



Guardsmen on the Gulf Coast
Clarence Williams/Iris Photocollective photo

Military Operations

Background: Military Support to Civil Authorities

The National Guard generally constitutes the first military support provided to civil authorities for domestic disaster relief. If civilian first responders and the National Guard cannot adequately respond, the Department of Defense (DOD) may be asked to deploy active-duty forces.

The Statutes and Role of the National Guard in Emergency Response

National Guard units conduct operations in one of three modes: (1) under control of their governor as commander-in-chief, on state active-duty status, with the state paying salaries and expenses; (2) under gubernatorial control, but operating under Title 32 of the U.S. Code, with the federal government paying mission costs;¹ or (3) under control of the President, having been federalized under provisions of Title 10 of the U.S. Code.² While governor-controlled, National Guard units may perform law-enforcement missions.³ When federalized under Title 10, however, National Guard units, like regular federal forces, are generally prohibited from enforcing laws.⁴

National Guard missions performed in state active-duty status include assisting in response to natural disasters such as hurricanes and other storms, and fires and floods which have not been declared federal disasters. Governors routinely use their states' National Guards for disaster-relief missions when local first responders are overwhelmed.⁵

The DOD Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support, dated June 2005, says local National Guard units are particularly well-suited for civil-support missions: They (1) are "forward deployed" in about 3,200 communities across the United States, (2) are readily available for use in either state active-duty status or Title 32 status, (3) routinely exercise with state and local first responders, and (4) have experience mobilizing for local disaster-relief missions.⁶

The National Response Plan (NRP) guides federal-agency emergency response and recognizes the role of governors in a federal system for the public safety and welfare of their states' people by coordinating state resources to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from a variety of man-made or natural disasters. Moreover, the Plan recognizes the governor's constitutional role as the commander-in-chief of the state's military forces – the National Guard – when in state active-duty or Title 32 status.⁷

Emergency Management Assistance Compact Provides a Framework for Interstate Mutual Aid

The Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) is an interstate agreement that provides a framework for interstate mutual aid using the National Guard. The National Emergency Management Association, an association of state emergency managers, administers EMAC⁸ and has developed a nine-step process for mutual aid.⁹ In addition to the EMAC process, some state-to-state mutual-aid agreements also exist for providing law-enforcement and other assistance in a crisis.¹⁰ States that receive assistance requests under EMAC are not obligated to send their National Guard units to affected states. In addition to the emergency managers' and state-to-state processes, the National Guard Bureau developed a 20-step process to deploy National Guard units in response to Hurricane Katrina under EMAC.¹¹

DOD Has a Supporting Role Under a Key Presidential Directive and the National Response Plan

DOD has a key supporting role under Homeland Security Presidential Directive-5 (HSPD-5) dated February 28, 2003,¹² and the NRP.¹³ The Presidential Directive specifies that DOD will provide military assistance to civil authorities for domestic incidents as directed by the President or when consistent with military readiness and appropriate under the circumstances and the law. The Directive also clearly states that the Secretary of Defense shall retain command of military forces when such forces are providing civil support. Finally, the Directive also requires DOD and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish “appropriate” relationships and mechanisms for cooperation and coordination between the two Departments.¹⁴

DOD responds to a domestic disaster within the National Incident Management System (NIMS), which provides a framework to integrate disaster response at all levels of government and the private sector. To coordinate its participation in the system, DOD has provided certain specialized training to military officers, known as Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officers, usually at the rank equivalent of Army colonel or Navy captain.¹⁵ The Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officers deploy to national or regional incident-command centers such as the Homeland Security Operations Center to coordinate the DOD response to the event. To manage DOD’s assistance as directed by HSPD-5, DOD has also provided specialized training to another cadre of colonels known as Defense Coordinating Officers (DCO).¹⁶ These officers generally deploy to the Joint Field Office (JFO) or other incident-command centers to process urgent requests for DOD assistance needed to assist civil authorities in responding to the immediate needs of the situation.¹⁷ DOD also provides a deployable support staff to the DCO, known as the Defense Coordinating Element, consisting of three to 30 service members or DOD civilians, depending on the nature and scope of the incident.¹⁸ DOD may also provide military officers to augment the staff of the Principal Federal Officer (PFO), the designee of the Secretary of Homeland Security in executing the federal disaster response.¹⁹ Finally, DOD has permitted FEMA, the Coast Guard, and other agencies to maintain a permanent presence at U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), the DOD Combatant Command for the North American area of operations.²⁰ DOD may also provide augmentation to the FEMA office at NORTHCOM in a large-scale disaster.²¹

The NRP establishes a key support role for DOD in assisting the federal agency that leads the federal disaster response. The NRP points out that the Secretary of Defense authorizes defense support to civil authorities for domestic incidents as directed by the President, or when consistent with military readiness and appropriate under the circumstances and the law – virtually the same language as that used in HSPD-5. Similarly, as with the Directive, the NRP specifies that the Secretary of Defense retains control over military forces at all times during its assistance to civil authorities, as specified in Title 10 of the U.S. Code.²²

In addition to assigning DOD a general role to support civil authorities, the NRP identifies DOD as a supporting agency to the lead agency in all 15 of the NRP’s Emergency Support Functions (ESF), reflecting the fact that DOD has unique resources and capabilities to provide humanitarian relief in a catastrophe. It also identifies DOD’s Army Corps of Engineers as a co-primary agency for ESF-3, Public Works and Engineering.²³ The table below provides additional information on DOD’s assigned roles under the ESFs.

Emergency Support Function	DOD's Specific Role
1. Transportation	Provides military liaison to ESF-1 desk and military transportation to move resources, and assists in contracting for civilian aircraft. ²⁴
2. Communications	Uses own resources to provide own communications and coordinates numerous other communication issues with the Federal Emergency Communications Coordinator. ²⁵
3. Public Works and Engineering	Army Corps of Engineers provides technical assistance, engineering, and construction management. ²⁶
4. Firefighting	Conducts firefighting on DOD installations and assists other lead agencies for fire-fighting on non-DOD land. ²⁷
5. Emergency Management Annex	No specific role identified. ²⁸
6. Mass Care, Housing, and Human Services	Army Corps of Engineers provides ice and water; inspects shelter sites for suitability; and assists in construction of temporary shelters and temporary housing repair. ²⁹
7. Resource Support	No specific role identified. ³⁰
8. Public Health and Medical Services	Transports patients to medical care facilities; assists with mortuary services; procures and transports medical supplies; and provides DOD medical supplies, blood products, medical personnel, laboratory services, and logistics support. ³¹
9. Urban Search and Rescue	When requested, serves as a primary source for rotary and fixed-wing aircraft to support urban search-and-rescue operations; and Army Corps of Engineers provides (1) certain training and structural integrity analysis, (2) assessments of whether buildings are safe to enter, (3) building stability monitoring, and (4) other services. ³²
10. Oil and Hazardous Materials Response	Provides the federal on-scene coordinator and directs response actions for releases of hazardous materials from its vessels, facilities, vehicles, munitions, and weapons; and Army Corps of Engineers provides response and recovery assistance involving radiological dispersion devices and improvised nuclear devices. ³³
11. Agriculture and Natural Resources	Assesses (1) the availability of DOD food supplies and storage facilities, (2) transportation equipment at posts near the affected area, and (3) laboratory, diagnostic, and technical assistance; and assists in animal emergency response; develops appropriate plans; and the Army Corps of Engineers provides expertise and resources to assist in removal and disposal of debris and animal carcasses. ³⁴
12. Energy	Coordinates emergency power team missions with power restoration activities and provides appropriate support. ³⁵
13. Public Safety and Security	If directed by the President, quells insurrection and provides physical and electronic security-systems assistance and expertise. ³⁶
14. Long Term Community Recovery and Mitigation	Provides technical assistance in community planning, civil engineering, and natural hazard risk assessment and supports national strategy development for housing, debris removal, and restoration of public facilities and infrastructure. ³⁷
15. External Affairs	No specific role identified other than to provide support as required. ³⁸

Applicable Statutes Provide DOD the Authorities to Deploy Forces

Various statutes govern DOD participation in emergency management. These statutes establish pre-disaster and disaster-response reimbursement procedures, authorize the use

of military forces to put down insurrection, and generally prohibit the use of military forces for law-enforcement purposes except to put down insurrection and in certain other limited circumstances.

Economy Act

The Economy Act permits federal agencies to provide goods or services to another federal agency when such support is requested. Such assistance will not necessarily be related to disaster response.³⁹

Stafford Act

The Stafford Act is the primary statute governing DOD and other federal agency disaster assistance under the NRP. Stafford Act reimbursements are authorized once a governor has asserted that state capabilities are overwhelmed and federal assistance is needed, and the President has declared an emergency.⁴⁰

Insurrection Act

The Insurrection Act authorizes the President to use military force to suppress an insurrection or end other domestic violence. Specifically, the President may employ military forces to restore order, prevent looting, and engage in other law-enforcement activities.⁴¹

Posse Comitatus Act

The federal Posse Comitatus Act of 1878 prohibits the use of the Army and the Air Force (originally part of the Army) to execute the laws of the United States except where authorized by the Constitution or Acts of Congress. Congress enacted the law to restrict the use of federal troops in the conduct of law enforcement in the South during Reconstruction.⁴² Federal courts have interpreted the Act to prohibit the use of troops in an active role of direct civilian law enforcement including search, seizure, and arrest. DOD has issued policy guidance extending the Posse Comitatus Act's restrictions to the Navy and Marine Corps. The Act does not apply to the National Guard when under the direct command of a state's governor.⁴³

Congress has created a number of specific exceptions to the general restrictions in the Posse Comitatus Act to authorize DOD to use its personnel and equipment in a number of circumstances to

- assist with drug interdiction and other law-enforcement functions,
- protect civil rights or property, or suppress insurrection,
- assist the U.S. Secret Service,
- protect nuclear materials and assist in solving crimes involving nuclear material,
- assist with some terrorist incidents involving weapons of mass destruction, and
- assist with the execution of quarantine and certain health laws.⁴⁴

Title 10

Title 10 of the U.S. Code establishes the armed services; defines their organization, missions, and general military powers; specifies personnel limits; defines training and education requirements and organizations; and specifies service, supply, and procurement roles. Generally, under Title 10, the military departments define training requirements, and design and implement the training.⁴⁵ Certain military commanders have interpreted this to mean that such training can include the deployment of forces from their home installation to another installation, which, coincidentally, also may position them for use in an upcoming mission in the same area.⁴⁶ In effect, this positions these commanders and forces closer to a disaster area before receiving a request for assistance, thus making them more immediately available to address immediate disaster relief needs.

Other Authorities

Under DOD doctrine, local commanders have the authority to unilaterally act to prevent immediate threats to life and property if it is not feasible to obtain prior approval from higher military authorities. At the same time, DOD directives require an oral civilian request before exercising this authority, except during a civil disturbance. DOD would be unlikely to obtain reimbursements for assistance rendered under the immediate-response authority.⁴⁷

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense) Prepares for and Guides DOD's Domestic Missions

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense) is principally responsible for the overall supervision of Homeland Defense activities in DOD. The Assistant Secretary is to develop policies, conduct analyses, provide advice, make recommendations on homeland defense, and provide support to civil authorities, emergency preparedness, and domestic crisis management in DOD. The Assistant Secretary is also to assist the Secretary of Defense in providing policy direction to NORTHCOM, and other combatant commands, when appropriate, to guide development and execution of these commands' plans and activities. Lastly, the Assistant Secretary is also the DOD domestic crisis manager and represents the Department on Homeland Defense and support to civil authorities matters with the lead federal agency,⁴⁸ often DHS.⁴⁹

DOD's Guidance and Key Strategy Documents Lay Out the Department's Views of Its Mission

DOD's guidance and Quadrennial Defense Review make clear that domestic natural-disaster response is not within the Department's primary mission set and will only be undertaken when forces are available, or if directed by the President or Secretary of Defense. Moreover, under the NRP, and consistent with departmental guidance, DOD provides support to the lead federal agency in responding to domestic natural disasters, but is not considered, and does not consider itself, to be a lead responder.⁵⁰

DOD Directives Guide the Department's Domestic Disaster Response

DOD has issued a set of directives and related documents that together establish DOD policy for military assistance to civilian authorities. The first is DOD Directive 3025.1, Military Support to Civil Authorities (MSCA), which requires DOD components to provide support requested by civil authorities once properly approved by the designated DOD approval authorities. The Directive is premised on the notion that DOD support is only to be provided if civil response capabilities are overwhelmed, as determined by FEMA. It also states that DOD's military operations other than military assistance to civil authorities have priority unless otherwise directed by the Secretary of Defense. The Directive states that DOD components may not procure or maintain any supplies, material, or equipment exclusively for civil emergencies unless directed by the Secretary of Defense. Lastly, it also states that military forces will remain under the control of DOD at all times.⁵¹

Ordinarily, FEMA tasks DOD to perform a mission by sending DOD a "mission assignment." However, DOD takes the view that among federal agencies, it is unique in that under the Constitution and under the Goldwater-Nichols Act, there is a military chain of command from the President to the Secretary of Defense to the Combatant Commander. The NRP specifies that the Secretary of Defense retains control over military forces at all times during its assistance to civil authorities, as specified by Title 10 of the U.S. Code.⁵² Under "existing authorities and as a matter of policy," DOD takes the position that "placing a FEMA official or a DHS official in command outside the Department of Defense within the military chain of command violates Goldwater-Nichols and is a bad idea."⁵³ DOD therefore interprets a "mission assignment" as a "request for assistance."

DOD Directive 3025.15, Military Assistance to Civil Authorities, was issued on February 18, 1997, and specifies the mechanisms that DOD's designated approval authorities will use to evaluate whether or not support should be provided to civil authorities. The Directive establishes the following six criteria against which requests are to be evaluated, usually by DOD's Office of the Joint Director of Military Support (JDOMS), which also determines what capability DOD has available to meet the request:⁵⁴

- legality (compliance with laws),
- lethality (potential use of lethal force by or against DOD forces),
- risk (safety of DOD forces),
- cost (who pays, impact on the DOD budget),
- appropriateness (if it is in DOD's interest to conduct the requested mission), and
- readiness (DOD's ability to perform its mission).⁵⁵

The JDOMS makes a recommendation to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whether to approve the request.⁵⁶ The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense) reviews the request for consistency with policy.⁵⁷

DOD Directive 3025.12, Military Assistance for Civil Disturbances (MACDIS), governs DOD's response to requests from federal, state, or local governments' law enforcement agencies to assist with civil disturbances. The Directive requires a specific Presidential order before the military can deploy on such a mission, except that DOD commanders may act unilaterally in the case of unexpected disasters including an earthquake, fire, or flood; if life is endangered; or if local authorities are unable to control the situation and circumstances preclude obtaining prior authorization by the President.⁵⁸

All three Directives are actually out of date, as the mentioned DOD components no longer have the responsibilities identified in the Directives or no longer even exist. For example, they specify that the Department of the Army is the DOD's executive agent for military support to civil authorities.⁵⁹ In fact, the JDOMS performed that function at the time of the Committee's investigation.⁶⁰ Directive 3025.1 designates the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Atlantic Command as the planning agent for military support missions,⁶¹ although that command was re-designated in October 1999.⁶² Conversely, the Directives make no mention of U.S. Northern Command, even though that command began operations on October 1, 2002, to carry out the types of domestic missions contemplated in the Directives.⁶³

DOD Differs Critically From Other Agencies

DOD's mission is to deter foreign aggression against the United States and to fight and win the nation's wars if deterrence fails. The Quadrennial Defense Review released in February 2006 addressed the use of military forces in domestic disaster-relief efforts. It pointed out that the ability of military forces to mitigate the effects of an attack on the homeland may also be useful for disaster-relief operations.⁶⁴

While DOD's mission is clearly focused on overseas operations as documented in the defense strategy, the June 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review identifies five key strategic objectives to support civil authorities:

- achieve maximum awareness of potential threats,
- deter, intercept, and defeat threats at a safe distance,
- achieve mission assurance to ensure that DOD can continue to operate after an attack,

- support civil authorities in minimizing the damage and recovering from domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive mass-casualty attacks, and
- improve national and international capabilities for homeland defense and homeland security.⁶⁵

While some active-duty and National Guard units are designed and structured to deploy rapidly as part of their military missions, the Department of Defense is not organized, funded or structured to act as a first responder for all domestic catastrophic disasters.⁶⁶

The Military Departments Prepare the Forces but the Joint Community Generally Employs Them

In accordance with Title 10 of the U.S. Code, the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy organize, train, and equip the force, among other things.⁶⁷ To organize the force, the military Departments establish such organizational structures as brigades, divisions, air wings, battle groups, air/ground task forces, and other configurations needed to facilitate accomplishment of the mission. In addition, the Departments identify, develop, and deliver training deemed appropriate to prepare the forces for their mission. Lastly, the Departments develop and acquire the weapons systems, equipment, and supplies needed by the forces to successfully carry out their missions.⁶⁸

While the military departments organize, train, and equip the force, the combatant commands generally execute the missions.⁶⁹ DOD's unified-command plan establishes five geographically based combatant commands that are responsible for conducting operations in their individual areas of operations.⁷⁰ NORTHCOM is based in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and is responsible for conducting military operations in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, certain Caribbean islands, and in the sea and air approaches to the United States.⁷¹

NORTHCOM's specific mission is to conduct operations to deter, prevent, and defeat threats and aggression aimed at the United States within assigned areas of operations and, when directed by the President or Secretary of Defense, to provide defense support for civil authorities.⁷² NORTHCOM's mission statement clearly indicates that the command only provides support to civil authorities if directed to do so, or the proposed mission is consistent with DOD's directives and other documents that specify the circumstances under which DOD conducts civil support.⁷³

NORTHCOM consists of the command headquarters, certain small deployable headquarters units, and certain non-deployable headquarters organizations that would coordinate operations within defined geographic locations, such as the National Capital Region and Alaska.⁷⁴ NORTHCOM generally executes its assigned missions through Joint Task Forces which are established to carry out specific missions. NORTHCOM has a small number of forces assigned to its headquarters and subsidiary units.⁷⁵

Status of Plans for Support to Civil Authorities

The Committee not know how effectively NORTHCOM planned for its role in Defense Support to Civil Authorities in a disaster response, nor is it clear if that planning is finished. At the Committee's hearing on February 9, 2006, the Commander of NORTHCOM, Admiral Timothy Keating, testified that Concept Plan 2501 (CONPLAN 2501) was "a comprehensive approach to providing Defense Support to Civil Authorities" and was "ready to be approved by the Secretary and it is on our shelf."⁷⁶ DOD defines a CONPLAN as "An operation plan in an abbreviated format that would require considerable expansion or alteration to convert it into an [operation plan] or [operation order]. A CONPLAN contains the combatant commander's strategic concept and those annexes and appendixes deemed necessary by the

combatant commander to complete planning. Generally, detailed support requirements are not calculated.⁷⁷ Although DOD states, “The fact that CONPLAN 2501 was still in draft had no impact on the speed and efficiency of NORTHCOM’s response,” the Committee has been unable to evaluate this assertion because, despite repeated requests, DOD has not provided the CONPLAN to the Committee. DOD has stated, “We cannot release the Draft USNORTHCOM CONPLAN 2501. It is still deliberative and pre-decisional.”⁷⁸

DOD Issues Execute Orders to Direct Missions and Augments Northern Command With Additional Forces When Needed

DOD directs that assigned commands undertake missions when ordered to do so via certain mission orders including “Execute Orders.” The Execute Order will be sent to commands assigned to missions and may include a variety of relevant information, including the provision of (1) intelligence or situational reports, (2) concepts of operations to be implemented, (3) procedures to be followed if assisting another lead federal agency, such as FEMA, (4) instructions in reporting on mission progress, and (5) mission-reimbursement information if appropriate.⁷⁹

When given a mission via such an order, NORTHCOM submits a “request for forces” to the Secretary of Defense who, in turn, will assign appropriate forces for the duration of the mission. Forces temporarily assigned to Northern Command can be pulled from anywhere in the force structure, but generally consist of forces based in the United States which are not already deployed on another mission. DOD’s Joint Forces Command issues an order transferring operational control of those forces from their current command to NORTHCOM for the duration of the mission.⁸⁰

Defense Coordinating Officers and Elements Are Often DOD’s First Deployers for Civil Support

Once DOD approves a request to provide defense support to civil authorities, it usually deploys the Defense Coordinating Office (DCO) and Defense Coordinating Element to the Joint Field Office (JFO) used to manage the federal response. The DCO serves as the single point of contact for requests to DOD originating at the JFO. (Other requests for DOD assistance may originate at such national response locations as the Homeland Security Operations Center.) The NRP identifies the DCO’s position and describes its responsibilities.⁸¹

The officer may also assign liaison officers to the JFO-based ESFs and refer contentious issues to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense) for resolution.⁸²

U.S. Department of Defense Response

Introduction

[The] movement of 72,000 men and women in military uniform within the United States is the largest deployment of military capability within our country since the Civil War. The scope and speed of ... our DOD Katrina response, was the largest, fastest civil support mission in our nation’s history.⁸³

– Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense

When we got off the airplane, General [Russel] Honoré [Commander, Joint Task Force Katrina] picked me up about 30 minutes later. He flew in by his helicopter, grabbed me and said, okay, I’m going to go orient you to your mission ... your job is to fix the airport and fix New Orleans.⁸⁴

– Major General William Caldwell, U.S. Army, Commander, 82nd Airborne Division

In general, DOD's response to Hurricane Katrina can be divided into three phases. In the first two phases – before landfall and immediately after landfall – DOD responded in accordance within its traditional posture under the NRP to provide assistance to civil authorities only after requested. However, as the DOD leadership recognized the potentially catastrophic nature of the disaster on Tuesday morning, August 30, 2005, DOD's approach shifted from this reactive approach to a forward-looking posture, including the mobilization of significant assets that DOD commanders anticipated might be needed for the response. This third phase represented a departure from DOD's traditional practice and enabled DOD to respond to requests for assistance in a timely manner.

During the first phase of DOD's response, in the week prior to landfall, DOD began to plan and prepare for the deployment of forces to provide support that might be requested by FEMA. DOD identified commodities that could be provided to FEMA, and led and participated in interagency teleconferences.⁸⁵ In addition, DOD deployed DCOs to Louisiana and Mississippi and identified military installations that would be available for FEMA use as staging bases. Although individual commanders exercised their own initiative to prepare, identify, and alert troops as a result of the forecasted magnitude of Katrina, and had expedited certain procedures, these actions were not coordinated by senior leaders of the Department. For the most part, DOD's actions were consistent with the type of pre-hurricane activities it had undertaken in the past. One of the lessons from Katrina is that these procedures are inadequate for a catastrophic incident.

The second phase occurred during and immediately after landfall. In this phase, DOD lacked any significant information regarding the extent of the storm's devastation. DOD officials relied primarily on media reports for their information. Many senior DOD officials did not learn that the levees had breached until Tuesday; some did not learn until Wednesday. As DOD waited for DHS to provide information about the scope of the damage, it also waited for the lead federal agency, FEMA, to identify the support needed from DOD. Although DOD continued to identify and prepare assets for potential deployments, for the most part DOD's actions during this phase were again consistent with its traditional posture under the NRP to be prepared to respond to requests, rather than actually begin responding on its own initiative. DOD's approach during this phase continued to be deliberative. The lack of situational awareness during this phase appears to have been a major reason for DOD's belated adoption of the forward-looking posture necessary in a catastrophic incident.

By Tuesday morning, however, DOD leadership began to recognize that the scope of the disaster may have been catastrophic, and that an expedited DOD response likely would be necessary. In addition, there was a growing frustration within DOD over the lack of requests for assistance from FEMA. On Tuesday morning the Deputy Secretary of Defense informed the commander of NORTHCOM that he had a "blank check" for any DOD resources that he believed were reasonably necessary for the Katrina response. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff directed the chiefs of the various services to begin deploying forces they believed might be needed for the response. This third phase of the response represented the type of approach that may be necessary in a catastrophic incident: anticipating requests and deploying assets in advance of requests.

DOD's shift in approach during this third phase enabled DOD to quickly respond to FEMA's mission requests; in a number of instances DOD "response" began before FEMA submitted the request. FEMA officials stated that although in the past they had found DOD's process cumbersome, during Katrina they felt DOD responded quickly and effectively to FEMA's requests. In a number of critical instances, DOD offered its assets and support to FEMA and DHS; in these instances, too, DOD support was deemed effective.

The third phase, however, revealed a critical need for improvement in military planning and preparation for catastrophic incidents, as well as the need to better integrate the military response into the overall response. In addition to DOD's being tasked by FEMA to provide support, the State of Louisiana asked both the National Guard and DOD to provide large numbers of ground troops. The resulting movement of 50,000 National Guard and 22,000 active-duty troops in response to Katrina was the largest deployment of military capability within the United States since the Civil War. The National Guard and active-duty military response provided critical humanitarian relief that saved lives and eased the suffering of thousands.

Many of the state and federal requests for military support, however, lacked adequate specificity. The responses to the requests for military support often were poorly coordinated with each other, if at all. The deployments of the National Guard troops were not well coordinated with the active-duty forces. One result was that local, state, and federal officials had differing perceptions of the numbers of federal troops that would be arriving, the missions they would be performing, who was in command of the military forces, and who should be in command.

Discussion

Severe Weather Execute Order

On August 19, one week prior to Hurricane Katrina's initial landfall on the Atlantic coast of Florida, the Secretary of Defense delegated to NORTHCOM the authority to deploy certain DOD assets as necessary to prepare for a hurricane. NORTHCOM holds responsibility for command and control over military operations conducted in defense of the continental United States, and in support of civil authorities, responding directly to the Secretary of Defense. Previously, all authority to deploy any such DOD assets had rested exclusively with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff, who serve as the uniformed advisors to the Secretary. However, recognizing that 2005 was forecast to be "a well above-average hurricane season" with "an above-average probability of a major hurricane landfall in the United States," the Secretary and the Joint Staff wanted to provide additional flexibility in advance of the hurricane season, and on Friday, August 19, issued the "Severe Weather Execute Order."⁸⁶

The order authorized the commander of NORTHCOM to "provide support to FEMA for planning and conducting disaster response operations in affected areas" for the duration of the 2005 hurricane season. This order granted approval for NORTHCOM to take two actions prior to a hurricane's landfall:

1. NORTHCOM was able to deploy DCOs and their staffs. Under the NRP, DCOs serve as DOD representatives to the JFO – the locally established operations center where federal, state, and local officials coordinate response activities. The DCO processes requests for military assistance, and ordinarily serves as the local commander of supporting military forces.⁸⁷
2. NORTHCOM was able to designate military installations for other uses, such as operational staging areas where FEMA could store commodities in preparation for distribution, or for ports.

Colonel Darryl Roberson, the Assistant Deputy Director of the Joint Staff for Antiterrorism and Homeland Defense, told the Committee: "It was unprecedented to allow NORTHCOM commander to move those kinds of assets in the [continental United States] without the [Secretary of Defense] being specifically notified on each occasion. So it was a big deal, and it proved to be very helpful, and allowed us to respond in a much quicker fashion than would normally have been the case last year."⁸⁸

Colonel Don Harrington, the permanent National Guard/DOD Liaison to FEMA, who helped develop the order after serving in that capacity through the hurricane season of 2004, reported that it resulted in a much earlier deployment of DCOs. “It takes a while ... to track down the SecDef [Secretary of Defense], get him to sign off on it, whether he’s in China or wherever.”⁸⁹

NORTHCOM ordered DCOs to deploy to Mississippi and Louisiana on Sunday, August 28, one day prior to Katrina’s second landfall.⁹⁰ However, in anticipation of formal orders, both officers deployed on Saturday and began to coordinate with FEMA personnel.⁹¹ Additionally, NORTHCOM designated Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi (85 miles east of Jackson, Mississippi), and Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana (200 miles northwest of Baton Rouge, Louisiana), as staging areas in response to FEMA requests.⁹²

The Pentagon: Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff

In the civilian leadership at the Pentagon, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, Paul McHale, has responsibility for domestic operations and disaster assistance.⁹³ Colonel Richard Chavez was his Senior Military Advisor for Civil Support. On August 23, Colonel Chavez learned of what would become Hurricane Katrina when the National Hurricane Center began tracking Tropical Depression 12. In consultation with Assistant Secretary McHale, he began standard hurricane preparations by assessing the availability of three key assets: Meals Ready to Eat (MREs), emergency medical capabilities, and FEMA staging bases.⁹⁴ Colonel Chavez presented his findings to the Secretary of Defense on August 28, the day before landfall. Although Tropical Depression 12 had become Hurricane Katrina, and had swelled from Category 1 to Category 5 status by that time, DOD did not alter the scope of the inventory.⁹⁵

The Office of the Assistant Secretary has not developed or implemented formal policies and procedures regarding that office’s role in preparing the Department for a civil-support mission, let alone one of catastrophic magnitude. For example, Colonel Chavez conducted these preparations on his own initiative, having derived these criteria from experience rather than from codified DOD guidance. Indeed, he said his office had intended to formalize these anticipatory actions into a pre-storm checklist, and now plans, as a result of Katrina, to expand the scope of the inventory to include other foreseeable needs such as shallow-draft boats.⁹⁶ As Katrina demonstrated, DOD needs to have procedures and plans to more fully prepare for catastrophic events.

Within the Joint Staff, the office dedicated to supporting civil authorities is the Office of the Joint Director of Military Support (JDOMS), then led by Brigadier General Terry Scherling.⁹⁷ The JDOMS began “24-7” monitoring of the situation in the Gulf of Mexico on Sunday, August 28, also activating a Crisis Action Team to process requests from FEMA.⁹⁸ Because DOD reports solely to the President, DOD treats FEMA mission assignments as Requests for Assistance, then considers whether the request may be supported, examining such issues as legality, possible harm to civilians, and the effect on readiness for overseas missions. JDOMS received relatively few requests prior to landfall. FEMA requested two staging bases, and that DCOs and their staffs be deployed to Louisiana and Mississippi. These requests were granted by NORTHCOM on the authority delegated by the Severe Weather Execute Order.⁹⁹ FEMA’s single request requiring JDOMS approval was received by DOD on Sunday at 5 p.m., requesting air and ground transportation “to support life saving and life sustaining missions.”¹⁰⁰ As will be discussed below, JDOMS processed the request the following day, 12 hours after landfall.

U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM)

Having begun tracking Katrina as Tropical Depression 12 on August 23,¹⁰¹ NORTHCOM issued a Warning Order on August 25, directing the Army, Navy, and Air Force to prepare

to “provide the necessary resources to conduct disaster relief operations consistent with defense priorities.”¹⁰²

The NORTHCOM Operations Directorate began conducting teleconferences – which included FEMA, First and Fifth Armies, and supporting commands of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force¹⁰³ – on August 24 in preparation for the initial landfall in Florida, continuing the teleconferences daily as the storm progressed into the Gulf. Before landfall, the conversations focused on evacuation plans for military bases, protection of military infrastructure, and the initial requests received from FEMA for staging bases and Defense Coordinating Officers and Elements.¹⁰⁴

Prior to landfall, logistics experts at NORTHCOM were aware of FEMA’s activities in positioning commodities. As in previous hurricanes, the planners listened in on daily video-teleconferences during which FEMA described its preparations in pre-positioning food, water, and ice.¹⁰⁵ They anticipated that they might be called upon to provide strategic airlift.¹⁰⁶ In addition, NORTHCOM planners had participated in the Hurricane Pam exercise in July 2004, and so were aware of the possible need for a “large-scale evacuation of personnel out of the city.”¹⁰⁷ But because DOD had not been asked by FEMA to take on any responsibilities in the preparations, the Army planners, under the NRP, had no “direct relationship” with FEMA.¹⁰⁸ They were in “listen only mode.”¹⁰⁹

Army Commanders: First Army

Lieutenant General Russel L. Honoré, Commanding General of First U.S. Army, was responsible for Army forces east of the Mississippi River. He had served in that position through the destructive hurricane season of 2004, and was aware of the likely requests for DOD assistance post-landfall. According to General Honoré, First Army had begun tracking the tropical wave that would become Katrina on August 8,¹¹⁰ well before it appeared as a tropical depression on the Pentagon’s screen. On August 24, as Tropical Depression 12 became Tropical Storm Katrina, First Army issued a Warning Order, followed on August 25 by a Planning Order, deploying the DCO and his staff to Florida and ordering equivalent elements to prepare to deploy to Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi.¹¹¹

General Honoré recognized early response as essential to saving lives, and from experience knew that equipment such as helicopters, boats, and communications equipment would be required. He wanted the necessary equipment and personnel identified and alerted in advance so as to expedite their eventual deployment. The process would involve multiple entities: NORTHCOM as the commander of military operations, Joint Forces Command as the provider of resources to NORTHCOM, and the Joint Staff in the Pentagon to ultimately authorize the deployment.

To initiate this process, General Honoré sent a message to NORTHCOM at about 1 p.m. on Sunday, August 28, requesting by 7 p.m. an assessment of the resources it considered necessary.¹¹² His immediate superior, Army Forces Command, sent an identical request to Joint Forces Command requesting a response by 2 a.m. Monday.¹¹³ After receiving General Honoré’s request, NORTHCOM forwarded an identical message to the Joint Staff at the Pentagon.

