



Minutes Nevada Homeland Security Commission Finance Committee Meeting

ATTENDANCE

DATE	2 June 2011
TIME	3:00 PM
LOCATION	500 S Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas NV 2478 Fairview Drive, Carson City NV
METHOD	Videoconference
RECORDER	Larry Casey

Committee Members	Present	Staff & Others in Attendance	Present
Doug Gillespie, Chairman	X	James Wright, Director DEM	X
Dr. Dale Carrison	X	Irene Navis, Clark County Emergency Manager	X
Bill Welch			
Stacey Giomi	X		
Doug Stevens	X		
Carolyn Levering	X		
Kyle Devine	X		
Angela Krutsinger	X		
Stan Smith	X		
Adam Sandler	X	Larry Casey, Homeland Security Commission Staff	X
Terry Bohl	X	Samantha Ladich, AG representative to the Commission	X

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

At 9:03 AM Chairman Gillespie called the meeting to order. A roll call was held and it was determined that there was a quorum present. There was a short delay due to communications problems. The meeting continued as soon as these problems were resolved.

COMMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Gillespie stated that today's meeting is scheduled to run all day but the goal will be to be done by lunch. We have spent a considerable amount of time at the last meeting discussing the merits of each of these projects. The merits should be clear to us all now all we have to do is make the decisions on money allocation.

Chairman Gillespie went on to thank all of the individuals at the state and local level that participated in the development of these projects. It is a vary tedious process and he stated he appreciated everyone going back and taking a hard look at their budgets. We are close very close to the authorized amount of funding.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Gillespie asked if there were any comments on the minutes of the 18 May 2011 meeting. The Chairman hearing no comments he entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Carolyn Levering made a motion to approve and Dr. Dale Carrison seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously and the minutes were approved.

COMMENTS BY THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY (SAA) AND URBAN AREA ADMINISTRATOR (UAA) -

Mr. James Wright expressed his thanks for the hard work on these projects. Early on we did not receive any guidance from DHS and we asked everyone to come together and work hard to develop the projects you see today.

He went on to offer a suggestion for projects "A" (Nevada Threat Analysis Center), "H" (State Silver Shield) and "W" (Nevada Dispatch interconnect) that would make more funds available for this years allocation. When we get to those items on the agenda we will go into more detail. We also have some of the highlights of the guidance from DHS that we will make available to you. He then introduced Ms. Kelli Anderson who provided information from DHS.

Ms Anderson gave a brief presentation prepared by DHS on the FFY2011 programs. She stated that there have been significant reductions (37.4% in SHSP, 20.4% in UASI). There has been a slight increase in the Management and Administration allowance (4% to 5.8%). She went on to explain the three DHS/FEMA priorities for FFY 11:

1. Advancing "Whole Community" Security and Emergency Management for the HSGP (SHSP and UASI). The objectives to Implement "Whole Community" have the Grantees developing and maintaining Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments (THIRAs) in order to be eligible for funds. Included in this priority are "Planning Organization", which includes the typing of equipment and training.
2. Building Prevention and Protection Capabilities for the HSGP includes objectives to implement the building of local counterterrorism capabilities.
3. Maturation and Enhancement of State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers. For the HSGP this means setting objectives to implement the maturation and enhancement of State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers and insure the building of analytic capabilities.

For the FFY 2011 grant cycle there are three major and two minor changes to the program:

