

Community Resilience Panel: Energy Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: June 6, 2016
TIME: 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. EDT
LOCATION: Conference Call
ISSUE DATE: June 16, 2016

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
Ronda Mosley (Chair)	PTI
Julia Phillips (Vice-Chair)	Argonne National Laboratory
Ryan Franks	U.S. Green Building Council
Erich Gunther	EnerNex
Chuck Hookham	CMS Energy
Leon Kempner	Bonneville Power Administration
Stuart McCafferty	Hitachi Microgrids
David Michel	CA Energy Commission
David Mizzen	ARA
Andrew Petrow	Consultant
David Ribeiro	ACEEE
Becky Rush	Derp Technologies
Gordon Schremp	State of California

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and Energy Standing Committee
NOTES BY: Julia Phillips, Argonne National Laboratory, and Ronda Mosley, PTI

1. Welcome

Ronda Mosley (Chair) opened the meeting with a brief introduction to the NIST 6 step process as presented in the NIST Guide. Ronda then introduced the NIST Disaster Resilience Fellow for Energy, Erich Gunther, to speak to the Fellow activities as related to the committee work.

Erich is currently working on four (4) energy related Guide Briefs that will supplement Step 2 of the NIST Guide. Each document is about 4-5 pages in length. The topics for Erich’s Guide Briefs are:

- Detailed guidelines on how to assess the energy requirements for your community
- Assess your energy sources (where does energy come from)
- Assessing energy infrastructure asset owner capability
- Energy system interdependencies

Discussion:

Dave Michel: Following Erich's discussion of his ongoing activities as a NIST Disaster Resilience Fellow, Gordon Schremp, who is on the call, is a leading expert in liquid fuels for the State of California. He would be willing to act as a key resource to the Fellows for this work and future activities.

How do we support Energy Fellows Erich's and Stuart's efforts?

The committee wanted to find a more formal way, working with the NIST staff, to bring Ronda into the review loop. Erich and David Mizzen noted that there is a Fellows meeting next week. They plan on discussing ways to better integrate with the standing committees. David Mizzen of Applied Research Associates (ARA), a contractor to NIST, will reach out to external reviewers (i.e., outside the fellows). The plan is to give external reviewers about two weeks or so to review and get comments back to the fellows.

How can the Energy Committee help design future documents or get ideas flowing to our Energy Fellows?

We can funnel ideas to the NIST Fellows. We can begin developing a series guidance documents to help communities and send ideas that are beyond the expertise/resources of this volunteer committee. We can send topics to the NIST Fellows for something that should/could be addressed.

Can we volunteer to be a reviewer for the Guide Briefs?

Yes. Reach out to David (dmizzen@ara.com) if you would like to be a reviewer for the Guide Briefs.

2. Identification of committee participants

Ronda led attendee introductions.

3. Group Discussion

Ronda reviewed and clarified the Energy Committee's Mission:

1. Provide documents materials and guidance for the Resilience Knowledge Base (RKB).

We want to find and vet items that already exist. Once the items have been vetted, push them into the large database (Resilience Knowledge Base [RKB]) so the public can get help and find documentation that will help them walk through the NIST six step planning process.

2. Our work should be targeted toward local governments (communities).

The committee explored and reviewed the six steps of the NIST Community Resilience Planning Guide.

Step 1 – Form a Collaborative Planning Team

The goal is to help local governments define who should be on their resilience planning team

Chuck: different governments have different understanding of what community resilience is and what it means. We need to understand the dynamics of the local government and what they know/don't know.

Step 2 - Understanding the (local government) situation

This is a large task that depends on population size, hazards, locations, etc. Our goal is to help local governments understand the energy perspective in the built environment. There are lots of parts and pieces to look at, tear apart, and examine closely. How can we help?

Dave Michel: The social dimension is critical – the characteristics of what you want to look at or what you want to assess before you start the analysis.

Ronda: I agree, but we don't want to be overly prescriptive. We each come with our own interpretations of the dimensions. If we are stuck, we can have NIST discuss their thinking about the six steps.

