



Minutes Nevada Homeland Security Commission Critical Infrastructure Committee Meeting

ATTENDANCE

DATE	17 May 2011
TIME	9:00 AM
LOCATION	4615 W Sunset Rd, Las Vegas NV 2478 Fairview Dr, Carson City NV
METHOD	Conference
RECORDER	Larry Casey

Committee Members	Present	Legislative & Ex-Officio Members, Staff and Others	Present
Brett Primas, Chairman	X	Gonzalo Cordova (Ex-Officio)	X
Sandra Baker		Michelle Belmont	X
Tod Carlini			
Bob Dorsey	X		
Steve Asher	X		
Nichole Hart	X		
John Horton	X		
Al Gillespie	X		
Carolyn Levering	X		
Steve Moyer	X		
Phil Roland	X		
Chris Ipsen			
Dick Casto			
		Larry Casey, Homeland Security Commission Staff	X
		Samantha Ladich, AG representative to the Commission	X

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

At 9:02 am Chairman Brett Primas called the meeting to order. Larry Casey called the roll and a quorum was established.

COMMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN – Chairman Primas introduced himself to the Committee. CPT Primas is with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) and is assigned to the Counter-Terrorism bureau. He stated that at the last meeting of the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security he laid out some of the goals for this committee. He stated that one of the things that will be done during this meeting is assigning tasks to individuals to work on. He asked the committee to continue to be open in its discussions of Critical Infrastructure (CI).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Primas entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the March 17th 2011 meeting of the Committee on Critical Infrastructure. Ms. Carolyn Levering made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nichole Hart. After a unanimous voice vote the minutes were approved.

NEVADA COMMISSION ON HOMELAND SECURITY MEETING REGARDING THE DIRECTION OF THE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE (CIC).

Chairman Primas provided a summary on the April 5, 2011 briefing provided to the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security with some comments on where the CIC needs to be moving.

He stated that if the Commission is going to take CI seriously then this committee needs to be more involved. The Committee also needs to take a more detailed look at the prioritized sector list that was passed out during the last meeting. We need to involve a larger cross section of stakeholders statewide. The CIC needs to work on developing and identifying dependencies and interdependencies. Last of all we need focus and keep in mind what the current threat stream is. The committee has to recommend sustainable strategies for programs now that grant dollars are decreasing. This will include reaching out to the stakeholders in the state.

Chairman Primas asked if the strategic plan that has been circulating was still in draft and if we needed to make any changes.

Ms. Levering indicated the plan had been approved back around August 2010. She mentioned that a good way to do things would be with a less subjective and more objective sort of approach. We should look at how we develop our recommendations to the Commission.

Chairman Primas indicated that it is important to recognize this is a statewide program with regional differences. No matter what we come up with there will be some disagreement. We need to move forward and look at our priorities for sustainment and what we need to pay attention to as far as the threat.

DATA CALL SUBMITTAL UPDATE.

Ms. Rachel Skidmore (Silver Shield/Urban Environmental Research –UER) provided an informational briefing on the recent Data Call update to DHS. The data call closed on 22 April. This year we have 248 Tier 1 & Tier 2 assets identified in Nevada. We have 228 assets in Clark County with the rest located in other counties in the state. Keep in mind assets may not be a single item but could also be clusters of facilities combined into one identified asset. DHS will review the data we submitted and will notify us sometime around 27 June when they open the material for modification of supplemental information.

The State list of assets will be submitted in September. It should be noted that many states have gone to DHS and stated they need to pay attention to the state lists because they contain other items of CI critical to the states but not included in the Tier 1 & 2 categories.

Chairman Primas asked if this list supports how much grant funding we would receive. (Answer – yes it does)

Ms. Skidmore went on to state this is the 4th we have worked on while numbers have increased slightly the major items have been identified and cataloged.

Chairman Primas stated that this data call is the single biggest piece we do to secure grant funding. He then asked if the 248 assets were all that we had resources to identify or is there a possibility we can find more. (Answer – The criteria for the assets comes from the federal government description. Although we may feel assets on the state list is important it has to be recognized to be considered. So unless the criteria changes we are close to complete.)

Dr. Shelia Conway stated that UER has their arms around the federal standards so we have gone a long way on identifying all the CI that fits the criteria. We still have some work to do with interdependencies and maximizing the collection of data. That is the next critical step.

Mr. Phil Roland asked what the criteria for the Information Technology (IT) sector are. (Answer – there are three categories and to meeting the criteria to be considered CI they have to meet two of the three. The categories are:

- 1) Mass casualties

- 2) Economic impact
- 3) Public effect.

IT is difficult to capture because IT touches so many areas assets are often seen as redundant and classified with other sectors.

PRIORITIZATION OF THE STATE CRITERIA FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

Chairman Primas stated that the committee needs to relook the April prioritization of CI. We should look at the information that was just presented on the data call and see how it lines up with the prioritization list. Right now we need to look for ideas on how to make a better prioritization process and create more involvement.

Mr. Bob Dorsey stated we should perform a gap analysis to show where we need to focus.

Mr. Steve Asher said we should look at the national and local threat status to sectors and see how those things impact sectors in Nevada. We need to have some flexibility built into the systems where we can make changes as the threat changes.

Ms. Hart felt it was important to analyze the UER data and from there provide a snapshot of where we are at this point in time.

Chairman Primas appointed Bob Dorsey, Steve Asher and Nichole Hart to work on this issue and at the next meeting brief the committee on a plan to update and refine the sector prioritization list.

CI/KR OUTREACH EFFORTS

Chairman Primas asked the committee how good was the process to involve the private/public sectors. We also asked if points of contacts for those sectors had been identified so we can contact them quickly if something comes up.

