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Mr. McCaul, from the Committee on Homeland Security, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

OVERVIEW

The Committee on Homeland Security met on January 23, 2013, for an organizational meeting for the 113th Congress under the direction of Chairman Michael T. McCaul of Texas. The Committee Membership, was set at 32 Members with 18 Republicans and 14 Democrats.

The Committee established six Subcommittees: The Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence; the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security; the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies; the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency; the Subcommittee on Transportation Security; and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.
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JURISDICTION AND LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The Committee on Homeland Security was re-established in the 113th Congress pursuant to H. Res. 5, the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, agreed to on January 3, 2013. The jurisdiction of the Committee is as follows:

HOUSE RULE X

ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES

Committees and their legislative jurisdictions

1. There shall be in the House the following standing committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4. All bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of the standing committees listed in this clause shall be referred to those committees, in accordance with clause 2 of rule XII, as follows:

* * * * *

(I) Committee on Homeland Security
(1) Overall homeland security policy.

(j) Committee on Homeland Security.
(1) Overall homeland security policy.
(2) Organization, administration, and general management of the Department of Homeland Security.
(3) Functions of the Department of Homeland Security relating to the following:
   (A) Border and port security (except immigration policy and non-border enforcement).
   (B) Customs (except customs revenue).
   (C) Integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information.
   (D) Domestic preparedness for and collective response to terrorism.
   (E) Research and development.
   (F) Transportation security.

* * * * *

General oversight responsibilities

2. (a) The various standing committees shall have general oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b) in order to assist the House in
(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of—
   (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of Federal laws; and
   (B) conditions and circumstances that may indicate the necessity or Desirability of enacting new or additional legislation; and
(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of changes in Federal laws, and of such additional legislation as may be necessary or appropriate.

(b)(1) In order to determine whether laws and programs addressing subjects within the jurisdiction of a committee are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress and whether they should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated, each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall review and study on a continuing basis—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(B) the organization and operation of Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities for the administration and execution of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(C) any conditions or circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation addressing subjects within its jurisdiction (whether or not a bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto); and

(D) future research and forecasting on subjects within its jurisdiction.

(2) Each committee to which subparagraph (1) applies having more than 20 members shall establish an oversight subcommittee, or require its subcommittees to conduct oversight in their respective jurisdictions, to assist in carrying out its responsibilities under this clause. The establishment of an oversight subcommittee does not limit the responsibility of a subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

c) Each standing committee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as described in clauses 1 and 3.

d)(1) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, each standing committee shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plan for that Congress. Such plan shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing its plan each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(A) consult with other committees that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction with the objective of ensuring maximum coordination and cooperation among committees when conducting reviews of such laws, programs, or agencies and include in its plan an explanation of steps that have been or will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(B) review specific problems with Federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(C) give priority consideration to including in its plan the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority;
(D) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review every 10 years; and
(E) have a view toward insuring against duplication of Federal programs.
(2) Not later than March 31 in the first session of a Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader, the Committee on Government Reform shall report to the House the oversight plans submitted by committees together with any recommendations that it, or the House leadership group described above, may make to ensure the most effective coordination of oversight plans and otherwise to achieve the objectives of this clause.
(e) The Speaker, with the approval of the House, may appoint special ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters within the jurisdiction of two or more standing committees.

* * * * *

Special oversight functions
3. (g)(1) The Committee on Homeland Security shall review and study on a continuing basis all Government activities relating to homeland security, including the interaction of all departments and agencies with the Department of Homeland Security.
(2) In addition, the committee shall review and study on a primary and continuing basis all Government activities, programs and organizations related to homeland security that fall within its primary legislative jurisdiction.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY TO ACCOMPANY CHANGES TO RULE X

(Congressional Record, January 4, 2005, Page H25)

