NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY COUNCIL

BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
July 17, 2012
1:30 PM – 4:30 PM EDT
1310 North Courthouse Road
Suite 300, Washington II Conference Room
Arlington, VA 22201

I.	**OPENING OF MEETING**	*Nancy J. Wong,* Designated Federal Officer (DFO), National Infrastructure Advisory Council (NIAC), Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
II.	**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**	*Nancy J. Wong,* DFO, NIAC, DHS
III.	**OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS**	*Nancy J. Wong,* DFO, NIAC, DHS
		The Honorable Rand Beers, Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, DHS
		Suzanne Spaulding, Deputy Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, DHS
		Caitlin Durkovich, Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, DHS
		Brian Kamoie, Senior Director, Preparedness Policy, National Security Staff
		Dr. Ahsha Tribble, Director for Critical Infrastructure Protection and Resilience Policy, National Security Staff *(invited)*

IV. APPROVAL OF APRIL 2012 MINUTES	*Nancy J. Wong,* DFO, NIAC, DHS
V. NIAC REGIONAL RESILIENCE WORKING GROUP UPDATE	*Constance H. Lau,* NIAC Working Group Chair *Dr. Beverly Scott*, NIAC Working Group Co-Chair
VI. PUBLIC COMMENT: DISCUSSION LIMITED TO MEETING AGENDA ITEMS AND PREVIOUS NIAC STUDIES	
VII. CLOSING REMARKS	*Suzanne Spaulding,* Deputy Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, DHS *Caitlin Durkovich,* Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, DHS
VIII. Adjournment	*Nancy J. Wong*, DFO, NIAC, DHS

MINUTES

NIAC MEMBERS PRESENT IN WASHINGTON:
Mr. David Grain, Mr. Michael Wallace

NIAC MEMBERS ATTENDING VIA CONFERENCE CALL:
Mr. Jack Baylis; Mr. Wesley Bush; Mr. Albert J. Edmonds; Mr. Glenn Gerstell; Ms. Margaret E. Grayson; Mr. Donald Knauss; Ms. Constance H. Lau; Mr. James Reid; Dr. Beverly Scott

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Mr. David Bronczek; Mr. Gilbert Gallegos; Mr. Philip Heasley; Commissioner Raymond Kelly; Mr. David Kepler; Mr. James Nicholson; Mr. Thomas E. Noonan; Mr. Bruce Rohde; Mr. Gregory A. Peters; Mr. Greg Wells

SUBSTANTIVE POINTS OF CONTACT PRESENT IN WASHINGTON:

SUBSTANTIVE POINTS OF CONTACT ATTENDING VIA CONFERENCE CALL:
Ms. Frances Paulson (for Mr. David Bronczek); Mr. Gerald Buckwalter (for Mr. Wesley Bush); Mr. Kevin Hayes (for Commissioner Raymond Kelly); Ms. Joan Gehrke (for Mr. James Nicholson); Mr. Joe Long (for Mr. Gregory A. Peters)

OTHER DIGNITARIES PRESENT:
Mr. Rand Beers, Under Secretary NPPD; Ms. Suzanne Spaulding, Deputy Under Secretary, NPPD; Ms. Caitlin Durkovich, Assistant Secretary, IP, DHS; Mr. Charles Donnell; Mr. Brian Kamoie; and Ms. Nancy Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

I. OPENING OF MEETING

Nancy J. Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

Ms. Nancy Wong, the DFO for the NIAC, called the teleconference meeting to order and welcomed all individuals, both in person and via teleconference, to the NIAC Quarterly Business Meeting. Ms. Wong introduced NIAC members and their staff, Mr. Charles Donnell, Special Assistant to the President for Resiliency, of the National Security Staff, other Federal Government representatives, and members of the press and public in attendance.

