



This Issue:

Interview: John Thomasian

Director of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices reports on the proceedings of last week's National Executive Forum for State Homeland Security Directors. Also included is a discussion of the intelligence fusion centers.

By John Morton
Interviews, Page 1

Asymmetric Warfare: Redefining Standard Terms

Chaos and confusion reign not just on the battlefield but also, particularly in recent times, in policy pronouncements, position papers, and the public consciousness. Principal problem is a proliferation of acronyms meaning almost the same thing - but not quite.

By Ashley Moore
Standards, Page 1

CERFPs: A New Resource for Emergency Response

The National Guard creates new units to deal with mass disasters. After the first responders come the WMD-CST teams, and behind them, providing a second protective shield for the American people, come the twelve CERFP units, stationed in FEMA regions.

By Christopher Schnaubelt
Military Support, Page 4

States of Preparedness

Virginia develops free emergency resources for business, imposes security fees on incoming oceanborne cargo. North Carolina considers creation of a new bio-research lab, adds to cutting-edge communications system. Wisconsin adds biological-agent detection systems.

By Anthony Lanzillotti
State Homeland News, Page 6

Special Report: September Is National Preparedness Month

DHS and American Red Cross join forces in a major national effort to encourage all Americans to prepare for emergencies. The ultimate goal is to persuade "every individual, family, and household" to take personal responsibility for preparedness.

By James D. Hessman
Editor in Chief, Page 8

For more details, visit:
DomesticPreparedness.com
Since 1998, Integrating Professional Communities of Homeland Security

Interview: John Thomasian, Director National Governors Association Center for Best Practices

By John Morton
Interviews

DomPrep.com's John F. Morton and Martin Masiuk visited John Thomasian, the director of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, at NGA Headquarters in Washington, D.C., last week. Thomasian was fresh from a two-day National Executive Forum for State Homeland Security Directors held earlier in the week in nearby Annapolis, Md. The theme of the forum, which was addressed by DHS (Department of Homeland Security) Secretary Michael Chertoff, was "Where Are We Now; Where Do We Need To Go?" In his report-out, Thomasian said that state homeland security directors are now putting more stress on prevention as opposed to response, and that the forum embraced the all-hazards approach to public safety, which engages the private sector. Thomasian focused on three operational themes in his remarks: intelligence fusion, critical infrastructure protection, and health and medical readiness.

September Is National Preparedness Month!
What Is Your Community Doing About It?
See Special Report Beginning on Page 7

Asymmetric Warfare: Redefining Standard Terms

By Ashley Moore
Standards

"As soon as technological advances may be applied to military goals and ... are already used for military purposes, they almost immediately seem obligatory, and also often go against the will of the commanders in triggering changes or even revolutions in the modes of combat." – Frederich Engels

Within the last few decades there have been profound changes in the way that war is conducted, and this has led to many other changes – in the uses and discussion of weaponry, for example, and in the public's perception of warfare. Today, one of the most important, most complex, and most misunderstood topics in the field of international conflict is the global proliferation of what usually are called weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Unfortunately, at least some WMDs also have been called WMEs (weapons of mass effects) and/or WMD/Es (weapons of mass destruction or effect), and this has led to considerable confusion.

Continued on the Next Page

Editorial and Circulation Office

517 Benfield Road, Suite 303
Severna Park, MD 21146
www.domesticpreparedness.com
(410) 518-6900

Editorial Staff

James D. Hessman
Editor in Chief
JamesD@domprep.com

Channel Masters

Rob Schnepf
Fire/HAZMAT
rschnepf@domprep.com

Joseph Cahill
Emergency Medicine
jcahill@domprep.com

Colonel (Ret.) Robert Fitton
Military Support
bfitton@domprep.com

Ashley Moore
Standards
amoore@domprep.com

Bonni Tischler
Customs & Border
btischler@domprep.com

Jay Kehoe
Law Enforcement
jkehoe@domprep.com

John Morton
Interviews
jmorton@domprep.com

James D. Hessman
Coast Guard
JamesD@domprep.com

Neil Livingstone
Smart Security
nlivingstone@domprep.com

Anthony Lanzillotti
State Homeland News
tlanzillotti@domprep.com

Business Office

Susan Collins
Circulation Director
subscriber@domprep.com

Sharon Stovall
Copy Manager
sstovall@domprep.com

Martin Masiuk
Advertising & Sponsorships
mmasiuk@domprep.com

Subscriptions

\$50.00 annually 26 issues for single user,
delivered via web or email. To order, visit
www.domprep.com and click on
subscribe.