In addition to forwarding the formal message, Major General Richard Rowe, Operations Director at NORTHCOM, recognized the urgency of the request and informally directed his staff to anticipate the need for military support: “[First Army] has forwarded request for capabilities. ... We need to get [the Joint Staff and Joint Forces Command] thinking about types of support that may be needed – joint solutions.”¹¹⁴ General Scherling, the Director of Military Support on the Joint Staff, responded to his e-mail. “Good plan, Sir,” she wrote. “This sounds VERY catastrophic.”¹¹⁵

Nonetheless, according to General Rowe, “Joint Forces Command and the Joint Staff did not do anything.” The Joint Staff did not even want to receive this message prior to landfall, he said, because a specific requirement had not yet been identified, and under DOD’s role in the NRP, DOD was not to respond until a request had been processed through FEMA: “They believe perhaps the likelihood of having to provide this kind of ... joint capabilities is not likely.”¹¹⁶ He reported to General Honoré that he was unable to provide the requested information, even 12 hours after Katrina’s landfall in Louisiana: “Somewhat hamstrung by JDOMS desire to wait” for requests for assistance, he wrote.¹¹⁷

Army Commanders: Fifth Army

Fifth Army held responsibility over Army forces west of the Mississippi River, which included Louisiana. Colonel Tony Daskevich deployed from Fifth Army as DCO to Louisiana, departing at noon on Saturday prior to the official NORTHCOM orders. The order, however, instructed him to deploy without the full complement of staff, or Defense Coordinating Element, that would normally have accompanied him, and instead to deploy two planners. He explained that the decision to deploy only two planners was based on uncertainty as to Katrina’s path and limited lodging space in Baton Rouge.¹¹⁸ To give his staff the flexibility to join him once the storm had passed and he had established his role in Baton Rouge, he sent the Element staff to Houston.¹¹⁹ Although he was concerned that they would not be available to assist him in the immediate aftermath, his Mississippi counterpart, Colonel Damon Penn, reassured him that “it takes a full 48 hours of assessment before they even start discussing DOD participation. I think you’re in good shape.”¹²⁰

Upon arriving in Baton Rouge Saturday night, August 27, Colonel Daskevich met with the senior FEMA officials in Louisiana, William Lokey and Scott Wells. They discussed the weather predictions and the potential severity of Katrina’s impact. There was no discussion of specific mission assignments to DOD, although there was a general discussion of what assets DOD might be able to provide.¹²¹ At the time of his arrival, Colonel Daskevich, who had recently taken part in training on the NRP, understood that DOD planned to operate on a “pull” system, following its established role wherein DOD is to respond to requests rather than to provide assets prior to identification of a specific need.¹²² Sunday morning, Colonel Daskevich met with Major General Bennett Landreneau, the head of Louisiana’s National Guard, and again, received no specific requests for DOD assistance.¹²³

Navy Commanders

As Katrina approached the Gulf Coast on Sunday, August 28, the helicopter landing ship USS *Bataan* lay in port in Ingleside, Texas, following an exercise in the Caribbean Sea. The *Bataan* offers a large flat deck, refueling capacity, vast hanger space for cargo transport, and substantial medical facilities. Vice Admiral Mark Fitzgerald, Commander of the Second Fleet, based in Norfolk, Virginia, placed the *Bataan* on alert, and offered it as an asset to NORTHCOM.¹²⁴ USS *Bataan* left port by midday, and, after re-embarking the helicopters – two medium-lift utility MH-60s and three heavy-lift MH-53s – moved to position herself behind Katrina as it came ashore.

Additionally, the Navy followed standard pre-landfall procedure by moving ships in the storm’s path out to sea. Five supply and logistics vessels left New Orleans for the Gulf of Mexico, remaining close enough to provide assistance as soon as Katrina passed. Aircraft departed from the Gulf Coast for protection, but Construction Battalion engineers (“Seabees”) in Gulfport, Mississippi, equipped with heavy-lifting vehicles and trained to build or rebuild structures quickly, sheltered from the storm locally in order to respond quickly if required.¹²⁵ In Baltimore, Maryland, the hospital ship USNS *Comfort* began preparations for deployment on Sunday.¹²⁶

Marine Corps Commanders

New Orleans is home to the headquarters of the Marine Corps Reserve Forces and its war-fighting component, the Fourth Marine Division, commanded by Major General Douglas O'Dell. General O'Dell evacuated his headquarters on Friday, August 26, to avoid the approaching storm.¹²⁷ Beginning Saturday, August 27, he began examining what Marine forces might be required for the response.

Realizing that transportation assets were the most difficult to move quickly and would be the linchpin if a fast response were required, he conducted assessments of the most important of these “enablers”: amphibious vehicles; motor transport in the event that infantry were deployed or a large evacuation were required; and a command-and-control element to receive and direct forces. The assessment was complete by mid-day Monday, shortly after landfall.¹²⁸

Realizing that his logistics and engineering equipment might also be required, Lieutenant General James Amos, Commander of the II Marine Expeditionary Force – a total of almost 50,000 troops – directed an assessment of resources such as bulldozers, trucks, road graders, mobile hospitals, and associated personnel.¹²⁹ “This is 35 years of being a Marine and it’s what we call anticipating a mission,”¹³⁰ he stated, explaining his recognition that Katrina

would be of devastating severity and that the Marines’ assistance would assuredly be required.

U.S. Transportation Command

U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) holds responsibility for ground, air, and sea logistical and transportation support to military operations, and is assigned a supporting role to U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in patient evacuation operations. As is standard practice in advance of a hurricane, TRANSCOM alerted numerous heavy-transport aircraft at bases throughout the country in the event that mass transportation of supplies, personnel, or evacuees would be required. The aircraft were alerted on Sunday, August 28, and included C-5s and C-17s at Dover, Travis, Charleston, and McCord

Air Force Bases.¹³¹ Additionally, TRANSCOM alerted two Contingency Response Wings,¹³² whose mission is to deploy to a damaged airfield, and rapidly repair the runway, lighting, navigation, and communications systems to restore aircraft operations.



General Honoré arriving on
USS *Bataan*
U.S. Navy photo

Immediate Response After Landfall

Situational Awareness

Like the rest of the federal government, for at least 24 hours after landfall, DOD had poor awareness of the extent of devastation in Louisiana and Mississippi. Throughout Monday, the day of landfall, DOD personnel remained in “wait-and-see mode.” In Katrina, this period of damage assessment took much longer than usual. Many of the first responders were immobilized by damage or flooding, and communications systems were incapacitated. As a result, DOD personnel relied on media reports; nearly all interviewed by the Com-

mittee said that by Monday evening they had concluded from various media reports that New Orleans had “dodged a bullet.”¹³³ They were not aware either of the levee breaches and overtopping, or the extensive flooding that followed.

The challenge of obtaining rapid and reliable information about hurricane damage is not new. According to what was then known as the General Accounting Office (GAO), “In the case of [1992’s] Hurricane Andrew, it was several days before the local authorities realized how bad the situation was and how much assistance was needed.” The GAO recommended “supporting state and federal agencies should not waste time waiting for accurate assessments but use their experience to push obviously needed assistance toward devastated communities before citizens begin to die for lack of it.”¹³⁴

Initial Request for Assistance: Two Helicopters

At 7 p.m. Monday, the Joint Directorate of Military Support (JDOMS) issued the first official order for military support to the response, directing the deployment of two helicopters to meet FEMA’s request for two helicopters to support initial surveys of the storm damage and the most urgent requirements by Rapid Needs Assessment teams. The order also provided general guidance to the armed services: “Be prepared to provide additional personnel, units, equipment, airlift, and/or other support as requested by FEMA and approved by SecDef.”¹³⁵ Colonel Roberta Woods, Deputy Director of Logistics at NORTHCOM, interpreted this order on Monday evening to mean that beyond the two helicopters, NORTHCOM and the services were to think ahead as to what they might provide: “At that time, again, we still had...no specific requirements to meet, no mission assignments, or word of mission assignments at that time.”¹³⁶

The First Air Cavalry Brigade in Fort Hood, TX, received orders to provide the two helicopters early Tuesday morning, and the aircraft were in Baton Rouge by 1 p.m.¹³⁷ They had launched within hours of receiving orders, but the JDOMS sent its orders 12 hours after landfall, and 24 hours after having received the request.¹³⁸ However, FEMA had requested that these two helicopters begin operations “8/30/2005 Tuesday,” so they arrived on the day FEMA requested.¹³⁹ The lack of situational awareness early in the response may have contributed to a delay; other witnesses have attributed the time of response to Department bureaucracy and a “cultural reluctance” to commit Department assets to civil support missions unless absolutely necessary.

DOD Culture and Bureaucracy May Have Impeded the Process Initially

Assistant Secretary McHale disputed that idea, saying that although, prior to the 21st century, DOD’s traditional role placed a primary focus on overseas missions, “September 11 made it very clear that homeland defense and civil support missions were ... equal to or of even greater importance than other more traditional missions.” He maintained that “if [resistance within the Department] ever had existed, [it] had ceased to exist in terms of the recognition of the importance of homeland defense and civil support missions.”¹⁴⁰

Some DHS officials have asserted that they were frustrated by how long it took DOD to approve requests for assistance,¹⁴¹ and have suggested that a delay in processing the large requests for assistance from DOD – the logistics request approved September 2, and a second set of requests approved September 5 – slowed the response effort. Some FEMA witnesses also said that they would have liked “things to happen faster” in terms of DOD’s bringing in assets for the response.¹⁴²

In its own analysis, the White House asserted that DOD’s “21-step” approval process – which included converting a mission assignment into a Request for Assistance and reviewing the request for legality and appropriateness, among other things – was “overly bureaucratic” and “resulted in critical needs not being met.”¹⁴³ FEMA Deputy Federal Coord-

dinating Officer (FCO) in Louisiana Scott Wells and other witnesses¹⁴⁴ described the process of gaining assistance from DOD as a “negotiation” in which DOD, along with the other government entities, collaborates in dividing up what needs to be done and by whom.¹⁴⁵

Colonel Chavez testified that FEMA officials did not always have a good understanding of what assets and resources DOD could provide to best accomplish a mission and of DOD’s processes for responding to FEMA’s requests for assistance.¹⁴⁶

Top DOD officials vigorously disputed the assertion that their approval process slowed the arrival of DOD assets. General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the Katrina response, said, “I don’t know if we have a 21-step process or not. If we do, it’s one that takes 21 seconds to complete.”¹⁴⁷ General Myers said DOD would “never” wait to start planning to execute a mission until formal orders were signed, saying such an approach would be “incongruous” with DOD culture.¹⁴⁸ Assistant Secretary McHale concurred, saying, “I can tell you, in a crisis, there are no 21 steps for approval.”¹⁴⁹

But some military officers reported encountering difficulties in responding to FEMA’s early requests. Captain Michael McDaniel, the lead Navy liaison to FEMA, described his experience in processing the helicopter request: “JDOMS is notorious or has been notorious, ‘Well, you can’t ask for it that way. You need to do it like this.’ Well, tell me how I need to ask for it, you know? I just need some helicopter support down there.”¹⁵⁰ Colonel Harrington, the lead DOD and National Guard Liaison to FEMA, agreed that “Yes, there were some delays over there for different reasons, and that created some angst,”¹⁵¹ adding:

I think it’s just a cultural thing, all the way up. From last year, it was both JDOMS, [Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense], and the SecDef. It was the entire – and even Northern Command to a degree, even though Northern Command was a little more proactive. Just a cultural reluctance that they want to make sure that mission analysis is done and all the options are explored before you come to DOD.¹⁵²

Prior to landfall, General Honoré had asked General Rowe, NORTHCOM Director of Operations, to identify certain assets for the response, including helicopters, boats, and communications equipment, but 12 hours after landfall General Rowe replied that he was “somewhat hamstrung by JDOMS desire to wait for [Requests for Assistance]”¹⁵³ and could not provide these critical assets to General Honoré. To the Committee, General Rowe explained: “I think the primary resistance is the organizational resistance and absence of a detailed, approved plan.”¹⁵⁴

“It’s hard to get them to do anything where there is a chance of failure,” Wells said, adding that DOD wants “to know 80 to 90 percent of the information before they will commit an asset to work with you.”¹⁵⁵ Wells asserted that DOD “could have played a bigger role. They could have played a faster and a bigger role.”¹⁵⁶

While FEMA and DHS officials have complained that DOD did not do enough, and was slow to process requests, this investigation has found that, in fact, FEMA originated very few requests in this early period. In one instance, DOD received complaints from DHS about actions it did take. As discussed above, the Navy had ordered the helicopter carrier USS *Bataan* to sail towards New Orleans behind the storm, and to prepare to provide assistance. However, on Monday afternoon, a senior DOD representative to DHS reported to Assistant Secretary McHale’s staff that “folks over here [are] hopping mad about the news of the Navy ship that announced their deployment without evident legal authority.”¹⁵⁷ The USS *Bataan*, the military’s most significant pre-landfall deployment, with helicopters prepared to assist with search and rescue, was challenged by DHS. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of De-

fense for Homeland Defense had to reassure DHS that USS *Bataan* was simply pre-positioning, and in fact would not engage in the response without the proper request and authorization.¹⁵⁸ *Bataan*'s helicopters launched on Tuesday, becoming the first active-duty aircraft to assist with search and rescue.

The Committee has found that the JDOMS was slow in approving the initial request for helicopter support in Louisiana. The record shows that the time required to process this initial request was not consistent with the scale of the disaster. This timeline and the testimony of witnesses both within and outside of DOD indicates that, while the extent of the damage may not have been known, both a traditional treatment of civil support as a secondary mission and a bureaucratic process slowed the response within the Department. The expeditious response by the helicopters themselves demonstrates that the Army was ready to mobilize, but that in this case, orders slowed the response. As will be seen, however, any reluctance and bureaucracy gave way beginning Tuesday, as top DOD officials took steps to expedite the responsiveness and bypass the ordinary approval process in moving assets forward.

The Pentagon: Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff

During the first two days after landfall, then-Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense Gordon England exercised primary authority over the Department's response because the Secretary was traveling with the President.¹⁵⁹ Deputy Secretary England described the level of accurate information in the Pentagon for the first 24 hours as "no input except what was on the news;"¹⁶⁰ his primary source of information was the television. He said he attempted to contact FEMA Director Michael Brown and other DHS officials early Monday morning, but was unsuccessful.¹⁶¹

Assistant Secretary McHale's office received a situation report at 5 p.m. Monday which included information indicating that the Industrial Canal and the 17th Street Canal levees had breached and that "much of downtown and east New Orleans is underwater."¹⁶² Assistant Secretary McHale's office attempted to contact the Army Corps of Engineers that evening and in the early hours of the next morning regarding these and other reports of levee breaches, but even into Tuesday morning, the Corps was unable to confirm whether the levees had been breached or overtopped, and whether any such damage could be repaired.¹⁶³ At 1:47 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon, DHS transmitted to DOD a report that the Army Corps had confirmed the breach at the 17th Street levee¹⁶⁴ and at 3:15 p.m., Assistant Secretary McHale's office received an e-mail detailing the Army Corps's intentions for repairing the breach.¹⁶⁵

Assistant Secretary McHale acknowledged that damage assessment was one area of the military response that should be improved, particularly after reviewing the lessons of Hurricane Andrew: "One of the fundamental lessons learned ... from Katrina is the need to have available immediate wide-area surveillance capabilities in order to more accurately and rapidly determine how much damage has been experienced."¹⁶⁶

On Tuesday morning, Assistant Secretary McHale instructed his Principal Deputy, Peter Verga, to encourage DHS to appoint a Principal Federal Official (PFO). The NRP dictates that in catastrophic incidents, the Secretary of Homeland Security is to designate a PFO to coordinate the overall federal response,¹⁶⁷ and given the now-apparent scale of the disaster, a PFO would be critical to managing the necessary response efforts. Assistant Secretary McHale said:

It was becoming increasingly clear that the damage was so severe that we would likely have a declaration of a major disaster and that a principal federal official ... was going to be a central element of leadership in terms of the federal response. ... I, therefore, thought that having a named PFO would be an important initial step in triggering the capabilities available under the National Response Plan. So I directed Peter Verga to call DHS and ... serve as a catalyst for the consideration to urge the appointment of a principal federal official ... because the PFO, once appointed, would become a critical enabler of follow-on DOD capabilities. By the end of that day, Mike Brown was appointed the PFO.¹⁶⁸

Furthermore, General Honoré had deployed to the Gulf Coast from Georgia, and NORTHCOM was preparing to designate him as the commander of active-duty military forces committed to the response. Another motivation underlying DOD's suggestion to DHS that it name a PFO appears to be concern within the Pentagon over the potential interpretation of the presence of a three-star general that the military was assuming control over the disaster response. An internal DOD e-mail indicates concern over a uniformed officer "being senior person on the ground." The message also indicates a preference that General Honoré report to a civilian official, and DOD maintain the appropriate posture of the military playing a supporting role.¹⁶⁹

It is not clear what role Verga's phone call played in Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff's decision to appoint a PFO; Assistant Secretary McHale stated in testimony, "All I know for sure is we did make that recommendation and that, by the end of the day, a PFO ... had been appointed."¹⁷⁰

U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM)

As discussed in Chapter 12 (Federal Preparations), NORTHCOM Operations Directorate had been conducting daily interagency teleconferences since August 24 to coordinate the military response.¹⁷¹ By 1:30 p.m. Mountain Time Monday, damage assessments were beginning, but were not conclusive.¹⁷² NORTHCOM's Deputy Director of Intelligence, Captain Brett Markham, told the Committee that "we relied heavily, on the 29th, on our National Technical Means"¹⁷³ (sensory equipment managed by national intelligence agencies to collect information for the benefit of the entire federal government). He said that some information – including a graphic representation of flooding received from the National Geospatial Agency¹⁷⁴ – was collected on August 29,¹⁷⁵ but that it didn't present a sufficiently clear picture.¹⁷⁶ Colonel Wesley McClellan, a senior member of NORTHCOM's Interagency Coordination Group, which comprises numerous interagency representatives, said that it also lacked damage assessment information, and was unable to specify the types of support needed from DOD.¹⁷⁷ Like his counterparts at the Pentagon, Admiral Keating, the NORTHCOM Commander, also woke up on Tuesday believing that "New Orleans dodged a bullet."¹⁷⁸ However, as the extent of the damage became clear on Tuesday, NORTHCOM staff clearly saw the need for military assistance, but was frustrated by the paucity of requests for assistance. Brigadier General Harold Moulton, who later in the week deployed from NORTHCOM to establish a command-and-control headquarters in New Orleans, described the growing frustration that developed as the damage became apparent:

The National Response Plan process establishes a sequence which goes from local asking for help from the state, state asking for help from the federal government, the federal looking around and choosing which appropriate spot through the mission assignment process to eventually get into. ... That whole concept seemed to be, for lack of a better term, frustrating for this staff and for

Admiral Keating as they were trying to figure out how to respond to this compelling human tragedy that they could see unfolding on TV.¹⁷⁹

Colonel Daskevich, who had deployed from Oklahoma on Saturday to serve as the DCO – NORTHCOM’s direct representative – in Baton Rouge, reported to the State Emergency Operations Center at 4:30 a.m. Monday.¹⁸⁰ He also spent most of Monday struggling to gain an accurate picture of the situation, and acknowledged that from Baton Rouge, he in fact had very little awareness of the developments in New Orleans. Colonel Daskevich appears to have received a report of levee failure on Monday.¹⁸¹ However, because he was unfamiliar with the significance of the levees, he did not recognize the potential implications of this limited information.¹⁸² “The hunt for information in the first 24, 48 hours after the storm was a challenge,” he said.¹⁸³ Having deployed with only one additional staff member, as ordered by NORTHCOM, Colonel Daskevich acknowledged that a lack of manpower, communications equipment, and operating space within the State Emergency Operations Center rendered it “extraordinarily demanding to try to keep up with all of the information flow and, of course, to actually do business” during the first several days.¹⁸⁴

The “Blank Check”

Whatever you can think of and get it moving *yesterday*, carriers, helos, trucks, amphibis, LCACs [Landing Craft Air Cushion], C-17s, C-130s, hospital ships, medical teams – whatever. Overkill is better than undershoot. POTUS [President of the United States] is coming back to D.C. tonight just for this.¹⁸⁵

–Admiral Ed Giambastiani, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to Admiral Keating, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, August 30, 2005.

Though officials had begun to learn more about the extent of the damage, through Tuesday morning the Department remained in a posture as dictated by the NRP, to allow FEMA to coordinate the response.¹⁸⁶ At the same time, senior officials within the Department responsible for homeland defense were becoming concerned that they were not receiving requests from FEMA, and that awaiting such requests could further delay the movement of military assets. Assistant Secretary McHale, who that morning met with Deputy Secretary England, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Myers to discuss the hurricane and the Department’s response during the daily morning briefing, said that notwithstanding media reports “that were less sobering than the scope of the actual damage,” the leadership recognized that the Department needed to mobilize its assets for the support requests they anticipated:

We were much more focused and concerned than the published reports of the damage might have justified. In part that was because certain key individuals expressed a deep concern that the damage was more severe than was being reported and so there was a collective sense that Hurricane Katrina was likely to be equal to or greater in damage than that of Hurricane Andrew in 1992.¹⁸⁷

Yet officials within the Pentagon were surprised at the silence from FEMA. First thing in the morning, General Myers inquired from his Operations Directorate how many requests the Joint Staff had received, “and the answer was, We hadn’t got any.” A resulting discussion with the Deputy Secretary, then, led to the conclusion that “We need to start leaning forward – they’re going to need some Department of Defense assets.”¹⁸⁸

During a meeting at 7:30 a.m. Central Time, Deputy Secretary England informed senior Pentagon officials, including representatives of the military services and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of the Department’s commitment to quickly provide to the

NORTHCOM Commander whatever assets were needed to support the overall hurricane response, and urged all commanders to “lean forward” to be able to quickly meet requests for assistance.¹⁸⁹ In a subsequent call that morning to Admiral Keating, Deputy Secretary England made clear that NORTHCOM would be provided any asset Admiral Keating deemed necessary.

Deputy Secretary England reported to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld:

We are leaning forward on all fronts. I have authorized all local commanders to provide their assistance and have authorized NORTHCOM and the Chairman to take all appropriate measures to push forward available DOD assets that could be useful to FEMA.¹⁹⁰

In a meeting at 3:40 p.m.,¹⁹¹ General Myers then instructed his service chiefs to work together with NORTHCOM in determining necessary assets, telling them to pre-position resources in anticipation of a request for assistance from FEMA, if they thought it prudent.¹⁹² To expedite the deployment process, he instructed the services to proceed on the authority of this vocal command – Secretary England’s direct instruction to Admiral Keating, and his own guidance to the service chiefs – and that the necessary paperwork would follow later.¹⁹³ “Think large,” he told them.¹⁹⁴

A vocal command of this magnitude is extremely rare in DOD. For the purpose of ensuring legality, availability of resources, and documentation of the chain of command, all deployments are normally processed rigorously through specific written orders and electronic tracking systems. Deputy Secretary England’s command represented an extraordinary delegation of military judgment, on the assurance that Admiral Keating would keep the Department informed. It was a “blank check,”¹⁹⁵ Deputy Secretary England said. Assistant Secretary McHale elaborated: “What was communicated ... was what we in the military call ‘commander’s intent.’ The message from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, consistent with the counsel provided by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, was to act with a sense of urgency and to minimize paperwork and bureaucracy to the greatest extent possible.”¹⁹⁶ As Admiral Keating understood the direction, “We’re moving anything we think FEMA will need. No obstacles from DOD or Joint Staff.”¹⁹⁷ While DOD’s inherent authorities to respond had not changed, and it was understood that all the necessary paperwork would follow, the decision reflected an extraordinary delegation to the military commanders. Assistant Secretary McHale said, “The climate in the decision-making process in this department could not have been more proactive than it was.”¹⁹⁸

Although individual commanders had already begun moving assets and conducting pre-deployment preparations, many witnesses have credited these actions with fundamentally shifting the overall response of DOD, particularly at the departmental level, into a proactive mode. Captain McDaniel, who represented the Navy to FEMA, said:

The pendulum swung from one extreme to the other through this. I mean, it went from having to pry Secretary Rumsfeld’s fingers off of a helicopter package ... and this 100-pound [sic] gorilla just goes, “Okay, we’ve got it.” Boom, and then the floodgates open.¹⁹⁹

Colonel Harrington agreed that the “cultural reluctance” had now been overcome, and that attitudes within the Department “dramatically shifted” as “things got a little crazy.”²⁰⁰

On Wednesday morning, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs issued guidance to Joint Forces Command (which maintains control of most military assets within the United States until they are assigned to Combatant Commanders such as NORTHCOM), consistent with his

guidance to the service chiefs on Tuesday: “(1) Continue to lean forward; (2) Remind services to work through Joint Task Force components; and (3) Be aggressive but don’t get in FEMA’s way.”²⁰¹ Forces had begun to deploy in large numbers to the region, some requested by NORTHCOM, and many others volunteering on their own initiative. The initial result was a “wide open barn door,” according to General Rowe, with NORTHCOM having difficulty tracking self-deployed assets.²⁰²

“Our primary concern for Wednesday will be search and rescue” Admiral Keating informed his staff. “Temperature index likely to exceed 100F in New Orleans. Folks that survived certain to need water, then food, then shelter.”²⁰³ However, officials at the Pentagon were surprised to have so few requests from DHS in the first few days after landfall.²⁰⁴ (See Chapter 23 for information on the assistance-request system.)

Colonel Darryl Roberson, Assistant Deputy Director for Antiterrorism and Homeland Defense in the Joint Staff, described his frustration at not being asked to do more sooner:

I will tell you that I personally felt very frustrated that we had not been called in earlier. We had assets available. We were all leaning forward. We knew we were going to receive them. We responded, in my opinion, in an unprecedented manner to everything that we got. I am absolutely convinced in my heart that it is a good-news story that DOD came to the rescue. That may sound strong. Obviously I’m biased. But in my mind, DOD saved the day to a large extent, and it was because of what we did. My frustration comes from the fact that I think we could have done it earlier if we had been asked.²⁰⁵

Assistant Secretary McHale expressed a similar frustration, stating that throughout the first week, he believed that FEMA’s requests for assistance were still not commensurate with the scale of the catastrophe and the types of efforts that would be required of DOD, and that even “by Saturday it was clear that the [requests] we had received, reviewed, and approved were pretty narrow in scope.”²⁰⁶ Yet on the message conveyed by Deputy Secretary England, military forces converged upon the Gulf Coast.

Mobilization of Military Forces

Despite an overall lack of awareness within the Department about conditions in Louisiana and Mississippi, a number of military commanders within the services took action, pursuant to their own command authority, to prepare assets for potential requests for assistance. In general, it is possible to characterize commanders’ actions throughout the first week as one of three types: (1) preparation and mobilization into the Joint Operating Area in coordination with NORTHCOM; (2) mobilization into the Joint Operating Area, but without full coordination with NORTHCOM; and (3) individual preparations conducted within the services, without specific orders to do so. To characterize the response most broadly, commanders took action consistent with the guidance of Deputy Secretary England and General Myers, making all reasonable efforts to pre-position assets or prepare for their deployment. And indeed, the overwhelming majority of deployments occurred prior to a request by DHS or FEMA. As will be discussed below, the lack of expected requests in fact led the Department to draft requests *for* FEMA, in recognition that such military assistance was required, but that FEMA had either failed to ascertain the requirements, or had inadequately expressed the requirements to DOD.

However, the original intent of the Secretary’s vocal order was that despite the lack of paperwork, all deployments and preparations were to be undertaken in coordination with NORTHCOM to ensure that Admiral Keating had knowledge of all forces operating in the

region, and to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the military response. The Committee has found that preparations in the early stages led to a faster response when the requests and orders finally came, and the pre-positioning of assets was essential to responding to immediate needs. Yet not all deployments were coordinated with NORTHCOM, possibly detracting from the unified effort as intended by officials, and ultimately causing NORTHCOM to deploy a headquarters “to get our arms around this Title 10 force structure that’s now just basically all merging on the same local area,”²⁰⁷ as described by the headquarters commander, General Moulton.

A NORTHCOM execute order at 10 p.m. Central Time expanded the geographic reach of commanders’ ability to provide assistance under the Immediate Response Authority. Whereas this authority was previously limited to a commander’s immediate vicinity, it now granted commanders located anywhere within the Joint Operating Area authority to provide assistance anywhere in the region, provided they coordinated with NORTHCOM through Joint Task Force Katrina.²⁰⁸ The combination of this order with the vocal direction from Deputy Secretary England and General Myers broadened the authority of military commanders to operate domestically, and was an extraordinary departure from the Department’s ordinary procedures. Because the Deputy Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs had encouraged commanders to use their inherent authority to pre-position assets into the disaster area (while coordinating with NORTHCOM), this order now permitted any pre-positioned unit to provide assistance using the expanded immediate response authority.

Navy

The Committee found that, overall, the Navy showed a strong willingness to push assets into response efforts, ultimately sending more than 20 ships and 100 aircraft into the Gulf of Mexico, often in advance of a request or an order. The Navy provided a wide variety of mobile platforms for landing and servicing aircraft, treating patients, transporting enormous quantities of cargo and commodities, in addition to land-based assets which included engineering battalions of Seabees and logistics support.²⁰⁹ But more than other services’ assets, which may often arrive by air in a matter of hours, the mobility of the Navy’s primary assets is limited by the “time-distance” problem: An immutable factor in a ship’s ability to arrive on scene is the distance it must travel and its maximum steaming speed. In this case, the presence of the helicopter carrier USS *Bataan* in the Gulf of Mexico prior to Katrina proved extremely fortunate, for many of the ships had to steam from Norfolk, Virginia, and with the combined preparation and steaming time, did not arrive in the Gulf until Saturday and Sunday.²¹⁰ But preparations for the ships’ deployment began shortly after landfall, even as the initial lack of damage assessments created an information vacuum.

In accordance with standard practice for hurricanes, Second Fleet Commander Vice Admiral Mark Fitzgerald placed a group of three amphibious-warfare ships in port in Norfolk, VA, on 24-hour alert for possible deployment.²¹¹ These three ships – the USS *Iwo Jima*, USS *Shreveport*, and USS *Tortuga* – had been previously designated as the Expeditionary Strike Group (ESG) to respond to contingencies on the East Coast or in the Atlantic Ocean.²¹² The ESG has large-deck vessels for landing helicopters, “well-decks” for retrieving amphibious landing craft, significant hangar and deck space for supplies, refueling capacity for helicopters, and facilities to provide showers, food, and water for both victims and response personnel. Admiral Fitzgerald also contacted Coast Guard Vice Admiral Vivien Crea, on Tuesday morning, and “offered help” from the Navy. He credits this channel of coordination as essential to the events of the first week; he had difficulty communicating with General Honoré and with NORTHCOM because of the initial focus on National Guard and Army land-based missions.²¹³ Ad-

miral Crea confirmed that, “The Navy was very proactive in sending things down. We didn’t have to ask them. . . . They started diverting ships and aircraft that direction.”²¹⁴

Meanwhile, having been stationed in the Gulf of Mexico at the conclusion of a previously scheduled exercise held prior to Katrina, the USS *Bataan* followed Katrina, and by Tuesday morning was within 150 to 200 miles of New Orleans.²¹⁵ Watching the news, the vessel’s commanders began identifying ways to help. At 3 p.m. CT, the *Bataan* received orders from Second Fleet to send helicopters into New Orleans to conduct search and rescue missions in coordination with Coast Guard District Eight.²¹⁶ The Navy and Marine Corps helicopters were in the air by 5 p.m., and reported to the Coast Guard Air Station commander,²¹⁷ that, as the designated On-Scene Commander, held responsibility for coordinating all air search-and-rescue assets. They were joined by two Navy SH-3 helicopters from Pensacola that arrived unannounced at the Coast Guard station, offering their services.²¹⁸ In all, USS *Bataan*’s aircraft rescued, evacuated, or transported over 2,000 persons.²¹⁹

Fleet Forces Command and Second Fleet identified Rear Admiral Joseph Kilkenny, Commander of the USS *Harry S. Truman* Carrier Strike Group, to represent the Navy on the proposed Joint Task Force Katrina under General Honoré.²²⁰ The Task Force was formally established late Tuesday night; Admiral Kilkenny flew to Naval Air Station Pensacola Wednesday morning,²²¹ where he began coordinating the deployment of Navy helicopters to the region.²²² Admiral Kilkenny echoed Admiral Fitzgerald’s statement that General Honoré was difficult to reach during the first few days, but that he was able to report back on his actions through Second Fleet;²²³ Admiral Kilkenny said that he knew General Honoré’s general intentions to focus on the immediate saving of lives through search and rescue, and could proceed by simply coordinating with Second Fleet.²²⁴

At 3 p.m. CT Tuesday, Fleet Forces Command had directed Second Fleet to launch the ESG. USS *Iwo Jima*, USS *Shreveport*, and USS *Tortuga* left Norfolk, Virginia, on Wednesday, scheduled to arrive off the Louisiana coast on Sunday afternoon.²²⁵ They carried a standard load of equipment called the Disaster Relief Kit. The kit included supplies such as bulldozers, medical supplies, water purification, and other equipment.²²⁶ Fleet Forces Command then deployed the aircraft carrier *Truman* (without orders from NORTHCOM) in order to provide fuel and deck space for the rapidly increasing fleet of helicopters. The aircraft carrier departed Norfolk on Thursday. On Friday NORTHCOM submitted a Request For Forces to the Joint Staff asking that *Truman* be committed to the response.²²⁷ The *Truman* was tasked with supporting the Joint Task Force upon its arrival off the coast of Biloxi, MS, on Sunday, September 4.²²⁸

On Thursday, Admiral Crea requested that Second Fleet assist with clearing channels in order to reopen shipping lanes into New Orleans and the Mississippi River, one of the nation’s most critical commercial routes, as quickly as possible.²²⁹ USS *Grapple* deployed the same day, assisting with salvage operations in Pascagoula, MS, on September 6. The mine-countermeasures ship USNS *Altair* deployed from Ingleside, TX, on Friday, September 2, and commenced port clearance operations on Saturday, September 3, arriving alongside the pier in New Orleans the same day.²³⁰ With the channel clear, the *Tortuga* was able to proceed up the river on Sunday, followed by the *Iwo Jima* on Monday, September 5.

