Community Resilience Panel:
Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: May 23, 2016
TIME: 2:00 – 3:00 PM EDT
LOCATION: By Conference Call
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
David Mizzen	ARA
Debra Ballen	IBHS
Brett Barclay	Independent Consultant
Donna Boyce	Solix
David Butry	NIST
Laura Clements	CBI
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Ann Goodman, PhD	City University of New York
Jesse Keenan, PhD	Columbia University
Ed MacMullen	ECONorthwest
Jan Opper	Opper Strategies & Solutions LLC
Richard Pearlson	Rap/Sat
Cotina Lane Pixley	University of the District of Columbia
Jay Raskin	Jay Raskin Architect
Youn Sim	County of Los Angeles

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 your name will be added.

2. Welcome and Introductions

David Eisenman, Social and Economic (S&E) Committee Chair, welcomed committee member attendees and indicated the purpose of the call. Discussion follows up with work conducted in Portland and positions the committee for its next meeting in Boulder, CO. David indicated he was happy to see the progress of work conducted in Portland. The group now needs to focus on how to get the Work Groups moving forward.

3. Work Group Path Forward

The group discussed the need for each work group to develop a scope of work or plan that lays out the leadership structure, actions, responsibilities, timeframes and product(s) that can be reported at the Boulder meeting. David suggested work groups meet at least once before Boulder and plan to report at that meeting.

One member asked whether information regarding the membership of each work group was captured during the Portland meeting. John Plodinec (Work Group 1) and Debra Ballen (Work Group 2) indicated they would provide a list of attendees from the Portland meeting.

Work Group members attending this conference call:

- Inventory
  - John Plodinec
  - Laura Clements

- Economics
  - Jan Opper
  - Ann Goodman
  - Debra Ballen
  - Ed McMullen
  - Youn Sim
  - Dave Butry

- Whole Community
  - Lawrence Frank
  - Cotina Lane Pixley
  - Donna Boyce
  - Richard Pearlson
  - Brett Barclay

In response to a request to refresh attendees regarding the purpose and intent of the work groups (refer to attachment for description of each work group), members presented several reviews.

John Plodinec reviewed the purpose and intent of Work Group No. 1 (Inventory). He reminded attendees that coordination and reaching out to other groups will likely be needed (in developing the inventory). He said the work group had identified an extensive compendium that will be a good starting point for their effort.

Lawrence Frank spoke for Work Group 3 (Whole Community). That group is looking at:

- How infrastructure ties in
- How underserved populations will be addressed
- How a community breaks down into individual components, along with the resulting dependencies and interdependencies.

Each work group commented on whether David's plans for Boulder were reasonable (meet on own, work out process/plan/product, develop leadership structure, and report at the next face meeting).

Work Group 1: John believes the plan for Work Group 1 is reasonable.

Work Group 2: Debra also believes David's plan is reasonable; however, there is a continuity issue and not a clear path forward regarding how to get there. In Portland, the work group identified a number of projects (5 or 6), and as a result, is resource constrained.

Youn indicated a discussion is needed regarding funding and financing options (in the economic analysis of resilience). Also, he suggested that looking at cost avoidance (do nothing) to determine the cost of a resilience plan may be an alternative. Youn suggested we not only consider the cost of the resiliency plan but also evaluate the economic benefits from building resilience in the community. The economic benefits could include jobs and construction contracts from rehabilitating/upgrading infrastructure projects, as well as overall economic enhancement in local business continuity by moving goods and people and increasing property values. Inviting economists to the Panel would be a good idea to help quantify those benefits in dollars. Members suggested "willingness to pay" as an additional idea.

Ann Goodman requested clarification regarding what was being asked. She also said the group needs to look at incentives to encourage action and communication between communities and the private sector. Debra asked for clarification on how members will work together, what the deliverable is (e.g., white paper), and how it will be executed. This sophisticated analysis requires critical thinking. The group expressed concern about time constraints and other challenges to complete the work.

John suggested conducting a critique of the Planning Guide and the Economic Decision Guide as a possible course of action. A white paper may not be the best course of action for Work Group 2. He reminded attendees that an important goal for these committees is helping NIST make sure they get it right. Jan Opper agreed a paper may be impractical, especially one of a peer review quality. The group discussed the need for the Economics Work Group to view itself as peer reviewers of the NIST documents and what is needed.

Work Group 3: Lawrence Frank recommended focus on the recent NIST document; Brett concurred. This effort needs to be a component for the work group going forward.

The group discussed continuity of the work groups with respect to attendance. Laura Clements indicated one approach is to identify one person from each group to get together and ensure some semblance of consistency in process across groups (identify actions, assign responsibilities, etc.), even though the content/tasks may differ from group to group.

A suggestion was made to develop a form each group would complete that documents its approach/path forward. Laura volunteered create this form and distribute to the other groups in the next several weeks. David suggested the completed form would be a good output from the Boulder meeting.

A suggestion was made to convene each work group individually to layout their path forward with regard to what has been asked (leadership, approach, product/outputs) and then discuss the results collectively

with leadership. David suggested these paths forward be briefed to the broader Social and Economic Committee. They can be polished and course corrected in Boulder. A suggestion was made that each work group prepare a summary of actions to date by Labor Day. David indicated he would try and attend each work group meeting for visibility and for the purpose of putting this summary document together.

David asked what kind of support the committee leadership needs to offer. A request was made to develop a form/series of questions that need to be asked/answered regarding what material is to be presented in Boulder. Guidance is needed to help regularize work group activities.

Actions and responsibilities from this call include:

- A form to guide work group briefs at the Boulder meeting (Laura Clements)
- The complete list of Social and Economic Committee members and work group members (Ann Terranova)
- Identification of work group leadership/points of contact for coordination purposes (Eisenman/Plodinec/Terranova)
- A poll to schedule first meeting of work groups prior to Boulder meeting is needed. The leadership will help organize the first meeting of each group and asked that ARA provide the logistical support (i.e., phone lines)
- Form/series of questions that need to be asked/answered of what is to be presented in Boulder (David Eisenman)

The call adjourned at approximately 2:50 pm EDT.

ATTACHMENT

Overview of Proposed S&E Committee Work Groups

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

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

1. cataloguing tools used and lessons learned
2. providing a resource for communities looking to implement the *Community Resilience Planning Guide*
3. identifying gaps in practices and tools

Work Group 2: Economics Work Group

This Work Group came from 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 would do a deeper dive on the financial and economic aspects of resilience, especially as they relate to the *Community Resilience Planning Guide* and its companion, *Community Resilience Economic Decision Guide for Buildings and Infrastructure Systems.* Topics that have already been mentioned 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 for identifying and characterizing all of the different elements that define a community in a consistent way and mapping this back to the infrastructure resilience elements. This might lead to identifying how dependencies differ among community subgroups and the resulting needs for different resources and priorities. This 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 its current "one-size-fits-all" approach.