



Meeting Minutes Nevada Commission on Homeland Security Cyber Security Committee

Attendance	DATE	May 2, 2017	
	TIME	3:00 PM	
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management State Emergency Operations Center 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, NV 89701	
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference	
	RECORDER	Karen Hall	
Committee Membership	Present	Committee Membership	Present
Lt. Governor Mark Hutchison	X	Joe McDonald	X
Terry Daus	X	Deron McElroy	X
Randall Bolelli	X	William Olsen	X
Caleb Cage	X	Shannon Rahming	X
Dennis Carry	X	Randy Robison	
Bob Dehnhardt	X	Cory Schultz	
Mehmet Gunes	X	Rachel Skidmore	X
Greg Hearn	X	Mike Smith	X
Robin Heck	X	Justin Zahn	
Scott Howitt	X		
Ex-Officio, Legislative, or Other			
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney	X	Karen Hall – Support/DEM	X

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Lieutenant Governor Mark Hutchison, Cyber Security Committee (CSC) Chairman, called the meeting to order. Karen Hall, Division of Emergency Management and Office of Homeland Security (DEM/HS) performed roll call. Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Hutchison opened discussion for public comment. No commentary provided in either venue.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Hutchison called for a motion to approve the minutes from the March 29, 2017, CSC Meeting. Joe McDonald, Switch. LTD., called for a correction to the minutes denoting his absence from the meeting. Motion to approve minutes as corrected was made by Shannon Rahming, State of Nevada Enterprise IT Services, with a second provided by Terry Daus, City of Henderson. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2017 HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (HSGP) PROJECT PROPOSAL REVIEW

Chief Caleb Cage, DEM/HS provided an overview of Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) process leading up to this meeting including reference to the creation of the THIRA, SPR, the importance of the CSC review of cyber related projects, and the CSC's rating on impact to the state and the ability to complete the project. Kelli Anderson and Karen Hall, DEM/HS, provided an overview of the process to be used in this meeting to review and rank prioritize the cyber security-related projects based on identified cyber objectives and individual proposal input. Discussion ensued on the process, with the decision to allow each cyber-related project presenter a limited amount of time to speak about their project based on requests from Terry Daus and Rachel Skidmore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD). Concern was presented by Dr. Mehmet Gunes, University of Nevada Reno, on whether there is any issue in taking part in the ranking regarding Project C. Per Samantha Ladich, Senior Deputy Attorney General, as long as there is no personal benefit from the project itself, ranking will not be an issue. To ensure equity, a roll call was performed by Karen Hall to identify all project presenters attending the meeting. Discussion highlights on each project are as follows:

Project A: Cybersecurity Capabilities

Presenter: Shannon Rahming, State of Nevada EITS

Discussion Highlights:

- William Olsen, NV Energy, inquired on Phase III end points, and Ms. Rahming indicated that log collector end points are scattered throughout the state network.
- Greg Hearn, Las Vegas Valley Water District, inquired on Phase III's 48-month projection and whether that is to complete the project in entirety or just this phase. Ms. Rahming indicated the proposal contains the phased components.
- Joe McDonald inquired if there would need to be matching funds with all of the projects, and Kelli Anderson spoke to the rumor that there may be a match. Ms. Rahming indicated that the State could meet the match if required.
- Terry Daus spoke to the end point capability of this project, and what else would be purchased with this project. Ms. Rahming indicated this would primarily be endpoints and second generation tools.
- Rachel Skidmore inquired what state agencies are involved, and whether the Nevada Threat Analysis Center would be involved with collection data. Ms. Rahming indicated the state network would touch every law enforcement agency that touches the network.
- Dennis Carry, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, inquired if this project identifies human behavior of those on the network, with Ms. Rahming indicating the project would be looking to upgrade to second generation tools to address human components to educate people on this issue.

Project B: Washoe County Sheriff's Office - Cybersecurity

Presenter: Dennis Carry, Washoe County Sheriff's Office

Discussion highlights:

- William Olsen inquired on Page 3 Equipment notations and whether this referred to ongoing maintenance. Per Sergeant Carry, this would be to sustain software; however it could include new software. Mr. Olsen presented concern on the sustainment of licensure with grant funding only. If this was lost, Sergeant Carry indicated that there would be a substantial loss of capability.
- Mike Smith, Clark County, inquired on what kinds of cyber-related incident response have resulted from this project in the past. Sergeant Carry indicated the types of incidents are related to hacking and data breaches of critical infrastructure or government-related occurrences.
- Kelli Anderson spoke to several software systems that are sustained to ensure capability, and often that is the only way to ensure such capability.
- Terry Daus inquired if sustainment and enhancement requests are allowed to be contained within the same request. Per Kelli Anderson, there has to be a delicate balance to ensure projects can sustain and enhance capability as necessary to keep up with ever evolving technology.