Ms. Wong provided a synopsis of the Council's formation, history, pertinent reports and studies produced, and feedback and reception of its products. She noted that the NIAC is a long standing committee as represented by the recent Executive Order renewal in October 2011. Ms. Wong identified the NIAC as a presidentially-appointed council, with its work directly related to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7 (HSPD-7), which established a national policy for Federal departments and agencies to identify and prioritize critical infrastructure and key resources and to protect them from terrorist attacks. The Council provides the President, Secretary for DHS, and leadership of other relevant agencies with advice on the security and resilience of critical infrastructure supporting public and private sectors.

Ms. Wong reiterated the importance of the public and private sector partnership, which is exemplified by the Council representing the perspective of the critical infrastructure environment, on which the National economy and public safety depend. She noted that during the Council's 11 year history, it completed 21 studies on matters such as cooperation and partnership between the public and private sectors, policies and strategies involving risk assessment, information sharing, and critical infrastructure protection and resiliency impacting the public and private sectors.

II. ROLL CALL

Nancy J. Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

Ms. Wong called the roll and recorded attendance, noting whether members were attending in person or via teleconference. She reminded members of the Council that the meeting is open to the public and that appropriate care should be taken if and when discussing potentially sensitive information.

Upon completion of the roll call, Ms. Wong explained the public comment period. Although the NIAC had received no requests for public comments, the time would be noted in the record. Ms. Wong then called to order the third NIAC meeting of 2012.

III. OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Nancy J. Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

Caitlin Durkovich, Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, DHS

Charles Donnell, Special Assistant to the President for Resiliency, National Security Staff

Brian Kamoie, Senior Director, Preparedness Policy, National Security Staff

Dr. Ahsha Tribble, Director for Critical Infrastructure Protection and Resilience Policy, National Security Staff (invited)

Ms. Wong explained that in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Council, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) framework provides that the Council's Designated Federal Officer will provide continuity for the Council by running the Council's meetings until new Council leadership is appointed. Ms. Wong invited Charles Donnell, Special Assistant to the President for Resiliency, National Security Staff to make introductory remarks.

Mr. Donnell thanked Nancy and the Council for the opportunity to speak at the meeting. Mr. Donnell noted that in the time since Mr. Donnell has been in his new position, that there has been a ground swell of interest in the Council's work. This as a result of the recent National Level Exercise which he described as a very robust cyber related exercise, and the recent Derecho weather event which impacted many States from Indiana to the East Coast. Mr. Donnell commented that the Derecho was the third such event that had resulted in severe power outages over the last ten months. The other events were the snow event last fall that effected the Northeast, and Hurricane Irene. Mr. Donnell emphasized the White house's commitment to building relationships with the critical infrastructure community. Mr. Donnell expressed his interest in working with the Council on their current study and committed to familiarizing himself with the past studies the Council has completed.

Ms. Wong thanked Mr. Donnell for his remarks and participation.

IV. APPROVAL OF APRIL 2012 MINUTES

Nancy J. Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

Ms. Wong opened the floor to discussion of the April 2012 meeting minutes. In the absence of comments, it was moved to approve the minutes. The Council voted to approve the minutes.

V. NIAC REGIONAL RESILIENCE WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Constance H. Lau, NIAC Working Group Chair

Dr. Beverly Scott, NIAC Working Group Co-Chair

Ms. Wong invited Ms. Lau and Dr. Scott to present their update on the study on Regional Resilience. Ms. Wong introduced Ms. Lau and Dr. Scott, the Chairs of the working group.

Ms. Lau thanked Nancy and extended her gratitude to Mr. Wallace for his participation and guidance. She outlined the progress so far, beginning with Mr. Wallace's scoping group identifying the value in a study on regional resilience, the creation of the working group and how the study topic was developed. Ms. Lau said the study will build on the prior studies that have been done, but will be

unique in its approach to resilience at the regional level. Where past studies had focused primarily on sector resilience, this study would represent something distinct. Ms. Lau explained the findings of the scoping group, particularly their recommendation that the study look at the Northeastern United States for its significance to the Nation, and the complexities of scenarios that are presented by that region. The study will focus on the lifeline sectors of water, energy, transportation and telecommunications. The Northeast region, Ms. Lau noted, might have applicability to other regions of the United States. Ms. Lau then invited Dr. Scott to continue the presentation.