Published by IMR Inc.

**Martin D. Masiuk, Executive Director
and Publisher,**

mmasiuk@domprep.com

COPYRIGHT 2005 IMR Inc.

**All rights reserved. Text is the
opinion of the author who holds no
liability for its use or interpretation.**

Two documents of fairly recent vintage, both of them produced by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, should help by redefining the standard term WMD for future use: the National Military Strategy (NMS), released in 2004; and the National Defense Strategy (NDS), released earlier this year. Both documents include discussions about “weapons of mass destruction or effect,” and both also use the term WMD/E to describe a broad range of adversary capabilities. The umbrella term WMD/E, as used in these documents, includes chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosive weapons as well as a number of other weapons that might be used in what is called asymmetric warfare (another somewhat ambiguous term).

There are, however, other “weapons” of various types – here the term is used much more generically – that to do their damage rely more on the impact of the disruption they can cause, rather than on the destructive kinetic effects involved. NMS cites cyber attacks, for example, against U.S. commercial information systems, and/or attacks against various modes of the nation’s interconnected air, sea, and land transportation network. Such attacks, even though non-lethal, might well have a greater and more damaging economic or psychological effect than would be caused by a relatively small release of a lethal chemical agent, and for that reason might justifiably be described as asymmetric warfare.

David, Goliath, Hannibal, and the Spartans

However, asymmetric warfare is not synonymous with terrorism. It is, rather, a military term used to describe warfare in which two opponents are so mismatched in their military capabilities (and/or accustomed methods of engagement) that, if the militarily disadvantaged power hopes to prevail, it must use any special advantages it possesses or effectively exploit its enemy's particular weaknesses. It is in that context that terrorism sometimes is used, as a tactic, by the weaker side in an asymmetric conflict. Following are just a few of the countless historical anecdotes that might be cited to illustrate how asymmetric warfare has been waged in the past:

--In the biblical tale of David and Goliath, David defeated the physically more powerful Goliath with “five smooth stones” launched from a sling. David’s victory was a triumph in warfare tactics, with the new and advanced prevailing over the old and outdated. Goliath relied on size, intimidation, and what today would be termed heavy weapons; David used advance planning, stealth, skill, and knowledge to defeat his much more powerful opponent.

--In the 6th Century B.C., the Assyrians poisoned enemy wells with a fungus that caused delusional effects – an early example of biological warfare – and in 184 B.C. Hannibal of Carthage not only used elephants to carry his troops and equipment over the Alps but also instructed his soldiers to throw clay pots filled with poisonous snakes onto the decks of enemy ships. Both of these innovative tactics caused havoc in the ranks of Carthage’s enemies in the short term, but did not result in a final victory. Carthage “must be destroyed” (*delenda est*), said the Roman Senate – and it was.

Continued on the Next Page

--Classic literature also reveals a number of incidents in which the fractious nations of the Mediterranean waged chemical warfare against one another. The Spartans, for example, used arsenic smoke against their enemies during the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.), and more than a thousand years later the Byzantine Greeks used "Greek fire" (a mixture of petroleum, pitch, sulfur, and various resins) at the siege of Constantinople (637 A.D.) to overcome their adversaries.

In modern times – more specifically, during the Gulf War – Dutch crackers stole information about U.S. troop movements from U.S. Defense Department computers, and then tried to sell the information to the Iraqis. However, the Iraqis thought the deal was a hoax and turned down the offer.

Battles Without Borders; Definitions Without Clarity

The way in which war is carried out is governed both by the principles of strategy and tactics and by the type of weapons available to the two sides. But confusion arises when technology has advanced to the point that a term that once defined a specific weapon or class of weapons is being used, in a more or less evolutionary way, to describe new weapons that are almost the same – but not quite.