Rule X and the Committee on Homeland Security

Legislative History
Overall homeland security policy—The jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over “overall homeland security policy” is to be interpreted on a government-wide or multi-agency basis similar to the Committee on Government Reform’s jurisdiction over “overall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities . . . .” Surgical addresses of homeland security policy in sundry areas of jurisdiction occupied by other committees would not be referred to the Committee on Homeland Security on the basis of “overall” homeland security policy jurisdiction.
For example, the Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over a bill coordinating the homeland security efforts by all of the critical infrastructure protection sectors. Jurisdiction over a bill addressing the protection of a particular sector would lie with the committee otherwise having jurisdiction over that sector.
Organization and administration of the Department of Homeland Security—The jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security would apply only to organizational or administrative aspects of the Department where another committee’s jurisdiction did not clearly apply. The Committee’s jurisdiction is to be confined to organizational and administrative efforts and would not apply to programmatic efforts within the Department of Homeland Security within the jurisdiction of other committees.

Homeland Security Oversight—This would vest the Committee on Homeland Security with oversight jurisdiction over the homeland security community of the United States. Nothing in this clause shall be construed as prohibiting or otherwise restricting the authority of any other committee to study and review homeland security activities to the extent that such activity directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Individual Committee Concerns

AGRICULTURE—The jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over “border and port security” shall be limited to agricultural importation and entry inspection activities of the Department of Homeland Security under section 421 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002. The Committee on Agriculture shall retain jurisdiction over animal and plant disease policy including the authority reserved to the Department of Agriculture to regulate policy under section 421 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and the Animal Health Protection Act, the Plant Protection Act, the Plant Quarantine Act, and the Agriculture Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account. The Committee on Agriculture shall retain jurisdiction over the agricultural research and diagnosis mission at the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

ARMED SERVICES—The Committee on Armed Services shall retain jurisdiction over warfighting, the military defense of the United States, and other military activities, including any military response to terrorism, pursuant to section 876 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

ENERGY AND COMMERCE—The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over measures that address the Department of Homeland Security’s activities for domestic preparedness and collective response to terrorism. The words “to terrorism” require a direct relation to terrorism. The Committee on Homeland Security’s jurisdiction over “collective response to terrorism” means that it shall receive referrals of bills addressing the Department of Homeland Security’s responsibilities for, and assistance to, first responders as a whole. The Committee on Energy and Commerce (and other relevant committees) shall retain their jurisdiction over bills addressing the separate entities that comprise the first responders. For example, the Committee on Energy and Commerce shall retain its jurisdiction over a bill directing the Department of Health and Human Services to train emergency medical personnel.

FINANCIAL SERVICES—The Committee on Financial Services shall retain jurisdiction over the National Flood Insurance Program and Emergency Food and Shelter Program of FEMA, and the Defense Production Act. The Committee on Financial Services shall retain its jurisdiction over the anti-money laundering, terrorist financing,
and anti-counterfeiting activities within the Department of the Treasury and the financial regulators.

**GOVERNMENT REFORM**—The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over “the organization and administration of the Department of Homeland Security.” The Committee on Government Reform shall retain jurisdiction over federal civil service, the overall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities, including Federal procurement, and federal paperwork reduction. The Committee on Government Reform shall retain jurisdiction over government-wide information management efforts including the Federal Information Security Management Act. The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over integration, analysis, and dissemination of homeland security information by the Department of Homeland Security, and the Committee on Government Reform shall retain jurisdiction over measures addressing public information and records generally including the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act. The Committee on Government Reform shall have jurisdiction over the policy coordination responsibilities of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement.

**INTELLIGENCE**—The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall retain jurisdiction over the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of all departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the National Counterterrorism Center as defined in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

**JUDICIARY**—The Committee on the Judiciary shall retain jurisdiction over immigration policy and non-border enforcement of the immigration laws. Its jurisdiction over immigration policy shall include matters such as the immigration and naturalization process, numbers of aliens (including immigrants and non-immigrants) allowed, classifications and lengths of allowable stay, the adjudication of immigration petitions and the requirements for the same, the domestic adjudication of immigration petitions and applications submitted to the Department of Labor or the Department of Homeland Security and setting policy with regard to visa issuance and acceptance. Its jurisdiction over non-border enforcement shall be limited to those aspects of immigration enforcement not associated with the immediate entry of individuals into the country, including those aspects of the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over border and port security including the immigration responsibilities of inspectors at ports of entry and the border patrol. As used in the new Rule X(1)(l)(9) and this legislative history, the word “immigration” shall be construed to include “naturalization” and no substantive change is intended by the new rule’s not containing the word “naturalization.”

