# **SENIOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

# SENIOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Indiana Government Center-South Conference Room C and Microsoft Teams Meeting

**Stephen Cox – Chair** 

# **MEETING MINUTES**

June 8, 2022 at 1:00 p.m.

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Barnes, Tracey – Indiana Office of Technology Executive Director Bilkey, Matt – Indiana State Police Assistant Chief of Staff/Operations Cain, Steven – Purdue University Extension

Cox, Stephen – Indiana Department of Homeland Security Executive Director Dignin, Kelly – Integrated Public Safety Commission Executive Director (proxy for Sally Fay)\*

Lee, Janice – Indiana Department of Homeland Security Division Project Manager (proxy for Peri Rogowski)

Elcesser, John – Indiana Non-Public Education Association Executive Director\* Johnson, Phil – University of Notre Dame\* \*attended via Microsoft Teams

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Beier, Bernie – Allen County Homeland Security Director Wilson, Michael – Warsaw-Wayne Fire Department Chief

#### CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND QUORUM

Stephen Cox, Indiana Department of Homeland Security (IDHS) Executive Director, called the SAC meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and it was determined that there was a quorum.

# **APPROVE MINUTES FROM May 16, 2022 MEETING**

Stephen Cox presented the May 16, 2022 SAC meeting minutes for approval.

# **MOTION:**

Tracey Barnes moved to approve the minutes from the May 16, 2022 SAC meeting. The motion was seconded by Steve Cain. A roll call vote was held, and the motion passed unanimously.

#### ALL IN FAVOR:

Barnes, Tracey Bilkey, Matt Cain, Steven Cox, Stephen
Dignin, Kelly (proxy for Sally Fay)
Lee, Janice (proxy for Peri Rogowski)
Elcesser, John
Johnson, Phil

OPPOSED: NA

# INFORMATION REGARDING THE FFY 2022 STATE HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM (SHSP) FEDERAL NOFO AND APPLICATION PROCESS

Rachel Cosner presented to the committee a review of the FFY 2022 SHSP national priorities, example projects, objectives, requirements and applications.

# SHSP Requirements

IDHS target allocation is \$4,847,500.00. IDHS, as the SHSP grant pass-through entity, is required to award 80%, or \$3,878,000.00, of the federal award while maintaining 20%, or \$969,500.00, for internal projects including 5%, or \$242,375.00, for the management and administration of the award. The 20% includes the two Fusion Center projects and a project for the Indiana State Excise Police. IDHS must ensure at least 30%, or \$1,454,250.00, of the federal award is used for Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities (LETPA) and this figure was exceeded by approved applications. IDHS must also ensure that at least 30%, or \$1,454,250.00, of the award goes toward the identified national priorities/investment justifications and this figure was exceeded by approved applications. IDHS must make these subawards available within 45 days after receiving the federal award letter. Lastly, the establishment of a Senior Advisory Committee is required by the SHSP grant.

#### National Funding Priorities

The FEMA-identified SHSP national priorities, or investment justifications (IJ), are as follows: Cybersecurity, Soft Targets/Crowded Places, Information and Intelligence Sharing and Cooperation, Domestic Violent Extremism, Enhancing Community Preparedness and Resilience and Enhancing Election Security.

# Cybersecurity Investment Justification

The cybersecurity investment justification does not have a minimum requirement. Cybersecurity investments must support the security and functioning of critical infrastructure and core capabilities as they relate to preventing, preparing for, protecting against or responding to acts of terrorism.

# Soft Targets and Crowded Places Investment Justification

The soft targets and crowded places investment justification must be at least 3%, or \$145,425.00, of the award. Soft targets and crowded places are increasingly appealing to terrorists due to their relative accessibility and large number of potential targets. This is complicated by the prevalent use of simple tactics and less sophisticated attacks. Public and private sectors should collaborate to enhance security in these locations.

