

1       Towards Measuring Resilience of Flood Prone Communities: A Conceptual Framework

2                               V.O.Oladokun<sup>1</sup> and B.E.Montz<sup>2</sup>

3                               <sup>1</sup>Department of Industrial and Production Engineering, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

4                               <sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, Planning, & Environment, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

6                               **Abstract**

7  
8   Community resilience has become an important policy and research concept for understanding and  
9   addressing the challenges associated with the interplay of climate change, urbanization, population  
10   growth, land use, sustainability, vulnerability and increased frequency of extreme flooding.  
11   Although measuring resilience has been identified as a fundamental step toward its understanding  
12   and effective management, there is, however, lack of an operational measurement framework due  
13   to the difficulty of systematically integrating socio-economic and techno-ecological factors. The  
14   study examines the challenges, constraints and construct ramifications that have complicated the  
15   development of an operational framework for measuring resilience of flood prone communities.  
16   Among others, the study highlights the issues of proliferation of definitions and conceptual  
17   frameworks of resilience, challenges of data availability, data variability and data compatibility.  
18   Adopting the National Academies' definition of resilience, a conceptual and mathematical model  
19   was developed using the dimensions, quantities and relationships established by the definition. A  
20   fuzzy logic equivalent of the model was implemented to generate resilience indices for three flood  
21   prone communities in the US. The results indicate that the proposed framework offers a viable  
22   approach for measuring community flood resilience even when there is a limitation on data  
23   availability and compatibility.  
24

25   Keywords: Hazard, Disaster, Flood, Resilience, Measurement, Fuzzy, Community

## 1.0 Introduction

Developing resilience of communities has become widely recognized as critical for disaster risk management due to the increased incidents of extreme weather events, such as flooding, which have disrupted economic activities, caused huge losses, displaced people and threatened the sustainability of communities across the world (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter 2018; Mallakpour and Villarini, 2015; Montz, 2009; Oladokun et al., 2017; Su, 2016a; Wing et al., 2018). Major international policy instruments such as the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction's (UNISDR) 2015 Strategic Framework and the 2005 Hyogo Framework have emphasized and adopted resilience principles in disaster risk management (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter et al., 2016). For instance, the interplay of extreme floods, population growth and rapid urbanization has increased flood hazard risks such that conventional flood risk management (FRM) measures of concrete structures, levees, flood walls and other defenses have become inadequate and unsustainable across various communities (Duy et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2018; Trogrlić et al., 2018; Wing et al., 2018). Resilience has gained a lot of attention, from both policy and research perspectives, involving using it to understand and address the challenges of land use, vulnerability and sustainability in the context of flooding (Cohen et al., 2016; Cohen et al., 2017; Folke, 2006; Parsons et al., 2016; Sharifi, 2016). Building community resilience has emerged as particularly relevant in dealing with flooding, which has become the most widespread and destructive of all natural hazards globally (Jha et al., 2012; Mallakpour and Villarini, 2015; Montz, 2009).

Consequently, there has been a shift from relying solely on large-scale flood defense and structural systems towards an approach that emphasizes the concept of community resilience as a strategic component of flood risk management (Hammond et al., 2015; Park et al., 2013). This shift is being reinforced by a consensus that since floods cannot be all together prevented; FRM must focus more on building the resilience of flood prone communities (Joseph et al., 2014; Oladokun et al., 2017; Schelfaut et al., 2011).

There is a consensus that the first and fundamental step toward understanding and operationalizing resilience for flood disaster and hazard management is to have an acceptable resilience measuring template (NRC, 2012). For instance, the ability to understand and objectively evaluate the impact of FRM programs, interventions and practices on community flood resilience is needed for making

57 political and business cases for proactive FRM investment from both public and private sectors.  
58 Cutter (2018) suggested that an acceptable template is a basic foundation for monitoring baselines  
59 and progress in building hazard resilience.

60 Furthermore, a measuring template will be useful as a decision support tool for the efficient  
61 deployment of scarce FRM resources and also provides a basis for monitoring resilience changes  
62 with respect to resource deployment. For instance, Keating et al. (2017) explained that there is a  
63 need for the continued development of theoretically sound, empirically verified, and applicable  
64 frameworks and tools that help in understanding key components of resilience in order to better  
65 target resilience-enhancing initiatives and evaluate the changes in resilience as a result of different  
66 capacities, actions and hazards.

67 Therefore, the search for an acceptable framework and empirical model for measuring resilience  
68 remains relevant and continues to attract attention (Cutter et al., 2016; Zou et al., 2018; Cai et al.,  
69 2018; Keating et al., 2017). Some existing measuring approaches, as identified in Cai et al., (2018),  
70 include the Baseline Resilience Indicators for Communities (BRIC), the Resilience Inference  
71 Measurement (RIM) framework, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA  
72 2010) Coastal Resilience Index, -the PEOPLES Resilience Framework, and the Communities  
73 Advancing Resilience Toolkit (CART). There is also the '5C-4R' Zurich Alliance framework  
74 combining the 'five capitals' of the UK's [Department for International Development](#) -~~DFID~~  
75 sustainable livelihoods framework (Scoones, 1998) and the four properties of a resilient system  
76 (Szoenyi, et al., 2016): the framework incorporates a technical risk grading standard (TRGS)  
77 developed by Zurich risk experts (Keating et al. 2017).

78 Despite the attention resilience has gained, the concept remains difficult to operationalize in the  
79 context of community flood risk management due to, among other factors, the difficulty in  
80 measuring resilience (Cutter, 2018; Fisher, 2015). Many experts and authors have noted the  
81 difficulty in integrating indicators of the natural and human systems as well as socio-environmental  
82 factors into resilience by most of the existing frameworks (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018; Fuchs  
83 and Thaler, 2018; Qiang and Lam, 2016). Resilience, as a multifaceted and multidimensional  
84 concept, has developed across multiple disciplines and applications such that resilience discourse  
85 has attracted multidisciplinary interests from both research and policy perspectives. While the  
86 wide spectrum of multidisciplinary and practice interests characterizing resilience discourse has

increased its understanding and generated insights, it has also led to the emergence of multiple variants of its definition as well as the absence of consensus on the conceptual framework for its measurement (Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Cutter 2018). For instance, resilience has been noted to have varied definitions depending on the hazard and disciplinary contexts, with over 70 definitions identified by Fisher (2015).

The multiplicity of definitions has led to proliferation of conceptual models, frameworks and interpretations (Costache, 2017), such that there is difficulty in transforming resilience measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational quantitative template. According to Cutter (2018), the difficulties in harmonizing and operationalizing these definitions have led to the emergence of a wide array of measurement approaches. Meanwhile, a pre-requisite to having an operational model, in the context of resilience measurement, is the adoption or convergence of definition by the resilience research and policy community. Such a definition should meet the following criteria: i) emanates from or receives the formal endorsement of a widely recognized institutional platform of stakeholders, ii) encompasses a wide spectrum of existing resilience concepts, iii) has some degree of simplicity, and iv) enjoys high acceptance of both the research and policy community. In a widely cited National Research Council report (NRC, 2012), the US National Academy of Sciences defines resilience as the ability of a system to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse events (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018). Therefore, this study has adopted this definition as the basis for the proposed framework for measuring the resilience of flood prone communities.

From a systems perspective, community-resilience is a non linear collection of socio-ecological, socio-political, techno-ecological and socio-economic entities, each characterized by dynamic and complex spatiotemporal interactions. Essentially, the concept of resilience involves the interactions of several entities each defined by some social, economic, natural, technical and environmental dimensions (Cai, et al., 2018; Norris et al., 2008). For instance, the community component was succinctly described by Cai et al. (2018) as a coupled natural and human system that manifests various sources of complexity such as nonlinearity, feedback, and uncertainty and dynamic interactions.

Furthermore, coupled with the challenge of complexity and the dynamic nature of community-resilience modeling is the challenge of data and computational analysis. It has been established

that information and data items characterizing community-resilience system are mostly imprecise, incomplete, vague, complex, fuzzy and subjective within the context of flood risk management (Kotze and Reyers, 2016; [Oladokun et al., 2017](#)). These characteristics present some operational and analytical challenges for any complex model based on traditional crisp mathematics and hard computational approaches because of data availability, data variability and data compatibility. The resilience measuring problem with its interplay of definitional ambiguities, multi-dimensionality, and spatiotemporal dynamics invariably results in complex mathematical models. Such models, given the level of incompleteness, vagueness, and subjectivity that characterizes the human and socio-political aspects of resilience, offer little tractability with conventional hard computational tools and are difficult to operationalize. Hence, Oladokun et al. (2017) suggested that a resilience measuring model may be more amenable to a soft computing analytical technique such as fuzzy logic.

### **1.1 Aim and objectives**

Based on the background presented above, this study is aimed at adopting a soft computing approach, a fuzzy logic computational model, for the proposed flood resilience measuring template. In particular, the objectives of the study are 1) the development of a descriptive model that outlines our abstract interpretation of community resilience as a system, using insights from relevant literature, interactions with experts and observations of selected flood prone communities, 2) development of an equivalent mathematical model of the resulting descriptive model using an appropriate tool to generate further insights, and 3) development of an equivalent fuzzy inference system suitable for computational and analytical purposes in the face of the aforementioned data issues. The next section briefly describes some relevant fuzzy logic concepts.

### **1.2 An Overview of Fuzzy Logic**

Fuzzy set theory provides a mathematical tool for modeling uncertain, imprecise, vague and subjective data which represents a huge class of data encountered in most real-life situations (Adnan et al., 2015; Lincy and John, 2016). The fuzzy logic (FL) concept, introduced in 1965 by Lot A. Zadeh, is an extension of the classical set theory of crisp sets. FL, like humans, accommodates grey areas where some questions may not have a clear Yes or No answer or black and white categorization. According to Zadeh (1996), Fuzzy Logic = Computing with Words. FL mimics human reasoning and capability to summarize data and focus on decision-relevant

information in problems involving incomplete, vague, imprecise or subjective information. It is a computational concept that allows for modeling of complex systems using a higher level of abstraction originating from our knowledge and experience. It provides a very powerful tool for dealing quickly and efficiently with imprecision and nonlinearity (Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014). This capability to mine expert knowledge and use limited or fuzzy data makes fuzzy inference systems (FIS) a suitable tool for resilience measurement modeling.

The concept of membership function (MF) is central to FIS. In traditional logic, an element  $x$  is either in or out of crisp set  $A$ ; in other words, its degree of membership of the set is either zero or one. However, in fuzzy logic the element  $x$  can be in a fuzzy set  $B$  ‘partially’ by using a MF  $\mu_B(x)$  which can return any real value between 0 and 1. This returned value is the degree of membership representing the degree to which the element belongs to a fuzzy set. Therefore, in FL, the truth of any statement becomes a matter of degree.

Thus for crisp set  $A$   $\mu_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

On the other hand, for a fuzzy set, the MF may be represented as follows

$$\mu_B(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } b_1 \leq x \leq b_2 \\ g(x) & \text{if } b_2 < x \leq b_3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Actually, the crisp set is a special case fuzzy set whose MF returns only zero or one. There are many functions that are used as MFs. Some widely used MFs, Generalized bell shaped, Gaussian curves, Polynomial curves, Trapezoidal, Triangular and Sigmoid MFs (Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014; Adnan et al., 2015). The Mamdani FIS approach (Mamdani and Assilian, 1975), adopted for this study, is made up of a fuzzy inference engine characterized by the use of carefully selected MFs and a fuzzy rule base. The rule base is a set of ‘IF THEN’ statements that capture experts’ knowledge of the logic governing the problem. The fuzzy inference system will provide a template for experts and other stakeholders to translate their perceptions of the problem and map their linguistics rating of these variables into a resilience index based on the fuzzy relationships we define.

## 2.0 Resilience Measuring: A Conceptual Framework

## 2.1 Descriptive model

The design objective is to have a conceptual framework and its associated mathematical model with sufficient tractability by minimizing the number of model elements and adopting the barest minimum relationships while maintaining a reasonable level of validity. Therefore, as the theoretical basis for the proposed conceptual model, as mentioned earlier, we are adopting the resilience definition put forward by the US National Academies (NRC 2012). Conceptually this definition implies that a community's resilience is a quantity that reflects capacities such as: 1) the community's coping capacities, in terms of a threshold of hazard it can absorb (Hazard Absorption Capacity  $H$ ), 2) its accessible resources (Resource Availability  $G$ ), and 3) its resource utilization efficiency determined by factors like its preparedness and its governance processes (Resource Utilization Processes  $\theta$ ). These capacities interact to define its ability to prepare for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse flooding events. We attempt to conceptualize this understanding as shown in Figure 1.

Each of the dimensions in Figure 1 is influenced by a number of technical, social, ecological, economic, and political factors following work that has been reported in the literature which sheds light on these factors and how they influence the dimensions (see Cohen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2013; Rose, 2017). For example, hazard absorbing capacity  $H$  is determined by a number of techno-ecological factors such as adequacy, sophistication and use of infrastructure and technology as well as redundant capacities. It is also determined by socio-ecological and socioeconomic factors that influence both individual and institutional coping capacities. Resource availability is determined by things like community capital, political influence, and economic activities as well as ecological resources accessible to drive the quality and timeliness of recovery. Resource utilization processes are determined by the quality of governance and institutions such as judiciary, police, media, and public service. These processes influence policy formulation and implementation, the ease of doing business and the efficiency of use of resources. A detailed structured and operational rendition of the foregoing is presented in sections 2.2 and 3.3.

Figure 1 here

Furthermore, in the context of FRM, the framework of Figure 1 recognizes that resilience enhances recovery or that recovery is an outcome of resilience whereby when a community, as a coupled system, becomes more resilient its capacity to experience post disaster recovery increases. In other words, recovery, in terms of time taken to attain post disaster recovery and the degree of recovery attained, is influenced by its resilience. Invariably the conceptual framework implicitly suggests that recovery (recovery speed and recovery quality) can surrogate resilience. This is reasonable because post disaster recovery is driven by resilience factors such as preparedness, and coping capacity, among others. This understanding is supported by the DROP disaster resilience model of place (DROP) as illustrated in [Cutter et al. \(2008\)](#), reproduced in [Figure 2](#).

Figure 2 here

## 2.2 Mathematical model

The next stage is to transform the conceptual framework of Figure 1 into an operational mathematical model. This is accomplished by defining a geometric model of the framework as shown in Figure 3. This model is then used to derive appropriate mathematical relationships for resilience measurement and provide some insights.

