

---

# Before Disaster Strikes

## Imperatives for Enhancing Defense Support of Civil Authorities

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



The Report of the  
**Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents**  
to the Secretary of Defense and the  
Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members,  
Committees on Armed Services,  
U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives

September 15, 2010

# The Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents

Steve Abbot  
Chairman

Frank Keating  
Vice Chairman

James Carafano

Dennis Celletti

James Greenwood

Jerry Grizzle

Ronald Harrison

Timothy Lowenberg

James Metzger

George Nethercutt

Raymond "Fred" Rees

Dennis Reimer

Ervin Rokke

September 15, 2010

The Honorable Robert M. Gates  
Secretary of Defense  
The Pentagon  
Washington, DC

The Honorable Carl Levin  
Chairman  
Committee on Armed Services  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC

The Honorable John McCain  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC

The Honorable Ike Skelton  
Chairman  
Committee on Armed Services  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC

The Honorable Howard P. "Buck" McKeon  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC

Mr. Secretary, Chairmen, and Ranking Members:

It is with a profound sense of urgency that we deliver the report of the Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents. This is a matter of critical national importance.

All of us who have worked in the area of domestic disaster response know that there are factors that complicate effective response to major incidents. They include the constitutionally designed Federal system of governance, the guarding of prerogatives by participants at all levels, "stove-piping" among the Federal family, and the lack of integrated planning at all levels. These factors will most certainly complicate a response to a major chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive incident, but they must not stand in the way of essential and timely preparation. Such an incident will happen. It is only a matter of time. The stakes are too high to delay action.

It is an obligation of all those in positions of responsibility to immediately search for, discover, and implement solutions to overcome the barriers to effective response. It is a national imperative. Notwithstanding the lower probability of the occurrence of such an incident compared with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, wildland fires, and other natural disasters, the potential consequences demand that we quickly find those solutions.

The subject is complicated, and there is more urgent work to be done. In the year of the Panel's deliberations, we have identified a number of findings and recommendations that will enhance Department of Defense capabilities for support of civil authorities and also significantly improve related policy, processes, and structures in other Federal agencies and at the State and local levels. Action is required now to implement these recommendations.

Let me commend Frank Keating, the Vice Chairman, and my other colleagues on the Panel for their service over the past twelve months. They brought to the table both a vast amount of experience and the energy and dedication required to address this matter of critical national importance.

We are grateful to have had the opportunity to serve.

Very respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Abbot", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right from the end of the signature.

Steve Abbot  
Chairman

# Executive Summary

This summary presents the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents, established by Section 1082 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Public Law 110-181, January 26, 2008 (as amended). The purpose of the Advisory Panel is to carry out an assessment of the capabilities of the Department of Defense to provide support to United States civil authorities in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) incident.

## Advisory Panel Membership

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Members of the Committees on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, appointed the following individuals as Advisory Panel members:

- Steve Abbot (ADM, USN, Ret), Panel Chairman
- The Honorable Frank Keating, Panel Vice Chairman
- James Carafano, Ph.D.
- Dennis Celletti (MG, ARNG)
- The Honorable James Greenwood
- Jerry Grizzle (MG, USA, Ret)
- Ronald Harrison (MG, USA, Ret)
- Timothy Lowenberg (Maj Gen, ANG)
- James Metzger (VADM, USN, Ret)
- The Honorable George Nethercutt
- Raymond “Fred” Rees (MG, ARNG)
- Dennis Reimer (GEN, USA, Ret)
- Ervin Rokke (Lt Gen, USAF, Ret)

Complete biographical information on each Panel member is contained in the full report.

## Advisory Panel Meetings

The Advisory Panel held meetings on the following dates at the following locations:

- September 15–16, 2009, The RAND Corporation Washington Office, Arlington, Virginia
- November 23, 2009, U.S. Northern Command Headquarters, Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado
- November 24, 2009, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado
- March 17–18, 2010, The RAND Corporation Washington Office, Arlington, Virginia
- June 2–3, 2010, The RAND Corporation Washington Office, Arlington, Virginia
- July 7, 8, and 9, 2010 (telephone conferences)

## Findings and Recommendations

This section includes the Panel’s findings and recommendations in toto, supplemented with a brief background explanation.

