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Greetings and Welcome!

On behalf of the entire staff, we are proud to host this DomPrep Executive Briefing. By design, these briefings are structured to be half-day, power-packed, by-invitation-only meetings that promote the exchange of ideas and provide networking opportunities. Your participation and response are greatly appreciated as our distinguished speakers shed light on the gaps discovered by the DomPrep40 surveys and spark discussions for possible solutions.

The important topic of this briefing is Preparedness Goals Associated with the Nuclear Threat. Headed by Vayl Oxford, a panel of experts will discuss gaps and synergies evident from the survey.

Key points to be addressed include:

- The Global Nuclear Detection Architecture’s role in preventing radiological & nuclear (R/N) attacks;
- Collaborative efforts between federal, state, and local governments to increase R/N preparedness;
- Integration across disciplines to better react to R/N threats; and
- Exercises and training initiatives to improve preparedness and response capabilities.

Please take a moment to review the agenda, as well as information about presenters and sponsors.

Those who are unable to join us in person will have the opportunity to listen to the proceedings in the Webinar section of DomPrep’s website: http://www.domesticpreparedness.com/Webinars/.

Your feedback and input on these briefings are always welcome as DomPrep strives to take preparedness to the next level.

Sincerely yours,

DomPrep Executive Team
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DomPrep40 Advisor, National Security Executive Policy Advisor,
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Vayl Oxford assumed the position of National Security Executive Policy Advisor at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) on 1 May 2012. He is the former Director of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO). Prior to DHS, he was the Special Assistant for Policy Planning in the DHS Science and Technology Directorate and Acting Director of the Homeland Security Advance Research Projects Agency. At the Department of Defense, he was the Deputy Director of technology development at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) and Chief of counter-proliferation programs at the Defense Special Weapons Agency/Defense Nuclear Agency.

Huban A. Gowadia
Deputy Director, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Huban A. Gowadia is the Deputy Director of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO). Prior to this assignment, she served as Assistant Director of DNDO’s Mission Management Directorate. She was appointed to the Senior Executive Service in 2006 to serve as DNDO’s first Assistant Director for Assessments. Previously, she served as Program Executive for DHS’s Science & Technology Countermeasures Test Beds. In 2001, she joined the Technology Integration Division in the Federal Aviation Administration’s Office of Civil Aviation Security Policy & Planning in Washington, D.C., which was then transitioned to the Office of Security Technologies in the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

Major General Timothy J. Lowenberg
The Adjutant General, State of Washington

Major General Timothy J. Lowenberg was appointed Adjutant General of the State of Washington on 13 September 1999. He also serves as Homeland Security Advisor to the Governor of Washington and as the State Administrative Agent. He serves as: Chair of Homeland Defense and Homeland Security of the Adjutants General Association of the United States; Chair of the Governor’s Homeland Security Advisors Council (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices); Chair of the Governor’s Domestic Security Subcommittee; and Chair of the Governor’s 2010 Winter Olympics Task Force Security Committee. He previously served as a founding Tri-Chair of the National Homeland Security Consortium (2005-2008).

Deputy Chief (Ret.) Joseph D. McKeever
New York Police Department (NYPD);
CRA, Vice President Counterterrorism & Private Sector Programs

Deputy Chief Joseph D. McKeever retired from the New York City Police Department (NYPD) in January 2011 after 29 years of distinguished service and joined CRA as Vice President of Counterterrorism & Private Sector Programs. A senior executive with extensive law enforcement experience, over the course of his career, he held positions of Commanding or Executive Officer in 12 NYPD units including: Commanding Officer of the Counterterrorism Division; Commanding Officer of the NYPD’s Counterterrorism Maritime Unit; NYPD representative on the Port of New York/New Jersey’s Area Maritime Security Committee. He also served as Chair of the “Securing the Cities” Executive Committee, the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) radiological and nuclear domestic detection and interdiction program.
The purpose of this briefing is to discuss gaps that were uncovered in a recent DomPrep survey. This survey was created and taken by a panel of experts (DomPrep40 Advisors) as well as the readers of the *DomPrep Journal*, the preliminary results of which were compared to uncover gaps that need to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30-8:40 | Welcome & Introduction of Sponsor  
Marty Masiuk, Publisher, DomesticPreparedness.com                                              |
| 8:40-9:00 | Vayl Oxford, DomPrep40 Advisor, National Security Executive Policy Advisor,  
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory                                                        |
| 9:00-9:20 | Huban A. Gowadia, Deputy Director, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office,  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)                                                   |
| 9:20-9:30 | Questions & Answers, Discussion                                                            |
| 9:30-9:50 | Break & Networking                                                                         |
| 10:10-10:20 | Questions & Answers, Discussion                                                            |
| 10:30-10:40 | Deputy Chief (Retired) Joseph D. McKeever, New York Police Department (NYPD);  
CRA, Vice President Counterterrorism & Private Sector Programs                              |
<p>| 10:40-11:00 | Questions &amp; Answers, Discussion                                                            |
| 11:00 | Adjourn                                                                                     |</p>
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</tr>
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DomPrep Survey
Preparedness Goals Associated with the Nuclear Threat
Prepared by Vayl Oxford, DomPrep40 Advisor