### 2.2.1 Notations, definitions and terms

We adopt the following notations, definitions and terms to explain the components of Figure 3 in the context of flood hazard.

- i. Hazard Absorbing Capacity ( $H$ ): ( $H=h$ :  $0 \leq h \leq 1.0$ ). The resilience of a community depends on the level of the flood hazard the community systems can absorb before totally collapsing or undergoing irreversible disintegration.  $H=1$  is the highest absorbing capacity whereby the community can absorb and survive the damages and disturbance (both structural and non structural) of the most severe category of flooding conceivable. This captures various resilience factors such as coping capacity, redundancy, preparedness, sense of place attachment and other capacities as explained in Table 1.
- ii. Resource Availability ( $G$ ). This is the quantum of resources available to plan and pursue recovery as well as achieve recovery quality level  $Q$  (including adaptive recovery). Note that  $G=g$  ( $0 \leq g \leq 1.0$ ) captures both economic and community capital. It is the measure of resources the community is able to attract as a result of its overall



- economic and political influence, its natural assets, and human capital assets (see Table 1 for further details).
- iii. Resource Utilization Processes ( $\theta$ ): With  $0 \leq \theta \leq \Pi/2$ , we define  $\rho$  ( $\rho = \sin \theta$ ) as system efficiency. This is a resilience component that affects recovery and revolves around factors such as preparedness, community governance, institutional systems and processes. It determines the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of resources to achieve recovery and establish adaptive capacity. In other words, how *well* resources are used is as important as how *much* of a set of resources is used in building resilience. It measures the probity, level of accountability, level of waste, corruption, red-tapism, and bureaucracies within the system. A community with strong institutions such as a functioning judiciary and an efficient civil service, for instance, will tend to return high  $\rho$ . So an ideal or utopian community will have its  $G$  deployed at  $\theta = \Pi/2$ , such that  $\rho = \sin(\theta) = \sin(\Pi/2) = 1$ .
- iv. Recovery Quality Level ( $Q$ ). This represents the outcome of post hazard conditions in terms of restoration quality and socio-ecological functionality, among others.

The following definitions apply with reference to Figure 3

- v.  $a_i$ : Resilience reservoir of a real system  $i$  is defined as the area of trapezium ABFE' determined by the hazard absorbing capacity, at  $H = h$ , of the system, the available quantum of resources ( $G = g$ ), the quality of governance processes and resource utilization systems ( $\sin \theta$ ) and the achievable recovery quality ( $Q = q$ )
- vi.  $a_u$ : The resilience reservoir of an utopian (ideal) system is defined as the area of square ACDE. This occurs at ideal FRM conditions: that is, a community system with adequate resources, perfect governance and processes with zero waste of resources and infinite hazard coping threshold when  $h = AE$  (or at maximum absorbing capacity),  $g = ED$  (maximum resource adequacy) and  $\theta = \Pi/2$  (perfect or utopian system with 100% efficiency or  $\sin \theta = 1.0$ ). The utopian system can achieve a perfect recovery index  $Q = q = 1.0$  or  $Q = AC$

Extensive review of the literature was carried out to provide an informed basis for mapping FRM factors and inputs to the dimensions of resilience. This is summarized as shown in Table

262 1. Theoretically, the values of the dimensions H, G,  $\theta$  can be estimated from adequate data on  
 263 these input factors and appropriate functions.

264 **Table 1 Resilience Dimensions Input Factors**

Commented [DVO1]: Table 1 moved to a separate sheet

Resilience Dimensions	Resilience input factors
1. Hazard Absorbing capacity H	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Level of infrastructure in terms of sophistication and adequacy. Effectiveness of FRM measures such as flood and shoreline defenses, forecast and warning system.</li> <li>2. Redundant capacities. Evidence of alternatives in critical utilities, evacuation routes, communication and energy infrastructures, hospitals, police posts, supermarkets.</li> <li>3. Evidence of redundant housing capacity.</li> <li>4. Ecological defenses and buffer. Evidence of complementary use of nature to improve threshold, e.g. using landscaping and topography, natural drainage and canals, vegetation cover, rain/storm water harvesting, permeable pavements, etc.</li> <li>5. Residents coping capacity. Evidence of large portion of populace with previous flood experience, awareness, cohesion and place attachment</li> <li>6. Evidence of stable or growing population in spite of past events.</li> <li>7. Educational and literary level of populace</li> <li>8. Evidence of social and communal clusters to enhance coping through support, meaning, avoidance etc., e.g. church, local sport team, ethnic clusters.</li> <li>9. Presence of critical and strategic institutions of national importance, e.g. university, military base, major ports, etc.</li> <li>10. Evidence of technology driven information dissemination, e.g. social media, sms (Ashraf and Routray, 2013; Cohen et al., 2017; Esteban et al., 2013; Ibanez et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2013; Mavhura et al., 2013)</li> </ol>
2. Resource Availability G	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of budgetary provision for, or commitment to, flood risk management.</li> <li>2. Evidence of thriving economic activities in the community, e.g. size of local GDP</li> <li>3. Evidence of economic strength of residents, e.g. per capita income, income level, housing value, savings, cooperative societies, etc.</li> <li>4. Evidence of political, institutional and economic influence that can attract grants and funds from national or regional sources, e.g. population</li> <li>5. Evidence of adoption of flood insurance plans.</li> <li>6. Availability of land for relocation development beyond or outside the flood plains.</li> <li>7. Evidence of community capital and community natural assets accessible for reconstruction, e.g. forest resources, granite and quarry deposits.</li> <li>8. Economic status of the 'parent' entity, e.g. the state's or country's GDP (Filion and Sands, 2016; Rose, 2017; Swalheim and Dodman, 2008; Thomas and Mora, 2014)</li> </ol>
3. Community Processes and Resource Utilization $\theta$	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of good governance</li> <li>2. Level of ease of doing business</li> <li>3. Evidence of strong institutions such as judiciary, police, media, and public service</li> <li>4. Evidence of culture of law and order.</li> <li>5. Ranking of internationally recognized bodies like Transparency International, World Bank, UN, CIA, etc. on the above (Begg et al., 2015; Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Rose, 2017; Tompkins et al., 2004)</li> </ol>

265

266 [Table 1 here](#)

267 Figure 3 here

### 268 2.2.2 Resilience modeling

269 The utopian resilience reservoir is the benchmark for evaluating resilience such that actual  
270 resilience  $R_i$  can be defined as the ratio of  $a_i$  to  $a_u$  as indicated in equation 1.

$$271 \quad R_i = \frac{a_i}{a_u} \quad (1)$$

272 Using the insights from Figure 1, we attempt to develop the mathematical model implied in  
273 equation 1 (note  $R$  is dimensionless since both  $a_i$  and  $a_u$  are areas).

$$274 \quad a_i = \frac{1}{2} \{AE' + BF\}AB \quad (2)$$

$$275 \quad a_u = AE \times ED$$

$$276 \quad a_u = H \cdot G \quad (3)$$

$$277 \quad \text{Note: } AE' \equiv h \quad (4)$$

$$278 \quad BF = AE' - F'E' = h - g \cos \theta \quad (5)$$

$$279 \quad AB = F'F = g \sin \theta \quad (6)$$

280 Putting 4, 5, 6 into 2

$$281 \quad \Rightarrow a_i = \frac{1}{2} \{h + (h - g \cos \theta)\}g \sin \theta$$

$$282 \quad a_i = hg \sin \theta - \frac{1}{2} g^2 \sin \theta \cos \theta$$

$$283 \quad a_i = hg \sin \theta - \frac{1}{2} g^2 \sin \theta \pm \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta}$$

284 Recall we define 'Efficiency of resource utilization system' as  $\rho = \sin \theta$

$$285 \quad \therefore a_i = hg\rho - \frac{1}{2} g^2 \rho \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \quad (7)$$

286 Putting 3 and 7 into 1

$$287 \quad R_i = \frac{hg\rho - \frac{1}{2} g^2 \rho \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}{HG} \quad (8)$$

288 Without loss of generality,  $h$  and  $g$  are treated as indices such that

289  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq g \leq 1$

290 Then  $H=G=1$  in equation 8 which implies

291 
$$R_i = hg\rho - \frac{1}{2}g^2\rho\sqrt{(1-\rho^2)} \quad (9)$$

292 Equation 9 is a valid expression for resilience.

293 That is,  $R_i = f(h, g, \rho)$ ,

294 Where  $h$ ,  $g$  and  $h$  are as explained in section 2.2.1 and their values —are decided by experts and/or  
295 stakeholders, varying depending upon the location and scale of application of the model.

### 296 **2.2.3 Some insights from model using some extreme values**

297  
298 This section discusses some example cases of the model (equation 9) output using selected  
299 hypothetical extreme parameters' values to generate further insights into model structure (with  
300 reference to Figure 1). The 'extreme' scenarios analysis is used to demonstrate how each of the  
301 [three](#) dimensions impacts  $R$ .

#### 302 **Case 1: As $\rho \rightarrow 0$ $R \rightarrow 0$**

303 In fact,  $R=0$  when  $\rho=0$ . This may be interpreted as the case when the resource utilization  
304 processes have zero efficiency (see Figure 4) or a collapsed governance system such as when a  
305 flood disaster occurs in a community ravaged by civil war with breakdown of law and order. In  
306 such situations, community resilience is nil as all resources put into recovery will be 'wasted,'  
307 irrespective of the level of coping or infrastructure previously in place.

308

309 Figure 4 here

310

#### 311 **Case 2: As $\rho \rightarrow 1$ $R \rightarrow hg$**

312 This implies that  $\theta=\pi/2$  or  $\sin\theta=1$  which depicts an ideal situation when the communal processes,  
313 FRM resource administration, and utilization systems are highly efficient and near perfect. Under  
314 this scenario, the resources  $g$  and community's coping capacities contribute maximally to  
315 resilience (see Figure 5).

316

317 Figure 5 here

318 **Case 3:  $g \rightarrow 0$      $R_t \rightarrow 0$**  Resilience disappears when resources dry up.

319

320 **Case 4:  $h=1$**  Resilience is determined by resource availability and utilization

321

322 **Case 5: As  $h \rightarrow 0$      $R \rightarrow 0^-$**

323 From Figure 6, resilience approaches zero from negative reservoir quadrant when  $h=0$  (i.e. coping  
324 and absorbing capacities disappear or collapse) and  $\rho < 1$  (efficiencies of resource use,  
325 preparedness, and governance systems fall below 1). The ‘Negative’ resilience reservoir quadrant  
326 characterizes vulnerable communities. Note that vulnerability is sometimes seen as the flip side of  
327 resilience (Folke et al., 2002) or a complementary community-hazard management concept  
328 (Cutter, 2018; Fekete and Montz, 2018; Shah et al., 2018). Hence from figure 6 as the  
329 absorbing/coping capacity  $h$  approaches zero, a community enters vulnerability mode because  
330 more resilience area lies below the positive plane. In other words, equation 9 suggests that a  
331 community without coping or built in absorbing capacities is vulnerable, especially if its  
332 governance structure is poor (i.e.  $\sin\theta \rightarrow 0$ ).

333

334 Figure 6 here

335

### 336 **3.0 Resilience fuzzy inference system (R-FIS): Computer model**

337 While the resulting model of equation 9 provides useful insights, its application however is  
338 premised on the availability of clear information on input factors and adequate data for estimating  
339 model parameters, That is, complete data as described in section 2.2 and Table 1, for estimating  
340 dimensions  $H$ ,  $G$  and  $\theta$ . However, there are issues of data availability and data compatibility  
341 (Parsons et al., 2016) which make it inefficient to do crisp estimation of these parameters.  
342 Therefore, to operationalize the proposed framework, a (FIS) equivalent has been developed.

343 A computer model of the proposed R-FIS (Figure 7) was designed in the Matlab fuzzy logic  
344 development environment. The environment was adopted because it supports easy to use [graphical](#)  
345 [user interface \(GUI\)](#) tools and has multiple MFs for implementing a FIS. A process consisting of  
346 systematic review of the literature, interactions with experts, meetings with community leaders,  
347 interviews of other stakeholders and field observations ([described in more detail in Section 4.1](#))

was-used to gain insights for specifying the R-FIS's design and inference engine's elements (Table 2) as well as determine appropriate IF THEN statements for the rule base (Table 3). With three input linguistic variables, each with three term sets (or possible values), there can be up to 27 explicit input variable combinations, or 27 explicit fuzzy rules combinations. Table 3 is a sample extract from the 27 'IF THEN' statements of the rule base.

Figure 7 here

[Table 2 here](#)

**Table 2 Fuzzy Inference Linguistic Variables Term set and Membership Functions**

Linguistic Variables	Term sets	Membership function
Hazard-Absorbing Capacity H Input 1	Low	PiMfunction
	High	GbellMf
	Very-High	SMfunction
Resource Availability G Input 2	Very-Low	ZMfunction
	Low	GaussianMfunction
	High	SigMfunction
Resource Utilization Processes $\theta$ Input 3	Poor	PiMfunction
	Good	GaussianMfunction
	Excellent	PiMfunction
Resilience $R_i$ Output	Very-Low	Zmfunction
	Low	Gauss2Mfunction
	Moderate	GbellMfunction
	High	PiMfunction
	Very-High	PiMfunction

**Commented [DV02]:** .. The response to (reviewer 2, comment to section 7) has been provided in the section 4.1 of the revised manuscript. We believe that is the most appropriate place to explain our methods in detail, as this section addresses the model itself.

**Table 3: Sample rules of the R-FIS 27 Rule Base\***

Rules premise	Rules Consequence	Weight
If (H is Low) & (G is Very Low) & ( $\theta$ is Poor) THEN	(Resilience is very low)	1
If (H is Low) & (G is Low) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Low)	0.8
If (H is Low) & (G is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	0.8
If (H is High) & (G is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	1
If (H is Very High) & (G is Very Low) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	0.7
If (H is Very High) & (G is High) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	1
If (H is Very High) & (G is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Very High)	1

\*Rules and weights to be determined by experts and/or stakeholders

[-Table 3 here](#)

Figure 8 shows the 3D surface plot resulting from an infinite combination of input factors. The shape of the resilience surface is determined by the rules (Table 3) and the selected membership functions (Table 2) used to express the term sets. This shape can be varied by modifying the membership functions, the term sets, the rules and their weights to reflect new realities and understandings about the resilience systems. This gives flexibility to simulate various combinations of parameters in order to arrive at an optimum design.