In addition to serving as General Honoré’s headquarters for the Joint Task Force in New Orleans, USS *Iwo Jima* provided showers, food, and rest for the first responders who had operated in the devastated city for a week. As the ship’s captain described in an e-mail on September 6:

We are one [of] the few full service airports in the area and have been operating aircraft . . . for almost 15 hours each day. We are also one of the only air

conditioned facilities within a 10 mile radius and ... we are also the only hot shower within miles. All day long we have been accommodating local policemen, firemen, state troopers, National Guard, 82nd Airborne division personnel with hot showers and hot food.²³¹

Numerous other ships and forces deployed, including the High Speed Vessel USS *Swift*, to replenish USS *Bataan* with disaster relief supplies, three Logistics Support vessels, and four amphibious hover-landing craft to transport supplies into New Orleans.²³² The hospital ship USNS *Comfort* had begun its preparations on Sunday before landfall; because its specialized personnel and equipment required additional preparation time, it deployed from Baltimore, MD, on Friday, September 2, arriving in Pascagoula, MS, on September 9.²³³

The Navy also deployed medium-lift and heavy-lift helicopters from 15 squadrons throughout the country. In addition to those already operating from the USS *Bataan*, a total of 50 rotary-wing aircraft deployed from Jacksonville, Norfolk, Corpus Christi, and San Diego,²³⁴ to assist with search and rescue, evacuation, and logistical operations. (See Chapter 21, Search and Rescue) The heavy-lift H-53 aircraft assisted the levee-repair operations, dropping sandbags into the breaches.²³⁵

Army

General Honoré, based at Fort Gillem, GA, as Commanding General of First Army, planned to deploy to the Gulf Coast as soon as the storm had cleared. Although he had not been ordered to do so, he wanted to establish himself in the area to be positioned advantageously as the response progressed: “My thought was ‘get there,’ because the first rule of war is you’ve got to get there,” he said.²³⁶ His authority as an Army commander permitted him to move from one military installation to another provided that such a movement could be considered training. Thus, he created an “Exercise Katrina,” and in coordination with NORTHCOM and his superior officer at Army Forces Command, planned his move to Camp Shelby, an Army facility in southern Mississippi.

General Honoré explained that it was not in his nature to wait for a Request for Assistance or deployment orders prior to moving: “That is a response, sometimes, by folks to say, ‘Let’s wait until they ask for something.’ But in this case, we’ve got a case where we need to save life and limb. We can’t wait for a [Request for Assistance] or shouldn’t be waiting for one. If there’s capability, we need to start moving.”²³⁷

General Honoré informed NORTHCOM and Admiral Keating of his plan to deploy to Camp Shelby on Monday afternoon,²³⁸ but because Katrina continued to track northward from the Gulf Coast, he could not move until Tuesday morning.²³⁹ He arrived at 11 a.m. CT²⁴⁰ and surveyed the base and the surrounding region of Gulfport and Biloxi, which looked to him like they “had been hit by a nuclear weapon.”²⁴¹ General Honoré had previously received NORTHCOM’s warning order to “be prepared to establish [Joint Task Force] Katrina covering the states of LA, MS, AL, FL, KY, TN, and GA for command and control of consequence management operations resulting from the severe weather caused by Hurricane Katrina.”²⁴² (A *Warning Order* instructs a commander to take all necessary preparations so as to be able to react immediately to a likely forthcoming *Deployment Order* or *Execute Order*). A NORTHCOM Execute Order, sent at 4 p.m. CT, alerted him to establish the Joint Task Force “on order.”²⁴³ At 10 p.m. CT, he received that order, officially converting his training mission into an operational mission.²⁴⁴ General Honoré assumed control over all active-duty forces then and subsequently involved in the response within the above states, now designated as the Joint Operating Area; he would report to NORTHCOM.

With General Honoré now in command of an area which bridged the areas of responsibility of First Army and Fifth Army, Fifth Army wanted to provide assistance to him. Colonel Daskevich, the DCO for Louisiana, lacked the necessary personnel and equipment to effectively cope with the constant flow of information and demands for his assistance from numerous levels and organizations. Fifth Army Deputy Commander Brigadier General Mark Graham deployed from Fort Hood on Wednesday to provide more senior DOD representation in Baton Rouge, and to handle the requests from higher levels. Bringing a small headquarters planning staff, he arrived at the Louisiana Emergency Operations Center at 5 p.m. CT and in a meeting with Governor Blanco, Louisiana Adjutant General Bennett Landreneau, and General Honoré was soon assigned the task of planning and coordinating the evacuation of New Orleans.²⁴⁵

Preparing for Deployment of Federal Troops

Of the vast quantity and range of military forces which deployed to the Katrina response, from ships and aircraft to medical teams and amphibious-assault craft, one deployment is distinguished from all others – one for which no FEMA mission assignment was issued, and which did not originate from a decision within DOD. On Saturday, September 3, the President ordered 7,200 troops from the high-alert units of the Army and the Marine Corps to deploy to Louisiana and Mississippi for the general purpose of humanitarian assistance. Although the Committee has not been provided access to documents and individuals explaining the reason for this deployment, the next section in this chapter will further discuss the events leading up to the deployment, beginning with Governor Blanco’s plea to President Bush on the night of August 29 for “everything you have got” and continuing through further requests and discussions between Louisiana, NORTHCOM, and Washington, D.C. The following will present the preparations conducted by the Army and the Marine Corps, which began, as might be expected of prudent commanders, with planning for assistance that might be required, despite lack of specific guidance. Although the preparations within the Army and the Marine Corps proceeded on very similar timetables, the Committee has been unable to establish whether these preparations were conducted in coordination with or based on guidance from NORTHCOM, the Joint Staff, or the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, or whether the services were preparing individually to react to the growing crisis in New Orleans.

82nd Airborne Division

The 82nd Airborne Division, commanded by Major General William Caldwell and based at Fort Bragg, NC, includes a combat unit known as the Division Ready Brigade, which consists of about 3,700 soldiers, is maintained on a high state of readiness, and has an advance element prepared to deploy anywhere in the world within 18 hours of receiving orders.²⁴⁶ Beginning Tuesday, the Division’s planning cell identified the assets that might be required to assist in the hurricane response, reviewed standing procedures for hurricane preparation, and consulted with an experienced DCO on the NRP and the standard procedures for providing assistance to civil authorities. Wednesday evening, Forces Command ordered that the Army “be prepared to provide a brigade-size force to operate distribution centers, and/or if appropriate authorization were received, conduct crowd control and security in the vicinity of New Orleans.”²⁴⁷

General Caldwell considered this guidance to be vague, and merely a codification of the general guidance provided by Forces Command in preparation for hurricane season, but issued an internal warning order to the Division Ready Brigade, increasing the state of readiness. Although the Division usually keeps an advance team of only 120 soldiers on two-hour recall, General Caldwell ordered all 5,000 soldiers to stand by in two-hour response mode.²⁴⁸

After receiving a call Friday morning from the Commander of Forces Command, which to him signaled a high likelihood of involvement, General Caldwell directed his staff to commence an exercise simulating a rapid deployment, combining all elements of the brigade – aviation, infantry, logistics, communications, and certain types of support. He also coordinated with Lieutenant General Robert Dale of U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM), based at Scott Air Force Base in St. Louis, MO, to pre-position four C-17 transport aircraft at Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina, in preparation for the deployment.²⁴⁹



Soldiers heading for the Gulf Coast
Army National Guard photo

Friday evening, Forces Command issued warning orders indicating that a deployment was likely, the first specific indication to General Caldwell that the Division Ready Brigade would, on short notice, be required to assist with the distribution of commodities, crowd control, and security in New Orleans.²⁵⁰

On Saturday morning the President announced the deployment in an address to the nation:

Today I ordered the Department of Defense to deploy additional active-duty forces to the region. Over the next 24 to 72 hours, more than 7,000 additional troops from the 82nd Airborne, from the 1st Cavalry, the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, and the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force will arrive in the affected areas. These forces will be on the ground and operating under the direct command of General Russ Honoré.²⁵¹

This public announcement was the first word that General Caldwell received that his brigade would deploy, although official orders from Forces Command arrived early in the afternoon.²⁵² General Caldwell contacted General Honoré, who told him: “[G]et here as fast as you can.” General Honoré also asked General Caldwell to bring a substantial command-and-control capability, by which he meant the appropriate personnel, equipment, and communications assets to plan, direct, and coordinate the numerous missions required of them. General Caldwell adjusted his deployment package correspondingly, adding several headquarters elements to enable the coordination and integration of ground forces, aviation units, and support personnel.²⁵³

The deployment began within hours; General Caldwell arrived in New Orleans seven hours after the President’s announcement. “Fix the airport, and fix New Orleans” was General Honoré’s guidance. Over the next two days, the 82nd Airborne presence swelled to more than 3,000 soldiers, many of whom arrived in a convoy of nearly 1,400 vehicles from Fort Bragg, North Carolina.²⁵⁴

General Caldwell then learned further from General Honoré that his mission was, first, to conduct search and rescue, then to provide humanitarian assistance, and third to provide presence. In its initial days, the 82nd Airborne assisted in restoring order at New Orleans International Airport and at the Convention Center, which continued to be a focal point for evacuees throughout the city, simply through their presence, and established connections

with the New Orleans Police Department. “I think the biggest, I’ll be honest, [thing] we probably did was to give them a sense of assurance that everybody is there to help you,” As General Caldwell said.²⁵⁵ Beginning Sunday, the 82nd Airborne worked with the National Guard in dividing the city into search sectors, and on Monday amplified FEMA’s search efforts by providing helicopters, boats, trucks, and additional troops to the Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) teams.²⁵⁶

First Cavalry Division

The First Air Cavalry Brigade of the 1st Cavalry Division in Fort Hood, TX, which consists of an aviation unit of UH-60 utility helicopters and CH-47 heavy-lift helicopters and a battalion of 1,500 troops, had begun “prudent planning” prior to landfall. The first order for two UH-60s arrived on Tuesday morning as a result of FEMA’s request to support the Rapid Needs Assessment teams in Louisiana. Later that day, the brigade received orders for six additional aircraft, which departed for New Orleans on Wednesday and joined the Louisiana National Guard search-and-rescue efforts based at the Superdome.²⁵⁷ (See Chapter 21.)

On Wednesday, the brigade received a warning order to prepare a command-and-control headquarters element for Title 10 (federalized National Guard) forces,²⁵⁸ a conduit for communications and planning consisting of 50 soldiers. Accordingly, the brigade commander, Colonel Dan Shanahan, departed to Naval Air Station Belle Chasse in New Orleans on Thursday evening, reporting to Joint Task Force Katrina as an aviation task force in command of Army aviation units, and coordinating with the Coast Guard.²⁵⁹ A medical evacuation unit of nine helicopters arrived from Fort Benning, GA, joining search-and-rescue efforts, evacuation, and distribution of food and water. By September 11, 50 aircraft were operating in Colonel Shanahan’s task force, although there was “always a need for more aircraft.”²⁶⁰

The Second Brigade Combat Team of the 1st Cavalry Division also received warning orders from Forces Command.²⁶¹ Like General Caldwell, Brigade Commander Colonel Bryan Roberts described the message’s guidance as very general, but he ordered his staff to begin preparing approximately 300 light and heavy vehicles for deployment. Their vehicles were undergoing maintenance following their recent return from Iraq, and so needed a 72-hour period to ready for deployment. Colonel Roberts understood that the mission would likely involve search and rescue, evacuation, debris removal, traffic control, and distribution of commodities. Colonel Roberts believed the soldiers were well-versed in these tasks because they had performed similar missions in their overseas commitments.²⁶²

Colonel Roberts flew to New Orleans International Airport on Friday in order to survey the area where he expected the team to stage.²⁶³ He returned to Fort Hood Saturday morning; by the time he arrived, the President had announced that the 1st Cavalry Division would deploy that day along with the 82nd Airborne.²⁶⁴ He arrived with his advance element on Sunday and reported to General Caldwell. Colonel Roberts’s unit began to arrive on Monday, with 1,638 troops on-site by Tuesday.

The 1st Cavalry operated primarily in Algiers Parish, on the south bank of the Mississippi River, conducting door-to-door search-and-rescue operations. Evacuation was to be voluntary only. Soldiers received guidance to knock on doors, and offer food, water, and assistance, and were all briefed on the Rules on the Use of Force,²⁶⁵ which explained the implications of the Posse Comitatus Act, which prohibits federal military forces from engaging in law-enforcement duties. The rules stated, “Force will be used only as last resort. If you must use force to fulfill your duties, use the minimum force required.”²⁶⁶ The 133rd Field Artillery Regiment of the Texas National Guard was embedded within the brigade in order to provide law-enforcement capability to the brigade as it patrolled the parish.²⁶⁷

Marine Corps

II Marine Expeditionary Force and 4th Marine Division

Much like the Army commands described above, commands within the Marine Corps planned, beginning mid-week, for the deployment of troops that were the most prepared and set at the highest level of alert posture. Unlike the Army, however, the Marines took additional preparatory actions for a major troop deployment, including positioning a headquarters command element in New Orleans, and sending engineering equipment via Navy ships. Indeed, evidence before the Committee suggests that the Marines may have ordered a significant portion of their troops and assets to deploy prior to the President's order on Saturday.

Lieutenant General James Amos, Commander of the II Marine Expeditionary Force based at Camp Lejeune, NC, called together his Planning Team immediately after landfall on Monday. Having begun to identify engineering equipment and aircraft in the preceding days, he now instructed his staff to plan for a major deployment of air and ground forces.²⁶⁸ As with the Norfolk-based naval units, there were initially no orders from NORTHCOM or the Joint Staff directing these Marine units to deploy. But mid-day Tuesday, after the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs had urged the services to be proactive in moving forces forward, General Amos received a Warning Order from his superior officer, the Commander of Marine Forces Atlantic, directing him to prepare to deploy the helicopters his staff had already identified.²⁶⁹

On Thursday, General Amos deployed helicopters and transport aircraft to Naval Air Station Pensacola in preparation for a variety of support missions.²⁷⁰ Expecting that tasking would soon be forthcoming for “lots of Marines,” he loaded his engineering equipment onto the USS *Iwo Jima* Strike Group on Thursday²⁷¹ and sent an advance party to establish a command-and-control headquarters at Naval Air Station Belle Chasse.²⁷² In anticipation of a deployment order he “put them [the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit (24 MEU), an infantry battalion of 1,200 Marines] on their packs” in preparation to deploy as early as Friday.²⁷³ At the time, the 24 MEU was the Marine equivalent of the Army's Division Ready Brigade, postured at the highest state of readiness and prepared to deploy anywhere in the world.

Evidence and testimony received by the Committee suggest that the Marine deployments were not fully coordinated within DOD, and that NORTHCOM was not fully aware of Marine Corps efforts in the Gulf. General Amos e-mailed General Honoré on Thursday morning, writing that he was sending helicopters and engineering equipment. “What can I do for you?” he asked.²⁷⁴ General Honoré responded, “HELLO BROTHER GET HERE AS FAST AS YOU CAN.”²⁷⁵ Friday morning, when General Amos told General Honoré of his intentions to send a command-and-control suite to New Orleans, General Honoré replied: “[It's] hitting fan get here fast as you can.”²⁷⁶ That day General Amos flew five aircraft to Belle Chasse carrying 150 Marines – the majority of the battalion's command element – along with a mobile communications suite, capable of establishing a command-and-control headquarters anywhere in the world.²⁷⁷ An e-mail to General Rowe of NORTHCOM from one of his planners shows that the Marines' preparatory movements were not coordinated with NORTHCOM: “They do not have orders to move out yet but they are inside our [Joint Operating Area] w/out [Joint Task Force Katrina] or [NORTHCOM visibility].”²⁷⁸

General O'Dell stated that a plan was already in place for the full deployment of Marines: “I knew it was General Amos's intention to deploy 24 MEU.”²⁷⁹ As General Amos confirmed, “I anticipated them leaving on Friday. I figured the [deployment] order was going to be signed on Friday.”²⁸⁰ The Committee received evidence that at least a preliminary or partial deployment order was signed on Friday.²⁸¹ On that date, Marine Forces Atlantic directed that a Marine task force, to consist of a broad range of air and ground amphibious assault assets from the 24 MEU and the Marine Reserve Forces, begin deploying on Friday, September 2,

and fully deploy no later than Saturday, September 3.²⁸² The troops were to deploy to Naval Air Station Belle Chasse, using their authority to reposition from one military base to another (as General Honoré had done in his initial movement to Camp Shelby) and to prepare to support General Honoré. Once established at Belle Chasse, they would be able to provide support on the expanded Immediate Response Authority granted by NORTHCOM.

Under these authorities, the deployment order appears to have been given in the spirit of General Myers's guidance encouraging the services to pre-position assets to enable their rapid employment when requested by FEMA. However, the deployment does not appear to have been fully coordinated within DOD. In particular, unlike all other troop deployments into the area under NORTHCOM's command, there had been no corresponding request for forces from NORTHCOM. General Rowe stated that although he knew General Amos and General Honoré were communicating, he was unaware of the specific exchanges leading up to the order: "That's one part of the help that I will have to give you that we did not ask for. However, I am aware that General Amos and General Honoré corresponded. General Honoré shared that with me, that General Honoré at that point said the help would be appreciated."²⁸³

Furthermore, this urgent need for the deployment of Marine troops does not appear to have been fully communicated to other DOD officials considering whether there was a need to deploy active-duty troops.

The next day, Saturday, September 3, the President issued a broad order for the deployment of active-duty ground troops. Because General Amos had anticipated the deployment for several days, with his Marines "sitting on their packs," they were "ready to go. ... I was determined that when we got the Execute Order, we were going to darken the skies with C-130s and get them down there as quickly as we can."²⁸⁴ Over the next 28 hours, aircraft ferried 1,250 troops, now reporting to General O'Dell,²⁸⁵ who had been appointed as Marine Component Commander for the Joint Task Force, reporting directly to General Honoré.

General O'Dell confirmed that the Friday order from Marine Forces Atlantic was subsumed into the President's order on Saturday: "Prior to the President's order, for planning, I knew that we would have elements of my division as I've described and 24 MEU from Camp Lejeune ... available." Most significantly, he added that the only thing that the President's order changed about the Marines' plans was that an element from the West Coast joined the 24 MEU.²⁸⁶

The forces initially operated in southwestern Mississippi, and then moved to St. Bernard Parish and the Lower Ninth Ward in New Orleans to perform door-to-door search and rescue missions. The West Coast-based Marines of the 11 MEU, however, were an unexpected capability. General O'Dell explained that he had not incorporated them into his plans, and that it was a challenge for him to provide them appropriate tasking and operating space: "We had to find work for them. We really had to look to find work for them."²⁸⁷ Ultimately, he said, the 11 MEU was tasked with debris removal in Slidell, Louisiana, where their efforts were initially welcomed, "but toward the end of the ten-day period, they were picking up sticks in granny's yard."²⁸⁸

U.S. Air Force and U.S. Transportation Command

Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) holds responsibility for ground, air, and sea logistical and transportation support to military operations, and is assigned a supporting role to the Department of Health and Human Services in patient evacuation operations. The command had alerted C-17 and C-5 transport aircraft on August 28; the crews were in three-hour standby status. According to Brigadier General Paul Selva, Director of Opera-

tions, TRANSCOM again followed its standard practice 12 hours after landfall, alerting eight additional aircraft.²⁸⁹

The first mission received was to transport eight Swift Water rescue teams from Travis and March Air Force Bases in California to Louisiana for surface search and rescue.²⁹⁰ Although Deputy Secretary England approved the request by 11 a.m. on Tuesday, TRANSCOM still had to locate a suitable airfield to receive these heavy-lift aircraft. Colonel Glen Joerger was assigned on Monday as the TRANSCOM liaison to FEMA in Washington, D.C., and arranged for Contingency Response Groups – on alert since Sunday – to deploy to re-open the New Orleans and Gulfport airports; both had been flooded, and their lighting and communications systems had suffered damage.²⁹¹ As a result, it was determined that the aircraft would land at Lafayette Regional Airport while the larger fields were reopened. The Response Groups evaluated the condition, restoring lighting, communications, and navigation systems, and performing maintenance on departing planes. By Tuesday evening, the airports were reopened, and the TRANSCOM aircraft were able to land with the Swift Water teams.²⁹²

Some witnesses attributed the timeline of this mission to a delay within DOD in approving the mission assignment for the aircraft. And although the request was initiated during the period in which DOD’s culture of reluctance is said to have slowed the approval process, the record shows that DOD personnel began work on this assignment on Monday, August 29, and that any delay was introduced by the difficulty in finding a suitable landing field rather than by the approval process itself.

On Thursday evening, September 1, DOD received a mission assignment to airlift evacuees from New Orleans to Houston.²⁹³ The Joint Staff processed the request on Friday, but the first evacuation airlift from the New Orleans International Airport had already occurred by 8 a.m. Thursday morning.²⁹⁴ The TRANSCOM operations at the airport actually involved three separate missions, according to Colonel Joerger: patient evacuation, citizen evacuation, and cargo delivery.²⁹⁵ TRANSCOM provided 15 transport aircraft – five C-17s, C-5s, and C-130s each – for the evacuation of patients as part of the National Disaster Medical System²⁹⁶ (National Disaster Medical System is an interagency system to evacuate patients and individuals with critical needs from hospitals in the event of an emergency). (See Chapter 22.) TRANSCOM evacuated 21,000 people from New Orleans by air between Thursday and Saturday.²⁹⁷

TRANSCOM also played a major role in the deployment of the 82nd Airborne Division. Once the deployment appeared likely to the division commander, TRANSCOM pre-positioned four C-17s at Pope Air Force Base in North Carolina on Friday afternoon.²⁹⁸ When the President ordered the troops to deploy on Saturday morning, TRANSCOM diverted additional aircraft to Pope, enabling the movement of personnel, vehicles, helicopters, and supplies, to New Orleans International Airport within hours of the President’s order.²⁹⁹

Standing Joint Force Headquarters-North

Though General Honoré initially deployed as commander of the First Army, with only a small staff, his command eventually grew to more than 22,000 personnel from all branches of the armed services.³⁰⁰ The Joint Task Force Katrina command structure grew more complex by the day, incorporating additional command elements as additional assets from the different services were absorbed into the Task Force. Admiral Kilkenny arrived on Wednesday as the Commander of the Navy component and General O’Dell took command of the Marine component on Saturday; additionally Major General M. Scott Mayes, Commander of the First Air Force, based at Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida, arrived late in the week to take command of the Air Force assets and to coordinate control of the airspace with the Federal Aviation Association.³⁰¹

It became apparent to NORTHCOM that additional measures were necessary to maintain command and control over the many active-duty assets and to coordinate with the ever-growing number of National Guard forces. Admiral Keating, for instance, reported that he had little sense of National Guard capabilities beyond simply the numbers of troops being deployed.³⁰² As for active-duty troops, he reported that after the President ordered 7,200 troops to mobilize, 8,800 actually deployed,³⁰³ many of whom were included based on personal requests from General Honoré to his fellow generals. As a result, NORTHCOM had difficulty maintaining an operational picture of the total military involvement. General Rowe complained in an e-mail to General Honoré, that he was “getting killed by the ‘good ideas flowing.’ ... Right now I have an unexplained 13th Corps support command flowing – about a thousand more 82nd Abn division than we asked for, odd Navy comms pieces. Unexplained marines. Services are killing me off of buddy deals.”³⁰⁴

Once NORTHCOM had assumed control of the active-duty military response on Tuesday, headquarters deployed planning and coordination elements. But on Friday, NORTHCOM decided to deploy Standing Joint Force Headquarters-North, a NORTHCOM entity designed to rapidly deploy a command and control element, led by General Moulton.³⁰⁵

General Moulton arrived with a staff of 38 in New Orleans Saturday morning, just prior to the deployment of the 7,200 active-duty troops. He established his headquarters at the Naval Air Station. His first task was to integrate National Guard forces with active-duty ground troops to take advantage of the National Guard’s law enforcement capabilities because the Posse Comitatus Act prohibits active-duty troops from engaging in law enforcement.³⁰⁶ They also had to coordinate the numerous assets devoted to the search-and-rescue mission, which was currently operating under different commands and following different procedures. The Standing Joint Force Headquarters established a common search-and-rescue grid and assigned responsibilities to the various entities involved.

Finally, General Moulton transitioned from search-and-rescue coordination to broader planning of the federal response for Coast Guard Vice Admiral Thad Allen, the Deputy Principal Federal Official, who later replaced Michael Brown as Principal Federal Official (PFO). General Honoré assigned General Moulton, together with General Graham from Fifth Army, to provide the PFO with operational planning assistance in incorporating DOD resources into the overall effort.³⁰⁷

Logistics

In disaster response, commodities flow into an area called the Federal Operational Staging Area. Often, this is a DOD facility.³⁰⁸ Under the NRP, the Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for procuring water and ice. The Army Corps contracts with vendors to purchase these goods, directing these vendors to deliver the commodities to the Operational Staging Area.

As for food, the other major commodity, FEMA typically requests military Meals Ready to Eat (MREs), which are ultimately supplied by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). FEMA assigns the General Services Administration (GSA) to arrange to have the MREs delivered to the Operational Staging Areas.³⁰⁹

A FEMA representative, usually from the affected FEMA region, manages these Operational Staging Areas. Based on priorities established by the state, the FEMA representative directs the movement of commodities from the staging area to locations in the state called Points of Distribution (PODs).³¹⁰ State and local personnel, often supervised by the National Guard, distribute goods at the PODs to the people who need them.

NORTHCOM had begun planning for large-scale logistics missions prior to Katrina’s landfall. After landfall, NORTHCOM’s logisticians were involved in the evacuation of patients,

and were “heavily involved” in the evacuation of people from the Superdome.³¹¹ However, prior to Friday, September 2, NORTHCOM was aware of, but not heavily involved with, FEMA’s actions in moving commodities into the Gulf Coast.

Although DOD had been called upon to assist in the movement of commodities in past hurricanes, including Hurricane Ivan along the Gulf Coast in 2004, NORTHCOM’s planners did not know before Friday that there was a need for them to become more involved in that issue in the Katrina response.³¹² Nor did the planners, a subset of the NORTHCOM organization, believe they could become more actively involved without a request to do so from FEMA.³¹³ Said a senior NORTHCOM planner, “We didn’t have details at that point in time, or real authority to gather those details.”³¹⁴

On Thursday, September 1, FEMA began asking DOD to take on responsibilities beyond those it had been called upon to fulfill in past disasters. For example, FEMA requested that DOD “provide airlift capability to transport” people being evacuated from New Orleans to Houston, Texas, with a cost estimate of \$20 million.³¹⁵ On that same day, FEMA also asked DOD to assist in the logistics of moving food and water to New Orleans and elsewhere on the Gulf Coast.³¹⁶

As the magnitude of the disaster was becoming clearer, there was growing concern among FEMA officials that Gulf Coast residents’ basic needs for food and water were not being met, and that FEMA’s logistics operation was becoming overwhelmed and would be unable to meet them.

Late Tuesday night or early Wednesday morning,³¹⁷ FEMA Director Michael Brown discussed with FEMA’s Federal Coordinating Officer (FCO) in Louisiana, William Lokey, the need to expand DOD’s role in the response, including logistics.³¹⁸ Brown said he raised this issue with personnel in the White House and urged them to declare an insurrection and federalize the entire response effort.³¹⁹ However, the Committee found no evidence that Brown’s desire to have DOD play a larger role in logistics was communicated by FEMA officials to DOD officials until Thursday, September 1.³²⁰

On Thursday, Ed Buikema, the Acting Director of the Response Division at FEMA, approached Ken Burris, the Acting Director of Operations, and said that FEMA needed DOD’s help with commodities, supplies, and logistics³²¹ because the high water made it “very difficult delivering supplies and commodities,”³²² because of DOD’s human and material resources,³²³ and because of the reports of civil disturbance “playing out on television.”³²⁴ Buikema’s view was that “DOD is very well equipped to not only deliver things in difficult situations, but also to provide the security that is commensurate to delivering that kind of service.”³²⁵ Burris agreed.³²⁶ Although FEMA moved more truckloads of commodities in the days following landfall than they did for all four major hurricanes that hit Florida in 2004,³²⁷ Burris thought that it still wasn’t enough to “keep up with the consumption rate.”³²⁸

Lokey thought the request was necessary, less as a response to a specific set of challenging circumstances, than as a catch-all to cover all aspects of a rapidly changing and generally overwhelming situation.³²⁹ According to him, this request was to “cover the eventualities ... because ... what we were faced with was well beyond anything I felt our system could handle.”³³⁰ Although Lokey’s view was that DOD did not need to take over all logistics,³³¹ then-FEMA Director Brown says that was exactly what he wanted DOD to do.³³²

After speaking with Buikema on Thursday morning,³³³ Burris called Colonel Chavez in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense.³³⁴ Burris told Colonel Chavez that “The FEMA logistics capability has been overwhelmed,” and that he “wants DOD to take over logistics operations in Louisiana and Mississippi.”³³⁵ Colonel Chavez viewed this request as extraordinary because it appeared FEMA was asking DOD to take

over its job.³³⁶ Colonel Chavez says he asked Burris, “is this really what you want us to do, take over the function? He indicated that that is indeed what they wanted to do.”³³⁷ Colonel Chavez told Burris that the request “would require a Secretary DHS to Secretary DOD call to initiate and significant General Counsel input.”³³⁸

The NRP stipulates that DOD is a supporting agency to all 15 ESFs. Thus, they are on notice that they may be called upon to assist civilian authorities in a variety of ways. However, in this instance, the civilian agency – FEMA – was asking DOD to take over a role it had not traditionally played in disaster response, and which is not listed as one of DOD’s support functions in any of the listed ESFs.³³⁹ Thus, Colonel Chavez’s surprise is understandable.

After conferring with Colonel Chavez, Burris modified his request to state that FEMA wanted DOD to “provide the support and planning and execution of the full logistical support to the Katrina disaster in all declared states in coordination with FEMA.”³⁴⁰ Burris also conveyed the information to DHS Secretary Chertoff so he could make the request to Secretary Rumsfeld.³⁴¹

Meanwhile, DOD sought clarification from officials at FEMA and from the Homeland Security Operations Center at DHS about the meaning of “full logistics support.”³⁴² As details of the potential mission were being collected, Secretary Rumsfeld and Assistant Secretary McHale conferred with General Duncan McNabb, the Logistics Director for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.³⁴³ In the Secretary’s office, Assistant Secretary McHale asked General McNabb whether DOD could perform this mission. “We can,” General McNabb told him.³⁴⁴

On Friday, September 2, FEMA sent the mission assignment to DOD. It stated:

Assistance Requested: FEMA request[s] that DOD provide planning and execution for the procurement, transportation and distribution of ice, water, food, fuel and medical supplies in support of the Katrina [disaster] in Louisiana and Mississippi.³⁴⁵

When DOD performs work pursuant to an approved FEMA mission assignment, DOD is reimbursed for the amount it costs DOD to perform that work up to the total amount “obligated” or authorized by FEMA. FEMA authorized spending \$1 billion for this assignment.³⁴⁶ Both FEMA and DOD viewed the billion-dollar total as an estimate, but one large enough to give DOD authority “to do what needed to be done” to get commodities moving into the Gulf Coast.³⁴⁷

In the words of Assistant Secretary McHale, it “may well have been the single most complex civil support mission in the history of the U.S. military.”³⁴⁸ Ultimately, for reasons discussed below, DOD did not take over all logistics operations from FEMA, although they did provide significant assistance. DOD plans to or has sought reimbursement from FEMA for only \$118 million of the \$1 billion dollars obligated under this mission assignment.³⁴⁹

The Secretary of Defense approved the request orally on Friday, September 2,³⁵⁰ and Assistant Secretary McHale notified DHS Deputy Secretary Jackson of the approval on Friday in an e-mail.³⁵¹

On Saturday, September 3, the paperwork was approved, and DOD issued its order directing the commander of NORTHCOM, Admiral Keating, to “plan and develop a concept of operations to execute logistical support operations in affected states of Louisiana and Mississippi.”³⁵²

On Friday, September 2, before the mission assignment was officially approved,³⁵³ NORTHCOM’s planning staff began gathering information in “excruciating detail” about what orders FEMA had already placed with the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), “how many

trucks are lined up, how many trucks have left, how many trucks have been loaded.”³⁵⁴ They started calling the operational staging areas and collecting detailed information from the FEMA representatives on the ground there.³⁵⁵

They learned that, unlike DOD, FEMA did not have “detailed supply accountability and the in-transit visibility of assets.”³⁵⁶ There was no tracking methodology, and no one within FEMA “owned” the complete commodities-movement process.³⁵⁷ They also learned that the DLA was sourcing the MREs from only two facilities,³⁵⁸ where loading was additionally constrained by space limitations and material-handling equipment.³⁵⁹

Commodities Crisis in Mississippi

NORTHCOM planners had little time to study FEMA’s logistics system in Louisiana because of a developing crisis in Mississippi. “We have got to get food and water [there],” Colonel Damon Penn, the DCO in Mississippi told Colonel Roberta Woods, Chief of Plans and Operations in NORTHCOM’s Logistics Division on Friday, September 2.³⁶⁰

Although the logistics mission assignment was broad, DOD’s logisticians knew from experience that they had to prioritize, and quickly.³⁶¹ Colonel Woods described how she and her staff, using their knowledge of the DLA distribution system, worked to speed food to Mississippi:

I know the food’s been ordered [from DLA]. I know precisely how many thousands of cases have been ordered ... and I know how many have left the warehouse.

We discover that trucks that were inbound to Mississippi have not arrived in Mississippi but have been diverted to Louisiana. So ... using that [billion dollar] mission assignment... [we] make the call ... to use airlift to get some of those MREs into Mississippi. ... We coordinate airlift of about 50,000 cases of MREs into Mississippi.

We put in the requirement to TRANSCOM to airlift. We put in the requirement to DLA to prepare the stocks for airlift. And on Saturday afternoon, evening, the 3rd, I think about 10,000 cases are flown into Gulfport, and on Sunday, the 4th, 40,000 cases are flown in.

