



Meeting Minutes

Nevada Commission on Homeland Security

Committee on Finance

Attendance	DATE:	April 1, 2020
	TIME:	1:00 p.m.
	METHOD:	Teleconference
	RECORDER:	Karen Hall
Voting Member Attendance		
Member Name	Title/Organization	Present
Joseph Lombardo – CHAIR	Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department	X
Greg Herrera – VICE CHAIR	Chief Deputy, Operations, Washoe County Sheriff’s Office	X
Mike Brown	State Government Affairs Director, R&R Partners	X
Christopher Lake	Executive Director, Community Resilience, Nevada Hospital Association	Abs
Carolyn Levering	Emergency Management Administrator, City of Las Vegas	X
Erin Lynch	Chief, Nevada Division of Healthcare Financing and Policy	X
Stan Smith	Vice President, Emergency Management, Boyd Gaming	X
Non-Voting Member Attendance		
Justin Luna	Chief, Nevada Division of Emergency Management	X
Legal Staff / Support Attendance		
Samantha Ladich	Senior Deputy Attorney General, Nevada Office of the Attorney General	X
Karen Hall	Management Analyst, Nevada Division of Emergency Management	X

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Lombardo called the meeting to order and read into the record the public meeting restrictions noted in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 241.023(1)(b). Roll call was performed by Karen Hall. A quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chair Lombardo opened the first period of public comment for discussion. No public comment was presented.

3. Approval of Minutes

Chair Lombardo called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the September 16, 2019, Committee on Finance meeting. A motion to approve the minutes as presented with no changes was presented by Chief Deputy Greg Herrera, and a second was presented by Chief Erin Lynch. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Review and Update on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Process and Allocations

Chief Justin Luna provided an overview of the FFY 2020 HSGP process, and an explanation of the documents provided for this agenda item. Highlights of the overview included the following:

▪ Agenda Item #4a – FFY2020 HSGP Requirements

In assessing the national risk profile for FFY 2020, four priority areas were identified as a concern, and due to the unique threats in the nation in 2020, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has determined that these four priorities should be addressed by allocating specific percentages of HSGP funds to each of these four areas, for a total of 20% allocation:

- Enhancing cybersecurity (including election security) – 5%
- Enhancing the protection of soft targets/crowded places – 5%;
- Enhancing information and intelligence sharing and cooperation with federal agencies, including DHS – 5%; and
- Addressing emerging threats – 5%.

The total allocation and the corresponding amount of HSGP funds that the State and Las Vegas Urban Area will be required to propose for each priority area to obtain a full allocation of HSGP funds is as follows:

- State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) – Total allocation is \$4,287,500 with the potential for a 15% plus-up of \$643,125 should the final application contain funding recommendations addressing the additional 5% for each priority area of concern. Of that allocation, the priority requirement of 20% totals \$857,500.
- Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) – Total allocation is a range from \$4,200,000 to \$5,250,000 should the final application contain funding recommendations addressing the additional 5% for each priority area of concern with the potential for a 15% plus-up of \$787,500. Of that allocation, the priority requirement of 20% totals \$840,000 up to \$1,050,000.

▪ Agenda Item #4b - 4b FFY20 HSGP Timeline

Chief Luna spoke to the timeline presented, noting the completion of the 2019 Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and State Preparedness Review (SPR), receipt of the FFY 2020 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), the release of the FFY 2020 HSGP project proposal requirements for Nevada’s grant application, and meeting schedule including the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security (NCHS) review of the FFY 2020 HSGP process, review/rank prioritization of FFY 2020 HSGP projects by the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee (NRAC) and Urban Area Working Group (UAWG).

The results of these efforts culminate today with a presentation to the Committee on Finance on recommendations to approve funding allocations for the SHSP and UASI. Once the Committee finalizes its recommendation, the NCHS will hear the Committee’s recommendation on April 9, 2020. If approved, the Nevada Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEM/HS) can submit the final grant application to DHS. The current deadline for that submission was extended from April 15, 2020, to April 30, 2020.

▪ Agenda Item 4c - Approved Strategic Capacities for FY20 NCHS 102119 (2)

Chief Luna spoke to the current Strategic Capacities to be Maintained (SCTBM) that were approved in October 2019 after review by the NRAC, Committee on Finance, and the NCHS. These capacities set the stage for the FFY 2020 process, and included:

- Fusion Centers
- Citizen Corps
- National Incident Management System
- Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosive
- Operational Communication
- Public Information and Warning
- Recovery
- Cybersecurity
- Planning

Chief Luna asked if Chief John Steinbeck had anything to add to the process as presented, with Chief Steinbeck indicating he did not have additional input for this agenda item.