### Authorities

The Panel examined the existing statutory provisions that apply to DoD civil support, especially provisions related to a CBRNE incident. While most agree that there is ample statutory authority, directives, and other policy for a wide variety of DoD support activities, the Panel suggests ways that authorities and policies can be better explained and clarified, as well as a modification to one statutory provision that will enhance DoD capabilities.

*Finding: The authorities for the Department of Defense to support civil authorities during a CBRNE incident are generally adequate but are not widely known and are frequently misunderstood. Moreover, officials at all levels of government could use additional training on the authorities for CBRNE incident response.*

#### *Recommendations:*

1. *That the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Council of Governors, develop a handbook for DoD support of civil authorities that explains in comprehensive detail—using scenarios as examples—how DoD capabilities may be legally employed nationwide for support of civil authorities for CBRNE incidents.*
2. *That Governors and Federal Cabinet Officials with CBRNE responsibilities ensure appropriate training of officials and employees on authorities for CBRNE incident response.*
3. *That the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General jointly lead an effort to coordinate with States and U.S. Territories to identify and resolve Federal-State-local conflicts in authorities for CBRNE incident response.*
4. *That the Congress amend the Stafford Act to include explicitly biological incidents in the provisions dealing with Federal support for major disasters.*

### DoD Guidance for Civil Support

There are at least seven key DoD Directives that relate to DSCA. Only one is dated later than 2000. A critical one is dated 1986. Importantly, civil authorities who may seek support from DoD will likely have to search multiple directives to determine what conditions may apply in a specific case.

*Finding: DoD guidance for all forms of Defense Support of Civil Authorities is fragmented, incomplete, and outdated.*

*Recommendation: That the Secretary of Defense immediately consolidate all directives dealing with Defense Support of Civil Authorities into a single source document.*

### Title 10 Reserve Components

By law, Title 10 Reserve Component units are prohibited from involuntary mobilization for conducting domestic operations except those involving a “weapon of mass destruction” or catastrophic terrorism. However, Title 10 reserve units might be closer to an affected area than active duty Title 10 units or National Guard units from other States, and Title 10 reserves, particularly the Army Reserve, have a significant number of the types of units DoD is most often asked to provide to civil support missions. As a condition precedent to expanding the use of Title 10 Reserve Forces,

however, it is critically important to resolve how unity of effort is to be achieved during a CBRNE response. Recommendations to that effect are also included in this report.

*Finding: The Title 10 Reserve Components include assets that might be valuable for CBRNE planning and response, but these assets are generally unavailable except for certain defined incidents.*

*Recommendations:*

1. *That the Secretary of Defense coordinate with the Council of Governors and then with the remaining Governors to identify Title 10 Reserve Component assets that may be beneficial in responding to the full range of CBRNE incidents—natural and manmade—and report these findings to the Congress.*
2. *That the Congress expand statutory authority to allow for planning by and employment of Title 10 Reserve Component assets for any CBRNE incident, whether a result of terrorism or other causes.*

## Training Authority and Requirements

It is essential to an effective response that forces are properly trained and exercised. There is significant room for improvement in this area. Although DSCA is a significant priority in the latest QDR, there is no systematic process to ensure that forces that could be given a DSCA mission are trained appropriately.

*Findings:*

1. *There is a lack of training authority to ensure that forces with a CBRNE response mission are consistently and properly trained.*
2. *Training that does exist for CBRNE response is often inconsistent, fragmented, or lacking fully developed standards.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense—*

1. *Direct a lead entity to serve as training authority for Title 10 and Title 32 forces with a designated CBRNE response mission.*
2. *Direct the development of a joint mission essential task list for Title 10 and Title 32 forces with a designated or potential CBRNE response mission, including but not limited to general purpose forces, CCMRF, CBIRF, CERFP, CST, and HRF.*

## Training Resources

CBRNE training facilities and funding must be enhanced to ensure adequate preparation.

