



# National Security Watch

NSW 10-2

8 September 2010

## Consequence Management: Steps in the Right Direction?

by Christine Le Jeune

### Introduction

As demonstrated by disasters such as the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and the 2010 Deepwater Horizon BP oil spill, unforeseen events within U.S. borders can pose threats to national security. And even with U.S. military forces overwhelmingly focused on operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, the Department of Defense (DoD) is expected to respond to such national emergencies. It is inevitable that local responders will, at times, require federal support.

Yet the U.S. government's efforts to develop a comprehensive response plan have been painfully slow. The issue is complex, with response efforts crossing local, state and federal jurisdictions to involve interagency partners at all levels of government. Finding answers to the questions about interaction between the responders and those accountable at the most senior levels of government is as fundamental as it is urgent: Who has jurisdictional responsibility? Who has fiscal responsibility? Who has the responsibility to coordinate the variety of responders and who is in charge of them? To answer these questions, the process must begin with an examination of each threat as it arises and how the government plans to respond.

The 2010 *National Security Strategy* (NSS) addresses the need to strengthen reactive capacity for managing the potential range of threats and hazards, which include terrorism, natural disasters, large-scale cyber attacks and pandemics.<sup>1</sup> While prevention and deterrence remain the ultimate strategy, it is clear that mitigation of these disasters will also be necessary at times. Thus one facet of the 2010 NSS calls for the ability to effectively manage emergencies: **the need to build capacity to respond to major national incidents with the greatest possible speed and agility.** This includes collaboration throughout all levels of government, within communities and within public-private partnerships, as well as adequate investment in equipment and operational capabilities.

The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) also acknowledges the increasing importance of DoD in assisting civil authorities and defending the nation from direct attacks, stating that "when responding to an event within the United States, the Department of Defense will almost always be in a supporting role."<sup>2</sup> This means that although DoD is not directly charged with responding to national disasters, it will provide support when requested and approved.

---

This series is published on an occasional basis by AUSA's **Institute of Land Warfare**, designed to provide news and analysis on pertinent national security issues to the members and leaders of the Association of the United States Army and to the larger policymaking community. The content may represent the personal opinions of the author(s) and not necessarily the position of the Association or its members. For further information, please visit the AUSA website at [www.ausa.org](http://www.ausa.org). Reproduction and distribution of this document is encouraged.

To confront these security challenges, DoD, as stated in the 2010 QDR, intends to reorganize its domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosive (CBRNE) consequence management enterprise. As part of this initiative, DoD has been working to create homeland response forces (HRFs) tailored to deal with CBRNE incidents. These plans align with the Army's focus on building forces capable of performing full-spectrum operations that range from tactical nuclear war and regional conventional conflict to operations of domestic disaster relief and domestic civil support. Within this context, multiple approaches are possible.

### The Legal Background

The United States government has a history of taking a guarded approach to domestic emergency management. The Federal Civil Defense Act (FCDA) of 1950 was designed to thwart sabotage, espionage and terrorism, giving DoD the authority to prepare, prevent and deter domestic incidents from asymmetric actors (such as saboteurs) and addressing preparedness for response to catastrophic disasters (nuclear war in particular).<sup>3</sup> Over time, however, these proactive models led to a split within the national response community between preparedness/mitigation and response/recovery; the absence of a peer nation competitor and other funding priorities thus resulted in the elimination of many preparedness efforts.

With the establishment of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in 1979, a comprehensive emergency response plan was installed. The 1988 Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act—which amended the Disaster Relief Act of 1974—lays out the federal support criteria and processes for disaster response activities.<sup>4</sup> The Stafford Act remains in place today and provides for federal government assistance once a presidential disaster declaration is effected. In particular, the act triggers financial and physical assistance through FEMA, granting FEMA the responsibility for coordinating government-wide relief efforts. Yet the Stafford Act only exacerbated the problematic split between preparedness/mitigation and response/recovery: it placed the greatest emphasis on post-event recovery by focusing on mitigating the effects of both natural and manmade hazards. One of the (possibly unintended) consequences for preparedness/mitigation was that DoD lost statutory authority to prepare for homeland security operations. Following the Stafford Act, the Federal Response Plan (FRP) was introduced shortly before Hurricane Andrew struck southern Florida, southwest Louisiana and the northwestern Bahamas in August 1992.

