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Executive Summary

The Task Force for Emergency Readiness (TFER) Pilot Program was introduced in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), FY 2008/2009 Appropriations Act, Sec. 908: The Administrator, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish ... a Task Force for Emergency Readiness pilot program for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 ... in not fewer than 5 States.

The purpose of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)—led TFER Pilot Program was “... to determine the value that a dedicated team of planners with extensive civil-military planning expertise [could] bring to assessing, strengthening, and advancing State catastrophic preparedness planning efforts ...” and was a result of the DHS Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2 Report (2006) and Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 Annex 1 (HSPD).

FEMA identified five TFER Pilot States, representing various geographies, state governance structures, and emergency planning capabilities—Washington State (FEMA Region X), Hawaii (FEMA Region IX), South Carolina (FEMA Region IV), Massachusetts (FEMA Region I), and West Virginia (FEMA Region III)—and collaborated with each TFER Pilot State to determine the most appropriate National Planning Scenarios for each state to use. Washington State used Scenario 9: Natural Disaster–Major Earthquake, focusing on catastrophic planning, emergency logistics, distribution, evacuation, and recovery. Hawaii used Scenario 10: Natural Disaster–Major Hurricane, focusing on logistics and evacuation. South Carolina used Scenario 1: Nuclear Detonation–10-Kiloton Improvised Nuclear Device (IND); Scenario 12: Explosives Attack–Bombing Using Improvised Explosive Device (IED); and Scenario 15: Cyber Attack. Massachusetts used Scenario 12: Explosives Attack–Bombing Using Improvised Explosive Device (IED). West Virginia used a chemical incident, a flood, and a mass evacuation.

FEMA published guidelines for the states in the TFER Pilot Information Package, outlining three main objectives: (1) develop a catastrophic response plan as an annex to the state’s emergency plans...
management planning, integrating federal, state, tribal, local, and private sector capabilities; (2) build relationships across sectors for interagency coordination; and (3) document lessons learned.

The TFER Pilot Program has assisted the states in testing the specific national planning scenarios to identify gaps in their state plans, and to utilize civilian-military personnel to develop and formalize state plans for responding to catastrophic events. The exercises have been carried out, are about to be conducted, or have been planned. In one of the three states that already have executed their scenarios, After-Action Reports (AAR) were completed and Improvement Plans were developed after gaps were identified. The focus on logistics by all states was a common thread, demonstrating the critical need to establish, address, improve, and/or revise state-level logistics planning for catastrophic events.

Each state strongly recommended continuation and enhancement of the program and expansion to the 54 states and territories. Lessons learned have been shared among the TFER Pilot States, and two states—Washington and Hawaii—collaborated on a multi-state exercise. With the ability to bring together federal, state, local, and private sector organizations and personnel, relationships improved in all cases, and associations of trust were established. The TFER Pilot States were able to develop State Catastrophic Annexes to their emergency plans, or to improve and reinvigorate such plans if they had been standing idle due to human or financial resource limitations—all due to the TFER Pilot Program initiative. TFER activity dramatically accelerated completion of catastrophic planning for all of the TFER States.

**Comments from Participating States**

- **Washington:** Having the TFER Pilot has pushed the planning timelines ahead by a factor of 3 to 4 years!
- **Hawaii:** We need a continental U.S. plan to integrate with federal catastrophic efforts. TFER is the only entity we have now.
- **South Carolina:** We found emergency response capabilities of which we were unaware, at all levels.
- **Massachusetts:** The Massachusetts TFER is a respected third party among the various levels/communities needed in the discussion to develop and improve catastrophic and emergency response plans.
- **West Virginia:** This is an opportunity for the National Guard through state emergency management to develop formalized/standardized programs for catastrophic emergency response. The more planning we do, the more planning we find that we need. We cannot rush these plans or attention to detail will be lost. All plans incorporate federal, state, and local contributions.

The TFER Program, funded through the 2008 and 2009 Homeland Security Preparedness Technical Assistance Program (HSPTAP) grant, focused on the employment of 2–3 full-time equivalent (FTE) civilian-military planners. The TFER personnel were employed by and worked
for the sponsoring state agency, which is under the auspices of the governor. The Pilot period of performance was 1 September 2008–28 February 2010; the performance period has now been extended through 31 August FY 2011. Without continued funding and a proposed Program of Record (POR) to maintain momentum, the information-sharing, catastrophic planning, and capturing of lessons learned, could cease.

1. TFER Pilot Program Overview

The TFER Pilot Program is a joint partnership between DHS and DoD. This FEMA-led initiative aims to support and strengthen catastrophic disaster preparedness of individual states by facilitating greater capacity in a more comprehensive integration of planning efforts across all levels of government: horizontal, across public and private sectors, jurisdictions, and functional disciplines, including local, tribal, and non-governmental organizations (NGO); and vertical, among state, regional, and federal agencies, including state emergency management and homeland security agencies, state National Guard (NG), FEMA and FEMA Regions, National Guard Bureau (NGB), U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM), and Department of Defense (DoD).

To accelerate catastrophic planning, the TFER Pilot Program tested the integration of military and civilian planning skills—under the guidance and direction of state-level emergency management agencies—as the foundation for an eventual national implementation. The TFER Pilot Program was conceived as a “joint” idea in that a TFER planner who had military status could learn the “civilian” lexicon used in emergency planning, contribute to the development of more robust civilian agency planning, and bring the acquired interdisciplinary knowledge and experience back to the NG Joint Force Headquarters–State (JFHQ-S). At the same time, the civilian planners could gain the military expertise of planning, which otherwise might be non-existent, and the combination of the two planning experiences (i.e., military and civilian) could result in an invaluable synergy of effort in planning for state catastrophic incidents.

In March 2009, FEMA, DoD, and the National Guard conducted training in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, for the initial cadre of TFER Pilot Program personnel. Each state received a Pilot Information Package and developed a Project Management Plan agreed-on by FEMA. In addition, the states utilized the National Preparedness Guidelines and the Comprehensive Planning Guide 101 as existing source documents from which they developed their TFER Programs.

DHS/FEMA developed the Virtual Joint Planning Office (VJPO) tool so that participating states could collaborate during the TFER Pilot Program. States reported that the tool was user friendly and facilitated interaction and information-sharing; it specifically enabled Washington and Hawaii to partner in the planning and implementation of Hawaii’s Category 4 Hurricane scenario.

Some states reported that due to uncertainty of funding they had difficulty hiring personnel and were slow to start up. As of this writing, some states have lost trained TFER personnel
because of the lack or uncertainty of funding. This personnel turnover is occurring in an environment in which a need for more planners with a wider variety of skills has been identified.

According to the TFER Pilot Information Package, the FEMA National Preparedness Director (NPD) will evaluate the TFER Pilot Program, its stated three objectives and corresponding measurement to determine the value of having dedicated FTE civilian-military experts integrated into the catastrophic planning process. The objectives are to:

- Develop/advance state catastrophic plans/annexes in response to the state-identified threat/scenario
- Build relationships with FEMA Federal Preparedness Coordinators (FPC), USNORTHCOM and USPACOM Defense Coordinating Officers (DCO), and the military services’ senior Reservist Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officers (EPLO), integrating them as planning partners

The TFER Pilot Program grew out of the analysis of the Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2 Report (2006) and is a response based on the following source documents:

- S.3623, Sec. 908, Task Force for Emergency Readiness–110th Congress
- National Guard Empowerment Act (2008)
- FEMA Gap Analysis Initiative (2007)
- Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act (2006)
- GAO 08-251/08-251 (USNORTHCOM).

Sec. 908 of the DHS 2008/2009 Appropriations Act mandates the submission of a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate, and to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, on the implementation and effectiveness of the TFER Pilot Program, providing recommendations for any modifications or expansion.

