



## Minutes Nevada Homeland Security Commission Critical Infrastructure Committee Meeting

### ATTENDANCE

<b>DATE</b>	20 January 2011
<b>TIME</b>	9:00 AM
<b>LOCATION</b>	555 E Washington Ave, Las Vegas NV 401 S Carson St, Carson City NV
<b>METHOD</b>	Conference
<b>RECORDER</b>	Larry Casey

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Legislative &amp; Ex-Officio Members, Staff and Others</b>	<b>Present</b>
Mike McClary, Chairman		Gonzalo Cordova (Ex-Officio)	<b>X</b>
Bob Dorsey, Vice Chairman			
Tod Carlini		Dr. Shelia Conway	<b>X</b>
Sandra Baker			
Bob Dorsey	<b>X</b>		
Steve Asher	<b>X</b>		
Nichole Hart			
Carolyn Levering	<b>X</b>		
Al Gilespeie			
John Horton	<b>X</b>		
Steve Moyer	<b>X</b>		
Phil Roland	<b>X</b>		
Chris Ipsen	<b>X</b>	Larry Casey, Homeland Security Commission Staff	<b>X</b>
Dick Castro	<b>X</b>	Glade Myler, AG representative to the Commission	<b>X</b>

### CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

At 9:00 am Chairman Pro-Tem Carolyn Levering called the meeting to order and asked the new members present to introduce themselves. After the introductions the roll was called and a quorum was established.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Pro-Tem Carolyn Levering entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the October 28<sup>th</sup> 2010 meeting of the Committee on Critical Infrastructure. Mr. Roland made a motion to approve the minutes that was seconded by Mr. Moyer. After a unanimous voice vote the minutes were approved.

### REVIEW OF THE GOALS AND MISSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Chairman Pro-Tem Carolyn Levering, using a handout of the CI Committee's strategic plan and goals as a reference, talked briefly on the current Mission and Goals for the Committee. (NOTE: this plan and the goals were provided as a supporting document for this meeting and are available from staff on request).

The most important goal for this committee is to develop recommendations to the Commission for the prioritization of sectors requiring identification, assessments and resources. This will be done annually by providing the Commission with an assessment of current and future trends related to the CI/KR capability.

We are getting our arms around the format for this report as well as just how CI/KR is categorized. This includes defining the interdependencies between physical CI facilities and cyber security. Last of all we are looking to identify the linkages, impacts and benefits of CI/KR programs and projects related to initiatives.

Mr. Glade Myler reported the review on the BDR designed to rework NRS 239C (Nevada Commission on Homeland Security) has been completed and will be sent out to everyone for their input.

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering noted that the work on this BDR has been going on now for almost a year and includes measures designed to address the concerns from the private sector and that copies were sent out yesterday (19 January). If anyone has any comments they would like to have added to the draft please get them in before 26 January so they can be included in the version that will be presented to the Commission during their 1 February meeting. It is very important we get this right and the only way we can get it right is with everyone's help.

Mr. Chris Ipsen asked if there were any specific items we were looking at with the BDR?

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering mentioned that for this body the privacy and protection of information from the private sector was protected is one of the main concerns. For the public sector the effects of disclosure of documents need to be clarified so that only that material that needs protection receives that protection.

Mr. Ipsen indicated he would look things over and would get with Mr. Myler with any comments and Mr. Myler stated he was looking forward to hearing from him.

#### **DISCUSSION ON THE STATE CRITERIA FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE INPUT FOR THE DHS DATA CALL**

Dr. Shelia Conway started the information briefing on the Nevada state criteria for identification of critical infrastructure and key resources (CIKR) for the annual Data Call process by presenting a list of the DHS recognized sectors of CI/KR. They include ones that Nevada has access to information: Agriculture and Food, Banking and Finance, Commercial Facilities, Communications, Emergency Services, Energy, Government Facilities, Information Technology, Critical Manufacturing, National Monuments/Icons, Postal and Shipping, Healthcare and Public Health, Transportation Systems and Water.

The sectors that Nevada does not have the ability to get information are: Chemical, Dams, Defense Industrial Base and Nuclear Reactors/Materials and Waste. Other agencies are responsibility for submitting information to DHS on these sectors.

The Silver Shield program is voluntary and works closely with the three fusion centers in Nevada.

From the Federal and State perspective the Nevada Critical Infrastructure Protection Plan (NCIPP) uses four categorizations relative of CI/KR to ensure mission success during risk or incident management. The High Priority lists are developed by direct guidance through DHS criteria. The next level is the Sector lists that are developed by the Sector Specific Agencies (SAAs) encompassing all 18 Sectors. The last level has the State lists that are developed at the local level to ensure that assets unique and critical to the state are recognized.

Mr. Gonzolo Cordova indicated that Nevada has three representatives that sit on the national sector coordinating councils. We can rely on these individuals to help us cleaning up the lists that are assembled at the national level.

Dr. Conway provided an example from the Agriculture and Food sector where their input was helpful in correcting problems with the federal lists.

The first state list was developed a number of years ago and are constantly being reviewed and updated. The criterion for what goes on this list does need work and they are looking for guidance on what should or should not be included on the list. Recognize the federal lists are revised annually.

A chart was provided that outlined the number of High Priority sites included in the 2010 Data Call.