**SCIENCE**—The Committee on Science shall retain some jurisdiction over the research and development activities of the Department of Homeland Security as such matters are incidental to the Committee on Science’s existing jurisdiction (except where those activities are in the jurisdiction of another committee).

**TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE**—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall retain jurisdiction over the Coast Guard. However, the Committee on Homeland Security has
jurisdiction over port security, and some Coast Guard responsibilities in that area will fall within the jurisdiction of both committees. Jurisdiction over emergency preparedness will be split between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall retain its jurisdiction under clause 1(r)(2) over “federal management of emergencies and natural disasters.” This means that the committee retains its general jurisdiction over the emergency preparedness and response operations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Bills addressing FEMA’s general preparation for disaster from any cause shall be referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over the Department of Homeland Security’s responsibilities with regard to emergency preparedness only as they relate to acts of terrorism. Thus, the Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over the responsibilities of the Office for Domestic Preparedness, in accordance with section 430 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

As indicated earlier, the Committee on Homeland Security’s jurisdiction over “collective response to terrorism” means that it would receive referrals of bills addressing the Department of Homeland Security’s responsibilities for, and assistance to, first responders as a whole and not over measures addressing first responder communities individually.

The Committee on Homeland Security shall have jurisdiction over the functions of the Department of Homeland Security relating to transportation security, while the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall retain its jurisdiction over transportation safety. In general, the Committee on Homeland Security would have jurisdiction over bills addressing the Transportation Security Administration and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure would have jurisdiction over bills addressing the various entities within the Department of Transportation having responsibility for transportation safety, such as the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security does not include expenditures from trust funds under the jurisdiction of other committees, including but not limited to the Highway Trust Fund, the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, the Federal Buildings Fund, and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

WAYS AND MEANS—The jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means over “customs revenue” is intended to include those functions contemplated in section 412(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and includes those functions as carried out in collection districts and ports of entry and delivery.

CHANGES TO THE STANDING RULES — SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

(Congressional Record, January 3, 2013, Page H12)

Clarifications in Rule X. Subsection (c) makes two clarifications with respect to clause 1 of rule X. Paragraph (1) clarifies that
the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction includes the general management of the Department of Homeland Security. This change is intended to clarify the Committee's existing jurisdiction over the organization and administration of the department, and is not intended to alter the pattern of bill referrals to the Committee on Homeland Security, nor is it intended to alter the existing oversight jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. Paragraph (2) conforms terminology used in the Committee on Natural Resources jurisdiction to terminology recognized by the Departments of State and Interior.
MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

(18–14)

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas, Chairman

LAMAR SMITH, Texas
PETER T. KING, New York
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina
VACANCY

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawai’i
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
ERIC SWALWELL, California

Appointment of Mr. Michael T. McCaul as Chair, and Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi as Ranking Minority Member on January 3, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 6 and H. Res. 7, respectively.

The Majority Members of the Committee were elected to the Committee on January 4, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 17; and the Minority Members on January 3, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 7.

Ms. Janice Hahn of California resigned as a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security on January 14, 2013.

Mr. Filemon Vela of Texas, Mr. Steven A. Horsford of Nevada, and Mr. Eric Swalwell of California were elected to the Committee on January 14, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 22.

Mr. Keith J. Rothfus of Pennsylvania resigned as a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security on April 16, 2013.

