

Community Resilience Panel: Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: September 21-22, 2016
TIME: September 21: 1:30 – 5:00 PM MDT; September 22: 8:00 – 10:00 AM MDT
LOCATION: Fort Collins, CO
ISSUE DATE: November 10, 2016

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
David Eisenman (Chair)	Division of General Internal Medicine/Health Services Research UCLA School of Medicine
Ann Terranova (Secretary)	AECOM
David Mizzen	ARA
Debra Ballen	IBHS
Brett Barclay	Independent Consultant
Lloyd Blanchard	IEM, Inc.
Donna Boyce	Solix
Laura Clemons	CBI
Maria Dillard	NIST
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
George Huff	The Continuity Project
Carolyn Imamura	Pacific Basin Development Council
Jen Marthia	J&M Global Solutions
Joe Nadzady	Summit Health Waynesboro Hospital
Jan Opper	Opper Strategies & Solutions LLC
Liesel Ritchie	University of Colorado Natural Hazards Center
Chris Spoons	Walden University
Alpa Swinger	PCA
Robert Thiele	Architect, AIA, LEED
Dave Williams	Oklahoma Small Business Development Center
Jay Wilson	NIST Fellow
Jacqueline Yannacci	American Red Cross

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 advise the committee secretary ([Ann Terranova](#)) to have your name added.

2. Welcome and Introductions

David Eisenman, committee chairperson, welcomed committee members attending the S&E Committee meeting in Fort Collins, Colorado.

Following the welcome, David reviewed the agenda to help guide the discussions over the course of the afternoon and morning session the next day (please see attached slide deck). The committee's discussions will focus on the Warsaw, Illinois flooding scenario prepared by the Buildings and Facilities Committee. In particular, the committee will apply the template prepared by a core group of S&E Committee members to identify social and economic gaps in the Warsaw analysis.

3. NIST Fellow Guide Brief Presentations

To provide context for the S&E Committee discussions, Liesel Ritchie and Donna Boyce (NIST Fellows) conducted brief presentations on the work undertaken by the NIST Fellows in developing a number of Guide Briefs. The Guide Briefs provide additional details and guidance with respect to implementation of the Community Resilience Planning Guide.

- Donna Boyce, with Solix, briefed the committee on her work developing a Guide Brief for Step 1 (Forming a Collaborative Planning Team).
- Liesel Ritchie, with the University of Colorado Natural Hazards Center, briefed the committee on her work developing two Guide Briefs associated with Step 2: 1) *Characterize the Population* – community members and their present and future needs and 2) *Identify Social Institutions*.

The presentation slides for both presentations by Donna and Liesel are attached.

4. Review and Discussion of Warsaw, Illinois Flooding Scenario

The S&E Committee's initial intent was to break into two separate groups, one focusing on social and the other on economic aspects. Because the number of attendees was relatively low, the group decided to discuss the scenario and provide feedback as a single group rather than breaking out.

Concepts/questions addressed by the committee as they relate to review and assessment of the Warsaw scenario are summarized below. The slides developed for the S&E Committee brief-out to the larger Panel membership (September 22) are attached for reference. Note that discussions focused on Steps 1 and 2 of the Community Resilience Planning Guide.

Planning Guide Step 1 (Form a Collaborative Planning Team):

- ***Where is the vision statement of where the town wants to go; what is the common understanding as a launching point?*** This is important to define the direction and ensure the community is working towards a common goal in its resilience planning efforts.
- ***What are the cultural responses to the disaster that differ by groups?*** It is important to make these determinations early because they will influence who is at the table in the early stages of forming the collaborative planning team.
- ***Other discussion topics:***
 - It is important to the process to establish a protocol for gathering information that will inform the decision-making process (for forming the collaborative planning team). Communities should establish a process that allows consistency in data collection (to be replicable and credible).

- Communities need a framework that considers the functions of disaster recovery leading to resilience by phase, as opposed to looking merely at the different sectors involved in recovery. Considering functions will better define who should be on the planning committee. This framework can be developed by doing a crosswalk of functions in the built environment with nodes and interdependencies.
- The committee discussed whether the collaborative planning team evolves over time (e.g., it's not static but changes with the needs and stage of resilience planning and recovery). It is important to consider the iterative relationship between Steps 1 and 2 of the resilience planning process.
- Taking a regional approach is important, and other towns/communities should be considered for membership on the collaborative planning team. For example, a community's needs may be addressed through its relationship with the county in which it is located or other regional planning body. This dependency should be addressed either through consultation or participation as a collaborative planning team member.
- Communicating risk is also an important element in resilience planning. Showing the actual risk through data visualization allows everyone to be included in the resilience conversation leading to the idea of having a personal, vested interest in the resilience planning process. This increases buy-in. There is the question of doing capacity building in getting people to a common understanding of risk perception and terminology. The power of stories and lessons learned should be brought to the table.
- The group also considered the fact that it will be difficult to get farmers to participate during planting and harvesting. This detail highlights the need for the planning process to be cognizant of seasonal effects on different community populations.

Planning Guide Step 2 (Understand the Situation)

- The committee reviewed the need for the Guide to describe, in detail, which social functions are dependent on each of the social agencies within a community and the social/economic considerations with respect to achieving resilience.

5. Preparation for Panel Report-Out

When discussions concluded, the S&E Committee provided input toward developing report-out slides for delivery by David to the broader Panel during the last session of the Panel meeting. The slides are attached.

Key points as a result of S&E discussions are:

- Integration with other committees is important to ensure full understanding of interdependencies among sectors and how social and economic elements fit. Avoid duplication of effort across committees.
- There is a need for a taxonomy of community functions and priorities focused on what needs to be done in a post-disaster setting to more fully achieve resilience.
- It is important to identify and inventory best practices and available resources to help communities implement a strong resilience program. Tying in real world examples of process and outcomes is key, targeting Steps 1 and 2 to reinforce the S&E considerations of resilience planning process.