Project C: Nevada Cybersecurity Workforce Development

Presenter: Dr. Mehmet Gunes, University of Nevada Reno

Discussion Highlights:

- Deron McElroy, Department of Homeland Security, inquired if this project considered the NIST Cybersecurity Framework during development. Dr. Gunes indicated he did not believe the NIST was factored as a consideration.
- William Olsen inquired on the plan to sustain this program past 2020. Dr. Gunes indicated his belief that this would be under the Cyber Security Center's budget after initial implementation.
- Terry Daus spoke to discrepancies in the proposal in Section 15F in Section III regarding personnel costs, and it was determined that the proposal was correct.
- Scott Howitt, MGM Resorts International, inquired who would benefit from this information, with Dr. Gunes indicating state employees and potentially students. Greg Hearn asked if this would be available to non-state employees. Kelli Anderson indicated that this project would have to have a statewide impact, and that this project does not entail charging for the information within the program. Dennis Carry presented concern in the expense of using HSGP funding to train individuals that will not stay in the state. Sergeant Carry also inquired if there is any plan on virtualizing this program. Kelli Anderson indicated that the equipment purchased for this program cannot bring money into UNR in any way related to the equipment. There cannot be program income resulting from the funds awarded.
- Shannon Rahming inquired if this project correlates to the study done by UNR during the last grant cycle. Per Dr. Gunes, there is not a direct correlation between the two projects.

Project D: Southern Nevada SCADA System Cybersecurity Assessment

Presenter: Matthew Beatty, Las Vegas Valley Water District

Discussion Highlights:

- William Olsen spoke to the vendor chosen for this project and inquired on the high cost of assessment. Mr. Beatty spoke to the specifics on the assessment portion of the project and the retaining of sensors.
- Deron McElroy inquired on whether a comparison that the current vendor can do versus what DHS can provide. Mike Smith also inquired if DHS tools were used first, with Mr. Beatty indicating that the advantage of a commercial vendor lay with the provision of equipment and heightened technology expertise.
- Terry Daus spoke to the equipment request as being part of the assessment, and discussion ensued on whether this was budgeted for at the city level. Currently it is being asked for within the city's budget, but budgets are not yet approved.
- Shannon Rahming inquired on how this is a statewide project. Mr. Beatty indicated that attacks could have a regional affect that could then affect the state.
- Kelli Anderson spoke to the challenges of grant compliance in going out to RFP before projects are approved and compliant with federal and state assurances. There may be a request to redo the RFP in that event. Greg Hearn indicated that this proposal does not include the entire regional system. In the future, Kelli encourages not going out to RFP, but rather RFI or request for quote to avoid supplanting or audit issues.
- Dennis Carry inquired if this is limited to SCADA infrastructure or would it address all of Las Vegas Valley water systems? Matthew Beatty indicated limited to SCADA network. This is for two SCADA system locations, LVVWD and the Alfred Merritt Smith Water Treatment Facility at the lake. William Olsen inquired on whether this project would extend into pumping locations, with Mr. Hearn indicating it does indeed cover a large part of the valley.

Project E: Mesquite Network Security

Presenter: Dirk Marshall, City of Mesquite

Discussion Highlights:

- William Olsen inquired if ongoing maintenance would be covered in regular Mesquite budgeting moving forward, with Mr. Marshall indicating that would be the case.
- Terry Daus inquired if this project is for enhancement that couldn't be done on current firewalls with Mr. Marshall indicating performance on current firewalls is not currently adequate. The software that is requested in the proposal will allow firewall enhancements. Kelli Anderson clarified if firewalls were included in the current budget.
- Dennis Carry presented discussion on other governmental entities using the Mesquite network.