Similarly, by changing the terms defining asymmetric warfare and/or the tools of war, one may inadvertently also be redefining the boundaries encompassing the very concept of asymmetric warfare as well as the weapons and the laws of war (*jus in bello*). If the war god's face has changed so much over the past few decades, it seems safe to suggest, then the laws of war and conduct of warfare may also have changed as well. That is particularly true today, when the U.S.-led war on international terrorism is being waged against ideological enemies who have pledged a global battle without borders. Whether the weapon used is an explosive device left on a sidewalk or a grenade hand-launched at a visiting U.S. president – or a computer virus encrypted in an email – the American people, and the citizens of all other Free World nations, have become increasingly and inevitably vulnerable to attack anywhere, at any time. Whether the attacker uses conventional or non-conventional weapons is no longer important – or, at best, describes a distinction without a difference.

That said, it still is imperative that the terms and definitions of war, and of the weapons used in war, be both clear and consistent. Here the place to begin is federal law (Title 18 USC 2332a), which defines the term "weapon of mass destruction" explicitly as follows:

- Any destructive device as defined by this federal law;
- Any weapon that is designed or intended to cause death or serious bodily injury through the release, dissemination, or impact of toxic or poisonous chemicals, or their precursors;
- Any weapon involving a disease organism; or
- Any weapon that is designed to release radiation or radioactivity at a level dangerous to humans.

This useful definition should be sufficient to block any attempt to use WMD to describe anything other than true weapons of mass destruction, which can be more specifically identified as chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosives (CBRNE) weapons. However, WMD also has been used in recent years to describe weapons of indiscriminate destruction, weapons of mass disruption, and weapons of mass effects. Modern U.S. military doctrine, as spelled out in JP 3-05 ("Doctrine for Joint Special Operations"), defines WMD as weapons that are capable of a high order of destruction and/or used in such a manner as to destroy large numbers of people.

The Fog of War Meets the Man on the Street

That perhaps should be sufficient, but it is not. What further confuses the picture is that the Laws of War (as defined by the United Nations Charter, the Geneva conventions, and the Hague conventions) describe a weapon as a tool that can be used during combat to kill or incapacitate, to destroy property, or to otherwise render resources non-functional or unavailable.

In short, weapons may be used to attack and/or defend, and consequently also to threaten. Basically, therefore, anything used to cause damage (even psychological damage) can be referred to as a weapon, and its form

Continued on the Next Page

and appearance might range from something as simple as a club to a much more complex “system of systems” as an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

Political factors have further complicated the situation, particularly when U.S./coalition forces were unable to find any weapons of mass destruction stockpiled in Iraq either during or after the war and despite the fall of Baghdad and the capture of Saddam Hussein and many of his top lieutenants. This is when the less well-known terms WME and WMD/E started to be used more widely, but not always too precisely.

For decision makers, contingency planners, exercise facilitators, and many others, the question now is whether to continue using the term WMD. It may be that all three terms have their place, as long as they are used clearly, properly, and precisely.

One way to start is to use WMD as specifically describing CBRNE types of weapons. WME would be reserved for discussions and/or descriptions of ICBMs, suitcase bombs, bunker busters, electromagnetic pulse weapons, and other nuclear weapons; and WMD/E could combine a twist of CBRNE with asymmetric warfare, plus information warfare and/or cyberterrorism. (Cyber weapons could create havoc by disrupting the computers that manage stock exchanges, power grids, and air traffic control and telecommunications systems; information warfare encompasses the dissemination of propaganda, or even disinformation, not only to the enemy but also to one’s own population, either to build support for the war effort or to counter enemy propaganda.)

Additional technological advances in war, and in weaponry, are inevitable, and probably will come at a more rapid pace. This means that changes in the vocabulary of war also are inevitable and, if not handled correctly, and quickly, will be the source of considerable confusion affecting not only the general public but also, perhaps, war planners and war fighters as well.

From the newest recruit to the battle-hardened noncoms to the most experienced flag and general officers, those who have been in combat understand the true meaning of the phrase “The Fog of War” – namely, the chaos and confusion that reign supreme

over the battlefield after the first shot has been fired in anger. It would be a shame if the same words were used to describe, accurately, the public’s understanding of the conflict as well.



