



Meeting Minutes The Nevada Homeland Security Working Group

Attendance	DATE	May 16, 2013	
	TIME	9:30 a.m.	
	LOCATION	Nevada Division of Emergency Management Training Room (Changed from Executive Conf. Room) 2478 Fairview Drive Carson City, Nevada 89701	
	METHOD	Video-Teleconference	
	RECORDER	Selby Marks	
Working Group Representative		Entity	Present
Stacey Giomi		Carson City	X
Carolyn Levering		City of Las Vegas	X
Ryan Turner		City of Henderson	X
Sandy Munns		City of Reno	X
Michael Johnson		Clark County	X
James Ketsaa		Clark County School District	X
Jim Pitts		Elko County	X
Daniel Thayer		Inter-Tribal Council	X
Nicole Hart		Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department	X
Jeff Page		Lyon County	
Mitchell Sperling		Nevada Air National Guard	X
Chad Westom		Nevada Dept. of Health & Human Services	X
Jeff Mohlenkamp		Nevada Department of Administration	
Peter Mulvihill		Nevada Department of Public Safety	X
Richard Nelson		Nevada Department of Transportation	X
Angela Krutsinger		Nevada Hospital Association	
Chris Magenheimer		North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District	X
Daniel Lake		City of North Las Vegas	X
Bruce Barnes		NV Energy	X
Rob Reeder		Regional Transportation Commission WC	X
Jerry Keating		Regional Transportation Commission SNV	X
Joe Curtis		Storey County	
Jane Shunney		Southern Nevada Health District	X
Aaron Kenneston		Washoe County	X
Mike Mieras		Washoe County School District	X
Darin Balaam		Washoe County Sheriff's Office	X
Russell Peacock		White Pine County	X
Keith Logan		Northeastern Nevada	X
<i>No Eligible Candidate named for SE NV</i>		Southeastern Nevada	
Tod Carlini		Western Nevada	X
Administrative Agent Representatives		Entity	Present
Chris Smith		State Administrative Agent	X
Fernandez Leary		Urban Area Administrative Agent	X
Legal Representative		Entity	Present
Samantha Ladich		Nevada Attorney General's Office	X
Support Staff Representative		Entity	Present
Selby Marks		Nevada Division of Emergency Mgt.	X
Doug Lyon		Clark County Facilitator	X

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair, Chief Fernandez Leary, Urban Area Administrative Agent (UAA) called the meeting to order. Selby Marks, Nevada Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (NDEM/HS) performed a roll call by named entity and representative. A quorum was established for this meeting. Dimitri Theodorou, Clark County School District represented James Ketsaa at this meeting, however he was not eligible due to proxy restrictions and could not count toward establishment of quorum.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Co-chair, Chief Leary called for public commentary from both the southern and northern venues. No commentary noted in either venue.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Co-Chair, Chief Leary called for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 4, 2012 Homeland Security Working Group meeting. Motion to approve minutes was presented by Ryan Turner, City of Henderson. A second was provided by Dan Lake, City of North Las Vegas. All were in favor with no opposition. Doug Lyon, Homeland Security Working Group (HSWG) Facilitator welcomed the body acknowledging new membership and efforts of the support staff in providing electronic forms, iPad technology, and review functions for this meeting. Mr. Lyon also indicated that the body be aware of using acronyms. Kelli Anderson, Nevada Division of Emergency Management instructed the body on accessing grant information via dem.nv.gov. Chief Bertral Washington, Homeland Security Commissioner thanked the body for the work they will undertake here in addition to that work which is conducted in numerous committees and other agencies which makes the Commission's work easier.

4. WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS BY THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT (SAA) AND URBAN AREA ADMINISTRATOR (UAA)

Deputy Director Jim Wright, Nevada Department of Public Safety addressed the working group with a brief note to the establishment of the body through Executive Order. Special emphasis was placed on the challenges that may be forthcoming due to funding, particularly in that both the HSWG and the UAWG need to work together in close collaboration per the established bylaws. This is the expectation of Governor Sandoval, the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security, and those that are served in the state. Deputy Director Wright thanked the body, wishing it luck with the upcoming meeting schedules. The Deputy Director stood in for Chief Chris Smith, SAA as the Chief was detained due to a Legislature issue.