*Findings:*

1. *There is a lack of suitable facilities for CBRNE response training.*
2. *The current/future Five-Year Defense Plans do not support adequate funding to execute the level of exercises and training events to support the mission requirements of USNORTHCOM and its subordinate organizations.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense—*

1. *Identify and resource multiple regional training centers for CBRNE response training. Ideally, one training center should be resourced for each FEMA region.*
2. *Provide the funding necessary for the training and readiness certification of forces with a designated CBRNE response mission.*

## Leadership Training and Professional Development

Improved training opportunities are essential to promote better understanding of response strategies, plans, and operations. All leaders should be proficient with the National Response Framework and the National Incident Management System, but few military leaders have been trained specifically for DSCA.

### *Findings:*

1. *The level of training for military and civilian leaders in response planning and operations is inadequate.*
2. *There is no sustainable pool of military personnel trained for the CBRNE response mission.*

### *Recommendations:*

1. *That the Secretary of Defense require the inclusion of instruction related to DSCA, the National Response Framework, and the National Incident Management System in the Officer Education Systems of all military services.*
2. *That the Secretaries of Homeland Security and of Defense jointly offer personal training on response planning and operations, to include the role of DSCA, to all Governors.*
3. *That the Secretary of Defense direct the services to establish within their personnel systems a means of identifying enlisted personnel, noncommissioned officers, and commissioned officers who possess particular skills and experience in DSCA for CBRNE, in order to develop a sustainable pool of CBRNE response personnel.*

## Exercises Among DoD and Other Federal Agencies

Senior Federal officials have expressed concern about the quality and utility of Federal CBRNE exercise programs. Exercises vary in quality and often have predetermined outcomes, reducing their usefulness. The nation needs to improve the quality of exercises and scenarios, not just increase their number.

*Finding: The type and quality of exercises involving the Federal Interagency for CBRNE-related incidents are inadequate.*

### *Recommendations:*

1. *That the President direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to lead a comprehensive Interagency evaluation of the adequacy and funding of Federal CBRNE exercise programs and recommend changes for their improvement.*
2. *That the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General require and fund exercises to evaluate activities and the use of authorities provided under existing statutes in which their departments play a key role, including the Insurrection Act and CBRNE-related statutes.*

## Command and Control of CBRNE Response Forces

Although there is a Constitutional basis for distinct and separate chains of command for State and Federal military forces, unity of effort requires the most-effective, most-coordinated use of such forces for domestic contingencies. Currently, such unity is not always achieved, and some argue that existing dual-status arrangements and liaison authority are not sufficient.

*Finding: Unified command and control of Federal and State military assets for CBRNE response continues to be problematic. Under current approaches, even unity of effort between Federal and State forces cannot be assumed or assured.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Council of Governors, promote unity of effort between State and Federal military forces during a response to CBRNE incidents by—*

1. *Providing Federal recognition of eligibility for dual-status command in every State and U.S. Territory.*
2. *Permitting, with the consent of State Governors and the authorization of the President, both National Guard commanders and certain Title 10 commanders who have been provided Federal recognition of eligibility to command in dual status for CBRNE incidents and other defined contingencies.*
3. *Developing plans for coordination of command and control authorities in the event of multi-state CBRNE incidents.*

## **A Joint Interagency Task Force for CBRNE Response**

As part of pre-incident planning and coordination, an organization that can quickly and effectively translate national-level decisionmaking for a CBRNE incident into operational and tactical actions is imperative. A joint interagency task force (JIATF) for CBRNE could provide such capability.

*Finding: There is currently no standing interagency organization that can direct the Federal operational response to a CBRNE incident in the homeland.*

*Recommendation: That the President direct that the Secretaries of Homeland Security and of Defense lead the establishment of a joint interagency task force that has the capability and authority to direct a Federal operational response to a CBRNE incident and that includes all Federal agencies with CBRNE-related functions under the National Response Framework.*

## **Determining Requirements for CBRNE Response Planning**

DoD possesses many capabilities that could be useful in response operations, and coordinating military and civilian planning efforts has become increasingly important. Major hurdles in this coordination are the lack of identified *requirements* for particular response scenarios and the lack of a complete accounting of the *capabilities* that State, local, tribal, or Federal civilian agencies can supply.

