

**Community Resilience Panel:
Coordinating Committee (CRPCC) Meeting**

MEETING DATE: March 9, 2017

TIME: 5:30 pm to 6:30 pm EST

ISSUE DATE: April 13, 2017

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Panel Position	Affiliation
Jay Raskin	Panel/CRPCC Chair	Jay Raskin Architect
Jesse Keenan	Panel/CRPCC Vice Chair	Harvard University
Lindsay Brugger	Panel/CRPCC Secretary	American Institute of Architects
Robert Ashcraft	Panel/CRPCC Buildings Stakeholder Representative	Accume Partners
Chris Baglin	Panel/CRPCC Governance Stakeholder Representative	PPC
Debra Ballen	Social & Economic Functions Stakeholder Representative	IBHS
Don Scott	Buildings & Facilities Chair	PCS Structural Solutions
Rachel Minnery	Buildings & Facilities Vice Chair	American Institute of Architects
Kathryn Condello	Communication Chair	CenturyLink
Priya Shrinivasan	Communication Vice Chair	New York City
Megan Clifford	Data, Metrics & Tools Chair	Argonne National Lab
Paolo Bocchini	Data, Metrics & Tools Vice Chair	Lehigh
Ting Lin	Data, Metrics & Tools Secretary	Marquette University
Leon Kempner	Energy Chair	BPA
Julia Phillips	Energy Vice Chair	Argonne National Lab
John Plodinec	Social & Economic Chair	CARRI
Ann Terranova	Social & Economic Secretary	AECOM
Susanne DesRoches	Transportation Chair	NYC Mayor's Office of Recovery and Resiliency
Mike Stuhr	Water and Wastewater Chair	Portland Water Bureau
David Mizzen	Panel Administrator	ARA
Steve Cauffman	Federal Sponsor	NIST
Kevin Bush	Federal Co-Sponsor	HUD
Sheri Moore	Liaison	USACE
Charlene Milliken	Co-Sponsor	National Academies

DISTRIBUTION: Attendees and CRPCC

NOTES BY: Lindsay Brugger, CRPCC Secretary

1. Welcome and Introductions

Jay Raskin (Chair) welcomed participants and thanked them for attending. Following introductions, he ascertained a quorum was present. A motion to approve the minutes of the February 7th meeting was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

Mr. Raskin specifically welcomed two new participants: Sheri Moore, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Charlene Milliken, National Academies.

2. Updates

a. Project Coordination Software

Not discussed.

b. Local Communities Survey

Not discussed.

c. Resilience Knowledge Base

Mr. Mike Stuhr stated that five strategic documents have been submitted to the RKB using a simplified taxonomy developed by the Water and Wastewater Committee. The documents were chosen because of their credibility as well as their applicability to mid-size and smaller utilities.

Mr. Raskin suggested a vote determine whether each document enters the RKB and the CRPCC agreed.

Ms. Debra Ballen posed a broader question; asking if it is permissible to include documents that are authored by consultants and/or have a self-promotional component. Mr. Stuhr and the CRPCC determined that is permissible in the case of the five proposed water and wastewater documents because they are credible, trusted resources that are valuable to the committee's primary audience.

Mr. John Plodinec posed a similar question; asking if presentations were suitable for the RKB. Mr. Stuhr stated that the water and wastewater presentation document was valuable to beginners and thus important to include in the RKB.

Mr. Plodinec also noted that the field of resilience is rapidly evolving and asked if the CRPCC should consider time-viability; suggesting that documents be tagged with an expiration date at which point they are re-reviewed.

Ms. Megan Clifford stated that she still has questions about the overall RKB purpose and intended user.

Mr. Stuhr added that a simpler taxonomy is needed; noting that the terms used are not definitive and that the exercise of completing the taxonomy may be a barrier to populating the RKB. Mr. Plodinec agreed, stating that he needs to better understand the layout of the database. Dr. Leon Kempner concurred. Mr. Raskin explained that the taxonomy is internal for committee use and is different from the user interface. Mr. Robert Ashcraft stated that the information contained within the taxonomy is important for database organization and suggested that the taxonomy be reconfigured onto multiple excel tabs: the first sheet could be completed by the committee while the more in-depth information could be completed by others. Ms. Clifford agreed. Mr. Plodinec also agreed; stating that it would be helpful for committees to only be

responsible for a small piece of the taxonomy. Mr. Plodinec asked who would be responsible for the rest of the taxonomy, noting that consistency is necessary. He suggested ARA take on this role. Dr. Kempner noted that it may be difficult for someone to complete the rest of the taxonomy without reading the document in question and thus completing the taxonomy would require a high degree of effort.

Ms. Susanne DesRoches questioned whether each sector could really use the same screening material, noting that it is critical to consider the intended audience. For example, in the case of the transportation committee, their first screening criteria assess if the document goes beyond code. Ms. Clifford reiterated the need to document the intent of the RKB: Who are the users and what is the purpose? Ms. Clifford also noted that if there are three overarching screening items that can be used by all sectors, then each committee could create sub-screening material. Ms. DesRoches stated that she sees value in each sector providing the taxonomy criteria for their proposed resources.

Mr. Ashcroft noted that a successful search mechanism requires a strong understanding of the audience and suggested interviewing potential users.

Mr. Steve Cauffman clarified that the purpose of the RKB is to provide actionable guidance to help people work through the steps of the guide.

Mr. David Mizzen explained that in the current format of the RKB, documents are categorized by step so as to directly relate to the guide. Mr. Mizzen noted that the RKB may need further categorization based on sectors. Ms. Clifford noted that not all documents will fall nicely into those steps. Mr. Cauffman added that some documents may address multiple steps and that that's ok. Dr. Jesse Keenan added that the parameters of the RKB are limited by what has already been defined and he trusts each committee's judgement.

Ms. Rachel Minnery asked if each resource should be checked against a performance standard.

Ms. DesRoches requested guidance on the level of effort each committee should anticipate; for example, are five documents requested? Mr. Cauffman recommended prioritizing: first seek documents that directly support the planning process; later add guidance that indirectly supports resilience planning.

Ms. Kathryn Condello requested guidance on the size of the average local government that would use the Guide/RKB. Mr. Cauffman answered small-medium size communities (25-150K). Mr. Raskin articulated that he wasn't sure we could pinpoint the size yet.

Mr. Raskin suggested a vote. A motion to approve the entry of all five documents into the RKB was made, seconded, and approved with one abstention.

3. Committee Reports

Not discussed.

- **Buildings and Facilities**
- **Communications**
- **Data, Metrics, and Tools**
- **Energy**
- **Social and Economic**
- **Transportation.**
- **Water and Wastewater**

4. RKB Submittals

See above Resilience Knowledge Base discussion.

- a) **Hazard Mitigation for Natural Disasters – EPA Document, publically available**
- b) **Water Sector Resilience – DHS Document, publically available**
- c) **The Bridge Linking Engineering and Society – NAE Document, publically available**
- d) **US Water Industry Report – Black & Veatch Report, publically available**
- e) **Critical Infrastructure Interdependencies – IEEE Journal, Permission needed**

5. Future Panel Meetings

Mr. Cauffman suggested New Orleans as a future panel meeting site, noting that ResCon just occurred and that the city will be celebrating its Tri-centennial in 2018.

Milwaukee, Chicago and St. Louis were also suggested. Ms. DesRoches echoed the suggestion of Chicago, noting that it would be beneficial to focus on a new hazard and that the city has been active in combating extreme heat.

Other Business

Mr. Raskin announced a correction to the agenda: the time of the next conference call will be Monday April 3, 2017 11am-noon EST.

6. Adjournment

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30pm EST.