Chief Leary thanked both the working group and the support staff for the participation to date, reiterating the need to work together in maximizing results, and particularly in efforts to obtain the most breadth of benefit. Chief Leary indicated that the UASI was able to take some projects off the board, and they look forward to working with the HSWG. Both he, and Chief Smith believe that this body can work together to obtain the best result across the State.

5. HOMELAND SECURITY WORKING GROUP STATUS, PROCESS, AND TIMELINE

Chief Leary presented an overview of the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP), guidance and award status, the federal application timeline, and the HSWG process with emphasis on the possibility of losing the UASI funding stream. *Please refer to the power-point presentation provided at this meeting.* Points of interest included:

- Grant guidance may occur between May 20th and May 24th of 2013, though it was hoped it would be in time for this meeting.
- There is concern regarding a recent drop in ranking which may prevent the UASI from obtaining funding in addition to the 5% sequester.
- The State Homeland Security Program is expected to receive an increase in funding.
- The time period for submitting grant applications has been shortened to 45 days, in effect cutting previous timetables in half.
- There may be a discretionary fund available for UASI.

6. REVIEW OF HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Kelli Anderson, NDEM/HS opened discussion pertaining to the detailed budget sheets and lessons learned in previous years, briefing the body on the expectations moving forward. Ms. Anderson instructed the body that budget narratives are due by end of business on Wednesday, May 29, 2013. She caveated this date could change due to when the grant guidance drops. No questions were presented in either venue. Doug Lyon did request that members not be afraid to present questions if needed. Ms. Anderson also informed the body that those project proposers putting forward projects including funding for training will be required to attend the Training and Exercise Planning Workshop (T&EPW). Projects containing requests for training will be highly scrutinized during this process, as the practice of moving funding from training to be de-obligated for other purposes has been an issue in years past. Ms. Anderson also briefed the body on how a project proposal becomes an investment justification. (Please refer to the handout material for an overview on this briefing). Selby Marks, NDEM/HS read into record the schedule of meetings moving forward.

7. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A HOMELAND SECURITY WORKING GROUP REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Chief Smith spoke to best practices in looking at project change requests (PCRs) in addition to re-obligation of Urban Area funding, indicating that both he and Chief Leary would like to create a Homeland Security Working Group Subcommittee. Using current guidance to administer this subcommittee, it is a requirement that the HSWG proper move to approve, and then vote on approval of this request. Aaron Kenneston, Washoe County provided the motion to approve the request, with Sandy Munns, City of Reno seconding the motion.

Discussion ensued with questions presented by several members. Jerry Keating, RTC Southern Nevada inquired as to how many members the subcommittee would be comprised of, with response from Chief Smith as a minimum of seven members. Dan Lake, City of North Las Vegas inquired on how makeup of the subcommittee would be established, with Chief Smith indicating that would be determined by the SAA and UAA pursuant to the existing bylaws. Nicole Hart, LVMPD inquired further on the makeup split, with Chief Smith indicating that determination has yet to be made. Aaron Kenneston inquired if the subcommittee would review UASI/SHSP changes, with Chief Smith indicating only SHSP changes would be under review. Sandy Munns inquires if the SAA would still have discretionary power during short time-frames, and whether the subcommittee would aid in the process. Chief Smith indicated that although mostly correct, the subcommittee would look only at PCRs greater than \$100,000.00 level with the intent that subcommittee members can review PCRs recommended by the HSWG to ensure the individual PCRs marry to the initial intent of the project. Concern was presented by Nicole Hart as to whether to table discussion when all information was worked out, and Ryan Turner, City of Henderson inquired if the intent of this subcommittee was to bring the entire HSWG together to improve the process. Chief Stacey Giomi, Carson City wished to confirm that the intention of the review process, particularly for those with both UASI and SHSP funding streams, be that both groups would have to review these requests.