More recently, the framework for responding to national emergencies was set forth first in the National Response Plan, which came into effect in December 2004 but was later replaced by the National Response Framework (NRF) in March 2008. The NRF lays the groundwork for the roles and responsibilities of

### Glossary of Acronyms

<b>ASCC</b>	Army Service Component Command
<b>CBRNE</b>	Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High-Yield Explosive
<b>CCMRF</b>	CBRNE Consequence Management Reaction Force
<b>CERFP</b>	CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Package
<b>CS</b>	Civil Support
<b>DCRF</b>	Defense CBRNE Response Force
<b>DHS</b>	Department of Homeland Security
<b>DoD</b>	Department of Defense
<b>FCDA</b>	Federal Civil Defense Act
<b>FEMA</b>	Federal Emergency Management Agency
<b>FRP</b>	Federal Response Plan
<b>HD</b>	Homeland Defense
<b>HRF</b>	Homeland Response Forces
<b>NORTHCOM</b>	U.S. Northern Command
<b>NRF</b>	National Response Framework
<b>NSS</b>	National Security Strategy
<b>QDR</b>	Quadrennial Defense Review
<b>TSC</b>	Theater Security Cooperation
<b>UCP</b>	Unified Command Plan
<b>USARNORTH</b>	U.S. Army North/Fifth Army
<b>WMD-CST</b>	Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team

local, state and federal government, in addition to defining the appropriate response actions and response organization structures. Because the strict legal codes restrict federal engagement, clarifying the coordination of response among local, state and federal governments is a particularly sensitive issue. Legally, the authority of the federal government to take over the management of a situation that “exceeds or is anticipated to exceed local or state resources”<sup>5</sup> is regulated by the Posse Comitatus Act and the Insurrection Act. The post-Reconstruction era Posse Comitatus Act was passed to strictly limit the ability of the federal government to use the military for purposes of law enforcement and to focus federal forces on defending U.S. borders. Literally meaning “the power of the county,” Posse Comitatus allows for Title 10 engagement by the federal government within U.S. borders only when expressly requested by local and state leaders. In its original format, the 1807 Insurrection Act consists of a set of laws governing the President’s ability to deploy troops within U.S. borders to handle lawlessness, insurrection and rebellion. All actions taken under the Insurrection Act have been exempt from the Posse Comitatus Act, which in 1956 was amended to allow the President to deploy troops when expressly authorized by the Constitution or an Act of Congress.

Even in the case of emergencies, the use of Title 10 servicemembers on U.S. soil remains a sensitive issue. Although it is understandable that the military may need to carry out response and support operations in the wake of a disaster when local and state forces are overwhelmed, such action falls within the grey area of U.S. constitutional law. In the present day where terrorists harboring chemical, biological, nuclear or other mass destruction capabilities pose a very real threat, law enforcement and homeland security functions have increasingly overlapped, calling into question the need to revisit Posse Comitatus and the Insurrection Act. Both acts were passed in an era when national security defenses relied primarily on traditional hard-power military structures—in response to traditional threats emanating from the standing armies of foreign nations—and when the defense of national borders was easily distinguishable from criminal law enforcement. To account for the rising necessity to deploy forces within national borders in the case of natural disasters and/or terrorist incidents, the Insurrection Act was modified by Congress in 2006 as part of the 2007 Defense Authorization Bill. However, the opposition surrounding the alterations to the Insurrection Act and the expanded power of the President to declare martial law led Congress to pass the Defense Authorization Bill of 2008, which repealed all changes to the 2007 bill. This restored the Insurrection Act to its more restricted, original 1807 status.

### **Framework of Response**

Effecting a timely and efficient response is not an easy task, made even more cumbersome by jurisdictional division of responsibility among local, state and federal governments. Problems are exacerbated further by the complex nature of multiple layers of government and the interagency institutions that serve them: On the one hand, local and state authorities seek to remain autonomous but also recognize the need for federal involvement under certain extreme conditions. On the other hand, legal restrictions force federal agencies to abide by a strict set of statutory and regulatory guidelines in their response. This requires careful coordination between the two.

Following the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, the heightened need to respond efficiently and effectively to catastrophes within U.S. borders led the federal government to revisit the response mechanisms in place. The 2002 Unified Command Plan (UCP) established U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) to plan, organize and execute homeland defense and civil support missions—marking the first time these missions fell under the direction of a single unified command.<sup>6</sup> NORTHCOM’s region of responsibility includes the continental United States, Alaska, Canada and Mexico, including the Gulf of Mexico and Straits of Florida as well as water space extending to approximately 500 nautical miles from the coast.<sup>7</sup> U.S. Army North/Fifth Army (USARNORTH), based at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, is both the joint forces land component command (JFLCC) and the Army service component command (ASCC) to NORTHCOM.<sup>8</sup> USARNORTH’s responsibilities are to conduct homeland defense (HD), civil support

(CS) and theater security cooperation (TSC) operations to protect the American public.<sup>9</sup> USARNORTH has Defense Coordinating Officers assigned to all ten FEMA regional offices to more effectively coordinate the availability and employment of DoD resources.