Dr. Scott identified the focus of her piece of the presentation as a brief status update, a definition of resilience, the study objectives that have been identified for the study, and the selection of the location of the study. Dr. Scott announced the selection of Philadelphia and the surrounding region for the case study area on regional resilience. The working group has begun reviewing applicable Federal, State, and local authorities, regulations, and policies to get a clear picture of the institutional planes within which resilience occurs. For the study the group will use the Council's definition from the 2009 and 2012 resilience studies with some small but notable adjustments. The stated focus on regional resilience will be the primary focus of this study and so the Study Group definition uses the explicit incorporation of concepts that were implicit in the general definition to ensure that those concepts were intentionally considered, specifically the notion of avoidance capabilities, the importance of partnership, and the critical component of learning and effectively mitigating the future risk by better anticipating and avoiding future potentially disruptive events.

Dr. Scott outlined the three study objectives presented; the focus and identification of best practices; the characteristics that make a region resilient; and the steps that can be taken by critical infrastructure owners and operators, State and local governments, and the private sector to improve resilience in their region.

Dr. Scott explained the decision to examine the Philadelphia region in the study. Dr. Scott identified the group's challenge as choosing a region that was sufficiently complex so that it would span several jurisdictions, states, and infrastructures, and could at the same time provide lessons to regions of similar size and complexity. The Philadelphia combined statistical area (CSA) spans four States, includes 6.6 million people, is economically significant, and has a rich mix of critical infrastructures. The CSA is similar in population, gross domestic product, and complexity to other major United States cities and regions. Dr. Scott said that New York City and Washington, D.C. were both considered but discarded because of their unique characteristics, New York City due to its size, and Washington, D.C. as the center of the Federal Government. Those factors give both regions a specialized and high risk profile.

Dr. Scott and Ms. Lau paused for comments from the Council, and hearing none, Ms. Lau continued the presentation.

Ms. Lau highlighted the framing questions required to complete the three study objectives outlined by Dr. Scott. These questions were distilled not only from the five teleconference meetings that the working group had, but also in-depth one-on-one interviews with working group members. The group will focus on the characteristics that make some regions more resilient than others, how organizations manage their critical infrastructure to increase resilience, the public-private partnerships that do exist currently, and how they might extend good best practices to all regions.

The study will look particularly at the question; How do personal relationships help in any national disaster?

Ms. Lau characterized the current study approach as flexible, designed to select the best method to get at particular questions. The group is currently reviewing best practices and legal authorities in the area of regional resilience, and trying to build on the work of prior studies. It is the Working Group's belief that there is a lot of work that has already been done, and that that work might allow the group to develop some hypothesis about a sector's resilience. The Working Group's goal being to apply that hypothesis to the Philadelphia CSA to examine regional resilience and whether best practices work and what gaps there might still be. If that hypothesis is viable, the group could then refine it, and be able to pressure-test that hypothesis in other regions. The group is being careful to ensure that the learning that comes out of this study can be applied across the United States, making sure to focus on the Federal role in particular.

Ms. Lau discussed the group's efforts to solicit feedback from the Federal officials tasking this study to ensure that the direction of the study would be of interest to them, and that they will find the results useful. Ms. Lau thanked the Working Group members and the support staff for their work and turned the meeting over to Ms. Wong for further business.

Ms. Wong recognized Deputy Under Secretary Spaulding for her comments.

Deputy Under Secretary Spaulding expressed that she was looking forward to seeing the results of this study, knowing that it builds on the previous work, including the resilience study of 2010, which was already terrifically helpful. Ms. Spaulding was pleased with the way the group framed the issues and the questions, and believes that there will be tremendous benefit from the work.