- **Major Change:** Identified three overarching priorities for SHSP and UASI to strongly encourage grantees to consider when developing their FY 2011 HSGP plans to include: Advancing "Whole Community" Security and Emergency Management, Building Prevention and Protection Capabilities, and Maturation and Enhancement of State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers
- **Major change:** Performance measures were developed for each of the priorities, which are requirements for a State Hazard Mitigation Plan that includes a THIRA; resource typing of procurements; tracking of the percentage of personnel trained in NSI; and percentage of fusion centers with documented plans, policies and SOP's for business processes
- **Major Change:** Required the SAA, if the SAA intends to retain any UASI funds, to prepare an Investment that demonstrates how the retained funds will be used to directly support the designated Urban Area in the State. This Investment will be included in the designated Urban Area's Investment Justification
- **Major Change:** Required that one fusion center Investment from a State to provide funding support to the State's primary fusion center, as designated by the Governor. Additionally, FY 2011 eligible UASI areas will be required to provide an Investment to the DHS-recognized fusion center in the Urban Area
- **Minor Change:** Allowed the use of critical emergency supplies such as shelf stable food products, water, and basic medical supplies as an allowable expense under UASI
- **Minor Change:** Encouraged States and Urban Areas to update their Homeland Security Strategies every two years and to submit an updated version of their Strategies as part of their FY 2011 HSGP application submission

Ms. Anderson then presented a slide that shows the various elements (and what percentage they are weighted for) that make up the Risk Formula. The chart shows the elements involved in how we get our funding.

Mr. Wright thanked Kelli for her briefing and introduced Ms. Samantha Ladich who has been appointed as the AG representative to Emergency Management and Homeland Security.

Ms. Irene Navis started her comments by thanking everyone for their hard work from the project managers to Investment Justification leaders to Mark Blomstrom, the DEM staff (especially Kelli Anderson). There has been a lot of give and take in this process. There has been a lot of close collaboration on these projects.

Once projects are approved by this body it is very important for the project managers to start working on their plans so they can be forwarded to DEM as soon as possible.

The guidance from DHS rally clarifies and supports the Commission's priorities and that we have a strong alignment. She went on to note the special cyber security guidance and how it ties into everything we do.

Ms. Navis closed with a comment that her office is working closely with DEM and the SAA and is moving forward to make sure the funds are distributed as quickly as possible.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZATION OF 2011 HSGP PRIORITIES WITH THE INTENT TO FORMULATE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON HOMELAND SECURITY –

Chairman Gillespie asked the committee if everyone had a copy of the most recent spreadsheet containing the current allocation of funds (the committee indicated they had copies). He then asked any of the project managers present if they would voluntarily eliminate or reduce their requested funding.

Ms. Carolyn Levering indicated that project "FF" (Advanced IED/WMD Defeat) has been pulled.

Mr. Wright indicated that project "A" (NTAC) will be requesting a change to their current allocation of FFY 2009 funds which will reduce their current request by \$320,969 in SHSP funds. The change request will be processed and be submitted for the next meeting of the Finance Committee scheduled for 12 July.

Project "H" (State Silver Shield) will also be submitting a change request for FFY 2009 funds amounting to \$436,805 in SHSP funds that will allow them to reduce their request for SHSP funds to \$0.

After a discussion with Washoe County, Project "W" (Nevada Dispatch Interconnect) will submit a change request for FFY 2009 funds that will allow them to reduce their request from \$785,000 to \$180,000.

Ms. Anderson pointed out that Washoe County Sheriff's office had reviewed the budgets for 2009 and 2010 for their Fusion Center and Silver Shield programs and found they could apply considerable savings to reduce their requests for funding as well as apply some funding to this project. She went on to state that the Finance Committee in July would need to approve those changes to the 2009 and 2010 budgets.

Chairman Gillespie indicated that the committee was looking forward to those change requests. If the program managers for these projects come up with cost savings they should be allowed to bring them back and use them properly.

Ms. Anderson indicated that with these changes the SHSP request was under-allocated.

Chairman Gillespie asked if we still needed to cut UASI funds (answer – yes).

Ms. Irene Navis indicated there may be some reductions to the UASI requests that have come in since the last meeting and asked Ms. Anderson if she could brief those changes.

Ms. Anderson indicated those changes had been posted to the spreadsheet except project “UU” (City of Las Vega Citizen Corps).

Mr. Pete Reinschmidt indicated that project “N” (NIMS Compliance) had been deleted they have sufficient funding to carry the project forward (noted by committee as being deleted on the spreadsheet).

A proposal was made by the program manager for project “ZZ” (Access control for cyber information) to reduce the UASI request by \$74,000 making the UASI request \$160,000 and a reduction of SHSP funds of \$111,00 making that request \$240,000.

