

## Community Resilience Panel: Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

**MEETING DATE:** March 21, 2016  
**TIME:** 2:00 – 3:00 PM EDT  
**LOCATION:** By WebEx  
**ISSUE DATE:** April 20, 2016

**ATTENDEES:**

Attendee	Affiliation
David Eisenman (Chair)	Division of General Internal Medicine/Health Services Research UCLA School of Medicine
John Plodinec (Vice Chair)	Community and Regional Resilience Institute
Ann Terranova (Secretary)	AECOM
David Mizzen	ARA
Donna Boyce	Solix
David Butry	NIST
Gregory Cade	National Fire Protection Association
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Ann Goodman	City University of New York
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
George B. Huff Jr.	The Continuity Project
Erica Kuligowski	NIST
Ed MacMullen	ECONorthwest
Jan Opper	Opper Strategies & Solutions LLC
Cotina Lane Pixley	University of the District of Columbia
Stephen Reissman	NOAA
Liesel Ritchie	Natural Hazards Center
Heather Rosenberg	US Green Building Council, Los Angeles Chapter
Jim Schwab	American Planning Association, Hazards Planning Center

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees and Social & Economic Standing Committee

**NOTES BY:** Ann Terranova, AECOM

### 1. Roll Call

Please refer to list of attendees. If you attended and your name is not on the list, please contact the standing committee secretary and your name will be added.

### 2. Welcome and Introductions

David Eisenman, Social and Economic (S&E) Committee Chairperson welcomed committee member attendees. He indicated the purpose of today's call was to prepare for the upcoming NIST Community Resilience Panel Meeting in Portland, OR. David indicated the S&E Committee has done a good job of getting up and running as a committee, and our previous discussions have led us to today. David reviewed the agenda slide to set the stage for what the Committee would discuss during the WebEx.

### 3. Overview of Proposed S&E Committee Work Groups

David reviewed the slides that described each of the three Work Groups, indicating he wanted to get feedback from committee members on:

- Are you interested in working on one of them?
- How would you fine tune them?
- Do we need other groups?

#### Work Group No. 1: Inventory of US Community Resilience Initiatives

Work Group No. 1 will pull together an inventory of community-based programs being implemented to enhance resilience in the community. Goals for this Work Group are to:

- 1) Catalogue tools used and lessons learned
- 2) Provide a resource for communities looking to implement the *Community Planning Guide*
- 3) Identify gaps in practices and tools

#### Work Group 2: Economics Work Group

This Work Group originated in the observation that we are Social and Economic Committee, but have spent most of our time up to this point on the social aspects of resilience. This Work Group will do a deeper dive on the financial and economic aspects of resilience, especially as they relate to the *Community Planning Guide* and its companion, *Community Resilience Economic Decision Guide for Buildings and Infrastructure Systems*. Topics already suggested for this Work Group to address include:

- Merging planning with funding cycles
- Integrating resilience into economic development
- Identifying financial incentives and business models

An important first goal for this Work Group is to identify its areas of focus and further efforts.

#### Work Group 3: Whole Community Work Group

S&E Committee members identified a need to identify and characterize all the different elements that define a community in a consistent way and map this back to the infrastructure resilience elements. This mapping might lead to identifying how dependencies differ among community subgroups and the resulting needs for different resources and priorities. This activity will also highlight these dependencies as they relate to underserved and vulnerable populations. An important goal for this Work Group is to clearly delineate the key components/sectors of a community so they can be tied back to their infrastructure needs. Also, as a result of this effort, the *Community Resilience Planning Guide* could be used more effectively in addressing community-specific nuances rather than continuing in its current “one-size-fits-all” approach.