Figure 8 here

### 3.2. Model expert scoring framework

Although information and explanations in Table 1, in principle, give a general guide for evaluating and quantifying these dimensional inputs of the resilience model, there is still the need for an easy to use operational template for capturing experts' input into the FIS in relatively standardized fashion. Table 4 is an example of such an input template designed for this study. A typical application procedure is described in section 4.1 with the case study communities.

[Table 4 here](#)

**Table 4 Linguistic Variables Input Template**

Linguistic Variables Dimension	Tick the grey box next to your linguistic rating		Tick the grey box that best reflects your score of your linguistic rating					
Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	High	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very High	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource Availability (G)	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	High	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

	Very High		9		10			
Resource Utilization Processes (4)	Poor		1		2		3	
	Good		4		5		6	
	Very Good		7		8			
	Excellent		9		10			
Location/city								
Date of assessment								
Assessors' name								

\*Table 1 can be attached to this scoring template as a guide

#### 4.0 Model Application: Study location

The following describes the application of the model using three flood prone communities in the United State (U.S.). Following decades of experience in dealing with hazards and disasters, cities and institutions in the U.S. offer considerable information and insights in community resilience systems management (Su, 2016b). Two coastal states of North Carolina and Virginia are home to many flood prone communities of various sizes with diverse socio-economic and technological characteristics that readily lend themselves to a study of resilience. Both states have adopted a number of FRM programs, policies, and strategies for building flood resilience across many rural and urban communities— ([North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program, 2019](#); [Mogollón et al., 2016](#)). Specifically, Norfolk, VA a coastal city in Virginia with a massive naval base, Greenville, NC, a large university town, and Windsor, NC a small riverine rural town were selected (Figure 9). Table 5 summarizes some vital socio- economic features of these communities.

Figure 9 here

Norfolk, located on the Chesapeake Bay and near several rivers, experiences precipitation flooding, when the intensity of rainfall exceeds stormwater drainage capacity, storm flooding from hurricanes and nor'easters, and tidal flooding due to its elevation and coastal location. Greenville, with relatively flat topography is located on the Tar River and is traversed by a number of small streams ([Pitt County Development Commission, 2019](#)). Besides riverine flooding, the relatively

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt



flat topography of its coastal plain location leads to flooding from intense or long-lasting rain events such that the stormwater system is incapable of handling the overland flow. Located on the meandering Cashie River in eastern North Carolina, Windsor has experienced four major floods since 1999, all from tropical storms. Thus, not only are the communities different demographically, but they have rather different flood regimes and histories, with Windsor and Greenville experiencing riverine flooding, though with very different patterns of damage, and Norfolk experiencing a combination of coastal and riverine flooding.

**Table 5 Study Locations: Demographic and Topographic Summary**

	Windsor NC	Greenville NC	Norfolk VA
Location type	Small town	City	Large city
Types flood	River/storm/ rain	River /storm/ Rain	Coastal /river rain/storm
Total Population	3,630	84,554	242,803
%Male	59.3	45.8	51.8
%Female	40.7	54.2	48.2
Median income *	29,063	34,435	44,480
Poverty rate *	27.8	32.5	21
Median Age	38.6	26.0	29.7
% Under 14	12.4	15.9	17.7
% 75 above	8.7	4.3	4.6
US Citizenship *	97.9	96.8	96.6
Non English speaking *	5.83	6.74	10.3
No of Households	1088	36071	85485
% Family household	61.2	46.3	58.7
Average household size	2.29	2.18	2.43
% Household with individuals above 65	34.1	14	20.3
No of Housing units	1193	40564	95018
% of housing units occupied	91.2	88.9	91.0
Mean property Value (\$) *	93800	147100	193400
** Elevation (feet)	25	56	30

\*Source <http://census.gov>

\*\* United States Geological Survey Topographic Maps

[Table 5 here](#)

#### 4.1 Model application: data gathering and results

For the purpose of illustration, input scores were developed using the template shown in Table 4 along with the guidelines in Table 1 and the communities' information, summarized in Table 5. The sample input data were generated based on the outcome of field studies and reflective

422 interactions with experts and stakeholders familiar with the study locations; these stakeholders  
423 include academics, government officials and community leaders. In particular the sample scoring  
424 was based on the insights derived from our understanding of their opinions, as well as demographic  
425 and socio-economic information extracted from various historical and government records,  
426 including the US census [\(Pitt County Development Commission, 2019; North Carolina Floodplain](#)  
427 [Mapping Program, 2019; Mogollón et al., 2016\)](#). For instance, during a 2018 workshop by the  
428 North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association held at Windsor, NC, the authors  
429 had the opportunity to interact with and mine the knowledge of academics, students, city managers,  
430 community leaders, relevant officials from emergency agencies, and curators of landmark centers,  
431 among others. The authors also took tours of Norfolk, VA and Greenville, NC, under the guidance  
432 of academics, GIS and FRM experts from the cities' universities. These interactions and the  
433 associated field studies provided insights for generating the sample scoring: [the studies involved](#)  
434 [interviews and qualitative characterization assessment from site observations of community flood](#)  
435 [control projects and individual property FRM retrofit systems](#). As an example, the perceptions of  
436 resident planning experts and other stakeholders on how some ongoing flood risk management  
437 interventions would have impacted the capacity of the community to cope with [varying flood](#)  
438 [levels was useful in classifying Hazard Absorbing Capacity, as was the extent and type of flood](#)  
439 [control and retrofit projects](#).

440 Table 6 shows the results. Norfolk and Greenville both have relatively high hazard absorbing  
441 capacities, with Norfolk rated as slightly lower owing to problems associated with the disruption  
442 that regularly occurs from overland flooding combined with tidal flooding. Windsor's is lower  
443 than Norfolk and Greenville but still moderate because of how the community has adapted to its  
444 flood risk. Not surprisingly, Norfolk has the highest resource availability and Windsor the lowest  
445 based on their size and relative wealth. At the same time, for the illustrative purposes here, size  
446 and diversity of the communities are seen to be inversely related to resource utilization processes.  
447 The model output, Resilience Index R, indicates that, based on the input values, Greenville's  
448 resilience is slightly greater than Norfolk's while, not surprisingly, Windsor lags rather far behind.

449

450

451

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

**Table 6 Input Scoring and R-FIS Resilience Index Output**

Experts Scoring  Community	Model Input						Model Output
	Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)		Resource Availability (G)		Resource Utilization Processes (θ)		Resilience Index R
	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	
Norfolk, VA	High	7.0	High	8.0	Good	6.0	<b>0.836</b>
Greenville, NC	High	8.0	Moderate	6.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.9</b>
Windsor, NC	Moderate	4.0	Low	2.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.477</b>

[Table 6 here](#)

The input to output mapping implemented in Matlab fuzzy toolbox allows for infinite combinations of input factors either by sliding or inputting the respective input variable axis on the fuzzy rule interface. Figure 10 is a snapshot of the input combinations for Greenville, using the scores from Table 6. The vertical bar (red line on each) can be moved to indicate how resilience changes with a change in one or another (or all) of the three variables. The yellow shapes indicate the rules (see the subset in Table 2) that contribute to each variable's score. All of the output, in both Table 6 and Figure 8, is based on expert insights and understandings and thus provides a dynamic template to measure resilience under different conditions. The proposed framework accommodates the understanding that community resilience should be treated as a multifaceted and multidimensional construct that can only be achieved by focusing on all aspects of a community system. While the fuzzy implementation of the framework can be used both as a resilience index tool and a resilience classification scheme, it is however, like many existing resilience measuring models, still dependent on the subjective opinions of experts and other stakeholders.

Figure 10 here

## 5.0 Discussion and Conclusions

Many previous studies have identified the multiplicity of definitions ~~(Costache, 2017; Fisher, 2015; Oladokun et al., 2017);~~ as one of the major difficulties in transforming resilience

measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational framework (Costache, 2017; Fisher, 2015; Oladokun et al., 2017). This study proposes three criteria for adopting a suitable definitional basis for a framework conceptualization. These criteria which address issues such as the need to achieve model simplicity and accommodate the multidimensional nature of resilience (Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Cutter 2018), were used to recommend the National Academies' definition of resilience (NRC, 2012) as a robust and viable basis for developing a measurement model.

Similarly, many scholars have highlighted dealing with the complexity involved in the integration of indicators of natural and human systems into a community resilience model (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018; Fuchs and Thaler, 2018; Qiang and Lam, 2016) as a key to transforming resilience measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational framework. Specifically To that end, we adopt a three-component system to define the definition-conceptual model transition in a way that reflects key relationships among technical, social, ecological, economic, and political factors that have been reported in literature (Cohen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2013; Rose, 2017) as key to the multidimensional treatment of resilience.

Transforming the conceptual model into a quantitative template requires some sound theoretically basis, a condition noted in Keating et al., (2017) as a prerequisite for developing an acceptable framework. Hence this study recognizes that such a framework must show clear logical relationships among the various indicators and dimensions of resilience and provide logical linkages between their abstraction and empirical requirements. The geometric based mathematical modeling approach we have adopted shows these relationships and provides the linkage between conceptual model and operational requirements. Based on this, mathematical functions were developed to establish logical relationships among key socio-technical parameters and quantities that characterize the community resilience system, thus infusing a theoretical basis into the framework. To enhance the integration of both technical and non-technical communal resiliency factors and reduce model complexity, the conceptual framework was defined using a minimum number of integrated components and interactions. This approach allows the adoption of a soft computing tool for model analysis. While the study developed a template for data collection and illustrated its application, the template still relies on subjective opinions of experts which may be seen as a drawback of the model. Hence further research is suggested to explore the automation

and standardization of the R-FIS input process by integrating with web based socio-economic and ecological rankings or indices of communities. Yet, from computational and operational perspectives, the adoption of a fuzzy inference system as an analytical tool is presented as a viable approach for harnessing the opinions and experiences of experts and residents.

In conclusion, ~~This study~~ this study -which is centered on the need for an acceptable template to measure flood resilience. ~~As such, it~~ examines the challenges, conceptual constraints and construct ramifications that have complicated the development of an operational framework for measuring the resilience of communities prone to flood hazard.

Although the proliferation of conceptual models and frameworks for understanding resilience has indeed posed some challenges for development of an acceptable scenario-based measurement framework, there has been evidence of rich multidisciplinary insights resulting from the continuously evolving collaborative platforms for driving resilience research, policy and discourse. Non-linearity, multiple feedbacks and other sources of complexity constitute major challenges to achieving operational practicality and model tractability while maintaining reasonable validity. There has also been the challenge of compatibility between the natural and human variables due to the well recognized complexity inherent in community resilience. ~~The study recommends and adopts the National Academies' definition of resilience (NRC, 2012) as a robust and viable basis for developing a measurement model. Based on this, mathematical functions were developed to establish logical relationships among key socio-technical parameters and quantities that characterize the community resilience system, thus infusing a theoretical basis into the framework. To enhance the integration of both technical and non-technical communal resiliency factors and reduce model complexity, the conceptual framework was defined using a minimum number of integrated components and interactions. This approach allows the adoption of a soft computing tool for model analysis.~~

In terms of insights, the ~~resulting~~ models from this study provide some explanations into the relationships existing among resilience factors and dimensions. For instance, the importance of good community governance, processes and resource utilization systems becomes obvious in the various scenario analyses. Furthermore, the model was able to document the relative impact of variables that contribute to or detract from resilience. Although only sample values were used, the

model application was able to illustrate the relative impacts that varying levels of institutional strength and resource availability, for example, have on progress toward resilience at a place.

~~While the study developed a template for data collection and illustrated its application, the template still relies on subjective opinions of experts which may be seen as a drawback of the model. Hence further research is suggested to explore the automation and standardization of the R-FIS input process by integrating with web-based socio-economic and ecological rankings or indices of communities. Yet, from computational and operational perspectives, the adoption of a fuzzy inference system as an analytical tool is presented as a viable approach for harnessing the opinions and experiences of experts and residents. Hence, the R-FIS provides a pathway for dealing with challenges of data issues such as missing data, spatiotemporal variations, and the use of subjective information because the critical input variables are locally and/or contextually defined. Thus, the proposed framework offers a viable approach for measuring flood resilience even when there are limitations of data availability and compatibility.~~

## Acknowledgements

*This work is part of a research carried out under the Fulbright African Research Scholar Program Award (2017/18) funded by the United States Government.*

## 6.0 References

- Adnan, M. M., Sarkheyli, A., Zain, A. M., and Haron, H. Fuzzy logic for modeling machining process: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 43 (3), 345-379, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-012-9381-8>, 2015.
- Ashraf, M., and Routray, K. K. Perception and understanding of drought and coping strategies of farming house holds in north-west Balochistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 5, 49-60, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2013.05.002>, 2013.
- Begg, C., Walker, G., and Kuhlicke, C. Localism and flood risk management in England: the creation of new inequalities? *Government and Policy*, 33 (4), 685-702, <https://doi.org/10.1068/c12216>, 2015.
- Brown, E. D., and Williams, B. K. Resilience and Resource Management. *Environmental Management*, 56(6), 1416–1427, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0582-1>, 2015.

564 Cai, H., Lam, N. S., Zou, L., and Qiang, Y. Modeling the Dynamics of Community Resilience to Coastal  
565 Hazards Using a Bayesian Network. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108(5), 1260-  
566 1279, <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1421896>, 2018.

567 Cohen, O., Bolotin, A., Lahad, M., Goldberg, A., and Aharonson-Daniel, L. Increasing sensitivity of results  
568 by using quantile regression analysis for exploring community resilience. *Ecological Indicators*, 66, 497-  
569 502, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.012>, 2016.

570 Cohen, O., Goldberg, A., Lahad, M., and Aharonson-Daniel, L. Building resilience: The relationship  
571 between information provided by municipal authorities during emergency situations and community  
572 resilience. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 121, 119-125,  
573 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.11.008>, 2017.

574 Costache, A. Conceptual delimitations between resilience, vulnerability and adaptive capacity to  
575 extreme events and global change. *Annals of Valahia University of Targoviste. Geographical Series*, 17  
576 (2), 198-205, <https://doi.org/10.1515/avutgs-2017-0018>, 2107.