Nicole Hart inquired if this was another level of review prior to pushing PCR's forward to the Finance Committee, with additional input from Jerry Keating asking if there are any provisions that specify and limit jurisdiction to the Chairs for equal representation within the state. Chief Smith indicated that the HSWG is empowered to act on behalf of the state, and the subcommittee would in turn represent the whole state. The check and balance is that both the SAA and the UAA have to agree. Nicole Hart inquired whether the HSWG Subcommittee would present to the Finance Committee those projects that have not been pushed forward, with Chief Smith indicating that providing that information would be no issue. Chief Smith asked Chief Leary if the current process of the UAWG is to do the same, pushing forward those projects not supported for review. Chief Leary indicated that is not currently the process, but would look into the process in the future.

Original motion by Aaron Kenneston, with second from Sandy Munns had no opposition in either venue. Motion passed unanimously.

**8. HOMELAND SECURITY WORKING GROUP PROJECT PROPOSAL PRESENTATIONS:
STATEWIDE PROPOSALS AND UASI PROPOSALS**

Chief Smith opened discussion on this agenda item with the caveat that this body is charged with maintaining safety and security within the state. The Chief looks forward to developing an atmosphere of collaboration. Chief Peter Mulvihill, Nevada Department of Public Safety asked for clarification on the reasoning as to why there are two Commission Priorities listed for intelligence and information sharing. Chief Smith gave a brief response indicating that the two are different as they are under different mission areas. Kelli Anderson indicated that no submitters placed a proposal under the Information and Sharing category as the 6th priority. Bruce Barnes, NV Energy indicated that the language may need to be modified pertaining to these two similar, but different priorities. Kelli Anderson indicated that the Commission establishes the priorities, and this body will review all proposals if there are any questions on priorities chosen under each proposal.

Discussion pursuant to each project is summarized briefly below:

Project A - Presenter Evan Hannah briefed the body on this project. Questions presented by Sandy Munns and Chief Mulvihill pertaining to the benefit this project would have for northern Nevada, specifically addressing the existence of current training liaison officer programs that may be able to accomplish the same goals. Concern presented by Aaron Kenneston on this request asking for SHSP monies for a program primarily aimed at the southern part of Nevada. Both Sandy Munns and Chief Giomi support this project, stressing the importance of information dissemination. Evan Hannah indicated the goal of this project is coordination of teams in the south and north.

Project B – Presenter Ryan Miller briefed the body noting the NTAC is one of 78 in the United States, and one of two in Nevada. Working with 17 out of 18 counties, tribal nations, the Governor’s office, and more, his goal is to share information on a collaborative basis. He is looking to sustain the NTAC to include current staff and operational costs. Nicole Hart pointed out a potential error relating to the amount of dollars allocated for sustainment of analyst and coordinator positions, with Lt. Miller indicating his attention to the mistake, although the overall cost of the project would not change as a result. Dan Lake inquired on funding received the prior year, with Lt. Miller indicating this year there is an increase due to the fact that he did not ask for a full budget last year as there were previous year’s monies available to cover costs. Kelli Anderson indicated she would work with each project presenter moving forward to correct any issues on the spreadsheet.

Project C – Presenter Jim Seebock stressed the importance of SNCTC’s role, particularly as it relates to the #1, and #3 priorities of the Commission. No questions were presented from the northern venue. Aaron Kenneston did present concern at the total amount of money being requested for this single project. HSWG member Jim Pitts, Elko County joined the meeting at 11:20am, as he was unavoidably detained. Kelli Anderson spoke to questions she will pose regarding the future line item budget.