CERFPs: A New Resource for Emergency Response

By Christopher Schnaubelt
Military Support

There have been no additional terrorist attacks on U.S. soil since the bombings of the Pentagon and the World Trade Center towers on 11 September 2001, and for that reason the American people should be grateful. Nonetheless, the threat level remains high, and intelligence sources report that terrorists are continuing to plan new attacks on the U.S. homeland, preferably attacks involving weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

To prevent such attacks, the nation’s law-enforcement agencies, at all levels of government, and America’s armed forces – specifically including the Guard and Reserve components – are and will continue to remain on high alert.

Meanwhile, the services also have devoted significant additional manpower, funding, and training time to the deterrence of new terrorist attacks and, if deterrence does not always work, to coping with the aftermath – while at the same time fighting the insurgency in Iraq, dealing with smaller-scale terrorist incidents in Afghanistan, and carrying out all of their other missions.

One result is that, despite the generous additional funding requested by the president and provided by Congress, the U.S. military is today still stretched perilously thin. Prudence dictates, therefore, that additional increases, in both manpower and capabilities, be authorized to provide a broader margin of safety against new terrorist attacks – which, counterterrorism experts warn, without exaggeration, could come “anywhere, at any time.”

Continued on the Next Page

Strategically Positioned Regional Assets

As the first military responder to any major disaster, natural or manmade, on U.S. soil, the National Guard is well positioned to provide the additional resources needed for consequence management in a WMD incident anywhere in the country. The National Guard recently implemented a new homeland-security initiative creating twelve “Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear or High Yield Explosives Enhanced Response Force Packages” – called CERFPs for short. To date, these units have been established in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Florida, Illinois, Texas, Missouri, Colorado, Hawaii, and Washington.

The CERFPs are not “state” units per se, though, but regional assets geographically distributed to ensure the presence of at least one team in each FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) region. The teams are also available to respond to various other emergencies via what are called Emergency Management Assistance Compacts.

Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, chief of the National Guard Bureau, said that one of the benefits of implementing the CERFP concept is that it “leverages existing capabilities and skills” instead of creating new units. “These regional assets not only add to the national [WMD] incident preparedness,” he also commented. “Of equal importance, they are deployable, fully available to the combatant commanders.”

Unlike the Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams (WMD-CSTs) previously created – which consist of 22 full-time Active Guard/Reserve program soldiers and airmen – most CERFP members are provided from existing units and are “traditional” or “M-Day” troops with civilian jobs. In addition to meeting the special requirements of the CERFP, team members also carry out traditional training to maintain the combat and other military skills required by their parent units.

Each CERFP consists of approximately 100 to 120 members (drawn from both the Army and the Air National Guard) who are trained and equipped primarily to carry out casualty decontamination, medical triage, and search-and-rescue missions. Most CERFP team members come from civil support and/or patient decontamination teams, medical, engineer, or chemical

units, and/or counter-drug aviation assets. Because of their flexible structure, the CERFPs have a robust capacity to incorporate other National Guard assets – e.g., fixed and rotary-wing aircraft, and/or transportation, infantry, and military police assets.

Some states – California is a prime example – plan to augment the initial CERFP concept by creating additional teams, using state funding, because only one team per region is funded through the National Guard Bureau. In addition, California has created its own Military Assistance to Civil Authorities (MACA) Brigade to train and manage its CERFP teams.

According to Colonel John Bernatz, executive officer of the California MACA Brigade, the cost of equipping and maintaining one CERFP team is approximately \$2 million, including start-up and annual maintenance costs.

California National Guard leaders say that the state’s size and its attractiveness as a terrorist target make the additional investment well worth the cost. “We live in a new world today,” Bernatz said. “We live in a world where an enemy has brought a war back to our shores.”

Added Value at a Reasonable Cost

In addition to meeting their usual training requirements, CERFP members are required to complete 540 hours of initial training plus a five-week hazardous materials course. Much of that training is provided by civilian emergency-responder programs, at an initial cost of \$600,000 per team. Team training is conducted in a phased fashion, and all twelve of the original teams were certified in mass casualty decontamination and medical triage/treatment during fiscal year 2004. The search-and-extraction phase of training and certification for the original 12 teams is expected to be completed during the current fiscal year (FY 2005).