577 Cutter, S. L. Linkages between Vulnerability and Resilience. In S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, *Vulnerability and*  
578 *Resilience to Natural Hazards* (pp. 257-270). New York: Cambridge Press, 2018

579 Cutter, S. L., Ash, K. D., and Emrich, C. T. Urban–Rural Differences in Disaster Resilience. *Annals of the*  
580 *American Association of Geographers*, 106 (6), 1236-1252,  
581 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2016.1194740>, 2016

582 Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., and Burton, C. A place-based model for understanding community  
583 resilience to natural disasters. *Global environmental change*, 18 (4), 598-606,  
584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013> 2008.

585 Duy, P. N., Chapman, L., Tight, M., Thuong, L. V., Ph.D, and Linh, P. N. Urban Resilience to Floods in  
586 Coastal Cities: Challenges and Opportunities for Ho Chi Minh City and Other Emerging Cities in Southeast  
587 Asia. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 144 (1), 2018.

588 Esteban, M., Tsimopoulou, V., Mikami, T., Yun, N. Y., Suppasri, A., and Shibayama, T. Recent tsunamis  
589 events and preparedness: Development of tsunami awareness in Indonesia, Chile and Japan.  
590 *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 5, 84-97, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.07.002>,  
591 2013.

592 Fekete, A., and Montz, B. Vulnerability: an introduction. In S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, *Vulnerability and*  
593 *resilience to natural hazards*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.

594 Filion, P., and Sands, G. Enhancing Hazard Resilience among Impoverished Urban Communities in Ghana:  
595 The Role of Women as Catalysts for Improvement. In P. Filion, and G. Sands, *In Cities at Risk: Planning for*  
596 *and Recovering from Natural Disasters* (pp. 31-46). Routledge, 2016.

597 Fisher, L. Disaster responses: More than 70 ways to show resilience. *Nature* , 518 (7537), 35-35,  
598 <https://doi.org/10.1038/518035a>, 2015.

599 Folke, C. Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses.  
600 *Global Environmental Change* , 16, 253–267, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002> , 2006.

601 Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, J. T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C. S., and Walker, B. Resilience and  
602 sustainable development: building adaptive capacity in a world of transformations. *AMBIO: A journal of*  
603 *the human environment* , 31 (5), 437-440, <https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447-31.5.437> , 2002

604 Fuchs, S., and Thaler, T. *Vulnerability and Resilience to Natural Hazards*. (S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, Eds.)  
605 New York: Cambridge Press , 2018.

606 Guo, L., He, B., Chang, M., Chang, Q., Li, Q., Zhang, K., et al. A comprehensive flash flood defense system  
607 in China: overview, achievements, and outlook. *Nat Hazards* , 1-14 , [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3221-3)  
608 [018-3221-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3221-3) , 2018.

609 Hammond, M. J., Chen, A. S., Djordjević, S., Butler, D., and Mark, O. Urban flood impact assessment: A  
610 state-of-the-art review. *Urban Water Journal* , 12 (1), 14-29 ,  
611 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1573062X.2013.857421> , 2015.

612 Ibanez, G. E., Buck, C. A., Khatchikian, N., and Norris, F. H. Qualitative Analysis of Coping Strategies  
613 Among Mexican Disaster Survivors. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping* , 17 (1), 69-85 ,  
614 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800310001639628> , 2004.

615 Jha, A. K., Bloch, R., and Lamond, J. *Cities and Flooding: A guide to Integrated Urban Flood Risk*  
616 *Management the 21st Centuries* . Washington : The World bank , 2012.

617 Joseph, R., Proverbs, D., and Lamond, J. Resilient reinstatement: what can we learn from the 2007  
618 flooding in England? In D. Proverbs, and C. A. Brebbia, *Flood Recovery, Innovation and Response IV* , v  
619 184, 175-186, . WIT Press , 2014.

620 Keating, A., Campbell, K., Szoenyi, M., McQuistan, C., Nash, D., and Burer, M. Development and testing  
621 of a community flood resilience measurement tool. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*. 17(1),  
622 77-101, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-77-2017> , 2017.

623 Kron, W. Flood Risk = Hazard • Values • Vulnerability. *Water International* , 30 (1), 58-68,  
624 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060508691837> , 2005.

625 Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., and Seville, E. Developing a Tool to Measure and Compare Organizations' Resilience.  
626 *Natural Hazards Review* , 14 (1), 29-41 , [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)NH.1527-6996.0000075](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000075) , 2013.

627 Lincy, G. R., and John, C. J. A multiple fuzzy inference systems framework for daily stock trading with  
628 application to NASDAQ stock exchange. *Expert Systems with Applications: An International Journal* , 44  
629 (C), 13-21 , <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.08.045> , 2016.



630 Mallakpour, I., and Villarini, G. The changing nature of flooding across the central United States. *Nature*  
631 *Climate Change* , 5, 250–254, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2516>, 2015.

632 Mamdani, E. H., and Assilian, S. An experiment in linguistic synthesis with a fuzzy logic controller.  
633 *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* , 7 (1), 1-13 , [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7373(75)80002-2)  
634 [7373\(75\)80002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7373(75)80002-2), 1975.

635 Mavhura, E., Manyena, S. B., Collins, A. E., and Manatsa, D. Indigenous knowledge, coping strategies and  
636 resilience to floods in Muzarabani, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , 5, 38-48,  
637 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.07.001>, 2013.

638 Mogollón, B., Frimpong, E. A., Hoegh, A. B., and Angermeier, P. L. Recent changes in stream flashiness  
639 and flooding, and effects of flood management in North Carolina and Virginia. *JAWRA Journal of the*  
640 *American Water Resources Association* , 52 (3), 561-577, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12408>,  
641 [2016](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12408).

642

643 Montz, B. Emerging Issues and Challenges: Natural Hazards. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research*  
644 *and Education* , 142, 42-45, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2009.00051.x> , 2009.

645 Multi-dimensional hurricane resilience assessment of electric power systems. *Structural Safety* , 48, 15-  
646 24 , <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2014.01.001> , 2014.

647 Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., and Pfefferbaum, R. L. Community resilience as  
648 a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness. *Community Psychology* , 4 (1-2),  
649 127-50, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>, 2008.

650 North Carolina. (2019). *NC Flood Mapping Program*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from Flood. NC.Gov :  
651 <https://flood.nc.gov/ncflood/>

652

653 NRC. *Disaster resilience - a national imperative*. Washington, DC: National Academies press, 2012.

654 Oladokun, V. O., and Emmanuel, C. G. Urban Market Fire Disasters Management in Nigeria: A Damage  
655 Minimization based Fuzzy Logic Model Approach. *International Journal of Computer Applications* , 106  
656 (17) , 2014.

657 Oladokun, V. O., Proverbs, D. G., and Lammond, J. Measuring flood resilience: A fuzzy logic approach.  
658 *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation* , 35(5), 470-487,  
659 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-12-2016-0029>, 2017.

660 Park, J., Seager, T. P., Rao, P. S., Convertino, M., and Linkov, I. Integrating risk and resilience approaches  
661 to catastrophe management in engineering systems. *Risk Analysis* , 33 (3), 356-367 ,  
662 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01885.x> , 2013.

Commented [DVO3]: Reference inserted to support lines 395-396

Commented [DVO4]: Reference inserted to support lines 395-396

663 Parsons, M., Glavac, S., Hastings, P., Marshall, G., McGregor, J., McNeill, J., Morley, P., Reeve, I., and  
 664 Stayner, R. Top-down assessment of disaster resilience: A conceptual framework using coping and  
 665 adaptive capacities. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 19, 1-11,  
 666 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.07.005>, 2016.  
 667 ~~Pitt~~ County Development Commision. (2019). *Geography and Climate*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from  
 668 ~~Pitt~~ County Development Commision: <http://locateincarolina.com/geography-climate/>  
 669  
 670 Qiang, Y., and Lam, N. S. The impact of Hurricane Katrina on urban growth in Louisiana: An analysis using  
 671 data mining and simulation approaches. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 30  
 672 (9), 1832-52, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13658816.2016.1144886>, 2016.  
 673 Rose, A. Broader Dimensions of Economic Resilience. In *Defining and Measuring Economic Resilience*  
 674 *from a Societal, Environmental and Security Perspective. Integrated Disaster Risk Management*.  
 675 Singapore: Springer, 2017.  
 676 Schelfaut, K., Pannemans, B., van der Craats, I., Krywkow, J., Mysiak, J., and Cools, J. Bringing  
 677 flood resilience into practice: the FREEMAN project. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 14 (7), 825-833,  
 678 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2011.02.009>, 2011.  
 679 Scoones, I. *Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis*. Institute for Development Studies,  
 680 Brighton, UK, <http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/3390>, 1998.  
 681 Shah, A. A., Ye, J., Abid, M., Khan, J., and Amir, S. M. Flood hazards: household vulnerability and  
 682 resilience in disaster-prone districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan. *Natural Hazards*, 93  
 683 (1), 147-165, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3293-0>, 2018.  
 684 Sharifi, A. A critical review of selected tools for assessing community resilience. *Ecological Indicators*,  
 685 69, 629-647, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.05.023>, 2016,  
 686 Su, Y. S. Discourse, Strategy, and Practice of Urban Resilience against Flooding. *Business and*  
 687 *Management Studies*, 2 (1), 73-87, <https://doi.org/10.11114/bms.v2i1.1348>, 2016.  
 688 Su, Y. S. Urban Flood Resilience in New York City, London, Randstad, Tokyo, Shanghai, and Taipei.  
 689 *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 6 (1), 92, <https://doi.org/10.5539/jms.v6n1>, 2016.  
 690 Swalheim, S., and Dodman, D. . *Building resilience: how the urban poor can drive climate adaptation*.  
 691 London: IIED, 2008.  
 692 Szoenyi, M., and Nash, D. *Measuring flood resilience – our approach*. Zurich: Zurich Insurance Company  
 693 Ltd, 2016.

Commented [DV05]: Reference added to support line 405

694 Thomas, J. A., and Mora, K. Community resilience, latent resources and resource scarcity after an  
695 earthquake: Is society really three meals away from anarchy? *Natural hazards* , 74 (2), 477-490,  
696 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-014-1187-3>, 2014.

697 Tompkins, E., and Adger, W. N. Does adaptive management of natural resources enhance resilience to  
698 climate change? *Ecology and society* , 9 (2), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26267677>, 2004.

699 Trogrlić, R. Š., Wright, G. B., Adedoye, A. J., Duncan, M. J., and Mwale, F. Taking stock of community-  
700 based flood risk management in Malawi: different stakeholders, different perspectives. *Environmental*  
701 *Hazards* , 17 (2), <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2017.1381582>, 2018.

702 Wing, O. E., Bates, P. D., Smith, A. M., Sampson, C. C., Johnson, K. A., Fargione, J., and Morefield, P.  
703 Estimates of present and future flood risk in the conterminous United States. *Environmental Research*  
704 *Letters* , 13, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaac65>, 2018.

705 Zadeh, L. A. Fuzzy logic= computing with words. *Fuzzy Systems, IEEE Transactions on* , 4 (2), 103-111,  
706 2016.

707 Zou, L., Lam, N. S., Cai, H., and Qiang, Y. Mining Twitter Data for Improved Understanding of Disaster  
708 Resilience. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* , 1–20,  
709 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1421897> , 2016,

**Table 1 . Resilience dimensions and descriptions of input factors influencing their states**

Resilience Dimensions	Resilience input factors
<b>1.</b> Hazard Absorbing capacity <b>H</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Level of infrastructure in terms of sophistication and adequacy. Effectiveness of FRM measures such as flood and shoreline defenses, forecast and warning system,</li> <li>2. Redundant capacities. Evidence of alternatives in critical utilities, evacuation routes, communication and energy infrastructures, hospitals, police posts, supermarkets.</li> <li>3. Evidence of redundant housing capacity.</li> <li>4. Ecological defenses and buffer. Evidence of complementary use of nature to improve threshold, e.g. using landscaping and topography, natural drainage and canals, vegetation cover, rain/storm water harvesting, permeable pavements, etc.</li> <li>5. Residents coping capacity. Evidence of large portion of populace with previous flood experience, awareness, cohesion and place attachment</li> <li>6. Evidence of stable or growing population in spite of past events.</li> <li>7. Educational and literary level of populace</li> <li>8. Evidence of social and communal clusters to enhance coping through support, meaning, avoidance etc., e.g. church, local sport team, ethnic clusters.</li> <li>9. Presence of critical and strategic institutions of national importance, e.g. university, military base, major ports, etc.</li> <li>10. Evidence of technology driven information dissemination, e.g. social media, sms (Ashraf and Routray, 2013; Cohen et al., 2017; Esteban et al., 2013; Ibanez et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2013; Mavhura et al., 2013)</li> </ol>
<b>2.</b> Resource Availability <b>G</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of budgetary provision for, or commitment to, flood risk management.</li> <li>2. Evidence of thriving economic activities in the community, e.g. size of local GDP</li> <li>3. Evidence of economic strength of residents, e.g. per capita income, income level, housing value, savings, cooperative societies, etc.</li> <li>4. Evidence of political, institutional and economic influence that can attract grants and funds from national or regional sources, e.g. population</li> <li>5. Evidence of adoption of flood insurance plans.</li> <li>6. Availability of land for relocation development beyond or outside the flood plains.</li> <li>7. Evidence of community capital and community natural assets accessible for reconstruction, e.g. forest resources, granite and quarry deposits.</li> <li>8. Economic status of the 'parent' entity, e.g. the state's or country's GDP (Filion and Sands, 2016; Rose, 2017; Swalheim and Dodman, 2008; Thomas and Mora, 2014)</li> </ol>
<b>3.</b> Community Processes and Resource Utilization <b>0</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of good governance</li> <li>2. Level of ease of doing business</li> <li>3. Evidence of strong institutions such as judiciary, police, media, and public service</li> <li>4. Evidence of culture of law and order.</li> <li>5. Ranking of internationally recognized bodies like Transparency International, World Bank, UN, CIA, etc. on the above (Begg et al., 2015; Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Rose, 2017; Tompkins et al., 2004)</li> </ol>

**Table 2.** Fuzzy inference linguistic variables term set and membership functions (Adnan et al., 2015; Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014)

