

The background of the slide is a landscape photograph. It shows a valley with a road in the foreground, a small village in the middle ground, and rolling hills in the background under a clear blue sky. The text is overlaid on this image.

THE SYNTHESIS

...let's put it all together

Students: Marie Charrière, Teresa Sprague, Andrei Lițu,
Mohammadali Hadianamri

Advisors: Thomas Glade, Thom Bogaard

CHANGES Fieldwork Activity

Buzău, Romania

15 September 2012

Hypothesis

- H_1 : The responses between the engineers/scientists and stakeholder/decision-maker groups are different.
- H_2 : Our work addresses the issues, problems, and needs expressed by the stakeholders/decision-makers

Methodology

- Method: qualitative observation
 - based on quasi-protocol, via set questions, repeated
- Input from group work
- Input from stakeholders (and team members)

Methodology

- Questions for other groups (engineers/scientists)
 - What did you want to do?
 - What were the problems or issues you encountered?
 - What were the changes or consequences of changes that you identified already?

Methodology

- Questions for the stakeholders/decision-makers:
 - Can you describe the current situation in your area for flooding and landslide hazards?
 - What are the issues of problems identified from these changes?
 - How has the situation changed?
 - Social?
 - Vulnerability?
 - Hazard?

Synthesis Analysis Structure

- Groups:
 - 1) engineers/scientists (group work)
 - 2) practitioners/decision-makers (stakeholders)
- Compare:
 - What changes are identified by the two groups?
 - What are the problems identified?
- Outcome:
 - How do they compare?

What changes are identified by each of the inputs?

Engineers/Scientists	Stakeholders/Decision-Makers
Trends <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changing drought and snow	Vice Mayor and Inspector for Environment Protection <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No big socio economic changes, quite isolated• Cannot predict future, depends on the funding
Hazard <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New structures (change in flow)• Inverse hazard mapping (safety first)	Architect (Head of Urban Planning) and Civil Engineer <ul style="list-style-type: none">• People from uphill to downslope, now flooded• Wood/clay to steel/cement (communism)• From agriculture to residential land use
Consequences <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updates of map• Estimate current elements at risk (based on past flood) Spatial Planning and Emergency Management <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Considering future development of the area	

What are the problems identified from these changes?

Engineers/Scientists

Trends

- Adjusting to time constraint
- Lack of data (back up what is claimed by locals)

Hazard

- Difficult identification (blocked view)
- Insufficient time to prepare

Consequences

- Map is outdated, from the 1970s
- Lack of evidence in the field (prev. flood)

Spatial Planning and Emergency Management

- Some translational issues
- Need for having hard copy (1 sheet) map

Stakeholders/Decision-Makers

Vice Mayor and Inspector for Environment Protection

- **FUNDING**
- Administrative delineation
- Topography prone to flash flooding

Architect (Head of Urban Planning) and Civil Engineer

- **FUNDING**
- Bureaucracy

Conclusion...

- H_1 : The responses between the scientific and stakeholder/decision-maker groups are different.
 - Lack of data & changes not considered for all
 - Funding
- H_2 : The exercise addresses the problems and needs expressed by the stakeholders/decision-makers
 - No: “action please” and again funding

Important points for CHANGES

- Inhabitants are important sources of information (esp. with lack of data)
 - **All groups made qualitative interviews!**
- Expectation of providing solutions (project has started)
 - **Q: “Why do you ask this question, you will give us the answer?”**
- Consider funding and direction from upper administration (where do funds come from?)
 - **Local scale, county scale, national scale?**