Chair Lombardo inquired on what the precipitating factor was in applying funding to election security. Chief Luna indicated it was a national directive requirement on the FFY20 HSGP NOFO to focus on projects related to election security. When the direction initially came out, there were many questions on the requirement and whether such requirements had the ability to be effective during the current grant cycle. It was determined that this would be a long-term focus with the HSGP grant moving forward, and most likely a requirement in future grant years. Chair Lombardo wanted to ensure that allocations were clearly denoted. Chief Luna indicated that the State would work with the Nevada Secretary of State's office to develop projects and potentially enhance current projects in place to meet this requirement for the entire state.

5. Review of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) and the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Proposal with the Intent to Formulate a Recommendation to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security

Chair Lombardo opened discussion on this agenda item asking Chief Luna to discuss the SHSP process, and Chief Steinbeck to discuss the UASI process:

Agenda Item 5-1 - FY20 HSGP SHSP Voting Ranking 3-11-20

This handout reflects the voting record from the March 11, 2020, NRAC meeting of which 13 competitive projects were rank prioritized. A total of 15 projects were initially submitted, but during the NRAC meeting, two projects were withdrawn.

Agenda Item 5-2 - FFY 2020 SHSP Ranked Projects FINAL Spreadsheet 033020

This handout reflects all projects submitted and categorized into those projects with SCTBM and competitive projects recommended for funding. A total of 34 projects with an SHSP component were recommended to be funded, and the process resulted in a balanced budget upon submission to the Committee on Finance.

Chair Lombardo wanted to clarify that everything above the red line is to be funded as SCTBM, and everything below is competitive and hierarchal in presentation to be funded. Chief Luna confirmed that projects above the red line were reviewed and vetted as SCTBM, and below the red line were the competitive projects. Additional explanation was given to the original funding requests of all projects and any reduction taken by the project owners to make room for other projects to be funded. The last four columns on the right side of the spreadsheet indicate the breakout for the national priorities to ensure the 5% requirement is addressed. The State will be working to fully develop a project to work on statewide election security issues. In the competitive projects, Projects 1-9 were recommended to be funded with the current grant award allocation, and the State is looking at additional projects that fall into the priority categories to include in the 15% plus-up category.

Kelli Anderson, DEM/HS, indicated that another line should have been drawn under Project #9 within the competitive projects. During the process, the determination was made that on those projects that fell below the red line, there was a possibility for them to be included in the plus-up category. DHS is allowing states to request an additional 15% plus-up allocation to both the SHSP and UASI to bolster priority investments. If certain projects were not funded through the standard process, there is a potential to place those projects under one of the four investment justifications for the priorities required. Ms. Anderson directed the Committee members to the black highlighted areas noting that some of these projects could be added into the plus-up category. Currently, a total of \$702,000 in projects has been added to the plus-up category; however, the total allocation for the plus-up for the State is only \$643,125, so there will have to be some cuts taken. This is how the process is trying to come up with a balanced budget. Chair Lombardo spoke to clarifying that the plus-up is not guaranteed, with Ms. Anderson indicating that if another SHSP jurisdiction fails to meet the priorities, that jurisdiction may be funded at the minimum level allowing the opening up of available plus-up funding to other states that qualify. Nevada would have to rely on another state to not meet the requirements to receive the plus-up funding. Chair Lombardo thanked Ms. Anderson for the work put into this process.