The Defense Science Board (DSB)\textsuperscript{4} Task Force on Achieving Interoperability in a Net-Centric…

\textsuperscript{4} The Defense Science Board examines and advises on matters related to the DoD scientific and technical enterprise.
Environment was outlined in its 2009 report, “Actions for the First 500 Days.” Action Item 18 of that report recommended that the National Guard Bureau (NGB) Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) should ... analyze the results of the current five pilot programs of the Task Force for Emergency Readiness and provide input for a nationwide capability.

2. Conclusion

Consistent with the verbiage in Sec. 908 of the 2008/2009 DHS Appropriations Act, the TFER Pilot Program should be continued and funded for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012. Each TFER Pilot State received from the DHS HSPTAP grant $200,000 for FY 2008 and $150,000 for FY 2009.

All five TFER Pilot States expressed the immediate need to continue the program to maintain the momentum of accomplishments gained through TFER catastrophic planning activities, and to facilitate the sharing of information and TFER work products with other states in the TFER Pilot States’ FEMA regions and with other states confronting the same threats and hazards. Continuation and eventual expansion of the TFER Pilot Program will improve nationwide capabilities and responses to catastrophic events/incidents.

The continuation of the TFER Program goes well beyond developing a catastrophic annex to the states’ Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans (CEMP) or Emergency Operations Plans (EOP)\(^5\); the TFER planning group must move forward to meet the next levels of catastrophic planning. With each exercise, the planners go through an entire planning cycle to identify existing gaps and address them, and continually assist local jurisdictions in their planning activities. One state pointed out that it is the mission of the DoD to protect the homeland and that the taxpayers pay for that. However, only limited DoD planning dollars are spent in preparing for that mission. The same effort that goes into war planning should go into catastrophic planning so that the National Guard, first responders, and all those involved in responding to a catastrophe have an opportunity to train and rehearse “jointly,” to be ready for those events so that American lives, at home, can be saved. It is critical for our nation to have these types of plans and assets in place and readily available.

3. Way Ahead

HSPD-8 Annex 1 states that “the security of the Nation requires that all\(^6\) levels of government possess the ability to conduct planning, to develop standard, coordinated plans, and to identify and dedicate resources to the development of those plans.” The plans must be tested regularly and improved through an inclusive and open process and there is a requirement to synchronize and coordinate plans at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels, as reflected in the TFER Pilot Information Package guidelines. Reports from the five TFER Pilot States, as well as direct responses from the participating State Adjutants General (included), are totally supportive of

---

\(^5\) This is the State equivalent of the National Response Framework.

\(^6\) Emphasis added.
the TFER project including strong recommendations to not only continue the programs in their states, but also to move forward to a nationwide capability. The Adjutants General further stated that the FEMA grant program was not the vehicle to use for funding and management of the program going forward. A five year program of record is recommended to provide continuity for the groundwork already accomplished and to move the program to the next level. The SAG Task Force recommends that interim funding be provided in 2011 and 2012 for the five TFER Pilot States. It further recommends that five additional states be added in FY 2011, (consider states located within the other FEMA regions) and that a plan be developed for integration of additional states in FY 2012, 2013, and 2014. This plan would include training, management, reporting, resource and funding requirements, and cross-sharing of products.
Lieutenant General (Ret.) William J. Hilsman  
Strategic Advisory Group Co-Executive Officer  
501 Addison Court  
Philadelphia, PA 19147-1403

Dear Gen. Hilsman:

I have reviewed the SAG TFER Report and concur with the Report and the Washington State Annex as written. For the reasons that follow, the State of Washington believes the TFER Pilot has been an unqualified success — in fact, has exceeded all expectations — and should be continued and expanded to other states as rapidly as possible.

Washington is one of a significant number of states in which the Adjutant General, the state’s senior Military commander, also has statutory responsibility for all statewide civilian emergency management operations. In several states, including Washington, the Adjutant General’s responsibilities also include key roles in state civilian emergency communications systems. For example, I have direct statutory oversight of Washington’s Enhanced 9-1-1 telecommunications system and serve on the State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) through which the state interfaces with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and sets standards and requirements for radio, VOIP and ROIP communications systems for all state, local, and tribal agencies.

When the TFER pilot was conceived, I was (and remain) Chair of Homeland Defense and Homeland Security of the Adjutants General Association of the United States (AGAUS) and was also Chairman of the National Governors Association Homeland Security Advisors Council (GHSAC). I therefore worked directly with the DHS and DoD officials who developed the TFER pilot. The pilot was intended to determine whether military planning assistance in state emergency management agencies would add rigor to state emergency response plans, especially for catastrophic-level incidents. Pilot states, in turn, were selected for the diversity of their state governance structures and for the non-adaptive natural hazards they and similarly situated states commonly encounter. In Washington and Hawaii, for example, the Adjutants General are members of the Governor’s Cabinet and have statutory oversight of all state emergency management functions. In West Virginia, the Adjutant General is a member of the Governor’s cabinet but emergency management functions are the responsibility of a separate state agency. In Massachusetts, military and emergency management functions are split among state agencies and the Adjutant General’s office is a sub-cabinet position. In South Carolina, the Adjutant General is a statewide elected official and does not report to the governor.

Given these distinct state governance arrangements and the uniformly positive impact TFER planners have had in each of the pilot states, it’s clear that the basic premise of the pilot has been amply demonstrated; namely, having experienced military planners augment state emergency planning functions under the supervision of civilian emergency management officials.
accelerates and strengthens state planning for catastrophic-level emergencies regardless of state governance structure. It's clear that all states—as well as all principal federal agencies—would benefit greatly by continuation and expansion of the basic TFER concept.

I say “basic TFER concept” because the strength of the pilot has been the fusion of military and civilian planning skills between state Military departments and state Emergency Management departments. Although the pilot’s funding mechanism (hiring military planners in a civilian capacity through DHS grant funds) has worked well in advancing unity of effort between civilian and military planners it is not the only possible funding scheme. I believe serious consideration should also be given to a second course of action: creating full-time military planning positions in state National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters that are specifically designed to work with state and local civilian agency planners.

The TFER pilot has amply demonstrated the value that military planners add to state emergency planning. In my experience, the skills acquired by military planners in moving thousands of personnel and thousands of tons of equipment to remote corners of the world, are scarcely if ever found in civilian emergency planning functions. In Washington, the addition of three (3) military planners to our Emergency Management Division’s core of eight (8) civilian planners accelerated completion of long-standing civilian strategic planning requirements by 3 to 4 years. It has also been my experience that most states have fewer civilian planning resources than Washington, so the impact of TFER planners in other states would likely be even more dramatic.

It should also be noted that the transfer of skills in the TFER pilot has not been one-directional. Our TFER planners also learned a great deal about civil emergency response processes and added significant civilian tactics, techniques and procedures to the skill sets they brought with them to their drill-status responsibilities as members of our Joint Forces Headquarters-Washington and as members of the organized Washington militia.

The National Guard is the first military responder in all domestic incidents. It’s key role within state government and its expeditionary role as a combat arm of the Department of Defense makes it a natural fusion agency as well as a “trusted” entity in every state and territory. The TFER program in Washington, and I dare say in each of the pilot states, has added substantial rigor to the emergency planning capacity of all principal state agencies as well as the state’s National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters. Federal emergency responders will directly benefit from our enhanced state of readiness.

