

Community Resilience Panel: Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: May 25, 2017
TIME: 3:00 – 4:00 PM EDT
LOCATION: Conference Call
ISSUE DATE: June 20, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
John Plodinec (Chair)	CARRI
David Eisenman (Vice-Chair)	Division of General Internal Medicine/Health Services Research, UCLA School of Medicine
Ann Terranova (Secretary)	AECOM
David Mizzen	ARA
Brett Barclay	Independent Consultant
Donna Boyce	Solix
Dave Butry	NIST
Laura Clemons	CBI
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Ann Goodman, PhD	City University of New York
Natalie Grant	Health and Human Services
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
Keely Maxwell	Environmental Protection Agency
Jan Oppen	Oppen Strategies & Solutions LLC
Richard Pearlson	RAPSAT
Liesel Ritchie	University of Colorado Natural Hazards Center
Heather Rosenberg	US Green Building Council, Los Angeles Chapter
Philip Schneider	National Institute of Building Sciences
Jim Schwab	American Planning Association, Hazards Planning Center
Alpa Swinger	Portland Cement Association
Kent Yu	SEFT Consulting Group

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 Plodinec offered an overview of the day's agenda.

3. Interdependency Data Sheet Update (John Plodinec/Laura Clemons)

John reviewed the findings/comments provided on the Interdependency Sheets (I-Sheets) that resulted from the cross committee breakout discussions in Miami. He indicated that some of the findings were interesting (impacting social and economic considerations after a disaster/event):

- Social aspects, including the reduction in public health (e.g., when there are building failures)
- Loss of the ability to get to places (to meet social needs)
- Demographic changes (as a result of rebuilding and recovery)

Other topics of discussion:

- The committee discussed the interaction between S&E and the Data, Metrics, and Tools (DMT) Committee. John found the results of this discussion surprising, pointing to a focus on business continuity and social capital.
- The cross-committee breakout sessions identified many key stakeholders for performance requirements. The remaining issue is identifying a person to be responsible for carrying out the actions identified.
- A committee member commented on the Transportation Research Board's (TRB's) strong focus on resilience and its call to action. The member stated that resilience is being aggressively addressed by that organization.
- John Plodinec mentioned that the comments on business continuity point to the difficulty of getting the public, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and businesses to provide quantitative performance objectives (e.g., RTOs). These organizations' involvement is called for in the Community Resilience Planning Guide (CRPG) process, but is actually a real gap that needs to be filled. Liesel Ritchie acknowledged that the gap was there and that addressing the gap is a challenge.
- Laura Clemons discussed the process for coding/evaluating the breakout group input. She indicated that most of what was disclosed was 70 percent identifiable; the remainder will require a deeper dive. The group considered a two-phase process and the need to think through the impacts associated with actions. It is important that we standardize the approach to data gathering and understand what others have done; it is also important to understand how we will use the information.
- The group noted the need to make sure we don't perpetuate disaster myths. We need to make sure our outcomes/conclusions are backed by empirical evidence. We also need to be sure the facts support anecdotal information.
- On a future call we will discuss the follow-on exercise (improving upon our cross-committee breakout process) to be used at the next Community Resilience Panel in-person meeting.

4. RKB Submission Process (John Plodinec)

The process John developed was predicated on the idea that the collaboration page is up and running. He asked David Mizzen to demonstrate the collaboration site on our next S&E Committee conference call. David will confirm that the credentials to access the collaboration site will be provided in June.

The group considered the process to follow if a potential RKB resource is rejected. If a resource is not accepted, a process should help the submitter understand why it was rejected and steps for resubmittal.

In further discussion, the group contemplated the relevance of revising materials for submittal. One member suggested that understanding the rationale for rejection could improve future submissions.

Regarding the process John laid out, we understand this is a pilot phase and the process can be improved upon once we begin to use it.

5. Future Direction of Community Resilience Panel (David Eisenman)

David discussed key points that came up during the last Coordinating Committee conference call:

- The loss of membership and attrition is a concern. We need to understand the scope of work and the purpose of the committees (e.g., are they to determine resources for the RKB or other perform productive activities).
- Committee members discussed the lack of available resources and the need for more interaction between the Panel and the Resilience Center of Excellence.
- NIST has undertaken some actions to encourage this engagement. The possible scope to follow will be based on the input/outcomes from the I-Sheets.
- One possible role for the Center of Excellence is developing resilience performance standards.
- Meetings between NIST, Panel leadership, and the Center of Excellence addressed a possible resilience performance standard. From a committee perspective, there is a desire for committees to produce tools/outputs themselves with the engagement of the Center of Excellence.

6. S&E Work Plan Development for Coming Year (suggested by Steve Cauffman at NIST)

Based on discussions with Steve Cauffman at NIST, there is a need to begin developing the S&E Committee work plan for the coming year. The group considered the importance of looking at the outcomes of the interdependency exercise (cross-committee breakouts) from Miami to inform development of the S&E Committee work plan. This likely will be a part of our discussion at the next CRP meeting. That meeting may potentially be held in Minneapolis on a date that has yet to be determined – targeting September/October timeframe.

7. Other Discussion

- Committee members evaluated the potential need for a smaller subset of the S&E Committee to convene to discuss next steps on the I-Sheets.
- The group also talked about the uniqueness of the Social and Economic Committee. Part of the committee's role is to communicate across other committees.

8. Actions:

1. Coordinate with David Mizzen on a collaboration site demonstration during our next S&E Committee conference call.
2. Coordinate an I-Sheet conference call (smaller subset of S&E Committee members) to discuss next steps.
3. Coordinate the next S&E Committee conference call for June.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 pm EDT.