Mr. Mark Sanford of South Carolina was elected to the Committee on June 12, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 257.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman

PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania, Vice Chair
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
VACANCY
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)
In the 107th Congress, the House Select Committee on Homeland Security was established on June 19, 2002, pursuant to H. Res. 449 (adopted by voice vote). The Committee was composed of nine Members of the House: Mr. Richard “Dick” Armey of Texas, Chairman; Mr. Thomas DeLay of Texas; Mr. Julius Caesar “J.C.” Watts of Oklahoma; Ms. Deborah Pryce of Ohio; Mr. Robert Portman of Ohio; Ms. Nancy Pelosi of California; Mr. Jonas Martin Frost of Texas; Mr. Robert Menendez of New Jersey; and Ms. Rosa L. DeLauro of Connecticut.

The mandate of the Select Committee in the 107th Congress was to “develop recommendations and report to the House on such matters that relate to the establishment of a department of homeland security.” The Select Committee accomplished its mandate on November 22, 2002, when the House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5005, a bill establishing the Department of Homeland Security, by unanimous consent, and cleared H.R. 5005 for the President. The bill was presented to the President on November 22, 2002, and was signed on November 25, 2002, becoming Public Law 107–296.

The termination date of the House Select Committee on Homeland Security was “after final disposition of a bill [ . . . ] including final disposition of any veto message on such bill,” which occurred on November 25, 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the 108th Congress on January 7, 2003, pursuant to provisions of H. Res. 5 (adopted by a recorded vote of 221 yeas and 203 nays). The Membership of the Select Committee was established on February 12, 2003, as: Mr. Christopher Cox of California, Chairman; Ms. Jennifer Dunn of Washington; Mr. William “Bill” Young of Florida; Mr. Donald “Don” Young of Alaska; Mr. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. of Wisconsin; Mr. Wilbert Joseph “Billy” Tauzin of Louisiana; Mr. David Dreier of California; Mr. Duncan Hunter of California; Mr. Harold Rogers of Kentucky; Mr. Sherwood Boehlert of New York; Mr. Lamar Smith of Texas; Mr. Wayne Curtis
“Curt” Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Christopher Shays of Connecticut; Mr. Porter J. Goss of Florida; Mr. David Camp of Michigan; Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida; Mr. Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia; Mr. Ernest James Istook, Jr. of Oklahoma; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. John E. Linder of Georgia; Mr. John B. Shadegg of Arizona; Mr. Mark E. Souder of Indiana; Mr. William McClellan “Mac” Thornberry of Texas; Mr. James A. Gibbons of Nevada; Ms. Kay Granger of Texas; Mr. Pete Sessions of Texas; Mr. John E. Sweeney of New York; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. John E. Sweeney of New York; Mr. Jim Turner of Texas; Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California; Mr. Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts; Mr. Norman D. Dicks of Washington; Mr. Barney Frank of Massachusetts; Ms. Jane Harman of California; Mr. Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland; Ms. Louise M. Slaughter of New York; Mr. Peter A. DeFazio of Oregon; Mrs. Nita M. Lowey of New York; Mr. Robert E. Andrews of New Jersey; Ms. Eleanor Holmes Norton, a Delegate from the District of Columbia; Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California; Ms. Karen McCarthy of Missouri; Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee of Texas; Mr. William “Bill” Pascrell, Jr. of New Jersey; Mrs. Donna M. Christensen, a Delegate from the U.S. Virgin Islands; Mr. Bobby “Bob” Etheridge of North Carolina; Mr. Charles Gonzalez of Texas; Mr. Ken Lucas of Kentucky; Mr. James R. Langevin of Rhode Island; and Mr. Kendrick B. Meek of Florida.

The Select Committee was authorized to develop recommendations and report to the House by bill or otherwise on such matters that relate to the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) as may be referred to it by the Speaker, and was charged with reviewing and studying on a continuing basis laws, programs, and Government activities relating to homeland security. In addition, the Select Committee was directed to conduct a thorough and complete study of the operation and implementation of the Rules of the House, including Rule X, with respect to the issue of homeland security, and submit its recommendations regarding any changes in the Rules of the House to the Committee on Rules not later than September 30, 2004.

