



# Meeting Minutes

## Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee

<b>Attendance</b>	<b>DATE</b>	October 8, 2019			
	<b>TIME</b>	9:00 A.M.			
	<b>LOCATIONS</b>	Legislative Counsel Bureau Legislative Building – Room 1214 401 S. Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701			
		Legislative Counsel Bureau Grant Sawyer Building – Room 4401 555 E. Washington Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89101			
		Great Basin College McMullen Hall – Room 102 1500 College Parkway Elko, NV 89801			
	<b>METHOD</b>	Video-Teleconference			
<b>RECORDER</b>	Meagan Werth-Ranson				
<b>Advisory Committee VotingMember Attendance</b>					
<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
Justin Luna	ABS	Jeremy Hynds	ABS	Chris Tomaino	ABS
John Steinbeck	X	Aaron Kenneston	X	Rachel Skidmore	ABS
Roy Anderson	ABS	Graham Kent	X	Corey Solferino	X
Solome Barton	ABS	Annette Kerr	X	Malinda Southard	X
James Chrisley	X	Mary Ann Laffoon	X	Mike Wilson	ABS
Cassandra Darrough	ABS	Chris Lake	ABS	Stephanie Woodard	ABS
Craig dePolo	X	Bob Leighton	ABS	Tennille Pereira	X
Robert Dehnhardt	X	Carolyn Levering	X	Christina Conti	ABS
Dave Fogerson	X	Connie Morton	X		
Jeanne Freeman	ABS	Todd Moss	ABS		
Mike Heidemann	X	Shaun Rahmeyer	X		
Eric Holt	X	Ryan Miller	X		
David Hunkup	ABS	Misty Robinson	X		
<b>Advisory Committee Non-VotingMember Attendance</b>					
Bunny Bishop	X	Melissa Friend	X	Jill Hemenway	X
Felix Castagnola	X	Kacey KC	ABS	Elizabeth Breeden	X
Bart Chambers	ABS	Rebecca Bodnar	X	Catherine Nielson	X
<b>Legal Representative</b>			<b>Entity</b>		<b>Present</b>
Samantha Ladich – Sr. Deputy Attorney General			Nevada Attorney General's Office		X
<b>Analyst/Support Staff</b>			<b>Entity</b>		<b>Present</b>
Meagan Werth-Ranson			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - North		X
Ryan Gerchman			Nevada Division of Emergency Management - South		X

### 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Deputy Chief John Steinbeck, Clark County Fire Department, called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Meagan Werth-Ranson, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEM/HS). Quorum was established for the meeting.

## **2. Public Comment**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. Administrator Shaun Rahmeyer, Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCDC), introduced Mike Matthews to the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC). Mr. Matthews is the new Protective Security Advisor (PSA) for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region IX and will be based out of Carson City, Nevada. No public comment was provided by the Elko venue, Las Vegas venue, or by phone participants.

## **3. Approval of Minutes**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes from the September 10, 2019, NRAC meeting. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas, thanked DEM/HS staff on the exceptional job done on the comprehensive minutes, and made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mary Ann Laffoon, Northeast Nevada Citizen Corps/Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Program, echoed Ms. Levering's sentiments on the quality of minutes; however, requested that under agenda item #5, last paragraph, fifth sentence should read "Medical Reserve Corps of Southern Nevada is a good example of a program that can be brought to the table." Misty Robinson, Southern Nevada Health District confirmed the correct name. Deputy Chief Steinbeck called for this correction to be made in the minutes. Ms. Levering amended her original motion to include the approval of the minutes with the correction stated. Ms. Laffoon seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

## **4. Quarterly Review of Current Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee Bylaws**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck opened discussion on the current bylaw language presented, and allowed the NRAC membership to review for several minutes. Carolyn Levering inquired on the header of the bylaws document states "These bylaws were adopted by the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee on October 25, 2018, and amended on July 9, 2019"; however, there are no updates on the final page of the document with that July 9, 2019, date. Ms. Levering also noted there is a clerical error on page two; the parenthetical statement that reads "should be Chair/ Vice Chair" needs to be removed. Ms. Levering also spoke to the tenth item titled "Amendments" being left blank. The updates should be under this item. Samantha Ladich, Nevada Office of the Attorney General, stated this appears to be a formatting error and will be brought forth again at the next NRAC meeting. Annette Kerr, Elko County, asked for clarification on the voting membership and if the number was set to 34. Deputy Chief Steinbeck noted that the voting membership was set to 34. Ms. Ladich spoke to 34 being the voting membership that was set the last time the bylaws were reviewed and 34 was reflected to match the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). Ms. Levering made the motion to amend the bylaws to strike the parenthetical citation at the top of page two, move the updates listed under the signature block under the area for amendments, and to add a third update under the amendments section to include the changes that were made at the July 9, 2019 date. Deputy Dave Chief Fogerson, East Lake Fire Protection District, provided a second. Motion passed unanimously.

