

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

**MEETING DATE:** November 10, 2016  
**TIME:** 2:00 – 3:00 PM EST  
**LOCATION:** Conference Call  
**ISSUE DATE:** December 12, 2016

**ATTENDEES:**

Attendee	Affiliation
John Plodinec (Chair)	Community and Regional Resilience Institute
David Eisenman (Co-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
Donna Boyce	Solix, Inc.
Greta Byrum	Director, Resilient Communities at New America
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Ann Goodman	City University of New York
Natalie Grant	US Department of Health And Human Services
George Huff	The Continuity Project
Keely Maxwell	Environmental Protection Agency Office of Research and Development
Jan Opper	Opper Strategies & Solutions LLC
Heather Rosenburg	US Green Building Council, Los Angeles Chapter
Jeff Rubin	Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue
Philip Schneider	National Institute of Building Sciences
Jim Schwab	American Planning Association, Hazards Planning Center
Robert Thiele	Architect, AIA, LEED
Jay Wilson	Clackamas County Emergency Management

**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](#)) and she will add your name.

### 2. Resilience Gaps (Discussion and Prioritization – see below for Partial List)

- [Jay Raskin](#) asked us to revisit resilience gaps from the first meeting. We need to identify what we need to change, add to, and prioritize:

1. Understand risk and translate to action
  2. Overcome the insulation of the underserved from those who can take action
  3. Break down the barriers between bureaucratic silos
  4. Develop means to engage communities
  5. Identify the attributes of a resilient community
  6. Effectively message
  7. Get resilience into existing plans
  8. Identify incentives and disincentives
  9. Develop a business case for resilience
- John asked whether there are any other resilience gaps that need to be added. Debra indicated there is a little of “apples to oranges” in this list because these are different types of gaps.
  - The group discussed the value in pointing out that there are different types of gaps (e.g., at the community level, research, etc.).
  - Debra indicated that Jay’s point in looking at the list of gaps is to identify what we know now vs. what we knew then (when the list was initially developed).
  - Initially the need for an inventory of resilience initiatives was on the list; this inventory requires that the group discuss each gap individually.
  - One member asked where ecological and environmental issues come into play, which are broad topics that can help inform other gaps.
  - The group discussed each gap in detail, as summarized below:

#### *Understand Risk/Translate to Action*

- Brett Barclay shared information regarding the United Nations Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) body of work with respect to risk. To improve understanding risk and translating to action, he recommends the S&E Committee review the definitions established by the [UNISDR Technical Panel Briefing on Disaster Risk Reduction Terminology](#). Risk is specifically addressed on page 27 of the second document in the list of exhibits, [Background Paper: Proposed Updated Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction](#).
- Brett also shared the fact that disaster risk is more fully examined and defined in [Annex 1](#) to the [Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015](#).
- David Eisenman indicated a challenge is (the S&E Committee) looking at the list from an actionable point of view. The committee needs to look at how poised we are to deal with the items on the list based on resources or lack thereof.

### *Overcome the Insulation of the Underserved from Those who can Take Action*

- Natalie Grant indicated they are investigating this at the White House level and have identified this issue as an existing gap, especially as it relates to the disaster recovery program. A request was made by a committee member to provide the reference to the White House initiative.
- Donna Boyce indicated the issue of poverty going into a disaster is a gap. She also stated a Guide Brief is under development to determine how to get multiple voices to the table, including vulnerable populations. The group discussed the fact that this important gap needs to be addressed (ties in with Guide Brief No. 1, but may be overshadowed). How to get people to the table is important to address.

### *Break Down Bureaucratic Silos*

- It is important to look at mechanisms that currently work; it is worth keeping this gap on the list. The group discussed resources that exist from a planning perspective that may help to break down the bureaucratic silos (per Jim Schwab at APA – see below).
  - Hazard Mitigation (<https://www.planning.org/research/hazards/>)
  - Post-Disaster Recovery (<https://www.planning.org/research/postdisaster/>)
  - Planning the Urban Forest, which can relate to green infrastructure & hazards like stormwater (<https://www.planning.org/research/forestry/>)
- Jeff Rubin indicated it is also a capacity issue (not just a knowledge issue) at the local level; a lot of the siloing takes place at the state and federal levels. Also, larger jurisdictions have similar issues with silos and the need to break them down (scale issue). Personalities and nature of the bureaucracy can also impede breaking down silos.
  - This is still a gap; perhaps change the wording to “overcoming bureaucratic barriers.”