The lessons learned from catastrophes, most notably Hurricane Katrina, have stimulated interagency cooperation across DoD, FEMA, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the National Guard, and to this effect a framework for a tiered response is laid out in the NRF. Involvement by DoD can be initiated in only two ways: at the direct request of the state governor under U.S. Code Title 32 authorities, or through DHS as the lead federal agency. The nature of the disaster determines the type of response. A CBRNE consequence management reaction force (CCMRF) is a Title 10 task force consisting of approximately 4,700 individuals commanded by a major general. Each CCMRF comprises three brigade-size task forces—operations, aviation and medical—along with smaller, more specialized elements. CCMRFs are specifically equipped and trained to provide response capabilities to multiple and simultaneous full-spectrum CBRNE incidents that could occur domestically as the result of a terrorist attack, accident or natural disaster. Beyond CBRNE detection and decontamination, these capabilities include transportation, logistics, communications and public affairs support at the local, state and federal levels. The *2010 Army Posture Statement* clearly states: “The CCMRF’s primary role when responding to a CBRNE event is to augment the consequence management efforts of the first responders.” Operating in support of the local authorities, CCMRF operations end once the immediate effects of the disaster are controlled and manageable by civil authorities alone.

In 2008, Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates launched a plan requiring three CCMRFs to be trained and ready for response. By early 2010 two CCMRFs—one active and one reserve component—were trained and ready, with projections for a third CCMRF to be operational by October 2010. However, because of conclusions drawn by the 2010 QDR, DoD plans to reorganize CBRNE response capabilities into a single-CCMRF Title 10 configuration under NORTHCOM. The current plan is for the active component CCMRF to be assigned to NORTHCOM on 1 October 2010. The reserve component CCMRF will be on prepare-to-deploy orders status while assigned to NORTHCOM through 20 September 2011; the life cycle of this unit until it is phased out is presently under discussion. The reason for this change (as stated in the QDR) is so that DoD can field faster, more flexible consequence management response forces.<sup>10</sup> Christine Wormuth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs, has stated that the single-CCMRF plan will allow the unit to respond to an incident with up to 2,000 troops within 24 hours of notification and 3,000 within 48 hours, rather than the 96 hours originally planned. (While these projections are admirable, whether a single plan will truly allow for a shorter response time remains to be proven in practice.) Primary catalysts for the decision to reorganize the CCMRF units were the need to rebalance forces to reflect the reality that response activities will usually be directed by the governor at the state level and the need—if absolutely necessary—to federally command and control responses to multiple, simultaneous events.

Instead of second and third CCMRFs, 10 HRFs—one for each FEMA region, located in 500-mile concentric circles that will command better than 90 percent of dispersion—will be built from existing Army National Guard endstrength to field an additional complementary all-hazards capability. Each HRF will consist of approximately 570 Guardsmen and maintain a medical team, a search-and-extraction team and a decontamination team molded around CBRNE capabilities and supplemented by command, control and communications capabilities.<sup>11</sup> With this regional approach, the ability of HRFs to provide regional response capabilities; to plan, train and exercise; and to cultivate strong ties between federal and state authorities should be increased. As a result, HRF response time will also be quicker, ranging from six to 12 hours, with HRFs geared primarily to deploy via ground transport but also transportable by air if required. Several states have already announced plans for development of HRFs for each FEMA region: Ohio and Washington will launch units by October 2011, and California, Georgia, Massachusetts, Missouri, New

York, Pennsylvania, Texas and Utah will follow suit in 2012. Each unit will focus on planning, training and exercising at the regional level when not engaged in consequence management operations.<sup>12</sup> If necessary, HRFs will function alongside other National Guard-sourced CBRNE consequence management forces that are employed by the governors. These forces include 57 weapons of mass destruction civil support teams (WMD-CSTs) and 17 CBRNE enhanced response force packages (CERFPs), as well as federally-controlled elements such as defense CBRNE response forces (DCRFs) and two consequence management command and control elements for follow-on forces. Current thought within the National Guard Bureau is that this new construct is more responsive with a better match of lifesaving capabilities and allows for an improved balance between state and federal control.