## **5. Seismic Risk Recommendations**

Dr. Craig dePolo, University of Nevada Reno, spoke to his ongoing work with seismic experts within and outside of the state to develop the seismic risk recommendations presented today. Deputy Chief Steinbeck inquired if the majority of the experts agreed with the recommendation language, and Dr. dePolo indicated that was the case. Focus was applied to strengthen the language as an attempt to address that this is a difficult problem which may, unfortunately, take a significant earthquake event before action is taken. Dr. dePolo presented the following recommendations, and discussion highlights are noted for each recommendation below:

- **URMB Seismic Risk:** “Nevadans are largely unaware of the seismic risk and threat of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings (URMBs). A broad and comprehensive education effort is needed to raise this awareness so Nevadans will understand the seismic risk they face from these types of buildings and to motivate actions to reduce this threat. When an earthquake strikes, these buildings and they fail, people are crushed when upper portions of brick or stone walls fall into the building or onto surrounding sidewalks, streets, and adjacent buildings.”
- **URMB Inventory:** “It is essential to know how many of URMBs exist in Nevada and prioritize these as to which pose the highest risks. Initial assessments based on county assessor data indicated there were over 20,000 URMBs in the state. Field verifications of URMBs underway in Clark County, Carson City, and Reno have lowered these counts to a projected few thousand buildings. Many URMBs have been torn down, damaged during earthquakes, and dozens have been retrofitted. This inventory and prioritization effort needs to be completed, especially in rural Nevada, where it is more challenging to allocate staff and funds.”
  - Carolyn Levering agreed that a statewide inventory assessment of URMBs needs to be completed even with progression of some ongoing larger community assessments. This recommendation could evolve into another project under the Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grant and could account for more rural community involvement. Once assessments are complete, there needs to be a process in prioritizing projects, and assessments should include recommendations on which structures should be torn down or retrofitted in addition to cost estimates. This type of process could be addressed through a phased approach with annual emphasis on specific URMB needs. Communities could band together to address permit fees. As an example, top priority buildings could be addressed the first year, and so on. Ms. Levering also spoke to match being applied to these types of applications. Dr. dePolo agreed with prioritizing what projects get done first, and perhaps that could involve occupancy or community needs.
  - James Chrisley, McCarran International Airport, inquired on the process which Dr. dePolo envisions on how tasking out the collection of data and rolling up that information into a grant application would be executed. Dr. dePolo spoke to the educational effort that would have to take place first and identifying how a community can start to address this issue. Until the inventories are identified, it’s difficult to communicate with the public and building owners the gravity of this issue. Clark County and Reno are examples of areas facing this issue currently, and it will take collective wisdom to address this problem. If the inventory is under control, and solutions are identified for the current state of URMBs, this would be a start. Communities could identify priorities and seek funding sources.
  - Carolyn Levering asked who is conducting URMB field verifications currently, with Dr. dePolo indicating this is being done by both jurisdictional building departments and fire departments. The Nevada Earthquake Safety Council (NESC) and DEM/HS hosted annual workshops in the past to identify URMBs, and then participants in those workshops applied techniques such as drive by visualizations, use of magnetometers to locate internal building reinforcements, etc. Clark County did initially receive a seed grant from NESC and the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV), engineering students were trained as interns and then went into the community to identify URMBs. Dr. dePolo expressed concern about rural Nevada, and indicated that an intern program could be used to address those communities.
  - Carolyn Levering indicated that regardless of the nature of assessment, she was interested in Dr. dePolo’s recommendation as to who the administering agency would be and how that agency could manage a project of this nature, its collective inventory, and managing the conduct of inventories where such inventories have not occurred. Ms. Levering asked if

the University of Nevada Reno (UNR) would be the administrative agent for both fiscal and programmatic needs. Dr. dePolo indicated that could be a possibility, and community involvement would be necessary. Dr. dePolo spoke to the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology study completed with the assistance of a grant received by the NESC, and the likelihood that UNR could perform further studies with existing resources. Universities are good conduits for this type of activity.