Linguistic Variables	Term sets	Membership function
Hazard Absorbing	Low	PiMfunction
Capacity H	High	GbellMf
<b>Input 1</b>	Very High	SMfunction
Resource	Very Low	ZMfunction
Availability G.	Low	GaussianMfunction
<b>Input 2</b>	High	SigMfunction
Resource Utilization	Poor	PiMfunction
Processes $\theta$ .	Good	GaussianMfunction
<b>Input 3</b>	Excellent	PiMfunction
	Very Low	Zmfunction
Resilience $R_i$	Low	Gauss2Mfunction
<b>Output</b>	Moderate	GbellMfunction
	High	PiMfunction
	Very High	PiMfunction

**Table 3 Sample rules of the R-FIS 27 Rule Base** (Rules and weights to be determined by experts and/or stakeholders)

Rules premise	Rules Consequence	Weight
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is Very Low ) & ( $\theta$ is Poor) THEN	(Resilience is very low)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is Low) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent ) THEN	(Resilience is Low)	0.8
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	0.8
If ( <b>H</b> is High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is Very Low) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	0.7
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent ) THEN	(Resilience is Very High)	1

**Table 4. Linguistic variables input template** (to be used with Table 1 as a scoring guide)

Linguistic Variables Dimension	Tick the grey box next to your linguistic rating		Tick the grey box that best reflects your score of your linguistic rating				
Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)	Low		1		2		3
	Moderate		4		5		6
	High		7		8		
	Very High		9		10		
Resource Availability (G)	Low		1		2		3
	Moderate		4		5		6
	High		7		8		
	Very High		9		10		
Resource Utilization Processes (θ)	Poor		1		2		3
	Good		4		5		6
	Very Good		7		8		
	Excellent		9		10		
Location/city							
Date of assessment							
Assessors' name							


**Table 5 Study locations- demographic and topographic summary** (Source: <http://census.gov> and United States Geological Survey Topographic Maps)

	Windsor NC	Greenville NC	Norfolk VA
Location type	Small town	City	Large city
Types flood	River/storm/ rain	River /storm/ Rain	Coastal /river rain/storm
Total Population*	3,630	84,554	242,803
Male * (%)	59.3	45.8	51.8
Female* (%)	40.7	54.2	48.2
Median income * (\$)	29,063	34,435	44,480
Poverty rate * (%)	27.8	32.5	21
Median Age* (yr)	38.6	26.0	29.7
Under 14* (%)	12.4	15.9	17.7
75 above* (%)	8.7	4.3	4.6
US Citizenship *(%)	97.9	96.8	96.6
Non English speaking *(%)	5.83	6.74	10.3
No of Households*	1,088	36,071	85,485
Family household* (%)	61.2	46.3	58.7
Average household size*	2.29	2.18	2.43
Household with individuals above 65* (%)	34.1	14	20.3
No of Housing units*	1,193	40,564	95,018
housing units occupied* (%)	91.2	88.9	91.0
Mean property Value (\$)*	93,800	147,100	193,400
** Elevation (meter )	7.62	17.07	9.14




**Table 6. Input scoring and R-FIS resilience index output**

<div> <div>Experts Scoring</div> <div>Community</div> </div>	Model Input						Model Output
	Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)		Resource Availability (G)		Resource Utilization Processes (θ)		Resilience Index <b>R</b>
	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	
Norfolk, VA	High	7.0	High	8.0	Good	6.0	<b>0.836</b>
Greenville, NC	High	8.0	Moderate	6.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.9</b>
Windsor, NC	Moderate	4.0	Low	2.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.477</b>




**Figure 1.** Resilience measuring conceptual framework




Schematic representation of the disaster resilience of place (DROP) model.

Figure 2: The Disaster Resilience of Place (DROP) model reproduced from Cutter et al, (2008).  
A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. This model illustrates the interrelationship between resilience and recovery within the hazard–resilience system.




**Figure 3:** Resilience conceptual model. A geometric model used to derive appropriate mathematical relationships of the proposed framework and provide some insights




**Figure 4.** Resilience area = 0 when  $\rho = \sin \Theta = 0$ . A variation of model Figure 3 depicting an extreme case of a community with zero efficiency in resource utilization.






**Figure 6.** Resilience as absorbing capacity approaches zero




**Figure 7.** Resilience fuzzy inference systems






**Figure 8.** Examples of resilience output surface plots.



**Figure 9.** The study area on map showing Greenville, NC; Windsor, NC and Norfolk VA  
Source: Produced in the GIScience Center, East Carolina University



**Figure 10.** Rule setting and output for Greenville

■ Active input membership functions ■ Active output membership function

# Towards Measuring Resilience of Flood Prone Communities: A Conceptual Framework

V.O.Oladokun<sup>1</sup> and B.E.Montz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Industrial and Production Engineering, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, Planning, & Environment, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

## Abstract

Community resilience has become an important policy and research concept for understanding and addressing the challenges associated with the interplay of climate change, urbanization, population growth, land use, sustainability, vulnerability and increased frequency of extreme flooding. Although measuring resilience has been identified as a fundamental step toward its understanding and effective management, there is, however, lack of an operational measurement framework due to the difficulty of systematically integrating socio-economic and techno-ecological factors. The study examines the challenges, constraints and construct ramifications that have complicated the development of an operational framework for measuring resilience of flood prone communities. Among others, the study highlights the issues of proliferation of definitions and conceptual frameworks of resilience, challenges of data availability, data variability and data compatibility. Adopting the National Academies' definition of resilience, a conceptual and mathematical model was developed using the dimensions, quantities and relationships established by the definition. A fuzzy logic equivalent of the model was implemented to generate resilience indices for three flood prone communities in the US. The results indicate that the proposed framework offers a viable approach for measuring community flood resilience even when there is a limitation on data availability and compatibility.

Keywords: Hazard, Disaster, Flood, Resilience, Measurement, Fuzzy, Community

## 1.0 Introduction

Developing resilience of communities has become widely recognized as critical for disaster risk management due to the increased incidents of extreme weather events, such as flooding, which have disrupted economic activities, caused huge losses, displaced people and threatened the sustainability of communities across the world (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter 2018; Mallakpour and Villarini, 2015; Montz, 2009; Oladokun et al., 2017; Su, 2016a; Wing et al., 2018). Major international policy instruments such as the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction's (UNISDR) 2015 Strategic Framework and the 2005 Hyogo Framework have emphasized and adopted resilience principles in disaster risk management (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter et al., 2016). For instance, the interplay of extreme floods, population growth and rapid urbanization has increased flood hazard risks such that conventional flood risk management (FRM) measures of concrete structures, levees, flood walls and other defenses have become inadequate and unsustainable across various communities (Duy et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2018; Trogrlić et al., 2018; Wing et al., 2018). Resilience has gained a lot of attention, from both policy and research perspectives, involving using it to understand and address the challenges of land use, vulnerability and sustainability in the context of flooding (Cohen et al., 2016; Cohen et al., 2017; Folke, 2006; Parsons et al., 2016; Sharifi, 2016). Building community resilience has emerged as particularly relevant in dealing with flooding, which has become the most widespread and destructive of all natural hazards globally (Jha et al., 2012; Mallakpour and Villarini, 2015; Montz, 2009).

Consequently, there has been a shift from relying solely on large-scale flood defense and structural systems towards an approach that emphasizes the concept of community resilience as a strategic component of flood risk management (Hammond et al., 2015; Park et al., 2013). This shift is being reinforced by a consensus that since floods cannot be all together prevented; FRM must focus more on building the resilience of flood prone communities (Joseph et al., 2014; Oladokun et al., 2017; Schelfaut et al., 2011).

There is a consensus that the first and fundamental step toward understanding and operationalizing resilience for flood disaster and hazard management is to have an acceptable resilience measuring template (NRC, 2012). For instance, the ability to understand and objectively evaluate the impact of FRM programs, interventions and practices on community flood resilience is needed for making

political and business cases for proactive FRM investment from both public and private sectors. Cutter (2018) suggested that an acceptable template is a basic foundation for monitoring baselines and progress in building hazard resilience.

Furthermore, a measuring template will be useful as a decision support tool for the efficient deployment of scarce FRM resources and also provides a basis for monitoring resilience changes with respect to resource deployment. For instance, Keating et al. (2017) explained that there is a need for the continued development of theoretically sound, empirically verified, and applicable frameworks and tools that help in understanding key components of resilience in order to better target resilience-enhancing initiatives and evaluate the changes in resilience as a result of different capacities, actions and hazards.

Therefore, the search for an acceptable framework and empirical model for measuring resilience remains relevant and continues to attract attention (Cutter et al., 2016; Zou et al., 2018; Cai et al., 2018; Keating et al., 2017). Some existing measuring approaches, as identified in Cai et al., (2018), include the Baseline Resilience Indicators for Communities (BRIC), the Resilience Inference Measurement (RIM) framework, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA 2010) Coastal Resilience Index, the PEOPLES Resilience Framework, and the Communities Advancing Resilience Toolkit (CART). There is also the ‘5C-4R’ Zurich Alliance framework combining the ‘five capitals’ of the UK’s Department for International Development sustainable livelihoods framework (Scoones, 1998) and the four properties of a resilient system (Szoenyi, et al., 2016): the framework incorporates a technical risk grading standard (TRGS) developed by Zurich risk experts (Keating et al. 2017).

Despite the attention resilience has gained, the concept remains difficult to operationalize in the context of community flood risk management due to, among other factors, the difficulty in measuring resilience (Cutter, 2018; Fisher, 2015). Many experts and authors have noted the difficulty in integrating indicators of the natural and human systems as well as socio-environmental factors into resilience by most of the existing frameworks (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018; Fuchs and Thaler, 2018; Qiang and Lam, 2016). Resilience, as a multifaceted and multidimensional concept, has developed across multiple disciplines and applications such that resilience discourse has attracted multidisciplinary interests from both research and policy perspectives. While the wide spectrum of multidisciplinary and practice interests characterizing resilience discourse has

increased its understanding and generated insights, it has also led to the emergence of multiple variants of its definition as well as the absence of consensus on the conceptual framework for its measurement (Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Cutter 2018). For instance, resilience has been noted to have varied definitions depending on the hazard and disciplinary contexts, with over 70 definitions identified by Fisher (2015).

The multiplicity of definitions has led to proliferation of conceptual models, frameworks and interpretations (Costache, 2017), such that there is difficulty in transforming resilience measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational quantitative template. According to Cutter (2018), the difficulties in harmonizing and operationalizing these definitions have led to the emergence of a wide array of measurement approaches. Meanwhile, a pre-requisite to having an operational model, in the context of resilience measurement, is the adoption or convergence of definition by the resilience research and policy community. Such a definition should meet the following criteria: i) emanates from or receives the formal endorsement of a widely recognized institutional platform of stakeholders, ii) encompasses a wide spectrum of existing resilience concepts, iii) has some degree of simplicity, and iv) enjoys high acceptance of both the research and policy community. In a widely cited National Research Council report (NRC, 2012), the US National Academy of Sciences defines resilience as the ability of a system to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse events (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018). Therefore, this study has adopted this definition as the basis for the proposed framework for measuring the resilience of flood prone communities.

From a systems perspective, community-resilience is a non linear collection of socio-ecological, socio-political, techno-ecological and socio-economic entities, each characterized by dynamic and complex spatiotemporal interactions. Essentially, the concept of resilience involves the interactions of several entities each defined by some social, economic, natural, technical and environmental dimensions (Cai, et al., 2018; Norris et al., 2008). For instance, the community component was succinctly described by Cai et al. (2018) as a coupled natural and human system that manifests various sources of complexity such as nonlinearity, feedback, and uncertainty and dynamic interactions.

Furthermore, coupled with the challenge of complexity and the dynamic nature of community-resilience modeling is the challenge of data and computational analysis. It has been established

that information and data items characterizing community-resilience system are mostly imprecise, incomplete, vague, complex, fuzzy and subjective within the context of flood risk management (Kotze and Meyers, 2016; Oladokun, et al., 2017). These characteristics present some operational and analytical challenges for any complex model based on traditional crisp mathematics and hard computational approaches because of data availability, data variability and data compatibility. The resilience measuring problem with its interplay of definitional ambiguities, multi-dimensionality, and spatiotemporal dynamics invariably results in complex mathematical models. Such models, given the level of incompleteness, vagueness, and subjectivity that characterizes the human and socio-political aspects of resilience, offer little tractability with conventional hard computational tools and are difficult to operationalize. Hence, Oladokun et al. (2017) suggested that a resilience measuring model may be more amenable to a soft computing analytical technique such as fuzzy logic.

## **1.1 Aim and objectives**

Based on the background presented above, this study is aimed at adopting a soft computing approach, a fuzzy logic computational model, for the proposed flood resilience measuring template. In particular, the objectives of the study are 1) the development of a descriptive model that outlines our abstract interpretation of community resilience as a system, using insights from relevant literature, interactions with experts and observations of selected flood prone communities, 2) development of an equivalent mathematical model of the resulting descriptive model using an appropriate tool to generate further insights, and 3) development of an equivalent fuzzy inference system suitable for computational and analytical purposes in the face of the aforementioned data issues. The next section briefly describes some relevant fuzzy logic concepts.

## **1.2 An Overview of Fuzzy Logic**

Fuzzy set theory provides a mathematical tool for modeling uncertain, imprecise, vague and subjective data which represents a huge class of data encountered in most real-life situations (Adnan et al., 2015; Lincy and John, 2016). The fuzzy logic (FL) concept, introduced in 1965 by Lot A. Zadeh, is an extension of the classical set theory of crisp sets. FL, like humans, accommodates grey areas where some questions may not have a clear Yes or No answer or black and white categorization. According to Zadeh (1996), Fuzzy Logic = Computing with Words. FL mimics human reasoning and capability to summarize data and focus on decision-relevant



information in problems involving incomplete, vague, imprecise or subjective information. It is a computational concept that allows for modeling of complex systems using a higher level of abstraction originating from our knowledge and experience. It provides a very powerful tool for dealing quickly and efficiently with imprecision and nonlinearity (Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014). This capability to mine expert knowledge and use limited or fuzzy data makes fuzzy inference systems (FIS) a suitable tool for resilience measurement modeling.

The concept of membership function (MF) is central to FIS. In traditional logic, an element  $x$  is either in or out of crisp set  $A$ ; in other words, its degree of membership of the set is either zero or one. However, in fuzzy logic the element  $x$  can be in a fuzzy set  $B$  ‘partially’ by using a MF  $\mu_B(x)$  which can return any real value between 0 and 1. This returned value is the degree of membership representing the degree to which the element belongs to a fuzzy set. Therefore, in FL, the truth of any statement becomes a matter of degree.

