



Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585

August 28, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Duane Sewell
Assistant Secretary
Defense Programs

FROM: Frank R. Pagnotta *frp*
Director
Office of The Secretary

SUBJECT: Personal Protection of The Secretary and
Other DOE Officials

It has been called to my attention that the attached Memorandum from you entitled "Personal Protection of the Secretary and Other DOE Officials" has been submitted for review and comments. However, I have not been a recipient of this Memorandum for action even though this matter was the subject of an on-going issue instituted by me with respect to the total security program for the James Forrestal Building.

As I am the individual primarily concerned with The Secretary's travel overseas on whose judgment the necessity for security personnel is predicated I believe there should be solicitation of my evaluation and recommendations.

I call to your attention that the accounting of support personnel provided in TAB A is incomplete as it does not fully take into consideration individuals from other DOE elements -- regional and IG Staffs -- who have provided security personnel on instances of threats of bodily harm against The Secretary and on foreign travel with The Secretary. I specifically raise this matter with you for if your office is to "designate a minimum number of staff positions to provide necessary personnel protection" you should be cognizant of the actual number of security personnel utilized for every situation.

I support Option C as you propose but disagree that a "Con" position is a requirement to provide "extensive initial training program and periodic refresher course." A fully competent and well trained security force should be a mandatory and positive attribute not a negative factor.

I call to your attention that all personnel on security detail with The Secretary have been trained specifically for this work. Attached for your information is a history of training for the protective detail.

I address the issue of where these individuals will be physically housed and contend that their employment as part of the Office of Security at the James Forrestal Building and posted therein is the only recourse necessary in order to achieve the maximum effectiveness of an immediate response group reacting to any security or personal threat to The Secretary or other DOE personnel who occupy offices in the Forrestal Building. In addition, as all Secretarial Officers are permanently housed within the Washington, D.C. area and not Germantown it appears logical that a personal protective force be centrally located in the Forrestal Building in order to respond immediately -- not to include a 45 minute drive from Germantown -- to any immediate security or personal threat.

While my comments were not requested I trust you will take them into consideration.

cc: The Secretary
Deputy Secretary
Under Secretary (Acting)
J. Michael Kelly

Attachments

HISTORY OF TRAINING FOR PROTECTIVE DETAIL

October 1977	Dailey, Dalinsky - Qualified	
November 1977	Sullivan, Phillips, Combs - Qualified	
November 1977 - March 1978	U.S. Secret Service VIP Protection Course - 1 week	11 members
	OSI VIP Protection Course - 2 weeks	2 members
April/June 1978	DOE Personal Protection Course conducted by D. Jones/W. Ahrens at FBI Academy - 4 days	16 members *All 16 qualified on FBI combat course
NOTE: Scheduled 3rd session was cancelled by Brenner memo 7/21/78.		
January 1979 - June 1979	Informal training and practice at DOE Range (GTN) until June 1979 when it closed.	
November 30, 1979	Jones, Combs, Sullivan, Phillips, Dailey, Rainey - Qualified - Andrews AFB	
February 6, 1980	Jones, Combs, Sullivan, Dailey, Rainey - Qualified - DEA Range	
May 9, 1980	Jones, Combs, Sullivan, Phillips continued training at Andrews AFB	
June 11, 1980	Jones, Combs - same as above	
August 8, 1980	Jones, Combs, Sullivan, Phillips - Qualified - Andrews AFB	



Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585

ACTION MEMORANDUM

TO: Secretary
Deputy Secretary

THRU: Acting Under Secretary

FROM: Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs

SUBJECT: Personal Protection of the Secretary and Other
DOE Officials

Issue

To determine if the Department should establish a fully trained group of people capable of providing personal protection to the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary and the Chief Financial Officer.

Background

On various occasions since the formation of the Department of Energy, the Office of Safeguards and Security (OSS) has been tasked to provide escort staff support for the Secretary. The details of this support are provided at Tab A. These tasks have been accomplished by "volunteer" staff members who have not been trained specifically for this purpose. There is some concern that without proper training, there may be a false sense of security associated with the support being provided. (This is in no way a reflection on the personnel who have "volunteered" in the past.)

Alternatives.

Option A: Do not provide personal protection services for the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretary and the Chief Financial Officer.

Pro: Would discontinue ad-hoc arrangements using volunteer employees who have not had proper training.

Con: The Secretary would have no protection or would have to go outside the Department to obtain Federal Protective Service or contractor protection.

Option B: Continue present arrangement.

- Pro:
1. Provides some limited assurance of protection
 2. Eliminates need for specialized training as proposed in Option C.

- Con:
1. Continues ad-hoc arrangements using untrained volunteers to provide support.
 2. Possibly provides sense of security which is not warranted because of lack of training.

Option C: Designate a minimum number of staff positions to provide necessary personnel protection and arrange for proper training.

- Pro:
1. Will make available a small staff of adequately trained and qualified people to perform the required service.
 2. Eliminates the need to rely on volunteers who are responsible for other activities within the Department.

Con: Requires a fairly extensive initial training program and periodic refresher courses.

Discussion

The provision of personal security protection for the Secretary and senior officials was not addressed in the legislation under which the Department was formed. Neither was personal protection a charter responsibility of the OSS or any other departmental element of the DOE at its original formation. As a consequence, the practice has been for the Office of the Secretary to seek ad hoc support from OSS attendant to official travel by the Secretary. We have never been successful in getting security protection support from other federal organizations responsible for this type of activity.

In view of the incidents of communicated threats made against the Secretary in the past, and the probability of unsafe conditions involving the Secretary of Energy's travels outside of the country in the future, I believe that prudence dictates action to institute a small personal protection training program in the DOE. If such a decision is forthcoming, my office will proceed with other appropriate departmental elements toward implementing such a program.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Secretary approve Option C and authorize Defense Programs to proceed to select and train a small but properly qualified group of employees to provide a protection function in DOE

Duane C. Sewell

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Date: _____

Next Steps

Actions will be taken to identify candidates and institute a complete protection training program.

Concurrences

AD-1, Heffelfinger	Date _____	Concur _____ Nonconcur _____	See Tab _____
GC-23, Williams	Date _____	Concur _____ Nonconcur _____	See Tab _____

Attachments: Tab A- Support Provided on Foreign Travel

Prepared by: Original prepared by DP-35:MJDowd:mej:353-3652:8//5/80
DP-2:PECoyle/DP-4:RLWainwright:gtp:252-2181: 8/18/80.(Rewrite)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
memorandum

DATE: January 18, 1980

REPLY TO: DP-351
ATTN OF:

SUBJECT: Security for Secretary Duncan

TO: E. F. Heinlein

In an attempt to pull in all loose ends here prior to my upcoming detail, and in an effort to keep my promise to keep Mr. Pagnotta advised, I called Dan Mayer of Secret Service Intelligence in the a.m. of this date.

I advised Mr. Mayer that I was following up on his report to us of January 3 re. a telephone threat to "blow up" Mr. Duncan. Mr. Mayer had specifically advised us he would keep us informed of developments in the Secret Service investigation.

Upon requesting that Mr. Mayer update our information on the threat, he stated that he had already given it to Mr. Vada of DOE security, and that Mr. Vada had told him not to provide such intelligence to the Washington Security Office. In spite of my requests for more information, Mr. Mayer refused to discuss developments on the threat further.

Douglas L. Miller
Douglas L. Miller

see me later

3/20/79

See
Secondary File at JRS
Home

Mr. Brooks from the Burgler Alarm Co. on 7

OK

art white
↙ ↘

A alarm - signal 1000 AM

Discovered with his job in
not aware of any problem

OK