- On an unrelated note, Carolyn Levering spoke to a 2009 Hazus Report provided by FEMA on earthquake risk in southern Nevada. Ms. Levering asked if UNR could provide a newer Hazus report to address new thresholds and property values, and perhaps PDM funding could be available for that service. Dr. dePolo indicated there should be a reference to newer Hazus information in the State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan; however he can run this report for Ms. Levering anytime.
- Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, spoke to the hazard of URMBs in Nevada. It may be beneficial to have Janell Woodward, State's Hazard Mitigation Officer, and Mark Shugart, FEMA Integration Team (FIT) leader, discuss processes and compliance within the mitigation program. Ms. Anderson presented concern for the potential to allocate funding to earthquake mitigation without considering the quality of applications put forth. It would be a problem to take away from other mitigation projects related to fire and floods. There has been a struggle to receive quality earthquake project applications, and looking at different funding streams and compliance with such funding streams is crucial. It's not up to the State to fund these projects, but rather FEMA determines what project it's willing to fund. Deputy Chief Steinbeck asked that Dr. dePolo work with DEM/HS to revise grant-related terminology within these recommendations.
- Dr. dePolo indicated that this process is just beginning, and it has yet to be determined what the highest priority projects may be at this point. Momentum in education is crucial, and projects should be merit based. It is possible to pick out individual buildings for potential PDM projects, but there are currently a handful of those potential projects identifiable at this time. Deputy Chief Steinbeck agrees with the current status of the recommendation process; however, it's imperative to get these initial statements and recommendations on the right path for future development.
- Kelli Anderson suggested working with Janell Woodward to come up with a plan and write an application addressing a specific building assessment, and wants to ensure not putting one threat above another in a merit-based application. Perhaps a planning grant could start this process. Deputy Chief Steinbeck indicated that is similar to what Clark County has done, and it could work. Dr. dePolo spoke to the building department moving forward with that project, but in Carson City, the fire department attended the URMB training course but needed to understand the buildings better. Sparks is going through their study currently, and the secondary communities will most likely be next. There is not a lot of staff to address this issue, and it's imperative to find stakeholders that are willing to perform these coordinated processes.
- Carolyn Levering asked Kelli Anderson if DEM/HS could provide technical assistance to the agency that will be crafting a grant application so that the agency is competitive with other pending mitigation applications. To supplement existing resources, a grant could add the resources needed to conduct assessments, creation of the priority process, and working with communities on their priorities. Public education is difficult, and engagement is difficult until the hazard hits a community. In the meantime, the case can be made on how to address this issue through a multi-year or multi-grant solution. If the state could assist with a planning or project grant, that would be a great step.