A nuclear attack on U.S. soil is possibly the most catastrophic threat facing the nation, which is why it has been at the top of the national security agenda for the last two administrations. President George W. Bush espoused a strategy based on a layered defense involving: increased efforts to secure and reduce nuclear material and stockpiles globally; increased efforts to counter nuclear smuggling through the Proliferation Security Initiative in 2003; enhanced international cooperation by expanding the 1991 Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and announcing the 2006 Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism; and, finally, increased focus on domestic measures to protect the United States against a radiological and/or nuclear (R/N) attack.

U.S. Initiatives to Guard Against Nuclear Attacks

- Develop an enhanced domestic system to detect, and report attempts to import or use, R/N materials/weapons in the United States;

- Enhance and coordinate nuclear detection efforts of federal, state, and local governments;

- Establish procedures needed to ensure that detection leads to effective response;

- Develop an enhanced Global Nuclear Detection Architecture; and

- Support the effective sharing of appropriate information.

President Barack Obama has built upon this strategy, while putting additional emphasis on reducing the threat, through the Global Nuclear Lockdown program and the New STrategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia. START further reduces the U.S. and Russian nuclear stockpiles.

Despite these concerted efforts, there are continuing concerns that the nuclear threat is growing. The Commission on the Prevention of WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction) Proliferation and Terrorism echoed this concern in its “World at Risk” report, which stated the following:

“The number of states that are armed with nuclear weapons or are seeking to develop them is increasing. Terrorist organizations are intent on acquiring nuclear weapons or the material and expertise needed to build them. Trafficking in nuclear materials and technology is a serious, relentless, and multidimensional problem. ... [T]he Commission was unanimous in concluding that the nuclear aspirations of Iran and North Korea pose immediate and urgent threats to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Successful nuclear programs in both countries could trigger a cascade of proliferation.”
Since the Commission’s report, activities in both of these nations reinforce the need for increased concern about their intentions and capabilities. With respect to Iran, assessments emanating from the International Atom Energy Agency’s (IAEA) inspections include:

- Operations at the deep underground enrichment facility near Qom;
- Uranium enrichment at the highest rate ever – i.e., 3.5 percent;
- Quantity of centrifuges operating in Natanz at a new high – with more than 5,000 yet to be installed;
- Production of enriched uranium at the fastest rate ever – i.e., 20 percent;
- Decreased amount of time needed to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon, which could produce enough material for a weapon in 43 days (dropping to 11 days by February 2013 if 20-percent enrichment rate continues).

These revelations, along with Iran’s stated objectives and ties to terrorist groups, serve as a clear signal that the United States needs a multi-faceted strategy to prevent Iran from crossing the nuclear threshold, while also recognizing that it may very well reach nuclear weapons state status. Meanwhile, North Korea continues to defy the international community with its missile launches and reported plans to conduct an additional underground nuclear test.

The Commission also cites that Pakistan poses a particular concern because of: (a) its own stockpile of nuclear weapons; and (b) the active presence of al-Qaida within its borders. Insights that came to light following the killing of Osama Bin Laden raise additional concerns about the nexus of terrorism with a nuclear armed state. Moreover, the recent nuclear crisis in Japan provides even more evidence that nuclear-related events require consideration of all-hazard approaches to threat response. Concerns about medical countermeasures arise after an R/N threat is acknowledged, and those concerns will require the public health community to be involved in managing the response even before an attack is officially launched.

Against this backdrop, DomPrep surveyed its readers regarding: (a) the current state of U.S. preparedness to defend against an R/N attack; and (b) steps that might and/or should be taken to improve preparedness.

**Key Findings**

- More than half of the respondents agreed that developing a domestic layer of the Global Nuclear Detection Architecture serves as an effective tool in preventing an R/N attack. Interestingly, almost one-third were unsure about its effectiveness possibly due to limited exposure to the goals of the architecture or a serious concern about its utility.

