

Community Resilience Panel: Social & Economic Standing Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE: November 9, 2015
TIME: 1:45 pm EST to 4:15 pm EST
LOCATION: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Gaithersburg, MD
ISSUE DATE: December 4, 2015

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
David Eisenman (Chair)	Division of General Internal Medicine/Health Services Research UCLA School of Medicine
Matthew John Plodinec (Vice Chair)	Community and Regional Resilience Institute
Debra Ballen	IBHS
Donna Boyce	Solix, Inc.
Jeff Braun	Fort Bend County
David Butry	NIST
Gregory Cade	National Fire Protection Association
Lawrence Frank	Atkins
Sondra Freilich	Homelad Security Studies & Analysis Institute
Ann Goodman	CUNY
Natalie Grant	US Department of Health and Human Services/ASPR
Jennifer Helgeson	NIST
George B. Huff Jr.	The Continuity Project
Cotina Lane Pixley	University of the District of Columbia
Lauren Mudd	Applied Research Associates, Inc.
Joseph Nadzary	Summit Health Waynesboro Hospital
Jan Opper	Opper Strategies & Solutions LLC
Richard Pearlson	Rap/Sat
Stephen Reissman	NOAA
Liesel Ritchie	Natural Hazards Center
Steven Rushen	Department of Homeland Security
Chris Spoons	Walden University
Catherine Tehan	ASCE
Ann Terranova	AECOM
John ' Jay' Wilson	Clackamas County Emergency Management
Qisong 'Kent' Yu	SEFT consulting group

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and Social & Economic Standing Committee

NOTES BY: Lauren Mudd, Applied Research Associates, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions

David Eisenman (Chair) led introductions of the participants and reviewed the goals for the meeting. A discussion of how the standing committee fits in with the other standing committees of the Panel took place. It was explained to the participants that the standing committee would have an opportunity to influence and work with the other standing committees because lifeline functions need to be restored to support the social institutions.

Participants first provided a definition of sector as society and human beings. Then, the participants began to provide input to identify the largest gaps and needs within the sector that need to be addressed in resilience planning and guidance products.

2. Discussion of first question for report-out: What are the largest gaps and needs within your sector that need to be addressed in resilience planning and guidance products?

The participants stated that understanding risks and vulnerabilities as they affect you directly (person, family, business) was a gap. Many people know their community is at risk, but don't internalize it (i.e., How do risk/vulnerability hurt ME? How does taking some action help ME?). Furthermore, translating the risk/hazard to an economic driver is another concern. We need to determine what healthcare resiliency, for example, means in terms of money. Once someone understands the importance of the risk, the question becomes "how do we get them to take action?" It was felt that the key is to translate an understanding of risk to reducing it.

Leveraging the idea or concept of a disaster/risk into day to day operations was also discussed. Specifically, the concept of risk and resilience needs to be conveyed such that people can do something up front by making smaller commitments initially instead of big commitment that will pay off much later. Small incremental changes require funding today, so communities need to know they are not wasting funding today to solve a problem that may never arise. Furthermore, making the business case to convince people to act is a big task right now. A strong business case needs to be made to fund resilience initiatives before a disaster occurs rather than acting only post-disaster. The business case should also include organizational resilience and the role local businesses play in recovery.

The group felt that a list of resilience efforts and what it being accomplished is needed to take the next steps. Moreover, help is needed to coordinate and disseminate the efforts.

There was some discussion that the Social & Economic Standing Committee could be split into two groups: one for social, and the other for economic considerations. However, it was noted that it was developed the current way for simplicity based on the NIST Guide. The group did note that it needs to differentiate between "social & economic" and "socio-economic." Moving forward, the group felt that it should focus on facilitating conversation to parse the community, and identify interactions between social and economic sectors and the infrastructure and provide a "map" for communities.

One of the key challenges identified was isolation of underserved populations. The thinking was that striving to solve a large problem helps to find smaller problems. It was mentioned that the number one

sustainable goal from the United Nations on September 25th was to eliminate poverty. It was stated that people in extreme poverty cannot go inside a hospital. For a community to become resilient, it needs to be able to account for the least fortunate, and empower those people daily so that they will fare better in a crisis. It was suggested that helping underserved populations develop their own plans instead of telling them what to do would be useful. Also, it is important to understand that they are already in the midst of their own disaster and we need to learn what are their communication networks and how do we access them.

Breaking the barriers of the silos of excellence (communication & coordination) was identified as another important gap. The silo based approach used in community development results in a lack of communication (e.g., emergency management does not communicate with school board to organize use of schools as emergency shelters). Communities need to plan and think ahead about small, cost efficient, highly effect means that they would be able to do now if they communicate.

Best practices in community engagement are also needed to push community resilience forward. Right now, it is left to the government agencies to figure out how to engage the rest of the community. Participants felt this standing committee could provide advice on how to engage stakeholders within a community.

In addition to creating a business case for resilience, participants felt that ways to measure the social impacts of resilience (i.e., non-monetary value) included measuring social capital, social impacts, and infrastructure needs to enable social function. The idea of defining/describing what a socially resilient community looks like was also discussed, as was the need for this standing committee to be linked to the Data, Metrics, and Tools Standing Committee.

The group discussed the fact that communities and individuals are getting confused due to the volume of different ongoing resilience initiatives. It was not clear to many what similarities and differences the various initiatives have. Furthermore, it was felt that communities want to better understand if the various guidance documents/tools have been tested elsewhere, whether they used a top-down or bottom-up approach, and what the best approach is for their own community.

