

Community Resilience Panel: Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: April 4, 2016
TIME: 1:00 – 4:30 PM PDT
LOCATION: Portland, OR
ISSUE DATE: June 7, 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
Donna Boyce	Solix, Inc.
Jay Wilson	Clackamas County, Oregon
George Huff Jr.	The Continuity Project
Greg Cade	NFPA
Youn Sim	County of Los Angeles
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Heather Rosenberg	US Green Building Council – Los Angeles
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
Kent Yu	SEFT Consulting Group
Ann Goodman	City University of New York (CUNY)
Ed MacMullen	ECONorthwest
Cotina Lane Pixley	University of the District of Columbia
Liesel Ritchie	Natural Hazards Center
Debra Ballen	IBHS
Paul Manson	Portland State University
Chris Spoons	Walden University
Alpa Swinger	Portland Cement Association
Laura Clemens	CBI

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 committee secretary (Ann Terranova) and your name will be added.

2. Welcome and Introductions

David Eisenman, Social and Economic (S&E) Committee Chair, welcomed committee member attendees and introduced Dr. Thaddeus Miller, Portland State University, to brief the S&E Committee on Urban Resilience to Extremes - Sustainability Research Network.

3. Dr. Miller Presentation Discussion/Q&A

A member of the group asked about risk and risk knowledge systems. Taking the New York surge problem as an example, which needs to be taken into consideration when planning for future events, how do we shift from “ostrich head in the sand” and think more critically using information we currently have (e.g., think about multiple issues – surge and rain events – how to plan for things that haven’t yet happened)?

The group discussed the need to plan for events that have not yet occurred. There is a need for multiple, multiple-disciplinary local champions to push this forward politically. There are challenges with availability of resources – what is known usually gets dealt with. Awareness is being created (realities with money, time, and who has the availability to get things done).

A fundamental flaw in the NIST Guide is that there is no mention of quantitative evaluation of hazard and risk. Without these, communities cannot prioritize. Additionally, given limited resources, how are projects being prioritized? (This is lacking in guidance).

Attendees discussed the idea that decisions are being made with limited information due to pressure from constituents (squeaky wheel syndrome). Dr. Miller’s work focuses on infrastructure and climactic changes, which will help resolve some of the issues associated with prioritization. One attendee commented on the need to look at the real problems communities face and factor those issues into the decision making/prioritization process. Dr. Miller’s efforts will help to identify the interdependencies among the different sectors, etc.

4. General Discussion

David provided an overview of work conducted by the S&E Committee to-date, how the committee arrived at its current state, and how to move the work of the committee forward. Dr. Liesel Richie then summarized her role as a NIST Disaster Resilience Fellow, focusing on the societal aspects of resilience. She also indicated the social and economic issues were combined into one chapter (Chapter 10 of the Guide). Dr. Richie addressed the lack of hazard and risk information in the Guide, acknowledging this needs to be brought to NIST’s attention.

David described in more detail the different work groups the S&E Committee established for work going forward. Also, he explained the Resource Knowledge Base being developed by the Panel, which is the initial reason for creating Work Group 1 (inventory community resilience initiatives, tools, lessons learned, etc.). Work Group 2 was established based on the need to address the economic aspects of resilience (financial incentives, etc.). Work Group 3 focuses on the whole community and the need to look at the elements of a community in more detail, understand interdependencies, etc.

After a show of hands, attendees agreed the three work groups will proceed as planned. The committee next conferred on the expectations regarding goals work groups are to accomplish. Overall, our charge is to further implementation of the Community Resilience Planning Guide, looking at it from the community’s perspective. Attention needs to be paid to the interdependencies among other committees.

This exercise needs to be pragmatic rather than academic. Products that result from the S&E Committee should address how the Guide can be implemented. Also, it is important to look at the Guide and offer insight into gaps and what additional information is needed. One member suggested that we consider the broader six steps laid out in the Guide and use those steps as the underpinning of what we are charged to do (fit our steps into the steps of the Guide). Another member pointed out that no product is too small.

The committee instructed the three Work Groups regarding information to be captured during their breakout discussions (to follow the slides for the broader S&E Committee report). Individual Work Groups reconvened at 4:00 pm to review discussions and prepare for the 4:40 pm report out to the Panel.

The S&E breakout session concluded at 4:30 pm.