On behalf of Governor Chris Gregoire, Co-Chair of the Council of Governors, I thank the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA for allowing Washington to be part of the TFER pilot. We urge federal authorities to continue funding our participation and to expand the TFER program to other states as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely,

Timothy J. Lowenberg
Major General
The Adjutant General
Annex A. Washington State

The Washington State Adjutant General (TAG) is the Commander of the Washington National Guard, oversees the Director of Washington State Emergency Management, and serves as the Governor’s Homeland Security Advisor. Washington had eight state emergency planners and then hired and incorporated three TFER-specific planners: a retired Active Duty (AD) Army Major, presently a member of the Washington State Guard, the unorganized Washington militia, which supplements the National Guard (NG) if those Soldiers and Airmen are activated; a second TFER planner is an active member of the Air National Guard (ANG), was a communicator, and now has a specialty in emergency management/disaster preparedness; the third planner was a logistics officer in the ANG for 9 years and is presently in the Washington State Guard militia. The process of combining military planners with civilian state emergency planners proved successful and helped develop subject matter experts (SME) with a cadre of skills for catastrophic planning.

Washington State based its TFER Pilot Program project areas on the 2006 Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2 Report and, at the state level, conducted its own CEMP gap analysis, which resulted in Washington’s focus on Emergency Support Function (ESF) 7: Logistics and Mobilization Support as related to National Planning Scenario 9: Natural Disaster–Major Earthquake.

A.1 Washington Scenarios

Washington focused on five areas: catastrophic planning, using a cross-pollination of military and civilian personnel, interstate and intrastate; emergency logistics; distribution; recovery; and evacuation. These five planning areas contributed to the CEMP at the state government level. TFER personnel were assigned to support emergency logistics planning development, covering the emergency distribution system from a FEMA staging area to a State Staging Area (SSA) to a local jurisdiction staging area, and onward to a point of distribution where citizens can pick up emergency supplies (e.g., water and food) to support life-sustaining activities after a catastrophic incident.

To this end, two exercises, outlined below, were conducted: (1) an “all-hazard incident response” to evaluate player actions against current response plans and capabilities that required deploying responders, and (2) a “resource moving and staging event” to test planning activities for movement coordination and staging areas. The specific exercise objectives are outlined below. Both Homeland Security exercises resulted in After-Action Report (AAR) and Improvement Plan (IP) products.

  - Objectives: Evaluate the order of steps in the State Reception and Integration Plan

---

7 These WA TFER personnel ended their tenure on 1 June 2010, due to completion of the current TFER funding and the uncertainty of future funding.
(SRIP) from Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activation through mobilization; determine efficiencies/inefficiencies; identify failures/gaps and provide corrective actions; and develop processes to correct inefficiencies/failures/gaps and incorporate into the final plan.

  - Objectives: Implement decision packages for Critical Logistics & Distribution, Communications, and Intelligence and Information-Sharing and Dissemination and activate the Movement Coordination Center (MCC)/EOC and SSA within 12 hours; within 1 hour, coordinate secure movement of resources through the disaster zone and cross-border with Canada; within 2 hours, mobilize the Movement Control Point (MCP); within 6 hours, mobilize an SSA; maintain real-time computer and voice communication among all entities and agencies, both federal and local; within 1 hour, demobilize all staff and locations.

### A.2 Washington State TFER Pilot Program Products

The Washington State TFER Pilot Program produced products specific to Washington and its exercises, and are available for sharing, as applicable, with other TFER Pilot States:

- Washington State Catastrophic Incident Annex (Draft)
- Washington State Reception and Integration Plan (SRIP) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) (Draft)
- Washington State Olympic Salvage III Exercise AAR/IP
- Washington State Exercise Rolling Porch AAR/IP: To set up and operate the MCC, mobilize the MCP, and activate the SSA
- Washington State SSA SOP
- Washington State Movement Coordination Appendix (Draft).

### A.3 Washington State Lessons Learned

As a result of both the Olympic Salvage III Functional Exercise and the Rolling Porch Exercise, gaps were identified and AARs/IPs were developed with recommendations for specific improvements.

The military planners, who are accustomed and trained to receive, move, and stage large numbers of people and volumes of equipment all over the world, brought this skill and expertise to the TFER initiative. Combined with the state and local civil planner skills and experience, the results proved enormously successful.

#### A.3.1 Successes

Washington has developed a stronger and closer working relationship with Hawaii by assisting Hawaii, along with Oregon (OR) and California (CA), through the State Emergency...
Management entity in its Category 4 Hurricane scenario exercise (See Annex B: Hawaii). The Washington Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) A-Team successfully tested the process for requesting assistance through this scenario, determining the resources needed, availability, and cost; it requested the resources and simulated sending them. In October 2009, during the early stages of the TFER Program, representatives from Hawaii traveled to Washington to gather documentation pertaining to Washington State’s 5 years of emergency logistics planning experience and lessons learned; this helped Hawaii “jump start” its TFER Program and planning of logistics focused on the Category 4 Hurricane scenario. This TFER planned exercise involving Hawaii and Washington was the genesis for a closer working relationship between the two states.

A.3.2 Challenges (A.3.2)

Washington estimated that the TFER Pilot Program reduced its catastrophic planning time by 3–4 years. However, those gains are in jeopardy and the responsibility for catastrophic planning will once again fall exclusively on the State Emergency Planners with the loss of the three TFER Pilot Program personnel (and the specific military expertise they brought to the initiative) on 1 June. The designated TFER Pilot Program personnel have moved to other and/or former positions due to the uncertainty of continued funding for the TFER Program.

A.4 Conclusion

Washington State was able to conduct two earthquake scenario–based exercises: an “all-hazards response exercise,” identifying gaps in its emergency preparedness; and a “resource moving and staging exercise,” implementing decision packages for critical logistics and distribution, communications, and intelligence, and information-sharing and dissemination. The TFER planning focused on five areas: catastrophic planning, evacuation, emergency logistics, distribution, and recovery. The TFER planners were able to develop a draft State Catastrophic Annex to the Washington CEMP. Washington also participated in the “request resources” portion of Hawaii’s planned hurricane scenario. The Washington TFER planners are no longer employed specifically for the TFER Pilot Program due to the uncertainty of program funding; however, Washington State strongly believes the TFER Program was key to its significant increase in catastrophic planning, and that it should be continued and expanded to other states to improve collaboration among the states and with federal, state, local, and tribal agencies.
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Lieutenant General (R) William J. Hilsman  
Co-Executive Officer  
Strategic Advisory Group  
Washington, D. C.

Dear General Hilsman:

Thank you for your continued support in maintaining the Task Force Emergency Readiness (TFER) Pilot Program.

The TFER Pilot Program was established to directly enhance State planning for catastrophic disasters with federal funding to hire military planners. Although Hawaii had gotten off to a slow start in hiring its TFER planners, we have since made great strides in meeting the logistics and resource management tasks outlined in the Hawaii Catastrophic Hurricane Operations Plan.

TFER planners, TFER funding, and other resources have clearly contributed to development of State, federal, county, and private industry partnerships and task forces that are required by the Hawaii Catastrophic Disaster Operations Plan. TFER resources enabled the State to initiate new partnerships and to assemble task forces to develop detailed plans and to identify issues in mass feeding, mass evacuation, debris removal, energy, critical resource relocation, and port continuity operations.

I strongly believe that the TFER Pilot Program funding has provided a significant contribution toward catastrophic disaster planning and should be retained. I am also confident that my fellow adjutant generals in other jurisdictions under the TFER Pilot program will agree with me.

If TFER Pilot Program funds are “rolled” into the Homeland Security Grant Program or other such grant initiatives, the intent to focus on catastrophic or capabilities building will not necessarily receive the attention the TFER has provided.