*Finding: The nation has not defined with sufficient clarity what assets will be required to respond to CBRNE incidents.*

*Recommendation: That the President direct prompt completion by DHS of the capabilities inventory, to include explicit definition of requirements and capabilities necessary to respond to CBRNE incidents, based on the most current National Planning Scenarios.*

## **Integrated Planning**

A national integrated planning system is essential for effective disaster response, especially for a CBRNE incident.

*Finding: There is currently no comprehensive national integrated planning system to respond to either natural or manmade disasters, including CBRNE incidents. Furthermore, planning among Federal agencies and other levels of government is fragmented and nonstandard, and there is no formal process by which State plans can inform Federal planning and vice versa, or by which international support can be considered.*

*Recommendation: That the President direct the establishment of an integrated planning system that promotes coordinated planning among local, State, and Federal Government entities and the private*

*sector and that includes provisions for support from international organizations and friendly and allied governments, especially Canada and Mexico.*

### **Forces for Defense Support of Civil Authorities**

Insufficient forces have been allocated or apportioned to USNORTHCOM, especially for potentially catastrophic CBRNE incidents. Despite the advent of the new National Guard Homeland Response Forces (HRFs), given the potential magnitude of a catastrophic CBRNE incident, general purpose Title 10 forces that may be required for DSCA should be identified, at least by type.

*Finding: Sufficient military forces have not been identified for DSCA. Furthermore, domestic military deployments generally are not conducted in accordance with the comprehensive processes used for overseas deployments. This results in difficulty in tracking responding units and effectively employing their corresponding capabilities.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense—*

- 1. Allocate or apportion additional Title 10 forces to U.S. Northern Command for CBRNE response.*
- 2. Direct that the Joint Staff and U.S. Northern Command develop Time-Phased Force Deployment Data for additional forces for domestic military deployments based on specific CBRNE Defense Support of Civil Authorities plans.*

### **The Defense Support of Civil Authorities Mission in Force Generation**

The 2010 QDR emphasizes the need for DoD to rebalance its policy, doctrine, and capabilities to better support six key missions, one of which includes homeland defense and DSCA. However, DoD is not placing sufficient emphasis on budget and planning priorities related to DSCA missions, including CBRNE response.

*Finding: The Quadrennial Defense Review of 2010, expanding on guidance in the most current National Defense Strategy and National Military Strategy, identifies homeland security as a significant mission, but there is inadequate provision for Defense Support of Civil Authorities in the force generation cycle.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense elevate the importance of the homeland security mission, to include DSCA for CBRNE response, to be equal to warfighting by—*

- 1. Clarifying the roles and missions required for responding to a CBRNE incident in the next National Defense Strategy.*
- 2. Specifically including DSCA for CBRNE and other catastrophic incidents as a mission equal to other missions in the force generation cycle, including all aspects of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, and facilities (DOTMLPF).*

### **The National Guard Homeland Response Force**

The 2010 QDR proposes that the existing CBRNE Consequence Management Response Force apportioned to USNORTHCOM be enlarged and reconfigured. Two additional CCMRFs will be reconfigured to act as command and control elements, and the National Guard will field ten new Homeland Response Forces, with one stationed in each of the ten FEMA regions.

*Finding: The Homeland Response Force (HRF) structure provides a regional approach to CBRNE incidents, but the resources for and allocation of HRF assets among and between States have not been fully resolved, particularly for multi-state incidents. Furthermore, plans for the employment of the HRF for specific CBRNE responses have not been fully developed.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with and advice from the Council of Governors—*

1. *Develop agreements for multi-state resourcing of HRF units.*
2. *Clearly define the process by which the HRFs will be trained, equipped, and employed.*
3. *Determine how HRFs and DCOs/DCEs will coordinate effectively to support response planning and execution.*

## **Establishing and Resourcing CBRNE Response Forces**

The Congress directed that the Panel “assess the adequacy of the process and methodology by which the Department of Defense establishes and maintains dedicated, special, and general purpose forces for conducting operations [to provide support to United States civil authorities in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive incident]” and “assess the adequacy of the resources planned and programmed by the Department of Defense to ensure the preparedness and capability of dedicated, special, and general purpose forces [to provide such support].” DoD policy, structures, and processes were being reviewed and significantly altered during the course of the Panel’s deliberations, in large part during the development of the 2010 QDR.