Mr. Asher stated that in the rural counties they have reached out to a small group of stakeholders, usually in the public sector (Fire, Emergency Medical Services, and Police) with some public works contacts. There hasn't been much contact with the private sector. We do need to work on getting a wider set of contacts.

Mr. Dorsey stated that the Northern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center (NNCTC) uses a server list of contacts for Northern Nevada that is used to maintain communications between sectors. That covers pretty much everyone we have contacts with.

Chairman Primas stated that he is sure we are missing some of our private sector contacts. We have gotten better at information sharing but can still grow our lists of contacts.

Ms. Hart and Ms. Skidmore both indicted that there are lists that involve the private sector but those lists do need to grow.

Mr. Gonzalo Cordova mentioned that UER and the Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center (SNCTC) should get with DHS and compare lists. He mentioned a number of groups who can represent sectors that might be helpful.

Chairman Primas stated that from his perspective he had two points:

- 1) Every day they get material that is sent out to sectors.
- 2) We also reach out to the sectors to develop material for things like the data call.

The sectors don't necessarily want to be included in multiple contact lists.

Mr. Asher mentioned the contact networks they have set up when they were doing Fusion Liaison Officer/Terrorism Liaison Officer (FLO/TLO) training. We work closely with those folks to provide them with information.

Mr. Dorsey mentioned that they look at the master list of trained FLO/TLO and tie them to the sectors they came from for their lists.

Mr. Steve Moyer stated the Utility Pipeline Coordinating Group has good contacts for both Southern and Northern Nevada. He asked Mr. Asher for some of his contacts in Northern Nevada so they can expand their list of contacts for the rural water districts. He then went on to describe the Info-Guard program and how it shares information.

Chairman Primas asked Ms. Michelle Belmont to work with Mr. Dorsey and Mr. Moyer and come up with a summary on what sort of outreach efforts were being made around the state.

COMPOSITION OF THE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE.

Chairman Primas opened the discussion on possible new members for the CIC by suggesting Michelle Belmont would be a good person to add to the committee. He then asked if there were any other individuals who should be represented.

Mr. Moyer suggested we have a representative from the Cyber community.

Ms. Levering noted we could use someone who can represent the chemical industry.

Ms. Hart suggested someone from Public Health.

Chairman Primas suggested we do not want to get too big as an organization. He asked Ms. Belmont to work with the committee members to come up with a list of suggested names.

ROLE OF THE PROGRAM MANAGER'S.

Chairman Primas stated that his intent is to lean on the three program managers in the state's fusion centers (Mr. Dorsey, Mr. Asher and Ms. Hart). He will be looking for them to coordinate and work on any actions the committee sees as necessary.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE/KEY RESOURCE (CI/KR) FUNDING.

Chairman Primas stated he is looking for comments from the field on this subject. The Silver Shield Program attracts controversy every year but has been a positive program. He asked if there were any concerns from the committee for the FY11 and FY12 grant years. Is there a direction we need to go to protect CI/KR in Nevada?

Ms. Levering noted that tomorrow (18 May) the Finance Committee would be discussing the various CI/KR programs for this cycle. Based on what we know we can expect at least a 25% cut in funding. It will get even worse for 2012 where a lot of urban areas will see further reductions. If the number of Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) drops to 10 then Las Vegas will fall off the list of cities receiving these funds. It becomes critical we find ways to sustain programs.

This loss of funding makes it all the more critical that we find sustainment funds for these programs.

Chairman Primas recognizing this discussion feeds into the next agenda item moved to the next item.

FORMULATION OF THE SILVER SHIELD SUSTAINMENT PLANS.

Chairman Primas stated this is a continuous problem. He tasked the program managers to analyze their programs and come back to the committee with recommendations by the next meeting. We have to find a way to keep this program running.

Ms. Belmont stated they are working on this issue and are hoping to outreach to other partners for assistance.

CONTENTS OF ANNUAL REPORT.

Chairman Primas discussed some of the items that need to be included in the annual report. What should go into the report is material on:

- 1) Sustainment of programs.
- 2) Quick history of CI/KLR efforts in Nevada
- 3) Historical data on budgets for programs – what have we spent
- 4) Regional output to outcome
- 5) How the CIPS tool is used to include the values and shortcomings.

The program managers will be reaching out to the membership for input to the report and we will discuss the report at the next meeting. We will need the report by August for the November Commission meeting.

Mr. Cordova noted we should in the discussion on output to outcome talk about how that has caused a reduction in risk to CI in Nevada.

Mr. John Horton stated that it would probably be a good idea to state how without the Silver Shield program you would destroy a lot of the trust that has been built up with the private sector.

Ms. Levering stated we should probably identify a strategic plan for how we need to address CI/KR along with some “best practices” that are in use.

Chairman Primas pointed out that after the fusion centers the next biggest amount of grant funding that has been allocated has been for CI/KR. We need to be able to demonstrate what has been done with the allocated money.

AB549 LEGISLATION UPDATE

Mr. Larry Casey provided a quick informational update to the Committee on the status of AB549 (Homeland Security Commission) legislation. On 16 May the bill had passed out of the Assembly and had been heard by the Senate Government Affairs Committee with no action. Mr. Bob Fisher, along with the Governor’s office, is working closely with the Senate Committee to answer any questions or concerns the Senators may have. It is on track to pass the Senate.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Primas asked whether or not there were any public comments.

Mr. Cordova talked about the DHS Cyber Security Division report presented to the Commission.

Chairman Primas asked whether or not there were any other public comments and on hearing none he adjourned the meeting.

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