I strongly urge your support for the continuation of the TFER Pilot Program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ROBERT G. F. LEE  
Major General, HING  
Adjutant General
Annex B: Hawaii

The Adjutant General (TAG) is responsible for the Hawaii National Guard and State of Hawaii Civil Defense (State Emergency Management). The TAG is also the Homeland Security (HLS) advisor to the Governor. Hawaii hired two personnel with TFER Pilot Program funding. The first individual was hired from within State Civil Defense (SCD) as a TFER planner with a focus on implementing the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC). The TFER Planner’s background reflects extensive experience in State government, serving as the State Exercise Training Officer; Hawaii National Guard Youth Challenge Academy Administrative Logistics Officer; State Strategic National Stockpile Coordinator; State Energy Emergency Preparedness Coordinator; and State Disaster Recovery Coordinator. The individual also served 17 years in the Army and currently holds the rank of Master Sergeant in the US Army Reserves. The second TFER planner, hired for her logistics background, worked from August 2009 to February 2010. This second vacant TFER planner position is currently being filled. The Homeland Security Branch Chief, a retired Army lieutenant colonel with a logistics background, is instrumental in implementing the TFER Pilot Program in Hawaii.

Hawaii based its TFER Pilot Program project areas on the 2006 Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2 Report, which cited a scenario involving the impact of a major hurricane (Category 4 Saffir-Simpson Scale) on the island of Oahu. In view of the critical logistical gaps Hawaii faces, the TFER Program focused on logistics and resource management and on development of a statewide integrated logistics system.

B.1 Hawaii Function and Scenario

The TFER Pilot Program implementation in Hawaii coincided with the development and completion of the Hawaii Catastrophic All-Hazards Concept Plan (CONPLAN) and Catastrophic Hurricane Operations Plan (OPLAN). Catastrophic disaster planning efforts on the part of federal, state, and local governments and industry partners clearly showed a need for an effective statewide logistics system. The OPLAN called for phased execution of tasks as a hurricane approaches the State of Hawaii. The OPLAN also requires the development of task force working groups— involving federal, state, county, NGOs, and private sector partners—to address mass evacuation, mass feeding, energy, transportation/port continuity, debris removal, critical resource relocation, and disaster housing. The OPLAN is based on the following assumptions: (1) a need to feed approximately 1 million people per day for 90 days; (2) the island of Oahu (and neighboring island communities) would be without power for 30–45 days; (3) there would be significant damage to the transportation system (roads, air and sea ports); (4) an estimated 38 million cubic yards of debris would need to removed; (5) 78 percent of residential structures would be destroyed; (6) about 350,000 residents and visitors may need to be evacuated; and (7) approximately 650,000 people will need shelter and disaster housing.

The TFER planners were actively engaged in all six task force working groups, along with the Statewide Logistics Working Group that would need to support all six groups during a disaster. For two weeks (May 24–June 4, 2010), Hawaii successfully conducted its annual statewide
hurricane preparedness exercise, *Makani Pahili 2010*, which involved a Category 4 hurricane directly impacting the island of Oahu. The state, county, federal, and selected private industry organizations focused on specific tasks per the Hawaii Catastrophic Hurricane Operations Plan, Annex C–Operations, and Annex D–Logistics, consistent with the following nine objectives:

- Perform life-saving and sustaining measures
- Conduct mass care and sheltering
- Minimize risk to tourists
- Maintain functionality of the water distribution system
- Deliver fuel to maintain essential services
- Restore power
- Maintain continuity of port operations
- Conduct debris clearance
- Protect on-island critical resources.

The Logistics and TFER personnel brought the six task forces together to look at the detailed actions required, both before and after the hurricane landfall. They analyzed the actions taken by each task force and created a synchronized matrix to identify interdependencies. Hawaii will continue to use the synchronization matrix model with all task forces in the July-August 2010 timeframe, identifying issues and synchronizing agency actions. After a synchronization matrix is completed for Honolulu, the logistics and TFER planners will address how Oahu would support the neighboring counties. Also, during the *Makani Pahili 2010* Hurricane Exercise, Hawaii exercised the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) state-to-state mutual aid process with the following states: Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, and Arizona.

### B.2 Hawaii State TFER Pilot Program Products

The Hawaii TFER Pilot Program has created a Logistics Working Group structure, bringing the six Working Groups together to plan a pre- and post-landfall response to a Category 4 hurricane. A two-week hurricane preparedness exercise was held May 24–June 4, 2010, which provided an opportunity to bring all OPLAN task forces together for two days to identify logistical interdependencies using a synchronization matrix model.

### B.3 Hawaii State Lessons Learned

#### B.3.1 Successes

During a catastrophic event, Hawaii traditionally has depended on the National Guard, but with all the recent deployments and the ever-increasing chances for future deployments, the state has begun planning with more of the local vendors and contractors (e.g., Target, Wal-Mart) who perform some of these logistical requirements daily. Also, due to the TFER Pilot Program and the planning expertise its personnel brought, Hawaii was able to work with the TFER Pilot State of Washington, along with the non-TFER states Oregon, California,
Nevada, and Arizona, to exercise EMAC procedures for logistical support during the two-week annual hurricane preparedness exercise, *Makani Pahili 10*. Since the hurricane exercise, and with the assistance of TFER personnel, logistics planning has been raised to a higher level within the Hawaii State Civil Defense Division and State Emergency Operating Center. Logistics planning remains the highest priority for state emergency managers and planners.

In Hawaii, the FEMA Pacific Area Office, Department of Defense (Defense Coordinating Officer (DCO)/Defense Coordinating Element (DCE), and State Civil Defense work together regularly (e.g., both FEMA and the DCO/DCE are involved in the six task forces and the Statewide Logistics Working Group mentioned above.

Hawaii State Civil Defense has connected its partners (federal, state, county, and private sector, including other states) with the FEMA-sponsored Virtual Joint Planning Office (VJPO) to provide comprehensive preparedness program execution and management. The VJPO communicator tool offers one more means for communicating with partners locally and nationally. The Hawaii Initiatives VJPO is used to connect all the task forces to develop their individual plans for integration into the logistics system.

### B.3.2 Challenges

Although the TFER funds are federal, Hawaii experienced a lengthy hiring process to fill two TFER planner positions. This condition was caused by the economic downturn in the State of Hawaii and by budget shortfalls. This resulted in an approximately 7-month delay to the start-up of the Hawaii TFER Program. In addition, the TFER Pilot Program was impacted by the unanticipated departure of one of the hired TFER logistics planners in February 2010.

### B.4 Conclusion

As a result of the TFER Pilot Program, Hawaii was able to focus on integrated logistics planning based on the planning assumptions in the Hawaii Catastrophic Operations Plan. The TFER Pilot Program funds and TFER planners contributed to development and maintenance of the six task forces whose purpose is to address the logistical needs to support: mass evacuation; mass feeding; debris removal; transportation/port continuity; energy; and critical resource relocation and disaster housing. The TFER Pilot Program has yielded results in detailed planning and called attention to the need for an integrated logistics system to support the Hawaii Catastrophic Operations Plan Annexes C and D, Operations and Logistics. Follow-on funding under the TFER Pilot Program is strongly recommended for supporting state, federal, and local government catastrophic disaster planning initiatives.
Dear General Hilsman:

I have reviewed the South Carolina Annex to the SAG TFER Report and concur with it as written. The annex effectively highlights my concerns with the TFER program, the overall advantages and my recommendations to improve an already beneficial program.

My primary concern is that TFER will be discontinued prior to South Carolina and other pilot states reaping the full benefit. For us, the meaning is simple, completing the catastrophic planning effort and fully coordinating the plans vertically and horizontally is crucially important. Finalizing the planning will ensure we are best prepared to defend this state from all threats. Furthermore, the planning process has identified gaps in our capability to respond to the threats embodied in all the scenarios. We need more time to address these gaps with our local, state and federal partners. Discontinuing funding for TFER would greatly hinder our ability to accomplish this task and fulfill our overall TFER mission.