- More than three-quarters of the respondents felt that current federal government efforts to increase preparedness of major U.S. cities were not adequate to protect against an R/N attack.

- Regarding the responsibility and means to develop capabilities and capacities to prevent an R/N attack, an overwhelming number of respondents feel that it is a shared responsibility among federal, state, and local governments. On the other hand, less than one-fifth felt the DHS-managed grant process was an effective approach to build capabilities and capacities.
• Nearly all of the respondents felt that integration across the federal government, law enforcement, and emergency response communities to react to a possible R/N threat is minimal or only exists in certain communities.

• More than three-quarters of the respondents agreed that exercises and training were very important to improving preparedness and response capabilities, and they should be routinely conducted at the state and local level with support from the federal government.

Survey Results

The DomPrep survey, originally conducted in 2011, was designed to address each of these issues, to solicit insights from stakeholders across federal, state, local, private sector, academic, and health areas, and to obtain a snapshot of the status of R/N preparedness within the United States. This same survey, was conducted again in 2012 to provide a view of the progress made in R/N preparedness in the 10+ years since the 9/11 attacks.

National-level policy sometimes does not convey to state and local levels despite the establishment of a more structured “homeland security community,” as was expected with the creation of DHS. Therefore, the success rate of federal departments and agencies working with state and local governments to build capabilities and capacities to address the broad array of natural events and terrorist threats is mixed. The responses to this survey illustrate this point for R/N domestic preparedness.

More than half of the responses to Question 1 indicate that there is a need for a domestic layer of the Global Nuclear Detection Architecture. However, almost one-third of the responses reflect uncertainty, which could stem from either: (a) a lack of understanding the goals of the domestic layer, or (b) a genuine concern that the domestic layer may not yield useful outcomes. It would be helpful to further analyze this specific result to determine if DHS and DNDO should increase efforts to explain the intent of the domestic layer.

To this point, 76 percent of the responses to Question 2 indicate that the federal government is not doing an adequate job of increasing R/N preparedness in major U.S. cities. However, despite this strong agreement, Question 3 reveals that 91 percent of respondents feel that the responsibility for improving preparedness to prevent a catastrophic attack against a major city is shared between federal, state, and local governments.

In light of these responses, Question 4 addresses the effectiveness of the DHS-managed grant program. Almost 65 percent of respondents feel that the process is not an effective way to build capabilities and capacities at the state and local level.

In Question 5, when queried about the utility of a standalone grant program to address catastrophic threat (e.g., biological, nuclear), responses were very mixed. Slightly less than 50 percent of the responses support a standalone grant program as an effective means to improve preparedness, while the other responses were almost evenly split between disagreement with its utility and uncertainty about its effectiveness. In general, the responses indicate that the current process is not effective. However, there is no real consensus on
an alternative approach. Additional discussion and analysis is needed to determine the most effective mechanism to improve preparedness – especially given the emerging threat environment and the reduction in available grant funding.

The last set of questions addresses the degree to which federal, state, and local governments are integrated – information sharing, integrated response, and exercise and training efforts. In these areas, there was a clear consensus. In response to Question 6, more than 80 percent of respondents agreed the public should be notified of a probable domestic R/N threat in order to enhance awareness and survivability. However, Question 7 reveals that more than 95 percent believe the integration across federal government, law enforcement agencies, and other emergency response elements is minimal or exists only in certain communities. When combined, these responses indicate that the public should be notified of a possible R/N threat, but there is little expectation of an integrated response to such a threat.

Integrated responses and the ability to assess response plans can best be evaluated through exercises and training (Question 8). More than 80 percent of respondents agree that exercises and training are very important to preparedness and should be conducted routinely at the state and local levels with support from the federal government.

**Conclusion**

Based on these results, several key conclusions can be drawn:

- Increased education and engagement between relevant federal agencies and state/local governments is needed to explain the goals and objectives of the domestic layer of the Global Nuclear Detection Architecture.

- Improved mechanisms leading to increased preparedness at the state and local levels and in major U.S. cities are needed beyond sole reliance on the DHS-managed grant program.

- Better integration is needed across the federal, state, and local levels to enhance preparedness and assess it over time.

Such integration can best be achieved through the development of R/N prevention and response plans that delineate roles and responsibilities across the federal, state, and local levels. Then, it can be supported by a robust exercise and training program that assesses those plans and allows them to evolve.
Survey Results

**QUESTION ONE**
Do you believe that developing a domestic layer of the Global Nuclear Detection Architecture serves as an effective tool in preventing a radiological or nuclear (R/N) attack against the United States?