The need for audience friendly messaging was also identified. It was noted that actions of resilience may not translate well to different areas of the community (e.g., working drought in Oklahoma received push back from the community that the government was trying to take control and force a plan upon them). Targeted messages for different audiences should help with these types of issues as well as addressing what is well received in an urban vs. rural environment. Again, learning how to connect with under resourced communities/groups is also a need. To inform decision makers in the education process, packaging information that can be used in decision making for smaller/rural communities would be useful. It was noted that resilient actions do not have to be packaged as “resiliency. ”

Finally, it was asked “How do we spark a level of resilience beyond disasters?” The discussion focused on the fact that communities create many other plans and that the standing committee could also focus on how to interweave community resilience plans into their existing plans so that the cost is borne more easily.

3. Discussion of the second question for report-out: Identify significant interdependencies and gaps with other sectors that impact resilience.

The participants felt strongly that the Data, Metrics, & Tools standing committee was the standing committee with which they had the most interdependence or overlap. Specifically, the Social & Economic Standing Committee is interested in how resilience is being measured, the state of a given community, and what are the metrics by which you can measure social resilience.

Moreover, there was discussion of how to determine a community's baseline resilience. The thinking was that there is a need to determine what it costs for a community to do nothing. This cost could then be weighed against the cost of implementing solutions to enhance resilience with that particular community. The participants also added that a crosscutting review of other standing committees was needed to see what the social effect will be & make sure the social aspect is captured.

4. Discussion of the third question for report-out: How do we address the needs and gaps we identified?

The standing committee started off by discussing the need to develop a communication strategy. This would allow it to initiate literacy surrounding resiliency. This was envisioned to help communities since there are many standards metrics being developed by many different federal agencies and other bodies. It would also help with communication between these agencies/bodies and communities. There was discussion that business continuity planning could serve as a starting point (i.e., how can a business operate during and after and disaster? How can they pay their employees? How can they receive goods?).

Developing an inventory of financial incentives/disincentives was also thought to be useful. It was noted that the Panel cannot recommend incentives, but can identify successful/unsuccessful incentives. The particular case of the U.S. Green Building Council's Resilience Project was discussed as an example of developing market incentives for resilience. It was also discussed that some laws levy tremendous incentives. Others felt that when government comes in with disaster relief funds after a hazard event, it is a disincentive to purchase flood insurance, for example. This inventory could also help communities by them making informed decision on how to develop land such that it will be resilient and sustainable. Similarly, this would also translate value at point of sale to reflect resilience rather than just the location (e.g., marketing home built to withstand hurricane vs marketing "beach front home")

Participants also discussed a number of other potential solutions, such as developing a portal of positive stories/experiences, a compendium of processes, and understanding the difference between societal expectation and the current state of infrastructure. It was noted that the NIST Center of Excellence (CoE) is doing work related to societal expectation vs. the current state of infrastructure, and that it would be useful to engage them to help with filling this void. In terms of a compendium of processes, this would include documenting work that is currently being done and lessons learned (e.g., Rockefeller), while trying to be as inclusive as possible. That is, the compendium could consider the following in evaluating the ongoing efforts:

- Does the guidance/tool take into account the social needs of the community & those that will be impacted

- How have stakeholders been engaged?
- Has their stakeholder engagement resulted in contributions to the guidance/tool, or were they just ticking a box?

The standing committee wants to be involved in evaluating pilot communities and implementation of the NIST Guide. The group also stated that data was needed to characterize a community. Participants felt that it would be possible to provide guidance to suggest ways to determine what a given community looks like from a socio-economic standpoint. However, it was also pointed out that there is a lot of information out there and that there was no need to reinvent the wheel to make these estimations.

5. Discussion of the fourth question for report-out: Are there others we need to engage to help us address these needs? Others may include SMEs/groups not at the meeting in your sector or SMEs/groups from other sectors.

The participants felt that a technology transfer was needed to help engage others in joining the Social & Economic standing committee. Furthermore, there was discussion of who did not have the resources to attend the meeting as well as how to get them to the meeting. The participants were encouraged to actively reach out to get others involved.

Participants felt that more local and direct service providers would be valuable to the standing committee, including stakeholders from the Service Provider Organization (SPO), and Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD). These groups would be able to address importance gaps including understanding real world challenges that could be used to inform the process, and allow the standing committee to address all population sizes.

The standing committee also discussed the idea of reaching out to representatives from the national academies that may be using the NIST Guide in communities. The group listed many different stakeholders beyond this to help gain a wide cross-section that would enable the group to develop useful products for communities. These stakeholders included

- Investors - what are they looking to get out of this initiative?
- Those who have implemented community resilience on the ground
- International association of emergency managers
- American Planning Association
- U.S. Green Building Council Resilience Program
- International city-council association / International city managers association
- FEMA/DHS – to gain the perspective of someone with a national view.
- Social/community psychologist
- Marketer / National Ad Council
- Educational Sector
- Faith and Community Based Organizations
- Volunteer Organizations

- Legislators, including mayoral organizations, local government executives, National Conference of State Legislators, National Association of Counties, and HUD
- National Association of Regional Developers
- IEDC
- National federation of independent businesses
- BOMA
- American Bar Association
- NIST Center of Excellence

6. Discussion of the fifth question for report-out: What are existing codes, standards, guidance, goals, and/or protocol that have been published, or are in-process, in your respective sectors?

Towards the end of the meeting, the standing committee only had a limited amount of time to answer the question above. However, the participants did identify that there were several resilience standards developed by the Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety (IBHS), such as fortified home, fortified commercial, and fortified business. It also has developed the Open for Business Program (a guide). It was also noted that the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) was has several standards related to resilience which are discussed in the NIST Guide.