Simultaneously now DLA is gathering more trucks to pick up MREs and have trucks begin delivering and – and that’s the shot in the arm. That surge of assets got Mississippi out of crisis mode and got routine flow into both Mississippi and Louisiana.³⁶²

NORTHCOM planners also retooled the way FEMA procured and transported commodities. Previously, the DLA, which supplied MREs, loaded them onto trucks that had to be arranged by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).³⁶³ The new structure gave DLA authority to contract for those trucks on its own, improving the flow of commodities to Mississippi.³⁶⁴

Distribution of Commodities in Louisiana and Mississippi

As they gathered data on how FEMA’s logistics system worked, the DOD planners were still unsure how much of the system DOD was being asked to assume and whether FEMA was going to back out of logistics completely.³⁶⁵ Although DOD planners believed the last stage of commodities distribution would remain in the hands of the National Guard, they were not sure whether FEMA would remain in control of the operating staging areas³⁶⁶ – Camp Beauregard, Louisiana, and the three Mississippi locations – all of which stand between the warehouse and the state-controlled points of distribution in the supply chain. By Saturday,

September 3, DOD developed a plan for how DOD would run operations at those staging areas traditionally run by FEMA.³⁶⁷

As part of developing the plan, a DOD official was tasked to “map” the commodities distribution system in Louisiana and Mississippi. This is how he described the process in Louisiana as of Tuesday, September 6:

In LA, trucks arriving at the FOSA are redirected to one of 20 State Receiving Points and from there, redirected to local Distribution Sites where the MREs, water, and ice are provided to the people of Louisiana. The Beauregard FOSA keeps records of how many trucks are directed to each State Receiving point. ... FEMA management at the FOSA provides C2 [command and control, in this case over the movement of commodities into and out of the site] of the supplies and equitably distributes based on the requirements at each State Receiving Point.³⁶⁸

The DOD official explained why he saw no need for federal active-duty troops to take over handing out commodities at the end of the distribution chain: “Unloading capabilities vary significantly at final distribution sites but at that point in the supply chain it doesn’t make much difference. MREs could be issued from the back of the trailer if required.”³⁶⁹

DOD never had to take over for FEMA at the Operational Staging areas. The commodities situation was stabilized in Mississippi by the large movement of food by air, and commodities distribution never turned into a crisis in Louisiana.³⁷⁰ NORTHCOM’s Colonel Woods described DOD’s role as “very much a cooperative effort. FEMA stayed in – in the chain and in the processes, and we – we put shots in the arm, is what we did.”³⁷¹

Thus, although DOD provided an important contribution to improving FEMA’s logistics operations, they did not – as was originally requested – “take over” those operations from FEMA. DOD’s contribution was to quickly bring to bear its expertise in planning and executing commodities movements. It was not to deploy large numbers of active duty troops to run the supply chain. In fact, large numbers of National Guard troops already deployed performed the bulk of the distribution work.

Katrina demonstrated that DOD has well-developed expertise in logistics management, but there is no reason that FEMA could not develop a similar level of proficiency.

The Second Large Group of Requests For Assistance

An extraordinary number of military assets were deployed by DOD, including assets deployed by Presidential order and by the individual services, with the expectation their capabilities would be required. When Assistant Secretary McHale notified DHS Deputy Secretary Jackson that the Secretary of Defense had approved the logistics mission assignment, he added that DOD possibly would be able to do even more.³⁷² Given the level of devastation on the Gulf Coast, it was clear to Assistant Secretary McHale that “a much greater level of DOD activity was going to be required.”³⁷³ On the morning of Saturday, September 3, shortly before the President announced his decision to deploy 7,200 active duty troops to Louisiana, Assistant Secretary McHale and Deputy Secretary Jackson met at the White House. According to Deputy Secretary Jackson, the President wanted “to get these troops on the ground as fast as possible, and we were determined to get the additional support missions defined with clarity and the assets that might be needed to be brought along with them to move them as quickly as possible.”³⁷⁴

Meanwhile, the President had announced the deployment, and the Army and Marine forces had begun to mobilize. Deputy Secretary Jackson and Assistant Secretary McHale met later that day with Deputy Secretary England at the Pentagon to begin “aggregating and classifying and categorizing what types of mission assignment activities we thought were needed by DOD.”³⁷⁵ Assistant Secretary McHale reported that they then “drew up a list of approximately 10 mission areas” in which DOD help had not yet been, but was likely to be, requested.³⁷⁶

The intent, according to Deputy Secretary Jackson, was to formulate “what are we trying to accomplish, what do we need to get done, how are we going to do it?”³⁷⁷ On Saturday, September 3, and the following day, DOD and DHS officials “at very senior levels”³⁷⁸ drafted a group of new DOD mission assignments:³⁷⁹

- conduct search-and-rescue operations,
- perform security-capabilities assessment and provide security-capabilities advice and technical assistance,
- collect and evacuate live persons to temporary processing centers,
- collect and remove bodies of deceased persons,
- restore flood-control systems,
- transport and distribute ice, water, food and medical supplies,³⁸⁰
- disease prevention and control,
- planning for the quarantine of areas within New Orleans,
- quartering and sustaining of FEMA headquarters support element and relief workers,
- health and medical support,
- debris removal,
- restoration of basic utilities and key transportation routes (land and water),
- geospatial-surveillance products and evaluations,
- logistical support at key air and sea distribution nodes,
- temporary housing, and
- long-range communications between headquarters nodes and firefighting.³⁸¹

Between Saturday, September 3, and Monday, September 5, as the Army and Marine troops converged upon Louisiana by air and land from Texas, North Carolina, and California, DHS and DOD officials drafted and refined seven separate Requests For Assistance derived from the broader aggregated request.³⁸² These seven requests, totaling an estimated cost of \$805 million,³⁸³ were approved by the Secretary of Defense the evening of September 5.³⁸⁴ The next morning, Tuesday, September 6, as the convoys of troops from the 82nd Airborne Division closed on New Orleans,³⁸⁵ DHS Deputy Secretary Jackson sent an e-mail to Assistant Secretary McHale thanking him “for your help with the RFAs and all other things. Very grateful.”³⁸⁶

As Assistant Secretary McHale and Admiral Keating both said, many of the requests in the second DHS set “already were in active execution” on September 5, when they were officially approved by the Secretary of Defense.³⁸⁷ Deputy Secretary Jackson described the process as “one of the best examples of cutting through bureaucratic red tape and getting on with the job that I participated in during the course of these first several weeks.”³⁸⁸

This investigation has shown that DOD was moving assets in many respects before they were either requested by FEMA or approved by the Secretary of Defense. The record indi-

cates that DOD logisticians were gathering information and developing a plan to execute the logistics mission assignment on Friday, September 2, prior to its oral approval by the Secretary of Defense later that same day, and prior to its formal approval on Saturday, September 3. In addition, DOD was already involved in search-and-rescue operations,³⁸⁹ evacuation operations,³⁹⁰ health and medical support,³⁹¹ geospatial surveillance,³⁹² and logistical support at key air and sea transportation nodes,³⁹³ restoring flood control systems,³⁹⁴ and transporting commodities.³⁹⁵

FEMA witnesses corroborated DOD's claim that DOD was working on the requests for assistance in advance of formal approval.³⁹⁶ FEMA, DHS, and state witnesses also praised DOD for its work in response to requests from FEMA.³⁹⁷ Even Deputy Federal Coordinating Officer in Louisiana, Scott Wells, who criticized DOD for taking too long to approve mission assignments, said that DOD never failed to complete a mission assignment in timely fashion.³⁹⁸ Wells' superior in Louisiana, Lokey, went further, stating "I do not think any military people I was working with were delaying doing anything but leaning extremely far forward."³⁹⁹ Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour described the MREs flown in with the assistance of Department of Defense personnel as a "godsend."⁴⁰⁰

Mississippi

On August 26, in advance of Hurricane Katrina, Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour issued Executive Order 939, activating the National Guard under the command of Major General Harold A. Cross.⁴⁰¹ The Mississippi National Guard has five primary missions in hurricane response: (1) search and rescue; (2) law-enforcement operations; (3) commodity distribution; (4) casualty evacuation; and (5) debris removal from roads and along major power grids.⁴⁰²

General Cross called up several National Guard units, including engineering and military-police units, which deployed to Camp Shelby, 70 miles north of the Mississippi Gulf Coast, and Camp McCain, in north central Mississippi, by Sunday, August 28, the day before landfall. About 175 other soldiers were positioned in Mississippi's three coastal counties of Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson to assist in preparation for and immediate response to the storm. That day General Cross began to order 10 more units into action. By landfall the next day, 3,088 Mississippi service members had been activated, remaining units had been placed on alert, and requests for assistance from other states had been identified.⁴⁰³

Though search-and-rescue and evacuation operations continued during and immediately after landfall, the bulk of the forces were ordered to the coast once the winds died down early Monday evening. When the level of devastation became apparent, General Cross ordered all remaining Mississippi National Guard troops into action and executed pre-planned assistance agreements from other states. General Cross also requested assistance from other states under Emergency Mutual Assistance Compact (EMAC) agreements.⁴⁰⁴

Through EMAC, the National Guard was able to pull together a division-size force of over 14,000 soldiers and airmen from 40 states, including Mississippi, by September 4.⁴⁰⁵ Total out-of-state force numbers peaked at nearly 12,000 by September 12, resulting in a combined force of over 16,000.⁴⁰⁶

Governor Barbour "emphatically" said that he never saw a need for federal troops and was never directly asked to federalize the Mississippi National Guard.⁴⁰⁷ General Cross also stated that he never requested federal troops.⁴⁰⁸ However, U.S. military personnel stationed at bases in Mississippi participated in the federal response to Katrina.⁴⁰⁹

By Wednesday evening, August 31, the National Guard began assisting with commodity distribution and began airlifting supplies to stranded residents.⁴¹⁰ Colonel Benjamin “Joe” Spraggins, Director of the Harrison County Emergency Management Agency, singled out this aspect of the National Guard’s response for praise.⁴¹¹

In the storm’s aftermath, the National Guard also had to contend with false alarms, which diverted crucial forces, as General Cross explained:

But the first couple of days. ... I had a need to get patrols out in communities and towns where there was looting reports. By the way, a lot of this was paranoia. People would call in saying they’re looting this town, they’re breaking into the hospital and la, la, la. And I would send MPs up there and no such thing was happening. And then we got a couple of reports of trucks being hijacked and we would send helicopter reconnaissance and MPs to that location and you’d see trucks stopped but they weren’t being hijacked, they were just refusing to drive without a military escort.⁴¹²

General Cross said his forces also supported local law enforcement:

We didn’t go in and take charge anywhere. We would go in and report to the sheriff or the police chief or the mayor and say, “Where do you need us?” And my standing orders were that you were to have at least one sworn officer with each squad of MPs so that they actually do the arrest.⁴¹³

In an after-action report, the Mississippi National Guard said it had:

- cleared over 3,900 miles of roadway;
- directly or indirectly assisted in over 600 rescues;
- airlifted 1.2 million MREs, 1 million gallons of water and critical medicines;
- conducted over 3,000 presence patrols, assisting in 65 arrests for crimes ranging from looting to domestic-abuse violations; and
- distributed by ground and distribution points over 39 million pounds of ice, 5.4 million gallons of water, and 2.7 million MREs in 37 counties.⁴¹⁴

Deployments of National Guard and Active-Duty Military Troops

The obligations and duties of the Guard in time of war should be carefully defined, and a system established by law under which the method of procedure of raising volunteer forces should be prescribed in advance. It is utterly impossible in the excitement and haste of impending war to do this satisfactorily if the arrangements have not been made long beforehand.

–Theodore Roosevelt, *First Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 3, 1901*.⁴¹⁵

Summary

In the afternoon of Monday, August 29, several hours after Katrina’s landfall, Governor Blanco telephoned President Bush. “We need your help,” the Governor told the President. “We need everything you’ve got.”⁴¹⁶ Based on their conversation, the Governor believed the President had “every intention to send all of the resources and assistance within the power of the federal government.”⁴¹⁷ Yet although over the next several days Governor Blanco made at least two more personal pleas to the President, by phone and in person aboard Air Force One, asking for a total of 40,000 federal troops, it was not until Saturday,

September 3, five full days after landfall, that the President ordered 7,200 Army and Marine ground forces to Louisiana.

One of the key questions about the response to Katrina is, “Why did it take so long for the President to respond to the Governor’s requests for federal troops?”⁴¹⁸

Unfortunately, much of the story of the President’s decisions remains opaque. The White House refused to permit the Committee to interview White House personnel about the President’s decision or the actions of the White House staff. DOD instructed its personnel not to discuss communications with the White House. Because the Committee has been unable to develop a complete and accurate record regarding these decisions, it is unable to make any findings regarding the President’s decision to order deployment of federal active-duty troops on Saturday, September 3, including the reasons why the President did not order that deployment sooner.

Nevertheless, the Committee has extensively interviewed Louisiana, DOD, and National Guard officials about their own decisions and actions. From their recollections, the Committee has been able to assemble a picture of a rapid but uncoordinated military response to the various requests for assistance.

Two more specific findings also have emerged. First, the large numbers of National Guard troops deploying into Louisiana were a major factor in DOD’s decision not to deploy additional active-duty troops into Louisiana prior to the President’s deployment order.

Second, the difference in opinion between state and federal officials about whether more active-duty military ground troops should have been deployed sooner appears to stem, in part, from the lack of coordination in the formulation and consideration of the various state and federal requests for military support. Requests for troops were made to the EMAC and the National Guard Bureau within DOD. Requests for troops also were made directly to the President, White House officials, and the commander of the military forces in Louisiana, General Honoré. Other requests for military assistance were made through FEMA according to the process set forth in the NRP for requesting DOD support. Many of the state and federal requests for military support lacked adequate specificity as to the missions to be performed or the capabilities being requested. The responses to the requests for military support often were poorly coordinated with each other. One result from this lack of specificity and coordination at all levels was that local, state, and federal officials had differing perceptions of the numbers of federal troops that would be arriving, the missions they would be performing, who was in command of the military forces, and who should be in command of those forces.

Discussion

The Constitution of the United States provides for two distinct chains of command for military forces within the United States: state governors command and control the state militias; and the President is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the United States. The NRP recognizes that either of these two military forces may be called upon for support in the event of a disaster or emergency: the National Guard, under the command of the governor; federal active-duty forces, under the command of DOD; and, ultimately, the President. The NRP provides for two distinct avenues for requesting these two types of military assistance.

Under the NRP, a state may request federal military support through FEMA, the agency responsible for coordinating requests for federal disaster support. Although FEMA may direct other federal agencies to perform a “mission assignment,” because the Secretary of Defense is the only federal official, other than the President, who may issue an order deploying U.S. military forces, DOD considers a FEMA mission assignment to be a “request for assistance.” DOD evaluates each FEMA request for assistance to determine if the request is appropriately tasked

to DOD and whether DOD has the ability and assets to perform the request. If DOD approves the request, the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, issues an order to the military to provide the requested assistance to FEMA.

Within FEMA, the Federal Coordinating Officer (FCO) is responsible for coordinating the requests for support made to the various federal agencies, including DOD.⁴¹⁹ The FCO is stationed at the Joint Field Office (JFO), which is the temporary federal facility established after a disaster for the coordination of federal, state, and local response activities.⁴²⁰ The FCO, among others, works with the DOD Defense Coordinating Officer (DCO), who is also stationed at the JFO and is responsible for coordinating and processing all requests for assistance to DOD.⁴²¹ Unless DOD establishes a different command structure for a particular disaster – which it will usually do for a major event like Katrina – the DCO will also be the on-site commander in charge of the DOD response.

FEMA issued 93 requests for specific federal military assets and capabilities to DOD; in general, DOD quickly and effectively responded to these requests.⁴²² None of these requests, however, involved large numbers of ground troops.⁴²³ The DCO in Louisiana “did not ever receive any specific request for large-scale federal forces that came from the state.”⁴²⁴ Rather, requests for large numbers of military troops were made directly to the President, other high-ranking Administration officials, and the military commander in the field.

The lack of specificity in these requests for federal military support, and the failure to coordinate their consideration through the coordination mechanisms used for the other requests for military assistance, was one of the sources of ongoing confusion and uncertainty regarding the scope and timing of the military response. The proliferation of processes used to request National Guard troops was yet another source of confusion.

In most circumstances – unless they are “federalized” for a specific purpose – National Guard forces will be operating under the command of the governors of the states. Typically, in a disaster, state National Guard troops will be called up or activated to full-time duty by a governor into “state active-duty” status, meaning they are under the command of the governor, performing state missions, such as humanitarian relief or law enforcement, and are paid for by state funds.

National Guard troops may also be under the control of a governor when activated under 32 U.S.C. § 502(f) (“Title 32” status). This provision allows the National Guard troops to be activated by DOD to perform training or “other duty,” with federal pay and benefits, yet remain under the control of the governor. Such “other duty” may include disaster-relief work or law enforcement. For example, Title 32 was used to provide federal pay and benefits to the National Guard troops who temporarily provided additional security to a number of airports after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.⁴²⁵

National Guard troops under the command of a governor, either in state active duty or Title 32 status, are not subject to the prohibitions in the Posse Comitatus Act against the use of any part of the military for law enforcement.⁴²⁶ In Katrina, the flexibility to use the National Guard to perform law enforcement was a significant motive for the primary reliance on the National Guard rather than active-duty military troops. The retention of this flexibility was also one of the major reasons Governor Blanco resisted attempts to “federalize” her National Guard troops – i.e., place those troops into active-duty status and under the President’s command.

The President may directly activate the National Guard, or “federalize” National Guard troops already in state active duty or Title 32 status, under a variety of circumstances. Under the Insurrection Act, the President may place the National Guard into federal service to sup-

press an insurrection against a state government, at the request of the state; enforce federal laws in the event of “unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages, or rebellion against the authority of the United States”; or to prevent an interference within the state of a constitutional right.⁴²⁷ Similarly, 10 U.S.C. §12406 provides the President the authority to call into federal service the members of the National Guard in the event of an invasion by a foreign nation, a rebellion, or if the President is “unable with the regular forces to execute the laws of the United States.”⁴²⁸ The Insurrection Act was recently invoked in 1992, at the request of the Governor of California, to quell the Los Angeles riots, and in 1989, in response to reports of looting in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, in the wake of Hurricane Hugo.⁴²⁹

The President may also employ active-duty troops under the Insurrection Act. DOD has prepared guidance for the use of active-duty troops to perform law enforcement missions, entitled “Military Assistance for Civil Disturbances (MACDIS).” The MACDIS guidance governs “planning and response by the DOD Components for military assistance to federal, state, and local government ... and their law enforcement agencies for ... civil disturbance operations, including response to terrorist incidents.”⁴³⁰

National Guard troops called into federal service under these authorities operate under the command of the President, receive federal pay or benefits, and are not subject to the prohibitions in the Posse Comitatus Act against the use of federal troops to perform law-enforcement activities. National Guard troops called into federal active duty under other authorities, however, are subject to the Posse Comitatus Act restrictions. These other authorities permit the President to call up the National Guard in time of war, a declared national emergency, or when otherwise authorized by law.

The NRP states that National Guard forces under the command of the governor, either under state active duty or Title 32 status, “are providing support to the Governor of their state and are not part of federal military response efforts.”⁴³¹ Accordingly, unlike requests for military assets under the control of DOD, requests for National Guard troops not under the control of the governor are not coordinated and processed through either the FCO or the DCO.⁴³²

In those instances in which National Guard troops from outside an affected state are needed for disaster response, a governor may use the EMAC to obtain those troops from other states. The EMAC is a congressionally approved interstate compact that permits a state to request and receive whatever type of assistance it might need from another state, including state National Guard forces, to respond to a domestic emergency.⁴³³



National Guard helicopters flying medical evacuations
U.S. Air Force photo

During Katrina, Louisiana began requesting National Guard assets through the EMAC process on Friday, August 26, three days before landfall. The first EMAC support – National Guard helicopters from Oklahoma – arrived in Louisiana on Monday, August 29, the day of landfall. On Tuesday, August 30, more helicopters from Texas and Oklahoma and about 230 ground troops from Florida, Georgia, and Texas arrived through the EMAC process.⁴³⁴

In Katrina, the EMAC process proved neither suitable nor capable to handle the type of large-scale deployments of troops needed in the Gulf region. The EMAC was never intended or designed to coordinate large military troop deployments. As a result, both Louisiana and Mississippi turned to the National Guard Bureau to “expedite” the deployment of National Guard troops from other states. The National Guard Bureau is the DOD entity responsible for advising the Army and Air Force on National Guard matters and communicating with state governments including state National Guards.⁴³⁵ Although the National Guard Bureau successfully expedited these troop deployments, they were not well coordinated with the other military responses, thereby contributing to the confusion as to the scope and effectiveness of the overall military response.

The National Guard Bureau’s application for Title 32 status for these troops recognized the unsuitability of the state-to-state EMAC process for this type of large-scale military deployment. On September 5, the Bureau requested DOD to grant Title 32 status for all of “the National Guard forces currently responding to Hurricane Katrina” under the EMAC compact, retroactive to August 29, the day of landfall.⁴³⁶ “The escalation from what was a local and regional response to one of national scope, and international attention, risks exceeding the capability and intent of the EMAC,” the Bureau wrote.⁴³⁷ “This development compels the transition of National Guard forces from State Active Duty (SAD) status under the EMAC to a federally funded status. Title 32 maintains DOD’s flexibility to utilize federally funded National Guard troops in a federal response and support-to-law enforcement role without Posse Comitatus raising issues.” The Bureau stated this change was imperative, as the EMAC arrangement was not “sustainable” or a “practical solution” for the maintenance of a military force this size.⁴³⁸ On September 7, DOD granted the request for Title 32 status and funding.⁴³⁹

Prior to and shortly after Katrina’s landfall, federal officials also recognized the possibility that military forces may be required for law enforcement. On August 28, the Vice President’s Counsel, David Addington, wrote to William Haynes, the DOD General Counsel: “Given the potential massive size of the problem there could be civil unrest during the aftermath ... you might want to have an [Insurrection Act] proclamation ... in the can in case it is needed.”⁴⁴⁰ On the morning of Wednesday, August 31, as the media reported a deterioration in civil order in New Orleans, Northern Command’s Operations Director, General Rowe, advised Pentagon officials, “recommend looking at ‘what if’ MACDIS required.”⁴⁴¹ Later that morning, the Joint Director of Military Support described to General Rowe the statutory and Constitutional authorities governing the use of armed forces for law enforcement. She told General Rowe that she planned to advise “senior leadership” that such action could be taken by the President invoking the Insurrection Act following either a state request through the Department of Justice, or a unilateral decision by the President.⁴⁴²

The following discussion presents the record developed by the Committee regarding the State of Louisiana’s requests for large-scale deployments of troops and the responses to those requests.

Tuesday, August 30: Governor Blanco asks General Landreneau, Adjutant General of the Louisiana National Guard, to request federal military assistance

As Governor Blanco toured New Orleans by helicopter and visited the Superdome Tuesday afternoon, the need for massive federal assistance became clear and urgent. Floodwaters

were spreading and rising throughout the city. The crowd of people at the Superdome was growing by the thousands, as residents flooded out of their homes flocked to dry ground and people “plucked off the roofs” from around the city were deposited there as well.⁴⁴³ Tensions rose too, due to concerns over food, water, security, and the fate of separated family members. The Governor determined that the people stranded there had to be evacuated “as soon as possible.” She asked Major General Bennett Landreneau, the Adjutant General of the Louisiana National Guard, for information about the location of the buses to be used for the evacuation, and instructed him to “ask for all available assistance from the National Guard and the United States Government, specifically federal military assistance.”⁴⁴⁴

Tuesday, August 30: General Landreneau speaks to General Honoré and to General Steven Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau

According to General Landreneau, he quickly relayed Governor Blanco’s request for military troops to General Steven Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and then to General Honoré, who later that day was appointed Commander of Joint Task Force Katrina, consisting of all the active-duty military forces in the Gulf Coast region responding to Katrina.⁴⁴⁵ Both General Honoré and General Blum, however, stated that General Landreneau first asked them for troops on Wednesday, August 31.⁴⁴⁶

Although the Governor’s timeline indicates that she spoke with General Landreneau regarding the need for troops following her afternoon visit to the Superdome, General Landreneau stated that in a telephone conversation with General Honoré on Tuesday morning he “conveyed the Governor’s desire for federal troops, in particular an Army division headquarters to plan, coordinate, and execute the evacuation of New Orleans.”⁴⁴⁷ General Landreneau stated that on that same day he asked General Blum to help obtain thousands of National Guard troops for relief efforts in Louisiana.⁴⁴⁸

General Honoré recalled that he first spoke with General Landreneau sometime Tuesday evening. Although General Landreneau mentioned the need to evacuate the Superdome, his main concern was the search and rescue efforts, which required helicopters, not ground troops.⁴⁴⁹ According to General Honoré, General Landreneau said he had already spoken to General Blum, who had assured him that “a lot of ground capacity was on the way.”⁴⁵⁰ General Honoré stated that General Landreneau did not make any “particular request” for a large deployment of federal active-duty troops.⁴⁵¹

Although General Blum recalled that he spoke with General Landreneau on Tuesday evening, he was unable to recall whether General Landreneau made a specific request for troops at that time.⁴⁵²

Although recollections differ as to whether General Landreneau specifically requested military assistance during either of these conversations on Tuesday, it is nonetheless clear that as of this date the state had established two new avenues, in addition to the traditional processes through the EMAC and the DCO, for requesting military support: (1) through General Blum and the National Guard Bureau, and (2) through General Honoré, the Commander of Joint Task Force Katrina. There were now four separate avenues for requests for military support; there would be little coordination among them.

Early hours, Wednesday, August 31: Louisiana National Guard Officers discuss with General Landreneau the need for more troops

Prior to and during landfall, Louisiana National Guard Brigadier General Gary Jones and the rest of his contingent had been stationed at Jackson Barracks, the headquarters of the

Louisiana National Guard in New Orleans, but by late Monday rising floodwaters forced him and his contingent to relocate to dry ground at the Superdome.

By late Tuesday, as it became apparent the Superdome would need to be evacuated, the senior Louisiana National Guard officers at the Superdome became concerned whether they had sufficient manpower to undertake this additional responsibility.⁴⁵³ Sometime between 2 a.m. and 4 a.m. on Wednesday,⁴⁵⁴ General Jones, his deputy Brigadier General Brod Veillon, and Colonel Steve Dabadie, Chief of Staff of the Louisiana National Guard, consulted with General Landreneau in Baton Rouge. General Jones recalled the conversation:

And I told General Landreneau that I felt like taking on the mission of evacuating all those people, in addition to the security missions and the engineer missions, and so forth, I had, was probably beyond the capability, not of my troops, but of my planning staff to execute, the people I had on the ground. And I asked for some support. And what he told me was they planned on asking for an active-duty division headquarters to come in and take over the evacuation. But he also gave me a key piece of information in that. And that was, there ain't going to be nobody get there until they get there. Until you get relieved of that mission, that is your mission. So from that point on I took that mission, and that's how we got it. And we never did give it up, because no one else ever stepped up to the plate to pick that thing up.⁴⁵⁵

Colonel Dabadie similarly remembered that General Landreneau agreed with the need for an active “division headquarters” unit – meaning a team of one or two dozen active duty personnel with expertise in planning, command, and logistics – for coordination and execution of evacuation.⁴⁵⁶

According to General Veillon, General Landreneau had also said, “I am ahead of you. I have already called General Blum and we have additional assets that will be arriving in the morning.”⁴⁵⁷

7:21 a.m., Wednesday, August 31: General Landreneau asks the National Guard Bureau to expedite the deployment process for National Guard troops from other states

By Wednesday morning, Louisiana officials recognized that the EMAC process was inadequate for this catastrophe. General Landreneau telephoned General Blum and asked for his help in expediting the EMAC process to send 5,000 National Guard soldiers to Louisiana. General Blum related the conversation:

He said that he needed 5,000 soldiers more to help, and I'm going to tell you at this point, it was clear in his voice that it was pretty imminent need ... [H]e communicated some emotion over the phone that he needed it, and he needed it now and that he reiterated that the armory at Jackson Barracks had flooded and that the Louisiana National Guard command and control had been relocated to the Superdome parking lot and that the Superdome is being cut off by rising water, it's becoming an island.⁴⁵⁸

Within minutes of General Landreneau's phone call, the Army National Guard began calling and e-mailing the Adjutant Generals of the National Guards across the country to alert them of the urgent need for National Guard military police, engineers, and high-water trucks.⁴⁵⁹ On a noon video-teleconference with the Adjutant Generals from all of the states, General Blum reiterated the immediate need for these National Guard capabilities.

The National Guard Bureau's improvised process proved extremely effective in mobilizing tens of thousands of National Guard troops and assets. The process that began Wednesday

morning resulted in the deployment of over 30,000 National Guard troops within approximately 96 hours.⁴⁶⁰ Partially as a result of their rapid deployment, however, most of the National Guard troops dispatched to Louisiana through this process did not know what their mission would be or where it would be performed until they arrived in Louisiana. The deployment process was “P for plenty,” according to General Vaughn. “There was not a lot of preciseness.”⁴⁶¹

Table 1: Activated National Guard Personnel Serving in Louisiana and Mississippi ⁴⁶²

Date	Number Serving in Louisiana			Number Serving in Mississippi		
	Louisiana National Guard Personnel	National Guard Personnel from Other States	Total	Mississippi National Guard Personnel	National Guard Personnel from Other States	Total
Aug. 30	5,804	178	5,982	3,822	16	3,838
Aug. 31	5,804	663	6,467	3,822	1,149	4,971
Sept. 1	5,804	2,555	8,359	3,823	2,861	6,684
Sept. 2	6,779	5,445	12,224	3,823	3,719	7,542
Sept. 3	6,779	10,635	17,414	3,823	6,314	10,137
Sept. 4	6,779	12,404	19,183	4,017	9,399	13,416
Sept. 5	6,779	16,162	22,941	4,017	10,999	15,016
Sept. 6	6,779	20,510	27,289	4,023	11,095	15,118
Sept. 7	6,779	22,589	29,368	4,023	11,388	15,411
Sept. 8	6,779	23,476	30,255	4,023	11,506	15,529

Source: Congressional Research Service, Hurricane Katrina: DOD Disaster Response, January 24, 2006, p. 12.

Although the National Guard Bureau’s mission was to expedite the EMAC process, the deployments initiated from the Bureau were not well coordinated with the EMAC process. As the National Guard Bureau’s Draft After Action Review found, National Guard forces were deployed “piece meal” into and out of Louisiana and Mississippi, and in many cases the Bureau’s process overlapped the EMAC process, “causing confusion and duplicated efforts.”⁴⁶³ The review concluded, “the large-scale and sustained operations required for this disaster requires a more systematic approach.”⁴⁶⁴

Even at the outset of the deployment process, the National Guard Bureau recognized the need for the National Guard to deploy a robust command and control capability along with the large number of troops that would be flowing into the state. General Blum immediately determined that additional command and control capability was needed in both Louisiana and Mississippi because National Guard combat brigades from each of those states were in Iraq.⁴⁶⁵ Headquarters elements from the 35th Infantry Division in Kansas deployed into Louisiana and from the 38th Infantry Division in Indiana deployed into Mississippi.⁴⁶⁶ “Both of these divisions had served in Bosnia and Kosovo and knew how to do Ph.D. level

command and control elements,” Lt. Gen Blum explained.⁴⁶⁷ They began arriving in theater on Friday, September 2.⁴⁶⁸ General Blum stated that command and control improved immediately afterwards.

Once they were on the ground, the command and control improved 100 percent in less than 24 hours. I mean, it started coming together. That’s the only place where I wish I had been a little faster on the trigger shooting those guys downrange, because they brought a great capability that was very well needed, because frankly, the guys that were there were getting tired. It was like bringing in, you know, the relief team.⁴⁶⁹

The National Guard deployment process was not well coordinated with the command of the active-duty military forces either. Assistant Secretary McHale testified to the Congress, “Military command and control was workable, but not unified. National Guard planning, though superbly executed, was not well integrated with the Joint Staff in NORTHCOM.”⁴⁷⁰

Senior DOD officers also expressed concern that the rapid, poorly coordinated state-to-state EMAC deployments, in effect “preempted” a large part of DOD’s role to coordinate the overall military response in the event of a domestic catastrophe. General Rowe, Director of Operations at NORTHCOM, observed that although this process provided “incredible amounts of manpower,” there was no integration or tasking of these forces until they arrived in the state. “It’s a heck of a way to do military business,” General Rowe commented.⁴⁷¹ Admiral Keating, Commander of NORTHCOM, stated that in a catastrophic event NORTHCOM, on behalf of DOD, should have a greater control over the deployment process.⁴⁷² Former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Myers agreed with both of these observations.⁴⁷³

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 31: General Honoré meets with General Landreneau and General Jones at the Superdome

General Honoré arrived at the Superdome at around 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday to assess the deteriorating conditions.⁴⁷⁴ “When I got there Wednesday morning,” General Honoré recalled, “it was hell.”⁴⁷⁵

General Honoré informed General Landreneau about some of the military assets that were en route, including U.S. Navy ships, but there was no discussion of ground troops at this meeting.⁴⁷⁶ General Honoré then met with New Orleans Mayor Ray Nagin, and Scott Wells, the FEMA Deputy FCO in Louisiana. Wells was the senior FEMA representative at the Superdome, reporting to William Lokey. They discussed how to evacuate the Superdome. Wells asked General Honoré if he could take the lead for the evacuation. According to Wells, General Honoré replied, “Whoa, wait a minute, I need to get my people here and then we’ll talk later.”⁴⁷⁷

As this exchange between Wells and General Honoré reflects, neither FEMA nor Louisiana officials had a clear understanding of General Honoré’s role and capabilities. Phil Parr, the head of one of FEMA’s emergency-response teams that was sent into Louisiana, was under the incorrect impression that General Honoré had been placed in charge of the Superdome evacuation.⁴⁷⁸ He also was disappointed that General Honoré had not brought more troops: “He had no troops on the ground to do what needed to be done early on.”⁴⁷⁹

State officials also did not have a clear understanding of the capabilities under General Honoré’s command. General Landreneau stated, “I was expecting troops to arrive.”⁴⁸⁰ Other Louisiana National Guard officers echoed this expectation.⁴⁸¹

General Honoré acknowledged that others may have misinterpreted his initial presence as the vanguard of a much larger military deployment of ground troops. General Honoré

explained, however, that this was not a classic military operation, where a commanding general appears at the battlefield only in the presence of a large number of troops:

In a classic military operation, I would have sat here in Atlanta and put a brigadier or a major general in Camp Shelby and maybe send a brigadier to New Orleans and to Biloxi. That's the classic. The general will sit back, get the feeds in from the troops. ... So in this case, I reversed a paradigm. I left my staff at home and went forward on the battlefield, which may have given a perception to people when they saw me that all the federal troops were there, which was not the case. And I never [pretended] that that was the fact when I got there, but people come up with their own assumptions. Well, damn, if the general is here, his troops must be outside the city. ... This is a humanitarian operation, not an attack on a foreign country where it gets secured and then the general comes in.⁴⁸²

Immediately after he found out that General Landreneau had made a direct request to General Honoré for federal military troops, Wells explained to Colonel Jeff Smith, General Landreneau's deputy at the Louisiana Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, how this direct request to General Honoré disrupted the "unified command" the state and FEMA were trying to achieve – i.e., a coordinated process for requesting assistance and directing response activities:

And I said, the state does not go to DOD directly, you're supposed to come to [FEMA], we will go to DOD to get whatever support you need. ... That breaks – that not only violates protocol, but it breaks the whole unified-command approach, when you go out to another agency and then this three-star general just shows up.⁴⁸³

Morning, Wednesday, August 31: Governor Blanco calls the White House to ask for "significant resources"

According to the Governor's timeline:

Governor Blanco places an urgent morning call to the White House in an effort to reach President Bush and express the need for significant resources. She is unable to reach President Bush or his Chief of Staff, Andrew Card. A later phone call reaches Maggie Grant in the White House Office of Intergovernmental Affairs. The Governor receives a call from Homeland Security Advisor Frances Townsend. Andrew Card returns her call too, and she requests his help in getting the promised FEMA buses into the New Orleans area.⁴⁸⁴

As the following events demonstrate, the transmission of the state's request for resources directly to the White House does not appear to have expedited the response to the state, at least with respect to federal military resources. White House officials did not understand what the Governor was requesting. There also appears to have been poor coordination between the White House and FEMA. Even after the Governor clarified the nature of her request directly with the President – that she wanted federal troops but not "federalization" – Brown continued to advocate to the White House that the response be "federalized." Additionally, Brown does not appear to have consulted with DOD regarding the need for federalization, either prior to or after advocating that position to the White House.