Ms. Spaulding noted that the insights provided by the Council make their way into policy documents at the highest levels. The resilience study from 2010, which looked at the electric and nuclear sectors, led directly to a meeting with DHS Secretary Napolitano and Energy Secretary Chu with members of the electricity and nuclear sectors discussing ways to enhance collaboration particularly with regard to major catastrophes that exceed the capacity and ability of one single sector to respond. That rose directly out of the pilot project effort the report talked about, and the insights that the Council provided.

Ms. Spaulding thanked the Council for allowing her to join in this, her third NIAC meeting, and participate in the discussion.

Ms. Wong recognized Mr. Wallace to discuss his observations on how the Council's recommendations have been implemented.

Mr. Wallace described a tabletop exercise that was validated with a CEO roundtable drawing on electricity sector representatives from around the country, and how that galvanized interest. Mr. Wallace stated that he believed that that engagement propelled private executives to move almost immediately on their part to understand the implications and urgency to address a beyond-reasonable failure of the electric grid in that sector.

Ms. Wong noted that the Council does not have to make recommendations to catalyze action, but just by asking a question that other people might have not asked, the Council can generate change.

The Council discussed the questions that they would like to pose to the Federal officials providing the current tasking.

Mr. Donnell responded to some of the Council's questions stating that DHS, on the heels of the national exercise, are recognizing the interdependency between our physical and cyber critical infrastructure and our cyber vulnerability, and that this is an area of interest. Following the Derecho event there is also significant interest in power response and restoration as well as the issue of aging infrastructure. Mr. Donnell identified those as the three things his team had identified.

Assistant Secretary Durkovich added that the federal family is looking at how they are organized for that public private sector outreach, and that there is recognition that it can be difficult at times. The desire is to streamline an approach that would be beneficial to all. She identifies that as something that she would seek to improve.

Both Mr. Donnell and Ms. Durkovich expressed strong interest in identifying how Federal facilities are involved as part of regional resilience. Mr. Donnell and Ms. Durkovich discussed a current pilot program near the National Capitol Region that will inform the larger effort being discussed by the Council.

Ms. Durkovich commented that the Government is good at looking at critical infrastructure in terms of its potential impact on the Government's ability in regards to continuity of operations, but has been slower to address critical infrastructure as a vital part of the economy and its impact on the government facility as a potential resource as part of the resiliency team.

Ms. Durkovich highlighted the Department's Regional Resiliency Assessment Program (RRAP) as a resource for the Council. Ms. Durkovich explained that that program was working closely with owners and operators to protect assets and increase awareness that we are built on a very complex and interconnected infrastructure.

Ms. Durkovich spoke on different regions and counties that deal with different hazards such as California and the Northwest regions dealing with earthquakes, mudslides. As a result, there are different levels of preparations, and ways to prepare. Realizing where the gaps are and where to go for additional resources is important. Ms. Durkovich highlighted the current Regional Initiative and the regional focus groups as helping with that effort. Ms. Durkovich described these focus group activities, going to the various Federal regions, and meeting with stakeholders on the State and local government level as well as reaching out to the private sector to discuss infrastructure protection and resiliency.

Dr. Scott asked would the results of the focus group studies be available to the NIAC working group.

Ms. Durkovich stated that seven have already been done thus far and they will work on getting a summary to the working group.

Ms. Wong will send a note to the Secretariat to send out the reports as they come available. The Regional Focus Groups are ongoing at the present time, and the next one will be held in Oklahoma.

Ms. Lau commented by saying this was really beneficial because the Working Group is currently in the data collection stage of the study.

Ms. Wong stated that Federal regions one, two, four, six, and nine have been done thus far. Also she commented that access will be granted to the reports once they become available.

Ms. Wong asked the Council members for any other contributions to the philosophical dialogue that Mr. Donnell started. Ms. Wong noted that there is a reasonable question to be asked related to how cyber and physical, as well as much of the continuity of critical infrastructures today, depend on cyber systems.

