Community Resilience Panel:
Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: March 9, 2017
TIME: 2:30 – 5:00 PM EST
LOCATION: In person (Miami, FL) and by conference call
ISSUE DATE: June 20, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
John Plodinec (Chair)	CARRI
Ann Terranova (Secretary)	AECOM
Debra Ballen	IBHS
Brett Barclay	Independent Consultant
Donna Boyce	Solix
Greg Cade	National Fire Protection Association
Laura Clemons	CBI
Donna Davis	NIST
Maria Dillard	NIST
Juan Fung	NIST Applied Economics Office
Ann Goodman, PhD	City University of New York
Joseph Gunset	Lloyd's America, Inc.
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
Tisha Holmes	Florida State University
Alex Kaplan	Swiss Re
Julie Kramer	Advanced Survival Technology, LLC
Jim Murley	Miami-Dade County Office of Resilience
Richard Pearlson	Rap/Sat
Liesel Ritchie	University of Colorado Natural Hazards Center
Alka Sapat	Florida Atlantic University
Chris Spoons	Walden University
Alpa Swinger	Portland Cement Association
David van der Leer	Van Alen Institute
Dave Williams	Oklahoma Small Business Development Center

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and Social & Economic Standing Committee
NOTES BY: Ann Terranova, AECOM

1. **Roll Call**

Please refer to the list of attendees. If you attended and your name is not on the list, please advise the committee secretary (Ann Terranova) and your name will be added.

2. **Welcome and Introductions (John Plodinec)**

John provided an overview of what we planned to accomplish (review agenda – see attached).

3. **Filling the Gaps**

After an overview regarding the process for discussing gaps, the group received clarification regarding the need to define gaps, knowledge required to fill gaps, etc. One member suggested working through one gap as a group to develop a better perspective on what is being asked of the committee in their breakout groups today.

The group held a discussion to help frame the assignment of conducting a collective brainstorm of the gap "developing a business case for resilience." Discussion topics included:

- Top down/bottom up – Tension exists between decision makers (e.g., elected officials) and grass roots (power in the people to become decision makers)

- We should encourage the leaders of grass roots movements to become the thought leaders

- There is a need to identify tools to help in the decision making process

The group also deliberated the need to take a step back (e.g., Step 1 – Form a Collaborative Team, Step 2 – Understand the Situation, etc.). This effort needs to be bounded by what was initially intended (e.g., what was the intended audience initially for the Planning Guide). As part of this discussion, the committee considered the overlap between stakeholders (e.g., business leaders who become elected officials, etc.); it is a fluid process and people wear multiple hats to address community resilience at the local level.

In terms of risk, we need to identify the risk, the cost to address that risk, and finally, the benefit (vs. cost). Additionally, what is the cost benefit for each kind of risk? As part of risk, the group also considered the need to look at multi-hazards and apply CBA (cost benefit analysis) across hazards, with reference to the 4-1 study (for every mitigation dollar spent, four dollars in benefits are modeled). We also need to look at the tools to measure impacts to human beings. Quantifying risk vs. rewards is difficult; it is delaying development of a business case.

Discussion continued on the need for incentives that encourage communities to take resilience action and how effective messaging fits into the broader picture of creating a business case. Once an effective business case is developed, the committee must determine who presents the business case.

Committee members deliberated the need for a resilience toolkit for decision making purposes (DHS/Region 4 needs assistance with this). For identified gaps, share (link) with the rest of the S&E Committee; there are pieces out there that address parts of what is needed (gaps).

What is the resilience dividend? This topic came up several times during the meeting, as a means to frame the business case discussion. We need to not look at things from a "one size fits all" perspective.

To further develop the business case, the committee should look at specific case studies (e.g., Miami Beach – what have they done and why was it good), as well as studies that can help make the business case (e.g. NIBS 4-1 study).

How will the Economic Planning Guide fit into making decisions about what is included in the business case (refer to EPG brochure)? It may not be the answer but can be a framework.

To end this discussion, the committee considered making the business case and:

- The need for NIST to include case studies, exemplars, and success stories. These anecdotal experiences need to be fairly fleshed out and well defined (replicable).

- The need to offer recommendations to NIST regarding which types of case studies would be beneficial.

Group 1 Breakout Feedback

Group 1 discussed all three gaps; they are all linked.

The Group began a list of resources (NAACP toolkit, "Tactical Urbanism," several sources of good stories doing a piece of one of the gaps really well, AU Center for Climate Change and Community Resilience – Communicating about Clean Energy and Climate Change Solutions).

This discussion led to identification of additional gaps, e.g., information that could help smaller cities/communities.

- Sources of stories include Project for Public Spaces, Future of Places, NIST, NAACP

- *Gap* → Could be turned into videos showcasing the successes of smaller communities, which could be included in the Resilience Knowledge Base. Funds would need to be identified for videos.

- *Gap* → Creating a long-term individual sense of empowerment when working on resilience.

Group 2 Breakout Feedback

Group 2 decided it was more of a flow of action:

- Understanding risk

- Getting resilience into decision making

- Breaking down the barriers

Filling the knowledge gap answer can be achieved through a series of questions:

- How are decisions made? What motivates people to make decisions? Etc.

- What is the capacity/knowledge of stakeholders? How do we synthesize lessons learned?

Barriers → look at institutions that have already done it. We must document and learn from those experiences. Identifying resources doesn't entirely fill the gap.

