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Overview

- About the SLTTGCC and RC3
- About the Regional Overview Project
- Findings: Current State of Critical Infrastructure Mission Implementation
  - State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Programs
  - Public-Private Partnerships
  - Challenges and Needs
- Advancing Critical Infrastructure Capabilities
  - Recommendations to Improve Federal Programs
  - Best Practices
  - Annual Outreach
About the NIPP Partnership Councils

State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Government Coordinating Council

- Established in 2007
- 28 members representing 10 States, 17 local governments, and 1 tribe
- Coordinate across jurisdictions and disciplines
- Provide senior-level strategic communications and coordination on security and resilience initiatives, activities, and best practices
- [https://www.dhs.gov/sltt-gcc](https://www.dhs.gov/sltt-gcc)

Regional Consortium Coordinating Council

- Established in 2008
- 32 members representing 37 States and 10 metropolitan areas
- Understand, connect, enable and build partnerships to enhance the protection of the critical infrastructure of the United States and the resilience of our communities
- [https://rtriplec.wordpress.com/](https://rtriplec.wordpress.com/)
Background: Regional Overview Project

**Background:**
- Collaboration between the SLTTGCC and RC3 partnership councils
- Build upon previous reports/studies of the partnership councils (Phase 1); submitted to DHS/IP and Council networks
  - SLTTGCC Regional Reports
  - SLTTGCC Tribal Report
  - RC3 Member and Mission Landscape Study

**Purpose and Value:**
- Help partners implement the critical infrastructure mission:
  - Support dialogue opportunities among critical infrastructure professionals
  - Develop documents for partners: Region Snapshot, best practice summaries, news articles
- Work directly with DHS:
  - Articulate stakeholder needs
  - Suggest improvements to Federal critical infrastructure programs to increase use/effectiveness in the field
1. SLTT critical infrastructure programs vary considerably between jurisdictions. No two programs exactly alike in mission responsibility or resource availability.

2. SLTT critical infrastructure programs are increasingly risk-informed. Programs prioritize efforts based on the dynamic threat environment, despite limited resources.

3. SLTT critical infrastructure programs focus activities on core capabilities: identify infrastructure, assess and analyze risk, build partnerships, and share information.

### Findings: SLTT Critical Infrastructure Mission Implementation

#### Home Agency Type

- 45% Fusion Center
- 25% Emergency Management
- 20% Homeland Security
- 10% Homeland Security / Emergency Management

#### Focus Areas Informing SLTT Program Priorities

- Lifeline Sectors
- Threat Information
- Natural Disaster Emergency...
- Economic Drivers
- Infrastructure Dependencies

#### NIPP 2013 Risk Management Framework

- Set Goals & Objectives
- Identify Infrastructure
- Assess & Analyze Risks
- Implement Risk Management Activities
- Measure Effectiveness

- INFORMATION SHARING
Findings: Partnership Critical Infrastructure Mission Implementation

4. Public-private **partnerships** embrace a non-profit governance structure and are designed to focus on all critical infrastructure issues across all sectors.

5. Public-private partnerships actively contribute to the critical infrastructure security and resilience mission through valued **preparedness and incident response activities**. Examples:
   - Hosting events
   - Sharing information
   - Coordinating private sector resources and expertise
   - Addressing operational concerns
Findings: Needs to Sustain Critical Infrastructure Activities

6. **SLTT programs** are concerned about sustaining program operations, due to reduced homeland security grant funding, loss of UASI designations, and constraints on SLTT budgets. Funding and personnel are needed to implement core program functions (assessments, outreach, training, and cyber activities).

![Primary SLTT Critical Infrastructure Program Needs](chart)

7. Sustainability is a major concern for **public-private partnerships**. Access to additional critical infrastructure education opportunities, stronger connections between partnerships, and improved information-sharing programs and mechanisms are needed.

![Primary Public-Private Partnership Needs](chart)
Advancing Critical Infrastructure Capabilities

Submit Recommendations to DHS to Improve Federal Programs
- Grants
- Training, Exercises, Technical Assistance, and Best Practices
- Cybersecurity
- Information Sharing
- DHS Field Personnel
- IP Gateway

Disseminate Best Practices
- Building cybersecurity program capabilities
- Hosting all-hazards exercises, topical Webinars, and sector conferences/workshops
- Active public-private partnerships, lifeline sector councils, and sector-specific working groups
- Real-time information-sharing networks
- Resource sharing networks
- Building local-level assessment and prioritization tools
- Establishing private sector liaison programs and EOC integration

Conduct Annual Outreach to Critical Infrastructure Personnel
- Email the SLTTGCC if you want to be contacted: SLTTGCC@hq.dhs.gov
SLTTGCC/RC3 Regional Working Group:

- **Kevin Clement**, State of Texas (SLTTGCC Regional Initiatives Working Group Co-Chair)
- **Irene Navis**, Clark County, Nevada (SLTTGCC Regional Initiatives Working Group Co-Chair)
- **Shelly Schechter**, Nassau County, New York (SLTTGCC Information Sharing Working Group Chair)
- **Tom Moran**, All Hazards Consortium (RC3 Vice Chair)
- **Peter Ohtaki**, California Resiliency Alliance (RC3 Executive Committee Member)

SLTTGCC Regional Initiatives Working Group:

- Irene Navis, Clark County, Nevada (Co-Chair)
- Kevin Clement, State of Texas (Co-Chair)
- Silvana Croope, State of Delaware
- Matthew Iannelli, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
- Susan Palchick, Hennepin County, Minnesota
- Shelly Schechter, Nassau County, New York
- Danielle Hale, Nueces County, Texas
- Jeff Graviet, Salt Lake County, Utah
- Brian Clement, East Greenwich, Rhode Island
- Paul Dean, University of New Hampshire
- Theresa Masse, Port of Portland, Oregon