On September 30, 2004, the Select Committee on Homeland Security submitted its recommendations on jurisdictional changes to the Rules of the House of Representatives to the Committee on Rules.

The Committee had six measures signed into law during the 108th Congress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pub. L. 108–268</td>
<td>To provide for the transfer of the Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex in the District of Columbia to facilitate the establishment of the headquarters for the Department of Homeland Security, to provide for the acquisition by the Department of the Navy of suitable replacement facilities.</td>
<td>H.R. 4332★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to H. Res. 5, the Select Committee terminated on January 2, 2005, with the expiration of the 108th Congress.

1 Indicates measures which were not referred directly to the Committee on Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

109th Congress

The 109th Congress marked the first Congress for the standing Committee on Homeland Security. During the two previous Congresses, the House of Representatives established separate Select Committees on Homeland Security: the first - to establish the Department of Homeland Security, the second - to monitor the initial activities of the Department and to examine the need for a standing committee in the House with jurisdictional authority over matters relating to the issue of homeland security.

The Committee on Homeland Security was established as a standing Committee of the House with the passage of H. Res. 5, on January 4, 2005. The resolution was adopted by a recorded vote of 220 yeas and 195 nays.

The Committee Membership was set at 34 Members with 19 Republicans and 15 Democrats. The following Members were appointed to the Committee on Homeland Security for all or part of the Congress: Mr. Christopher Cox of California; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. Don Young of Alaska; Mr. Lamar S. Smith of Texas; Mr. Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Christopher Shays of Connecticut; Mr. John Linder of Georgia; Mr. Mark E. Souder of Indiana; Mr. Tom Davis of Virginia; Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California; Mr. Jim Gibbons of Nevada; Mr. Rob Simmons of Connecticut; Mr. Mike Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Stevan Pearce of New Mexico; Ms. Katherine Harris of Florida; Mr. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana; Mr. David G. Reichert of Washington; Mr. Michael T. McCaul of Texas; Mr. Charles W. Dent of Pennsylvania; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida; Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California; Mr. Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts; Mr. Norman D. Dicks of Washington; Ms. Jane Harman of California; Mr. Peter A. DeFazio of Oregon; Ms. Nita M. Lowey of New York; Ms. Eleanor Holmes Norton of District of Columbia; Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California; Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee of Texas; Mr. Bill Pascrell of Jr., New Jersey; Ms. Donna M. Christensen of U.S. Virgin Islands; Mr. Bob Etheridge of North Carolina; Mr. James R. Langevin of Rhode Island; and Mr. Kendrick B. Meek of Florida.

On February 9, 2005, the Committee on Homeland Security adopted its Rules, which provided for the establishment of five Subcommittees. The Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack; the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment; the Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity; the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight; and the

On October 7, 2005, the Committee revised its Rules to establish a Subcommittee on Investigations.

The Committee had eight measures signed into law during the 109th Congress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005.</td>
<td>H.R. 1288(^\text{★})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.</td>
<td>H.R. 3(^\text{★})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006.</td>
<td>H.R. 889(^\text{★})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007. (Title VI - Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act)</td>
<td>H.R. 5441(^\text{★})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Security and Accountability For Every Port Act of 2006” or the “SAFE Port Act”.</td>
<td>H.R. 4954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Fence Act of 2006.</td>
<td>H.R. 6061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{★}\) Indicates measures which were not referred directly to the Committee on Homeland Security.

110th Congress

The Committee on Homeland Security continued as a standing Committee pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 5, agreed to in the House on January 4, 2007, by a record vote of 235 yeas and 195 nays.