Step 3 - Determine Goals and Objectives

Determine what other goals and objectives need to be added from the energy perspective.

Step 4 – Plan Development

Gather information and determine the resilience plan's goals and objectives.

Step 5 – Plan Preparation, Review, and Approval

Step 6 - Plan Implementation and Maintenance

We need to share information about exercises where local governments can use already existing information rather than being required to recreate the wheel.

Can we add bullet points to the 6 steps? What are the group's thoughts on what is missing? What kind of system can we create internally where we collect and vet documents so local governments can use them?

Chuck: Involved in NERC. There are differing levels of understanding of the issues and risks and what the costs may be.

Regarding Step 3, we need to define the performance goals that the local government can actually perform.

Becky: Is there a plan for someone to become qualified to facilitate this process? Some communities do not recognize the need to have something like this in place.

There are many issues related to who does the work and whether they are qualified to be facilitators. Governments do not have the time, education, nor funds to undertake something like this. The RKB is supposed to help local governments understand what resources are available to ease the planning process. We should consider train-the-trainer programs, where early adopters will train the new implementers.

Dave Michel: Many folks who work on resilience look for engineering solutions and do not think about actions.

Ronda: Local governments are going to be in different places; so our collection of documents should be useful for wherever the local government is in the process and support all six steps.

How do we go about collecting and identifying the documents? How should our committee vet and accept documents? Should we create criteria on how these documents work through our committee and get passed on to the Coordinating Committee for acceptance into the RKB?

Julia suggests including the reason(s) you think that document is worth pushing forward as these can help with criteria development.

Becky thinks we should identify what specific step in the planning process your document adheres to and why (this can also help with the criteria development).

Work with the assumption that we will start to identify documents, planning guides, materials that support the six steps and as you find them, they pass through your own process, and you think they would be a worthy contribution to the RKB. For example, to submit a document for review, you could create a short document that includes the following:

- Title
- Brief executive summary
- Which step it applies to
- Recommendation/thoughts of why this document is worthy of submission

ACTION ITEM FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS - Suggest a step you are most comfortable with or documents that go through all the steps. Send documents to Ronda and she will start to send out an update once a week.

Dave Ribeiro: What types of documents are you looking for? Short? Long? What is most appropriate to pass along? I lean towards shorter, concise documents for governments that have to operate under staff constraints.

Dave Michel: There is a tendency to collect information that provides solutions (#4) but may not be applicable to the local government's particular problem. There needs to be a minimal review for how they got to the assessment (the solutions?). How do we deal with other systems that play with energy?

As a committee, we need to make sure there are enough clarification and definitions, and ensure we answer the questions Dave identified.

Chuck Hookham graciously agreed to represent our committee on the newly established working group to look at how the RKB should be created. He will work on the nomenclature/taxonomy for the database. The initial scheduled meeting on June 21, 2016. There is already disagreement on what *taxonomy* means. Chuck will report back to our committee on the RKB subcommittee developments.

Dave Michel: Our mission deals with the built environment for the local government. Does this neglect the larger infrastructure that feed in to the local communities (Grid, pipelines)? How far should we go?

This is why forming the committee (Step 1) is so important. It is also essential that the local utilities participate in this planning process. We must foster communication between the local governments and the utilities that supply the local community with energy.

David Mizzen: The NIST planning process Uses the local government as the logical convener for the resilience planning team because it has the ability to access the necessary expertise within the community (i.e., reaching down into the community) as well as reaching up to regional, and state resources.

Chuck: It seems as though it would depend on the type of community. We have to be flexible to those different situations.

Ronda: Let the local government decide how they use the information in the database.

4. Next Panel Meeting

The next committee meeting will be scheduled in August. Committee members will be sent a Doodle Poll for possible meeting dates and times.

This committee is open to the public, so if there are folks who could participate and would like to, let Ronda (rmosley@pti.org) know and she will reach out to them.

5. Schedule

The next two face-to-face Panel meetings (Fall 2016 and Spring 2017) take place in Boulder, CO at the NIST facilities and at the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida, respectively.

6. Adjournment

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:10 PM EDT.