12:43 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: U.S. Senator David Vitter of Louisiana informs Terry Ryder, Executive Counsel to Governor Blanco, of a conversation with Karl Rove, White House Deputy Chief of Staff, regarding Rove's comments on "federalization"

In addition to former White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card, it appears that Governor Blanco's request to White House Homeland Security Advisor Townsend was passed along to Deputy Chief of Staff Karl Rove. Senator Vitter relayed to Ryder that Rove "understands that the Governor is asking to federalize the evacuation piece."⁴⁸⁵ The Committee has been unable to determine what Rove's understanding at this time may have been regarding the Governor's request – whether he believed the Governor was seeking federal assistance in evacuating the Superdome, or seeking federal control of the evacuation.

2:30 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: Governor Blanco tells President Bush she does not want "federalization"

According to Ryder, immediately after he relayed Sen. Vitter's conversation with Rove to Governor Blanco, the Governor telephoned President Bush to clarify her request – she wanted federal assistance, but did not want to give up her command of the National Guard troops within the state.⁴⁸⁶

According to Ryder's notes, the Governor made it clear she did not want to "federalize" the evacuation. "I'm not asking for federalization," the Governor told the President. "It's not a federalization request."⁴⁸⁷ Rather, the Governor told the President she wanted "to be a partner in a unified command."⁴⁸⁸ Under a "unified command," the Governor would remain in command of the National Guard troops, and the President would be in command of the active-duty forces. Ryder also reported that the Governor also told the President, "We have a communication problem and [it] needs improvement."⁴⁸⁹ The Governor repeated her request for federal military assistance.⁴⁹⁰ At the Committee's hearing, when asked whether she was seeking National Guard or active-duty troops, Governor Blanco replied, "It was both. We needed troops."⁴⁹¹

Mid-afternoon, Wednesday, August 31: FEMA officials consider federalization

At about the same time that the Governor informed the President that she did not want federalization, senior FEMA officials began discussing it. Lokey recalled a conversation with Brown:

I remember going to Michael Brown and saying, this is beyond me, this is beyond FEMA, this is beyond the state. We need to, and I used the term, we need to federalize this or get a massive military invasion in here to get some help. And Mike said, "I'll talk to headquarters. I'll talk to DHS about that and I'll talk to the attorneys."⁴⁹²

Lokey told the Committee staff he did not understand what he meant when he used the term "federalization":

I don't exactly know what I meant. What I meant was that – what I was talking about was turning this over to somebody that can manage something this size. I've never done something like this. I was trying my best. I wasn't doing very good at it. So that was just a term I used.⁴⁹³

Brown confirmed Lokey's account.⁴⁹⁴ On Wednesday, Brown concluded that FEMA, state, and local capabilities were inadequate. He stated that Louisiana, "for whatever reason – culture, their system, their lack of resources," was "dysfunctional."⁴⁹⁵ In Brown's view, the inability to establish a unified command was evidence of this dysfunction:

There was not a unified command yet. The Governor was overwhelmed, and the Governor didn't have a good decision-making process set up around her where she could make decisions; bless her heart. I mean, it really bugged me. She had too many people coming in telling her what she needed to do, from

U.S. Senators all the way down to, I mean, I don't know who they were, just showing up in her little room coming in just hodgepodge saying, you need to be doing this and that and everything else.

And you just can't have that. You need to have a unified command where that stuff comes in and gets sorted out, and then [LOHSEP Acting Deputy Director] Jeff Smith or somebody comes in and says, Governor, here are your decision points, you need to go to X, or Y, or Z and make those.⁴⁹⁶

Brown stated that he recommended the entire response be “federalized,” meaning that the President invoke the Insurrection Act and place the National Guard under the control of the active-duty forces:

Because at that time, we're looking at these stories of shootings and looting and everything else going on, and I'm fearful that's spiraling out of control, and I want active-duty troops that are ready, willing and able to kill in that area, because we can't do search and rescue with that kind of stuff going on.⁴⁹⁷

Brown stated that he telephoned either White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card or Deputy Chief of Staff Joe Hagin to recommend federalization of the response in Louisiana. “I had conversations that said, Andy, we need to federalize this thing.”⁴⁹⁸

Although Brown told the Committee that for the next 72 hours he was a “strong advocate” of this position⁴⁹⁹ – i.e., that a “massive military” involvement was necessary, including active-duty ground troops that were “ready, willing and able to kill” – there is scant evidence that he or anyone else in FEMA discussed this view with DOD. It appears that he did not discuss this issue with General Honoré, who told the Committee that nobody had ever expressed to him any need for active-duty ground troops.⁵⁰⁰ Furthermore, it apparently was not until the next day, Thursday, September 1, that FEMA began discussing with DOD the need for DOD to take over the logistics mission.⁵⁰¹

Assistant Secretary McHale stated that possibly as early as Wednesday, officials in the Pentagon began considering what role the military should play in restoring order, and whether active-duty troops should be used for law enforcement activities in addition to the 4,200 National Guard military police who were already deploying to the region.⁵⁰² On Saturday, September 3, the President ordered the deployment of 7,200 active-duty troops from the Army and the Marine Corps to Louisiana. Assistant Secretary McHale explained that they were sent “not for the purposes of law enforcement, but for ... humanitarian relief. It was clear, however, that ... they would be available and readily deployable for law enforcement-related missions if the President, under the Insurrection Act, were to use his statutory and Constitutional authority, to reassign those units for purposes of enforcing constitutional rights or other provisions of federal law.”⁵⁰³

Mid-afternoon, Wednesday, August 31: Governor Blanco tells FEMA Director Brown and Louisiana Federal Coordinating Officer Lokey she does not want federalization

According to Lokey, “within an hour” of his conversation with Brown about federalization, Governor Blanco requested to see him. “What's this about you taking over my disaster?” she asked Lokey.⁵⁰⁴ Governor Blanco later explained that she objected to federalization because it could have subjected the state's National Guard troops to the Posse Comitatus Act prohibition against federal troops conducting law enforcement activities.⁵⁰⁵ “I did not want the Guard federalized,” Governor Blanco testified. “It's very important for a governor to be able to retain control of the National Guard precisely for its law enforcement capabilities.”⁵⁰⁶

Louisiana officials also believed there was no need to federalize the Guard. “Let me remind you the state is still sovereign,” a member of the Governor’s staff told Lokey and Brown. “We can handle it,” General Landreneau added.⁵⁰⁷ “Fine, good,” Brown said.⁵⁰⁸

6 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: Governor Blanco asks General Honoré to coordinate the evacuation of New Orleans.

Late Wednesday afternoon, General Honoré arrived at the State Emergency Operation Center (EOC) in Baton Rouge, and met with Governor Blanco and General Landreneau. They discussed the state’s priority missions, particularly search and rescue and the evacuation of New Orleans and the surrounding area. FEMA Director Brown was also present.⁵⁰⁹ “Federalization” was not discussed. Governor Blanco asked General Honoré “to coordinate the evacuation efforts in New Orleans, so that General Landreneau can concentrate on saving lives, search and rescue, and law and order issues.”⁵¹⁰

In the midst of this discussion, General Graham, Deputy Commander of Fifth U.S. Army, arrived at the EOC, after driving seven hours from his headquarters in San Antonio, TX. General Graham brought with him 24 other personnel from Fifth Army headquarters for the purpose of providing support to the DCO in Baton Rouge.⁵¹¹ Shortly after General Graham joined the discussion about the state’s priorities, General Honoré turned to him and said, “Mark, evacuate the City of New Orleans and the Greater New Orleans area.” “Yes, sir,” General Graham replied.⁵¹²

Again, the principal participants in these conversations expressed differing perceptions and expectations as to the numbers and types of military troops that would be following. Governor Blanco and General Landreneau appear to have been under the impression that General Honoré would use a large number of federal troops to conduct the evacuation; General Honoré believed large numbers of additional active-duty troops were not needed for this mission. At the very least, the persistence of these differing expectations and perceptions amongst these principals appears to indicate a failure in communication among the principals and among the various organizations they represented.

According to the Governor’s timeline, the Governor asked General Honoré “if he brought a large number of soldiers, and learns that he arrived with only a small support staff. The evacuation must be conducted by National Guard troops, as the federal contingent has not arrived.”⁵¹³

General Landreneau told the Committee, “The Governor was very clear that she needed troops on the ground, that she needed a federal assistance. . . . She said she needed – she was using the number 40,000 and she was saying she needed soldiers, she needed boots on the ground.”⁵¹⁴ General Landreneau added, however, that the Governor never specified which type of troops she was seeking. “I don’t recall her ever defining or differentiating between active or National Guard. She wanted the help.”⁵¹⁵

General Landreneau recalled General Honoré “stating that he was aware that the National Guard EMAC forces were going to be flowing into the state.”⁵¹⁶ “I don’t recall the Governor ever saying that’s not good enough,” General Landreneau stated.⁵¹⁷

Similarly, General Honoré did not recall the Governor’s making any specific request for more federal ground troops.⁵¹⁸ Nor did General Honoré believe additional federal ground troops were necessary to meet the state’s priorities. “The National Guard was flowing a lot of troops in there. And at the point in time, the priority mission was search and rescue.”⁵¹⁹ General Honoré believed that for the search-and-rescue mission he needed “thousands of helicopters, not troops,” and that for the Superdome evacuation mission he needed buses.

Based on this assessment of the resources needed to accomplish these missions, General Honoré did not request additional federal ground troops.⁵²⁰

Likewise, General Graham did not believe he needed additional troops. “I needed buses,” General Graham said.⁵²¹ Shortly after enough buses were located, General Graham and his team coordinated the efforts of the Louisiana National Guard, Louisiana State Police, and other supporting agencies – whose personnel were already present – to actually conduct evacuations of the Superdome, the I-10 overpass, and the Convention Center.

6:05 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: General Richard Rowe, NORTHCOM, informs General Honoré that Governor Blanco is asking for federal active-duty troops

In an e-mail sent at 6:05 p.m., Major General Richard Rowe, Director of Operations at NORTHCOM, sought General Honoré’s views on the Governor’s requests for “federal troops”:

There should be calls coming your way. There is a desire to concentrate National Guardsmen into [New Orleans] for [law-enforcement]/security tasks. Governor has asked that federal troops pick up rest of the tasks being uncovered by Guard in state. Thoughts? What does this mean in terms of scale? Type capabilities?⁵²²

6:23 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: General Honoré’s staff informs General Rowe there are enough National Guard troops

Replying to General Rowe, Colonel James Hickey, General Honoré’s Executive Officer, wrote that “[We] think there are enough ARNG [Army National Guard] Soldiers and volunteers to perform all these missions,” but that General Honoré would try to obtain more information about the state’s request while in Baton Rouge that evening.⁵²³

8:40 p.m., Wednesday, August 31: DOD puts ground troops on alert

At 8:40 p.m., Army Forces Command put several of its forces with rapid-deployment ability on high alert (“Be Prepared to Deploy” status).⁵²⁴ the 82nd Airborne Division of XVIII Airborne Corps, which describes its mission as, “Within 18 hours of notification, the 82nd Airborne Division strategically deploys, conducts forcible entry parachute assault and secures key objectives for follow-on military operations in support of U.S. national interests;”⁵²⁵ and the 1st Cavalry Division of III Corps, which describes itself as the “Army’s largest division and only armored contingency force, ready to deploy anywhere in the world on a moment’s notice.”⁵²⁶

Thursday, September 1: President Bush meets with Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and General Blum to discuss the military response⁵²⁷

The Committee has been unable to obtain any details about this meeting.

11:46 a.m., Thursday, September 1: General Honoré tells General Rowe National Guard troops are sufficient

After meeting with Governor Blanco and General Landreaneau the previous evening, General Honoré again informed General Rowe that he did not believe additional federal ground troops were necessary. Personally responding to General Rowe, General Honoré wrote:

PUSH BACK. I WILL SEE GOV TODAY. WILL SHOW HER FLOW OF NG TROOPS. NG HAS GROUND FIGHT IN HAND WITH [24,000] IN NEXT R6 HOURS.⁵²⁸

General Blum confirmed that he and General Honoré were in agreement that the number of National Guard troops in the state and on the way was adequate:

When I went down there on one of my trips, and we actually sat down on two buckets under a tree and we had a conversation, I mean, between the two of us saying hey, this is what I got coming down here, Russ, and he's going, It sounds right; it sounds good.⁵²⁹

1:46 p.m., Thursday, September 1: General Honoré urges Marines to “GET HERE AS FAST AS YOU CAN”

Early Thursday afternoon, General Honoré exchanged e-mail messages with General James Amos, Commander, II Marine Expeditionary Force, urging him to get to the New Orleans area as quickly as possible, along with the various assets he had placed aboard Navy amphibious ships that were steaming toward the Gulf Coast region. “HELLO BROTHER. GET HERE AS FAST AS YOU CAN,” General Honoré wrote.⁵³⁰ General Honoré explained to the Committee that he desired the capability that the Marines were bringing which included search-and-rescue helicopters, airspace command and control, and ground troops to assist with search and rescue and delivery of food and water.⁵³¹

At the Committee's hearing, Senator Levin asked whether General Honoré's request for the Marines to deploy into New Orleans was inconsistent with the “push back” to the Governor's request for more active-duty troops. Admiral Keating, Commander of NORTHCOM, responded that it was his understanding the Governor was seeking military police, for which active-duty troops would have been unsuitable due to the restrictions in the Posse Comitatus Act, whereas General Honoré was seeking the particular capabilities the Marines could bring, such as helicopters and troops to conduct search and rescue.⁵³² However, General Rowe's e-mail of the previous day indicated that the Governor was seeking federal active-duty troops to perform non-law-enforcement activities so the National Guard troops could concentrate on law-enforcement activities.

General Honoré stated that there “wasn't a big cry for federal ground troops” at the time he wrote the e-mail,⁵³³ but that on Friday, he believed additional active-duty ground forces would be helpful.⁵³⁴ The record therefore remains unclear why the Marines were preparing to deploy ground troops at the same time that DOD officers were stating there was a sufficient number of National Guard troops on the ground.

1:50 p.m., Thursday, September 1: General Rowe tells General Honoré the official DOD guidance is to use National Guard forces to the fullest extent possible

Continuing the e-mail chain regarding the Governor's general desire for federal troops, General Rowe reports back to General Honoré:

Guidance is “guard” in NO and “guard” to fullest extent possible for tasks in LA and MS. NGB [National Guard Bureau] supports. EMAC working. OSD [Office of Secretary of Defense] and CJCS [Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff] agree with this.⁵³⁵

This DOD position is reflected in the DOD Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support, which in the first instance relies upon the National Guard and military reserves for civil-support missions.⁵³⁶ “The National Guard has more than three centuries of experience in dealing with domestic response,” Assistant Secretary McHale explained. “It makes sense to use active-duty military forces primarily for overseas missions, war fighting missions, and to rely on Reserve component capabilities, most especially the National Guard, for homeland defense and civil support.”⁵³⁷

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Myers, confirmed that this e-mail accurately reflected DOD’s view, at the time, that in light of the large numbers of National Guard troops flowing into the region, there was not a need for additional active-duty troops.⁵³⁸

3:30 p.m., Thursday, September 1: Governor Blanco meets with General Honoré

The Governor’s timeline does not mention this meeting,⁵³⁹ General Honoré does not recall any request for federal troops at this meeting.⁵⁴⁰

7:45 p.m., Thursday, September 1: Rear Admiral Robert F. Duncan, U.S. Coast Guard, urges Governor Blanco to federalize the response

Early Thursday evening, Rear Admiral Robert F. Duncan, Commander, Eighth Coast Guard District, recommended to the Governor that she “federalize” the response. Terry Ryder, Executive Counsel to Governor Blanco, described Admiral Duncan’s advice:

He had been in the field with his folks on helicopters. He had one change of clothes. Many of the people – his house was under water. . . . He was having to use a Coast Guard credit card to buy water. He was mad at Mike Brown. That is why he was there. He ran into the Governor. While he is talking to the Governor, he does tell her . . . we need to get armed people on the street. He advised her to federalize, which that time was kind of clear he wanted to bring in the Department of Defense people forces.⁵⁴¹

The record is not clear whether Admiral Duncan was recommending that additional DOD forces be brought in or, in addition, that the state National Guard troops be placed under federal command, as is suggested by the term “federalize.”

9:20 p.m., Thursday, September 1: General Blum urges Governor Blanco not to federalize the response

On Thursday evening Governor Blanco met with General Blum. They discussed troop levels and the appropriate command-and-control structure for the military forces in the state. The Governor told General Blum that although she was “very happy” with the response of the National Guard, she was still not satisfied because she needed an additional 30,000 troops – to make a total of 40,000 troops within the state – and very few active-duty forces had arrived.⁵⁴² General Blum committed to work with General Landreneau to get the capabilities that the state needed, although General Blum did not believe that would necessarily entail 30,000 more ground troops.⁵⁴³

General Blum also recommended against placing the state National Guard forces under federal control. General Blum told the Governor and her staff that federalization was “not necessary to receive more federal assets,” and “would have significantly limited [the state’s] capacity to conduct law-enforcement missions.”⁵⁴⁴ He recommended the continuation of the joint command structure, whereby General Landreneau would continue to command the National Guard forces, and General Honoré would continue to command the active-duty forces.

Early mid-morning, Friday, September 2: Department of Defense officials discuss how to obtain greater federal control over the response in Louisiana

The Administration spent much of Friday, September 2, searching for ways to assert greater federal control over the response in Louisiana.⁵⁴⁵ These efforts began with a series of meetings at the Pentagon involving Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Myers, Assistant Secretary McHale, and Lieutenant General James Conway,

Director of Operations for the Joint Staff. According to DOD documents, the discussions concerned various options for gaining greater federal control over the military forces in Louisiana, including the National Guard forces. These options included use of the Insurrection Act and the designation of a single military officer to be in command of both the National Guard and active duty forces – a so-called “dual hat” commander.⁵⁴⁶

On several recent occasions prior to Katrina, DOD and several states had used a dual-hat commander to integrate the operations of the National Guard and active-duty forces.

The single dual-hat officer reported to the Governor when exercising command and control over the National Guard forces, and to the President when exercising command and control over the active-duty forces. This structure was employed at the 2004 Democratic and Republican National Conventions, and the 2004 G-8 Summit, where both active-duty and National Guard forces worked together to provide security.

Although the Committee was not able to interview White House officials about the President’s actions or decisions, the military advantages of the dual-hat command structure – an integrated command structure for all of the military forces in the region – appear to have been a significant motivation underlying DOD’s support for the proposal. Both General Myers and Assistant Secretary McHale advocated the dual-hat approach. For General Myers, establishing a single chain of command for all military forces was “a basic tenet of how we like to do our business.”⁵⁴⁷ At the time, Assistant Secretary McHale also supported the proposal because it would provide a more integrated command structure. According to Assistant Secretary McHale, he recommended the dual-hat command to the Secretary of Defense, who “reviewed that recommendation, concurred in that recommendation, and took it to the President for the President’s consideration.”⁵⁴⁸

Late morning, Friday, September 2: President Bush and Governor Blanco discuss the deployment of federal troops

President Bush arrived aboard Air Force One at the New Orleans Louis Armstrong Airport late Friday morning. Mayor Nagin, FEMA Director Brown, General Blum, White House Chief of Staff Card, White House Deputy Chief of Staff Hagin, Louisiana Senators Landrieu and Vitter, and several Louisiana congressmen were present for an initial meeting with the President and Governor Blanco. After the initial meeting, President Bush and Governor Blanco met privately.⁵⁴⁹

Aboard Air Force One, late Friday morning, September 2: Mayor Nagin recommends the federal government assume control

During the initial meeting aboard Air Force One, Mayor Nagin recommended that General Honoré be placed in charge.⁵⁵⁰ Mayor Nagin testified:

I probably was a bit pushy at that meeting, because in the midst of all the rhetoric that was going on around the table, I stopped everyone and basically said, “Mr. President, Madame Governor, if the two of you don’t get together on this issue, more people are going to die in this city, and you need to resolve this immediately.” And they said yes. And I said, “Well, everybody else in this room, let’s leave and let them work this out right now.”⁵⁵¹

Aboard Air Force One, late Friday morning, September 2: Governor Blanco asks President Bush for more troops and rejects federalization

Still aboard Air Force One, Governor Blanco, President Bush, and Deputy White House Chief of Staff Hagen met privately for about 30 to 45 minutes. Governor Blanco again

pressed the President for federal troops, as only about 13,000 of the 40,000 troops that she had requested had arrived. “I needed people,” the Governor testified.⁵⁵² The President raised the issue whether the National Guard forces should be placed under federal command; the Governor made her position “very clear” that she did not want to give up her authority over the National Guard. “I told the President that the proper way to do business would be for me as governor to retain control of the National Guard and for him to simply send troops in.”⁵⁵³ The Governor told the President that if she changed her mind, she’d let him know within 24 hours.⁵⁵⁴

Approximately a week later, the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* reported what happened at that meeting as follows:

After the session with Blanco, the President invited Nagin into his office and told the mayor that he was “ready to move today” on the troop deployments and had offered two command options to Blanco, Nagin said. The mayor did not identify the options. However, the President said Blanco wanted 24 hours to make a decision, according to Nagin, who later roasted the governor in national TV interviews for the delay: “It would have been great if we could have left Air Force One, walked outside, and told the world that we had this all worked out,” Nagin told an interviewer. “It didn’t happen, and more people died.”⁵⁵⁵

The Committee has attempted to determine whether the deployment of federal troops was delayed in order to give the Governor time to reconsider her position on the Administration’s proposal. On Friday, September 2, active-duty ground forces were prepared to deploy,⁵⁵⁶ but the President did not issue the deployment order until late Saturday morning.

Both the White House⁵⁵⁷ and the Governor’s office⁵⁵⁸ deny that this decision to deploy these or other active-duty ground troops was delayed by the President’s request or the Governor’s refusal to accede. General Blum, who was aboard Air Force One Friday morning as well, has said that this was also his impression.⁵⁵⁹

General Myers told the Committee that from a military perspective, it was necessary to establish the command-and-control structure before a sizeable number of troops would be deployed.⁵⁶⁰ Then-FEMA Director Brown told the Committee that he and other Administration officials told the Governor that troops could be deployed more quickly if there were a more unified military command – i.e. all under federal control – but the President’s request for greater authority over the military forces within the state was not part of any type of “carrot and stick” approach toward the Governor.⁵⁶¹ Because the White House has refused to permit White House officials to be interviewed by the Committee, and DOD officials have refused to discuss their conversations with White House officials, the Committee’s record on this issue is incomplete.

Late afternoon, Friday, September 2: Pentagon officials continue to discuss options for assuming greater command of the response.

Throughout Friday, DOD officials continued to analyze various options for strengthening the federal response. These options included (1) invoking the Insurrection Act as a basis for asserting federal control over all of the military forces in the region, (2) appointing an active-duty officer to be “dual-hat” commander of both the National Guard and active duty forces, and (3) “Beef up FEMA,” presumably meaning provide additional support to FEMA.⁵⁶²

11:32 p.m., Friday, September 2: White House faxes “dual-hat” proposal to Governor Blanco

Late Friday night, the White House faxed to the Governor a proposal, accompanied by a draft letter prepared for the Governor to transmit to the President, that would have established General Honoré as a dual-hat officer, providing him with command and control over the Louisiana National Guard, reporting to the Governor, while retaining command and control over active-duty forces in Louisiana, reporting through the DOD chain of command to the President.

The White House dual-hat proposal faxed to the Governor differed from the dual-hat commands used for the G-8 Summit and the 2004 political conventions in that in those previous instances, the dual-hat commander was a state National Guard officer who was placed into active-duty (Title 10) status for the purpose of also exercising command and control over the active-duty forces. The President's dual-hat proposal to Governor Blanco would have placed an active-duty officer rather than a National Guard federal officer in the dual-hat position. This active-duty officer would have exercised command and control over both the active-duty forces, acting under a chain of command that reported to the President, and command and control of the National Guard forces, reporting to Governor Blanco. The proposal also provided that in the event of a conflict, the federal chain of command would prevail.

Terry Ryder, the Governor's Executive Counsel, received the fax when it arrived at the Executive Mansion in Baton Rouge, near midnight:

What happens is that fax comes in and I looked at it and realized it was an arrangement which was in the direction of so called federalization. ... I immediately called the Governor. ... I believe I told her I wanted to pull all of her senior advisors together immediately, and this is probably about midnight, to have them all look at it and to get back to her after we read that in the MOU. ... I woke them all up and brought them back to the OEP and we all read it, brainstormed for a while, and at some point ... we called the Governor back and said, "Governor, this is the so called federalization and this is what it does," and in that conversation with Landreneau, with [former FEMA Director James Lee] Witt, we refreshed our recollection on Gen. Blum's conversation on the night before.⁵⁶³

Andy Kopplin, Governor Blanco's Chief of Staff, told the Committee the Governor's immediate reaction:

The Governor said, I'm not signing anything in the middle of the night. You guys do a thorough review of the issues surrounding it. ... If it could save lives and deliver more resources, that's something that I would want to do.⁵⁶⁴

Later that night, Kopplin spoke to White House Chief of Staff Card. According to Kopplin, Card said, "They'd like the Governor to sign this letter asking for this [agreement]." Kopplin also said, "He indicated that it would improve coordination and speed the delivery of federal assets."⁵⁶⁵

Card and General Blum also spoke to Governor Blanco.⁵⁶⁶ Governor Blanco told General Blum that she "certainly didn't want to make midnight decisions, even though I happened to be very wide awake."⁵⁶⁷ When asked whether she felt "under pressure at that point, as compared to the conversation with the President earlier in the day," Governor Blanco answered, "Well, it was a very different kind of pressure, but I still told him no. ... I was very definitive, sir. There was never a question in my mind as to the lines of authority."⁵⁶⁸

General Blum related that Governor Blanco never wavered from the position that she remained in charge of the National Guard forces in Louisiana:

The bottom line of it is there were many offers and overtures made to the Governor on command and control, but they all centered on a Federal officer being in charge of the Governor's National Guard, and that was rejected. It was offered by several messengers, and it was sent in various forms or variations. But the option was always – the bottom part of the option, the overriding piece of the option never deviated from it will be a federal officer that will be in charge of your National Guard and the federal troops that are there, and the Governor rejected the offer.⁵⁶⁹

8:56 a.m., Saturday, September 3: Governor Blanco telephones White House Chief of Staff Card to reject the dual-hat proposal

“In retrospect,” Assistant Secretary McHale testified, “I’m glad that we did not invoke either a dual-hatted commander or the statutory authority under the Insurrection Act.” He explained that “in a crisis environment, I think it’s almost inevitable that a president and a governor will have differences of opinion. To put an officer in the crossfire between the two of them I think is untenable.”⁵⁷⁰

11 a.m., Saturday, September 3: The President announces the deployment of 7,200 active-duty forces from the 82nd Airborne, 1st Cavalry, and II Marine Expeditionary Force⁵⁷¹

These active-duty forces were placed under the command of General Honoré, and the National Guard forces remained under the command of Governor Blanco and General Landreneau.

Governor Blanco testified that she never needed these federal troops for law enforcement: “I had the National Guard for that.”⁵⁷² Assistant Secretary McHale stated that DOD considered that these troops would be a contingency if additional forces were required to supplement the National Guard Military Police for law enforcement. But the President did not invoke the Insurrection Act, and the active-duty troops were never called to perform law enforcement. Rather they performed numerous other humanitarian missions, including door-to-door search and rescue, debris removal, and logistics support. Moreover, their mere presence had a reassuring effect, according to many witnesses. “That was a recognition by people that the administration and the nation was responding,” said Colonel Terry Ebbert, the Director of Homeland Security for the City of New Orleans.⁵⁷³

Two days later, Admiral Keating expressed his confidence in the dual-command structure for the National Guard and active-duty forces. In response to a question about “what advantage or disadvantage federalizing the operation would have meant,” Admiral Keating stated:

From our perspective it would not have provided an advantage over our current situation. I think this is a topic of, I know it’s a topic of discussion between the President, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, and Secretary Chertoff, but from this headquarters through General Honoré. . . . We’re satisfied with the current command and control arrangement where the Governors of Mississippi and Louisiana exercised their constitutional prerogative of control of the National Guard, and Russ Honoré as Joint Task Force Katrina’s commander has command of the active-duty forces.⁵⁷⁴

Conclusion

To a large degree, the divergence of opinion between state and federal officials on the federal military response to troop-deployment requests appears to be the result of the ad-hoc processes by which the large-scale requests for troops were made and evaluated. The process envisioned by the NRP for requesting DOD assistance was not used for the large-scale requests for military troops. Instead, these requests were made through a variety of other channels, both state and federal. The requests were not specific; the responses were not coordinated. Communication among all of the entities involved in this issue ranged from poor to non-existent. It therefore is no surprise that there has never been a “meeting of the minds” on DOD’s responsiveness to the state requests.

The Katrina response, as detailed in this section, indicates the need for better coordination between the states and the principal federal agencies involved in coordinating the military response – DOD, DHS, and FEMA. This response also indicates the need to better coordinate the responses of the military forces under the different state and federal commands – the National Guard and the active duty forces – especially in a catastrophic event.

Recommendations:

- The Department of Defense (DOD) and the state governors should develop an integrated plan for the employment of National Guard units and personnel in state status when large-scale military support is requested by a state to respond to a catastrophic incident or disaster. The plan should include a process for identification of National Guard units with the capabilities required to respond to the incident or disaster, and should take into account the availability of National Guard units for mobilization for national-defense missions. The plan should include expedited procedures for requesting and approving federal funding under Title 32, United States Code, for National Guard forces employed in accordance with the plan, and procedures for DOD and governors, during a catastrophe, to coordinate the process of matching units and capabilities of National Guard forces with the requirements of governors.
- All DOD support activities should be coordinated with the other federal support activities provided under the framework of the National Response Plan in the event of an emergency or disaster. The entire spectrum of potential DOD support activities should be integrated into the overall planning and preparedness activities led by the Department of Homeland Security at the federal, state, and local levels.

Department of Defense Conclusion

The Department’s contributions to the Katrina response flow directly from its professional, sustained emphasis on education, training, retention, and rigorous adherence to standards, coupled with a budget and resources unparalleled across the government. Military culture also played a role, as many officials reported to the Committee that their efforts in response to Katrina were the most rewarding and satisfying missions of their often extensive careers. Lieutenant Colonel Gordon Ellis of the Ohio National Guard commanded a battalion that deployed to the Superdome during the first week, and reported:

Like all commanders, my soldiers were there about seven days before they had their first shower. They never once complained while they were there, and to see the professionalism and the dedication that those young soldiers displayed

throughout that difficult time makes me immensely proud to have been a part of that.⁵⁷⁵

However, as with all agencies and all levels of government, Katrina exposed weaknesses of, and raised questions about, the military's mechanisms for responding to disasters. Given DOD's unmatched power and size, and its unique Constitutional status, these questions merit careful consideration.

To what extent should the nation rely upon the Department of Defense in disaster response? The Department of Homeland Security was created, in part, to respond to domestic emergencies, but Katrina revealed that in critical missions, particularly in logistics, search and rescue, and command and control, it was unprepared to address a catastrophe of Katrina's magnitude. At the same time, Department of Defense, since September 11, 2001, and since establishing U.S. Northern Command, has revised its mission to reflect a greater focus on homeland defense. Its capabilities in this arena have therefore grown more robust. But Assistant Secretary McHale cautioned against placing too much reliance upon the military's capabilities:

I would urge you to think simultaneously about speed and the fundamental public policy missions, public policy questions associated with the role of the military within domestic American society and constitutional government. . . . We have to balance not only what the military is capable of doing, questions of speed and resources, but what the military ought to be doing consistent with the historically constrained role of the military within domestic American society.⁵⁷⁶

Is it wiser to further develop these capabilities in DHS? If DOD's resources were already engaged in an overseas mission, military support might not be available to the extent that it was during Katrina. In that case, a more capable DHS would be preferable, especially since many of the missions DOD performed were not uniquely military. DHS could adopt military models of logistics, training, career development, and centralized incident management to improve its ability to function independently.

At the same time, when military assistance is required, to what degree should we rely on a system in which specific assets are requested? After-action reviews stressed, just as they had following Hurricane Andrew, that DOD must not wait for requests to push assets forward. But Katrina revealed a tension between a system of planned, coordinated movement, and the value of commanders' initiative in moving in advance of orders. Initiative, in this case, proved essential to the swift deployment of resources, but it also contributed to an uncoordinated response, in which strategic commanders lacked clear visibility over the force structure.

Katrina also revealed tension between gubernatorial and Presidential executive powers, underlying a delicate federalist balance: should governors retain full control of their National Guard forces after catastrophic events? The governors of the two most seriously affected states here answered "yes" unequivocally.⁵⁷⁷ Yet at the height of the crisis, the President and senior military and civilian DOD leaders grew concerned that the scale of the military response – both the size of the National Guard force and the addition of federal active-duty ground troops – required a single commander. Governor Blanco's rejection of their proposed solution, however, has led DOD officials to realize that unity of command, long a staple of military operations, can also prove inconsistent with states' Constitutional powers.