The planning process and TFER planners with the South Carolina Emergency Management Division have also highlighted the program’s greatest advantage: the ability to establish plans and responses to threats some of which previously we had little ability to address. Funding three TFER positions for South Carolina has been vital to our ability to maintain planning momentum in this critical mission area.

As discussed in the VTC, our recommendations stand:

a. Find a funding source to continue the program while expanding the program to all 54 states and territories. TFER has allowed us to establish a solid planning baseline. The other states would find the program equally as beneficial.

b. Increase coordination between the pilot states through the sharing of planning products and processes. Sharing best practices and collaborating on projects always produces a better effort through the synergy resulting from such coordination.
c. Maintain federal, state, and local participation in all stages of the planning effort. It is the vertical and horizontal coordination and shared planning processes that produce the most effective plans and capabilities to best address these many threats to our states.

Thank you for the opportunity to address TFER. Should you have further questions or concerns please feel free to contact me, Ricky Platt, my Director of the South Carolina Emergency Management Division, or Jon Boettcher, Chief of the Plans Section, South Carolina Emergency Management Division. You may reach Ricky at phone: 803-737-8563, or e-mail: rplatt@emd.sc.gov Please contact Jon at phone: 803-737-8563, or e-mail: jhboettc@emd.sc.gov.

Sincerely,

Stanhope S. Spears
Major General, SCARNG
The Adjutant General
Annex C: South Carolina

The South Carolina Emergency Management Division (SCEMD) falls under the South Carolina Adjutant General. This structure provided flexibility in administering the grant funds and in hiring the South Carolina TFER planners. South Carolina has been involved with the TFER Program since its inception with DoD, and through the transition to its current status as a FEMA HSPTAP grant pilot.

The combination of military backgrounds and experience with various state and federal agencies enabled the South Carolina TFER planners to incorporate both horizontal and vertical integration into their plans. The first South Carolina TFER planner is a retired Navy Reserve Captain with experience in expeditionary logistics and war planning at major fleet commands. In his civilian job at a state agency, he served 10 years as Emergency Management Coordinator, participating in state EOC activations in the ESF 3 area. His wide variety of war planning, logistics planning, and plans oversight experience, combined with his civilian expertise in the public works and engineering arenas, enabled him to provide valuable contributions to the TFER planning team. The second TFER planner is a retired Naval Intelligence Officer, with specific expertise in public safety, emergency management/emergency medical service (EMS), and law enforcement training. This TFER planner has 36 years of combined Public Safety experience (e.g., fire, EMS, law enforcement/security) at the local, state, and federal levels. The third TFER planner has an Air Force background, is trained in intelligence, anti-terrorism, and force protection, and has extensive South Carolina law enforcement expertise. Before assuming her duties as a TFER planner, she served as a homeland security coordinator at the State Law Enforcement Division. She has a graduate certificate in Terrorism Studies and a Master’s degree in Public Administration.

The South Carolina TFER Pilot Program used several baseline documents and information-gathering techniques to help develop the objectives for the TFER Pilot Program. These documents were the TFER Pilot Information Package (1 December 2008), video teleconference and conference calls with FEMA and the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED), the State EOP, as well as Appendix Nine to the State EOP (Catastrophic Incident Response Plan). In addition to these baseline documents, they analyzed where the TFER personnel would provide the most benefit to the state—response planning for catastrophic events that would overwhelm local emergency response capabilities. The South Carolina TFER planners focused on updating the State Terrorism Response Plan, developing response plans based on the 15 National Planning Scenarios, and increasing horizontal and vertical integration in emergency response planning (federal, state, and local participation).

C.1 South Carolina Scenarios

The South Carolina TFER planners were able to simplify the 15 national planning scenarios by grouping similar scenarios. This resulted in nine major scenarios on which the TFER planners could focus. These scenarios were the 10Kt Improvised Nuclear Device, Multiple Improvised Explosive Device Events, Radiological Dispersal Device Response, Terrorist Attack, Cyber Attack,
Biological Event (including Anthrax Attack and Plague Attack), Pandemic Influenza, Chemical Event (including Toxic Industrial Chemicals Release, Chlorine Explosion, Blister Agent Attack, and Nerve Agent Attack), and Agricultural Event (including Food Contamination and Foreign Animal Disease). The South Carolina TFER planners decided to fully develop plans to address four of the nine identified scenarios, and they plan to continue developing the remaining five scenarios if TFER Pilot Program funding is continued.

C.2 South Carolina State TFER Pilot Program Products

South Carolina developed the following Response Plans, which are in draft form until the update to Appendix Nine of the State EOP is completed in September 2010.

Products of TFER Pilot Program “Phase One” (Update of the State EOP in September 2010):

- Draft 10Kt Improvised Nuclear Device—Completed (Ready for Publication)
- Multiple Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Events—Completed (Ready for Publication)
- Radiological Dispersal Device Response Plan—Completed (Ready for Publication)
- Updated Terrorist Response Plan—In Progress (Ready September 2010)
- Cyber Attack Response Plan—In Progress (to be completed in TFER Pilot Program “Phase Two”).

Several additional response plans, based on the following scenarios, are planned to be finished in “Phase Two” of the TFER Pilot Program:

- Biological Event
- Pandemic Influenza
- Chemical Event
- Agricultural Event.

The South Carolina TFER planners also participated in a state-wide exercise, 14–19 June 2010. This exercise began with a response to a hurricane off the coast of South Carolina, which was followed immediately by a terrorist attack in the northern part of the state.

C.3 South Carolina State Lessons Learned

C.3.1 Successes

The South Carolina TFER planners identified several key successes that the TFER Pilot Program brought to South Carolina’s planning capabilities. The first was the ability to fill in the existing gaps in Appendix Nine of the State EOP, addressing catastrophic incident response. The South Carolina TFER planners were able to create three complete draft response plans, update one existing plan, and begin developing a Cyber Attack Response Plan as part of the pilot. In addition, capability gaps were identified for each of the response plans during the TFER Pilot Program. The Cyber Response Plan was a particular success cited by the South Carolina TFER personnel, referencing the emphasis on
consequence management and the ability to leverage this plan for other scenarios. Instead of focusing on cyber defense, the South Carolina TFER planners decided to focus on the infrastructure recovery aspect of a cyber attack. Finally, the 14–19 June state-wide exercise was viewed as a huge success from a planning standpoint because it incorporated multiple scenarios (e.g., hurricane, terrorist attack) and required coordination at various levels (e.g., federal, state, local).

C.3.2 Challenges

From South Carolina’s perspective, the TFER Pilot Program began with good oversight from FEMA and coordination among the TFER Pilot States. However, because each state focused on different scenarios and used varying approaches relative to their unique situations, the connection between the TFER Pilot States was soon lost. The sharing of lessons learned and techniques/procedures would have been a great help in developing catastrophic plans through the TFER Pilot Program. South Carolina also cited good initial training opportunities through the TFER Pilot Program; however these opportunities did not extend throughout the life of the program, and thus were not available to all South Carolina TFER staff. The second and third hired South Carolina TFER planners went through an informal in-house training procedure. The South Carolina TFER personnel also cited several uncertainties about the TFER Pilot Program’s future, namely the uncertainty of continued funding, duration, and lack of DHS guidance and/or feedback.