## **Challenges**

Throughout the process of consequence management reorganization, many questions remain unanswered. Since the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, major shifts in policy regarding transnational threats have occurred. Yet the United States government remains encumbered by statutes and policies that predate this period and hamper operational flexibility and the ability to deliver what local communities need, as well as what national leadership expects. One of the more complex issues is the question of leadership during an emergency. While the aforementioned bottom-up framework for response works well in theory, it is often less orderly in practice. During emergency situations when assistance by the federal government is required within a limited time frame, the decisionmaking process can become blurred and depend largely on the situation. In the case of larger catastrophic events, DoD has stated that it could envision two chains of command: one with HRFs under command of the governor and the other consisting of Title 10 forces under NORTHCOM.<sup>13</sup> Yet the details of this command exercise structure have not been mapped out, and questions about who would ultimately have the final authority remain unanswered. To complicate the situation even more, DoD has also stated that if necessary “in the most extreme case,” HRFs could be federalized to fall under a single chain of command reporting to NORTHCOM.<sup>14</sup> The question of authority also reflects the funding source. While the federal government will fund Title 32 forces that officially fall under local authority, no set guidelines exist for who really has the authority when the federal government is paying. Rather, in these situations the question of authority is resolved on a situational basis, which can lead to tension between state and federal officials.

With the United States still engaged in Afghanistan and Iraq, questions surrounding the deployability and training of HRFs have also been raised. National Guard units assigned to the HRF missions will not be deployable at that time so that they will be free to respond to national emergencies if required.<sup>15</sup> However, one concern has been that units rotating into the HRF capacity will not have the correct type of training for domestic consequence management missions. When NORTHCOM was initially established, public concern about military forces actively deployed on national soil focused largely on the training aspect. A focal point of public concern was that Soldiers recently returned from deployment in Afghanistan or Iraq would reflexively draw upon their combat training when reacting to domestic incidents, needlessly endangering innocent American civilians and thereby contributing to the crisis instead of mitigating it. However, under the new plan to create 10 HRFs, National Guard troops of each HRF host state who have returned from deployment abroad will undergo retraining specific to consequence management response. Oversight of training and evaluation has also been addressed through coordination and collaboration between the National Guard and NORTHCOM and agreement that the entire consequence management enterprise must be plug-and-play, with minimal interoperability issues between the National Guard and active duty NORTHCOM forces. The National Guard will shoulder the responsibility with NORTHCOM and USARNORTH, with the active component providing forces as needed.

Furthermore, the decision to cut the number of CCMRFs has raised questions about the ability of HRFs to respond to national emergencies, as well as the nature of the response. Following the failure of response mechanisms after Hurricane Katrina, DoD faced pressure to respond more quickly and with

greater impact in the immediate aftermath of an incident; multiple CCMRFs appeared to provide the solution. However, because of active Army engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan and the lack of existing specialized reserve component units specific to CBRNE consequence management, the three-CCMRF plan has transformed into the single-CCMRF plan with supporting HRFs. While DoD maintains that the reorganization of CCMRFs and HRFs into FEMA regions will advantageously allow for a quicker response time and improved cooperation with local officials and responders, others maintain that this path does not provide enough response forces and resources to meet the demands placed upon them to protect the American public.

Former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Paul McHale has expressed deep concern over the restructuring of the original CCMRF plan, arguing that a single-CCMRF plan would place U.S. national security at greater risk.<sup>16</sup> Taking the complex issues of authority, resources, homeland defense, homeland security, chain of command and responsiveness into consideration, McHale has warned that HRFs are smaller, less robust and limited in capability and thus do not adequately replace the second and third CCMRFs. According to McHale, four aspects are of special concern: First, HRFs controlled by state governors would result in NORTHCOM becoming a “hollow force” that could provide only limited resources in the case of a major incident. Second, the Title 10 CBRNE units would need to be assembled ad hoc and may never have trained jointly under NORTHCOM, leading to a less unified and effective response. Third, NORTHCOM’s oversight of service components that would be assigned under its command and control in the case of an emergency would be limited. And finally, McHale has argued that while the CERFP addition to CBRNE consequence management forces is welcome, it does not offset the two CCMRFs eliminated from the original plan. Still, McHale’s successor, Paul Stockton, argues that speed is the most critical, lifesaving aspect of homeland response: the number of lives saved on a large scale is congruent to the immediacy with which HRFs arrive at the scene. Beyond McHale’s criticisms, this reasoning for CCMRF restructuring has not seen much objection. Yet the question of whether HRFs are an adequate substitution for a three-CCMRF plan or even a step in the right direction for consequence management may not truly be answered until they are put to the test after a catastrophic event.