Ms. Anderson stated that this action leaves the SHSP fund short \$251,706 of the allocation. An option is to take some of the UASI funded projects that could be applied statewide and use the excess SHSP funds to cover their costs. This would almost bring us to a zero balance.

Ms. Krutsinger motioned to Change the UASI fund request in project “P” (HSWG Planning, Assessment and Grant Process Implementation) and add \$132,000 to the SHSP request (making the new SHSP total \$264,000). Mr. Staci Giomi seconded the request. The motion was passed and the change in funding was approved.

Chairman Gillespie stated his feedback to the committee as the chairman there are a couple of requests for equipment that can go away, freeing up money that can be used to add funding to some of the projects where we cut. One piece of equipment in particular – the North Las Vegas Police Department tactical robot – recalling the presentation on 18 May we have other tactical robots available in the valley. By working together with the systems on hand we can save \$85,000.

He also noted in the City of Las Vegas HAZMAT request where they needed to buy a truck for \$47,000. It seemed logical that between Metro, the City and the County there has to be a truck that could pull a trailer. I’m not so sure we need to buy a new truck and that would take us over \$100,000.

Ms. Krutsinger suggested we go back and look at the projects (like the SNCTC projects) where we have like \$900,000 in contract personnel.

Chairman Gillespie stated that we can discuss those issues and then when on to say that we are making good progress here on cuts and he mentioned the two pieces of equipment that are part of the “response” aspect of what we are talking about. He expressed a desire to hear from the project managers. Those two projects (confirmed by Kelli Anderson) would put us over the total we would need to cut from the UASI requests.

Ms. Carolyn Levering, speaking for project “Z” (Southern Nevada Hazardous Material Team) mentioned that they have significantly cut the request for this project from its initial stages. We are working with Clark County to coordinate for the use of their equipment. As a reminder the prime mover was dropped from the last years grant request and is a primary part of this request. It is designed to move the on hand trailer and equipment.

Dr. Carrison mentioned that Mr. Dan Lake (project manager for “BB” – North Las Vegas Tactical Robot) is currently out at the Race Track at an exercise. He mentioned that the request is due to the NLV police SWAT team not having one. Not having one available in a time sensitive dynamic situation they feel having to wait for another robot to arrive is a problem.

Mr. Giomi asked about project "YY" (Statewide Disaster Recovery Planning) is shown as a UASI funded only project. Is it really a statewide project? (Answer – it began as a statewide project but as reductions were made it became a UASI project.) – He went on to ask if we had an idea where the funds we cut that are access are going to be placed. If we move the project "YY" funds to SHSP and we are done.

The committee then discussed a number of options to cross level SHSP and UASI funds between a number of projects. Based on this discussion Ms. Krutsinger made a motion that we subtract the UASI funding from the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (project "U") and move the requested amount into the SHSP category. Ms Carolyn Levering seconded the motion. Chairman Gillespie asked if there were any further comments, hearing none he called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

After cross leveling Mr. Giomi asked about problems with the Law Enforcement carve out (LETPA program). Ms. Anderson stated that at this time the LETPA for SHSP funds is under-allocated and we have to add back in \$11,955 into a LETPA program. Mr. Giomi noted that we still have to allocate \$32,539 in SHSP funds and if we allocate all this into the LETPA program then we are OK.

Ms. Anderson confirmed that this would work but that there was a limited number of projects that could be defined as part of the LETPA program, basically in this case the Northern Nevada Fusion Centers ("A & B"), State Silver Shield ("I"), and the Washoe County Dispatch Interconnect ("W") projects (all of which had their funding requests reduced).

Mr. Bohl motioned that the \$32,539 in SHSP funding should be restored to "W" (Washoe County Dispatch Interconnect). Ms. Levering seconded the motion for the purpose of opening the discussion on this proposal.

Mr. Chris Magenheimer stated the additional funds would be used to increase the capabilities to communicate with the rural counties. Anything we can do would just continue to enhance that capability.