**Silver Shield  
High Priority Nomination Data Call 2010**

Asset Count	Clark	Washoe	Rural	Grand Total
Agriculture and Food	5	1		6
Chemical and Hazardous Materials		1		1
Commercial Facilities	180	7	1	188
Dams	1	1		2
Energy	1			1
Government Facilities	25			25
Health Care and Public Health	2	1		3
Information Technology	1			1
Nuclear	1			1
Transportation	3	3	1	7
Water	4	2		6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>241</b>

**Total Percentages    92.5%    6.6%    0.8%**

The 2010 State data call list information was then presented in a list:

**Silver Shield  
State List Data Call 2010**

Asset Count	Clark	Washoe	Rural	Grand Total
Agriculture and Food	6	4	45	55
Banking and Finance	38	13	10	61
Chemical and Hazardous Materials Industry	9	13	13	35
Commercial Facilities	204	29	32	265
Communications	14	7		21
Critical Manufacturing	4	10	51	65
Dams	16	5	23	44
Emergency Services	125	64	209	398
Energy	41	4	3	48
Government Facilities	448	140	136	724
Healthcare and Public Health	47	14	20	81
Information Technology	11	4	2	17
Nuclear	18	4	4	26
Postal and Shipping	34	17	55	106
Transportation	31	6	5	42
Water	186	8	16	210
National Monuments and Icons	1	1		2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,233</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>2,200</b>

**Total Percentages    56.0%    15.6%    28.4%**

Dr. Conway indicated that these lists drive funding and if we do not work these lists to make sure the most current and correct information is included then Nevada stands to loose out on funding opportunities.

DHS has recognized that there are other areas that are critical to states that are outside of those on the federal lists. These are reflected in the State list of CI/KR. As the tables indicate the state list is quite a bit larger than the federal list. The sites on the state list come from input from local authorities such as fire, law enforcement and emergency managers and from other sources such as the Commission that indicated schools needed to be included in the state list. Silver Shield is asking for guidance on what things need to be included on the state lists.

Mr. Myler asked about the Dams on the Truckee River in California that are located above Reno.

Mr. Steve Asher indicated they are on the California CI/KR lists but Nevada coordinates closely to make sure they address those dams as part of a regional approach to CI/KR.

Mr. Cordova indicated that once material is submitted during a data call it becomes Protected Critical Infrastructure Information (PCII) and is classified.

Dr. Conway stressed that without this sort of protection then those organizations that participate voluntarily will not cooperate. It is critical that this protection, which is part of the BDR that was mentioned earlier, is put into law. She also went on to note that not all of the items on the federal list are stand alone sites – some of the commercial sector sites (like the LV Strip) are clustered together. Clustering sites together shows the interdependency between different sites in an area.

Mr. Bob Dorsey went on to brief the funding sources. DHS has specific criteria to determine sites with National level significance.

- a. Funding is related to Urban Area Security Initiative area within the state (*Clark County Only*)
- b. Other funding related to State Homeland Security Grant Program
- c. Funding can be related to specific sites that meet qualifications for advanced site analysis and special funding e.g., Buffer Zone Protection Program

Mr. Dorsey then went on to compare the Federal and State data calls. In the federal data call only nationally recognized CI/KR is used. Sites have nationally determined baseline characteristics related to funding e.g., UASI and fall into a national level of responsibility. The state call recognizes strategic local facilities relative to the collateral support of national level. There is a collaboration with local first responder community and also takes into account both Inter and Intra-state collaboration.

Mr. Dorsey then went on to state that the sustainability for the CI/KR strategic plan is conditional on future funding and made some recommendations to the Committee from Silver Shield:

- Evaluate current CI/KR identification goals and objectives, committee modify as appropriate
- Committee recommend sustainable program strategies
- Based upon strategies Silver Shield will develop an operational plan to function within available funding

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering then opened the meeting up for comments and asked the question that if we were not receiving federal funds how would we drive the process where we determine what it is we protect. We need to also consider the method and the steps we will use to protect the CI/KR. The way we have been working is we have X-amount of dollars go do as much as you can with it rather than spend rather than finding out how much it will cost to protect those areas. CI programs continue to have competitors for limited funds. We need to be strategic with our recommendations.

Mr. Dorsey stated the need for correct input from Silver Shield to the Committee and the Commission. It is important that we understand the process that is used for data collection. We must look at collection and data management.

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering stated that the data collection task will shrink as sites are identified and cataloged but it will never completely go away.

Dr. Conway mentioned that some input will seldom change, for example utilities seldom have changes to their data but a resort will frequently make changes. We need to consider the nature and type of facility as these will drive the frequency of changes and how often the data has to be updated. Right now one of the growing trends we see for what is becoming a problem is the growing cyber threat.

Mr. Steve Moyer indicated that cyber is the number one threat to his organization.

Mr. Cordova indicated that the cyber assets and utilities are an example of interdependency.

Dr. Conway stated that they commonly track trends just to see where new threats are developing.

Mr. Asher noted that they cannot determine is how those trends will impact federal, state and local lists. What might be important to the local authorities may not be important to the federal authorities.

Mr. Chris Ipsen talked briefly on cyber and CI/KR and just how closely the two are interrelated. Dealing with physical security of assets is only part of the whole picture we have to look at the cyber assets.

Mr. Dorsey indicated a concern about the cyber area and stated this should be the #1 area where funds should be focused.

Chairman Pro-Tem asked Mr. Ipsen if he was aware of any specific sources of cyber security funding.

Mr. Ipsen stated that his organization is working with private industry for partners who what to help out. Without federal funds we will have to go to the private sector.

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering indicated that the committee needs to look at how to put cyber into what has been up to now been a physical security issue. She then tasked the committee to look into the sectors and prioritize them. This information would be a part of the discussion at the next meeting.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT AND ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Pro-Tem Levering asked whether or not there was any public comment. Hearing no public comments adjourned the meeting.

Meeting notes completed by Larry Casey, for questions call (702) 486-0797 or email [LFCasey@dhs.nv.gov](mailto:LFCasey@dhs.nv.gov)