Thus for crisp set  $A$   $\mu_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

On the other hand, for a fuzzy set, the MF may be represented as follows

$$\mu_B(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } b_1 \leq x \leq b_2 \\ g(x) & \text{if } b_2 < x \leq b_3 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Actually, the crisp set is a special case fuzzy set whose MF returns only zero or one. There are many functions that are used as MFs. Some widely used MFs, Generalized bell shaped, Gaussian curves, Polynomial curves, Trapezoidal, Triangular and Sigmoid MFs (Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014; Adnan et al., 2015). The Mamdani FIS approach (Mamdani and Assilian, 1975), adopted for this study, is made up of a fuzzy inference engine characterized by the use of carefully selected MFs and a fuzzy rule base. The rule base is a set of ‘IF THEN’ statements that capture experts’ knowledge of the logic governing the problem. The fuzzy inference system will provide a template for experts and other stakeholders to translate their perceptions of the problem and map their linguistics rating of these variables into a resilience index based on the fuzzy relationships we define.

## 2.0 Resilience Measuring: A Conceptual Framework

## 2.1 Descriptive model

The design objective is to have a conceptual framework and its associated mathematical model with sufficient tractability by minimizing the number of model elements and adopting the barest minimum relationships while maintaining a reasonable level of validity. Therefore, as the theoretical basis for the proposed conceptual model, as mentioned earlier, we are adopting the resilience definition put forward by the US National Academies (NRC 2012). Conceptually this definition implies that a community's resilience is a quantity that reflects capacities such as: 1) the community's coping capacities, in terms of a threshold of hazard it can absorb (Hazard Absorption Capacity  $H$ ), 2) its accessible resources (Resource Availability  $G$ ), and 3) its resource utilization efficiency determined by factors like its preparedness and its governance processes (Resource Utilization Processes  $\theta$ ). These capacities interact to define its ability to prepare for, absorb, recover from, and more successfully adapt to adverse flooding events. We attempt to conceptualize this understanding as shown in Figure 1.

Each of the dimensions in Figure 1 is influenced by a number of technical, social, ecological, economic, and political factors following work that has been reported in the literature which sheds light on these factors and how they influence the dimensions (see Cohen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2013; Rose, 2017). For example, hazard absorbing capacity  $H$  is determined by a number of techno-ecological factors such as adequacy, sophistication and use of infrastructure and technology as well as redundant capacities. It is also determined by socio-ecological and socioeconomic factors that influence both individual and institutional coping capacities. Resource availability is determined by things like community capital, political influence, and economic activities as well as ecological resources accessible to drive the quality and timeliness of recovery. Resource utilization processes are determined by the quality of governance and institutions such as judiciary, police, media, and public service. These processes influence policy formulation and implementation, the ease of doing business and the efficiency of use of resources. A detailed structured and operational rendition of the foregoing is presented in sections 2.2 and 3.3.

Figure 1 here

Furthermore, in the context of FRM, the framework of Figure 1 recognizes that resilience enhances recovery or that recovery is an outcome of resilience whereby when a community, as a coupled system, becomes more resilient its capacity to experience post disaster recovery increases. In other words, recovery, in terms of time taken to attain post disaster recovery and the degree of recovery attained, is influenced by its resilience. Invariably the conceptual framework implicitly suggests that recovery (recovery speed and recovery quality) can surrogate resilience. This is reasonable because post disaster recovery is driven by resilience factors such as preparedness, and coping capacity, among others. This understanding is supported by the DROP disaster resilience model of place (DROP) as illustrated in Cutter et al. (2008), reproduced in Figure 2.

Figure 2 here

## **2.2 Mathematical model**

The next stage is to transform the conceptual framework of Figure 1 into an operational mathematical model. This is accomplished by defining a geometric model of the framework as shown in Figure 3. This model is then used to derive appropriate mathematical relationships for resilience measurement and provide some insights.

### **2.2.1 Notations, definitions and terms**

We adopt the following notations, definitions and terms to explain the components of Figure 3 in the context of flood hazard.

- i. Hazard Absorbing Capacity ( $H$ ): ( $H=h$ :  $0 \leq h \leq 1.0$ ). The resilience of a community depends on the level of the flood hazard the community systems can absorb before totally collapsing or undergoing irreversible disintegration.  $H=1$  is the highest absorbing capacity whereby the community can absorb and survive the damages and disturbance (both structural and non structural) of the most severe category of flooding conceivable. This captures various resilience factors such as coping capacity, redundancy, preparedness, sense of place attachment and other capacities as explained in Table 1.
- ii. Resource Availability ( $G$ ). This is the quantum of resources available to plan and pursue recovery as well as achieve recovery quality level  $Q$  (including adaptive recovery). Note that  $G=g$  ( $0 \leq g \leq 1.0$ ) captures both economic and community capital. It is the measure of resources the community is able to attract as a result of its overall

- economic and political influence, its natural assets, and human capital assets (see Table 1 for further details).
- iii. Resource Utilization Processes ( $\theta$ ): With  $0 \leq \theta \leq \Pi/2$ , we define  $\rho$  ( $\rho = \sin \theta$ ) as system efficiency. This is a resilience component that affects recovery and revolves around factors such as preparedness, community governance, institutional systems and processes. It determines the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of resources to achieve recovery and establish adaptive capacity. In other words, how *well* resources are used is as important as how *much* of a set of resources is used in building resilience. It measures the probity, level of accountability, level of waste, corruption, red-tapism, and bureaucracies within the system. A community with strong institutions such as a functioning judiciary and an efficient civil service, for instance, will tend to return high  $\rho$ . So an ideal or utopian community will have its  $G$  deployed at  $\theta = \Pi/2$ , such that  $\rho = \sin(\theta) = \sin(\Pi/2) = 1$ .
- iv. Recovery Quality Level ( $Q$ ). This represents the outcome of post hazard conditions in terms of restoration quality and socio-ecological functionality, among others.

The following definitions apply with reference to Figure 3

- v.  $a_i$ : Resilience reservoir of a real system  $i$  is defined as the area of trapezium ABFE' determined by the hazard absorbing capacity, at  $H = h$ , of the system, the available quantum of resources ( $G = g$ ), the quality of governance processes and resource utilization systems ( $\sin \theta$ ) and the achievable recovery quality ( $Q = q$ )
- vi.  $a_u$ : The resilience reservoir of an utopian (ideal) system is defined as the area of square ACDE. This occurs at ideal FRM conditions: that is, a community system with adequate resources, perfect governance and processes with zero waste of resources and infinite hazard coping threshold when  $h = AE$  (or at maximum absorbing capacity),  $g = ED$  (maximum resource adequacy) and  $\theta = \Pi/2$  (perfect or utopian system with 100% efficiency or  $\sin \theta = 1.0$ ). The utopian system can achieve a perfect recovery index  $Q = q = 1.0$  or  $Q = AC$

Extensive review of the literature was carried out to provide an informed basis for mapping FRM factors and inputs to the dimensions of resilience. This is summarized as shown in Table

1. Theoretically, the values of the dimensions H, G,  $\theta$  can be estimated from adequate data on these input factors and appropriate functions.

**Table 1 here**

Figure 3 here

### 2.2.2 Resilience modeling

The utopian resilience reservoir is the benchmark for evaluating resilience such that actual resilience  $R_i$  can be defined as the ratio of  $a_i$  to  $a_u$  as indicated in equation 1.

$$R_i = \frac{a_i}{a_u} \quad (1)$$

Using the insights from Figure 1, we attempt to develop the mathematical model implied in equation 1 (note R is dimensionless since both  $a_i$  and  $a_u$  are areas).

$$a_i = \frac{1}{2}\{AE' + BF\}AB \quad (2)$$

$$a_u = AE \times ED$$

$$a_u = H \cdot G \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Note: } AE' \equiv h \quad (4)$$

$$BF = AE' - F'E' = h - g\cos\theta \quad (5)$$

$$AB = F'F = g\sin\theta \quad (6)$$

Putting 4, 5, 6 into 2

$$\Rightarrow a_i = \frac{1}{2}\{h + (h - g\cos\theta)\}g\sin\theta$$

$$a_i = hg\sin\theta - \frac{1}{2}g^2\sin\theta\cos\theta$$

$$a_i = hg\sin\theta - \frac{1}{2}g^2\sin\theta \pm \sqrt{1 - \sin^2\theta}$$

Recall we define 'Efficiency of resource utilization system' as  $\rho = \sin\theta$

$$\therefore a_i = hg\rho - \frac{1}{2}g^2\rho\sqrt{(1 - \rho^2)} \quad (7)$$

Putting 3 and 7 into 1

$$R_i = \frac{hg\rho - \frac{1}{2}g^2\rho\sqrt{(1-\rho^2)}}{HG} - \quad (8)$$

Without loss of generality, h and g are treated as indices such that

$$0 \leq h \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq g \leq 1$$

Then  $H=G=1$  in equation 8 which implies

$$R_i = hg\rho - \frac{1}{2}g^2\rho\sqrt{(1-\rho^2)} \quad (9)$$

Equation 9 is a valid expression for resilience.

That is,  $R_i = f(h, g, \rho)$ ,

Where h, g and h are as explained in section 2.2.1 and their values are decided by experts and/or stakeholders, varying depending upon the location and scale of application of the model.

### 2.2.3 Some insights from model using some extreme values

This section discusses some example cases of the model (equation 9) output using selected hypothetical extreme parameters' values to generate further insights into model structure (with reference to Figure 1). The 'extreme' scenarios analysis is used to demonstrate how each of the three dimensions impacts R.

#### Case 1: As $\rho \rightarrow 0$ $R \rightarrow 0$

In fact,  $R=0$  when  $\rho=0$ . This may be interpreted as the case when the resource utilization processes have zero efficiency (see Figure 4) or a collapsed governance system such as when a flood disaster occurs in a community ravaged by civil war with breakdown of law and order. In such situations, community resilience is nil as all resources put into recovery will be 'wasted,' irrespective of the level of coping or infrastructure previously in place.

Figure 4 here

#### Case 2: As $\rho \rightarrow 1$ $R \rightarrow hg$

This implies that  $\theta=\pi/2$  or  $\sin\theta=1$  which depicts an ideal situation when the communal processes, FRM resource administration, and utilization systems are highly efficient and near perfect. Under

this scenario, the resources  $g$  and community's coping capacities contribute maximally to resilience (see Figure 5).

Figure 5 here

**Case 3:  $g \rightarrow 0$        $R_t \rightarrow 0$**  Resilience disappears when resources dry up.

**Case 4:  $h = 1$**  Resilience is determined by resource availability and utilization

**Case 5: As  $h \rightarrow 0$        $R \rightarrow 0^-$**

From Figure 6, resilience approaches zero from negative reservoir quadrant when  $h=0$  (i.e. coping and absorbing capacities disappear or collapse) and  $\rho < 1$  (efficiencies of resource use, preparedness, and governance systems fall below 1). The 'Negative' resilience reservoir quadrant characterizes vulnerable communities. Note that vulnerability is sometimes seen as the flip side of resilience (Folke et al., 2002) or a complementary community-hazard management concept (Cutter, 2018; Fekete and Montz, 2018; Shah et al., 2018). Hence from figure 6 as the absorbing/coping capacity  $h$  approaches zero, a community enters vulnerability mode because more resilience area lies below the positive plane. In other words, equation 9 suggests that a community without coping or built in absorbing capacities is vulnerable, especially if its governance structure is poor (i.e.  $\sin\theta \rightarrow 0$ ).

Figure 6 here

### **3.0 Resilience fuzzy inference system (R-FIS): Computer model**

While the resulting model of equation 9 provides useful insights, its application however is premised on the availability of clear information on input factors and adequate data for estimating model parameters, That is, complete data as described in section 2.2 and Table 1, for estimating dimensions  $H$ ,  $G$  and  $\theta$ . However, there are issues of data availability and data compatibility (Parsons et al., 2016) which make it inefficient to do crisp estimation of these parameters. Therefore, to operationalize the proposed framework, a (FIS) equivalent has been developed.

A computer model of the proposed R-FIS (Figure 7) was designed in the Matlab fuzzy logic development environment. The environment was adopted because it supports easy to use graphical user interface (GUI) tools and has multiple MFs for implementing a FIS. A process consisting of systematic review of the literature, interactions with experts, meetings with community leaders, interviews of other stakeholders and field observations (described in more detail in Section 4.1) was used to gain insights for specifying the R-FIS's design and inference engine's elements (Table 2) as well as determine appropriate IF THEN statements for the rule base (Table 3). With three input linguistic variables, each with three term sets (or possible values), there can be up to 27 explicit input variable combinations, or 27 explicit fuzzy rules combinations. Table 3 is a sample extract from the 27 'IF THEN' statements of the rule base.

Figure 7 here

Table 2 here

Table 3 here

Figure 8 shows the 3D surface plot resulting from an infinite combination of input factors. The shape of the resilience surface is determined by the rules (Table 3) and the selected membership functions (Table 2) used to express the term sets. This shape can be varied by modifying the membership functions, the term sets, the rules and their weights to reflect new realities and understandings about the resilience systems. This gives flexibility to simulate various combinations of parameters in order to arrive at an optimum design.

Figure 8 here

### **3.2. Model expert scoring framework**



Although information and explanations in Table 1, in principle, give a general guide for evaluating and quantifying these dimensional inputs of the resilience model, there is still the need for an easy to use operational template for capturing experts' input into the FIS in relatively standardized fashion. Table 4 is an example of such an input template designed for this study. A typical application procedure is described in section 4.1 with the case study communities.

**Table 4 here**

#### **4.0 Model Application: Study location**

The following describes the application of the model using three flood prone communities in the United State (U.S.). Following decades of experience in dealing with hazards and disasters, cities and institutions in the U.S. offer considerable information and insights in community resilience systems management (Su, 2016b). Two coastal states of North Carolina and Virginia are home to many flood prone communities of various sizes with diverse socio-economic and technological characteristics that readily lend themselves to a study of resilience. Both states have adopted a number of FRM programs, policies, and strategies for building flood resilience across many rural and urban communities ([North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program, 2019](#); Mogollón et al., 2016). Specifically, Norfolk, VA a coastal city in Virginia with a massive naval base, Greenville, NC, a large university town, and Windsor, NC a small riverine rural town were selected (Figure 9). Table 5 summarizes some vital socio- economic features of these communities.