Ms. Levering asked if there were any other program managers who were asking for the restoration of SHSP funds to their LETPA project.

Ms. Anderson stated that this project ("W") is dependent on the 13 July change request that they will be submitting to reallocate 2009 funds. By adding \$32,539 to this project the Fusion Centers and Silver Shield will be able to keep more of their own funds and not make as big a change request.

Chairman Gillespie recalled that the guidance from DHS funding put a priority for LETPA funding to the Fusion Centers (he then read the direct guidance from DHS). After reading this his thought was that we take the \$32,539 and put it into the Fusion process.

Ms. Anderson stated DEM had recently asked that question to DHS during a conference call and they were told the Interconnect Project ("W") did fit into the LETPA category based on the current state strategy that has the communications working together with the fusion process.

Chairman Gillespie hearing no further discussion called for a vote and after a unanimous voice vote the measure passed to allocate \$32,359 in SHSP funds to Program "W".

Ms. Anderson noted we had \$288 in UASI funding left to allocate and Mr. Giomi recommended it go to Project "UU" (Las Vegas Citizen Corps). Ms. Krutsinger seconded the motion and hearing no other discussion Chairman Gillespie called for a vote. The motion to allocate the \$288 to program "UU" was approved unanimously.

Chairman Gillespie confirmed with Ms. Anderson that at this time the request to allocate 2011 SHSP funds is balanced against the authorized amount allocated to Nevada. He then went on to ask about the upcoming July Finance Committee meeting and the reallocation requests that were discussed during this process.

Ms. Anderson stated the requests for the July meeting are due to DEM by 13 June so they can be presented at the 13 July meeting.

Chairman Gillespie asked if there were any other concerns the committee needed to cover for this recommendation.

Ms. Anderson briefly talked about the 80/20 split (where no more than 20% of funds can be allocated to State agencies). We do have a problem with this and it will require all players who participated in this process to sign an agreement to allow this money to pass through in this fashion. If we do not get those signatures then we cannot allocate funds in this way. DEM will craft the MOU and collect the appropriate signatures.

Mr. Giomi asked who would have to sign the MOU. (Answer – Anyone who submitted a project would have to sign the agreement.). He stated that based on this the issue will not be getting signatures from projects getting money it will come from getting those projects who did not get funds to sign. He went on to ask what happens if someone refuses to sign the agreement.

Ms. Anderson indicated that in this case the money for state agencies would have to pass through a local jurisdiction so they would not have to be handled by the state. She noted that we do not have to resolve this allocation until the first week in September so we have time and DEM is committed to working with the program managers to make sure they get their funding in a timely manner. She then identified the only additional issue concerns personnel costs and having them properly identified in the project plans. DEM will work closely to make sure this happens.

CONFIRMATION OF INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION LEADERS

Chairman Gillespie asked Ms. Anderson to elaborate on what DEM was looking to have with this item. Ms. Anderson stated the intent was to make sure all the Investment Justification leaders are aware they have a responsibility to prepare their IJs and submit them to DEM in time and that everyone is working together.

Mr. Bohl pointed out that the DHS IJ format is difficult to use and asked when the IJs were due. (Answer – DEM has to submit the draft request by 13 June with the final version due on 20 June. IJ leads must have turned in their input by 6 June. Ms. Anderson described the process that DHS has required for the 2011 process.) Taking this information the Chairman stated for the record that IJ leaders must submit the required material to DEM by 6 June.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Gillespie thanked everyone for all their hard work and cooperation. We all had to give up something to get something. He thanked Jim Wright and the DEM people for their efforts and for the cuts they volunteered in their programs. He then asked whether or not there was any public comment.

Mr. Rick Martin expressed his thanks for the hard work and wanted to specifically mention Ms. Anderson and her team (Valerie Sumner, Sonja Williams, Jodie Bass, Nikki Powers).

Hearing no other Public Comments Chairman Gillespie entertained a motion for adjournment. Dr. Carrison made the motion and it was seconded by Ms. Krutsinger, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned.

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