Project D – NDOT MPLS, \$66,000.00

Project E – Clark County MPLS, \$230,000.00

Project X – Nevada Core MPLS Implementation, \$352,360.00

Rick Nelson indicated that presenter for Project D, Dave Loar, had been delayed and if possible, the body could forward until he could be present. Presenter Steve Martin instructed the body that he could speak to all three projects, D, E, and X as they were all related. He briefed the body on the basic requests for each projects. Aaron Kenneston and Stacey Giomi inquired if these are all to be considered together. Steve Martin indicated projects broken down into three parts for affordability split amongst three entities moving forward at their own discretion. Discussion ensued pertaining to NCSC rankings, of which these projects were ranked 4, 5, and 6 respectively in addition to concern about moving forward with this type of broadband effort. Stacey Giomi asked if all projects must go together or if they can be taken individually in addition to asking why there are differing capabilities. Capability can be changed if needed per Mr. Martin. Should be “intelligence and information sharing”. Nicole Hart and Stacey Giomi believe this should be aligned with communications.

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

Project F – Presenter Al Noyola briefed the body indicating that Phase I was complete, and that cyber-security is a forefront priority. Phase II is a train-the-trainer project which requests funding from both the UASI and SHSP. Should UASI funding go away, Mr. Noyola is hopeful there is still consideration for this project as written through SHSP means. No questions were posed in the northern location. Nicole Hart inquired if the recognition of 501(c)(3) status had been obtained as of yet, with Mr. Noyola inferring that the strategic planning session is in the works for the bylaw creation and website at cybersafe.nv.org. At the request of Ryan Turner, Mr. Noyola indicated that this project has been validated by the Nevada Cyber Security Committee, with a ranking of #2. This was confirmed by Commissioner Chris Ipsen, Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. The #1 priority was disaster recovery. CIAS has seen uniquely positive participation in the north and south. It's a positive step forward.

Project G – Presenter Darin Balaam presented his project stressing the need for cyber security awareness through training. Aaron Kenneston inquired if there is overlap with the previous proposal, or if there are efficiencies we can achieve between both proposals. Assistant Sheriff Balaam indicated if there is, he would be open to collaboration.

Project H – Presenter Terry Daus briefed by body on his project request, indicating results will enable the state to develop data recovery for the Henderson area and LVMPD. Mr. Daus stressed the importance of returning information technology systems to a functional status, indicating this as a critical function. Aaron Kenneston again inquired if there is potential for overlap between all of the cyber-related projects to establish efficiency. Mr. Daus indicated that while the other projects were more information driven, this project is more technological. Bruce Barnes, NV Energy anticipated that we already have a business analysis impact, and whether this is a new initiative. Discussion ensued, and it appears the last business analysis was done at least 10 years ago, so it is not current. Commissioner Ipsen indicated that this is an ongoing process, and technology is changing rapidly. Business impact analysis is critical when bringing systems up and down. Kelly Anderson indicated she will make a correction to the Proposing/Lead Agency denotation on this project, eliminating the MPLS notation.

Project I – Presenter Jim Earl gave a detailed briefing to the body indicated this project is supported by numerous Chief Information Officers pertaining to network monitoring. Referring to the vicious cycle of malware, Mr. Earl stressed that Silver-Net connects all cities and counties including law enforcement, and financial support for such monitoring will end in October 2013. The 501(c)(3) will be a likely target of sequester. Mr. Earl's intention is to extend protection to the state and its networks operated by Clark County, Washoe County, and the City of Las Vegas. This is important for the first responder community. Carolyn Levering, City of Las Vegas indicated that in review of his proposal, there is no specific discussion with affected cities as to how those cities are budgeting for this over the next 18 months. Aaron Kenneston agreed, indicating again there could be potential to achieve efficiency. Mr. Earl indicated there is no redundancy with this proposal. Per a question posed by Ryan Turner, Mr. Earl indicated that this project was presented as an informational item to the Cyber Security Committee, however action could not be taken as the meeting cycle was too short. Kelli Anderson inquired if the project is new, or an enhancement. Per Mr. Earl, it should be an enhancement as the Homeland Security Commission has approved other continuous monitoring projects in the past. Further questions continued if this project was an augmentation. Sustainment of the new cyber analyst is currently unknown.

The body broke for lunch at 12:06pm for one hour. Meeting resumed at 1:15pm.