- Dr. Graham Kent presented concern over the lack of engagement the Nevada Legislature and the Governor have exhibited in supporting this issue. Until that happens, Dr. Kent feels that nothing the NRAC can do in a monthly setting will significantly move the needle forward. Nevada is no less likely to have the types of events that have occurred in California. Deputy Chief Steinbeck acknowledged Dr. Kent's concern, but also emphasized to not diminish the importance of this information to the stakeholders involved in the NRAC process. Eliminating threats is the highest level of accomplishment, and taking even smaller steps is valuable. Dr. dePolo indicated it will be a deadly earthquake that will motivate change. Knowing where URMBs are and being ready with concrete recommendations to address mitigation will be most effective right now.
- Carolyn Levering inquired when the NRAC will be looking at PDM grants. Kelli Anderson indicated most likely that will occur in December's meeting prior to the January 2020 deadline. There is not a lot of time to review the applications due to the complex types of projects. Janell Woodward, and Bunny Bishop, State Floodplain Manager, have performed ongoing outreach to northern and southern Nevada. Northern Nevada had many participants; however southern Nevada did not. These projects are difficult and complicated, requiring dedicated staff to manage. Ms. Levering wanted to know what role the NRAC would have in prioritizing projects, with Ms. Anderson indicating these types of projects are primarily reviewed by subject matter experts (SME), and it may not be the NRAC's purview to look at them at that depth. The NRAC was provided a list of quality applications previously reviewed by SME's in the past, and Ms. Anderson anticipates the same type of process this year; however, if the NRAC wants to review the applications, it will take an extraordinary amount of time. Ms. Levering spoke to the difficulty in deciding the priority of mitigation, and hopes that with technical assistance from DEM/HS, there could be a quality application on behalf of mitigating earthquakes throughout the state. Misty Robinson inquired if there is an executive summary that goes along with the applications that could be reviewed by the NRAC in lieu of reviewing the actual application. Ms. Anderson indicated that had not been done in the past, but could be if warranted. Janell Woodward spoke to a quality application provided for a seismic retrofit for the Reno City Hall. Though that project was subsequently not chosen to move forward by FEMA, corrections to missing cost benefit analysis information may allow that project to be accepted this year.. The technical review given by FEMA will allow resubmittal this year. FEMA has locked down the grant application process with its own priorities, and states need to comply with those priority categories. It may not be a heavy lift for the NRAC to review applications based on the priorities of FEMA. Dr. dePolo spoke to the Nevada Hazard Mitigation Planning Committee's (NHMPC) creation of a worksheet allowing checks to application evaluation which has been successful in the past. It's a lot of work to review, but there is a process. Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson likes the idea of a project application summary presented to the broad range of expertise on the NRAC which can be shared with stakeholders to assist other communities. Dr. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County, thanked Dr. dePolo and Dr. Kent for this information, and in his opinion, it's possible that earthquakes are a top threat due to the cascading effects in the aftermath of a significant earthquake. There have been several runs at identifying URMB, and that process is not close to being finished. Dr. Kenneston is happy with the forward progress that is being made but agrees more needs to be done.
- **Nevada URMB Website:** "Reducing seismic risk of URMBs in Nevada is a daunting task, but it must be done. If we do nothing, these buildings will eventually be eliminated by attrition and future earthquakes, but this will likely be at a cost of thousands of Nevadan lives and serious injuries, and

much property and economic loss to building owners, tenants, passersby, and communities. Information, strategies, incentives, and motivating movements of action are needed for a task this large. A web site should be supported and created by the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee that informs Nevadans about URMBs and lays out approaches and techniques to retrofitting URMBs. Nevada can draw many lessons learned from other western states and Canada on how to best manage and reduce the risks of URMBs.”

- Deputy Chief Steinbeck presented concern on the NRAC hosting this website as it might be difficult with the advisory structure of the NRAC. The creation and need of the website is important, and would be supported within the recommendations. Dr. dePolo indicated this should be a project, perhaps using National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) funding. Dr. dePolo indicated he could take out the NRAC reference from this recommendation, and perhaps the Nevada Seismological Lab could host the site. The word needs to be pushed out to citizens and contractors for training needs.
- Carolyn Levering recommended the consideration of having the website linked with the Nevada Seismological Lab and to potentially apply planning-related grant resources to that site instead. For a more creative solution, Ms. Levering indicated the Nevada Emergency Preparedness Association (NEPA) may be a potential avenue to address this issue as they are currently in the process of launching a new redesigned webpage in January 2020. This may be a potential host site opportunity to gain web visibility for this issue.
- Dr. Graham Kent indicated the Nevada Seismological Lab would be happy to host this site or work with NEPA to provide links as necessary as a way to get ample visibility. Deputy Chief Steinbeck indicated his agency could participate as well in pushing information from his agency’s site.
- **Headwinds to Reducing Risk:** “There are very difficult challenges associated with reducing the risk of URMBs, including costs, business disruption, tenant disruption, and the challenge of making weak buildings more earthquake-resistant or replacing them. In many cases, retrofit costs are comparable to tearing buildings down and rebuilding modern structures. Replacement is one of the most effective strategies for eliminating these risks. One strategy to reduce the financial burdens to owners is to share costs with those that benefit from reducing risks. Costs can be shared through federal pre-disaster grants, state and local programs that contribute funds, community block grants, community bonds, waving permit fees, private donations, and other ways. Sharing costs can become a strong motivation to act for owners.” Dr. dePolo referenced the photos provided in the presentation and the pushback received in Portland from the placards placed on the buildings indicating the URMB danger. The pushback came from various groups concerned with the placards being placed in low-income housing areas.
- **Addressing the Risk:** “Addressing the risk of thousands of Nevada URMBs in a timely manner will take actions to get momentum going, and to measure and make significant progress. One strategy to do this would be to create a decade of URMB reduction in Nevada once information and support mechanisms are in place. The Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee recommends that the state of Nevada allocate funds on the order of \$5M for each year of this decade. This will help support retrofitting and replacing the highest risk buildings in the state. The Committee also strongly encourages political leadership and support at all levels of government and the private sector.”
  - Carolyn Levering spoke in context with the current application period for the PDM grant funding, and indicated there could be one or more projects submitted. The public education piece could be placed under the Planning category which would eliminate a cost-benefit analysis as a challenge to applying for PDM funding. Dr. dePolo agrees with getting more retrofitting projects underway.