The Committee on Homeland Security met on January 23, 2007, for an organizational meeting for the 110th Congress under the direction of Chairman Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi. The Committee Membership was set at 34 Members with 19 Democrats and 15 Republicans. The following Members were appointed to the Committee on Homeland Security for all or part of the Congress:

Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California; Mr. Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts; Mr. Norman D. Dicks of Washington; Ms. Jane Harman of California; Mr. Peter A. DeFazio of Oregon; Mrs.Nita M. Lowey of New York; Ms. Eleanor Holmes Norton a Delegate from the District of Columbia; Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California; Ms. Sheila Jackson-Lee of Texas; Mrs. Donna M. Christensen a Delegate from the U.S. Virgin Islands; Mr. Bob Etheridge of North Carolina; Mr. James R. Langevin of Rhode Island; Mr. Henry Cuellar of Texas; Mr. Christopher P. Carney of Pennsylvania; Ms.Yvette D. Clarke of New York; Mr. Al Green of Texas; Mr. Ed Perlmutter of Colorado; Mr. Bill Pascrell, Jr. of New Jersey; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. Lamar Smith of Texas; Mr. Christopher Shays of Connecticut; Mr. Mark E. Souder of Indiana; Mr. Tom Davis of Virginia; Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California; Mr. Mike Rogers of Alabama; Mr. David G. Reichert of Washington; Mr. Michael T. McCaul of Texas; Mr. Charles W. Dent of Pennsylvania; Ms.Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida; Mr. Gus M. Bilirakis of Florida; Mr. David Davis of Ten-
nessee; Mr. Paul C. Broun of Georgia; Mrs. Candice S. Miller of Michigan; Ms. Marsha Blackburn of Tennessee; Mr. Kevin McCarthy of California; and Mr. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana.

The Committee established six Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism; the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment; the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection; the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology; the Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response; and the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight.

The Committee had four measures signed into law during the 110th Congress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Indicates measures which were not referred directly to the Committee on Homeland Security.

111th Congress

The Committee on Homeland Security continued as a standing Committee pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 5, agreed to in the House on January 6, 2009, by a record vote of 235 yeas and 195 nays.

The Committee on Homeland Security met on February 4, 2009, for an organizational meeting for the 111th Congress under the direction of Chairman Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi. The Committee Membership, was set at 34 Members with 21 Democrats and 13 Republicans. The following Members were appointed to the Committee on Homeland Security for all or part of the Congress: Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta Sanchez, of California; Ms. Jane Harman of California; Mr. Peter A. DeFazio of Oregon; Ms. Eleanor Holmes Norton a Delegate from the District of Columbia; Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California; Ms. Sheila Jackson-Lee of Texas; Mr. Henry Cuellar of Texas; Mr. Christopher P. Carney of Pennsylvania; Ms. Yvette D. Clarke of New York; Ms. Laura Richardson of California; Mrs. Ann Kirkpatrick of Arizona; Mr. Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico; Mr. Bill Pascrell, Jr. of New Jersey; Mr. Emmanuel Cleaver of Missouri; Mr. Al Green of Texas; Mr. James A. Himes of Connecticut; Ms. Mary Jo Kilroy of Ohio; Mr. Eric J.J. Massa of New York; Ms. Dina Titus of Nevada; Mr. William L. Owens of New York; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. Lamar Smith of Texas; Mr. Mark E. Souder of Indiana; Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California; Mr. Mike Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Michael T. McCaul of Texas; Mr. Charles W. Dent of Pennsylvania; Mr. Gus
M. Bilirakis of Florida; Mr. Paul C. Broun of Georgia; Mrs. Candice S. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Pete Olson of Texas; Mr. Anh “Joseph” Cao of Louisiana; Mr. Steve Austria of Ohio; and Mr. Tom Graves of Georgia.

The Committee established six Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Border, Maritime, and Global Counterterrorism; the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment; the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection; the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology; the Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response; and the Subcommittee on Management, Investigations, and Oversight.

The Committee had 14 measures signed into law during the 111th Congress:

### 111th Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pub. L. 111—198</td>
<td>Homebuyer Assistance and Improvement Act.</td>
<td>H.R. 5623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. L. 111—252</td>
<td>To allow certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees who serve under an overseas limited appointment for at least 2 years, and whose service is rated fully successful or higher throughout that time, to be converted to a permanent appointment in the competitive service.</td>
<td>H.R. 1517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*† Indicates measures which were not referred directly to the Committee on Homeland Security.
*† Indicates measures which were not referred to the Committee, but to which measures were included during Congressional action.