C.4 Conclusion

Neither SCEMD nor SLED has the funding or manpower to continue the planning capabilities that have been provided by the TFER planners. The TFER Pilot Program enabled South Carolina emergency planners to incorporate experienced military logistics planners into their overall program to help develop plans that would not otherwise be available during catastrophic events. The TFER personnel also provided several key recommendations for the future of the TFER Program. One recommendation is to find a funding source to continue the program while expanding the program to all 54 states and territories. The method of funding might be a hybrid-type program that allows DoD funding to be used for civilian personnel (e.g., using the National Guard Technician Program to hire a civilian planner under a Title 32 funding stream). The South Carolina TFER personnel also recommended that, if the program were to continue, coordination be increased between the TFER Pilot States through the sharing of planning products and processes. Finally, the South Carolina TFER personnel recommended maintaining the flexibility of the current program when expanding it, to ensure federal, state, and local participation.
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July 7, 2010

The Adjutant General
Massachusetts National Guard

LTG (R) William J. Hilsman
Strategic Advisory Group Co-Executive Officer

General Hilsman,

Despite the short duration of the program, the Massachusetts Task Force for Emergency Readiness (MA TFER) pilot program was successful in its efforts to establish itself as a respected third party in the emergency planning arena and function in a dynamic liaison capacity. This allowed the MA TFER to facilitate forward progress among emergency planners at multiple state agencies who are continuously challenged to conduct planning and, at the same time, effectively balance a daunting work-load of day-to-day operations. Continued funding will permit the TFER to maintain a focus on key issues of significant importance to the Commonwealth’s homeland security priorities and integrate our Federal partners into more of the State planning activities.

A unique aspect of this program was that it encouraged a decentralized execution of the program which permitted Massachusetts to develop a workable approach to its planning activities recognizing the Commonwealth’s political realities and varying levels of local readiness as opposed to those of the other states. This translated into the achievement of tangible success with great value to the citizens of Massachusetts as well as strengthened partnerships and working relationships between emergency planners at all levels of government as well as private sector agencies.

The MA TFER program provided a solid foundation for continued collaborative regional planning activities which, if they continue to be resourced, will lead to the ultimate goal of the program - the establishment of a system of synchronized state and federal plans that integrate Local, State, Federal and private sector operational capabilities for an effective National response.

I appreciate the opportunity you provided for my review of the Strategic Advisory Group’s draft MA TFER Annex. A recommended revision of that annex is attached for inclusion in the final report.
I strongly recommend sustainment of the TFER pilot program with expansion to other interested states and the continued sharing of lessons learned and best practices.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph C. Carter
Major General, MA NG
The Adjutant General

Enclosure as
Annex D: Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Adjutant General is the Commander of the Massachusetts National Guard and the Massachusetts TFER personnel were embedded at the Joint Force Headquarters—Massachusetts (JFHQ-MA). The TFER Pilot Program was administered by the Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security.

Massachusetts hired three full-time TFER personnel. The lead Massachusetts TFER emergency planner has an active-duty military police background, is a Major in the Massachusetts National Guard, and presently is completing a Master’s degree in Government at Harvard. A second planner has been with the Massachusetts National Guard for more than 30 years, has worked at the National Guard Bureau (NGB) Headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, and has served as the Command Chief Warrant Officer for the Army National Guard nationwide. He has a B.A. and M.A. from Boston College, and an MBA from Anna Maria College. The third planner is experienced in logistics and retired as a Chief Warrant Officer Four after 37 years, with 15 of those years in the Armor Branch as a maintenance technician and maintenance First Sergeant. In hiring the TFER personnel, Massachusetts emphasized the need to have personnel who can bring military planning expertise to the process, developing plans that are updated as exercises are conducted.

D.1 Massachusetts Scenarios

Although the Massachusetts TFER Pilot Program initially focused on contributing to the Boston Urban Area Security Initiative’s Improvised Explosive Device planning efforts (National Planning Scenario 12), offset timelines between the TFER Program and the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program, combined with the TFER Program’s brief performance period, resulted in an adjustment in focus of the Massachusetts TFER team. The team changed its focus to concentrate on facilitating collaborative emergency planning between federal, state, local, and (in some cases) private partners. Focus areas were determined based on their ability to positively impact the Commonwealth homeland security priorities, giving significant consideration to the grant program’s short evaluation period.

D.2 Massachusetts State TFER Pilot Program Products

The Massachusetts TFER team developed or enhanced the following products during the TFER Pilot Program:

- Cape Cod Emergency Traffic Plan—The Cape Cod Emergency Traffic Plan (CCETP) is a traffic management plan borne out of Massachusetts’ experience with Hurricane Edouard’s Labor Day assault in 1996, during which both evacuation routes over the Cape Cod Canal had backups of more than 25 miles. The plan is under continuous revision and its major supporting effort, transient shelter operations at the Massachusetts Military Reservation, is now considerably stronger following direct TFER involvement. The TFER, with continued funding, will work to grow the CCETP into a formal evacuation plan, with consideration to
the seasonal visitors’ disposition following their exit from Cape Cod.

- State-wide Medical Support Planning—The Massachusetts TFER identified state-wide medical support planning as an area that needed serious attention. The team facilitated collaborative planning among the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, and FEMA to create a state-wide medical support plan. This planning effort focused on leveraging federal resources (e.g., Federal Medical Stations) while at the same time increasing the Commonwealth’s capability for self-reliance. Continued work in this area will focus on additional collaboration with the Medical Reserve Corps units and the development of a medical response force within the newly revitalized Massachusetts State Defense Force.

- Massachusetts NG Critical Infrastructure Identification within the Automated Critical Asset Management System (ACAMS)—Working with the Commonwealth Fusion Center, TFER team personnel added select Massachusetts NG facilities (24 facilities) into the ACAMS database to ensure that local and state first responders had access to sufficient information about the Massachusetts NG infrastructure in the Commonwealth for their emergency response planning.

- Comprehensive Interagency JRSOI Plan—The Massachusetts TFER planners laid the groundwork for a regional, interagency Joint Reception, Staging, Onward Movement, and Integration (JRSOI) Plan by carefully examining the Commonwealth’s capacity to support such operations with state-owned military real estate, air fields, and so on. This valuable data, collected over several months, was provided to the National Guard so that the JFHQ-MA, armed with a realistic understanding of its own capabilities, could then approach its regional and Massachusetts partners and facilitate forward progress toward a regional JRSOI Plan. This effort, coordinated through FEMA Region 1, is ongoing, and if TFER planning efforts are continued, the goal is to link this work to the plans being developed under the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant.

- State Defense Force Revitalization—The TFER planners were also integral in revitalizing the Commonwealth’s state-level militia force, known as the Massachusetts State Defense Force (MSDF). This new, contemporary organization is focused exclusively on homeland security and is designed to provide a relevant, ready, respected, and reliable cadre of skilled professionals capable of assisting Massachusetts in an emergency. A key MSDF mission, as mentioned above, is providing a trained medical response force to, among other things, operate a Federal Medical Station without the need for out-of-state assistance. A resiliency focused capability as such did not currently exist within the Commonwealth and was completely developed by the TFER.

- Force Package Planning—The Massachusetts TFER is developing force packages (i.e., tailored Massachusetts NG domestic response capabilities) for use as planning tools during interagency planning as well as to serve as templates for use by other state agencies. A primary goal in developing these packages is that they will help clarify capabilities and capability gaps in state emergency plans. The Massachusetts State Emergency Management Agency has expressed interest in pursuing this concept; the force packages
developed by the Massachusetts TFER will serve to prove the validity of the concept and form the templates that may be used by state agencies as they develop their own capability packages.

D.3 Massachusetts State Lessons Learned

D.3.1 Successes

The Massachusetts TFER Pilot Program was able to establish itself as a respected third party in the emergency planning arena and to function in a dynamic liaison capacity. This enabled the TFER to facilitate forward progress among emergency planners at multiple state agencies who are challenged continually to conduct planning and, at the same time, to effectively balance a daunting workload of day-to-day operations. Continued funding will permit the TFER to maintain a focus on key issues of importance to the Commonwealth’s homeland security priorities.