Project J – Presenter Valerie Sumner briefed the body on project background information including the importance of the yellow-dot system and its relation to medical information about the household. Jim Pitts indicated his support of this program. Aaron Kenneston inquired if this project was in addition to the Citizen Corps money received in the state. Chief Smith indicated there is no direct funding stream for Citizen Corps, as that ended last year. Kelli Anderson inquired if this project is really related to public information and warning rather than planning. Ms. Sumner indicated she felt strongly that the function lies in public information and warning due to the assistance provided to first

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

responders. Discussion also touched briefly on whether the performance period was adequate for completion of this project.

Chief Smith suggested that the body should be looking at grouping similar projects, with agreement noted by Kelli Anderson. Ms. Anderson indicated as the body works through the process, there should be an understanding that the outcome of the meeting is to group projects by the priority of which they were submitted. Stacey Giomi inquired further if the groupings would be by core capability, with confirmation that they would be grouped in that manner.

Project K – Presenter Aaron Kenneston briefed the body on this project's sustainment request for the public information warning plan, with the goal to personally visit every county ensuring the plan is accessible throughout the state. Additionally, every emergency manager, and partners, will be included as to understand the tools available. Michael Johnson, Clark County indicated that transmissions don't work well in his area due to topography issues. Mr. Kenneston indicated that without cell towers or additional repeaters, increasing the reach of communication capability is difficult. The goal of this project is to take existing means and tie them together, though Mr. Kenneston acknowledges there are big gaps in the technology. Dan Lake inquired about Mr. Kenneston's entry on line item "12d" pertaining to PIO training for \$20,000. Mr. Kenneston indicated the intent is to put training out into rural locations. Vendors will use their own monies to come to Washoe if they wish to put on classes. Mr. Lake suggested that Mr. Kenneston amend his proposal to reflect this.

Project L – Presenter Valerie Sumner briefed the body on this project. Ms. Sumner defended the need for this project to remain in the category of Public Information and Warning; however through much discussion throughout the body, this project may have to be changed to Planning.

Project M – Presenter Michael Johnson briefed the body on this project, with inquiry from Peter Mulvihill, Nevada Department of Public Safety as to whether this program takes into consideration taking advantage of other training programs. Mr. Mulvihill indicated training is available through the state for far less money.

Project N – Presenter was not available to present this project. Carolyn Levering indicated that this project has been pulled for consideration. Nicole Hart, LVMPD indicated that the UAWG believes this to be rescinded due to the for-profit status of the submitter.

Project O – Presenter Paul Burke briefed the body on this project. Carolyn Levering inquired if the project falls under the SWIC's responsibility. Per Mr. Burke, this year the training falls under NIMS, and the NCSC has approved this to be moved forward. Kelli Anderson asked that Mr. Burke provide state sub-recipients jurisdiction information pertaining to item #9 on the project proposal form. Chad Westom asked if there could be a brief clarification on item "12f" regarding personnel and contractors as it relates to the purpose for each. Mr. Burke indicated that contractors provide the training under interoperable communications, and there is currently no one with that skillset in-house. Ryan Turner inquired if information submitted under the personnel section is either existing or new in nature. Mr. Burke indicated that PSIC program may be currently supporting contractors in training, and currently there is a contractor under the PTE Manpower position, and the others would be new.

Jerry Keating inquired as to how much training the state has performed for Clark County Fire Department (CCFD) this past year, with Mr. Burke indicating that CCFD to his knowledge had not requested any training from the state, although the state did support the provision of training.

Project P – Presenter Stacey Giomi briefed the body on this project, indicating that it builds on a PSIC grant to build an Ethernet microwave network to connect disparate systems. CAD sharing would be available amongst law enforcement and fire personnel. The NCSC ranked this project as #3. Carolyn Levering presented concern if the \$617,260.00 represented the entire cost, or if this was a phased approach. Chief Giomi indicated this is the full amount, however if phased, could present additional costs due to equipment installation and repeated integrations.