Figure 9 here

Norfolk, located on the Chesapeake Bay and near several rivers, experiences precipitation flooding, when the intensity of rainfall exceeds stormwater drainage capacity, storm flooding from hurricanes and nor'easters, and tidal flooding due to its elevation and coastal location. Greenville, with relatively flat topography is located on the Tar River and is traversed by a number of small streams ([Pitt County Development Commission, 2019](#)). Besides riverine flooding, the relatively flat topography of its coastal plain location leads to flooding from intense or long-lasting rain events such that the stormwater system is incapable of handling the overland flow. Located on the

meandering Cashie River in eastern North Carolina, Windsor has experienced four major floods since 1999, all from tropical storms. Thus, not only are the communities different demographically, but they have rather different flood regimes and histories, with Windsor and Greenville experiencing riverine flooding, though with very different patterns of damage, and Norfolk experiencing a combination of coastal and riverine flooding.

Table 5 here

#### **4.1 Model application: data gathering and results**

For the purpose of illustration, input scores were developed using the template shown in Table 4 along with the guidelines in Table 1 and the communities' information, summarized in Table 5. The sample input data were generated based on the outcome of field studies and reflective interactions with experts and stakeholders familiar with the study locations; these stakeholders include academics, government officials and community leaders. In particular the sample scoring was based on the insights derived from our understanding of their opinions, as well as demographic and socio-economic information extracted from various historical and government records, including the US census ([Pitt County Development Commission, 2019](#); [North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program, 2019](#); Mogollón et al., 2016). For instance, during a 2018 workshop by the North Carolina Chapter of the American Planning Association held at Windsor, NC, the authors had the opportunity to interact with and mine the knowledge of academics, students, city managers, community leaders, relevant officials from emergency agencies, and curators of landmark centers, among others. The authors also took tours of Norfolk, VA and Greenville, NC, under the guidance of academics, GIS and FRM experts from the cities' universities. These interactions and the associated field studies provided insights for generating the sample scoring; the studies involved interviews and qualitative assessment from site observations of community flood control projects and individual property FRM retrofit systems. As an example, the perceptions of resident planning experts and other stakeholders on how some ongoing flood risk management interventions would have impacted the capacity of the community to cope with varying flood levels was useful in classifying Hazard Absorbing Capacity, as was the extent and type of flood control and retrofit projects.

Table 6 shows the results. Norfolk and Greenville both have relatively high hazard absorbing capacities, with Norfolk rated as slightly lower owing to problems associated with the disruption that regularly occurs from overland flooding combined with tidal flooding. Windsor's is lower than Norfolk and Greenville but still moderate because of how the community has adapted to its flood risk. Not surprisingly, Norfolk has the highest resource availability and Windsor the lowest based on their size and relative wealth. At the same time, for the illustrative purposes here, size and diversity of the communities are seen to be inversely related to resource utilization processes. The model output, Resilience Index R, indicates that, based on the input values, Greenville's resilience is slightly greater than Norfolk's while, not surprisingly, Windsor lags rather far behind.

Table 6 here

The input to output mapping implemented in Matlab fuzzy toolbox allows for infinite combinations of input factors either by sliding or inputting the respective input variable axis on the fuzzy rule interface. Figure 10 is a snapshot of the input combinations for Greenville, using the scores from Table 6. The vertical bar (red line on each) can be moved to indicate how resilience changes with a change in one or another (or all) of the three variables. The yellow shapes indicate the rules (see the subset in Table 2) that contribute to each variable's score. All of the output, in both Table 6 and Figure 8, is based on expert insights and understandings and thus provides a dynamic template to measure resilience under different conditions. The proposed framework accommodates the understanding that community resilience should be treated as a multifaceted and multidimensional construct that can only be achieved by focusing on all aspects of a community system. While the fuzzy implementation of the framework can be used both as a resilience index tool and a resilience classification scheme, it is however, like many existing resilience measuring models, still dependent on the subjective opinions of experts and other stakeholders.

Figure 10 here

## **5.0 Discussion and Conclusions**

Many previous studies have identified the multiplicity of definitions as one of the major difficulties in transforming resilience measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational framework (Costache, 2017; Fisher, 2015; Oladokun et al., 2017). This study proposes three criteria for adopting a suitable definitional basis for a framework conceptualization. These criteria which address issues such as the need to achieve model simplicity and accommodate the multidimensional nature of resilience (Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Cutter 2018) were used to recommend the National Academies' definition of resilience (NRC, 2012) as a robust and viable basis for developing a measurement model.

Similarly, many scholars have highlighted dealing with the complexity involved in the integration of indicators of natural and human systems into a community resilience model (Cai et al., 2018; Cutter, 2018; Fuchs and Thaler, 2018; Qiang and Lam, 2016) as a key to transforming resilience measurement from an abstract concept into an objective operational framework. To that end, we adopt a three-component system in a way that reflects key relationships among technical, social, ecological, economic, and political factors that have been reported in literature (Cohen et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2013; Rose, 2017) as key to the multidimensional treatment of resilience.

Transforming the conceptual model into a quantitative template requires some sound theoretically basis, a condition noted in Keating et al., (2017) as a prerequisite for developing an acceptable framework. Hence this study recognizes that such a framework must show clear logical relationships among the various indicators and dimensions of resilience and provide logical linkages between their abstraction and empirical requirements. The geometric based mathematical modeling approach we have adopted shows these relationships and provides the linkage between conceptual model and operational requirements. Based on this, mathematical functions were developed to establish logical relationships among key socio-technical parameters and quantities that characterize the community resilience system, thus infusing a theoretical basis into the framework. To enhance the integration of both technical and non-technical communal resiliency factors and reduce model complexity, the conceptual framework was defined using a minimum number of integrated components and interactions. This approach allows the adoption of a soft computing tool for model analysis. While the study developed a template for data collection and

illustrated its application, the template still relies on subjective opinions of experts which may be seen as a drawback of the model. Hence further research is suggested to explore the automation and standardization of the R-FIS input process by integrating with web based socio-economic and ecological rankings or indices of communities. Yet, from computational and operational perspectives, the adoption of a fuzzy inference system as an analytical tool is presented as a viable approach for harnessing the opinions and experiences of experts and residents.

In conclusion, this study which is centered on the need for an acceptable template to measure flood resilience examines the challenges, conceptual constraints and construct ramifications that have complicated the development of an operational framework for measuring the resilience of communities prone to flood hazard. Although the proliferation of conceptual models and frameworks for understanding resilience has indeed posed some challenges for development of an acceptable scenario-based measurement framework, there has been evidence of rich multidisciplinary insights resulting from the continuously evolving collaborative platforms for driving resilience research, policy and discourse. Non-linearity, multiple feedbacks and other sources of complexity constitute major challenges to achieving operational practicality and model tractability while maintaining reasonable validity. There has also been the challenge of compatibility between the natural and human variables due to the well recognized complexity inherent in community resilience. In terms of insights, the models from this study provide some explanations into the relationships existing among resilience factors and dimensions. For instance, the importance of good community governance, processes and resource utilization systems becomes obvious in the various scenario analyses. Furthermore, the model was able to document the relative impact of variables that contribute to or detract from resilience. Although only sample values were used, the model application was able to illustrate the relative impacts that varying levels of institutional strength and resource availability, for example, have on progress toward resilience at a place.

Hence, the R-FIS provides a pathway for dealing with challenges of data issues such as missing data, spatiotemporal variations, and the use of subjective information because the critical input variables are locally and/or contextually defined. Thus, the proposed framework offers a viable approach for measuring flood resilience even when there are limitations of data availability and compatibility.

522

## 523 **Acknowledgements**

524 *This work is part of a research carried out under the Fulbright African Research Scholar Program*  
525 *Award (2017/18) funded by the United States Government.*

526

## 527 **6.0 References**

528 Adnan, M. M., Sarkheyli, A., Zain, A. M., and Haron, H. Fuzzy logic for modeling machining process: a  
529 review. *Artificial Intelligence Review* , 43 (3), 345-379, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-012-9381-8>,  
530 2015.

531 Ashraf, M., and Routray, K. K. Perception and understanding of drought and coping strategies of farming  
532 house holds in north-west Balochistan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , 5, 49-60,  
533 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2013.05.002>, 2013.

534 Begg, C., Walker., G., and Kuhlicke, C. Localism and flood risk management in England: the creation of  
535 new inequalities? *Government and Policy* , 33 (4), 685-702, <https://doi.org/10.1068/c12216>, 2015.

536 Brown, E. D., and Williams, B. K. Resilience and Resource Management. *Environmental Management* ,  
537 56(6), 1416–1427, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-015-0582-1>, 2015.

538 Cai, H., Lam, N. S., Zou, L., and Qiang, Y. Modeling the Dynamics of Community Resilience to Coastal  
539 Hazards Using a Bayesian Network. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* , 108(5), 1260-  
540 1279, <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1421896>, 2018.

541 Cohen, O., Bolotin, A., Lahad, M., Goldberg, A., and Aharonson-Daniel, L. Increasing sensitivity of results  
542 by using quantile regression analysis for exploring community resilience. *Ecological Indicators* , 66, 497-  
543 502, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.012> , 2016.

544 Cohen, O., Goldberg, A., Lahad, M., and Aharonson-Daniel, L. Building resilience: The relationship  
545 between information provided by municipal authorities during emergency situations and community  
546 resilience. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* , 121, 119-125,  
547 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.11.008> , 2017.

548 Costache, A. Conceptual delimitations between resilience, vulnerability and adaptive capacity to  
549 extreme events and global change. *Annals of Valahia University of Targoviste. Geographical Series* , 17  
550 (2), 198-205, <https://doi.org/10.1515/avutgs-2017-0018> , 2107.

551 Cutter, S. L. Linkages between Vulnerability and Resilience. In S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, *Vulnerability and*  
552 *Resilience to Natural Hazards* (pp. 257-270). New York: Cambridge Press, 2018

553 Cutter, S. L., Ash, K. D., and Emrich, C. T. Urban–Rural Differences in Disaster Resilience. *Annals of the*  
554 *American Association of Geographers* , 106 (6), 1236-1252,  
555 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2016.1194740>, 2016

556 Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., and Burton, C. A place-based model for understanding community  
557 resilience to natural disasters. *Global environmental change* , 18 (4), 598-606,  
558 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013> 2008.

559 Duy, P. N., Chapman, L., Tight, M., Thuong, L. V., Ph.D, and Linh, P. N. Urban Resilience to Floods in  
560 Coastal Cities: Challenges and Opportunities for Ho Chi Minh City and Other Emerging Cities in Southeast  
561 Asia. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* , 144 (1), 2018.

562 Esteban, M., Tsimopoulou, V., Mikami, T., Yun, N. Y., Suppasri, A., and Shibayama, T. Recent tsunamis  
563 events and preparedness: Development of tsunami awareness in Indonesia, Chile and Japan.  
564 *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , 5, 84-97, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.07.002> ,  
565 2013.

566 Fekete, A., and Montz, B. Vulnerability: an introduction. In S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, *Vulnerability and*  
567 *resilience to natural hazards*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.

568 Filion, P., and Sands, G. Enhancing Hazard Resilience among Impoverished Urban Communities in Ghana:  
569 The Role of Women as Catalysts for Improvement. In P. Filion, and G. Sands, *In Cities at Risk: Planning for*  
570 *and Recovering from Natural Disasters* (pp. 31-46). Routledge , 2016.

571 Fisher, L. Disaster responses: More than 70 ways to show resilience. *Nature* , 518 (7537), 35-35,  
572 <https://doi.org/10.1038/518035a>, 2015.

573 Folke, C. Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses.  
574 *Global Environmental Change* , 16, 253–267, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.04.002> , 2006.

575 Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, J. T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C. S., and Walker, B. Resilience and  
576 sustainable development: building adaptive capacity in a world of transformations. *AMBIO: A journal of*  
577 *the human environment* , 31 (5), 437-440, <https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-7447-31.5.437>, 2002

578 Fuchs, S., and Thaler, T. *Vulnerability and Resilience to Natural Hazards*. (S. Fuchs, and T. Thaler, Eds.)  
579 New York: Cambridge Press , 2018.

580 Guo, L., He, B., Chang, M., Chang, Q., Li, Q., Zhang, K., et al. A comprehensive flash flood defense system  
581 in China: overview, achievements, and outlook. *Nat Hazards* , 1-14 , [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3221-3)  
582 [018-3221-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3221-3), 2018.

583 Hammond, M. J., Chen, A. S., Djordjević, S., Butler, D., and Mark, O. Urban flood impact assessment: A  
584 state-of-the-art review. *Urban Water Journal* , 12 (1), 14-29 ,  
585 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1573062X.2013.857421>, 2015.

586 Ibanez, G. E., Buck, C. A., Khatchikian, N., and Norris, F. H. Qualitative Analysis of Coping Strategies  
587 Among Mexican Disaster Survivors. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping* , 17 (1), 69-85 ,  
588 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800310001639628>, 2004.

589 Jha, A. K., Bloch, R., and Lamond, J. *Cities and Flooding: A guide to Integrated Urban Flood Risk*  
590 *Management the 21st Centuries* . Washington : The World bank , 2012.

591 Joseph, R., Proverbs, D., and Lamond, J. Resilient reinstatement: what can we learn from the 2007  
592 flooding in England? In D. Proverbs, and C. A. Brebbia, *Flood Recovery, Innovation and Response IV* , v  
593 184, 175-186, . WIT Press , 2014.

594 Keating, A., Campbell, K., Szoenyi, M., McQuistan, C., Nash, D., and Burer, M. Development and testing  
595 of a community flood resilience measurement tool. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*. 17(1),  
596 77-101, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-77-2017>, 2017.

597 Kron, W. Flood Risk = Hazard • Values • Vulnerability. *Water International* , 30 (1), 58-68,  
598 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060508691837>, 2005.

599 Lee, A. V., Vargo, J., and Seville, E. Developing a Tool to Measure and Compare Organizations' Resilience.  
600 *Natural Hazards Review* , 14 (1), 29-41 , [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)NH.1527-6996.0000075](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000075), 2013.