The Massachusetts TFER team relied primarily on direct coordination with the other four TFER Pilot Programs, but did make limited use of the Virtual Joint Planning Office (VJPO) tool to share best practices. Lessons learned from using the VJPO indicate that it has significant potential for greater use on expansion of TFER, especially at the region level. The DHS Lessons Learned Information System (LLIS) tool, commonly used by first responders and the interagency community to share emergency response practices and procedures, was not regularly used by the Massachusetts TFER, but offers a potential resource site for further exploration by the team. This information-sharing tool has proven valuable across multiple levels of government and different agencies, and is frequently used by military and civilian agency planners.

Decentralized TFER execution permitted Massachusetts to develop a workable approach for the program given the Commonwealth’s unique political realities and levels of readiness as compared with those of other states. This translated into the achievement of tangible success that has great value to the citizens of Massachusetts.

D.3.2 Challenges

Although a specified period of performance is a necessary aspect of any grant program, the brief 18-month TFER Pilot Program period of performance was a distraction to the planning team given the large number of TFER assessments performed. Examples include the biannual and annual progress reports required of the grant program, the 6-month FEMA evaluation, the final FEMA evaluation, an in-depth review by the Strategic Advisory Group, and a Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit. Transitioning future TFER funding out of the grant arena and into a more programmatic realm would significantly curtail such overlapping reviews and permit the Massachusetts TFER, as well as those of other states if and when the program is expanded, to focus attention on emergency planning for catastrophic events.
D.4 Conclusion

The direction and approach that the Massachusetts TFER Pilot Program planning team took, after switching its focus from a scenario-based IED incident to an assessment of specific focus areas within the Commonwealth’s emergency planning community, proved valuable in bringing state, local, and county agencies together with NGOs under the “umbrella” of state emergency planning. The Massachusetts TFER Pilot Program team suggested that sustainment of the TFER Pilot Program with expansion to additional states and continued sharing of lessons learned, based on the nuances and unique situation of each state, would be of significant benefit to each overall state’s catastrophic planning. The Massachusetts Adjutant General fully concurs with the team’s recommendation that TFER continue as a fully funded program.
MEMORANDUM FOR LTG (R) WILLIAM J. HILSMAN, STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP CO-EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SUBJECT: West Virginia Recommendation for Continued Task Force for Emergency Response (TFER) Program and Funding

1. The purpose of this letter is to document my full support for continued and expanded funding and related support for the TFER program. I predicate this recommendation based on the following considerations:

   a. The documented and absolute continuing requirement for concentric emergency planning among all stakeholders within any given state.

   b. TFER methodology appears to be the process of choice that ensures adequate emergency planning across the entire spectrum of emergency managers and planners.

   c. TFER minimizes political or turf battles by utilizing entities such as the National Guard in a manner that serves the community by providing emergency planning on a platform that is agency agnostic.

   d. The TFER process, as defined today, meets the FEMA requirements by incorporation of National Planning Scenarios, Target Capabilities, and/or individual states unique catastrophic planning requirements.

   e. TFER planning represent a streamlined approach utilizing minimal staff coordinate all planners among multiple agencies involved with catastrophic planning; thereby, proving to be an extremely cost effective methodology.

2. The WV TFER process is emerging into a viable service to the Nation, the State, and to the Local Entities by providing astute planning that will serve, in the event of catastrophe, to save life, limb, and property. For instance, in WV, we are emerging into TFER 2nd generation that is fully involving all stakeholders in the planning, validation, and testing of the entire process. The WV Director of Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management will be serving with my staff and other primary stakeholders as a "planning and working" team to ensure that all requirements are considered, documented, and addressed. Without this level of teamwork and cooperation, there cannot be sufficient coordinated planning efforts to adequately protect our citizens. Only through TFER can a coordinated effort cause the expected result of "real" planning.
3. In conclusion, and without reservation, I emphatically recommend, not only full, but expanded continuation and funding of the TFER program. In my opinion, TFER is the only existing viable tool that will lead to a complete and workable statewide solution (which may be parlayed into national planning). The end-state of TFER meets FEMA guidance, utilizes NIMS compliance, and serves to protect our citizens. This is accomplished by minimal staffing that incorporates planners across the Emergency Management and stakeholder audience making it an excellent, cost effect mechanism readily meeting proposed end state goals.

4. Thank you for your efforts and continued support of TFER.

Allen E. Tackett  
MAJOR GENERAL, WVARNG  
The Adjutant General
Annex E: West Virginia

The West Virginia Adjutant General is the Commander of the state’s National Guard and has operational control of the TFER Pilot Program, which is administered by the State Administrative Agency of the West Virginia Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety (DMAPS). Two full-time TFER personnel were hired. One is a retired Huntington, West Virginia, Fire Chief, who also was the Huntington Emergency Services Director; the other was a West Virginia National Guardsman who served in the active-duty Army, focusing on logistics. The West Virginia TFER identified the need to add a third planner with a background in law enforcement, security, and/or health, if funding were to become available. The West Virginia TFER team also anticipates a future need for geographic information system (GIS) skills to complement the existing expertise and to address the varying emergency response needs.

In an effort to increase momentum and enhance planning, the Adjutant General directed increased involvement among all stakeholders during the planning and validation of TFER processes and products. For example, the West Virginia Director of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DHSEM) will be a primary team member, along with multiple agencies with their planning, GIS, and leadership resources. This action will facilitate additional “reach-out” capabilities, ensuring a plan that meets the full spectrum of needs of the TFER-affected community. This concept, as directed by West Virginia TAG, Major General Tackett, ensures that the “smart” people from the represented communities, coupled with the TFER effort, have a concentric process that takes advantage of the expertise of the affected emergency planners and leaders, subsequently providing better catastrophic planning for West Virginia citizens. West Virginia based its TFER Pilot Program project areas on the West Virginia Emergency Operations Plan; the Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 (CPG 101); the National Planning Scenarios; Target Capabilities List 2.0; and the 2006 Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2 Report. It selected Scenario 10: Natural Disaster—Major Hurricane, Category 4, after conducting a hazard threat assessment. Originally, West Virginia was going to select Scenario 6—Chemical Attack—Toxic Industrial Chemicals, but decided the TFER mission would focus on the three major scenarios that would most impact the state.

E.1 West Virginia Scenarios

The West Virginia TFER scenarios included a chemical incident in the Kanawha Valley; the failure of the Bluestone Dam; and a National Capital Region (NCR) evacuation, all due to a

---

8 The Target Capabilities List (TCL) 2.0, published by FEMA, provides guidance on the specific capabilities and levels of capability that federal, state, local, tribal, and non-governmental entities should develop and maintain in order to ensure readiness for all-hazards. The TCL provides references and baseline information for 37 capabilities across the prevention, protection, response, and hazard mitigation mission areas. While the 37 capabilities found in the TCL are not the only capabilities that should be built and maintained, there are those that have the highest payoff in terms of national readiness. The TCL is derived from the tasks identified to be performed to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from the 15 National Planning Scenarios that are representative of the range, scope, magnitude, and complexity of major incidents, including terrorism, natural disasters, and other hazards. The capabilities support various National Response Plan Emergency Support Functions (ESF)/Annexes.
Category 4 hurricane. The target capabilities embedded within these three scenarios included citizen evacuation and shelter in place; mass care (sheltering, feeding, and related services); resource management/critical logistics; hazardous materials (HAZMAT); and onsite management.

The Bluestone Dam (1949), now undergoing a phased reconstruction, was determined to have a weak foundation with the potential for initiation of failure based on current hydrologic and structural criteria. Such a failure would be a major catastrophic event.9

If there were an NCR evacuation due to a natural or man-made disaster/act of terrorism, West Virginia would be a primary traffic pass-through, which would have a monumental impact on West Virginia’s infrastructure, roads, and services. In addition, the West Virginia Director of Homeland Security has proposed this scenario for the last several years.