The National Guard CERFP teams are certified either by the 1st U.S. Army (states east of the Mississippi River) or by the 5th U.S. Army (states west of the Mississippi River). To receive certification in triage treatment and decontamination, the teams must demonstrate their ability to decontaminate and treat at least 60 victims per hour.

Continued on the Next Page

In recent exercises, several teams have exceeded requirements and processed more than 120 victims per hour.

The ability to carry out triage quickly and effectively is an important factor in determining which individuals actually require decontamination and treatment. During an August 2004 exercise at Camp Blanding (near Jacksonville, Fla.), approximately 3,000 people simulated exposure as a result of terrorist use of Sarin gas and a radioactive isotope at a nearby airport. Not all of the “exposed” victims actually required decontamination or treatment, however.

A Redundancy of Resources in Reserve

In future disasters, including terrorist attacks, on U.S. soil the first responders reaching the disaster site usually will be, as now, civilian fire, medical, and law-enforcement personnel. If and when needed, though, a National Guard WMD-CST also will be deployed to assist the civilian incident commander by providing an assessment of the situation, identification of the agent, and a determination of what additional military resources might be needed if the incident exceeds the WMD-CST’s own capabilities.

CERFPs – which are designed to support civilian authorities in events involving a suspected chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive attack – also might be deployed in situations requiring their special capabilities. Because the CERFPs consist of troops in an M-Day status, however, they usually will require additional time for organization and deployment (the CSTs are in a fulltime status and have a timeline of 4-8 hours in which to respond to an emergency call).

In most potential emergencies requiring CERFP assistance, their deployment will be carried out in accordance with guidelines governing the National Incident Management System, which requires that local emergency managers request military assistance, via the state emergency management agency, from the state governor. If the incident occurs in a state that does not have its “own” CERFP, an “out of state” team would be requested either through a FEMA regional headquarters or an Emergency Management Assistance Compact.

CERFPs also have the capacity to be called to federal active duty (under Title 10, U.S. Code) by the president and assigned to either the U.S. Northern Command or the U.S. Pacific Command. However, unless federalized under Title 10, the CERFPs will operate under the command and control of the state governor, through the state adjutant general, in either a State Active Duty or Title 32 U.S. Code status. Regardless of their status, the CERFP teams will remain under a military chain of command while providing direct support to civilian authorities.



States of Preparedness

By Anthony Lanzillotti

State Homeland News

VIRGINIA

Develops free emergency resources for businesses, but imposes security fees on incoming oceanborne cargo

A new online resource – the Virginia Business Emergency Survival Toolkit (available at www.vaemergency.com/business) – has been developed by a group of emergency organizations in Virginia that includes information and other resources that the state’s businesses can use to help prepare for and recover from natural disasters and other emergencies.

Virginia Governor Mark Warner, who announced the availability of the toolkit earlier this month, recognized the efforts of the developers, including the Virginia Department of Emergency Management, the Virginia Citizens Corps, the Virginia Department of Business Assistance, and the Virginia Crime Prevention Association.

Among the specific topics covered in the toolkit are various insurance matters, disaster planning, and threat recognition. Companies with emergency plans already in place can use the website to check and update their plans.

Related Notes: (1) At the beginning of this month, the Virginia Port Authority (VPA) began charging a \$2

Continued on the Next Page

security fee per cargo container on all containers arriving at state-owned port facilities. The state's decision to impose a fee follows similar decisions by such major ports as Miami and Houston. Federal DHS (Department of Homeland Security) grant money that is used to buy the security equipment needed for the inspection of containers does not cover operational costs or the cost of maintenance after the expiration of manufacturer warranties.

The VPA's board voted unanimously to impose the fee – and fees on other types of cargo as well – in the hope of offsetting some of these new/increased costs of doing business.