### 112th Congress

The Committee on Homeland Security continued as a standing Committee pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 5, agreed to in the House on January 5, 2011, by a record vote of 238 yeas and 191 nays.

The Committee on Homeland Security met on January 26, 2011, for an organizational meeting for the 112th Congress under the direction of Chairman Peter T. King of New York. The Committee Membership, was set at 33 Members with 19 Republicans and 14
Democrats. The following Members were appointed to the Committee on Homeland Security for all or part of the Congress: Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. Lamar Smith of Texas; Mr. Daniel E. Lungren of California; Mr. Mike Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Michael T. McCaul of Texas; Mr. Gus M. Bilirakis of Florida; Mr. Paul C. Broun of Georgia; Mrs. Candice S. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Tim Walberg of Michigan; Mr. Chip Cravaack of Minnesota; Mr. Joe Walsh of Illinois; Mr. Patrick Meehan of Pennsylvania; Mr. Benjamin Quayle of Arizona; Mr. Scott Rigell of Virginia; Mr. Billy Long of Missouri; Mr. Jeff Duncan of South Carolina; Mr. Tom Marino of Pennsylvania; Mr. Blake Farenthold of Texas; Mr. Mo Brooks of Alabama; and Mr. Robert L. Turner of New York. Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta Sanchez, of California; Ms. Jane Harman of California; Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee of Texas; Mr. Henry Cuellar of Texas; Ms. Yvette D. Clarke of New York; Ms. Laura Richardson of California; Mrs. Donna M. Christensen a Delegate from the U.S. Virgin Islands; Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois; Ms. Jackie Speier of California; Mr. Cedric L. Richmond of Louisiana; Ms. Hansen Clarke of Michigan; Mr. William R. Keating of Massachusetts; Ms. Kathleen C. Hochul of New York; Ms. Janice Hahn of California; and Mr. Ron Barber of Arizona.

The Committee established six Subcommittees: The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies; the Subcommittee on Transportation Security; the Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management; the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications; the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security; and the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.

The Committee had 10 measures signed into law during the 112th Congress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards Act of 2011.</td>
<td>S. 1487★ (H.R. 2042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of the Armed Forces Act.</td>
<td>H.R. 1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Tunnel Prevention Act of 2012</td>
<td>H.R. 4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To require the Transportation Security Administration to comply with the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act.</td>
<td>H.R. 3670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012.</td>
<td>S. 743★ (H.R. 5289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012.</td>
<td>H.R. 3838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012.</td>
<td>S. 3542 (H.R. 6028)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★ Indicates measures which were not referred directly to the Committee on Homeland Security.
† Indicates measures which were not referred to the Committee, but to which Members were appointed as Conferees.
The Committee on Homeland Security continued as a standing Committee pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 5, agreed to in the House on January 3, 2013, by a record vote of 228 yeas and 196 nays.

The Committee on Homeland Security met on January 23, 2013, for an organizational meeting for the 113th Congress under the direction of Chairman Michael T. McCaul of Texas. The Committee Membership, was set at 32 Members with 18 Republicans and 14 Democrats. The following Members were appointed to the Committee on Homeland Security for all or part of the Congress:

