

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

**MEETING DATE:** September 8, 2017  
**TIME:** 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM  
**ISSUE DATE:** November 7, 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
David Mizzen	Panel Administrator	ARA
John Ferris	Federal Co-Sponsor	EPA
Brittany Kiessling	Federal Co-Sponsor	EPA
Chris Baglin	Panel/CRPCC Governance Stakeholder Rep	PPC
Peter Vickery	Panel Administrator	ARA
Susanne DesRoches	Transportation Chair	NYC Mayor's Office of Recovery & Resiliency
John Plodinec	Social & Economic Chair	CARRI
Julia Phillips	Energy Vice Chair	Argonne National Lab
Megan Clifford	Data, Metrics & Tools Chair	Argonne National Lab
Sheri Moore	Federal Co-Sponsor	USACE
Priya Shrinivasan	Communication Vice Chair	New York City
Don Scott	Buildings & Facilities Chair	PCS Structural Solutions
Dryver Huston	Water & Wastewater Secretary	University of Vermont
Robert Ashcraft	Panel/CRPCC Buildings Stakeholder Rep	Accume Partners
Debra Ballen	Panel/CRPCC Social & Economic Functions Stakeholder Rep	IBHS
Steve Cauffman	Federal Sponsor	NIST
Terri McAllister	Federal Sponsor	NIST

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees and CRPCC

**NOTES BY:** Lindsay Brugger, CRPCC Secretary

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Jay Raskin (Chair) welcomed participants and thanked them for attending. A motion to approve the minutes of the July 10<sup>th</sup> meeting was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

### 2. Discussion of Committee Action Plans for the Next Year

Mr. Raskin asked each committee to provide an overview of their work plan.

- **Buildings and Facilities (Don Scott):** Committee members are proud of what we're doing and what we've accomplished as a committee. However, they feel there is a lack of direction for the entire Panel and the committees are working in silos. A blog might be helpful in creating more interaction between committees. Ultimately, the Panel needs a common goal that everyone works towards. The Panel needs to relate resilience efforts to the design process and/or relate to how a community might use the NIST process. The committee will divide into building sector teams to develop guides or checklists to help communities know what questions to ask as they work through the NIST process. Each building sector team will reach out to public/private organizations that represent those sectors as well as work with fellow CRP committees. The NIST Guide is at the macro level, the committee's work will try to dig into the micro level.
- **Communications (Priya Shrinivasan):** The committee is working on identifying best practices, focusing on an all hazard approach, for the RKB. The committee will frame the recommended resources in a community friendly way. The committee is also developing a provider list to help communities know who to contact. The list will include major providers that cover about 80% of the population. The committee is also engaged with a project by CTIA that has overlaps with the NIST work. CTIA has a working group that is focused on wireless network resilience (emergency preparedness) and improving coordination between local governments and telecom providers. The working group is developing best practices for local governments and wireless providers.
- **Data, Metrics, and Tools (Megan Clifford):** The committee is seeking a specific, collective goal from the Panel and noted that the roles and responsibilities document the committee drafted added a lot of clarity for DMT. The committee is drafting a gap identification and recommendations template and has asked for assistance in distributing the portfolio management white paper. The committee has found numerous valuable tools that could be included in the RKB, but is hung up on the taxonomy.
- **Energy (Julia Phillips):** The committee has struggled to find an appropriate direction and has suffered significant attrition because subsets of committee members (utility companies, community managers) have different goals. We would like to see community stakeholders join the committee. The committee needs direction to regain momentum.
- **Social and Economic (John Plodinec):** The committee sees the RKB as a tool to help people make decisions and suggests this as a potential unifying principle for the Panel. The committee has drafted a charter for themselves that they will share with the broader Panel. The charter helps define how the committee sees itself fitting into the overall Panel. By the October meeting the committee plans to have a document defining what is needed in terms of the resilience message (i.e., the business case). The document will answer the "what's in it for me" question communities have. Ultimately, community members don't care about assets; they want service.
- **Transportation (Susanne DesRoches):** The committee has focused on building a relationship with TRB to avoid the duplication of efforts (TRB has resilience section/area of research). The committee sees an analysis of codes and standards by sector as a potential value the Panel could provide to communities.
- **Water and Wastewater (Dryver Huston):** The committee has defined their scope as "water, wastewater, and storm water." The committee is currently assessing documents for the RKB, focusing on how-to resources (rather than academic), as well as case studies that would be useful for small utilities.

**Discussion:** Throughout the committee report outs, the coordinating committee discussed the relationship between the committees, the RKB, and the overall goal(s) of the Panel. They determined that the NIST Community Resilience Planning Guide describes the "process" at a macro scale but needs a complementary "how to" that delves into the micro scale. This need is a gap that the committees are well suited to fill: the Guide is an organizing construct and requires committee assistance to inform the use of the Guide.

The RKB is seen as a mechanism for enabling access to the micro “how to” elements. Three audiences were identified for the RKB:

- Private sector business
- Local community advocates
- Local municipal county hazard mitigation and emergency management staff

Additional areas of importance that were identified and should be included in future committee work are:

- Enhanced codes and standards
- Historic preservation
- Land use

### Survey Results

Mr. Jesse Keenan shared the preliminary results of the Panel’s survey. The survey tested three primary questions:

1. Is it just big cities that are engaged in resilience planning?
2. Are resilience planning activities being driven by Emergency Managers?
3. Are disaster/engineering definitions of resilience dominant?