- Deputy Chief Dave Fogerson suggested striking the \$5M reference, and instead saying the NRAC recommends that the state of Nevada allocate funds for each year of this decade. Dr. dePolo sees this as seed money to address the highest priority buildings by using multiple funding sources. Deputy Chief Steinbeck echoed Deputy Chief Fogerson's concerns.
- Annette Kerr noted that this agenda item was also to discuss and vote on the development of earthquake-specific recommendations to be included in the annual assessment and report to be completed in December 2019. Regardless of the fact that this is a difficult challenge associated with this process, it should still be included in the assessment and report. These need to be a priority as it shows that progress is being made.
- Deputy Chief Steinbeck agrees that progress is being made on this topic. When this process first started, the statements were very broad. Those statements have been broken down into more direct statements but there is still work that needs to be done. As a Committee, remedies need to be looked at as the expansion of the original statement.
- Dr. dePolo noted corrections to the final statement to be as follows; removing the NRAC as the website hosting agency from the third paragraph and replacing with a generic Nevada, the recommendation of the dollar amount, Kelli Anderson will review the funding streams. Dr. dePolo suggested taking these corrections and placing this statement in the annual report.

Carolyn Levering made a motion to accept this statement regarding seismic risk and threat in Nevada to be included into the yearend report, making the changes in the final paragraph where it states ideally Nevada would make appropriate and adequate funds, striking the order of five million and continuing on with available each year of this decade. Misty Robinson provided a second. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Graham Kent, University of Nevada Reno, provided a presentation on the ShakeAlert and AlertWildfire Systems. Dr. Kent asked how these different hazard monitoring systems can help get earthquake early warning systems to Nevada. Ultimately, the goal is to have an early earthquake warning system that is resilient and available to the public. Nevada gets one chance every decade. Dr. Kent noted that tonight, one out of every ten Californians will have their power shut off. That is about four million people. The Power sources that are hoped to be resilient enough are also linked to about 300 fire cameras. The point is that we get hammered by traffic to the website, or Mother Nature, this hits the entire network and not just certain areas. This is a big experiment that has never happened before. This will play hand in hand to make a better system. Dr. Kent spoke to the earthquake early warning system basics. In an earthquake, a rupturing fault sends out different types of waves. The fast moving P-Wave is first to arrive, but damage is caused by the slower S- Wave and later-arriving surface waves. Sensors detect the P-wave and immediately transmit data to an earthquake alert center where the location and size of the quake are determined and updated as more data becomes available. A message from the alert center is immediately transmitted to your computer or mobile phone, which calculates the expected intensity and arrival time of shaking at your location. The importance here is to make sure equipment works on the worst days, not just the best days.

Dr. Kent spoke to the slide provided in the handout that focused on the year 1954 and the importance of four minutes. When there is an earthquake, if there is connectivity, everyone will jump onto a social media outlet and unintentionally crash the system. It is important for these sites to remain functional as there is a great chance for a second, larger earthquake to follow. Dr. Kent noted that if an expert on the internet was questioned as to how the internet works, they would be unable to tell you how it actually works. Dr. Kent quoted Paul Barford, a professor of computer science at the University of Wisconsin, "Surprisingly, there isn't even a good map of the Internet's highways and byways to clearly show locations that, if taken out, would

severely hamper the system.” Dr. Kent spoke to a picture that was provided in the handouts that shows the latency issues after the Ridgecrest earthquake. The map shows the magnitude of the shaking on the towers. Earthquake early warning systems are being added to fire cameras in eastern California. The earthquake early warning system is set to roll out on October 17, 2019, in California. There is a flow over process concerning the border. The Chief of California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) is working with Chief Justin Luna, DEM/HS, to see if Nevada would be willing to embrace this flow over idea. This could benefit the Reno, Carson, Sparks, Tahoe, and Minden geographical areas in regards to the early earthquake warning system.