*Findings:*

1. *DoD’s assessment processes are significantly hampered by the lack of integrated planning among Federal, State, and local entities—especially information about potential civilian shortfalls. However, the overall approach employed by DoD to assess what might be needed and what can reasonably be resourced is generally appropriate.*
2. *Additional efforts will be required to provide a critical assessment of the specific analytical processes and methods, but these efforts would provide the greatest utility once strategic questions are better answered and assumptions better defined.*

*Recommendations:*

1. *That the Secretary of Defense ensure that future processes for developing dedicated, special, and general purpose forces for support of civil authorities for CBRNE response include consultation with all necessary stakeholders at the Federal, State, and local levels.*
2. *That the Secretaries of Defense and of Homeland Security report to the Congress on the evaluation of the May 2010 National Level Exercise.*
3. *That the Secretary of Defense report to the Congress the findings of the Senior Steering Group and similar processes and events as a means of further answering the specific questions raised in the Panel’s enabling legislation.*

## **A Repository for DSCA Data and Analysis**

To estimate sufficient requirements for disaster response, government agencies need comprehensive data on and analysis of the types and amounts of capabilities that have been previously provided or will likely be requested.

*Finding: There is currently no coordinated Federal effort, including a central repository, to capture data and analysis from emergency and disaster response operations that includes Defense Support of Civil Authorities.*

*Recommendations:*

1. *That the Secretary of Defense establish a central DoD repository for deployment data on DSCA operations, including natural and manmade incidents. The repository should include all data on the original request for DoD support, military units and personnel deployed, details of their operations, logistical and transportation support, command and control, and funding, as well as related analysis.*
2. *That the President direct the establishment of a standardized, central Federal repository for data and analyses of all Federal response activities for natural and manmade emergencies and disasters, of which the DoD repository will be an integral part.*

**Plan Sharing for CBRNE Response**

A coordinated national response demands that response plans be shared among all Federal, State, and local response entities. State and local governments need to develop detailed disaster response plans, including plans for maintaining governance.

*Finding: Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for CBRNE response are not making a sustained and comprehensive effort to share all-hazards response plans. Sharing plans is essential for the development of coordinated Federal, State, and local responses to disasters, especially CBRNE incidents.*

*Recommendations:*

1. *That the President explicitly require, in his forthcoming directive on national preparedness, that response plans be shared across Federal agencies and that States share their plans with other States and with the Federal Government as a condition of future related Federal disaster planning assistance. The Presidential directive should define requirements for quality response plans.*
2. *That Governors develop COG plans with sufficient detail to ensure the succession of State leadership and essential services during an emergency, to include large-scale CBRNE incidents.*
3. *That Governors direct their emergency management agencies to share all State and local response plans, including COG plans, with Federal civil and military agencies and with States in their FEMA region and other adjoining States.*
4. *That the President direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to coordinate with Governors to establish a formal process by which State and local plans are shared with and inform Federal planning and vice versa, and that the President direct the establishment within DHS of a repository for Federal, State, and local response plans, to be updated annually.*
5. *That the President direct DHS and DoD to continue efforts—such as the Task Force for Emergency Readiness—to bolster States’ response planning efforts by making available military capabilities in preparedness planning, and that the Congress fund such efforts at the appropriate levels of government.*
6. *That the Secretary of Defense direct that, to the maximum extent feasible, existing DoD domestic response plans be declassified and future plans be unclassified.*

**The Defense Coordinating Officer/Defense Coordinating Element**

The DCO is the primary point of contact for DoD support to civil authorities at an incident site. The DCO should play a pivotal role in the sharing of response plans between DoD, States, and major municipalities. Given its resources, the DCO/DCE is unlikely to perform all of its assigned missions effectively to ensure adequate preparation, planning, and response, particularly for catastrophes, including CBRNE incidents.