The survey found that:

- Generally, large cities tend to consider more hazards, natural hazards, and climate change impacts in their planning processes.
- There was a high correlation between emergency and hazard plans and resilience plans.
- Infrastructure plans are most likely to incorporate elements of resilience while land use plans are least likely to incorporate elements of resilience.
- By sector, across all plan categories, buildings and facilities were addressed most frequently.
- A significant cohort of actors are coming from emergency management and engineering based units.

#### 4. Engagement of Federal Co-Sponsors/Liaisons and National Academies

**EPA (John Ferris & Brittany Kiessler):** How can Panel activities be integrated into existing federal structures? FEMA addresses mitigation as well as recovery. The EPA is developing a resilience tools inventory of EPA products as part of Community Resilience Indicators project.

**USACE (Sherri Moore):** USACE uses the framework: Prepare, absorb, recover & adapt (PARA). What are the greatest risks our communities face and how can the Panel fill the gaps? How can the Panel help communities understand their risk? Out of those risks, what’s *actionable*? How do you cut through the noise (there’s a lot of information out there). Don’t be afraid of being specific. Specific tools (and case studies) can be powerful.

#### 3. Panel Goals & Objectives

Dr. Terri McAllister asked what is needed to make a significant difference in fostering community resilience (and can be accomplished in the next 12-18 months). Seven topics were identified:

- **Recovery Support.** Considering the communities recovering from Hurricanes Harvey and Irma, articulate why resilience is an important part of recovery.
- **Standards/codes assessment, regulations, best practices assessment.**
- **RKB as a tool.** The RKB should be geared towards a specific audience with the ability to filter information, relate information to the Guide's 6 steps. This tool should also provide relevant case studies.
- **Decision support.** Community leaders and stakeholders need help defining what questions to ask.
- **Knowledge (data) gaps.** Fill these gaps via case studies, resources.
- **Getting started guidance.** Communities don't know where to begin.
- **Risk communication.** Communities don't know their risk and don't understand why they need resilience.

The CRPCC voted on these seven ideas and based on the voting, proposed a common goal for the Panel to develop a Decision Support Framework for Community Resilience to which each committee will contribute. The CRPCC also agreed that the RKB would be developed as a supporting mechanism for the other goals, where important documents for each goal are organized according the 6 steps of the NIST Guide. The proposed common goal also subsumed three of the other ideas proposed, recognizing their importance to underpinning the larger goal and their alignment with the goals of the Panel. The Panel goal to be accomplished in the next 18 months (by Spring 2019) is:

- Develop a Decision Support Framework to help communities become more resilient by identifying key resilience questions communities should be asking, and providing resources to help them understand best practices for community resilience. The framework will address 3 main areas:
  - **Recovery Support** – What are the decisions that need to be made to facilitate recovery (i.e., building back better)? What questions should communities be asking? This will include developing guidance for getting started in resilience planning and helping communities understand their risks.
  - **Knowledge Gaps** – What tools and information are available? What best practices/success stories can be identified from recent disasters (e.g., Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria)?
  - **Standards and Codes/Regulations/Best Practices** – What communities need to know? How can the minimum health safety and welfare requirements be enhanced?

Mr. Raskin requested a motion to adopt the Decision Support Framework as the guiding goal of the Panel for the next 18 months. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

Mr. Raskin asked each committee to review their work plan in light of the Decision Support Framework.

## 5. Planning for October Panel Meeting

Mr. Raskin requested that each committee describe how they'd like to use their time at the October Panel meeting so as to determine how much work time will be needed.

- **Buildings and Facilities (Don Scott):** Will need a significant amount of time to dive into building sector work. Would also like to have a joint committee meeting with the Social and Economic committee.
- **Communications (Priya Shrinivasan):** Would like committee-focused work time as well as some collaboration time.

- **Data, Metrics, and Tools (Megan Clifford):** Needs to have a focused committee discussion with a community stakeholder. We would also like a small amount of time to split DMT into the other committees.
- **Energy (Julia Phillips):** The committee is struggling and needs to hear from community voices. We may benefit from hearing from Communications Committee and their engagement with a community stakeholder.
- **Social and Economic (John Plodinec):** Hoping to have a representative from the Center of Excellence. We will also need time to meet with the Buildings and Facilities Committee.
- **Transportation (Susanne DesRoches):** Will need time to focus on the newly identified Panel framework and revisit the RKB.
- **Water and Wastewater (Dryver Huston):** The committee has a full workload and is happy with agenda as it stands.

Mr. Raskin summarized the above needs as having both committee-specific work time as well as a flex period in which the Buildings and Facilities Committee can meet with the Social and Economic Committee and the Communications Committee can meet with Energy Committee. During this time, other groups may work within their own committees or send members to join other committee workgroups.

Ms. Baglin questioned the role of stakeholder reps. Mr. Raskin explained that the role, per the panel charter, is to prevent bias but he is open to expanding that role and suggested the stakeholder reps make a recommendation.

Ms. Clifford asked that the representatives from the Center of Excellence take part in the October meeting and emphasized the need to discuss succession planning.

## 6. Adjournment

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at approximately 2:00 PM EST.