Subsequent discussion resulted in the rank prioritization of the five projects as presented. Projects were ranked by statewide, urban area, and combined statewide/urban area methodology to ensure rankings could be applied despite any unforeseen changes in federal grant guidance or non-funding of a specific funding stream within the HSGP. Randall Bolelli, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Deron McElroy, and Chief Cage refrained from ranking. Members read into record their specific rankings, and Karen Hall compiled the final results as follows:

State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) Only Projects:

- Rank #1 – Project A: Cyber Security Capabilities
- Rank #2 – Project B: Washoe County Sheriff's Office Cybersecurity
- Rank #3 – Project C: Nevada Cybersecurity Workforce Development

Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Only Projects:

- Rank #1 – Project E: Mesquite Network Security
- Rank #2 – Project D: Southern Nevada SCADA System Cybersecurity Assessment

SHSP/UASI Combined Projects:

- Rank #1 – Project A: Cyber Security Capabilities
- Rank #2 – Project B: Washoe County Sheriff's Office Cybersecurity
- Rank #3 – Project E: Mesquite Network Security
- Rank #4 – Project D: Southern Nevada SCADA System Cybersecurity Assessment
- Rank #5 – Project C: Nevada Cybersecurity Workforce Development

Chairman Hutchison opened discussion on the rankings as provided. No further discussion presented. A motion to approve the rankings as presented and to be forwarded to the HSWG was provided by William Olsen, and a second provided by Dennis Carry. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

5. REVIEW OF COMMITTEE REPORT DEVELOPMENT

Chief Cage provided an overview of the updated draft outline for the Cyber Security Report based on recommendations made during the March 29, 2017, CSC meeting. Emphasis was placed on reminding the CSC of the Governor's request to have a draft report completed by the last quarter (fall/winter) of 2017 to address the 2018 HSGP process in addition to the final version of this report complete by April 2018 to impact the next legislative session. Chairman Hutchison inquired on the specific action needed from the CSC today with respect to this overview, with Samantha Ladich, Senior Deputy Attorney General indicating that the CSC could choose to direct Chief Cage to continue working on the draft document with input from the Committee. Discussion was opened for review of the current outline with the following suggested changes and/or discussion highlights:

- 1) **Front Matter**
 - No specific changes requested during the meeting.
- 2) **Executive Summary**
 - No specific changes requested during the meeting.
- 3) **History of the Cyber Security Committee**
 - No specific changes requested during the meeting.
- 4) **Purpose of the Cyber Security Committee**

- **d), i), (2):** An inquiry by Robin Heck, City of Las Vegas, was made on whether the inclusion of FY 2017 and 2017 on this bullet point may limit the CSC in any way to those two years specifically. Chief Cage indicated those two years are specific to the existence of the CSC and the success of grants approved during that time period, and is not meant to be a limiting factor. If necessary, this can be changed;
- **d), i), (3):** A request by Terry Daus, City of Henderson, was made to expand this section to include performance and impacts of the projects;
- **d), i), (4):** A request by Rachel Skidmore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD), was made to include the Urban Area Working Group (UAWG) in addition to the Homeland Security Working Group (HSWG) for recommendation considerations;
- **d), ii):** A request by Joe McDonald, Switch LTD, was made to include a bullet point on cyber education and training for review and verification by the CSC. Chairman Hutchison expanded on this request and indicated that it could fit under 4), d), i) as well. Additional request made by Terry Daus to ensure specific requests of the Governor are included. Chief Cage indicated that his use of the term “landscape” in this section would include specific requests from the Governor, and if necessary, could be presented as bullets under this section; and
- **d), ii), (4):** An inquiry by Deron McElroy, Department of Homeland Security, was made on whether the CSC will recommend legislative standards for the state to follow or adopt and how to determine where an agency may fall in line with such standards, with Chairman Hutchison indicating that within this framework, legislators may benefit from the Committee’s expertise. Concern presented by Mr. McElroy on how to measure performance, with Mr. Daus indicating that once standards are set at a state level, measurement can be gauged by such standards. Chief Cage indicated that should there be a set of policies or procedures that the state agencies could use, that would be the type of recommendation the CSC would address.

5) Conclusion

- No specific changes requested during the meeting.

6) Appendices

- No specific changes requested during the meeting.

Chairman Hutchison opened discussion on whether these adjustments can help Chief Cage moving forward with future drafts. Chief Cage indicated that at this point, and due to the Governor’s timeline for completion of this project, he would like to begin building out each section and baseline language specific to the outline using the input received in today’s meeting and historical information that is already easily accessible. In doing so, the CSC will have a more robust document to review rather than a simple outline. Once completed, Chief Cage would then again bring forth the updated draft document for review by the CSC for further input and/or approval. Chief Cage’s efforts on the project to date were applauded by numerous members of the CSC, and support was given to move forward on the project as discussed.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Hutchison opened discussion for public comment, and welcomed Bob Dehnhardt, State of Nevada Chief Information Security Officer, as the newest member appointed to the CSC. No other commentary provided by either venue.

7. ADJOURN

Chairman Hutchison called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion to adjourn was presented by Chief Cage, and a second was presented by Shannon Rahming. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.