*Finding: The Defense Coordinating Officer (DCO)/Defense Coordinating Element (DCE) is not adequately sized and structured for its assigned missions, and it is not sufficiently expandable to effectively coordinate responses to or command Federal military forces in a major CBRNE incident.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense—*

1. *Review and as required modify DCO/DCE structures and missions to ensure effective mission performance.*
2. *Remove the command and control authority of the DCO/DCE for all military forces.*
3. *In consultation with the Council of Governors and with the participation of the Secretary of Homeland Security, establish a protocol for the sharing of State and Federal plans for CBRNE incidents and other catastrophes, with the DCO/DCE playing a key coordinating role.*

## **A Common Operating Picture for CBRNE Response**

Civil-military coordination for emergency response is currently hampered by the lack of a COP to which response organizations can fully contribute and which they can fully use. This is despite legislation to direct such coordination and communication.

*Finding: There is currently no standard or sufficient mechanism for localities, States, and Federal agencies to share a civil-military common operating picture to support CBRNE incident response.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Homeland Security, with support from the Secretary of Defense—*

1. *Direct new efforts to develop completely the Homeland Security Information Network and Common Operating Picture to enable timely civil-military coordination for CBRNE response operations.*
2. *Study and report to the President on both the implications of relying on the Internet for vital communications during an emergency and whether backup capabilities are sufficient to support response operations in the event of a large-scale CBRNE incident.*

## **Civil Support Teams**

Stationing criteria require that a CST be available for mutual support and response based on a radius of 250 miles and a response time of five hours. As a result, the Panel concludes that the current 55 certified CST locations and the two new (as yet uncertified) CSTs in New York and Florida meet these criteria, with some risks accepted in western Texas in FEMA Region VI.

*Finding: The number of National Guard Civil Support Teams is adequate for the present, but their effectiveness would benefit from staff augmentation, and the current Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) does not support the modernization necessary to sustain them.*

*Recommendations: That the Secretary of Defense—*

1. *Authorize an augmentation of not fewer than six additional personnel to each Civil Support Team.*
2. *Neither authorize more Civil Support Teams nor change their locations at this time.*
3. *Ensure that adequate funding is projected in current and subsequent Future Years Defense Programs to support modernization of CST equipment.*
4. *Require the Chief, National Guard Bureau, annually to report on CST capability shortfalls and to recommend required funding to support adequate CST modernization and sustainment.*

## **Conclusions and the Path Ahead**

The Panel conducted its deliberations in a time of substantial change in this area, including the establishment and fielding of the new National Guard Homeland Response Force organizations. Based on the most recent evidence available to us, we believe that our recommendations will remain valid even as DoD's changing approach becomes better defined. If time had permitted, the Panel

would likely have explored other issues, such as joint reception, staging, onward movement, and integration, as well as potential DoD involvement in enforcing a Federal quarantine.

We recognize the substantial progress that has been made in recent years in all aspects of homeland security, including many aspects of DoD support of civil authorities. Nevertheless, DoD cannot enhance its support of civil authorities by itself—and our findings and recommendations reflect that simple fact. We therefore encourage the Congress; the President, the Secretary of Defense, and other Federal Executive Branch officials; and the State and local officials to whom our findings and recommendations are directed to proceed promptly to implement those within their purview.

## Abbreviations

ADM	Admiral
ANG	U.S. Air National Guard
ARNG	U.S. Army National Guard
CBIRF	Chemical Biological Incident Response Force
CBRNE	chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive
CCMRF	CBRNE Consequence Management Response Force
CERFP	CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Package
COG	continuity of government
COP	common operating picture
CST	Civil Support Team
DCE	Defense Coordinating Element
DCO	Defense Coordinating Officer
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DoD	Department of Defense
DOTMLPF	doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, and facilities
DSCA	Defense Support of Civil Authorities
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FFRDC	Federally Funded Research and Development Center
FYDP	Future Years Defense Program
GEN	General
HRF	Homeland Response Force
JIATF	joint interagency task force
Lt Gen	Lieutenant General
Maj Gen	Major General
MG	Major General
NDRI	National Defense Research Institute
QDR	Quadrennial Defense Review
USA	United States Army

USAF	United States Air Force
USN	United States Navy
USNORTHCOM	U.S. Northern Command
VADM	Vice Admiral