### *Identify Attributes of a Resilient Community*

- The group discussed whether this issue is still a gap. The UNISDR has a mature definition of attributes of a resilient community. Additionally, George Huff wrote about this in a proposed Guide Brief that is under development, in which a number of these attributes/characteristics have been identified.
- The consensus is this is not a gap.

### *Effectively Message*

- We know how to message, but need to apply the behavioral aspect of how effective messaging can drive to action.
- The group discussed the distinction about (resilience) messaging – understanding it and acting upon it are two different things.
- The challenge with communication is not just emergency communications or articulating risk, but communicating the value of holistic resilience planning in a way that is motivating and actionable to communities. Communication about resilience planning continues to be wonky, technical, and complex.

### *Get Resilience into Existing Plans and Decision Making*

- There is little information with regard to this gap. Jim with APA indicated a number of states require planning at the local level to address this issue in some manner. The state requirements may not specify resilience, but the concepts/factors are being incorporated to some extent.
- The idea of decision making (tied to the planning process) needs to be incorporated into this gap.
- The group discussed the fact that an overarching goal of the NIST Planning Guide is to do just this.

### *Identify Incentives and Disincentives*

- Phil Schneider with NIBS indicated a body of work has been done on this issue, citing two documents:
  - Developing Pre-Disaster Resilience Based on Public and Private Incentivization ([https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/MMC/MMC\\_ResilienceIncentivesWP.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/MMC/MMC_ResilienceIncentivesWP.pdf))
  - An Addendum to the White Paper for Developing Pre-Disaster Resilience Based on Public and Private Incentivization ([http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/mmc/MMC\\_IncentivizationWB\\_Add.pdf](http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.nibs.org/resource/resmgr/mmc/MMC_IncentivizationWB_Add.pdf))
- The group discussed the need to get the mechanisms for incentivizing in place.

### *Develop a Business Case for Resilience*

- This issue is partially addressed in the Economic Guide, however this is a definite gap that needs to be addressed.
  - Members of the committee cited several different sources, including Government Finance Officers Association (<http://www.gfoa.org/search/node/resilience>).

### **3. Confirmation of S&E Committee Ambassadors**

- Greta Bynum volunteered to serve as the ambassador for the Communications Committee.
- Brett Barclay volunteered (via email) to serve as the ambassador for the Energy Committee.
- Other volunteers already confirmed include:
  - Liesel Ritchie – Data, Metrics, and Tools
  - Richard Pearson – Transportation
  - Robert Thiele – Buildings & Facilities
  - Donna Boyce – Water/Wastewater

#### 4. Resilience Inventory Discussion with Data, Metrics, and Tools (DMT) Committee Members

- John said he spoke recently with Megan Clifford, chair of the DMT Committee, and they are developing a document to help with integration with other committees (Laura Clemons sat in on their meeting in Ft. Collins, noting there is overlap).
- S&E was somewhat “shoe-horned” into the NIST Planning Guide at the last minute and was not well integrated into other sectors (e.g., building ownership not addressed).
- Those present discussed the need to find a better way to get integrated with other Panel committees. The committee ambassador initiative is a start, but we need to do better.
- John asked that committee members provide input on what the committee should focus on and what products we should develop.
- The group discussed the relationship between the Fellows and the committees, and whether there is a process for how the two work together, how to leverage resources between the two, etc. This process needs to be more fully defined.
- **Actions:**
  1. Look at other definitions of risk (e.g., UNISDR definition) – All
  2. Provide John with input on products the committee needs to be focusing on – All
  3. Schedule next call before the end of the year – Ann Terranova

*The call adjourned at approximately 3:10 pm EST.*