Ms. Durkovich added that this is certainly one of her main focus areas. She wanted everyone to be aware of the new Assistant Secretary for Cybersecurity and Communications, Michael Locatis. Ms. Durkovich affirmed that she and Assistant Secretary Locatis are very committed to working together to further this agenda. As many have heard, with the sheer volume of digital disruptions, it would be impossible to see all of what takes place every day. The Department would start this conversation off by talking about the National Level Exercise, the issues and challenges that the framework raised, and even how the Department responded to various issues.

Mr. Donnell pointed back to the resilience piece, talking about the thresholds of the Federal Government. The model that currently is used, which is the Stafford Act declaration model, follows the constitutional system in which a state Governor goes to the President and declares that a situation is overwhelming and requests Federal assistance. Prior to this happening, there are a lot of other steps that take place. This doesn't incorporate into regional resilience, but this is a constraint of the system that we currently use, which recognizes the full authority the Governor has to make that request.

Ms. Lau raised a question, in the event of an incident, how do you improve resilience before it even happens so that the private sector can become better prepared? Ms. Lau asked how do you trigger Federal Government assistance and attention prior to an event happening?

Mr. Donnell acknowledged the great point and touched on how the government typically deals with FEMA, DHS, and a handful of other departments as well as agencies. Each of the Federal Departments and agencies has authorities by which they can work on the preparedness side of this equation. FEMA deals with this, but just in terms of incident management planning by helping out state and locals preparing for any type of event. PPD-8 also has the natural disaster recovery framework, which is also post incident, and the Government is trying to figure out how to rebuild the community to be more resilient. Mr. Donnell notes that sometimes things are done on the front end rather than doing it after the incident occurs.

Mr. Wallace commented that the Working Group has a relatively limited amount of time, ability and executive resources to develop the study. Mr. Wallace suggested that the group stay at a relatively high level emphasizing on forcing the identity of gaps and the reasons for those gaps, as that has proven to be a useful approach. Mr. Wallace suggested, that his background in utility and energy

means that he views things differently than the Federal Government. The Working Group may be able to presume what the answers will be and identify those gaps from the private sector's perspective.

Dr. Scott also added that the group needs to answer something very basic, like what is regional?

Ms. Wong asked for a motion to accept the recommendations of the working group identifying next steps. The motion was made and approved.

VI. Public Comment: Discussion Limited to Meeting Agenda Items and Previous NIAC Studies

Ms. Wong moved the discussion to the public comment period. In the absence of pre-registered speakers, she moved the discussion to closing remarks.

VII. Closing Remarks

The Honorable Rand Beers, Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, DHS

Charles Donnell, Special Assistant to the President for Resiliency, National Security Staff

Caitlin Durkovich, Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, DHS

Ms. Wong invited Mr. Donnell to deliver closing remarks.

Mr. Donnell thanked the Council for their time and effort, and expressed his appreciation for the Council's work to increase the relationship between the public and private sector.

Ms. Wong invited Assistant Secretary Durkovich to deliver closing remarks.

Ms. Durkovich thanked the members for their time and lauded the decision of private citizens to dedicate themselves to service in this way. Ms. Durkovich expressed her desire to bring out stakeholders individually and have conversations one-on-one. Ms. Durkovich expressed her excitement for the work that the Council is doing on regionalization and noted how it worked in concert with the Departments efforts like the Regional Initiative and the RRAP program. Ms. Durkovich offered to make those resources available to the Council as they continue their work.

Ms. Wong invited Under Secretary Beers to deliver closing remarks.

Mr. Beers thanked the Council for their work and praised the number of report that the Council has been able to complete. Mr. Beers stated that those reports serve as an important opportunity for the Department to get ideas that are and to refocus on those ideas that have perhaps been forgotten. Mr. Beers expressed that the Department would not successfully survive without the kind of input organization like the Council bring to the table. Mr. Beers also thanked the former NIAC Chairman Mr. Berkley for his service and leadership, and presented him with a plaque as a token of appreciation for his dedicated service as a member of the Council.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Nancy J. Wong, DFO, NIAC, DHS

Ms. Wong thanked all in attendance and adjourned the meeting.

