

Community Resilience Panel: Coordinating Committee (CRPCC) Meeting

MEETING DATE: April 5, 2016
TIME: 9:30 am PDT to 11:00 am PDT
ISSUE DATE: April 26, 2016

ATTENDEES:

Attendee	Affiliation
Jay Raskin (Chair)	Jay Raskin Architect
Jesse Keenan (Vice Chair)	Columbia University
Debra Ballen (Secretary)	Insurance Institute for Business & Home Safety
Kevin Bush	HUD
Steve Cauffman	NIST
Megan Clifford	Argonne National Laboratory
David Eisenman	UCLA
Terry McAllister	NIST
David Mizzen	ARA
Ronda Mosley	Public Technology Institute (PTI)
Don Scott	PCS Structural Solutions
Michael Stuhr	City of Portland
Peter Vickery	ARA

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, a motion to approve the agenda was made, seconded, and unanimously approved. A motion to approve the minutes of the February 29, 2016, meeting was also unanimously approved.

2. Updates

A. Panel Membership and Standing Committee Officers

There are now more than 350 people registered for the panel. Almost all Standing Committee officers are in place, although a personnel change involving one officer necessitates that we designate a new Secretary for the Communication Committee.

B. Resource Knowledge Base

The Committee discussed the process for approving new content for the Resource Knowledge Base (RKB). The NIST Community Resilience Guide (“the Guide”), previously recommended for by the CRPCC for Panel approval for addition to the RKB, has not yet been approved, due to the cumbersome approval process set forth in the Panel Charter and Bylaws—which state that “greater than two-thirds

(67%) of the vote of those who attended the most recent meeting is required to approve a measure.” Although “abstain, with comment” votes are subtracted from the denominator in the percentage approval calculation, non-votes are not subtracted, making it difficult to reach the 67 percent threshold through electronic voting, given the large number of non-voters that are common in any remote voting scenario. Additionally, some Panel members have commented that the document presented for approval was too long to review in a short period of time, got lost in their SPAM filter, or that they lacked the technical expertise to approve it.

Taking these issues into account, the group discussed possible improvements to the RKB approval process, noting that any changes would require an amendment to the Bylaws. The group agreed that the CRPCC could be the vehicle for approving additions to the RKB, upon the recommendation of the relevant Standing Committee. It was also suggested that the relevant Standing Committee be responsible for drafting a one-page cover sheet for each proposed RKB document, including a short abstract, key words for meta-data, and a digital object identifier (DOI)—although some committees may have resource constraints on getting this done.

The group also discussed whether documents need to be peer reviewed prior to being considered for approval for the RKB. This answer might depend on the type of document and the type of review it went through prior to being proposed for the RKB.

Additionally, the Committee discussed but did not fully resolve, who should conduct the peer review (suggestions: Standing Committee Chairs or volunteers) or how this would occur. While these open issues await resolution, there was a consensus that the Bylaws should be amended to facilitate the RKB approval process—the suggestion was to allow the CRPCC to approve most proposed content for the RKB, with a full Panel approval process for documents that are developed through the Standing Committees or under the auspices of the Panel. The CRPCC Chairs will develop a Bylaws amendment for consideration by the CRPCC.

In discussing these matters, the CRPCC recognized that there are multiple audiences for RKB documents—e.g., technical experts, advocacy leaders, the private sector—and different types of documents would be most useful to different audiences. And, it is important to organize the RKB so it is easily searchable and useful. The cover sheet concept is one way to accomplish this goal, although the cover sheets themselves must be reviewed for consistency; this seems to be a role for the Panel Administrator.

Several members of the Data, Metrics, and Tools Committee volunteered to participate in a Working Group to make recommendations regarding the design, structure, and functionality of the RKB site. The other Standing Committee Chairs were asked to identify at least one volunteer from each Committee to join this effort. The six steps of the Guide can serve as an organizational scheme for the RKB.

The group also noted that the HUD Regulatory Barriers Taxonomy, as modified by memos from the Standing Committee Chairs, is currently being considered as the basis for the RKB webpage being developed by ARA. There may be opportunities through federal sponsors or the Public Technology Institute to field test the site once the design, structure, and functionality are complete.

Another consideration is whether a legal disclaimer on the Panel homepage is required to the extent that Standing Committees or the CRPCC are deemed to have approved the content of RKB documents.

C. Policy Committee/Stakeholder Groups

The Administrator is waiting for final approval of the long-form membership registration, which will allow Panel Members to identify their stakeholder group and indicate interest in joining the Policy Committee. The form is being reviewed by OMB for Paperwork Reduction Act compliance, with no projected approval date. The long-form membership registration will also address problems with e-mail distribution lists, but in the interim, members can bring those problems to the attention of the Panel Administrator.

3. Reports from the Standing Committees

Chairs of the Buildings and Facilities; Data, Metrics, and Tools; Energy; Social and Economic; and Water and Wastewater Committees reported on their meetings the previous afternoon. All reported good progress but cited a desire for more working time during the next Panel meeting. Additionally, since many participants in Committee meetings were new to the process, it was necessary to invest time orienting newcomers. This situation will likely occur in future Panel meetings that focus on local issues and involve local community representatives (who may only attend a single meeting in their area). There was consensus that the current format of Panel meeting, which includes engaging communities who are actively addressing resilience, is a good model and should continue. Future meetings, however, should address the concerns raised.

4. Next Panel Meetings

The next Panel meeting will be in Denver, Colorado in approximately six months. The meeting will include presentation(s) from Fort Collins representatives who are actively implementing the NIST Community Resilience Guide. The Spring 2017 meeting will be held in Miami, Florida. As part of this discussion, the group addressed sponsorships to provide coffee at future Panel meetings.

5. Other Business

The Committee discussed eligibility for Voting member Status on the Panel and Committees. According to the Bylaws, all Panel members attending the first three Panel meetings have the right to vote at each of those meetings; after that, voting rights are deactivated if a Voting member has missed two consecutive meetings (whether face-to-face or virtual), or has not responded substantively to two consecutive requests (within a 12-month period) for document review and comment. At this point, all Panel registrants are considered Voting members (since there have only been two Panel meetings), but after the third panel meeting, it will be necessary to identify Voting and Non-Voting members for purposes of both Panel and Standing Committee votes.

CRPCC members agreed that the Portland meeting has been very informative and productive. To facilitate efficient work flows, Committee report-outs should be reconciled to avoid duplication.

6. Adjournment

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m. PDT.