601 Lincy, G. R., and John, C. J. A multiple fuzzy inference systems framework for daily stock trading with  
602 application to NASDAQ stock exchange. *Expert Systems with Applications: An International Journal* , 44  
603 (C), 13-21 , <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.08.045>, 2016.

604 Mallakpour, I., and Villarini, G. The changing nature of flooding across the central United States. *Nature*  
605 *Climate Change* , 5, 250–254, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2516>, 2015.

606 Mamdani, E. H., and Assilian, S. An experiment in linguistic synthesis with a fuzzy logic controller.  
607 *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* , 7 (1), 1-13 , [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7373(75)80002-2)  
608 [7373\(75\)80002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7373(75)80002-2), 1975.

609 Mavhura, E., Manyena, S. B., Collins, A. E., and Manatsa, D. Indigenous knowledge, coping strategies and  
610 resilience to floods in Muzarabani, Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , 5, 38-48,  
611 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2013.07.001>, 2013.

612 Mogollón, B., Frimpong, E. A., Hoegh, A. B., and Angermeier, P. L. Recent changes in stream flashiness  
613 and flooding, and effects of flood management in North Carolina and Virginia. *JAWRA Journal of the*  
614 *American Water Resources Association* , 52 (3), 561-577, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12408>,  
615 2016.

616

617 Montz, B. Emerging Issues and Challenges: Natural Hazards. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research*  
618 *and Education* , 142, 42-45, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2009.00051.x> , 2009.



619 Multi-dimensional hurricane resilience assessment of electric power systems. *Structural Safety* , 48, 15-  
620 24 , <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strusafe.2014.01.001> , 2014.

621 Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F.,and Pfefferbaum, R. L. Community resilience as  
622 a metaphor, theory, set of capacities and strategy for disaster readiness. *Community Psychology*, 4 (1-2),  
623 127-50, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>, 2008.

624 North Carolina. (2019). *NC Flood Mapping Program*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from Flood. NC.Gov :  
625 <https://flood.nc.gov/ncflood/>

626

627 NRC. *Disaster resilience - a national imperative*. Washington, DC: National Academies press, 2012.

628 Oladokun, V. O.,and Emmanuel, C. G. Urban Market Fire Disasters Management in Nigeria: A Damage  
629 Minimization based Fuzzy Logic Model Approach. *International Journal of Computer Applications* , 106  
630 (17) , 2014.

631 Oladokun, V. O., Proverbs, D. G.,and Lammond, J. Measuring flood resilience: A fuzzy logic approach.  
632 *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation* , 35(5), 470-487,  
633 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-12-2016-0029>, 2017.

634 Park, J., Seager, T. P., Rao, P. S., Convertino, M.,and Linkov, I. Integrating risk and resilience approaches  
635 to catastrophe management in engineering systems. *Risk Analysis* , 33 (3), 356-367 ,  
636 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01885.x> , 2013.

637 Parsons, M., Glavac, S., Hastings, P., Marshall, G., McGregor, J., McNeill, J., Morley, P., Reeve, I.,and  
638 Stayner, R. Top-down assessment of disaster resilience: Aconceptual framework using coping and  
639 adaptive capacities. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , 19, 1-11 ,  
640 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2016.07.005>, 2016.

641 Pitt County Development Commision. (2019). *Geography and Climate*. Retrieved May 04, 2019, from Pitt  
642 County Development Commision: <http://locateincarolina.com/geography-climate/>

643 Qiang, Y.,and Lam, N. S. The impact of Hurricane Katrina on urban growth in Louisiana: An analysis using  
644 data mining and simulation approaches. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* , 30  
645 (9), 1832–52, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13658816.2016.1144886>, 2016.

646 Rose, A. Broader Dimensions of Economic Resilience. In *Defining and Measuring Economic Resilience*  
647 *from a Societal, Environmental and Security Perspective. Integrated Disaster Risk Management*.  
648 Singapore: Springer , 2017.

649 Schelfaut, K., Pannemans, B., van der Craats, I., Krywkow, J., Mysiak, J.,and Cools, J. Bringing  
650 floodresilienceintopractice:theFREEMAN project. *Environmental Science and Policy* , 14 (7), 825-833 ,  
651 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2011.02.009> , 2011.

652 Scoones, I. *Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis*. Institute for Development Studies,  
653 Brighton, UK, <http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/3390>, 1998.

654 Shah, A. A., Ye, J., Abid, M., Khan, J., and Amir, S. M. Flood hazards: household vulnerability and  
655 resilience in disaster-prone districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, Pakistan. *Natural Hazards* , 93  
656 (1), 147-165, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-018-3293-0>, 2018.

657 Sharifi, A. A critical review of selected tools for assessing community resilience. *Ecological Indicators* ,  
658 69, 629–647, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.05.023> , 2016,

659 Su, Y. S. Discourse, Strategy, and Practice of Urban Resilience against Flooding. *Business and*  
660 *Management Studies* , 2 (1), 73-87, <https://doi.org/10.11114/bms.v2i1.1348> , 2016.

661 Su, Y. S. Urban Flood Resilience in New York City, London, Randstad, Tokyo, Shanghai, and Taipei.  
662 *Journal of Management and Sustainability* , 6 (1), 92, <https://doi.org/10.5539/jms.v6n1>, 2016.

663 Swalheim., S.,and Dodman, D. . *Building resilience: how the urban poor can drive climate adaptation*.  
664 London: IIED, 2008.

665 Szoenyi, M.,and Nash, D. *Measuring flood resilience – our approach*. Zurich: Zurich Insurance Company  
666 Ltd, 2016.

667 Thomas, J. A.,and Mora, K. Community resilience, latent resources and resource scarcity after an  
668 earthquake: Is society really three meals away from anarchy? *Natural hazards* , 74 (2), 477-490,  
669 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-014-1187-3>, 2014.

670 Tompkins, E.,and Adger, W. N. Does adaptive management of natural resources enhance resilience to  
671 climate change? *Ecology and society* , 9 (2), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26267677>, 2004.

672 Trogrlić, R. Š., Wright, G. B., Adeboye, A. J., Duncan, M. J.,and Mwale, F. Taking stock of community-  
673 based flood risk management in Malawi: different stakeholders, different perspectives. *Environmental*  
674 *Hazards* , 17 (2), <https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2017.1381582>, 2018.

675 Wing, O. E., Bates, P. D., Smith, A. M., Sampson, C. C., Johnson, K. A., Fargione, J., and Morefield, P.  
676 Estimates of present and future flood risk in the conterminous United States. *Environmental Research*  
677 *Letters* , 13, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaac65>, 2018.

678 Zadeh, L. A. Fuzzy logic= computing with words. *Fuzzy Systems, IEEE Transactions on* , 4 (2), 103-111,  
679 2016.

680 Zou, L., Lam, N. S., Cai, H.,and Qiang, Y. Mining Twitter Data for Improved Understanding of Disaster  
681 Resilience. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* , 1–20,  
682 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1421897> , 2016,

**Table 1 . Resilience dimensions and descriptions of input factors influencing their states**

Resilience Dimensions	Resilience input factors
<b>1.</b> Hazard Absorbing capacity <b>H</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Level of infrastructure in terms of sophistication and adequacy. Effectiveness of FRM measures such as flood and shoreline defenses, forecast and warning system,</li> <li>2. Redundant capacities. Evidence of alternatives in critical utilities, evacuation routes, communication and energy infrastructures, hospitals, police posts, supermarkets.</li> <li>3. Evidence of redundant housing capacity.</li> <li>4. Ecological defenses and buffer. Evidence of complementary use of nature to improve threshold, e.g. using landscaping and topography, natural drainage and canals, vegetation cover, rain/storm water harvesting, permeable pavements, etc.</li> <li>5. Residents coping capacity. Evidence of large portion of populace with previous flood experience, awareness, cohesion and place attachment</li> <li>6. Evidence of stable or growing population in spite of past events.</li> <li>7. Educational and literary level of populace</li> <li>8. Evidence of social and communal clusters to enhance coping through support, meaning, avoidance etc., e.g. church, local sport team, ethnic clusters.</li> <li>9. Presence of critical and strategic institutions of national importance, e.g. university, military base, major ports, etc.</li> <li>10. Evidence of technology driven information dissemination, e.g. social media, sms (Ashraf and Routray, 2013; Cohen et al., 2017; Esteban et al., 2013; Ibanez et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2013; Mavhura et al., 2013)</li> </ol>
<b>2.</b> Resource Availability <b>G</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of budgetary provision for, or commitment to, flood risk management.</li> <li>2. Evidence of thriving economic activities in the community, e.g. size of local GDP</li> <li>3. Evidence of economic strength of residents, e.g. per capita income, income level, housing value, savings, cooperative societies, etc.</li> <li>4. Evidence of political, institutional and economic influence that can attract grants and funds from national or regional sources, e.g. population</li> <li>5. Evidence of adoption of flood insurance plans.</li> <li>6. Availability of land for relocation development beyond or outside the flood plains.</li> <li>7. Evidence of community capital and community natural assets accessible for reconstruction, e.g. forest resources, granite and quarry deposits.</li> <li>8. Economic status of the 'parent' entity, e.g. the state's or country's GDP (Filion and Sands, 2016; Rose, 2017; Swalheim and Dodman, 2008; Thomas and Mora, 2014)</li> </ol>
<b>3.</b> Community Processes and Resource Utilization <b>0</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evidence of good governance</li> <li>2. Level of ease of doing business</li> <li>3. Evidence of strong institutions such as judiciary, police, media, and public service</li> <li>4. Evidence of culture of law and order.</li> <li>5. Ranking of internationally recognized bodies like Transparency International, World Bank, UN, CIA, etc. on the above (Begg et al., 2015; Brown and Williams, 2015; Cohen et al., 2016; Rose, 2017; Tompkins et al., 2004)</li> </ol>

**Table 2.** Fuzzy inference linguistic variables term set and membership functions (Adnan et al., 2015; Oladokun and Emmanuel, 2014)

Linguistic Variables	Term sets	Membership function
Hazard Absorbing	Low	PiMfunction
Capacity H	High	GbellMf
<b>Input 1</b>	Very High	SMfunction
Resource	Very Low	ZMfunction
Availability G.	Low	GaussianMfunction
<b>Input 2</b>	High	SigMfunction
Resource Utilization	Poor	PiMfunction
Processes $\theta$ .	Good	GaussianMfunction
<b>Input 3</b>	Excellent	PiMfunction
	Very Low	Zmfunction
Resilience $R_i$	Low	Gauss2Mfunction
<b>Output</b>	Moderate	GbellMfunction
	High	PiMfunction
	Very High	PiMfunction

**Table 3 Sample rules of the R-FIS 27 Rule Base** (Rules and weights to be determined by experts and/or stakeholders)

Rules premise	Rules Consequence	Weight
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is Very Low ) & ( $\theta$ is Poor) THEN	(Resilience is very low)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is Low) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent ) THEN	(Resilience is Low)	0.8
If ( <b>H</b> is Low) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	0.8
If ( <b>H</b> is High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent) THEN	(Resilience is Moderate)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is Very Low) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	0.7
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Good) THEN	(Resilience is High)	1
If ( <b>H</b> is Very High) & ( <b>G</b> is High) & ( $\theta$ is Excellent ) THEN	(Resilience is Very High)	1

**Table 4. Linguistic variables input template** (to be used with Table 1 as a scoring guide)

Linguistic Variables Dimension	Tick the grey box next to your linguistic rating		Tick the grey box that best reflects your score of your linguistic rating					
Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	High	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very High	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource Availability (G)	Low	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	High	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very High	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource Utilization Processes (θ)	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Location/city								
Date of assessment								
Assessors' name								


**Table 5 Study locations- demographic and topographic summary** (Source: <http://census.gov> and United States Geological Survey Topographic Maps)

	Windsor NC	Greenville NC	Norfolk VA
Location type	Small town	City	Large city
Types flood	River/storm/ rain	River /storm/ Rain	Coastal /river rain/storm
Total Population*	3,630	84,554	242,803
Male * (%)	59.3	45.8	51.8
Female* (%)	40.7	54.2	48.2
Median income * (\$)	29,063	34,435	44,480
Poverty rate * (%)	27.8	32.5	21
Median Age* (yr)	38.6	26.0	29.7
Under 14* (%)	12.4	15.9	17.7
75 above* (%)	8.7	4.3	4.6
US Citizenship *(%)	97.9	96.8	96.6
Non English speaking *(%)	5.83	6.74	10.3
No of Households*	1,088	36,071	85,485
Family household* (%)	61.2	46.3	58.7
Average household size*	2.29	2.18	2.43
Household with individuals above 65* (%)	34.1	14	20.3
No of Housing units*	1,193	40,564	95,018
housing units occupied* (%)	91.2	88.9	91.0
Mean property Value (\$)*	93,800	147,100	193,400
** Elevation (meter )	7.62	17.07	9.14


**Table 6. Input scoring and R-FIS resilience index output**

<div> <div>Experts Scoring</div> <div>Community</div> </div>	Model Input						Model Output
	Hazard Absorbing Capacity (H)		Resource Availability (G)		Resource Utilization Processes (θ)		Resilience Index <b>R</b>
	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	Linguistic Score	Score	
Norfolk, VA	High	7.0	High	8.0	Good	6.0	<b>0.836</b>
Greenville, NC	High	8.0	Moderate	6.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.9</b>
Windsor, NC	Moderate	4.0	Low	2.0	Very Good	8.0	<b>0.477</b>






**Figure 1.** Resilience measuring conceptual framework




Schematic representation of the disaster resilience of place (DROP) model.

**Figure 2.** The Disaster Resilience of Place (DROP) model reproduced from Cutter et al, (2008). A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. This model illustrates the interrelationship between resilience and recovery within the hazard–resilience system.




**Figure 3:** Resilience conceptual model. A geometric model used to derive appropriate mathematical relationships of the proposed framework and provide some insights




**Figure 4.** Resilience area = 0 when  $\rho = \sin \Theta = 0$ . A variation of model Figure 3 depicting an extreme case of a community with zero efficiency in resource utilization.






**Figure 6.** Resilience as absorbing capacity approaches zero




**Figure 7.** Resilience fuzzy inference systems




**Figure 8.** Examples of resilience output surface plots.





**Figure 9.** The study area on map showing Greenville, NC; Windsor, NC and Norfolk VA  
Source: Produced in the GIScience Center, East Carolina University



**Figure 10.** Rule setting and output for Greenville

■ Active input membership functions ■ Active output membership function