I hereby certify the foregoing minutes accurately represent the discussion and events that transpired at the meeting held on the date first noted above.

By: Renee Murphy ADFO Date: 10/19/2012
Renee Murphy, Alternate Designated Federal Officer, NIAC

National Infrastructure Advisory Council (NIAC)

Regional Resilience Working Group

July 17, 2012 – Report #1

Constance H. Lau
President and Chief Executive Officer,
Hawaiian Electric Industries, Inc.
Co-Chair

Dr. Beverly Scott
General Manager/CEO
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority
Co-Chair

Agenda

- Background
- Working Group Members
- Status Update
- Definition of Resilience
- Study Objectives
- Study Region
- Framing Questions
- Preliminary Approach
- Next Steps

Background

- At its April 17, 2012 Quarterly Business Meeting, the Council approved the recommendation of the Regional Resilience Scoping Working Group to launch a new study that
  - Builds on prior Council studies and incorporates a strong element of regionalization of resilience.
  - Focuses on the Northeastern U.S., the lifeline sectors (energy, water, transportation, and telecom), and key sectors important to the Northeast, and has applicability to other regions of the U.S.
  - Involves Council members who have experience and expertise in one or more of the regions or sectors of interests.
- Federal Government representatives affirmed that the study should proceed. A Regional Resilience Working Group was formed and the study was launched.

Working Group Members

WG Member	Sector Experience
Constance H. Lau, *President and Chief Executive Officer, Hawaiian Electric Industries, Inc. (HEI)*, Co-Chair	Electricity, Financial Services
Beverly Scott, *General Manager/CEO Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)*, Co-Chair	Transportation
Jack Baylis, *Executive Director and Senior Vice President for The Shaw Group*	Water
Glenn S. Gerstell, *Managing Partner, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley, & McCloy LLP*	Water, Telecommunications
David J. Grain, *Founder and Managing Partner, Grain Management*	Telecommunications
Margaret E. Grayson, *President, Grayson Associates*	IT, Defense Industrial Base
James A. Reid, *President, Eastern Division, CBRE, Inc,*	Commercial Facilities
Michael J. Wallace, *Former Vice Chairman and COO, Constellation Energy*	Electricity, Nuclear

Status Update

- Two members added, 5 meetings conducted
- Reaffirmed and refined study scope
- Agreed on study objectives
- Selected Philadelphia and surrounding region to serve as a case study on regional resilience
- Agreed on preliminary study framing questions
- Reviewing federal, state, and local authorities

Defining Regional Resilience

Working Definition of Regional Resilience[1]:

The ability to reduce the magnitude and/or duration of disruptive events.

The effectiveness of a resilient **regional** infrastructure depends upon the ability to anticipate, **avoid**, absorb, adapt to, rapidly recover from, **work together**, and **learn** from a potentially disruptive event.

[1] Based on NIAC reports on resilience (*Critical Infrastructure Resilience* 2009, and *A Framework for Establishing Critical Infrastructure Resilience Goals* 2010)

Study Objectives

1. **Best Practices**: Identify the characteristics that make a region resilient and the steps that can be taken by critical infrastructure owners and operators; federal, state, and local government; and the private sector to improve resilience within their region.

2. **Process Improvements**: Determine how public and private critical infrastructure partners can work together to improve regional resilience.

3. **Federal Role**: Recommend how federal government capabilities and resources can help accomplish resilience goals and address any gaps that can help regions become more resilient.

Study Region: Philadelphia

- Philadelphia combined statistical area (CSA):
  - 6.6 million people, 8th largest CSA in the US
  - Complex region spans four states (PA, NJ, DE, MD)
  - Economically significant: $331 million GDP in 2008
  - Contains key critical infrastructures with complex interdependencies (energy, transportation, chemicals, banking and finance, commercial facilities, public health and healthcare)
  - Close in population and GDP to other major US cities
- Extend examination to Baltimore and Washington regions for lifeline sectors

Framing Questions for Regional Resilience: Best Practices

What are best practices for regional resilience?