It also remains unclear whether HRFs will be used only in response to CBRNE events or also in other capacities for major natural disasters. As was demonstrated by National Guard deployment to American Samoa following a tsunami in September 2009, applicable CCMRF capabilities have been and will be utilized for other events. Officially, DoD is not charged with responding to natural disasters but will provide support when others cannot. Thus DoD is caught in a mission dilemma when it comes to responding to national events: Should it defend the nation or respond (as a consequence management force) to save lives, mitigate suffering and restore order? The inherent tension that exists between providing support for defense of the nation and ensuring homeland security could be tested in the event that—in an extreme case—the responsibility would fall on NORTHCOM to respond to both simultaneously. This means that NORTHCOM, at the insistence of Congress, must be prepared for both but realistically has the forces to support only one at a time. How this would play out if both capacities were needed at once remains undetermined.

### **Which Way Forward?**

Given the developments in HRF reorganization in early 2010 and the persisting challenges surrounding the usefulness and functionality of HRFs in response to CBRNE events, many questions remain unanswered. The issue of authority and control over the response forces remains a sensitive issue, as was most vividly demonstrated during Hurricane Katrina when governors requested federal funding yet fought fiercely to maintain on-the-scene authority over actions within their jurisdiction. Such uncertainties are to the detriment of a quick and effective response to highly time-sensitive catastrophes. No one is currently designated to specifically coordinate response among local, state and federal structures in the event of an emergency, although this is a focal issue of the National Governors Association and others. And in January

2010, the President signed an executive order establishing a Council of Governors to review the cooperation between state and federal governments in the event of a threat to homeland defense. The council has been examining the process of accountability and a provision in the law that would allow for a dual-status commander who could wear two hats—first and foremost Title 32 but also Title 10 if necessary, when state governments become overwhelmed by no-notice events. Thus far, Congress has not been enamored of the idea of a dual-status commander; however, precedents for this and provisions in the law are currently under examination. **Regardless of the findings, a framework for horizontal integration throughout the consequence management enterprise remains essential to success.**

With foreseeable defense budget cuts based on recent comments by the Secretary of Defense, concerns also revolve around funding the consequence management enterprise. Any budget reductions will not be effected over the next Program Objective Memorandum cycle; however, this question will not disappear in the long term. The development of HRFs will most likely contribute to the ability of the National Guard to maintain its force structure and in this way give it solid rationale to argue against any budget cuts. Lowering the budget for consequence management should be approached cautiously, primarily because it will directly affect the ability to save American lives in the immediate aftermath of a crisis on American soil. Regardless of potential cuts, the overall federal budgetary authority governing homeland defense and domestic operations does not provide DoD the necessary budgetary authority to prepare, prevent and deter operations. Instead, the authorities—enshrined in the Stafford Act and DoD policies—force the departments into a reactive posture and prevent the military from building necessary capabilities.

As the CBRNE elements of HRFs undergo restructuring, DoD must also decide how to use these forces most prudently so that it can utilize the totality of available resources to the greatest effect. The support for and critique of the move to a single-CCMRF plan also raises questions about how to most effectively provide rapid support in the case of CBRNE emergencies while navigating the current challenges. In recognition of this, in August NORTHCOM directed and USARNORTH as the lead agency executed Command Post Exercise Vibrant Response 2010 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. This culminating training event focused on CCMRF defense support of civil authorities' missions in a consequence management role during CBRNE events and on challenging the command and control aspects of a joint task force headquarters that would be required to respond rapidly to a domestic disaster. Training and continued exercising are vital to horizontal integration across the spectrum of the entire consequence management enterprise, to ensure the highest degree of readiness in the event of an incident. As the main land force responsible for responding to an event, USARNORTH is one of the most important actors and must also have the materiel requirements necessary to carry out its missions. As the United States enters the second decade of the 21st century, it has some deep-seated and deeply concerning homeland security challenges. While progress has been made, much work remains. Resources must be marshaled to identify ready solutions.