Chief Lynch thanked Ms. Anderson for the explanation provided and wanted clarification on why some of the projects below the red line were listed as new projects when similar projects were also listed in the SCTBM category. Ms. Anderson indicated it was about the project itself, and not the individual line items. The projects above the red line illustrate the bare minimum funding required to maintain the projects. Some of the larger jurisdictions will have two projects because they are addressing any enhancements separate and outside of the maintain category. What is required to maintain the project is the priority. Ms. Anderson did speak to some initial confusion in the Zoom grants portal with requestors only being able to choose between “maintain” and “new” projects, but that issue was thoroughly vetted and projects are properly listed as maintained or enhanced. Chief Lynch inquired how the Committee could verify how these maintained projects are monitored. Ms. Anderson indicated the close collaboration with project managers of the maintained projects, quarterly reporting, and financial reporting requirements. DEM/HS tracks the progress of each project to ensure compliance and any funding drawdown. There are additional programmatic reporting requirements that are presented throughout the HSGP process. Chair Lombardo wanted to ensure Chief Lynch understood this explanation, and Chief Lynch indicated that the explanation was understandable, and she asked that in future meetings, the expiration of the grant funding be listed as a reference. Chief Luna indicated that information could be added in the future. Chair Lombardo spoke to the lag in reported numbers and that by the time the Committee sees this information, the numbers could have changed. Ms. Anderson indicated that most subgrantees report every 90 days, and then it takes time

to review and reimburse. Typically, if asked a question on this during a public meeting, Ms. Anderson can report the real-time numbers. Many times, if there appears to be a large allocation of funding left unspent, it is due to a large contract awaiting the layout of funds.

Chair Lombardo moved on to the UAWG process and turned the agenda item over to Chief Steinbeck. Chief Steinbeck asked Ms. Anderson to provide the information for the UAWG as well. The process was very similar to the SHSP process:

Agenda Item 5.3 - 2020 UASI Ranked Projects FINAL Spreadsheet 033020

Ms. Anderson walked the Committee through this spreadsheet, which listed projects that came in for the UASI, funding requested, the differentiation between maintained projects and new projects, and additional projects needing to be added to cover the priority investment of Enhancing Soft Targets. The UAWG came out with a three-tiered balanced budget, one for the minimum allocation, one for the maximum allocation, and one for the plus-up allocation. Projects were chosen for the plus-up application above and beyond the maximum allocation amount. The UASI, if it does not meet the minimum funding for the priority investments, could be awarded the minimum allocation whereas, if those priority investments are funded, the UASI could receive the maximum allocation in addition to being eligible for the plus-up amount.

Chief Steinbeck spoke to the FFY 2020 UASI process being much more complicated than in years past. While understanding that DHS needed a mechanism to address and reward effective UASI jurisdictions, Chief Steinbeck doubts that any of the plus-up funding will be awarded despite the time and energy applied in trying to comply with the grant guidance. It was extremely important to protect those strategic capacities that were absolutely necessary; however, it may have been more effective if those UASI jurisdictions that had not utilized funding or met the priority requirements had their unused allocations placed into a second round of competitive funding.

Chair Lombardo asked for clarification on Agenda Item 5.3, inquiring if those items highlighted in orange are supposed to be above the line for funding recommendation. Ms. Anderson spoke to the orange highlighted projects being those election security projects that must be funded. It was determined where those projects best fit and how they needed to be funded. Ms. Anderson did indicate that her delay in reviewing the spreadsheet was that she was referencing the spreadsheet provided by Karen Taylor, Clark County Office of Emergency Management, and the information just appears a little different in formatting than Ms. Anderson's spreadsheet. Chair Lombardo indicated that the highlighted items in orange will move above the line as funded, and everything below that will be considered a new project.

Chair Lombardo asked Ms. Anderson what form the motion would need to take to approve the recommendations. Ms. Anderson indicated that her preference would be to have a vote on each recommendation provided, one for the SHSP FFY 2020 projects and one for the UASI FFY 2020 projects. This way, there is a document that can be submitted into the DHS portal for each funding stream. As to the form of the motion, a reference to the corresponding spreadsheet for each funding stream would be sufficient. Chair Lombardo asked if anyone had any questions, and no questions were presented.

Chair Lombardo asked Chief Lynch if she could please provide a motion to approve both recommendations. Chief Lynch motioned to approve, as presented, the SHSP funding

recommendation submitted by the Nevada Resilience Advisory Committee on Agenda Item 5.2. No second was provided. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously. Chief Lynch made a second motion to approve, as presented, the UASI funding recommendation submitted by the Urban Area Working Group on Agenda Item 5.3. Mike Brown seconded the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Lombardo asked for a correction of the acronym “HGSP” to “HSGP” on the title of Attachment B. Ms. Anderson indicated that correction would be made.

6. Public Comment

Chair Lombardo opened the second period of public comment. No public comment was presented.

7. Adjourn

Chair Lombardo called for a motion to adjourn. Chief Deputy Greg Herrera motioned to adjourn the meeting. No second was called for or presented. Meeting adjourned.