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

Project Q – Presenter Stephanie Wilson briefed the body on this. Dan Lake indicated there is a plan in place to allow dispatch in CCSD to talk with dispatch. Discussion ensued as to the total of consoles required, and the fact that consoles aren't related to staffing levels. Current operations require moving radio traffic to allow for emergency channels. Brian Nebeker indicated that there are skeleton shifts on days and swings with restrictions to how many positions are manned. Key operations are not at a level of 6, they are at a level of 10. Dispatch center acts currently as call takers and dispatchers. 8 positions would allow them to function at higher level of efficiency and safety. Stacey Giomi inquired if field deputies have communication with SNACC using mobile radios, with discussion resulting in the fact that this project is to connect those 8 consoles to SNACC, it has nothing to do with the field units. Kelli Anderson asked if this should be operational coordination or communications. Brian Nebeker indicated that it hasn't been vetted by the NCSC at this time, and this is scheduled to be vetted at the next grants subcommittee meeting.

Project R – This project was taken off this list for consideration.

Project S – Presenter Richard Resnick briefed the body on this proposal, indicating the scope of which would include Arizona, Department of Public Safety, Clark County School District, police, and various other departments. Mr. Resnick indicated that Mesquite will no longer be a dead spot tying interoperability between Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. Use of de-obligated funding, internal funding, and other grant resources has allowed this request to be brought down under \$500,000.00. A correction to the date on line #3 was made to reflect 2/2014. Chief Magenheimer inquired if this project was vetted by the NCSC, with indication from Mr. Resnick that it has not. VHF capability will be maintained for the Bunker Hill and Moapa Valley area, as all legacy systems will be maintained. Further discussion surrounded the designation of core capability for this project..

Project T – Presenter Kelli Baratti briefed the body on this project indicating that it is a priority #4 from the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security. The contract will go before the Board of Examiners in June 2013 with a 90-day roll-out beta test. The resource management piece is denoted as sustainment, with the credentialing piece denoted as an enhancement. No sub grantees are noted for this project. Dan Lake presented concern about future costs, speaking directly to a balance of \$540,000.00 still unspent. Ms. Baratti indicated the resource management portion reflects her position, while the resource management support contractor is an existing part-time position. Though the credentialing project technician was funded in FFY2011, it was cut in FFY2012, and Ms. Baratti is asking for that position back. FFY2011 money in the amount of \$540,000.00 is still showing unspent as a condition tied to the contract she has referred to in this conversation. Discussion ensued as to who actually has these programs, with Ms. Baratti indicating the state does. Also discussed was the necessity to maintain three servers for redundancy. Nicole Hart presented concerns over supplanting issues, particularly with how WebEOC has been licensed to this point. Ms. Anderson indicated that the purchase of WebEOC was out of a Homeland Security program in 2003, not under SHSP. Since that time, it has been sustained by EMPG and Homeland Security. There is no supplanting. .

Project U – Presenter Kelli Anderson briefed the body on this request, indicating this request is similar to requests in past years. There was no request last year as there were enough funds to sustain the project. Of importance with this request is the request to purchase a web-based program to automate the grant process. Such a system would present real-time reporting on both state and UASI progress to meet state goals on projects. Though the cost appears to be hi, other grant programs may be leveraged with access through a pay structure. This would assist in communications to federal partners and manual data calls. Discussion was presented as to whether this request should be under planning instead, with Ms. Anderson indicating that she is open to look at other options. The system is currently being used in Arizona, Texas, Utah, and Florida as well as other states.

Project V – Carolyn Levering indicated that this may fall under MMR, and as such the project was removed from consideration.

Project W – Presenter Sandy Munns briefed the body on this project, indicating that he will modify the request to eliminate the suits, but the request for \$186,000.00 for gas detection equipment needs to remain. Kelli Anderson inquired if one entity will purchase the equipment and then push it out to other

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

entities. Mr. Munns indicated the purchase would be done through Reno Fire Department, co-owned by Triad, and issued out to the three named entities in the proposal. Carolyn Levering, noting the changes, inquired whether the designation of operational coordination applies to this project now, with Mr. Munns in agreement.

Project Y – This project was removed from consideration.