As has been outlined, the challenges to consequence management are complex and enduring yet critically important to U.S. national security. Until plans and policies proactively match resources to this vital aspect of national security, the United States risks finding itself in a disaster of its own making.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> White House, *National Security Strategy*, May 2010, p. 18, [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss\\_viewer/national\\_security\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf). The 2006 *National Security Strategy* also addresses the need to ensure that “U.S. military forces and emergency responders are trained and equipped to manage the consequences” of such attacks (White House, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, March 2006, p. 22, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/USnss2006.pdf>). Written in the immediate aftermath of 11 September 2001, the 2002 *National Security Strategy* focuses primarily on external security threats posed by international terrorism and does not largely

address consequence management (White House, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 2002, <http://merln.ndu.edu/whitepapers/USnss2002.pdf>).

- <sup>2</sup> Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, February 2010, p. 19, [http://www.defense.gov/qdr/images/QDR\\_as\\_of\\_12Feb10\\_1000.pdf](http://www.defense.gov/qdr/images/QDR_as_of_12Feb10_1000.pdf).
- <sup>3</sup> The FCDA was repealed in November 1994, with all remnants of the civil defense authority transferred to Title VI of the Stafford Act; see Homeland Security National Preparedness Task Force, *Civil Defense and Homeland Security: A Short History of National Preparedness Efforts*, September 2006, <http://training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/edu/docs/DHS%20Civil%20Defense-HS%20-%20Short%20History.pdf>.
- <sup>4</sup> Title III of the Stafford Act on “Major Disaster and Emergency Assistance Administration” notes, “Any Federal agency charged with the administration of a Federal assistance program may, if so requested by the applicant State or local authorities, modify or waive, for a major disaster, such administrative conditions for assistance as would otherwise prevent the giving of assistance under such programs if the inability to meet such conditions is a result of the major disaster.” See *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, and Related Authorities*, FEMA 592, June 2007, p. 10, [http://www.fema.gov/pdf/about/stafford\\_act.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/about/stafford_act.pdf).
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Homeland Security, *National Response Framework*, January 2008, p. 24, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf>.
- <sup>6</sup> For more detailed information on the 2002 UCP, see AUSA National Security Watch 03-2, “The 2002 Unified Command Plan: Changes and Implications,” 21 February 2003, [http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw\\_pubs/nationalsecuritywatch/Documents/nsw03-2.pdf](http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw_pubs/nationalsecuritywatch/Documents/nsw03-2.pdf).
- <sup>7</sup> Hawaii and other U.S. territories fall under the command of U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Southern Command, respectively. See U.S. Northern Command website at <http://www.northcom.mil/About/index.html>.
- <sup>8</sup> For further reference, see AUSA National Security Watch 07-1, “U.S. Army North/5th Army: Building Relationships to Defend the Homeland and Meet Emerging Regional Challenges,” 15 February 2007, [http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw\\_pubs/nationalsecuritywatch/Documents/nsw07\\_1.pdf](http://www.ausa.org/publications/ilw/ilw_pubs/nationalsecuritywatch/Documents/nsw07_1.pdf).
- <sup>9</sup> See U.S. Army North’s website at <http://www.arnorth.army.mil>.
- <sup>10</sup> See DoD, 2010 QDR Report, p. 19.
- <sup>11</sup> Department of Defense, “DoD Announces Remaining Eight National Guard HRFs,” news release, 12 July 2010, <http://www.defense.gov/releases/release.aspx?releaseid=13697>.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>13</sup> Christine Wormuth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs, quoted in Sergeant First Class Jon Soucy, “DoD relooks at plans for Guard response capabilities,” *army.mil*, 24 March 2010, <http://www.army.mil/-news/2010/03/24/36269-dod-relooks-at-plans-for-guard-response-capabilities/>.
- <sup>14</sup> Soucy, “DoD relooks at plans for Guard response capabilities.”
- <sup>15</sup> Major Cory Angell and Sergeant Doug Roles, “National Guard Division Commanders Conference,” *Blackanthem Military News*, 11 February 2010, [http://www.blackanthem.com/News/Military\\_News\\_1/National-Guard-Division-Commanders-Conference21770.shtml](http://www.blackanthem.com/News/Military_News_1/National-Guard-Division-Commanders-Conference21770.shtml).
- <sup>16</sup> As noted in Christopher J. Castelli, “McHale Takes Homeland Defense Concerns to QDR Independent Panel,” *Inside the Army*, 12 July 2010, <http://www.insidedefense.com> (requires subscription).
- <sup>17</sup> U.S. Army, *Stand-To*, 23 August 2010, <http://www.army.mil/standto/archive/2010/08/23/>.

*Christine Le Jeune is a National Security Analyst with AUSA’s Institute of Land Warfare.*



**Association of the United States Army**  
2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22201-3385  
703-841-4300      [www.ausa.org](http://www.ausa.org)