

Community Resilience Panel: Coordinating Committee (CRPCC) Meeting

MEETING DATE: September 21, 2016
TIME: 5:15 pm to 6:45 pm Mountain Time
ISSUE DATE: October 11, 2016

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Panel Position	Affiliation
Jay Raskin	Panel/CRPCC Chair	Jay Raskin Architect
Jesse Keenan	Panel/CRPCC Vice Chair	Harvard University
Debra Ballen	Panel/CRPCC Secretary	IBHS
Stephen Cauffman	Federal Sponsor	NIST
Megan Clifford	Data, Metrics & Tools Chair	Argonne National Lab
Susanne DesRoches	Transportation Chair	NYC Mayor's Office of Recovery and Resiliency
Brendan Doyle	Federal Sponsor	U.S. EPA
David Eisenman	Social & Economic Chair	UCLA
Therese McAllister	Federal Sponsor	NIST
David Mizzen	Panel Administrator	ARA
Julia Phillips	Energy Vice Chair	Argonne National Lab
Don Scott	Buildings & Facilities Chair	PCS Structural Solutions
Priya Shrinivasan	Communication Vice Chair	New York City
Sunil Sinha	Water & Wastewater Vice Chair	Virginia Tech
Mike Stuhr	Water and Wastewater Chair	Portland Water Bureau
Tom Wall	Transportation Secretary	Argonne National Laboratory

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and CRPCC
NOTES BY: Debra Ballen, CRPCC Secretary

1. Welcome and Introductions

Jay Raskin (Chair) welcomed participants and thanked them for attending. Following introductions, he ascertained that a quorum was present. A motion to approve the minutes of the August 9 meeting was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

As a new federal sponsor, Brendan Doyle provided his perspectives on the day's Panel and committee meetings. He noted the importance of waste management as a component of community resilience and disaster response/recovery. He also observed the potential disconnect between available federal data and the data/information needs of communities engaged in resiliency planning; he hopes the Panel can help bridge this gap. Additionally, the issue of natural resources damages is an important aspect of risk management for future disasters. Vice Chair Jesse Keenan thanked him for these perspectives and noted

that the U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit has a Natural Resources subgroup that could be connected to the work of the Panel. The Panel discussed addressing Environmental Services resilience issues either as part of the Water/Wastewater Committee or as a separate committee.

2. Nominations/Voting Panel Officers

A number of Panel leadership positions are up for election, with new terms of office to begin January 1, 2017. The Panel Administrator will contact individuals whose terms are up at the end of the year to discuss the election process. The nomination period is open until October 28.

3. Communications Tools

The new web page has been approved by NIST and should be running within a few weeks. The Project Coordination Software is still undergoing NIST approval, and there is no timetable for when that process might be completed.

The longer registration form is now operational, but very few Panel members have re-registered. Many Panel members may be confused about the need to re-register. The Panel Administrator will explore whether it is possible to contact only those Panel members for whom the more detailed information in the longer form (e.g., Committee or Working Group selections) is needed, and/or provide an opt-out procedure that may obviate the need for re-registration for many Panel members.

4. Updates

Standing Committee Officers delivered their reports:

- **Buildings and Facilities (Don Scott):** The committee has completed and discussed all the scenarios and is developing new goals to share with the Panel in the morning. The committee was divided into small working groups to identify its top goals, including:
 - Create standards for a building vulnerability assessment. Consider surge capacity for future use.
 - Evaluate and monitor existing buildings.
 - Align building performance goals with unified design criteria and evaluation
 - Recommend protocol for incorporating climate data projections into base code design
 - Create recommendations for building and planning department competencies and processes
- **Communications (Priya Shrinivasan):** A new committee Chair will be nominated shortly. The committee engaged with the Fort Collins communications sector and reviewed a New York City case study, focusing on lessons learned. The committee currently is very industry-focused and will make an effort to bring in more community representatives. One challenge is the competitive nature of the communications industry, combined with the unwillingness of companies to share strategies in advance of a disaster (there tends to be more cooperative efforts following an event).
- **Data, Metrics, and Tools (Megan Clifford):** It was extremely useful to hear the needs of communities that are using the NIST Guide and are otherwise engaged in resilience planning. These needs are key to defining user requirements and developing future products. The community feedback indicates that data, metrics, and tools should be more locally focused. Additionally, the committee developed a better understanding of its role: to provide feedback on the NIST Fellows and NIST COE products, helping ensure materials meet end user needs. The DMT Committee will not focus on producing products given the time limitations of volunteers. Efforts to coordinate with other