West Virginia now is coordinating with FEMA to test the new National Mass Evacuation Tracking System (NMETS) this summer in the Eastern Panhandle.

E.2 West Virginia State TFER Pilot Program Products

As a result of the TFER Pilot Program, West Virginia developed the following products, which will be available for sharing when published:

- Draft (Shell) Catastrophic Incident Annex for the West Virginia EOP
- Capacity Development Plan, pending senior leader and stakeholder review, specifically targeting West Virginia counties
- Catastrophic planning assessment, pending senior leader and stakeholder review, analyzing the impact of the Bluestone Dam failure on hospitals, schools, homes, bridges, and other infrastructure
- Protocols for mass decontamination, in conjunction with an NCR evacuation due to a chemical failure or terrorist incident.

E.3 West Virginia State Lessons Learned

E.3.1 Successes

West Virginia developed a draft of its State Catastrophic Incident Annex, fulfilling one of the main objectives of the TFER Pilot Program. The TFER Pilot Program in West Virginia has enabled enhanced relationships, improved collaboration, and expanded information sharing among federal, state, and local emergency management stakeholders.

---

9 West Virginia has extensive expertise in recovery from floods because there have been 87 FEMA-declared floods in 15 years in the state.
E.3.2 Challenges

Because the TFER Pilot Program is a grant program with a duration of only 18 months, there was significant difficulty in hiring people with the requisite military/civilian catastrophic planning skills and experience, thus delaying the start-up of West Virginia’s TFER.

The farther the West Virginia TFER personnel got into the catastrophic planning process, the more they realized that the scope of the work was increasing. With implementation of the TFER Pilot Program, they were faced with a resistance to planning from other agencies, and learned that those agencies sometimes overestimated their planning capacity and/or misconceived their capability to respond to a major catastrophic incident. During their assessments, the West Virginia TFER determined that there were insufficient human resources available to accomplish the tasks that are necessary during an incident response and that, in some cases, key individuals were identified as having multiple roles and/or responsibilities, which would be impossible to fulfill during an actual catastrophic incident. In addition, they found there was a general scarcity of supplies, resource inventories, and equipment. Two areas were identified for improvement: logistics distribution and storage systems.

E.4 Conclusion

West Virginia has made excellent progress in carrying out its state TFER mission, realizing the value of integrating military and civilian personnel into the State Catastrophic Planning process, reducing the planning time, collaborating and sharing with other TFER Pilot States, and identifying existing gaps in planning. West Virginia has developed a draft (shell) of its State Catastrophic Plan as an annex to the State EOP. After stakeholder review and validation, this document will prove to be a valuable planning document for potential catastrophic events. However, West Virginia also realizes that adequate time and resources are needed to continue this endeavor. West Virginia has begun to build relationships, one of the TFER Pilot Program objectives, but it takes time to build trust and to increase cooperation among federal, state, and local entities. Part of this initiative requires educating state and local participants on the Target Capabilities and HLS doctrine. NGOs and the private sector also must be included in the effort to develop Capacity Development Plans. West Virginia participants recommended the TFER Program be extended so that planning could be continued throughout all phases of catastrophic incident operations and be enhanced by including planners with a wide variety of experience—the broader the knowledge base, the better the plans.
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Annex F    List of National Planning Scenarios

The National Planning Scenarios developed by the Homeland Security Council (HSC) and DHS in 2005 are being updated using a phased approach in FY 2009–2011. The scenarios are planning tools representative of a range of potential natural disasters and terrorist attacks, and include related impacts. The scenarios are as follows:

Scenario 1: Nuclear Detonation–10-Kiloton Improvised Nuclear Device

Scenario 2: Biological Attack–Aerosol Anthrax

Scenario 3: Biological Disease Outbreak–Pandemic Influenza

Scenario 4: Biological Attack–Plague

Scenario 5: Chemical Attack–Blister Agent

Scenario 6: Chemical Attack–Toxic Industrial Chemicals

Scenario 7: Chemical Attack–Nerve Agent

Scenario 8: Chemical Attack–Chlorine Tank Explosion

Scenario 9: Natural Disaster–Major Earthquake

Scenario 10: Natural Disaster–Major Hurricane

Scenario 11: Radiological Attack–Radiological Dispersal Devices

Scenario 12: Explosives Attack–Bombing Using Improvised Explosive Device

Scenario 13: Biological Attack–Food Contamination

Scenario 14: Biological Attack–Foreign Animal Disease (Foot and Mouth Disease)

Scenario 15: Cyber Attack
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Annex G   Reference Documents and TFER Pilot State POCs

In addition to the source documents from which the TFER Pilot Program was based (see Section 1.), the TFER Pilot States referenced the following documents for program implementation:

- DHS/FEMA TFER Pilot Information Package (2008)
- Target Capabilities List 2.0 (2007)
- National Planning Scenarios (2009)

To obtain state-specific assessments of emergency response capabilities and/or draft or final TFER products, please contact the following state personnel points of contact:

- Washington    John Ufford, j.ufford@emd.wa.gov, (253) 512-7052
- Hawaii        Dolores Cook, dcook@scd.hawaii.gov, (808) 733-4300 x819
- South Carolina Jon Boettcher, jhboettc@emd.sc.gov, (803) 737-8500
- Massachusetts Bryan Pillai, bryan.pillai@state.ma.us, (508) 233-6807
- West Virginia Michael Todorovich, michael.todorovich@us.army.mil, (304) 561-6675
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# Annex H  Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAR/IP</td>
<td>After Action Report/Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAMS</td>
<td>Automated Critical Asset Management System (DHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Active Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG</td>
<td>Air National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD(HD&amp;ASA)</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and America’s Security Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCETP</td>
<td>Cape Cod Emergency Traffic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Course of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONPLAN</td>
<td>Concept Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning Guide (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCO</td>
<td>Defense Coordinating Officer (DoD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMAPS</td>
<td>Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety (West Virginia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
<td>Defense Science Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Emergency Management Assistance Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>Emergency Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPLO</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officer (DoD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>Emergency Support Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Federal Preparedness Coordinator (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZMAT</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>Homeland Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSPD</td>
<td>Homeland Security Presidential Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSPTAP</td>
<td>Homeland Security Preparedness Technical Assistance Program (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HURREX</td>
<td>Hurricane Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED</td>
<td>Improvised Explosive Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Improvised Nuclear Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>Integrated Planning System (DHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFHQ-S</td>
<td>Joint Force Headquarters State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRSOI</td>
<td>Joint Reception, Staging, Onward Movement, and Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLIS</td>
<td>Lessons Learned Information Sharing System (DHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTG</td>
<td>Lieutenant General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSDF</td>
<td>Massachusetts State Defense Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Movement Coordination Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>Movement Control Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>National Capital Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Guard Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMETS</td>
<td>National Mass Evacuation Tracking System (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPD</td>
<td>National Preparedness Directorate (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPD</td>
<td>National Protection &amp; Programs Directorate (DHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPLAN</td>
<td>Operational/Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>Program of Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCPGP</td>
<td>Regional Catastrophic Plan Grant Program (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCPT</td>
<td>Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>Strategic Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>State Civil Defense (Hawaii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCEMD</td>
<td>South Carolina Emergency Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLED</td>
<td>South Carolina Law Enforcement Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIP</td>
<td>State Reception and Integration Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>State Staging Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>The Adjutant General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFER</td>
<td>Task Force for Emergency Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD(NPPD)</td>
<td>Under Secretary of Defense (National Protection &amp; Programs Directorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNORTHCOM</td>
<td>United States Northern Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPACOM</td>
<td>United States Pacific Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VJPO</td>
<td>Virtual Joint Planning Office (DHS/FEMA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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