The final resolution was to achieve unity of effort through the close coordination of federal and state-controlled military forces. But as has been widely documented, numerous factors challenged this coordination. While the Committee has not determined that a lack of coordination impaired the effectiveness of the military response to Katrina, many leaders agree that we must establish mechanisms now to ensure unity of effort between the Guard

and active-duty forces the next time they are called for such a common cause. Only through forethought, planning, and consensus among the agencies and levels of government can we ensure that we do not encounter a political or leadership crisis in a catastrophe that may be even more destructive, and provide less warning, than Katrina.

1 U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Response Plan*. Washington: Government Printing Office, Dec. 2004, p. 8 [hereinafter *NRP*].

2 Committee staff interview of Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 4, 2006, transcript p. 85.

3 *NRP*, p. 43.

4 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 88.

5 National Academy of Public Administration, *The Role of the National Guard in Emergency Preparedness and Response*, Jan. 1997, pp. 18, 123-126.

6 U.S. Department of Defense, *Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support*, June 2005, p. 35.

7 *NRP*, p. 8.

8 National Emergency Managers Association, "What is EMAC?" <http://www.emacweb.org/?9>. Accessed on Apr. 19, 2006.

9 National Emergency Managers Association, "How does EMAC Work?" <http://www.emacweb.org/?142>. Accessed on Apr. 19, 2006.

10 P.L. 104-321, 110 Stat. 3877, and 3879-3880.

11 National Guard Bureau, *National Guard After Action Review: Hurricane Response*, Dec. 21, 2005, p. 63.

12 The White House, Homeland Security Presidential Directive-5: Management of Domestic Incidents, Feb. 28, 2003.

13 See: *NRP*.

14 The White House, Homeland Security Presidential Directive-5: Management of Domestic Incidents, Feb. 28, 2003.

15 Committee staff interview of Col. Don Harrington, U.S. Army, Military Liaison to FEMA, conducted on Jan. 6, 2006, transcript pp. 6-8.

16 Committee staff interview of Col. Anthony F. Daskevich II, U.S. Army, Louisiana Defense Coordinating Officer, conducted on Jan. 10, 2006, transcript p. 10.

17 *NRP*, p. 42.

18 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 15.

19 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 134.

20 Committee staff interview of Clair Blong, Liaison to U.S. Northern Command, FEMA, conducted on Dec. 8, 2005, transcript p. 9.

21 Blong interview, Dec. 8, 2005, p. 93.

22 *NRP*, p. 10; 10 U.S.C. § 162.

23 *NRP*, p. ESF-v.

24 *NRP*, p. ESF #1-4.

25 *NRP*, p. ESF #2-12.

26 *NRP*, pp. ESF #3-5 through 3-8.

27 *NRP*, p. ESF #4-4.

28 *NRP*, pp. ESF #5-1 through 5-6.

29 *NRP*, p. ESF #6-6.

30 *NRP*, pp. ESF #7-1 through 7-6.

31 *NRP*, p. ESF #8-9.

32 *NRP*, p. ESF #9-6.

33 *NRP*, p. ESF #10-10.

34 *NRP*, p. ESF #11-10.

35 *NRP*, p. ESF #12-4.

36 *NRP*, p. ESF #13-6.

- 37 NRP, p. ESF #14-5.
- 38 NRP, p. ESF #15-5.
- 39 31 U.S.C. § 1535.
- 40 42 U.S.C. §§ 5121-5206.
- 41 10 U.S.C. §§ 331-335.
- 42 U.S. General Accounting Office, *DOD Can Combat Fraud Better by Strengthening Its Investigative Agencies*, Mar. 21, 1983, p. 15.
- 43 18 U.S.C. § 1385.
- 44 U.S. General Accounting Office, *Homeland Defense: DOD Needs to Assess the Structure of U.S. Forces for Domestic Military Missions*, July 11, 2003, p. 11.
- 45 10 U.S.C. §§ 111, 3013, 3062, 3203-3207, 4301, 5013, 5062, 8013, 8062, 8201.
- 46 Committee staff interview of Lt. Gen. Russel L. Honoré, U.S. Army, Commanding General, First U.S. Army, conducted on Jan. 9, 2006, transcript p. 14.
- 47 Paul Wolfowitz, Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments and others, "Reporting 'Immediate Response' Requests from Civil Authorities," Apr. 25, 2005. Provided to Committee; U.S. Department of Defense, Directive Number 3025.1, "Military Support to Civil Authorities (MSCA)," Jan. 15, 1993, pp. 7-8 [hereinafter DOD Directive 3025.1, MSCA].
- 48 Paul Wolfowitz, Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments and others, "Implementation Guidance Regarding the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense," May 25, 2003. Provided to Committee.
- 49 NRP, p. 9.
- 50 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 90, 109.
- 51 DOD Directive 3025.1, MSCA, pp. 5-7.
- 52 NRP, p. 10; 10 U.S.C. § 162.
- 53 Testimony of Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Defense Department's Role in the Response*, Feb. 9, 2006.
- 54 Office of Management and Budget, *A Review of Existing Authorities and Procedures for Using Military Assets in Fighting Wildfires*, May 17, 2004, p. 7.
- 55 Committee staff interview of Col. Darryl Roberson, U.S. Air Force, Assistant Deputy Director, Antiterrorism and Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Nov. 10, 2005, transcript p. 4.
- 56 Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. Terry Scherling, U.S. Air Force, Director of the Joint Staff, National Guard Bureau, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 19, 2006, transcript p. 8.
- 57 DOD Memorandum, *Implementation Guidance Regarding the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense*, Mar. 25, 2003, p. 1.
- 58 U.S. Department of Defense, Directive Number 3025.12, "Military Assistance for Civil Disturbances (MACDIS)," Feb. 4, 1994, pp. 3-5 and 8 [hereinafter DOD Directive 3025.12, MACDIS].
- 59 DOD Directive 3025.1, MSCA, p. 2; U.S. Department of Defense, Directive Number 3025.15, "Military Assistance to Civil Authorities," Feb. 18, 1997, p. 5; DOD Directive 3025.12, MACDIS, p. 6.
- 60 Joint Staff Washington, Message, "Transfer of the Army Director of Military Support Mission to the Joint Staff," May 2003. Provided to Committee.
- 61 DOD Directive 3025.1, MSCA, p. 4.
- 62 U.S. Joint Forces Command, "11: New Name, Future, Focus." <http://www.jfcom.mil/about/History/abthist6.htm>. Accessed on Apr. 20, 2006.
- 63 U.S. Northern Command, "U.S. Northern Command: History." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/history.htm. Accessed on April 20, 2006.
- 64 U.S. Northern Command, "U.S. Northern Command: History." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/history.htm. Accessed on April 20, 2006.
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, Feb. 6, 2006.
- 65 U.S. Department of Defense, *Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support*, June 2005, pp. 2-3.
- 66 Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. William Caldwell, U.S. Army, Commander, 82nd Airborne Division, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 28, 2006, transcript p. 8; Committee staff interview of Lt. Gen. Steven Blum, Chief, National Guard Bureau, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 19, 2006, transcript pp. 110-111.
- 67 10 U.S.C. § 111.
- 68 10 U.S.C. §§ 3013, 5013, 8013.

69 10 U.S.C. §§ 162, 164.

70 U.S. Department of Defense, "Unified Command Plan: The World with Commanders' Areas of Responsibility." <http://www.defenselink.mil/specials/unifiedcommand/>. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006.

71 U.S. General Accounting Office, *Homeland Defense: DOD Needs to Assess the Structure of U.S. Forces for Domestic Military Missions*, July 11, 2003, p. 5; U.S. Department of Defense, *Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support*, June 2005, p. 8.

72 U.S. General Accounting Office, *Homeland Defense: DOD Needs to Assess the Structure of U.S. Forces for Domestic Military Missions*, July 11, 2003, p. 11.

73 U.S. Northern Command, "About Us." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/about_us.htm. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006.

74 U.S. Northern Command, "Joint Task Force Alaska." http://northcom.mil/about_us/JTF_Alaska.htm. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006; U.S. Northern Command, "Joint Force Headquarters National Capital Region." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/JFHQ_NCR.htm. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006; U.S. Northern Command, "Standing Joint Force Headquarters North." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/SJFHQN.htm. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006.

75 U.S. Northern Command, "About Us." http://www.northcom.mil/about_us/about_us.htm. Accessed on Feb. 28, 2006.

76 Testimony of Adm. Timothy Keating, U.S. Navy, Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Defense Department's Role in the Response*, Feb. 9, 2006.

77 U.S. Department of Defense, DOD Dictionary of Military Terms, 2005. <http://www.dtic.mil/jel.doddict/data/o/03883.html>. Accessed on May 4, 2006.

78 Col. David Rhodes, e-mail to Tom Eldridge, Dan Berkovitz, Brian Lepore and Eric Andersen, Senate Committee staff members, Feb. 16, 2006, 6:33 p.m.

79 U.S. Department of Defense, "EXORD for DOD Support to FEMA for Hurricane Katrina," Aug. 29, 2005.

80 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, transcript p. 118; U.S. Northern Command, message to Joint Staff Washington, "Request for Forces," Aug. 30, 2005, 1745 Z, p. 1-4. Provided to Committee (Z corresponds to Zulu time, the military designation for Greenwich Mean Time. It refers to the time at the prime meridian.); 10 U.S.C. § 162; Committee staff interview of Margaret Kruse, Joint Forces Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Nov. 16, 2005, record of interview pp. 1-2.

81 *NRP*, p. 42.

82 *NRP*, p. 42.

83 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 49 (Between Aug. 29 and Sept. 10, 2005, 72,000 military personnel were deployed to the Gulf Coast area: 50,000 National Guardsmen from every state and territory as well as the District of Columbia and 22,000 active-duty troops.).

84 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 40-41.

85 Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), *Hurricane Katrina/Rita/Ophelia Interim Timeline*, Nov. 2, 2005, pp. 1-2. Provided to Committee.

86 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Message to Commander, U.S. Northern Command and others, "Severe Weather Execute Order (EXORD) for DOD Support to FEMA (FEMA)," Aug. 19, 2005, 2300 Z. Provided to Committee.

87 *NRP*, p. 37. Also, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Homeland Security*, Joint Publication 3-26, Aug. 2, 2005, p. GL-7. ("A military or civilian official who has been designated by the Department of Defense to exercise some delegated authority of the Department of Defense executive agent to coordinate military support to civil authorities activities.").

88 Col. Roberson interview, Nov. 10, 2005, p. 29.

89 Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 8.

90 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "Mod 3 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 28, 2005, 1200 Z. Provided to Committee.

91 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 27; Col. Damon C. Penn, e-mail to Col. Mark Fields and Col. Anthony Daskevich, Aug. 27, 2005, 3:07 p.m. Col. Anthony Daskevich deployed the day before from the Fifth U.S. Army in Fort Sill, Oklahoma, to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, arriving at the temporary FEMA office by 6:30 p.m. Saturday, August 27. On the same day, Col. Damon Penn deployed from First Army and arrived in Jackson, Mississippi by 10 p.m.

92 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "Mod 2 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 27, 2005, 2230 Z; U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "Mod 3 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 28, 2005, 1200 Z. Provided to Committee.

93 U.S. Department of Defense, "Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense OASD(HD) DCIP." <http://www.dod-ap.msiac.dmo.mil/oasd.htm>. Accessed on Mar. 1, 2006 ("The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense (ASD(HD)) is the overall supervisor of homeland defense (HD) activities for the Department of Defense. The ASD(HD) will oversee HD activities, develop policies, conduct analysis, provide advice, and make recommendations on HD, support to civil authorities, emergency preparedness and domestic crisis management matters within the Department.").

94 Committee staff interview of Col. Richard Chavez, U.S. Air Force, Senior Military Advisor for Civil Support, Office of

the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Nov. 9, 2005, transcript p. 36.

95 Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 41. However, Col. Chavez did state in his interview that Katrina demonstrated the value of examining the availability of other assets; for example, having learned the value of an immediate employment of watercraft for the purpose of performing water rescues, Chavez stated that he intends to include low-draft and shallow-draft boats among his pre-landfall assessments during the coming year's hurricane season. Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 27.

96 Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 27.

97 U.S. Department of Defense, Joint Publication 3-26, "Homeland Security," Aug. 2, 2005, p. IV-10.

98 Col. Roberson interview, Nov. 10, 2005, pp. 31-32.

99 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "NORTHCOM Mod 2 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 27, 2005, 2230 Z; U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "NORTHCOM Mod 3 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 28, 2005, 1200 Z. Provided to Committee. Brig. Gen. Scherling said that Katrina showed that additional assets might have been useful had they been deployed earlier, and that consideration was being given to broadening the Order for next year's season:

There are certain types of capabilities that certainly should be considered, and the first thing that we want to do is gain situational awareness, so we want to have the ability to go in and assess a situation. We want to be able to save lives. And so, you want the capability to have search and rescue. And then, you want to be able to go in and stabilize the situation where you probably need potentially the Corps of Engineers and many of the things that are somewhat outlined broadly in the emergency support functions of the National Response Plan.

Maj. Gen. Scherling interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 81.

100 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 3212EM-LA-DOD-01, Aug. 28, 2005. Provided to Committee.

101 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 1. Provided to Committee.

102 U.S. Northern Command, Message to U.S. Joint Forces Command and others, "WARNORD FOUR/Tropical Storm Katrina," Aug. 25, 2005, 0014 Z. Provided to Committee.

103 Committee staff interview of Col. Thomas Muir, U.S. Army, Deputy Chief, Current Operations, J33, U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 6, 2005, transcript pp. 11-12.

104 Col. Muir interview, Dec. 6, 2005, p. 14.

105 Committee staff interview of Col. Roberta Woods, U.S. Army, Chief, Plans and Operations Division, U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 7, 2005, transcript pp. 14, 37-38.

106 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 12.

107 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 14.

108 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 38, 12 ("Pre-incident we don't have any set actions that we take because we must respond to an approved mission assignment. So it's monitoring, trying to anticipate where there might be shortfalls and advise as - as appropriate if we see indications of shortfalls.")

109 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 38.

110 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 10.

111 U.S. Department of Defense, First U.S. Army, Joint Task Force Katrina, Hurricane Katrina Chronology. Provided to Committee.

112 First U.S. Army, Message to U.S. Northern Command, "Request for Force Capabilities (Title X) ISO possible DSCA operations as a result of Hurricane Katrina," Aug. 28, 2005, 1656 Z. Lt. Gen. Honoré requested assets as follows: 24 hours after landfall: satellite phones, light or utility helicopters for reconnaissance, damage assessment, and command/control shallow-draft boats for Search and Rescue and supply transportation. 48 hours after landfall: medium lift aviation for transportation of supplies and personnel medical units for Search and Rescue and evacuation, engineer units for construction, utility and transportation, power generators, military police units, high-water trucks.

113 U.S. Army Forces Command, Message to U.S. Joint Forces Command, "Request for Force Capabilities (Title X) is possible DSCA operations as a result of Hurricane Katrina," Aug. 28, 2005.

114 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to NC-JOC - Director - OMB, Aug. 28, 2005, 5:31 p.m. Provided to Committee.

115 Maj. Gen. Terry Scherling, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rowe, Aug. 28, 2005, 3:41 p.m. Provided to Committee.

116 Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, Director of Operations, J3, U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 20, 2006, transcript p. 31.

117 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré and Lt. Gen. Joseph Inge, Aug. 29, 2005, 6:46 p.m. Provided to Committee.

118 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 28.

119 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 30.

- 120 Col. Damon Penn, e-mail to Col. Anthony Daskevich, Aug. 28, 2005, 8:16 a.m. Provided to Committee.
- 121 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, pp. 24-25; Committee staff interview of William Lokey, Federal Coordinating Officer for Hurricane Katrina in Louisiana, FEMA, conducted on Nov. 4, 2005, transcript pp. 81-84.
- 122 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, pp. 39-40.
- 123 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, pp. 46-47. He and the leadership of Fifth Army decided to deploy the rest of his staff Sunday morning, but as the storm's path was still unclear, they sent the staff to Houston to await further direction. Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 30.
- 124 Committee staff interview of Vice Adm. Mark Fitzgerald, U.S. Navy, Commander, U.S. Second Fleet, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Nov. 15, 2005 (untranscribed). It is important to note that as a Fleet Commander, he did not possess the authority to command an operational mission; as directed by the Goldwater-Nichols Act, all Fleet-commanded missions must be classified as either training or equipping. Because NORTHCOM had not yet designated the Gulf as a Joint Operational Area, and because FEMA had not requested Navy assistance, *Bataan's* movement on Aug. 28 was classified as training. But she proved to be one of the earliest, and therefore, most essential assets available in the critical first days after landfall.
- 125 U.S. Fleet Forces Command, briefing slides, "Hurricane Katrina Navy Mission: Providing Rescue and Civil Support Relief from the Sea, Air and Land," Nov. 14, 2005, p. 7. Provided to Committee.
- 126 U.S. Fleet Forces Command, briefing slides, "Hurricane Katrina Navy Mission: Providing Rescue and Civil Support Relief from the Sea, Air and Land," Nov. 14, 2005, p. 7. Provided to Committee.
- 127 Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. Douglas O'Dell, U.S. Marine Corps, Commanding General, 4th Marine Division, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 14, 2005, transcript p. 12.
- 128 Maj. Gen. O'Dell interview, Dec. 14, 2005, pp. 16-18. It is important to note that he did not activate or move units into the gulf region prior to landfall or prior to receiving an order from NORTHCOM, but merely assessed availabilities and placed units on alert within the Marine Corps, similar to the process Lt. Gen. Honoré sought to achieve with his request message to NORTHCOM.
- 129 Committee staff interview of Lt. Gen. James Amos, U.S. Marine Corps, Commander, Second Marine Expeditionary Force, conducted on Dec. 14, 2005, transcript, p. 9.
- 130 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 11.
- 131 Committee staff interview of Brig. Gen. Paul Selva, U.S. Air Force, Director of Operations, U.S. Transportation Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 16, 2006, transcript p. 13.
- 132 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 4. Provided to Committee.
- 133 Committee staff interview of Adm. Timothy Keating, U.S. Navy, Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted by Senator Susan Collins, Feb. 3, 2006, (untranscribed). Admiral Keating "woke up Tuesday morning saying New Orleans dodged a bullet." McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 34. "At that point, the magnitude of the disaster was still unknown, Hurricane Katrina made landfall on Monday, August 29. The news reports that we had all read on the following morning prior to the meeting that is the subject of my testimony were consistently inaccurate. If you take a look at The Washington Post or other publications, it's clear that for reasons that I think we understand a little better now but have not yet fully explained, initial media reports were more optimistic than warranted. There were references in news stories to having dodged the bullet. This is not a criticism of the media coverage. This was a huge storm, the scope of the damage was vast, and situational awareness was not yet clear. In any event, we went into the meeting on Tuesday morning with media reports that were less sobering than the scope of the actual damage."
- 134 1A JOC Watch Battle Captain, e-mail to 5th Bde, 87th Div, S-3 Ops and others, Sept. 1, 2005, 4:03 p.m. Lt. Gen. Honoré was among the recipients and "DoD Force Protection Lessons Learned: Hurricane Andrew, 24 August 1992, South Florida" was attached. Provided to Committee.
- 135 Joint Staff, Message to U.S. Northern Command, "DOD Support to FEMA," Aug. 29, 2005, 2300 Z. Provided to Committee. (Authorized by Brig. Gen. Scherling.).
- 136 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 28.
- 137 Committee staff interview of Col. Dan Shanahan, U.S. Army, Commander, 1st Air Cavalry Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 23, 2006 (not yet transcribed).
- 138 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 3212EM-LA-DOD-01, Aug. 28, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 139 FEMA, Mission Assignment Task Order Form, Aug. 28, 2005.
- 140 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 12.
- 141 See e.g.: Committee staff interview of Edward Buikema, Acting Director, Response Division, FEMA, conducted on Nov. 21, 2005, transcript p. 168. See also: Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 183 ("I think the process from beginning to end probably takes longer than it should."). However, Mr. Buikema was basing his statement that he was frustrated on a false premise, i.e., that the billion dollar logistics request was not "done" until Sept. 5. In fact, as discussed above, it was approved on Sept. 2. Buikema admitted that he "lost visibility" of this particular request and so had difficulty accounting for what he perceived caused a delay in its approval, but he still had an "instinct" that DOD was the cause for the delay. Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 171.

- 142 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 213.
- 143 U.S. Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, *The Federal Response to Hurricane Katrina: Lessons Learned*. Washington: Government Printing Office, Feb. 2006, p. 54 [hereinafter, The White House, *Hurricane Katrina Lessons Learned*] (“From the time a request is initiated until the military force or capability is delivered to the disaster site requires a 21-step process.”). The source for this statement is the U.S. Department of Defense, Joint Center for Operational Analysis, “Incident Command Request Briefing,” Nov. 1, 2005. That PowerPoint briefing includes a slide depicting the DOD approval process, and includes the statement “21 steps to get a truck.” The White House, *Hurricane Katrina Lessons Learned*, p. 54. The report then states that DOD’s processes resulted in “critical needs not being met” citing a written statement by Mayor-President Melvin “Kip” Holden submitted for a hearing before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on Sept. 28, 2005. Upon review, the statement by Mayor-President Holden does not support the factual assertion made by the Townsend Report because it does not relate to DOD.
- 144 Committee staff interview of William Lokey, Federal Coordinating Officer for Hurricane Katrina in Louisiana, FEMA, conducted on Jan. 20, 2006, transcript pp. 130-134. (One-billion dollar request was “negotiated with DOD”)
- 145 Committee staff interview of Scott Wells, Deputy Federal Coordinating Officer for Hurricane Katrina in Louisiana, FEMA, conducted on Nov. 15, 2005, transcript p. 124.
- 146 Committee staff interview of Col. Richard Chavez, U.S. Air Force, Senior Military Advisor for Civil Support, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Nov. 22, 2005, pp. 147-150; Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 30 (DOD liaison officers helped FEMA officials “with the verbiage of the mission assignment.”).
- 147 Committee staff interview of Gen. Richard Myers, U.S. Air Force (Ret.), former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 28, 2006, transcript p. 77.
- 148 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 79.
- 149 McHale, Senate Committee Hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.
- 150 Committee staff interview of Capt. Michael McDaniel, U.S. Navy, Navy Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officer to FEMA, conducted on Dec. 2, 2005, transcript p. 156.
- 151 Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006, pp. 27-28.
- 152 Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006.
- 153 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré and Lt. Gen. Joseph Inge, Aug. 29, 2005, 6:46 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 154 Maj. Gen. Rowe interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 31.
- 155 Wells interview, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 123.
- 156 Wells interview, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 124.
- 157 Michael Ritchie, e-mail to Anthony Capra, Aug. 29, 2005, 1:14 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 158 Col. Richard Chavez, e-mail to Anthony Capra and Michael Ritchie, Aug. 29, 2005, 2:35 p.m. Provided to Committee (“Does not fit policy for Immediate Response.”).
- 159 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 29.
- 160 Committee staff interview of Gordon England, Deputy Secretary of Defense, conducted by Senator Susan Collins on Feb. 3, 2006 (untranscribed).
- 161 England interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 162 Anthony Capra, e-mail to Paul McHale, Aug. 29, 2005, 5:25 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 163 Col. David Rhodes, e-mail to Tom Eldridge and Dan Berkovitz, Senate Committee staff members, May 3, 2006, 5:28 p.m.
- 164 Anthony Capra, e-mail to POL DoD HD Coordination Group and others, Aug. 30, 2005, 1:47 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 165 Mark Roupas, e-mail to Paul McHale, Aug. 30, 2005, 3:15 p.m. Provided to Committee. It is unclear what constituted confirmation of the breach to Assistant Secretary McHale’s office. Col. Chavez stated that Assistant Secretary McHale’s office received confirmation from the Corps at sunrise Wednesday morning. Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 85.
- 166 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 97.
- 167 *NRP*, p. 33.
- 168 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 131-132.
- 169 Capt. Frank Thorp, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Walter Sharp, Aug. 30, 2005, 8:15 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 170 Testimony of Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, before the U.S. House, Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: Preparedness and Response by the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the National Guard of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama*, Oct. 27, 2005.

- 171 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 1.
- 172 NC JOC-Director-OMB, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe and Rear Adm. Gene Brooks, Aug. 29, 2005, 4 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 173 Committee staff interview of Capt. Brett Markham, U.S. Navy, Deputy Director of Intelligence, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 7, 2005, transcript pp. 61-62.
- 174 Committee staff interview of Capt. Brett Markham, U.S. Navy, Deputy Director of Intelligence, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 8, 2005, transcript p. 5.
- 175 Capt. Markham interview, Dec. 8, 2005, pp. 4-5.
- 176 Capt. Markham interview, Dec. 8, 2005, pp. 7-8.
- 177 Committee staff interview of Col. Wesley McClellan, U.S. Navy, Navy Emergency Preparedness Liaison to FEMA, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 23, 2006, transcript p. 18.
- 178 Adm. Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 179 Committee staff interview of Brig. Gen. Moulton, U.S. Air Force, Director, Standing Joint Headquarters-North, U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Dec. 5, 2005, transcript pp. 69-70.
- 180 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 69.
- 181 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 79.
- 182 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, pp. 78-80.
- 183 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, p. 85.
- 184 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2005, pp. 68-69.
- 185 Adm. Edmund Giambastiani, e-mail to Adm. Timothy Keating, Aug. 30, 2005, 4:59 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 186 Col. Richard Chavez, e-mail to Tony Capra, Aug. 30, 2005, 8:25 a.m. Provided to Committee (“We need to keep these actions in the proper lane to avoid confusion and duplication of effort. FEMA is the lead and is the conduit for all Federal response coordination, planning and execution.”).
- 187 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 34-35.
- 188 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 9.
- 189 Col. David Rhodes, e-mail to Eric Andersen and Brian Lepore, Senate Committee staff members, Mar. 28, 2006, 4:25 p.m.; McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 30.
- 190 Gordon England, memorandum to SECDEF [Donald Rumsfeld], Aug. 30, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 191 Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, “Meetings Regarding Hurricane Katrina,” Sept. 7, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 192 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 9-10 (“And so with a verbal order from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, I called all the service chiefs, and I ask them...what we’ve got to do is...we gotta lean forward. We know we’re going to get asked to do things, so you services know what you provide and these kind of things, so work with Northern Command; make sure what you’re doing is smart, but start to lean forward. And if you need to preposition or move stuff, start to move and preposition stuff, because you know we’re going to get...the requests.”).
- 193 Adm. Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 194 Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, “Meetings Regarding Hurricane Katrina,” Sept. 7, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 195 England interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 196 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 37.
- 197 Adm. Timothy Keating, e-mail to Gen. Richard B. Myers and others, Aug. 30, 2005, 12:24 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 198 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 30-31.
- 199 Capt. McDaniel interview, Dec. 2, 2005, p. 69.
- 200 Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 81.
- 201 U.S. Joint Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Timeline, Nov. 15, 2006, p. 5. Provided to Committee.
- 202 Maj. Gen. Rowe interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 42.
- 203 Adm. Timothy Keating, e-mail to Brig. Gen. Frank Helmick and others, Aug. 30, 2005, 9:18 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 204 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 14-15 (“During that week, before ...we had received a modest number of requests for assistance from the Department of Homeland Security. During that period of time, when the Department of Defense were prepared to review and approve a greater number of RFAs covering a wider range of missions than those we actually

received – in short, we were leaning forward in anticipation of RFAs from Department of Homeland Security, but because of the magnitude of the event and the complexity of some of the mission requirements, the RFAs had not yet begun to appear in large numbers...during that first week, the RFAs we had received were fairly specific and modest in scope.”).

205 Col. Roberson interview, Nov. 10, 2005, p. 114.

206 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 14-15, 39.

207 Brig. Gen. Moulton interview, Dec. 5, 2005, p. 43.

208 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, “NORTHCOM Mod 6 to EXORD Katrina,” Aug. 31, 2005, 0300 Z. Provided to Committee.

209 U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina, Navy Mission: Providing Rescue & Civil Support Relief from the Sea, Air and Land, Aftermath. Provided to Committee; JTF-Katrina, Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 3, 2005. Provided to Committee.

210 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 1.

211 Vice Adm. Fitzgerald interview, Nov. 15, 2005.

212 Vice Adm. Fitzgerald interview, Nov. 15, 2005.

213 Vice Adm. Fitzgerald interview, Nov. 15, 2005.

214 Committee staff interview of Vice Adm. Vivien Crea, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Coast Guard Atlantic Area and Commander, Maritime Defense Zone Atlantic, conducted on Jan. 3, 2006, transcript p. 40.

215 Committee staff interview of Capt. Richard Snyder, U.S. Navy, Executive Officer, USS *Bataan*, conducted on Nov. 14, 2005 (untranscribed); JTF-Katrina, Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 3, 2005. Provided to Committee.

216 Capt. Snyder interview, Nov. 14, 2005.

217 Capt. Snyder interview, Nov. 14, 2005.

218 Committee staff interview of Capt. Bruce Jones, U.S. Coast Guard, Commanding Officer, Coast Guard Air Station New Orleans, conducted on Nov. 9, 2005 (untranscribed). Evidence suggests that DOD had debated whether USS *Bataan* was authorized to provide assistance with its helicopters prior to being requested or ordered. Col. Chavez wrote in an e-mail to a DOD liaison at DHS that although Vice Adm. Fitzgerald had publicly announced the availability of USS *Bataan* and her helicopters, the ship’s captain does not have the authority to assist unless specifically ordered: “Does not fit policy for Immediate Response.” Col. Richard Chavez, e-mail to Tony Capra, Aug. 29, 2005, 2:35 p.m. Provided to Committee.

219 Capt. Snyder interview, Nov. 14, 2005.

220 Committee staff interview of Rear Adm. Joseph Kilkenny, U.S. Navy, former Joint Forces Maritime Component Commander, JTF Katrina, conducted on Nov. 30, 2005 (untranscribed).

221 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 11. Provided to Committee.

222 Rear Adm. Kilkenny interview, Nov. 30, 2005.

223 Rear Adm. Kilkenny interview, Nov. 30, 2005; Vice Adm. Fitzgerald interview, Nov. 15, 2005.

224 Rear Adm. Kilkenny interview, Nov. 30, 2005.

225 JTF-Katrina, Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 3, 2005. Provided to Committee.

226 Committee staff interview of Rear Adm. Reuben Bookert, U.S. Navy, Joint Force Maritime Component Commander, U.S. Second Fleet, conducted on Nov. 16, 2005 (untranscribed).

227 U.S. Northern Command, message to Joint Staff, “Request for Forces,” Sept. 2, 2005, 0530 Z. Provided to Committee. The message also requested the USS *Whidbey Island* and four logistics ships from Military Sealift Command.

228 JTF-Katrina, Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 4, 2005. Provided to Committee.

229 Vice Adm. Crea interview, Jan. 3, 2006, p. 41.

230 U.S. Fleet Forces Command, “Hurricane Katrina, Navy Mission: Providing Rescue and Civil Support Relief from the Sea, Air and Land,” p. 9. Provided to Committee.

231 Rear Adm. Anthony Winns, e-mail to Lt. Gen. James Conway, Sept. 15, 2005, 1:20 p.m. Provided to Committee.

232 Insung Lee, e-mail to HSOC.SWO and others, Aug. 31, 2005, 11:50 a.m. Provided to Committee.

233 U.S. Fleet Forces Command, “Hurricane Katrina, Navy Mission: Providing Rescue and Civil Support Relief from the Sea, Air and Land,” p. 9. Provided to Committee.

234 Committee staff interview of Cmdr. Thomas Quinn, U.S. Navy, Director of Operations, Naval Air Forces, Atlantic, conducted on Nov. 15, 2005 (untranscribed).

235 Vice Adm. Mark Fitzgerald, e-mail to Adm. Michael Mullen, Sept. 2, 2005, 5:53 p.m. Provided to Committee.

236 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 48.

237 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 46.

238 Col. Tom Muir, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, Aug. 29, 2005, 4 p.m. Provided to Committee.

- 239 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 33.
- 240 U.S. Department of Defense, First U.S. Army, Joint Task Force Katrina, "Hurricane Katrina Chronology." Provided to Committee.
- 241 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 29.
- 242 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "NORTHCOM Mod 4 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 30, 2005, 0200 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 243 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "NORTHCOM Mod 5 to EXORD Katrina," Aug. 30, 2005, 2100 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 244 U.S. Department of Defense, First U.S. Army, Joint Task Force Katrina, Hurricane Katrina Chronology. Provided to Committee.
- 245 Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 24-27.
- 246 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 8.
- 247 U.S. Forces Command, Message to III Corps and XVIII Corps, "FORSCOM Frago #8 Provides Support of BDE Size Forces ISO Hurricane Katrina Relief Operations," Sept. 1, 2005, 0039 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 248 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 20.
- 249 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 25-26. Notes from the Forces Command teleconference at 8 a.m. correspond to this time frame, and state that the command was "just waiting for the trigger to deploy," and that a phased deployment plan was in place to commit the Brigade to the response. U.S. Forces Command, notes of FORSCOM Teleconference, Sept. 2, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 250 Col. Michael Okita, e-mail to Maj. Gen. William Caldwell and others, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:02 a.m. Provided to Committee. According to Maj. Gen. Caldwell, "It was no longer be prepared now, it was on order. When you change to an on order, that means you need to plan on it occurring at some time in the future. It doesn't mean it will, but it just says you need now to plan on it. And they said, on order deploy your Division Headquarters [approx. 180 people] and a Brigade Task Force [approx. 3,200 people] in support of JTF Katrina...with the purpose of operating distribution centers, crowd control and security, in the New Orleans area." Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 23-24.
- 251 President George W. Bush, "President Addresses Nation, Discusses Hurricane Katrina Relief Efforts," radio address, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:06 a.m. ET. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/09/20050903.html>. Accessed on Apr. 21, 2006.
- 252 U.S. Forces Command, Message to Commanders of III Corps and others, "FORSCOM Exorder Deploys Units in Support of JTF-KAT," Sept. 3, 2005, 1729 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 253 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 31-32.
- 254 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 36 ("The fact that we moved that force and did not kill, maim or injure a single person is absolutely incredible. They went from a cold start. I don't keep 1,383 vehicles prepped and ready to go on a key moment's notice. I keep about - I'd have to guess, about 180 to 240. So we literally were going across the Division grabbing vehicles, people, because we just realized the great need for command and control, logistics support, medical support, so we put that all on the road.").
- 255 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 49.
- 256 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 50-53.
- 257 Col. Shanahan interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 258 U.S. Northern Command, Message to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, "NORTHCOM Mod 8 to EXORD Katrina," Sept. 2, 2005, 0015 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 259 Col. Shanahan interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 260 Col. Shanahan interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 261 U.S. Forces Command, Message to III Corps and XVIII Corps, "Frago 8," contained in e-mail from First Army Joint Operations Center Watch Team to LTG Honoré and others, Sept. 1, 2005, 4:23 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 262 Committee staff interview of Col. Bryan Roberts, U.S. Army, Commander, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Cavalry Division, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 23, 2006 (untranscribed).
- 263 Col. Roberts interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 264 President George W. Bush, "President Addresses Nation, Discusses Hurricane Katrina Relief Efforts," radio address, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:06 a.m. ET. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/09/20050903.html>. Accessed on Apr. 21, 2006.
- 265 Col. Roberts interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 266 U.S. Department of Defense, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Review Task Force, "Standing Rules for the Use of Force," Sept. 2, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 267 Col. Roberts interview, Feb. 23, 2006.
- 268 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 10.
- 269 Second Marine Expeditionary Force, Hurricane Katrina Timeline. Provided to Committee; Lt. Gen. Amos interview,

Dec. 14, 2005, p. 14.