- **2011 Responses**
  - Not sure: 26.1%
  - Yes: 59.4%
  - No: 14.5%

- **2012 Responses**
  - Not sure: 30.1%
  - Yes: 52.9%
  - No: 17.0%

**QUESTION TWO**
Are current efforts of the federal government adequate to increase the preparedness of major U.S. cities to protect against an R/N attack?

- **2011 Responses**
  - Not sure: 13.5%
  - Yes: 10.4%
  - No: 76.1%

- **2012 Responses**
  - Not sure: 18.2%
  - Yes: 5.8%
  - No: 76.0%
**QUESTION THREE**
The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has stated that “all events are local.” Do you believe the responsibility for preventing a catastrophic attack against a major U.S. City rests with state and local governments, the federal government, or both?

2011 Responses
- State/Local: 4.9%
- Federal: 5.5%
- Shared: 90.6%

2012 Responses
- State/Local: 6.5%
- Federal: 1.9%
- Shared: 91.6%

**QUESTION FOUR**
The “preferred” method to improve preparedness against terrorist attacks is the DHS-managed grant process. Is this adequate and appropriate for building capabilities and capacities needed, at the state and local levels, to prevent a catastrophic R/N attack?

2011 Responses
- Not sure: 31.1%
- Yes: 18.3%
- No: 50.6%

2012 Responses
- Not sure: 16.3%
- Yes: 19.0%
- No: 64.7%
**QUESTION FIVE**
Do you believe that state and local governments would be better served by a stand-alone grant program to address catastrophic threats such as R/N or biological attacks?

![2011 Responses pie chart](chart1)

Not sure: 23.8%
Yes: 45.7%
No: 30.5%

![2012 Responses pie chart](chart2)

Not sure: 27.5%
Yes: 43.8%
No: 28.8%

**QUESTION SIX**
If and when a domestic R/N threat is identified, do you believe the public should be notified to enhance awareness and survivability?

![2011 Responses pie chart](chart3)

Not sure: 15.3%
No: 11.0%
Yes: 73.6%

![2012 Responses pie chart](chart4)

Not sure: 9.8%
No: 8.5%
Yes: 81.7%
**QUESTION SEVEN**
To what degree do you believe the federal government, law-enforcement agencies, and other elements of the emergency response community are integrated to react to a probable R/N threat?

- **Well integrated with clearly designated roles, responsibilities, and procedures in place**
- **Integration in certain communities, but not broadly across the United States**
- **Minimal integration of the nation’s prevention & response communities**

![Percentage of Responses Graph](Image)

**QUESTION EIGHT**
How important do you think exercises and training are to improving preparedness and potential response capabilities to meet the R/N threats?

- **Very important, should be routinely conducted at state & local levels, with federal support**
- **Very important, should be executed at federal level with some state & local involvement**
- **Moderately important, depending on organizations, agencies, and political jurisdictions participating**
- **Of limited importance, with minimal enduring effect**

![Percentage of Responses Graph](Image)
FLIR Systems is the world’s largest supplier of detection and protection sensors and systems. FLIR now offers advanced capabilities to detect threats in all of the critical CBRNE segments – chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive. These compact, portable, laboratory-caliber systems are in use across a broad spectrum of applications, including incident response, force protection, field-based forensics and critical facility security.

**Incident Response**
As the first to enter a potential disaster zone, first responders require tools that can do the job and get personnel back to safety fast. FLIR provides light weight, mobile, fast, and effective CBRNE equipment that can readily be taken into the hot zone.

**Force Protection**
FLIR has developed re-configurable modules that allow rapid response to CBRN threats. The system is designed to support comprehensive reconnaissance operations in order to characterize the threat and confirm or deny the presence of WMDs.

**Field-Based Forensics/Mobile Labs**
In the event of a CBRNE attack, response must be effective, deployment quick, and identification and sample-handling accurate. FLIR is changing the paradigm from “sample-to-lab” to “lab-to-sample” with the development of easy to use, laboratory quality systems designed for use in the field.

**Critical Infrastructure**
FLIR has developed the first practical, affordable CBRN security solution for critical infrastructure. As a “detect-to-protect” system, ThreatSense™ uses a layered approach to counter aerosolized threats as well as the movement of radioactive sources.

As both a systems provider and technology supplier to the defense industry, FLIR Systems leverages unparalleled technical expertise to address the emerging challenges of our time. For more information on the FLIR detection solutions, visit [www.flir.com/detection](http://www.flir.com/detection).
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