Project Z – Presenter Selby Marks briefed the body on the necessity of both the SWIC and CPM positions. Kelli Anderson questioned item “12f” and whether these positions were state employees. Mr. Marks indicated that both are contracted personnel. A correction was made to the original request for funding 25% from UASI and 75% SHSP. Funding request of \$192,500 will be moved to 100%. This funding request will cover 50% of the required monies needed for both positions, and the other half will be covered by SLIGP.

Committee broke for break at 2:54pm, resuming meeting at 3:05pm.

Project AA – Presenter Irene Navis indicated this project is a companion to Projects BB and U filling the gap with no intention to be an overlap to Citizen Corps or CERT. Dan Lake presented concern that there are two venues functioning here. If the state is funded to do this, duplicative portions of the request should be withdrawn. Aaron Kenneston questioned a \$50,000.00 request from SHSP, with Ms. Navis indicating that she is not yet certain the state will cover that portion.

Project BB – Presenter Mike Johnson noted that this proposal shared similarities to Proposal AA, and moving forward, this will be combined with Project AA.

Project CC – Presenter Sharon Harding briefed the body on this project, indicating the necessity of sustaining the volunteer program. Ms. Harding spoke to her concern of not being able to obtain new volunteers. There have been 157,000 hours of volunteer work done within this program, issuing handicap parking citations, assisting hundreds of thousands of people. Because of the size and scope of this program, the additional investigators are sorely needed.

Project DD – Presenter Darin Balaam briefed the body on this project to sustain and expand the current program in place. Sustainment will be accomplished by the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office and a current contractor providing outreach.

Project LL – Presenter Rick Diebold briefed the body on the importance of this project with emphasis on what CERT does. He supports Lincoln, Nye, and Esmeralda counties as well.. Kelli Anderson apologized for an administrative error, correcting the amounts requested as \$39,100.00 for SHSP, and \$156,400.00 for UASI

Project EE – Presenter Regina Marotto briefed the body with an overview of ITERC activities, indicating that this project submission is equally split between sustainment and enhancement to continue NIMS and THIRA completion. THIRA was not previously a requirement, but NPGP requires this moving forward into FFY2014. Ms. Marotto indicated that it is possible to coordinate with Project O, however several tribes did participate wanting to have their own jurisdiction instead. Kelli Anderson inquired if the tribes are required to submit their own THIRA, with clarification from Ms. Marotto that this is the case per FEMA. Ms. Anderson further inquired if the federal government indicated if they would support the THIRA directly or if the states would have to support the THIRA through the traditional HSGP. There could be the possibility of unfunded mandates.

Project FF – Presenter Devin Ballard briefed the body on the importance of this project, with interjection that the project should be “sustained”. Kelli Anderson will correct this on the proposal. Aaron Kenneston inquired how this project coordinates with CST, with Mr. Huffmaster indicating there is a good partnership between the two entities. Kelli Anderson indicated that moving forward, a detailed line item budget will have to look at the pieces of equipment in question

OFFICIAL MINUTES – Approved at the June 13, 2013 Homeland Security Working Group Meeting.

Project GG – No presenter was available to speak to this project. Chief Smith indicated that the project will still be kept for consideration.

Project HH – Project taken off of list for consideration.

Project II – Presenter Chris Sproule briefed the body on the importance of this project, with Aaron Kenneston inquiring if this mimics programs such as Citizen Corps. Carolyn Levering noted support of this project as previous acts which were more municipality-based became more regional in nature. The Las Vegas MMRS assets are deployable statewide. Additional discussion presented by Jane Shunney, Southern Nevada Health District pertaining to the inclusion of prophylactics and other

Project JJ – Presenter Evan Hannah briefed the body that the UAWG agreed, and approved \$123,000.00 for equipment on FFY2010 de-obligated funding. They could not put in \$20,000.00 for exercise requirements. Mr. Hannah requested to pull the remainder of this proposal from consideration.

Project KK – No presenter was available to speak to this project. Chief Smith indicated that the project will still be kept for consideration.