270 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, pp. 15-16; Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, Timeline, What Marine forces were deployed, when were they deployed, and on what authority were they deployed? Provided to Committee (states that on Sept. 1, multiple aircraft “self-deploy to NAS Pensacola, FL”).

271 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 21.

272 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 22. “JTF Katrina Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 2, 2005” confirms that as of 7 a.m. Friday, “SPMAGTF assessment team in Belle Chase. ADVON COB today. CE 03 Sept. 130 Pax CE total,” and also “Reserve AAV platoon closed on ISB Gulf Port, MS. BPT posture.” JTF-Katrina, Commander’s Assessment, Sept. 2, 2005. Provided to Committee.

273 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 75.

274 Lt. Gen. James Amos, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Honoré, via First Army JOC Watch Battle Captain, Sept. 1, 2005, 8:25 a.m. Provided to Committee.

275 Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Amos, via 1A JOC Watch Battle Captain, Sept. 1, 2005, 7:48 p.m. Provided to Committee.

276 Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, e-mail to Lt. Gen. James Amos, Sept. 2, 2005, 10:08 a.m. Provided to Committee.

277 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, pp. 23-24.

278 Capt. Robert Reininger, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, Sept. 2, 2005, 6:35 a.m. Provided to Committee.

279 Maj. Gen. O’Dell interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 28.

280 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 75.

281 Marine Forces Atlantic, Message to Commanding General, II MEF and Commander of Marine Forces Reserve, “COMMARFORLANT Deployment order,” Sept. 2, 2005, 1850 Z. Provided to Committee.

282 Par. 3.A.2 of the COMMARFORLANT Deployment order states: “Concept of op. COMMARFORLANT requests ROMMARFORRES to ID, Prep, and deploy aviation assets into ISB NAS Pensacola, FL and det AAV vic Gulfport, MS for further movement into affected areas iso SPMAGTF GC. COMMARFORLANT dir CG II MEF to ID, prep and deploy a SPMAGTF iso comdr JTF Katrina HA/DR operations in and around the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. SPMAGTF deploys via sea, land, and hcptr NLT 03 Sep 05.” Marine Forces Atlantic, Message to Commanding General, II MEF and Commander of Marine Forces Reserve, “COMMARFORLANT Deployment order,” Sept. 2, 2005, 1850 Z. Provided to Committee.

283 Maj. Gen. Rowe interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 80.

284 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 25.

285 Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, pp. 27-28.

286 Maj. Gen. O’Dell interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 32.

287 Maj. Gen. O’Dell interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 33.

288 Maj. Gen. O’Dell interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 34.

289 Brig. Gen. Selva interview, Feb. 16, 2006, pp. 12-15.

290 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1603DR-LA-DOD-01, Aug. 30, 2005. Provided to Committee.

291 Committee staff interview of Col. Glen Joerger, U.S. Air Force, Former Vice Commander, 436th Airlift Wing, Dover Air Force Base, pre-designated Director of Mobility Forces, Air Mobility Command, U.S. Transportation Command, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 6, 2006, transcript p. 15.

292 Col. Joerger interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 17.

293 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1603DR-LA-DOD-14, Sept. 1, 2005. Provided to Committee.

294 Col. Joerger interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 27.

295 Col. Joerger interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 20.

296 William Lokey, e-mail to Michael Lowder, Edward Buikema, Nicol Andrews and Thomas Bossert, Aug. 31, 2005, 12:30 a.m. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. DHS 0004688.

297 Col. Joerger interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 28.

298 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 25-26.

299 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 34.

300 McHale, Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

301 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, U.S. Army, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Paul Sullivan, Sept. 1, 2005, 7:28 a.m.; Capt. Robert Reininger, U.S. Coast Guard, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, Sept. 1, 2005, 10:54 a.m.

302 Adm. Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.

303 Maj. Gen. Rowe interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 84.

- 304 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, Sept. 4, 2005, 10:47 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 305 Brig. Gen. Moulton interview, Dec. 5, 2005, p. 24. NORTHCOM directed the deployment in message “Mod 12 to EXORD Katrina,” Sept. 3, 2005, 1200 Z. Provided to Committee.
- 306 He and his Louisiana National Guard counterpart, Brig. Gen. Hunt Downer, who had taken on the task of Reception, Staging, Onward Movement and Integration of Guard forces, derived a draft solution of the problem: “So we sort of, on the back of a napkin, if you will, drew up a basic construct, which is we would try to take over some of the key mission sets to then probably utilize National Guard forces for those missions that Title 10 guys could not do.” Brig. Gen. Moulton interview, Dec. 5, 2005, p. 42.
- 307 Brig. Gen. Moulton interview, Dec. 5, 2005, pp. 52-53.
- 308 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 54.
- 309 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 54-55.
- 310 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 54-55.
- 311 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 40. Woods and her staff were “aware of a need to get food into the Superdome,” but did not interpret that as something the NORTHCOM staff had to work because they understood it was being worked at the state and JTF level. Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 40.
- 312 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 18, 40.
- 313 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 20 (“Our ability to support is dependent upon a mission assignment which gives us that authority to provide the support.”).
- 314 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 41.
- 315 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1603DR-LA-DOD-14, Sept. 1, 2005. Provided to Committee.
- 316 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1603DR-LA-DOD-12, Sept. 1, 2005. Provided to Committee (requesting “DOD/NG (EMAC) provide 50,000 MRE’s/Water to people located in the vicinity of the LA Superdome NLT [not later than] daybreak 01 Sept. 05. Also provide 1,000 MREs/water to people located in the vicinity of Clover Leaf” in the amount of \$100,000.00); FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1603DR-LA-DOD-13, Sept. 1, 2005. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. DHS 0000525 (requesting “DOD/NG (EMAC) to air drop food (MRE) & water along Gulf Coast areas affected by Hurricane Katrina and City of New Orleans” in the amount of \$300,000.00). These mission assignments are different from the one billion dollar mission assignment to have DOD take over logistics discussed below. The 50,000 cases of MREs delivered to Mississippi on Sept. 3-4, 2005 were delivered pursuant to the one billion dollar assignment, not these two assignments. Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 46-47, 75-76.
- 317 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, pp. 133, 140.
- 318 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 134. Lokey said that’s when he told Brown, “that we needed to get help.”
- 319 Committee staff interview of Michael Brown, former Director, FEMA, conducted on Jan. 23, 2006, transcript pp. 198-199.
- 320 For example, Ken Burris, FEMA’s acting director of operations, told staff in his interview that, prior to Buikema’s visit that Thursday morning, he did not believe DOD needed to play a larger role in logistics. Committee staff interview of Ken Burris, Chief of Operations, FEMA, conducted on Dec. 29, 2005, transcript p. 82. Col. Al Jones, a defense liaison who was assigned permanently to assist Brown and was with him on Thursday when Brown met with General Honoré stated that Brown told Honoré DOD “could possibly” help with logistics. Committee staff interview of Col. Al Jones, U.S. Army, Senior Army Advisor, Georgia Army National Guard, conducted on Mar. 2, 2006, transcript p. 36. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Paul McHale said that he spoke with Brown on Wednesday, August 31, and that Brown did not mention that he wanted DOD to take over FEMA’s logistics function. Committee staff interview of the Hon. Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Feb. 17, 2005 (untranscribed).
- 321 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, pp. 156-157.
- 322 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 166.
- 323 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 169.
- 324 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 169.
- 325 Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 170.
- 326 Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, p. 82. Initially, Burris stated that FEMA wanted DOD to “take over the process of distributing [commodities] into the forward operating areas.” *Source:* Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, p. 117; however, after reviewing the actual mission assignment, Burris stated that DOD was being asked to assume FEMA’s responsibility. *Source:* Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, p. 124.
- 327 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 137.
- 328 Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, p. 112.
- 329 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 138.
- 330 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 134.

331 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 137 (“At the time this took place, we did not need that help from them ... As a matter of fact, I’m not sure they ever took over that.”).

332 Brown interview, Jan. 23, 2006, p. 186 (“as I recall the meeting, it was more I want you to do logistics. I want you just to take over logistics completely”). Aside from Brown’s statements in his staff interview, we have not found corroborating evidence that Brown made a request to Honoré on Wednesday that DOD take over all logistics. General Honoré did not mention it in connection with his staff interview when he discussed what he said was a brief “sidebar” meeting with Brown on this date. *Source*: Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 103. Honoré also does not include any meeting with Brown in his timeline of events for Wednesday August 31, but he does include a meeting with Brown the next day, Sept. 1, 2005. *Source*: U.S. Department of Defense, First U.S. Army, Joint Task Force Katrina, Hurricane Katrina Chronology. Provided to Committee. In addition, Brown testified to staff that he thought he met with Honoré on a different day than August 31, the day he had a telephone conversation with the General. *Source*: Brown interview, Jan. 23, 2005, p. 181. Thus, Brown may have made his request for logistics assistance the next day. This is consistent with the recollection of Col. Al Jones, who testified to Committee staff that Brown mentioned logistics to Honoré in a meeting with him on Thursday, Sept. 1, 2005. However, Jones remembered that Brown said DOD “could possibly” help with logistics, which is a different recollection from Brown’s. *Source*: Col. Jones interview, Mar. 2, 2006, p. 36. In light of this conflicting testimony, we have not been able to resolve when Brown first raised this issue with DOD officials or what specific request he made when he did raise it.

333 Although a number of witnesses testified that this exchange and other events related to this assignment took place on Thursday, Sept. 1, the documentary evidence we have reviewed (cited below) suggests it may have taken place on Friday, Sept. 2.

334 Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, pp. 82, 84.

335 Col. Richard Chavez, e-mail to Thomas Kuster, Sept. 2, 2005, 9:38 a.m. Provided to Committee. In his staff interview, Chavez recalled the request as “take over all logistical operations for FEMA.” *Source*: Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, pp. 118-119. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Paul McHale recalled the initial request as “full logistics support throughout the entire area of responsibility.” *Source*: McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

336 Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 121.

337 Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, p. 133.

338 Col. Richard Chavez, e-mail to Thomas Kuster, Sept. 2, 2005, 9:38 a.m. Provided to Committee; Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 9, 2005, pp. 119, 121.

339 ESF-1 – Transportation, for example, includes as a “function” that DOD “Provides military transportation capacity from the U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) to move essential resources and assist in the contracting for civilian airlift when requested and approval by the Secretary of Defense.” *NRP*, p. ESF #1-4.

340 Captain Mike McDaniel, e-mail to the DOD Joint Directorate of Military Support and others, Sept. 2, 2005, 10:48 a.m. (“I received a hard copy of an e-mail from Mr. Ken Burris just now with the following wording:

Gentlemen,

This is the request that was made of DOD this morning. I spoke with Col. Chaves [sic] in the Dep Sec office of DOD that instructed me that the request must come from Secretary to Secretary.

‘FEMA request that DOD provide the support the planning and execution of the full logistical support to the Katrina disaster in all declared states in coordination with FEMA.’

We currently have DOD lashed up with our Response Division to make this happen and our DOD reps are moving forward.

Mr. Burris indicated to me that the wording was very important.”).

See also: Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 22, 2005, p. 134 (“From that point on, again, there were a number of e-mails, as we saw ... that went between Mr. Burris and Chertoff saying that the Secretaries should talk. Whatever happened in the interim, the next e-mail I got from Ken Burris and phone call was okay, I’m revising the request for assistance, and the request for assistance now stated that DOD provide support to FEMA for procurement and distribution of ice, food, water, fuel, and medical supplies.”). Col. Chavez thought it was significant that the request submitted on Friday requested DOD’s “support” in the Katrina response in “specific areas” rather than the initial request which requested that DOD take over logistics from FEMA. Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 22, 2005, pp. 122-123.

341 Burris interview, Dec. 29, 2005, p. 83. We have not been able to establish whether Secretary Chertoff called Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. However, an e-mail establishes that Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Paul McHale spoke with Chertoff’s Deputy Michael Jackson, so the matter ultimately may have been handled at a level below the Secretaries. Paul McHale, e-mail to Michael Jackson, Sept. 2, 2005, 7:41 p.m. Provided to Committee (“Thought you might be interested in reading this follow-up to our conversation.”).

342 McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006; Adm. Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.

343 Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Hurricane Katrina/Rita/Ophelia Interim Timeline, Nov. 2, 2005, p. 8. Provided to Committee; Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 22, 2005, p. 118.

344 Col. Chavez interview, Nov. 22, 2005, pp. 118, 114.

345 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1604DR-MS-DOD-19, Sept. 2, 2005.

346 FEMA, Mission Assignment, 1604DR-MS-DOD-19, Sept. 2, 2005. As discussed below, this amount was an estimate.

347 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 82-83. Although some amount of this assignment was de-obligated, this had no effect on DOD's logistics operation. Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 83; Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, pp. 134, 137 (Assignment was to "cover the eventualities.").

348 Written Statement of Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, for the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on Hurricane Katrina: The Defense Department's Role in the Response, Feb. 9, 2006, p. 8; McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

349 U.S. Department of Defense, "DOD FEMA Mission Assignment Summary," as of Feb. 28, 2006, p. 1. Provided to Committee. Although FEMA de-obligated \$500 million dollars from this mission and then re-obligated the same amount, we have not been able to discern any effect on DOD's activities in carrying out the mission from those fiscal decisions.

350 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 43-45; McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

351 Paul McHale, e-mail to Michael Jackson, Sept. 2, 2005, 7:41 p.m. Provided to Committee ("Michael - Thought you might be interested in reading this follow-up to our conversation. SECDEF has agreed to support your RFA for broad logistics support, throughout the entire four state AOR. We're working on the specific language - and a planning staff to implement it. We may actually be able to do more than you have requested. We will get back to you with written confirmation tomorrow AM. Keep up the good work. Paul").

352 U.S. Department of Defense, "MOD 8 to EXORD for DOD Support to FEMA for Hurricane Katrina," signed by Peter F. Verga, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, and others, Sept. 3, 2005. Provided to Committee. MOD 8 ordered NORTHCOM to begin logistical support operations, "upon CJCS approval of CONOPS."

353 On that Friday morning, Gary Moore, the Director of Logistics for FEMA, spoke with Col. Roberta Woods, Chief of Plans and Operations in NORTHCOM's Logistics Division in Colorado Springs, Colorado, and said, "Robbie I need help. ... We need help with commodity distribution: food, water, ice. ... We're sending a mission assignment to ... DOD for this." Woods' impression was that the Moore's request was "Pretty much open-ended, start to finish." *Source:* Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 36. Woods said that this call was a major turning point. "That's when life changed for me personally and for the bulk of the J4 staff." *Source:* Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 36. Woods asked Moore, "Who do I talk to ... to figure out what's going on and what's needed?" *Source:* Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 43. She got the information and "immediately began doing detailed tracking as best we could, understanding processes, systems. I mean, we were ... massively in the information gathering mode at this time because we had not had direct access to information. We had sort of eavesdropped." *Source:* Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 44.

354 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 44.

355 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 57.

356 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 51.

357 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 52.

358 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 46.

359 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 59; Brig. Gen. Mike Lally, e-mail to Brig. Gen. Paul Selva, Sept. 4, 2005, 12:34 p.m. Provided to Committee (discussing difficulties of having too many aircraft converge on Norfolk, Virginia to airlift MREs because it was difficult to put the MREs on pallets "in this short amount of time").

360 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 46, 53-53.

361 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 62 ("And ... that's what ... our experience ... in military logistics taught us, is you prioritize. Everything can't be all the same equal importance right now because it requires all the same kinds of transportation.").

362 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 46-48.

363 *NRP*; Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 50.

364 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 50.

365 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 45 ("We tried to grasp the magnitude of the task, you know, what is it you really want us to do, because FEMA did not step out. And ... for a little while, we were in the is FEMA going to completely back out and DOD has it all, or is FEMA staying and we're just going to assist?"). *See also:* JTF-Katrina, Commander's Assessment, Sept. 2, 2005, 7 p.m. Provided to Committee.

366 NORTHCOM's logistics staff thought it likely that the distribution infrastructure at the state level - in other words, after the operational staging area managed by FEMA - "would remain in place to execute that piece of the task." *Source:* Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 63. Admiral Keating said NORTHCOM did not want to take over distributing commodities for the last part of the distribution chain because DOD could not legally command National Guard forces involved in that task. *Source:* Admiral Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006. Col. Jones, the military advisor to PFO Brown, who was involved with developing DOD's commodities distribution plan during the first weekend after the storm, told the Committee that the National Guard advised they would remain in control of distribution from the PODs. *Source:* Col. Jones interview, Mar. 2, 2006, p. 40.

367 Rear Adm. Steven Maas, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Robert Dail, Sept. 3, 2005, 2:59 p.m. Provided to Committee; Col. Roberta Woods, e-mail to Col. James Hodge, Sept. 5, 2005, 8:24 p.m. Provided to Committee ("NORTHCOM Headquarters have responsibility for distribution management from the depot (either DLA or USACE contract, etc) to the Forward Operational Staging Area [FOSA] - that's from the strategic level into the [Joint] O[perating] A[rea]. [Joint] T[ask] F[orce]-Katrina

... has responsibility for management at the FOSA (in coordination with FEMA) down to the state designated distribution points. (That's the operational level.) The state has responsibility for the tactical level distribution to individuals.”).

368 Col. James Hodge, e-mail to Rear Adm. Steven Maas, Sept. 6, 2005, 9:18 p.m. Provided to Committee.

369 Col. James Hodge, e-mail to Rear Adm. Steven Maas, Sept. 6, 2005, 9:18 p.m. Provided to Committee. *See also:* Lt. Gen. Robert Dail, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Duncan McNabb, Sept. 3, 2005, 11:56 a.m. Provided to Committee (DOD “will not execute ‘tactical distribution.’”).

370 Wells interview, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 91 (“I don’t recall distribution of supplies being I’ll call it, a red item. Maybe an amber item, but it was working. We had the op – we had the staging area at Beauregard working; we had an oversight feeding that [was] working, and then we were putting stuff forward. Now, from that point forward, we had problems. But people were getting food, people were getting water, people in the Superdome got food and water every day.”).

371 Col. Woods interview, Dec. 7, 2005, pp. 45-46.

372 Paul McHale, e-mail to Michael Jackson, Sept. 2, 2005, 7:41 p.m. Provided to Committee.

373 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 16.

374 Committee staff interview of Michael Jackson, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, conducted on Jan. 27, 2006, transcript p. 25.

375 Jackson interview, Jan. 27, 2006, p. 26.

376 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 15-16.

377 Jackson interview, Jan. 27, 2006, pp. 26-27.

378 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 16. Edward Buikema, the acting Director of FEMA’s Response Division was present at the meeting and described England’s view of whether DOD was willing to take on large portions of the response effort: “He was – he was more than willing to help out, as I recall. He was very positive, very much no resistance. It was a very frank discussion. As I mentioned, Deputy Secretary Jackson was there. I was there, but just observing more than anything, but it was a positive, very positive discussion.” Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 259. The colloquy continued, “Q: So people at the top level seemed to want to get this done. A: Yes, sir.”

379 Col. Darryl Roberson, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rich Rowe, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:39 p.m. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. DHS-HSOC-0004-0003817; Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, pp. 160-162.

380 This requirement appears redundant vis a vis the earlier \$1 billion logistics mission assignment, and indeed, one draft version of this mission assignment indicates “portions of which may already be covered on MS-DOD 19,” the logistics mission assignment. Col. Darryl Roberson, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rich Rowe, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:39 p.m. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. DHS-HSOC-0004-0003817.

381 Paul McHale, e-mail to Matthew Broderick and others, Sept. 5, 2005, 5:07 p.m. Provided to Committee (including e-mail chain among DHS and DOD officials regarding the large FEMA Mission Assignment attached to this e-mail); Col. Darryl Roberson, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rich Rowe, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:39 p.m. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. DHS-HSOC-0004-0003817 (enclosing a very similar list that appears to have been drafted earlier in the process but which contains substantially the same list of missions, and which states “Sir, there was a meeting this evening with representatives of DHS, FEMA, OSD, JS, and COE to craft a RFA/mission statement that would reflect the increased responsibilities DoD is taking on with Hurricane Katrina. The following two products [one an organization chart and one a list of the missions described above] have been agreed to at the ASD level.”).

382 This original list was approved by the Deputy Secretaries of Defense and Homeland Security in the evening on Saturday, Sept. 3, 2005. *Source:* Matthew Broderick, e-mail to Gail Kulisch and Admiral Timothy Sullivan, Sept. 4, 2005, 12:30 p.m. Provided to Committee (referencing the attachment and stating, “Results are a series of meetings between both Dep Secs and lower level staffing actions”). On Sunday, Sept. 4, Deputy Secretary England sent a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense setting forth the draft in written text. *Source:* Deputy Secretary of Defense and Vice Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, memorandum to Secretary of Defense, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral Keating, Sept. 4, 2005, 1:30 p.m. Provided to Committee (“If you agree with the draft it will be sent to DHS to be put on the normal RFA form. It will then be processed and appear in an orders book for your final approval.”). The Secretary of Defense, who was traveling to the Gulf Coast when he received this memorandum via facsimile, “responded favorably to the substantive content of this document” but instructed that the various requests be broken out into “more logical and operationally effective component parts” because “the topics included ... related resources.” *Source:* McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 19. McHale stated that there was “no resistance on the part of this department to the underlying substance of the RFA.” Rather, “The Secretary instructed me to disaggregate a very brief, very broad single RFA into more logical and operationally effective component parts so that mission areas that were discretely defined would not be illogically folded into a single document.”

383 Written Statement of McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006, p. 9.

384 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 20. *See also:* Frank DiFalco, e-mail to Ken Burris, Sept. 5, 2005, 7:28 p.m. Provided to Committee (“please process the attached RFAs and submit to DOD this evening.”). Although we cannot pinpoint the time of approval, these two sources indicate that the Secretary of Defense approved the RFAs after 7:28 p.m. the evening of Sept. 5, 2005, although he vocally approved them earlier. Paul McHale, e-mail to Frank DiFalco, Sept. 5, 2005, 7:37 p.m. Provided to Committee (“SecDef gave VOCO to the draft RFA we sent you.”).

385 Maj. Gen. Caldwell interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 36.

386 Michael Jackson, e-mail to Paul McHale, Sept. 6, 2005, 11:17 a.m. Provided to Committee.

- 387 Written Statement of McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006, p. 9; Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 388 Jackson interview, Jan. 27, 2006, pp. 27-28.
- 389 The USS *Bataan* launched helicopters for search and rescue and logistics missions at 6 p.m. ET, Tues. Aug 30, 2005, in coordination with U.S. Coast Guard District Eight. Capt. Snyder interview, Nov. 14, 2005.
- 390 Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 25-28, 44-45.
- 391 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 11. Provided to Committee (indicates Wednesday, Aug. 31, 2005.: Aeromedical Evacuation mission (47 patients).).
- 392 U.S. Joint Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Timeline, Nov. 15, 2006, p. 8. Provided to Committee (indicates Friday, Sept. 2: "Navy P-3 conduct streaming video mission to assess hurricane impact.").
- 393 U.S. Joint Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Timeline, Nov. 15, 2006, p. 7. Provided to Committee (indicates Thursday, Sep 1: "468,000 MREs shipped.").
- 394 Col. Joerger interview, Jan. 6, 2006, pp. 13-16; U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 15. Provided to Committee (indicates that on Friday, Sept. 2, 2005: "Navy CH-53 helos dumping sand bags [in] levee breaches.").
- 395 U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 17. Provided to Committee (indicates that on Saturday, Sept. 3, 2005: "Slingload of MRE's are made along the Gulf Coast.").
- 396 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 135 (Q: So they were already helping with this [the one billion dollar logistics request]? A: Oh heavens, yes. Oh, yes.).
- 397 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 136 ("But what I will speak to is Col. [Daskevich] and his people. They busted their ass to do anything I asked them to do. Our bureaucratic processes are slow."). Lokey described DOD's assistance in evacuating the Superdome, stating "They did the planning for it and their people – they had people down at the bus distribution, or the collection points, staging areas, and at the Dome, they were helping organize the National Guard folks and the other folks on scene, lined the people up and get them on the buses. They did it for us and I thought they did an excellent job." Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 140. *See also:* Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 205 ("Honoré's a guy, he makes things happen. ... He was picking up garbage, he was rescuing people, he was doing all sorts of stuff that he had the people and the stuff to do.").
- U.S. Joint Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Timeline, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 8. Provided to Committee (indicates Friday, Sept. 2: "Navy P-3 conduct streaming video mission to assess hurricane impact.").
- U.S. Joint Forces Command, Hurricane Katrina Comprehensive Timeline, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 7. Provided to Committee (indicates Thursday, Sept. 1: "468,000 MREs shipped.").
- U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 15. Provided to Committee (indicates that on Friday, Sept. 2, 2005: "Navy CH-53 helos dumping sand bags in levee breaches.").
- U.S. Northern Command, USNORTHCOM Hurricane Katrina Timeline (Draft), p. 17. Provided to Committee (indicates that on Saturday, Sept. 3, 2005: "Slingload of MRE's are made along the Gulf Coast.").
- Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 135.
- Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 136 ("But what I will speak to is Col. [Daskevich] and his people. They busted their ass to do anything I asked them to do. Our bureaucratic processes are slow"). Lokey described DOD's assistance in evacuating the Superdome, stating "They did the planning for it and their people – they had people down at the bus distribution, or the collection points, staging areas, and at the Dome, they were helping organize the National Guard folks and the other folks on scene, lined the people up and get them on the buses. They did it for us and I thought they did an excellent job." *Source:* Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 140. *See also:* Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 205 ("he makes things happen, and quite frankly, when he started making things happen, I didn't care because he was making things happen and he was picking up garbage, he was rescuing people, he was doing all sorts of stuff that he had the people and the stuff to do."); Buikema interview, Nov. 21, 2005, p. 181 ("I believe they did" fulfill all mission assignments that FEMA gave them; "In terms of the communications and cooperation between us, it was good ... it was good."); Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. Bennett Landreneau, U.S. Army, Adjutant General, Louisiana, conducted on Jan. 11, 2006, transcript p. 78 ("I believe he [Brig. Gen. Graham] was helping a lot.").
- 398 Wells interview, Nov. 14, 2005, pp. 122, 123.
- 399 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 135.
- 400 Testimony of Gov. Haley Barbour, Mississippi, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Role of the Governors in Managing the Catastrophe*, Feb. 2, 2006 ("Ultimately, the United States military provided us 1.5 million MREs that – I remember them flying in C-17s, if I remember right, there at Gulfport, Biloxi, and started unloading tens of thousands of cases of MREs. Again, I don't know whether to attribute that to FEMA being agile or the military just filling in for them, but for us, it was a godsend.").
- 401 Gov. Haley Barbour, Mississippi, Executive Order 939, Aug. 26, 2005; Written Statement of Maj. Gen. Harold A. Cross, Adjutant General, Mississippi Army and Air National Guard, before the U.S. House, Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: Preparedness and Response by the State of Mississippi*, Dec. 7, 2005.
- 402 Joint Force Headquarters, Mississippi National Guard, Memorandum, "Hurricane Katrina Narrative," Oct. 20, 2005, p.

1. Provided to Committee.

403 Written Statement of Maj. Gen. Cross, House Select Committee hearing, Dec. 7, 2005.

404 Written Statement of Maj. Gen. Cross, House Select Committee hearing, Dec. 7, 2005.

405 Joint Force Headquarters, Mississippi National Guard, Memorandum, "Hurricane Katrina Narrative," Oct. 20, 2005, p. 9. Provided to Committee.

406 Joint Force Headquarters, Mississippi National Guard, Memorandum, "Hurricane Katrina Narrative," Oct. 20, 2005, p. 7. Provided to Committee.

407 Gov. Barbour, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

408 Committee staff interview of Maj. Gen. Harold Cross, Adjutant General, Mississippi Army and Air National Guard, conducted on Jan. 26, 2006, transcript p. 12.

409 These forces included the Seabee base in Gulfport, Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, and Columbus Air Force Base. General Cross interview, Jan. 26, 2006, p. 15.

410 Written Statement of Maj. Gen. Cross, House Select Committee hearing, Dec. 7, 2005.

411 Committee staff interview of Col. Joe Spraggins, U.S. Air Force, Director, Harrison County Emergency Management Agency, MS, conducted on Nov. 17, 2005, transcript pp. 131-132.

412 Maj. Gen. Cross interview, Jan. 26, 2006, pp. 38-39.

413 Maj. Gen. Cross interview, Jan. 26, 2006, p. 41.

414 Joint Force Headquarters, Mississippi National Guard, Memorandum, "Hurricane Katrina Narrative," Oct. 20, 2005, p. 4. Provided to Committee.

415 Theodore Roosevelt, First Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 3, 1901. 14 Messages and Papers of the President 6672.

416 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Response to the U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Document and Information Request Dated October 7, 2005 and to the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina, Overview of Gov. Kathleen Babineaux Blanco's Actions in Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina, Dec. 2, 2005, p. 7 [hereinafter Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline]. See also: Eric Lipton, Eric Schmitt, and Thom Shanker, "Political Issues Snarled Plans for Troop Aid," *The New York Times*, Sept. 9, 2005, Section A, p. 1.

417 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 7.

418 See: Eric Lipton, Eric Schmitt, and Thom Shanker, "Political Issues Snarled Plans for Troop Aid," *The New York Times*, Sept. 9, 2005, p. 1; Robert Travis Scott, "Politics delayed troops dispatch to N.O.," *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, Dec. 11, 2005, p. 1; Susan B. Glasser and Michael Grunwald, "The Steady Buildup to a City's Chaos; Confusion Reigned At Every Level of Government," *The Washington Post*, Sept. 11, 2005, p. A01; Nicole Gaouette, and others, "Katrina's Aftermath, The Response; Put to Katrina's Test; After 9/11, a master plan for disasters was drawn. It didn't weather the storm," *Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 11, 2005, p. 1.

419 *NRP*, p. 34.

420 The National Response Plan (NRP) describes the Joint Field Office (JFO) as "a multiagency coordination center established locally. It provides a central location for coordination of Federal, State, local, tribal, nongovernmental, and private-sector organizations with primary responsibility for threat response and incident support. The JFO enables the effective and efficient coordination of Federal incident-related prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery actions." *NRP*, p. 28.

421 The NRP designates the Defense Coordinating Officer (DCO) as "DOD's single point of contact in the JFO," and assigns him the responsibility to "coordinate and process" requests for assistance, "orchestrate the accomplishment of approved mission assignments," and "refer problematic or contentious issues" to higher military authorities. *NRP*, p. 42. The NRP excepts three types of requests for assistance from the requirement to coordinate through the Defense Coordinating Officer: (1) requests to the Army Corps of Engineers, which itself is considered a primary supporting agency under the Plan; (2) requests to the Army and Air National Guard, which under the NRP "are not part of Federal military response efforts"; and (3) requests for support to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for law enforcement and domestic counterterrorism activities. The NRP states that the DCO "may continue to perform all duties" in the NRP even if a Joint Task Force is established. *NRP*, p. 42.

422 McHale, House Select Committee hearing, Oct. 27, 2005.

423 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 132.

424 Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 132. William Lokey, the FEMA Federal Coordinating Officer, also stated FEMA did not make requests for large numbers of troops. Committee staff interview of William Lokey, Federal Coordinating Officer for Hurricane Katrina in Louisiana, FEMA, conducted on Nov. 4, 2005, transcript p. 224.

425 U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *Hurricane Katrina: DOD Disaster Response*, by Steve Bowman, Lawrence Kapp, and Amy Belasco, Jan. 24, 2006, p. CRS-8.

426 10 U.S.C. §§ 12301, 12302, 12304. The Congressional Research Service states that in the event of a catastrophic natural disaster, 10 U.S.C. § 12302 – which permits the President to activate the National Guard "in time of war or of national emergency declared by the President or when otherwise authorized by law" – "would probably be the authority that would be most useful for calling large numbers of National Guard personnel and other reservists to federal active

duty for an extended period of time. ... Historically, however, 10 U.S.C. § 12302 has only been used for national security purposes and it could be controversial to use this authority for disaster relief purposes.” U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *Hurricane Katrina: DOD Disaster Response*, by Steve Bowman, Lawrence Kapp, and Amy Belasco, Jan. 24, 2006, p. CRS-10.

427 10 U.S.C. §§ 331-335.

428 10 U.S.C. § 12406. This section requires such an order to be issued through the governors of the affected states.

429 U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *The Use of Federal Troops for Disaster Assistance: Legal Issues*, by Jennifer K. Elsea, Sept. 16, 2005, p. CRS-3.

430 DOD Directive 3025.12, MACDIS.

431 *NRP*, p. 42.

