RKB) is important to the CRP, he suggested making a request to share the DMT document with the Community Resilience Panel Coordinating Committee (CRPCC) for discussion. Although NIST is a key player in the CRP, he would like to ensure inclusion of materials from other agencies besides NIST. Larry Altenburg suggested making specific reference to other agencies and key programs that directly affect community resilience. Megan noted we could list all agencies, e.g., Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Mat suggested considering priorities for 2017 and 2018 to respond to requests from a number of agencies. Floyd DesChamps asked whether other agencies have review committees that are similar to ours. Megan responded with an example. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has inter-agency review, but Megan pointed out that the CRP is unique because of a large cross-cutting volunteer group. Although NIST has the responsibility to lead, the CRP is not government-focused, although there are senior government representatives in the CRPCC.

Jay Raskin mentioned the Water and Wastewater Committee is developing seismic standards for piping, which could be good for DMT to track. Megan suggested we solidify this document, vote, and share with other committee chairs. For instance, the Water and Wastewater Committee could work on their standards and solicit DMT feedback before release.

Brendan Doyle proposed contributing EPA's identified gaps, such as environmental resilience indicators, to be vetted through DMT. Megan asked Brendan to send the language to add into the document for final review and feedback.

Paolo pointed out that the current list 1a-b are mostly for NIST, with questions of whether to provide feedback; 1c-e are broader, which could include e.g., Rockefeller. Megan mentioned that the CRP consists of multiple agencies including NIST. Paolo followed up, suggesting that we remove the first "NIST" occurrence in the document. Megan recommended taking advantage of opportunities, e.g., Brendan from EPA is eager to contribute to and get feedback from DMT. We could hear more from agencies on board to start, but not to limit ourselves on federal products. We could also include great non-profit materials on RKB.

Frank Lavelle asked what this group can do once every few months regarding draft materials prior to publication – there may be a NIST timeline concern, depending on whether it is formal review or informal feedback and whether voting is required. Megan gave a recent example of informal review of the NIST Fellow's model where Megan and Ting sought and compiled DMT feedback. It is good to engage the Panel to review work, e.g., by NIST COE and NIST Fellows and not release documents without Panel involvement.

Eleanore Hajian would like to see all draft materials under consideration by CRPCC go through review, with clarified mechanism, by nomination or request. Megan agreed the DMT could initiate review if members come across fantastic materials or by request, e.g., from EPA. Paolo further distinguished the selector (of materials) vs. the reviewer (who provides feedback). Eleanore echoed that DMT could offer options available to let requestors tell us what they want us to do.

Brendan asked whether there are explicit steps/protocols for members of the CRP to submit to the RKB, e.g., resources to submit to this group from other groups to forward to CRPCC. Megan responded that resources produced by other committees (e.g., Water and Wastewater) can come to this cross-cutting committee. DMT can serve as a reviewer or selector to apply criteria and categorize materials with checks and balances.

Action Item: Megan will work with Paolo and Ting to pass a revised version of the roles and responsibilities document onto the DMT committee members.

4. Review and Discussion of Energy Committee's Evaluation Criteria

Megan shared evaluation criteria developed by the Energy Committee, previously presented by Julia Phillips in Colorado. She asked the DMT committee whether we should promote it to RKB, and whether the criteria would be scalable to the local level that resonates with DMT. In the context of recommended materials for potential template application, DMT committee members previously recommended links/documents (see "3. DMT Links & Documents") and presented materials in Portland (see "1. Meetings\c. 04Apr2016_Portland, OR\Presentations"); the Water and Wastewater Committee used a 1-5 rating to accept or reject documents; a taxonomy is important for Jesse Keenan who is leading RKB.

Mat suggested applying the same criteria across committees for the RKB. Megan acknowledged the discussion about standard criteria across the Panel, and added that Jay wants to allow flexibility for every committee to determine its own criteria, ideally adopting other committees' criteria with appropriate adjustments.

Frank pointed out that the current criteria are document centric and could expand to tools and data (with documentation). Megan mentioned that criteria could be applied to data, metrics, tools, or other standards. Regarding Mat's concern that standards may not be free, Jay was aware of this issue with a paywall to get into standards. Megan responded this could be an example of conditional acceptance.

Eleanore noted that there could be a larger discussion with recommendations to the Panel leadership involving other committees on how DMT can help to facilitate collective understanding and ensure local relevance in the planning process. Megan will start discussion across leadership with more details. Jay mentioned that Ronda Mosley is spearheading an effort to do survey for local communities. Megan noted that the survey is proactive to meet user needs, while this effort is mainly to find/produce great documents and solicit user feedback. Eleanore echoed the need to tap into the "Molly's of the world" to ensure what's important to community users goes into the RKB.

Paolo viewed this as criteria to accept documents to RKB and suggested a role of curator instead of selector to provide additional guidance on how to navigate. Eleanore mentioned a cloud source mechanism, such as a rating app, to gather what government/individuals think. There could be practical considerations such as human, technical, equipment, and funding resources. Helpful resources can be self-identified by people who use them. Maybe taxonomy can address initial indication to help someone navigate whether something may be worthwhile. Megan followed up that in the previous RKB meeting in Colorado, points of discussion included architecture of RKB, e.g., similar to Amazon, enable star ratings and provide additional suggestions. It is important to continue DMT participation in RKB.

Action Items: Megan to follow up with Jay on evaluation criteria consistency via CRPCC, and to find out about the next RKB meeting in which Eleanore would be happy to participate.

5. Vote to Approve "Recommendation Paper: Including Portfolio Management Practices into NIST Guide and RKB" for CRPCC Review

Megan led DMT Working Group C "Tools", where a recommendation paper entitled "Recommendation Paper: Including Portfolio Management Practices into NIST Guide and RKB" was drafted by Leanne with contributions from Jerry. Leanne presented this recommendation paper during the DMT committee meeting. The committee unanimously approved this paper to go forward for CRPCC review.

Action Item: Megan to follow up with Jay and invite Leanne to present this recommendation paper in the January 2017 CRPCC meeting.

6. Updates from DMT Committee Members Serving on Other Committees

DMT members serving dual roles on other committees provided full committee additional context for Panel activities.

Megan noted similar efforts in Social and Economic Committee, which held a number of meetings in which DMT members participated. Megan held a coordination call with the new chair, John Plodinec, and plans to share relevant DMT documents as a cross-cutting collaboration to have meaningful impact. Paolo is a DMT representative in the Transportation Committee, which held no recent meetings. The Transportation Committee is linked with the Transportation Research Board in the National Academies with funding to support research. Ting mentioned that Louis Conway was participating in the Buildings and Facilities Committee's monthly meetings with a major focus on applying the NIST Guide Steps 1-6 on various hazard scenarios in different communities. Sunil Sinha is spearheading the Water and

Wastewater Committee's resilience knowledgebase document submission form, submission guidance, and review guidance.

7. New Business

The CRPCC meetings are held monthly. The CRP website is migrating to <https://crpanel.nist.gov/>. Project coordination software is forthcoming. Stay tuned for the next RKB meeting. The fourth CRP in-person meeting is in Miami on March 9-10, 2017 – please register at https://crpanel.nist.gov/?page_id=5067.

Megan thanked the committee for their input and continued engagement.