

Asset Protection: A Mission for the National Guard



Gustav W. Franke
LTC, USARNG
HQ FORSCOM
FCJ5-WPN
Fort McPherson, GA
404-669-6300

Abstract

Presidential Executive Order 12656 assigns certain responsibilities to the various Federal department and agencies. The program developed by the Department of Defense (DoD) to meet the requirements of the Executive Order is the DoD Key Asset Protection Program. One of the primary players in this program is the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard in each state. The National Guard has a major role in support of state emergencies beyond this important federal mission. A key example of the different types of missions conducted by State National Guard was seen during the recent Los Angeles riots. The supporting role that the National Guard has in each state is vital to the security of that state and the national level. The proposed cutbacks for the National Guard poses a question that remains to be answered, "What is the impact that this reduction will have on the emergency response capabilities of that state?"



Asset Protection: A Mission for the National Guard

By Gustav W. Franke

Presidential Executive Order (EO) 12656, signed by President Reagan on November 18, 1988, assigns emergency preparedness responsibilities. Under Section 204 of this EO the head of each Federal department and agency is responsible for the identification of facilities and resources essential to national defense and the national welfare, to assess the vulnerabilities of each facility and develop strategies, plans, and programs to provide for the security of the identified facilities and resources.

While some agencies have identified assets, the Department of Defense (DoD) is the only department that has established a program that meets the responsibilities established in EO 12656. The program that establishes this for DoD is the Key Asset Protection Program (KAPP). Under DoD Directive 5160.54 the Executive Agent for KAPP is the Commander in Chief, Forces Command (CINCFOR). Military services and other agencies nominate facilities that they feel are important to DoD for mobilization, deployment, and sustainment of the nation's military force during a national emergency. One of the primary goals of KAPP is to help participating facilities improve their security and emergency preparedness. The organization that is primarily responsible for the identification of vulnerabilities for assets that are identified as COMPLEX assets¹ is the Defense Investigative Service. The responsibility for the identification of vulnerabilities for SIMPLE assets² and the development of physical security plans for all assets is the State National Guard Area Command (STARC). The STARC has the responsibility of visiting each KAPP asset within the state and obtaining information which will enable the military planners to develop physical security plans for that specific facility.

The Defense Investigative Service (DIS) conducts a detail analysis of each COMPLEX facility to identify possible security vulnerabilities. An assessment is then made of each facility and an evaluation in the following areas is conducted: emergency

¹A COMPLEX facility is one that has large acreage, multiple buildings, complex production paths, entry into the key asset and contact with asset management is required to complete the vulnerability survey.

²A SIMPLE facility has small acreage, few buildings of small size, simple production path, and does not require contact with management or entry into the facility to complete the vulnerability survey.

planning, lighting, fencing, intrusion detection, back-up power, security force and fire detection or suppression. Additional representatives from the Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard and the National Guard participate in the vulnerability surveys. An exit briefing is provided by the DIS field representative to the management and/or facility security personnel to provide them with a basic understanding of the findings. This is followed with a detailed report mailed to management outlining the findings and recommending areas or methods that could improve the identified security shortfalls.

The State National Guards vulnerability survey of SIMPLE assets is an abbreviated version of the DIS survey and is conducted without bother to facility management, in most cases. The National Guard develops a detail physical security plan, using the information obtained in the vulnerability survey, for each asset COMPLEX and SIMPLE. The physical security plan, PSP as it is called, is an extensive plan to provide protection to the facility should it be necessary, during a variety of threat scenarios. The PSP will identify the size of the military force, the special training required, and the special equipment required to provide protection to the identified asset. It must be understood that the use of military force is the last stop in the protection responsibility train. The first responsibility falls to that of the owner and then to the various law enforcement agencies up through the Department of Justice.

The role that the National Guard (NG) has within each state is vital to the DoD effort in planning for the protection of these key asset in case of a national emergency. In almost all cases the National Guard is the first force that is going to be available to respond to the request for assistance from local law enforcement officials or other authorities. The mission of protecting these asset is part of the historical mission that the National Guard has always had in protection of the homeland, and securing the welfare of the nation, state and local population.

Almost every state has identified facilities within its boundaries, which are different from those identified on the DoD Key Asset List (KAL). These state identified assets are essential to the operation of the state and the welfare of its population. These facilities may be identified on a state asset or critical facility list and share a priority within that state not unlike the DoD Key Asset List. Within the state this list may be of a higher priority because of the importance and value that the facilities have to the state, they are not just a facility that produces an item for the DoD or support mobilization, they are facilities that provide for the welfare of the population of the state.

In addition to these known assets which exist within each state, but perhaps are not on a list, there are numerous assets that are essential to the welfare of the population at the local and county level that have yet to be identified. This fact came to the forefront during the recent riots in Los Angeles. County officials, based on a Utility Situation Report, requested that the California National Guard afforded protection to certain identified infrastructure facilities. The importance of these vital assets was unknown until local and county personnel requested their protection. The request for protection of local critical facilities during the Los Angeles riot was even carried to the national level. This one event points to the importance of developing a national asset identification program.