9. PROJECT PROPOSAL FUNDING DISCUSSION

Doug Lyon opened discussion on this agenda item by asking the body to categorize project requests by priority. Each proposal priority was read into record, with discussion on whether to leave the priority designation as is, or to change it to better reflect a more appropriate priority. A summary of the outcome of this discussion is as follows regarding Projects A through LL:

Committee agreed to leave the following projects with no change to originally submitted priority designation:

A, B, C, F, H, I, K, M, O, P, T, W, X, Z, AA, CC, DD, EE, GG, II, KK, LL

Committee agreed to change the following projects from their originally submitted priority designations to the following designations:

D: Changed to Operational Communications; HSWG agreed unanimously

E: Changed to Operational Communications; HSWG agreed unanimously

G: Changed to Planning; HSWG agreed unanimously

J: Changed to Planning; on a majority vote of 21 yay to 1 nay, HSWG changed priority to Planning. Committee discussion over Project J ensued as the Valerie Sumner, Project Manager felt strongly that this project should be prioritized under Public Information and Warning. Jim Pitts, Elko agreed. Discussion continued as to why this project was not considered a warning device, with Chief Smith indicating that the overall reach of Citizen Emergency Response Teams (CERT) is not public information, but rather planning.

L: Changed to Planning; HSWG agreed unanimously

Q: Operational Communications; HSWG agreed unanimously

S: Operational Communications; HSWG agreed unanimously

U: Planning; HSWG agreed unanimously

FF: Operational Coordination; HSWG agreed unanimously

Doug Lyon and Chief Smith called for a final vote to ensure consensus, with the recommendation from Chief Smith that those items identified as changed are voted on first. Chief Giomi presented a motion to approve those projects which are to be changed according to the vote, with Ryan Turner seconding the motion. All were in favor with no opposition. Chief Giomi presented a motion to approve the remainder of the project which were voted on that have no recommended changes, with Dan Lake seconding the motion. All were in favor in both instances with no opposition.

10. PROJECT PROPOSAL FUNDING DISCUSSION

Doug Lyon opened the discussion recommending that any submitting body amend their proposals based on the feedback obtained from the working group.

Kelly Anderson read into record the total dollar amount of all submitted project requests for FFY2013, less those projects noted as withdrawn earlier are as follows:

SHSP:	\$4,663,149.00
UASI:	<u>\$3,717,184.00</u>
Total:	\$8,380,333.00

Chief Smith indicated that it is imparitive to move a balanced budget to the Finance Committee again this year. This will show a firm commitment to the investment justification process. In order to accomplish this, project leads need to work together, or pare down projects to better leverage resources. Kelli Anderson explained how the process will move forward, indicating there will be three deliverables to include adjusted proposals, line item budgets, and the budget narratives. The narratives will allow what is being done with the line items within the budget. Aaron Kenneston inquired as to how confident funding amounts will be this year? Chief Smith indicated that he expects similar funding for SHSP less sequestor impact, and although there is a possibility of no longer having a dedicated funding stream for UASI, work is being done with Secretary Napolitano for discretionary funding. Once that information is available, it will be shared with the group.

Stacey Giomi inquired who this information will be sent out to, and Kelli Anderson indicated that the information will go out to all project managers and interested parties.

Chief Smith put forth a recommendation that the voting membership of the working group meet in person in Carson City, with a small venue to be offered in Las Vegas for those members who cannot travel for this meeting.

Doug Lyon thanked the state staff, and the UASI personnel for working through this process today. Chief Smith reiterated his thanks, offering additional gratitude to the Emergency Management staff in their support of not only this body, but numerous others bodies as well.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Lake indicated that the iPad technology worked very well.

Bruce Barnes presented commentary on the fact that although critical infrastructure was a high priority of the Commission, many of the proposals heard today had very little to do with critical infrastructure. As a member of the private sector involved heavily in cyber security, Mr. Barnes indicated that although he could not submit project justifications on his own, he could offer his assistance to anyone submitting enhanced projects.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chief Smith called for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was presented by Ryan Turner, and a second was provided by Nicole Hart. All were in favor with no opposition.