432 The National Response Plan states:

Nothing in this plan alters or impedes the ability of federal, State, local, or tribal departments and agencies to carry out their specific authorities or perform their responsibilities under all applicable laws, Executive orders, and directives. Additionally, nothing in this plan is intended to impact or impede the ability of any Federal department or agency head to take an issue of concern directly to the President, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President for National Security, or any other member of the President’s staff. *NRP*, p. 2.

433 Article II of the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) Articles of Agreement states:

The prompt, full, and effective utilization of resources of the participating states, including any resources onhand or available from the Federal Government or any other source, that are essential to the safety, care and welfare of the people in the event of any emergency or disaster declared by a party state, shall be the underlying principle on which all articles of this compact shall be understood.

National Emergency Management Association, “EMAC Articles of Agreement.” <http://www.emacweb.org/?146>. Accessed on May 18, 2006.

434 Louisiana National Guard, Timeline of Significant Events Hurricane Katrina, Dec. 7, 2005; National Guard Bureau, Hurricane Katrina Update Brief, Sept. 11, 2005, 11 a.m. Provided to Committee.

435 10 U.S.C. §§ 10501, 10502. Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 23.

436 Lt. Gen. Steven Blum, memorandum for Secretary of Defense, through Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Sept. 5, 2005, p. 1. Provided to Committee.

437 Lt. Gen. Steven Blum, memorandum for Secretary of Defense, through Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Sept. 5, 2005, p. 1. Provided to Committee.

438 Lt. Gen. Steven Blum, memorandum for Secretary of Defense, through Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Sept. 5, 2005, p. 1. Provided to Committee.

439 Gordon England, memorandum for Secretary of the Army and Acting Secretary of the Air Force, Sept. 7, 2005. Provided to Committee.

440 David S. Addington, e-mail to William J. Haynes, Aug. 28, 2005, 8:41 p.m. Provided to Committee; filed as Bates no. 000007. Mr. Addington recommended that Mr. Haynes prepare a “Proclamation to Disperse,” whereby the President would “immediately order the insurgents to disperse and retire peaceably within their abodes” (10 U.S.C. §334), and executive orders for 10 U.S.C. 332, “Use of militia and armed forces to enforce Federal authority,” and 10 U.S.C. §334, “Interference with State and Federal Law.”

441 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Thomas Miller, Aug. 31, 2005, 7:46, a.m. Provided to Committee.

442 Maj. Gen. Terry Scherling, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rowe and others, Aug. 31, 2005, 10:25 a.m. Provided to Committee.

443 Committee staff interview of Col. Thomas Beron, Commander, 61st Troop Command, Louisiana Army National Guard, and Lt. Col. Douglas Mouton, Commander, 225th Engineering Group, Louisiana National Guard, conducted on Dec. 1, 2005, transcript p. 102.

444 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, p. 9.

445 For an explanation of Lt. Gen. Honoré’s activities prior to being designated Commander of Joint Task Force Katrina, see prior text regarding the “First Army” and “Army Commanders.”

446 See: National Guard Bureau, After Action Review, “Hurricane Response September 2005,” Dec. 21, 2005, p. 13. Provided to Committee (second entry for “31 August Wednesday”: “CNGB asks to talk with MG Landreneau, TAG LA”). Lt. Gen. Blum’s recollection and the NGB timeline is consistent with notes dated at 7:21 a.m. on Wednesday the 31st taken by National Guard Bureau Major Karl Konzelman, of a conversation between Maj. Gen. Landreneau, Army National Guard Director Lt. Gen. Clyde A. Vaughn, and Lt. Gen. Blum, as well as the recollection of Lt. Gen. Vaughn. Major Konzelman’s notes are reprinted in: U.S. House, Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina, *A Failure of Initiative*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2006, p. 206 [hereinafter U.S. House, *A Failure of Initiative*]. See also: Committee staff interview of Lt. Gen. Clyde A. Vaughn, U.S. Army, Director, Army National Guard, U.S. Department of Defense, conducted on Jan. 18, 2006, transcript pp. 22-23.

447 Testimony of Maj. Gen. Bennett C. Landreneau, U.S. Army, Adjutant General, Louisiana, before the U.S. Senate,

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Defense Department's Role in the Response*, Feb. 9, 2006. In his interview with the Committee staff, Maj. Gen. Landreneau said he requested an active-duty division. "I told him that we felt like we needed active-duty support in the state. I felt like we needed an active-duty division to help us – to help with the planning and execution of the movement of displaced persons out of New Orleans." *Source*: Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 9. Maj. Gen. Landreneau's testimony that he requested an active-duty headquarters element rather than an entire division is consistent with the recollections of other LANG officers, see below. Maj. Gen. Landreneau also told the Committee staff he informed FEMA Director Brown and FCO Lokey of his request to Lt. Gen. Honoré for a headquarters division of active-duty troops. Brown "turned to his staff and said we need to make sure we log that request and that it's properly funneled through the right request chain." *Source*: Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 56-57. Neither Brown nor Lokey could recall that conversation or any other conversation in which Maj. Gen. Landreneau requested federal active-duty troops. *Source*: Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 98 (Q. "At any time, did General Landreneau relate to you any request that he made to General Honoré for Federal troops?" A. "I don't recall it."); Brown interview, Jan. 23, 2006, p. 188 (Q. "Do you remember the first time you learned of a request for significant numbers of troops, National Guard or Federal active-duty?" A. "You know, counsel, I don't."); *Compare with*: Committee staff interview of Col. Steven Dabadie, Former Chief of Staff, Louisiana National Guard, conducted on Jan. 12, 2006, transcript p. 118 ("He told me that the first conversation that he had shortly after I talked to him was with General Honoré, and they talked about a division headquarters and tasking that division headquarters with planning, coordinating, executing evacuation.").

448 "I told him the need for troops and that I needed his [help] with the EMAC [Emergency Management Assistance Compact] push, and gave him an assessment of what I thought we needed at that time. ... At that time that we were talking about 10,000 or more, and then I called him back later and I said it's going to be more." General Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 12-14. *See also*: Task Force Pelican, Louisiana National Guard Timeline of Significant Events Hurricane Katrina, Dec. 7, 2005, p. 6 (sixth entry for "30 Aug 05": "Requested additional EMAC assistance through NGB"). Maj. Gen. Landreneau's testimony that he first sought assistance from the National Guard Bureau on Tuesday, August 30, is consistent with the recollections of Lt. Gen. Honoré and three of his subordinate officers in the Louisiana National Guard: Brig. Gen. Gary Jones, the Commander of the LANG's Joint Task Force Pelican, Brig. Gen. Brod Veillon, Assistant Adjutant General for the Louisiana National Guard and Commander of the Louisiana Air National Guard, and Col. Steve Dabadie, Chief of Staff for Maj. Gen. Landreneau. (All witnesses interviewed by the Committee were instructed not to discuss their testimony with other potential witnesses and agreed to abide by this instruction.)

Maj. Gen. Landreneau also stated that in a subsequent conversation he relayed the substance of his conversation with Lt. Gen. Blum to Lt. Gen. Honoré. *Source*: Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, General Honoré. *Source*: General Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 12. As a result of differing recollections, the Committee is unable to determine whether Maj. Gen. Landreneau had more than one conversation with Lt. Gen. Honoré on Tuesday, or the precise time when any such conversation occurred.

449 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 72-74.

450 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 67.

451 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 67, 75. Lt. Gen. Honoré also said he told Maj. Gen. Landreneau that "We had about 5,000 troops that possibly could be ready to deploy," including the 82nd Airborne Division and the 1st Cavalry Division of the 5th Army. Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 67. Maj. Gen. Landreneau recalled this conversation occurring on Wednesday, August 31, when Lt. Gen. Honoré arrived at the Superdome. *Source*: Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 8-9.

452 Referring to the NGB's timeline, which reports a request for 5,000 troops from Maj. Gen. Landreneau first occurring early Wednesday morning, Lt. Gen. Blum stated, "I talked to him at home one night before that, which probably was Tuesday night, but I don't see that in here [the NGB timeline], because this is generated from my operations center, not from my home phone." Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 33.

453 Louisiana National Guard Brig. Gen. Brod Veillon recounted how his concerns over security became magnified when the rising waters flooded the generator providing power to the Superdome:

About 11 on Tuesday night, they came to us and said, "Boys, the water is rising. The generator has about a foot to go. You will lose the generator when the water tops the wall." I asked the man, "What happens when we lose a generator?" He said, "All the lights go out." I said, "Every light in the Dome?" "Every light." So I knew the Dome would go dark, and I was concerned at that point for what we were going to do if the whole place went black.

Committee staff interview of Brig. Gen. Brod Veillon, Assistant Adjutant General – Air, Louisiana National Guard, conducted on Nov. 29, 2005, transcript p. 58.

454 A number of witnesses, including Col. Dabadie, provided conflicting and inconsistent accounts of when this conversation and other conversations about the need for additional troops occurred. Col. Dabadie interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 99-103, 107. The Committee cannot rule out the possibility that there was more than one related conversation on this subject at different times from early Tuesday to early Wednesday. The weight of the evidence and testimony indicates that this particular conversation occurred in the wee hours of Wednesday morning.

455 Committee staff interview of Brig. Gen. Gary Jones, Assistant Joint Forces Commander/Army, Louisiana Army National Guard, conducted on Dec. 7, 2005, transcript pp. 92-93, 139-40.

456 Col. Dabadie interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 99-100. According to Col. Dabadie, "a little bit after" that conversation, Maj. Gen. Landreneau told him that he had asked Lt. Gen. Honoré "about a division type headquarters." Col. Dabadie added:

“And I think that is kind of where General Graham came into the picture, and then the rest of the forces were National Guard – conversation with General Blum and the rest of the forces were National Guard through EMAC.” Col. Dabadie interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 102-103, 118.

457 Brig. Gen. Veillon interview, Nov. 29, 2005, p. 191.

458 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 34. Referring to notes taken by his assistant, Major Karl Konzelman of the Army National Guard, Lieutenant General Clyde Vaughn, Director of the Army National Guard, provided a similar recollection of this conversation. Lt. Gen. Vaughn understood Maj. Gen. Landreneau’s primary need was for additional security forces. *Source:* Lt. Gen. Vaughn interview, Jan. 18, 2006, p. 23. Major General Harold Cross, the Adjutant General of the Mississippi National Guard, called General Blum about the same time, and also asked the National Guard Bureau to expedite the EMAC process for Mississippi. *Source:* Maj. Gen. Cross interview, Jan. 26, 2006, pp. 12-14. *See also:* Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 49-50; Lt. Gen. Vaughn interview, Jan. 18, 2006, p. 49.

459 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 36.

460 National Guard Bureau, Hurricane Katrina Update Brief, Sept. 10, 2005, 10 a.m. Provided to Committee.

461 Lt. Gen. Vaughn interview, Jan. 18, 2006, p. 31. The Committee asked Lt. Gen. Vaughn:

Q: Is it correct to characterize the process as follows, that initially General Landreneau, when he called and said I need 5,000 that he was saying this is big, I’m going to need a lot; I don’t know exactly what I’m going to need, but I’m going to need a lot. And then, on the Guard’s end, you interpreted that ... [t]hey’re going to need a lot, let’s just send whatever we’ve got in, and we’ll refine it? Was that what you were doing?

LT. GEN. VAUGHN: I think that’s right on the money. I think it’s exactly like that.

Lt. Gen. Vaughn interview, Jan. 18, 2006, p. 33.

462 National Guard Bureau, Hurricane Katrina Update Brief, Sept. 10, 2005, 10 a.m. Provided to Committee.

463 National Guard Bureau, After Action Review, “Hurricane Response September 2005,” Dec. 21, 2005, p. 6. Provided to Committee.

464 National Guard Bureau, After Action Review, “Hurricane Response September 2005,” Dec. 21, 2005, p. 6. Provided to Committee.

465 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 54.

466 National Guard Bureau, After Action Review, “Hurricane Response September 2005,” Dec. 21, 2005, p. 20. Provided to Committee.

467 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 54

468 National Guard Bureau, After Action Review, “Hurricane Response September 2005,” Dec. 21, 2005, p. 20. Provided to Committee.

469 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, pp. 54-55.

470 McHale, House Select Committee hearing, Oct. 27, 2005.

471 Maj. Gen. Rowe interview, Jan. 20, 2006, pp. 125-126.

472 Adm. Keating interview, Feb. 3, 2006.

473 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006.

474 U.S. Department of Defense, First U.S. Army, Joint Task Force Katrina, “Hurricane Katrina Chronology.” Provided to Committee.

475 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 71-72.

476 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 43-44.

477 Wells interview, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 121; Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 76-77. Although Gen. Honoré talks about evacuation planning, he does not state that he was asked to take over the evacuation.

478 Committee staff interview of Phil Parr, Federal Coordinating Officer, Region I, FEMA, conducted on Nov. 16, 2005, transcript p. 47.

479 Parr interview, Nov. 16, 2005, p. 69. There were similar uninformed expectations in FEMA headquarters. Col. Don Harrington, the lead DOD liaison to FEMA, was asked whether at FEMA there was “any expectation that [Lt. Gen. Honoré] would be bringing a large number of forces with him?” “Yes, yes,” Col. Harrington responded and then explained:

I had to kind of let them know that the troop presence he brought, he didn’t control the Guard. They had to understand that. But that he was not necessarily going to bring a huge number of troops initially. You know, he had to get an assessment, and plus you had a large number of National Guard troops.

Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 100.

480 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 44.

481 Committee staff interview of Col. Glenn Curtis, Chief of Staff, Louisiana National Guard, and Lt. Col. Jacques Thibodeaux, Joint Director of Military Support to Civilian Authorities and Branch Chief, Louisiana National Guard, conducted on Dec. 6, 2006, transcript pp. 270-271.

482 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 131-134.

483 Wells interview, Nov. 15, 2005, p. 67. Lt. Col. Jacques Thibodeaux of the Louisiana National Guard, the Joint Director of Military Support during Katrina, responded to Mr. Wells's concern, as raised by Committee staff during the interview, by stating that it was Mayor Nagin, not Lt. Gen. Honoré, who was at all times in charge of the evacuation of the Superdome and New Orleans:

Mayor Nagin was also there and Col. Ebert, who is his emergency operations manager – I think Col. Ebert's title is Director of Homeland Security for New Orleans – were both also involved in that meeting. ... So it was, once again, not a break in protocol. It was a civilian entity, a civilian representative trying to facilitate the evacuation of his city. And General Landreneau and General Honoré were both there in any attempt to facilitate that. Basically a unified command system; a meeting amongst commanders of certain areas to facilitate DOD support, both National Guard and active component.

Lt. Col. Thibodeaux interview, Dec. 6, 2006, pp. 267-269.

484 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 9.

485 Committee staff interview of Terry Ryder, Executive Counsel, Office of the Governor, LA, conducted on Jan. 10, 2006, transcript pp. 192-194. Andy Kopplin, Chief of Staff to Governor Blanco, recalled a similar conversation with Senator Vitter:

Either Mr. Ryder or Senator Vitter mentioned to me Senator Vitter wanted to visit with the Governor about his conversation with Mr. Rove about federalization in regard to the Governor's conversation that morning with Ms. Townsend, the Homeland Security advisor. And the question was, did the Governor's request for additional federal assistance constitute a request for federalization, because that was the way it had been reported to the Senator per his – at some point, whether it was Senator Vitter first or Terry or – well, I talked to both Terry, and I talked to Senator Vitter about that.

Committee staff interview of Andy Kopplin, former Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor, LA, conducted on Jan. 6, 2006, transcript p. 122.

486 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 202.

487 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 203.

488 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 203. Andy Kopplin, Governor Blanco's Chief of Staff, expounded on the Governor's comments regarding the appropriate command structure for the response. After receiving Senator Vitter's question whether the Governor's request for additional federal assistance constituted a request for federalization, Kopplin sought the advice of Col. Smith, the Deputy Director of LOHSEP, on the consequences of federalization:

I think the conclusions were fairly clear that the Governor's request, which was for additional federal assistance to help in particular with the evacuation, would not benefit from federalization but, in fact, the law enforcement functions of the guard could, in fact be compromised. ... So the Governor took immediate action to clarify by placing a second call of the day looking for the President. This time, she got him, and she made the point that she's looking for assistance, that she needed assistance, but the unified command she felt was the appropriate structure to continue to use.

Kopplin interview, Jan. 6, 2006, pp. 122-125.

489 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 203.

490 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, p. 203. The Governor's timeline characterizes the conversation between the Governor and the President as follows:

She stresses to him that the situation is extremely grave and asks for additional resources. Governor Blanco also specifically stresses that she wants to continue to be his partner in a unity of effort as is called for under the National Response Plan. To relay the urgency and magnitude of the need at that point in time, the Governor tells the President she estimates 40,000 troops would be needed, and again reiterates her frustration about the FEMA buses.

Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 10.

491 Testimony of Gov. Kathleen Blanco, Louisiana, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Role of the Governors in Managing the Catastrophe*, Feb. 2, 2006.

492 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 71. Lokey provided a similar recollection at another point during the interview:

I went to Brown and said, we've got to do something, sir. This is more than we can do. Our programs aren't designed for this. Our resources aren't there, so whatever. ... We had to do something, and the only group I know that knows how to do stuff that big and has done it before was the United States military.

Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 91.

493 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, pp. 88-89.

494 Brown interview, Jan. 23, 2006, p. 198.

495 Committee staff interview of Michael Brown, former Director, FEMA, conducted on Feb. 23, 2006, transcript p. 113.

496 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, pp. 115-116. Dolph Diemont, the U.S. Department of Transportation's representative at the state EOC, described how Brown communicated his frustration to the federal staff at the EOC:

When he came in and they closed the door he turned beet red and said this is unacceptable. You guys are all incompetent. This is not going the way we want. We've got to change it. You know, I don't know what the hell's going on. You know, screaming and yelling at us, at everybody. It was hard to take because we were pouring our hearts out, trying to get the job done, and instead of encouragement, we got that kind of – it was ... demoralizing.

Committee staff interview of Dolph Diemont, Region X Regional Emergency Transportation Representative, Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response, U.S. Department of Transportation, conducted on Jan. 6, 2006, transcript p. 80.

497 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, p. 114.

498 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, pp. 114-115.

499 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, p. 123.

500 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 141.

501 This point is discussed in the Logistics portion earlier in this chapter.

502 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 57-62.

503 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 61. Lt. Gen. Inge, U.S. Army, Deputy Commander of U.S. Northern Command, stated in a press conference following the President's deployment orders on Sept. 3, 2005, that the Title 10 Troops "will not take on a law enforcement role [nor] have they been directed in any way to do so. They will provide security. They will ... be available to relieve National Guard soldiers who are in state status should there be a requirement for National Guard guys to do law enforcement. ... I am not aware of any discussion of waiver of Posse Comitatus that's taken place." Lt. Gen. Joseph Inge, U.S. Northern Command, "Defense Department Briefing on Ongoing DoD Response to Hurricane Katrina," news briefing, Sept. 3, 2005. <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2005/tr20050903-3849.html>. Accessed on May 16, 2006.

504 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 71.

505 The Posse Comitatus Act restrictions do not apply if the National Guard troops are activated under the Insurrection Act. See: U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *The Posse Comitatus Act and Related Matters: A Sketch*, by Jennifer Elsea, June 6, 2005.

506 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

507 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 72.

508 Lokey interview, Jan. 20, 2006, p. 72. Although Lokey recalled the state's reaction as unambiguously negative, Brown interpreted it differently: "There was enough ambiguity that I thought we might actually be able to pull it off, that she might actually agree to this. And she did say...she needed more time; she needed to talk to her staff about it, which I fully understood and respected, but I really thought I had kind of made some inroads there." Brown interview, Jan. 23, 2006, p. 201.

509 FEMA Director Brown telephoned Lt. Gen. Honoré prior to his arrival in Baton Rouge. According to Brown, "[Lt. Gen. Honoré] already had a litany of things he wanted to do, and I had to back him down and say, 'I may want all of those things done, but until we get federalized or however we work this out, I'm still in control, and you need to let me know what you want to do.'" Source: Testimony of Michael Brown, former Director, FEMA, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: The Roles of DHS and FEMA Leadership*, Feb. 10, 2006. Maj. Gen. Landreneau recalled a similar conversation after General Honoré arrived at the EOC in Baton Rouge. According to Maj. Gen. Landreneau, Brown told General Honoré "that he was the primary federal official, P.F.O., and General Honoré was not going to anything in the way of marshalling resources or doing anything without his concurrence." "Yes, sir," Lt. Gen. Honoré replied. Source: Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 54. In his second interview with the Committee, Brown related that he was not dissatisfied with Lt. Gen. Honoré's performance; in fact, Brown believed that Lt. Gen. Honoré was doing an excellent job of operating within DOD's role under the unified command. Rather, according to Brown, he engaged in this colloquy with Lt. Gen. Honoré in order to strengthen the unified command that Lt. Gen. Honoré and Maj. Gen. Landreneau were attempting to establish. Source: Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, pp. 118-119.

510 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 10. Lt. Gen. Honoré stated that the Governor's timeline fairly reflected the substance of this conversation. Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 121-122.

511 Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 22-26.

512 Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 27-28. General Graham had begun his assignment at the 5th Army headquarters on August 15. From that time until his assignment in Hurricane Katrina, General Graham's duties had focused on the 5th Army's transition to its newly focused mission of homeland defense and defense support to civil authorities. Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 5-10, 24-26.

513 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 10; Col. Curtis and Lt. Col. Thibodeaux interview, Dec. 6, 2006, pp. 270-271.

514 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, pp. 57-58.

515 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 58.

516 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 58.

517 Maj. Gen. Landreneau interview, Jan. 11, 2006, p. 61.

518 Col. Anthony Daskevich, the Defense Coordinating Officer in Baton Rouge also was present at this meeting and re-

called that the Governor did not make a specific request for additional federal ground troops. *Source:* Col. Daskevich interview, Jan. 10, 2006, pp. 130-132. General Graham also stated that the Governor did not make any request for federal troops during the part of the conversation in which he was present. *Source:* Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 29-30.

519 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 103-105.

520 Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 130. At another point during the Committee's interview Lt. Gen. Honoré identified several other types of assets that DOD provided during that first week:

We knew we needed helicopters. We knew we needed COMs [communications] capability. We knew we needed MEDEVAC. And these started to flow... This is Wednesday morning, and we're doing this without an open request. We've got no request for any specific capability, but what we have done is an assessment that these types of capabilities could be used, and started to flow them.

Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 123-124.

Lt. Gen. Honoré addressed why he did not call on the 82nd Airborne Division for the deployment of a large number of ground troops on day one: "The type of capability we needed wasn't necessarily the 82nd. They'd jump in and secure for us, recon for us. The type of capability we needed at that time was evacuation capability. ... I don't recall any serious conversation on why we didn't have the 82nd Airborne there on day one." *Source:* Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 127. General Richard Myers, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during Katrina, told the Committee that another consideration was the primary mission of the 82nd Airborne was to be prepared for potential overseas missions. *Source:* Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 33-34. Col. Don Harrington, the DOD liaison to FEMA, explained, "There is a reticence, too, to deploy the 82nd down range. It's not something really - keep in mind, that next year, the [terrorists] may take advantage of this. You know, that's a very big concern. So do you want to kick everybody out in, what I call the Hindenburg disaster mode? Everybody goes out, the Hindenburg is burning. Everybody goes down range, and you don't realize that some people may be taking advantage of that." *Source:* Col. Harrington interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 101. Assistant Secretary McHale commented, "We don't want to turn the 82nd Airborne into a first responder, always available on a moment's notice for law enforcement activity throughout the United States. To be prepared for such a mission would require a change in the training and equipment of the 82nd. It would also produce a significant change in the historically defined role of the military within domestic American society." *Source:* McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 90-91.

521 Brig. Gen. Graham interview, Jan. 12, 2006, pp. 143-145.

522 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Col. James Hickey, Aug. 31, 2005, 6:05 p.m. Provided to Committee. General Honoré was cc'd on the e-mail and the subject was "LA Security mission." Col. Hickey was General Honoré's executive officer. In the context of this e-mail, the term federal troops appears to refer to federal troops that are not National Guard troops - in other words, active-duty troops.

523 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Col. James Hickey, Aug. 31, 2005, 6:05 p.m. Provided to Committee.

524 U.S. Army Forces Command, Message to Commander, First Army, and others, "FORSCOM FRAGO #8," Sept. 1, 2005, 0039 Z. Provided to Committee. *See also:* JTF-Katrina, Commander's Assessment, Sept. 3, 2005. Provided to Committee.

525 82nd Airborne Division, "82nd Airborne Division Mission." <http://www.bragg.army.mil/82dv/Mission.html>. Accessed on Apr. 13, 2006.

526 1st Cavalry Division, "Reorganization." <http://pao.hood.army.mil/1stcavdiv/index.htm>. Accessed on Apr. 13, 2006.

527 U.S. Department of Defense, Hurricane Katrina Major Events Timeline, Draft, Dec. 28, 2005, 12:52 p.m. Provided to Committee.

528 Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, e-mail to Maj. Gen. Rowe, Sept. 1, 2005, 11:46 a.m. Provided to Committee; Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 139.

529 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 78.

530 Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, e-mail to Lt. Gen. James Amos, Sept. 1, 2005, 1:46 p.m. Provided to Committee.

531 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 288.

532 Adm. Keating, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

533 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 139.

534 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, pp. 250-251.

535 Maj. Gen. Richard Rowe, e-mail to Lt. Gen. Russel Honoré, Sept. 1, 2005, 1:50 p.m. Provided to Committee. Approximately 15 minutes later, Lt. Gen. Honoré responded, "GOT IT."

536 U.S. Department of Defense, *Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support*, June 2005, p. 35.

537 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, p. 56.

538 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 30-31. Gen. Myers stated that DOD continued to hold this view on Friday afternoon, even after the Governor made an additional request to the President for more federal troops on Friday morning aboard Air Force One. Nonetheless, according to Gen. Myers, DOD sent additional troops requested by the Governor. The troops already were on high alert status, Gen. Myers noted, "so you said okay, if the Governor thinks we need more, we'll send more." *Source:* Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 39. Lt. Gen. Blum, who met with both the President and the Governor on that Friday, stated, "It was clear in my mind that by 3:00 on Sept. 2 that there were sufficient forces in Louisiana to manage the security condition, to complete the search and rescue operation, and that the Governor of Louisiana

- agree to that assessment and personally expressed it to me as well as Mayor Nagin.” *Source*: Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2005, p. 72.
- 539 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, pp. 11-12; Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, pp. 183-184.
- 540 “I don’t recall a specific request from the governor for Title X troops at that time.” Lt. Gen. Honoré interview, Jan. 9, 2006, p. 184.
- 541 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, pp. 213-215.
- 542 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 57; Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, p. 12.
- 543 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 57.
- 544 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, p. 12. Lt. Gen. Blum told the Committee that this description of his views is “entirely consistent with my recollection.” Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, p. 68.
- 545 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, p. 125.
- 546 Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Hurricane Katrina/Rita/Ophelia Interim Timeline, Oct. 31, 2005, p. 9; Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense), Hurricane Katrina/Rita/Ophelia Interim Timeline, Nov. 2, 2005, p. 9. Earlier that morning the President met with Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and Lt. Gen. Blum to receive “a hurricane status brief.” U.S. Department of Defense, Draft Hurricane Katrina Major Events Timeline, Dec. 28, 2005, 12:52 p.m. Provided to Committee.
- 547 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, p. 43; England interview, Feb. 3, 2006.
- 548 McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.
- 549 Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, p. 14.
- 550 Testimony of Mayor C. Ray Nagin, New Orleans, LA, before the U.S. Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on *Hurricane Katrina: Managing the Crisis and Evacuating New Orleans*, Feb. 1, 2006. When asked by the Committee whether he was advocating that the National Guard be federalized, Mayor Nagin replied, “It was just a question of who had final authority. I’m not sure of the details of what they were debating.” *Source*: Mayor Nagin, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 1, 2006. It is not clear what “final authority” would have meant other than federal control of the National Guard, since the mayor, as head of the local government, was the incident commander. “He’s the civilian, the lead civilian authority in charge of that municipality. He is really the only one that can control that operation.” *Source*: Lt. Col. Thibodeaux interview, Dec. 6, 2006, pp. 268-269. *See also*: Mayor Nagin, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 1, 2006 (affirming role as incident commander for New Orleans).
- 551 Mayor Nagin, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 1, 2006. Governor Blanco testified, “the Mayor was not in our meeting that I had with the President, per se. . . . At that point in time, Mayor Nagin had not been in good communication with us. You know, the communication system had fallen down.” Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.
- 552 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006. The Governor also sent a letter to the President on Sept. 2, requesting additional federal troops and other resources:
- Based on our initial assessment, I have previously requested significant federal support to include: an additional 40,000 troops; trailers of water, ice and food; commercial buses; base camps; staging areas; amphibious personnel carriers; deployable morgues; urban search and rescue teams; airlift; temporary housing; and communications systems. Even if these initial requests had been fully honored, these assets would not be sufficient to address our critical, immediate needs.
- Governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco, letter to President George W. Bush, Sept. 2, 2005.
- 553 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006. The Governor’s timeline elaborated:
- The Governor has a private conversation with President Bush about the command structure of the operations, and reiterates her need for a significant number of federal troops. The President asks Governor Blanco to put her troops, the Louisiana National Guard and EMAC National Guard, under control of a Department of Defense appointed General. By the time of Friday’s conversation, the situation has evolved and the immediate needs on the ground are far different than the needs when federal troops were first requested earlier in the week.
- Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor’s Timeline, p. 14.
- 554 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.
- 555 Robert Travis Scott, “Politics delayed troops dispatch,” *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, Dec. 11, 2005, National, p. 1.
- 556 In particular, elements of the 24 Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) were prepared to deploy and could have deployed on Friday. Lt. Gen. Amos told the Committee:
- I anticipated [the Special Air Contingency Marine Air Ground Task Force] leaving on Friday. I figured the DEP [deploy] order was going to be signed on Friday. . . . I kind of expected the DEP order was going to happen on Friday, and that’s because all the news was reporting the President was going to make an announcement on one of his public things while he was going around New Orleans. . . . So I expected them to actually start moving out on Friday. So I put them on their what we call, affectionately, put them on their packs probably – I either did that Wednesday afternoon, the 31st, or the first.
- Lt. Gen. Amos interview, Dec. 14, 2005, p. 75.

557 White House Briefing to Committee, given by Kenneth Rapuano, Deputy Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, Dec. 12, 2005.

558 The Governor's timeline addresses this issue:

Erroneous reports have been circulated that she denied federal troops or delayed help for 24-hours. The facts are clear and evidence confirms that the Governor requests early and often the need for additional federal military presence, including a federal military presence and assets. At no time does anyone from the federal government tell her that federal troops are withheld because the existing structure was inadequate. In fact, the new proposal is first presented to her aboard Air Force One on Friday, four days after the storm struck on Monday, and the President never suggests that federal troops were reliant on this new structure nor did he convey that the joint command structure is insufficient.

Source: Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 15. Regarding the Mayor's charge that the Governor's position delayed the deployment of federal troops and impeded the overall response in Louisiana, the Governor testified, "I will tell you at that point in time, Mayor Nagin had not been in good communication with us. You know the communication system had fallen down." Source: Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

559 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, pp. 100-101.

560 Gen. Myers interview, Feb. 28, 2006, pp. 38-43.

561 Brown interview, Feb. 23, 2006, p. 121.

562 Thomas Kuster, e-mail to Col. Richard Chavez, Sept. 2, 2005, 5:31 p.m. Provided to Committee.

563 Ryder interview, Jan. 10, 2006, pp. 237-238. Witt was serving as a consultant to the Governor.

564 Kopplin interview, Jan. 6, 2006, pp. 159-160.

565 Kopplin interview, Jan. 6, 2006, p. 153.

566 According to Governor Blanco, "It was Blum, Blum, Blum, and then Card came in on the third." Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

567 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006. The Governor's timeline summarizes these exchanges:

Close to midnight on Friday, Gov. Blanco receives phone calls from Gen. Steve Blum, just after his return to DC, and White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card, who want to discuss with her their proposed organizational restructuring. She hears them out, but continues to believe, given the stabilization now underway and the massive National Guard buildup on the ground, that bringing in the federal forces and putting them under the command of Gen. Honoré to coordinate with Gen. Landreneau who leads the Guard forces is the most effective solution.

Louisiana Office of the Governor, Governor's Timeline, p. 15.

568 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

569 Lt. Gen. Blum interview, Jan. 19, 2006, pp. 83-86.

570 McHale, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 9, 2006.

571 President George W. Bush, "President Addresses Nation, Discusses Hurricane Katrina Relief Efforts," radio address, Sept. 3, 2005, 10:06 a.m. ET. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/09/20050903.html> Accessed on May 16, 2006.

572 Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006.

573 Committee staff interview of Col. Terry Ebbert, U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.), Director, New Orleans Office of Homeland Security, LA, conducted on Jan. 10, 2006, transcript pp. 170-171.

574 Adm. Timothy J. Keating, "Defense Department Briefing on Ongoing DoD Response to Hurricane Katrina," news briefing, Sept. 5, 2005. <http://www.dod.mil/transcripts/2005/tr20050905-3851.html>. Accessed on May 16, 2006. At a press conference on Tuesday, Sept. 6, Gen. Myers was asked whether the response would have been quicker had it been federalized:

GEN. MYERS: I think the response by the National Guard, which is under state authority in both Louisiana and Mississippi, and I assume Alabama and Florida as well, was, I think, very quick. I think if you asked the TAGs of that state, I think they responded very quickly.

Sec. Donald Rumsfeld and Gen. Richard Myers, "Defense Department Operational Update Briefing," news briefing, Sept. 6, 2005. <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2005/tr20050906-secdef3862.html>. Accessed on May 16, 2006.

575 Committee staff interview of Lt. Col. Gordon Ellis, U.S. Army, former Commander of First Battalion, 148th Infantry, Ohio National Guard, conducted on Feb. 16, 2006, transcript pp. 88-89.

576 McHale interview, Jan. 4, 2006, pp. 88, 110.

577 Gov. Barbour, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006 ("I made very plain from day one that we didn't ... need the federal government to run our National Guard. ... I was very emphatic it was the wrong thing to do."); Gov. Blanco, Senate Committee hearing, Feb. 2, 2006 ("It's very important for a governor to be able to retain control of the National Guard precisely for its law enforcement capabilities.").