Dr. Kent noted the path forward should include the following: microwave-based multi-hazard networks that have more constituents, lower overall costs to build/run due to sharing of infrastructure, constant testing, and the ability to pay for themselves in a year or so. Cellular technologies are still unproven during catastrophic events and have a poor performance in terms of bandwidth and blocks of downtime; this is a good backup but bad as core technology. Opportunity for Earthquake Early Warning/Alert Systems is evolving away from a “single hazard” approach, while providing an emergency-grade level of resiliency for the generational event.

## **6. Briefing on Statewide Cybersecurity Initiatives**

Administrator Shaun Rahmeyer, Office of Cyber Defense Coordination (OCDC) spoke to the statewide cybersecurity initiatives. Nationally and recently in the State of Nevada, October is the month in which cybersecurity professionals take the opportunity to extend additional education and awareness to cyber support. During the Cybersecurity Awareness Month, efforts go into educating individuals on strong password tips, online privacy, and numerous areas to become more knowledgeable. There is great information online through the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Administrator Rahmeyer spoke to Senate Bill (SB) 69. SB 69 was approved, mandating the OCDC develop Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) specifically for political subdivisions in the State of Nevada to utilize their own organizational Cyber Security Incident Response Plans. This document needs to be filed annually in their office. The NAC process is lengthy and the goal is to have the NACs approved by the end of the current calendar year. This will allow for the political subdivisions all of the year 2020 to file their plans with the state. There has been a huge educational outreach across all of Nevada.

Administrator Rahmeyer spoke to the current landscape that was identified by speaking to professionals around the state. It was discovered there is not a lot of structure around the state. Some programs are more structured than others and some programs don’t really exist. There is an opportunity to help discuss policies and program maturity, provide technical support, and manage resources. It was very clear there are not a lot of resources available. OCDC started looking at ways to address this with the understanding there are not a lot of financial resources available and to look at existing capabilities. The OCDC conducted a high level review of the correlation between the DHS definition of response and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) definition of response. The aspects of life and property can be found in both definitions with understanding there was some commonality between these two definitions. Administrator Rahmeyer also pointed out three common areas the NIMS incident response with the cybersecurity response. Those areas were recovery, protection, and response. The OCDC wanted to ensure it was not overstepping the direction that FEMA guidelines outlined. FEMA’s cybersecurity architecture is focused on technical capabilities. This was a problem. This is an area that needs to be further addressed. A more strategic approach would garner more attention. The OCDC also looked at FEMA’s Strategic Plan to ensure nothing was being left out. FEMA quantifies that cybersecurity is an emerging threat. Administrator Rahmeyer disagrees as the financial loss alone is expected to be around six trillion dollars by the year 2021. This is the largest transfer of wealth in human history. This six trillion dollar loss includes; direct theft, fraud and hardware loss, cost of insurance, and loss of intellectual property. Goals of the FEMA Strategic Plan include; decommission of legacy systems, increase cybersecurity resources and metrics, and value of cybersecurity investments. The State can assist



with preparedness, communication and information management, resource management, and command and management during a cybersecurity event.

The NRAC has an opportunity to help champion a more emergency management/NIMS response during a cyber incident response, help protect cyber assets, and continue promoting education, training, and mentorship. This module could be easily replicated and used further. Misty Robinson inquired how the OCDC was planning for any events, like the internet of things, and how that is managed with cybersecurity efforts. Administrator Rahmeyer stated this would be a long answer and would be happy to provide a summary at the next meeting. Smart devices deployed in homes and smart cities are a great concern. There is a lot of focus of providing services through these devices but not a lot of thought on security of devices. From a state perspective, there is a lot of room for discussion on statutes or policies to manage security on devices.