(2) The Fairfax County Health Department is seeking to recruit 3,000 more volunteers for its Medical Response Team, which currently has approximately 3,000 volunteers in its Medical Reserve Corps. No medical experience is necessary to join the corps, which is made up of members from the Fairfax County Citizens Corps. Officials said that all volunteers will be trained to respond and assist in the event of an attack or other emergency requiring medical assistance. Citizens of Fairfax County and others interested in the program can obtain more information about it at www.fairfaxmrc.org.

NORTH CAROLINA

Creation of a new bioresearch lab is being considered, while a cutting-edge communications system takes a major step toward completion

Wake Forest University's School of Medicine in Winston-Salem is making preliminary plans to build a new biological research laboratory. Deputy Associate Dean of Research David Friedman said that there has been considerable discussion between scientists and architects about the location, type, and cost of the new laboratory, which probably would be a level-three facility. The new lab, which would be added to or made part of an existing building on the campus, would be able to deal with the most dangerous diseases that are presently curable.

Friedman expressed hope that the new lab would permit the university "to recruit outside scientists" and expand its capability to research deadly diseases. Last

month, Wake Forest also hosted a conference, focused on the anthrax threat, that was attended by scientists from across the nation. Wake Forest scientists are currently working on a broad spectrum of programs, funded under a number of federal biodefense grants, which is another reason university officials are interested in the possibility of funding construction of the new lab.

Elsewhere in the state, Vance County has been awarded a DHS (Department of Homeland Security) grant to build a tower that will be a major component of a statewide digital radio network called VIPER (Voice Interoperability Plan for Emergency Responders), which allows a number of agencies to communicate with one another despite using different radio systems. The North Carolina Highway Patrol, which is managing the network, will supervise the building both of the new tower and, later, another one, already planned, that will join the first tower, which is now in place on the Vance-Granville county line.

WISCONSIN

Installs additional biological-agent detection systems

The state's main U.S. Post Office branch – on Packerland Drive in Green Bay – will soon receive a new electronic biological-agent detection system that will sample articles of mail automatically and alert postal workers if anthrax and/or other biological-weapon agents are detected. The system should be operational by the end of this month. At least three other Wisconsin post offices use the same technology.

Similar equipment, designed and developed by numerous vendors, is operational at post offices and other government and private-sector facilities in cities and states throughout the country. One drawback to the use of many of these detection systems is their high false-alarm rate. The only systems that provide what are considered to be 100 percent accurate results are collection systems in which samples are taken over a specific time period, usually 24 hours, and cultured in a laboratory.

The downside to collection systems is that the exact time that an agent is collected usually cannot be

Continued on the Next Page

determined because of the long sampling periods involved and the time it takes to culture and test the samples that are collected. Many states currently use both types of systems, which are funded primarily through the federal BioWatch program and various related grants. DHS and private-sector officials generally agree, though, that better systems, with fewer false positives, will be developed and deployed as biodefense technology continues to improve.



Special Report: September Is National Preparedness Month

By James D. Hessman
Editor in Chief

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the American Red Cross (ARC) announced last week that they have joined forces to co-sponsor National Preparedness Month 2005, a nationwide effort scheduled for this coming September, “to encourage Americans to prepare for emergencies in their homes, businesses, and schools.”

The DHS/ARC goal, officials said, “is to increase public awareness about the importance of preparing for emergencies and to encourage individuals to take action.”

As of early last week, 126 public and private-sector organizations had already signed up as members of the “2005 National Preparedness Month Coalition.” That number compares favorably with the total of just over 80 organizations enrolled in the September 2004 coalition as participants in the first national preparedness month. This year’s total is expected to expand rapidly during the summer months as additional businesses, organizations, and communities develop and refine their own preparedness plans.

Among the major private-sector organizations already pledged to participate are the Ad Council, the American Hospital Association, the American Library Association, the American Medical Association, the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, Business Executives for National Security, the Girl Scouts of America, the Federation of American Hospitals, the Humane Society of the United States, the

International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Association of Broadcasters, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Fire Protection Association, the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Reserve Officers Association, the Salvation Army USA, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Joining them in the escalating effort are such public and/or quasi-public organizations and agencies as the Civil Air Patrol, the Internal Revenue Service, the National Association of Counties, the National Guard Bureau, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Postal Service, and the USA Freedom Corps.

