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The Disaster Recovery Literature and Practice

- Least Understood Aspect of Emergency Management (scholars and practitioners)
- Who is Responsible for Recovery?
  - The Planner Emergency Management Divide
  - Public Sector
  - Others – emerging leadership
  - Reframing the question
- Disaster Recovery Dominated by the Post-Event Administration of Federal Programs
- Pre-event Planning for Post-Disaster Disaster Recovery Remains Marginalized
- A Review of the United States Disaster Assistance Framework: Planning for Recovery (Smith 2010)
Governor’s Office of Recovery and Renewal and the Disaster Recovery Assistance Framework

- Implementation Focus
- Institutionalizing State and Local Capability
- Beyond the Stafford Act
- Three Objectives
  - Identification of Funding
  - Policy Counsel
  - Education, Outreach, and Training
Characteristics of the U.S. Disaster Recovery Assistance Framework

- Disaster Assistance: Funding, Policy and Technical Assistance
- Disaster Assistance Network
- Rules
  - Level of Prescriptiveness
  - “Zone of Uncertainty”
- Understanding of Local Needs
  - Greatest Resources, Least Understanding of Local Needs?
  - Closest to Problem, Least Prepared, Fewest Resources?
- Timing Within Organizations and Across Disaster Assistance Network
  - Speed of Aid versus Deliberative Approach (i.e. planning for recovery)
  - Coordinative Challenges
- Horizontal and Vertical Integration
- The Role of Planning – Improving the Disaster Recovery Assistance Framework
  - Process
  - Plan-Making
Disaster Recovery Process (Haas, Kates and Bowden 1977)

Figure 6. A Model of Recovery Activity

- Periods:
  - Emergency
  - Restoration
  - Reconstruction I
  - Reconstruction II

- Capital Stock:
  - Damaged or Destroyed
  - Patched
  - Rebuilt (Replacement)
  - Improved and Developed

- Normal Activities:
  - Ceased or Changed
  - Return and Function
  - Return at Predisaster Levels or Greater
  - Improved and Developed

- Maximal Coping Activity
- Minimal Coping Activity

Sample Indicators:
- Completion of Search and Rescue
- End of Emergency Shelter or Feeding
- Clearing Rubble from Main Arteries
- Restoration of Urban Services
- Return of Refugees
- Rubble Cleared
- Attain Predisaster Level of Capital Stock and Activities
- Completion of Major Construction Projects
### Horizontal and Vertical Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizontal</strong></td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transforming the Disaster Recovery Assistance Framework
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The Role of Planners and Planning in the Disaster Recovery Assistance Framework

- Improved Use of Existing Planning Tools and Processes
  - Boundary Spanning Function
  - Pre-Event Planning

- Land Use Planning Tools
  - Among the Most Effective / Underutilized in Recovery
  - Poor Coordination between Planners and Emergency Managers

- Planning Process – Disasters as Conflict/Altruism
  - Dispute Resolution
  - Policy Dialogue
  - Negotiation
  - Facilitation
  - Public Participation / Participatory, Inclusive Decision Making Across Network

- Connectivity to Framework – Changing the Defining Characteristics
  - Rules, Understanding of Local Needs, Coordination of Aid, Timing

- Creating the conditions in which leaders emerge and collaboration thrives