## **7. Discussion on the Development of Strategic Capacities to be Maintained for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck referred the NRAC to the documents that were provided in the packets and provided several minutes for review. Carolyn Levering noted the September 16, 2019, Nevada Commission on Homeland Security Finance Committee (Finance Committee) Meeting Minutes were included in the member packets for review. Ms. Levering provided background information as to why this was on the Finance Committee agenda. Last year, when the strategic capacities were drafted by the NRAC, the Finance Committee had not had any opportunity to provide input into that process. A way to correct this was to bring these strategic capacities to the Finance Committee to allow input into the discussion. The items that were recommended for addition or striking are not accepted changes at this time. When the opening of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) application process and the strategic capacities were identified, it caused challenges for a couple of the long standing programs that had been funded in the past. Ms. Levering made the motion for changes to address this problem at the Finance Committee meeting. The changes included; adding the Las Vegas Hazardous Materials Team as a program under the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosive (CBRNE) strategic capacity. Deputy Chief Steinbeck pointed out that numerous funding streams are being used here. The Urban Area has a tremendous amount of investment into the Las Vegas Hazardous Material Team as well as the Henderson Hazardous Material Team. This has been a challenge in creating a strategy to delineate between Urban Area prioritization and having a statewide strategy. There is a regional funding source, and one is a statewide funding source. Ms. Levering suggested re tasking the Las Vegas Hazardous Materials Team as an Urban Area Hazardous Materials program and apply to the Urban Area. The other addition under the Planning strategic capacity was to add the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS). This was unintentionally left off when the document was created in FFY19. This is the perfect opportunity to ensure it is included moving forward but to also note this is also an Urban Area specialty. There was a great deal of discussion at the Finance Committee meeting regarding cybersecurity.

DHS guidance requires some element of a cyber-project. It is unsure if with this guidance there needs to be an actual cyber strategic capacity. There have been challenges with funding being held in cyber-projects and not being able to be expended. It was recommended that cybersecurity be grouped into competitive projects as to proceed with a little more caution. The recommendation was to strike cybersecurity as a strategic capacity but to maintain it as a project under the competitive consideration. Administrator Rahmeyer asked for clarification, based on a scoring perspective, if there would be a measureable impact if the future grant proposals do not fall within the strategic capacity. Deputy Chief Steinbeck stated that the idea of strategic capacities was to maintain prioritizes funding; this does not mean that the prioritized programs included receive a blank check. The programs still have to show what is being maintained, a multi-year strategy for maintaining those capacities, and if there are addition capacities that are put forward for funding. The new projects are removed from the maintaining portion of the process. The removal from the prioritized list of

funding does hurt the abilities in some ways to be funded but it does not hurt the ability in the competitive process. One of the concerns of the Finance Committee was what is being sustained and what is being developed. Carolyn Levering spoke to the fact that a long term cyber project that requires maintenance has not been established as of yet. Right now there is no long term cybersecurity program in the state where we can state an "X, Y, and Z" as to what has been accomplished and here is the "A, B, and C" of what to do moving forward. The cybersecurity projects that have been submitted will always be new projects. Deputy Chief Steinbeck agreed that it is important to look at threats and not sacrificing other programs that have large investments already. Administrator Rahmeyer spoke to the understanding historically, and there is a lot of opportunity for how investments are managed for effective long term purposes. Cybersecurity is valuable and it is important to not be tied into a new process. The understanding is that cybersecurity is always changing so it is difficult to have a project stay the same year after year. There is an exception to this in regards to training and education. There is never enough access to training. Administrator Rahmeyer noted there are 300,000 open positions in cybersecurity fields. It is extremely difficult to find qualified staff.

Kelli Anderson offered information from the grant perspective side. One of the ideas of putting together the maintaining capacities was to ensure that DEM/HS was maintaining existing projects and investments in Nevada's projects. There were a few anomalies, due to human error, that were not included in the process at the beginning. There is some confusion between the Urban Area priorities and the state priorities. One thing to point out is that cybersecurity has been a challenge. If cybersecurity is not left in the maintaining strategic capacities, DEM/HS will still need to fund one cyber project based on grant guidance if deemed. The money that was used from deobligated funds for cybersecurity training went off without any issues. The first round of training is now starting for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 HSGP grant. DEM/HS funded the Secretary of State feed for voting elections monitoring for two years running. Robert Dehnhardt, Nevada Department of Administration, asked for clarification in removing cybersecurity and possibly penalizing future ongoing projects moving forward. Deputy Chief Steinbeck stated this will be reviewed on a yearly basis and there is potential for it to be added at a future date again to the maintaining strategic capacities. This does not take away the work, the vetting or presentations that go along with this process. Mr. Dehnhardt expressed concerns at how the removal of cybersecurity will be viewed and what message that sends as a state. Deputy Chief Steinbeck noted that sheltering is a big gap for the state; there are a lot of things that need to be addressed. Maintaining strategic capacities shows what the state priorities are moving forward.