Information and Intelligence Sharing and Cooperation Investment Justification

The information and intelligence sharing and cooperation investment justification must be at least 3%, or \$145,425.00, of the award. This investment justification is where the Fusion Center's application will be housed. Cooperation and information sharing among state, federal and local partners across all areas of the homeland security enterprise, including counterterrorism, cybersecurity, border security, immigration enforcement and other areas is critical to homeland security operations and the prevention of, preparation for, protection against and responding to acts of terrorism.

#### Domestic Violent Extremism Investment Justification

The domestic violent extremism investment justification must be at least 3%, or \$145,425.00, of the award. This investment justification must be in support of the state's efforts to combat the rise, influence and spread of domestic violent extremism.

# Enhancing Community Preparedness and Resilience Investment Justification

The enhancing community preparedness and resilience investment justification must be at least 3%, or \$145,425.00, of the award. This investment justification must bolster community preparedness and resilience by investing in local, community-driven capabilities, enable community organizations to have the capabilities to withstand acts of terrorism and provide essential services, and address the needs of underserved, atrisk communities to help ensure consistent and systematic, fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals before, during, and after a disaster.

# Enhancing Election Security Investment Justification

The enhancing election security investment justification does not have a minimum requirement. Securing election infrastructure and ensuring an election free from foreign interference are national security priorities. Threats to election systems are constantly evolving, so defending these systems requires constant vigilance, innovation, and adaptation.

#### Addressing National Priorities

IDHS sent an information bulletin to the locals the week of May 16, 2022, which highlighted this year's national priorities, funding caps, application caps and SHSP requirements. Applicants could submit one priority application and one non-priority application with a cap of \$150,000.00 per project. These applications were due on June 1, 2022, at 5 p.m. EDT. IDHS received a total of one-hundred nine (109) applications requesting \$13,038,229.79. Seventy-seven (77) of the applications were priority and the remaining thirty-two (32) were non-priority applications. Each application was reviewed three times and ranked based on fit of terrorism nexus, national priority and Indiana core capability ranking. Additionally, all communications projects were reviewed by the Statewide Interoperability Coordinator (SWIC) and all cyber security projects were reviewed by the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT). The Core Capabilities applicants used to justify their projects will be compared to Indiana's Core Capabilities chart, which was determined by the 2021 Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR). Regarding the core capability chart, green is considered a high priority, yellow is considered a medium priority, red is considered a low priority and grey is not considered a priority at this time.

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: FUND

Thirty-six (36) projects totaling \$4,605,125 were recommended for funding by the SHSP review committee. Seventeen (17) projects totaling \$2,484.899.09 were recommended for the National Priority IJs. Nineteen (19) projects totaling \$2,120,225.91 were recommended for the Local IJs.

#### **MOTION**

Steve Cain moved to approve and include the thirty-six (36) applications in the federal application. The motion was seconded by Phil Johnson. A roll call vote was held, and the motion passed. Matt Bilkey had stepped out prior to the roll call vote.

### **ALL IN FAVOR:**

Barnes, Tracey
Cain, Steven
Cox, Stephen
Dignin, Kelly (proxy for Sally Fay)
Lee, Janice (proxy for Peri Rogowski)
Elcesser, John
Johnson, Phil

### OPPOSED: NA

# REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: DENY

The SHSP review committee recommends the SAC deny the remaining seventy-three (73) projects which totaled \$8,328,330.12.

#### **MOTION:**

Steve Cain moved to deny the remaining seventy-three (73) applications. The motion was seconded by Phil Johnson. A roll call vote was held, and the motion passed. Matt Bilkey had stepped out prior to the roll call vote.

## ALL IN FAVOR:

Barnes, Tracey
Cain, Steven
Cox, Stephen
Dignin, Kelly (proxy for Sally Fay)
Lee, Janice (proxy for Peri Rogowski)
Elcesser, John
Johnson, Phil

# OPPOSED: NA

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The next SAC meeting will be in August or September after IDHS receives the federal award from FEMA. Rachel Cosner will send an invite to the SAC closer to the date.

#### ADJOURNMENT:

Following no further discussion or business, Stephen Cox thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Tracy Barnes moved for the meeting to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Steve Cain. The SAC meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m.