The private-sector companies and corporations – many of them active in the homeland-security/counterterrorism field – in the coalition as of last week include ABC Radio Networks, the Archer Daniels Midland Company, the AT&T Corporation, BAE Systems, the BellSouth Corporation, The Boeing Company, The Dial Corporation, GE Consumer & Industrial, GE Healthcare, Hewlett-Packard, Honeywell, Major League Soccer, Management Sciences Associates Inc., NASCAR, Nextel Communications, RadioShack Corporation, Target, Verizon Communications, and Wal-Mart Stores Inc.

The companies and organizations listed, and many others, DHS/ARC spokespersons said, are planning, among other things, to “provide information, host events, and sponsor activities that disseminate emergency preparedness messages to ... their customers, members, employees, stakeholders, and communities across the nation.”

Initiatives, Essays, Ideas, and Demonstrations

The seemingly ambitious plans announced last week are likely to be only the beginning. “No community ... [will be] truly prepared for a disaster,” said ARC President and CEO Marsha J. Evans, “until every individual, family, and household takes personal responsibility for preparedness.” Red Cross chapters throughout the country are and will be available, Evans said, to help people “create a family disaster plan so that each person knows what to do, where to go, and how to contact loved ones.”

Continued on the Next Page

The DHS/ARC plans have received solid bipartisan support from both houses of Congress. Senators Susan Collins (R-Maine) and Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.) and Representatives Christopher Cox (R-Calif.) and Bennie Thompson (D-Miss.) have agreed to serve as the congressional co-chairs of National Preparedness Month 2005, and it can be taken for granted that all other members of both houses will participate in various preparedness seminars, panel discussions, and other public events in their home states and congressional districts.

Companies already involved, or preparing to become involved, in the field of domestic preparedness are expected to demonstrate their products at the same public venues and/or at their own open houses. Some also are likely to sponsor essay contests for high schools and colleges in their home communities and/or to help underwrite the cost of seminars and panel discussions open to the press and public.

The end result is expected to be not only an exponential increase in public awareness of the need for preparedness – personal, individual, and at all levels of government – but also a torrential flood of new ideas, initiatives, and programs that, no matter where they originate, can quickly and easily spread throughout the country.

A Fair Start at Union Station

There is probably no private-sector organization better qualified to serve as co-sponsor of National Preparedness Month 2005 than the American Red Cross – which, as DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff commented in the department’s 9 June announcement, “has long been a leader in emergency preparedness and response.” Working through a nationwide network of almost 900 locally supported chapters, the ARC’s 35,000 employees and one million volunteers form one of the world’s foremost lifesaving organizations – which in recent years has mobilized relief for individuals and families affected by the estimated 70,000 disasters, large and small, that occur throughout the country each year.

The ARC also annually trains more than 15 million people in various lifesaving skills, serves as the largest supplier of blood and blood products to more than 3,000 hospitals throughout the United States, works with the nation’s armed services in support of U.S. military families both within the United States and overseas, and helps assist the victims of international disasters and conflicts in many other areas of the world.

DHS officials said that National Preparedness Month 2005 “will officially launch” on 1 September “with a public emergency awareness fair ... at Union Station in Washington, D.C.” Officials emphasized in last week’s announcement that any event or activity conducted during National Preparedness Month would be “purely voluntary,” and that the department “is not financially obligated to any ... coalition member.”

DHS promotes its public emergency preparedness programs primarily through the Citizen Corps and what is called “the Ready campaign.” The Citizen Corps is a grassroots DHS program that “localizes” the department’s preparedness messages and provides local opportunities for citizens to receive emergency-response training, participate in community exercises, and/or support local emergency responders. Ready is a national public-service advertising campaign, produced by the Advertising Council (in partnership with DHS), that is designed “to educate and empower Americans to prepare for and respond to potential terrorist attacks and other emergencies.” (For additional information about the department’s plans for National Preparedness Month visit www.Ready.gov)



The preceding is the first in a series of T.I.P.S. articles on the preparations for and lessons learned from National Preparedness Month 2005. Future articles will report on local and state plans and programs, various training exercises involving the nation’s first-responder communities, and a broad spectrum of other emergency-preparedness events and activities planned for the month of September.