We must understand risk and translate that understanding into action:

- How do we understand and evaluate new or accelerating risks from emerging factors (e.g., climate change)?

- What (is the) scale (action, data availability)?

- What are the capacities of different actors?

- Who are the stakeholders? What are their various agencies/power/influences?

- We must gather/synthesize lessons learned.

There are several necessary steps to get resilience into decision making and existing plans:

- Integrate what we know from diverse areas of social sciences into other disciplines:
    - How are decisions made?
    - What motivates people to take action?

- Break down the barriers between bureaucratic silos:
    - Implement interagency working groups.
    - Look at "finer scale" groups as a model; agencies that already do this at a local level.
    - What is the governance structure?
    - Identify what skills/data each brings to the table.
    - Identify and use other institutions that have broken down silos for communities and add on resilience initiatives.

Group 3 Breakout Feedback

Group 3 evaluated the Business Case for Resilience.

The reason/purpose for developing a business case is that we want to demonstrate/gain buy-in that it will benefit the community (through evidence of business cases).

- At some point resilience will require a financial expenditure (benefit/cost).

- Property rights must be addressed in some manner. To whom do cost and benefits accrue?

Although the business case is important, we need to consider other cases (e.g., social case for resilience – building trust – social return on investment).

We need to define the different cases that need to be made. What positive benefits accrue to the community by undertaking these different things. We need to see/understand the benefit and turn it into action (social and economic business case). For example, hotel laundering – the power of social/peer pressure to get people to reuse towels vs. washing them.

The group needs to look at how anecdotal experience can help influence resilience in other communities (getting to the peer pressure concept). The group should also consider the process of a community developing their own social/business case.

- What are the benefits of resilience in the absence of a disaster? What compels people to act?

- What moves the process forward? Who is the "translational leader?"

Prioritizing Gaps:

- <u>John</u> asked which of the three gaps is the most important. The group evaluated developing a business case that helps frame solutions and approaches to addressing other gaps (decision making and barriers).

- The Guide Briefs developed by Fellows to support Guide implementation (e.g., forming a collaborative planning team) will play into the gap discussion and addressing those gaps.

- Stakeholders must meet and make resilience decisions before a disaster strike. This goal will be challenging to accomplish given the way communities rally around disasters.

4. Interdependencies Discussion – Preparing for Cross-Committee Breakouts

<u>John</u> delivered an overview of what we are trying to accomplish with this discussion (refer to slide).

<u>Laura</u> followed with her summary of the process for discussing interdependencies (refer to handout).

Committee members offered feedback on the process:

- Provide a specific example (to focus the discussion).

- Tables within the Guide are similar to what we want to accomplish; however, it is important to lead committees through the process.

- Provide guidance to attendees before they break into groups.

- A suggestion was made to provide categories to respond to (e.g., health, education, job loss, family and kinship, etc. – from Guide)

- Discuss interdependencies first among sectors, then the social/economic interdependencies. **Clarification –** this is the first in a series of elicitations that will focus on each of the five sectors plus data, metrics, and tools.

- The committee needs to look at the process as opposed to the product.

- Reduce the number of examples per sector (on the sheet)

- Regarding timeframes:
  - 5 minutes of introduction in breakout groups
  - 40 minutes of group discussion

- Followed by identification of the top three requiring most cross-committee collaboration.

Report out on S&E Committee input:

- Loss of historic structures leads to loss of cultural identity.

- Loss of medical records/prescription information can result in death; starting from ground zero may result in making bad decisions about medical care.

- Raw sewage could affect health, tourism and agricultural industries.

- *Redundancies* – need to review back-up plans (e.g., does someone have a fireplace in place of electrical heat).

5. Additional Feedback from <u>Brett Barclay</u>

Due to issues with the conference call phone used during the S&E Committee meeting, it was difficult for remote participants to hear and contribute to the discussions. As a result, <u>Brett Barclay</u> offered the following feedback via email after the conclusion of the committee meeting.

Here are a few candidates for the discussion of social interdependencies with the Data, Metrics & Tools Committee, which are from the work by <u>Andrew Zolli & Ann Marie Healy</u> in their book "Resilience: Why Things Bounce Back," and what they refer to as resilience-bolstering characteristics individuals, groups, and communities when they in the "warm zone" of:

- Connectedness – Being connected, but not too connected, such as those within and among formal and informal networks.

- Collaboration – Being able to couple with others when it helps, but decouple when it's detrimental which could be further described as levels of cooperation and trust.

- Diversity - Being diverse, but not too diverse.

Another social measure from <u>Zolli & Healy</u> could be a community's degree of adhocracy (<u>Toffler and Mintzberg</u>), which characterizes informal team roles, limited focus on standard operating procedures, deep improvisation, rapid cycles, selective decentralization, empowerment of specialist teams, and general intolerance of bureaucracy.

You also include a social measure for the existence of, or conditions that foster, "translational leadership."

Collectively, these measures might help to assess a community's overall "adaptive capacity," which arguably is perhaps the ultimate metric of resilience.

Lastly, Brett noticed <u>Zolli & Healy</u> also identified what they refer to as "a powerful vocabulary for evaluating the resilience or fragility of the big systems like cities, economies, and critical infrastructure:"

- Tight Feedback Loops

- Dynamic Reorganization

- Built-in Countermechanisms

- Decoupling

- Diversity

- Modularity

- Simplicity

- Swarming

- Clustering

6. Meeting Adjourned

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 pm EST.