Annette Kerr reminded the NRAC that we are going from five core capabilities to nine strategic capacities. The pot of money gets smaller and smaller for competitive projects as a result of the completion as well as maintaining capacities. There is a reduction in funding for the state as a whole. Ms. Kerr expressed concern as to what point do the maintained projects find ways to become self-funded. The more maintaining capacities that are added the less opportunity there is for competitive projects. Deputy Chief Steinbeck mentioned this is the balance that is trying to be achieved. There are a lot of Committees that help in this process and it is important to have different input. When the strategic capacities to be maintained are established, it is understood that the grant funding can go away and is not guaranteed. Lieutenant Corey Solferino, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, noted concern in reviewing these strategic capacities from year to year. This is undermining the Commission's authority to prioritize. Deputy Chief Steinbeck noted that the goal is to make sure these are current and vetted. The goal is to not change these from year to year but it isn't meant to be set in stone either. It is agreed that there will be adjustments from year to year. It is unknown what the effects are going to be in the future.

Carolyn Levering spoke to this being an action agenda item. Looking at the current raw document, there is a desire to retain the cybersecurity strategic capacity and adding a training component. It was also recommended to add broader language to the Las Vegas Hazardous Materials Team to specify that it is an Urban Area Hazardous Materials Program. This will ensure that Henderson is not limited to one team or jurisdiction. The final recommendation is to also include the MMRS under the Planning strategic capacity.

Deputy Chief Steinbeck agrees in the importance of identifying what are also Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) projects. Kelli Anderson agreed with the idea of labeling the projects as this will clear up any confusion. Administrator Rahmeyer appreciates the inclusion of cybersecurity as a strategic capacity. Mary Ann Laffoon expressed her support for including training under Cybersecurity as it is proven to work.

Carolyn Levering motioned for the NRAC to accept the Finance Committee recommendations with the caveat to broaden the reference of the Las Vegas Hazardous Materials team to the Urban Area Hazardous Material Program in addition to restoring cybersecurity as a strategic capacity, but to identify additional training programs, development, and enhancements. The MMRS capability should remain the same. Mr. Dehnhardt seconded the motion. No discussion was presented in any venue pertaining to this motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

## **8. Public Comment**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck opened the discussion for public comment in all venues. Annette Kerr asked for clarification on whether the NRAC's meeting length was under time restraints. Deputy Chief Steinbeck indicated that there are no specific time restraints other than a respect for the membership's time and trying to make the meeting shorter when possible. Future meeting business may take the full 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. time allotment. The NRAC has absorbed the function of numerous committee functions, as evidenced by today's discussions on earthquake and URM concerns. It is not possible to gauge how long discussion will be on certain agenda topics. Discussions may have to be moved to future meetings to ensure that the proper amount of preparation and discussion time can be applied to important topics. Ms. Kerr reiterated her concern speaking to a previous presenter being under time constraint, and wants to ensure that this body doesn't prohibit those important discussions. Steve Rosenbaum, Nye County Local Emergency Planning Committee, spoke to the discussion today pertaining to strategic capacities, and events that are happening in California with respect to interoperable communications and the decertifying of ham radios throughout state facilities as one of their communication elements. This is an alarming development, and there are concerns with the fragility of digital-only communications. Interagency and memorandum of understanding agreements could be compromised during disasters. Mr. Rosenbaum requested the assistance of DEM/HS in contacting Cal OES to get a better understanding of what is taking place in that state. Deputy Chief Steinbeck thanked Mr. Rosenbaum and supports this concern. This issue will be agenda at a future meeting with the opportunity of those involved to bring forth discussion on the topic. Carolyn Levering spoke to concerns on not seeing the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) agenda topic included in this meeting. Ms. Levering emphasized the importance of bring this agenda item back as soon as possible.

## **9. Adjourn**

Deputy Chief Steinbeck called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion to adjourn was presented by Eric Holt, Lincoln County, and a second was provided by Connie Morton, Southern Nevada Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.