committees continue, although this coordination was more challenging during the in-person meeting where committees were meeting simultaneously. It was suggested that materials be shared across committees and consideration be given to mix committees at the next in-person Panel meeting.

The Committee also discussed the need for outreach regarding the work of the Panel and the role of the Resilience Knowledge Base (RKB) in this regard. Stephen Cauffman indicated that Fort Collins is the only community currently going through all six steps of the NIST Guide, but several others are utilizing parts of the guide or focusing on specific sectors. Although not using the Guide, a number of very large cities have invested millions of dollars in resilience planning. Feedback from these communities, even on an informal basis, would be very useful. Other community resilience initiatives (e.g., National Academies (“NAS”) pilot communities) also may have useful information and/or feedback.

- **Energy (Julia Phillips):** The Energy Committee meeting was sparsely attended, and consistent participation remains a challenge. The committee has received three documents for proposed inclusion in the RKB and developed criteria for evaluating these and future documents: 1) Is the document an industry-accepted document? 2) Is the document readily available to the public at no charge? 3) Are there any potential conflicts of interest by the author or sponsor? 4) Is the sponsor credible? 5) Is the document timely? and 6) Is the document scalable to the local level? Based on the answers to these questions, the committee will accept, decline, or request more information/refinement on submissions.
- **Social and Economic (David Eisenman):** The committee spent time clarifying its role (e.g., creating new content, evaluating existing content; providing input to Guide Briefs; integrating social and economic needs into the work of other committees; etc.) Further discussion in the morning will determine a path forward. The committee also reviewed the Warsaw, Illinois scenario developed by the Buildings and Facilities Committee, identifying areas where a social and/or economic perspective is needed. The committee has completed a data inventory, but there may be some overlap with similar work by the Data, Metrics, and Tools Committee.
- **Transportation (Susanne DesRoches):** There are multiple, and distinct, transportation modes that must be considered in community resilience planning, including surface, heavy rail, air, public transportation, ports, and pipelines. The committee continues to work in partnership with NAS’ Transportation Research Board (TRB). The goal is to leverage TRB research, while adding a community resilience focus.
- **Water and Wastewater (Mike Stuhr):** The committee affirmed its focus on small- to mid-sized utilities that do not have the resources for resilience planning. The committee recognized the need for an all hazards approach, rather than a focus on hurricanes and earthquakes. The group also formed three subcommittees: Water, Wastewater, and RKB.

5. Update on RKB and U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit

Although formal population of the RKB is on hold, Dr. Keenan has been thinking about the most effective way to use the RKB as a communications and information resource. Recognizing that content will vary by committee, he believes most content should be short and easy to understand. He is also considering technical and design elements, as well as work flow.

The U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit has given the RKB a head start. A major public announcement relating to the USCRT is expected within the next week.

6. Scheduling

The next Panel meeting is scheduled for March 9-10 in Miami, Florida. The meeting will focus on climate change, sea level rise, hurricanes, economics, and socioeconomics.

An announcement regarding the March meeting should be made as soon as possible to assist Panel members with travel plans.

No decision regarding the location of the fall 2017 meeting has been made, although a Midwestern location might be the most feasible.

7. New Business

A number of committees will augment the scenarios developed by the Buildings and Facilities Committee. This effort may involve reaching out to the same communities and, at some point, result in tabletop exercises that are useful to the communities.

It was suggested that the CRPCC define a coordinated approach for engaging with communities and soliciting feedback to ensure Panel materials meet communities' needs and ultimately are used.

8. Adjournment

There was no other business, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 6:45 p.m. Mountain Time.