- What are the characteristics that make some regions more resilient than others?
- How do regions manage their critical infrastructure to increase their resilience?
- How do public-private partnerships and relationships affect regional resilience?
- What is the relationship between infrastructure and economic resilience? Do owners and operators benefit from and value regional resilience?
- How can regions mitigate risks associated with infrastructure interdependencies?

Framing Questions for Regional Resilience: Process Improvements

How can public and private CIKR partners work together to improve regional resilience? What steps can be taken by CIKR owners and operators, state and local jurisdictions, and the private sectors to improve resilience within their region?

- What is the protocol for engaging public and private stakeholders before, during, and after an event? What mechanisms are available?
  - What can the federal government do to rapidly bringing together key public and private decision makers/executives to direct resources to mitigate risk?
  - What is the interplay among major cities, between sectors, and between stakeholders of those sectors, especially users?
  - What processes and structures exist or are needed to address unforeseen catastrophic events?
- What are the respective roles of the private sector, local and state governments, community organizations, and the federal government to recover from a large scale regional event?
  - What federal and state authorities and legal framework exist for responding to disasters?
  - How are resources allocated for recovery after a major disaster?
- What barriers exist to effective private sector coordination, such as security clearances, that inhibit sharing of information?

Framing Questions for Regional Resilience: Federal Role

How can federal government capabilities and resources best accomplish resilience goals and address any gaps to make regions more resilient?

- What is the federal role in helping regions to bring together stakeholders to identify gaps and help improve their protective posture?
- What can the federal government itself do (in terms of its own organization) to address proper planning for events to improve resilience? For example, could the federal government use predesignated incident commanders to work with the private sector?
- What agencies of the federal government need to work together more effectively – e.g., new roles, structures, and authorities needed to improve resilience – prior to an event occurring?
- What are the triggers that elevate a scenario to require federal engagement?
  - What are the benchmarks for the trigger points and what are the responsibilities at these points?
- What are the implications of a major loss of CI services to federal facilities in the Philadelphia-DC corridor?

Preliminary Approach

- Review best practices and legal authorities
- Develop a hypothesis of effective regional resilience
- Conduct a case study of the Philadelphia metropolitan area
  - Examine resilience of key critical infrastructure sectors within Philadelphia's combined statistical area
  - Examine resilience of the lifeline sectors (energy, water, transportation, and telecommunications) into the Baltimore and Washington area to capture major regional interdependencies
  - Strain critical infrastructures to reveal gaps in regional resilience
  - Examine the impact of events on federal facilities
- Use case study results to pressure test hypothesis in other regions for general applicability
- Recommend federal government measures, consistent with legal authorities and appropriate federal role, to improve resilience before, during, and after a regional incident

Next Steps

- Continue review of legal authorities
- Continue review of studies of regional and community resilience
- Initiate interviews to understand
  - Best practices in regional resilience
  - What works well, what doesn't
  - Key gaps in regional resilience
- Examine options for straining critical infrastructures in a regional scenario
- Capture lessons from June mid-Atlantic "derecho" storm
- Invite Council members to participate as experts
- Incorporate input from July 17 NIAC meeting

Questions for the Administration

1. What factors are driving the Administration's emphasis on improving regional resilience? In what ways can regional resilience reduce critical infrastructure risks beyond the sector-specific efforts being pursued at the national level?
2. Are there particular security concerns or gaps regarding critical infrastructure failures across regions?
3. Are there particular issues or gaps that the NIAC should focus on regarding the public and private sector roles in making regions more resilient?
4. Is the Administration interested in having NIAC examine the impact of regional critical infrastructure failures on federal facilities that depend on these infrastructures?
5. There are already many public and private guides, models, and resources to help regions become more resilient. How can the NIAC add to this conversation?
6. Could the Administration provide some insight on how the National Planning Frameworks outlined under PPD-8 will evolve so that we can understand the context against which our study will be done and the inject points where the output of our study could help inform what you are developing?