#### 4. Open Discussion about S&E Work Groups

- Ed MacMullen with ECONorthwest expressed interest in participating in the Economics Work Group given his expertise and the fact that he works in this area. He will speak on resilience, economic impacts, and the National Disaster Resilience Competition during a moderated session at the Portland meeting. Some of his talk will tie in nicely with the Economics Work Group.
- Erica Kuligowski with NIST provided an overview of the document *A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Resilience at the Community Scale*, which she referenced in an earlier email to Committee members regarding the Whole Community Work Group. Erica indicated the work up to this point (in developing the referenced publication) focused on defining community dimensions in a pre-disaster setting, what services are provided, and relationships among systems (e.g., infrastructure, electricity, drinking water, social systems – refer to *Figure 4. Conceptual framework of community dimensions, services, systems and resources*, in the referenced document).
  - It is important to focus on dependencies. The NIST group worked through a scenario to “put meat on bones” on the chart (Figure 4) for the health dimension.
  - When looking at the Whole Community Work Group, Erica indicated there is a lot of overlap with the NIST group she worked with in developing the Conceptual Framework document.
  - She also indicated The Conceptual Framework effort could be a starting point for the S&E Whole Community Work Group.
- Jim Schwab with American Planning Association suggested that element of mobility (more conceptual, not just transportation) is an element for inclusion. He indicated this is a great task for an urban planner (such as he) and would like to be involved in the Whole Community Work Group.
- A question was asked about synergies between the Whole Community Work Group and the group Erica worked with at NIST. She suggested we reach out to Steve Cauffman (NIST) regarding how to leverage one against the other. NIST may be more general; this effort could make things more specific and provide more focus.
- Jan Opper suggested we need to think about how a product is going to be used. Erica agreed and mentioned that she sent a methodology out to the group as a point of reference. This Work Group may take a different approach.
- Discussion took place regarding the issue of dependencies and how they vary from community to community; guidance to help communities understand issues and think about how they apply to their own circumstances will be an important tool.
- Liesel Ritchie indicated the NIST Disaster Resilience Fellows are working on Guide Briefs (e.g., “how- to’s” such as Forming a Collaborative Planning Team, etc.). This is currently in tabular format, however she feels we can be much more creative in the way of cognitive tools (and how we present information). However, merely filling out a form may be a place to start.

- John Plodinec indicated there will be synergies between Work Group 1 (Inventory) and Work Group 3 (Whole Community); this could help shape our effort and the effort of the NIST Program.
- Lawrence Frank asked whether we were the only committee working on an inventory; other committees may be working on something familiar. He would like to sign up for the Whole Community Work Group, but can contribute to other Work Groups we stand up.
- Discussion took place regarding the need to identify in Portland how the S&E Committee is going to be working with other committees (e.g., Data and Metrics Committee).
- To bring this discussion about the Work Groups to closure, David Eisenman confirmed we have gotten expressions of interest to stand up all three Work Groups discussed; we can take this as affirmation and discuss the process in more detail in Portland.
- George Huff had a comment regarding economic resilience (referencing Chapter 10.4.2 of the Guide), which could link to briefs mentioned by Liesel and Erica.

## **5. Preparing for Portland**

David reviewed the general agenda for Portland:

- At the beginning of the S&E Committee breakout, Thaddeus Miller will be speaking to lessons learned from a National Science Foundation SF initiative with cities around the world to look at social and economic factors and how they are joining these frameworks. This discussion will possibly inform the work of the S&E Committee.
- Breakout sessions will be used to work in the three S&E Committee Work Groups previously discussed during the WebEx. A suggestion was made to use the template provided for the overall S&E Committee report-out for individual Work Group reporting.
- The presentation @ 8:10 am on Tuesday will focus on the NIST Economic Decision Guide and ongoing NIST activities. Jennifer Helgeson with NIST (and an S&E Committee member) will be delivering that presentation.
- Donna Boyce asked that slides from today's WebEx be sent out in preparation for Portland.
- A question was asked if there were options for people not being able to attend in person; David Mizzen indicated they were working with the hotel to work out remote participation. In addition, separate rooms for the Work Group breakouts have been requested.

*The call adjourned at approximately 2:40 pm EDT*