The development of an asset list that identifies facilities which are critical to national welfare (the population) is the development of a list that identifies the assets at the local and county level. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in efforts to establish a National Asset Identification and Protection Planning System (NAIPPS) is moving not only to identify assets essential to all Federal departments and agencies, but also those local (city and county) essential facilities. This effort will be coordinated through the various state Offices of Emergency Services (OES). The protection of these facilities during an emergency is a mission that will fall to the National Guard.

During the LA riots a key factor in asset protection was made clear when the Joint Task Force (JTF) Commander determined that it was not his mission to provide federal forces (even those NG forces that were federalized) to provide the protection of essential facilities identified by the state or local authorities. (The JTF-LA did provide protection to 12 facilities within the riot area.) The state National Guard command had made the decision not to allow the federalization of the forces protecting identified assets. The California National Guard utilized Security Force elements of the Air National Guard to provide protection to 28 key facilities at 21 separate locations throughout the riot area. This decision was made based on an understanding of the restrictions on federal forces verses the role and mission capabilities of the National Guard in state status in support of the local law enforcement agencies. It is important to understand that the National Guard in state status can execute a broader range of missions in support of law enforcement than is allowed by the same force once it is federalized.

One of the primary missions that the National Guard has always had is that of responding to state emergencies. The nature of the emergency makes little difference, either man made or natural, when a locality within the state requires assistance

because of a major emergency, the State NG is one of the key organizations that respond. The mission of asset protection is a mission that goes hand in hand with other emergency missions that are performed by the State NG. A primary example of this was seen during the recent LA riots, while the federalized forces were working to control the riots, State NG forces were protecting assets critical to the local and county welfare.

The nation and the state of California were fortunate in that only one area of the country was faced with a serious riot that required first state and then federal response. Additional riots, in San Francisco and San Diego, would have significantly increased the requirement for military forces in both riot control and asset protection support missions. The demands by the federal and state government for asset protection could have been significant, but the task of protecting assets and facilities at the local and county level, which are currently unidentified, could have been monumental in relation to known federal and state assets. The welfare of the population would require that these local supporting facilities be protected.

The mission of protecting these vital facilities, in most cases, would fall to the State NG. Federal forces have a federal protection mission which has certain restrictions and as proven during the LA riot may not be allocated to protect state or local assets, assets that are key to the welfare of the local population, without specific direction to do so.

The discussion to this point has only focused on the problems that could have occurred within California. What would be the impact on NG force requirements if such events had occurred in major cities throughout the country. More significant, what NG force structure in those states would be required to meet and quell such an event. What force structure would be required to ensure that the vital facilities, which provide for the welfare of the population in each state, are afforded proper protection. What other resource can respond to emergencies such as this within a minimum time frame. The California National Guard was on location and available to accept missions from the local law enforcement agencies in less than twelve hours. The federal forces that were alerted did not arrive for some thirty-six hours. It is clear that the force that responds first, is the force that is already there, and that is the NATIONAL GUARD. Will each state have this NG response capability available in the future?

If the State National Guards are not equipped with the necessary force structure to respond and function as a cohesive element, have the combat, combat support and combat service support elements located within each state, then the operational capability to support missions of this type will be severely

restricted. Additional forces from other areas will have to be called for support. Requirements for outside supporting forces will delay force activation and response time. This will limit the immediate availability of forces to the local law enforcement authorities. It will not make any difference if the external supporting forces have to come from the active force or from an adjacent state, a delay will cost the same. As seen in LA, the response force must move rapidly to protect and reduce loss of life and property. This is true not only in a riot, but in other disasters as well. Delays because of the lack of available forces, support and planning, which cause loss of human life and millions of dollars in damage are just not acceptable.

Executive Order 12656 only requires Federal departments and agencies to address facilities and resources essential to national defense and national welfare. What is now clear is that the Federal Emergency Management Agency needs to move, in coordination with the National Guard Bureau and State National Guard at state levels to work with the local Offices of Emergency Services to pin point those areas within each state that could be considered critical for the welfare of the state, the nation and the national defense. Then further, working with local and county officials identify the supporting infrastructure that is essential to the welfare of the population within those areas. This facility identification needs to include not only the vital supporting infrastructure, but major distribution centers for commodities and services that are essential for the welfare of the population at all levels. The State NG, in close coordination with the OES, further needs to develop a plan of action for the identified areas which will address resources requirements and identify available forces within a given distance of selected areas. Notification of these units should take place and specific mission assignments given, to include coordination with local law enforcement officials and preparation for zirconium mobilization scenarios developed. All these steps will ensure that the response of each State NG will not be delayed and both life and property can be saved should National Guard units have to be called to respond to an emergency.