Michael T. McCaul of Texas; Mr. Lamar Smith of Texas; Mr. Peter T. King of New York; Mr. Mike Rogers of Alabama; Mr. Paul C. Broun of Georgia; Mrs. Candice S. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Patrick Meehan of Pennsylvania; Mr. Jeff Duncan of South Carolina; Mr. Tom Marino of Pennsylvania; Mr. Jason Chaffetz of Utah; Mr. Steven M. Palazzo of Mississippi; Mr. Lou Barletta of Pennsylvania; Mr. Chris Stewart of Utah; Mr. Keith J. Rothfus of Pennsylvania; Mr. Richard Hudson of North Carolina; Mr. Steve Daines of Montana; Mrs. Susan W. Brooks of Indiana; Mr. Scott Perry of Pennsylvania; Mr. Mark Sanford of South Carolina; Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi; Ms. Loretta J. Sanchez of California; Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee of Texas; Ms. Yvette D. Clarke of New York; Mr. Brian Higgins of New York; Mr. Cedric L. Richmond of Louisiana; Mr. William R. Keating of Massachusetts; Mr. Ron Barber of Arizona; Mr. Donald M. Payne, Jr. of New Jersey; Mr. Beto O’Rourke of Texas; Ms. Tulsi Gabbard of Hawaii; Mr. Filemon Vela of Texas; Mr. Steven A. Horsford of Nevada; and Mr. Eric Swalwell of California.

The Committee established six Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence; the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security; the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies; the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency; the Subcommittee on Transportation Security; and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.

The Committee had one measure signed into law during the First Session of the 113th Congress:

**113th Congress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pub. L. 113—27</td>
<td><strong>Helping Heroes Fly Act.</strong></td>
<td>H.R. 1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S. 1327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S. 1403)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security held nine hearings, receiving testimony from 27 witnesses, and considered six measures.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee on Homeland Security met on January 23, 2013, for an organizational meeting for the 113th Congress under the direction of Chairman Michael T. McCaul of Texas.

The Full Committee met pursuant to notice and adopted the Committee Rules for the 113th Congress by unanimous consent. The Committee also approved the Committee on Homeland Security’s Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress and Committee Resolution No. 1, relating to staff hiring, both adopted by unanimous consent.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

Pub. Law 113–27, H.R. 1344 (S. 1367, S. 1403)

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air pas-
senger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Summary

This law directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop and implement a process to ease travel and, to the extent possible, provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled Armed Forces members and veterans, and their accompanying family members or non-medical attendants. The TSA is required to maintain an operations center to provide for the movement of such members and veterans through screening before boarding a domestic or foreign passenger aircraft. Additionally, the law requires TSA to establish and publish certain protocols to contact the operations center to request expedited screening services for the service member or veteran. Furthermore, the TSA is directed to annually report to Congress on the implementation of the program. The TSA retains its flexibility to require additional screening of any individual if intelligence or law enforcement information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

As of March 2013, TSA began implementing the policies codified in this law at security screening checkpoints. This law seeks to facilitate the screening of our Nation’s wounded warriors’ through airports and free up TSA screeners to focus on real threats to our aviation systems. The Committee has long advocated for less onerous airport screening for our men and women in uniform. In fact, this bill builds upon past legislation promoted by the Committee, including the Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of the Armed Forces Act (Pub. L. 112–86), which requires TSA to provide expedited screening to active duty military traveling on official orders.

Legislative History

H.R. 1344 was introduced in the House on March 21, 2013, by Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Richmond, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1344 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The House considered H.R. 1344 on May 21, 2013, under Suspension of the Rules and passed the measure by a 2/3 recorded vote of 413 yeas with none voting “nay”, (Roll No. 166).

H.R. 1344 was received in the Senate on May 22, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

On August 1, 2013, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344 by unanimous consent. The Senate then passed H.R. 1344, with an amendment, by unanimous consent.

The House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1344, on August 2, 2013, by unanimous consent.

H.R. 1344 was presented to the President on August 6, 2013, and signed into law on August 9, 2013, as Public Law 113–27.

S. 1367, a Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on July 25, 2013, by Mr. Pryor and Ms. Ayotte; and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
S. 1403, a Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on July 31, 2013, by Mr. Pryor and Ms. Ayotte; and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. The text of S. 1403 was adopted by the Senate during consideration of H.R. 1344 on August 1, 2013.

**TSA LOOSE CHANGE ACT**

**H.R. 1095**

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

**Summary**

H.R. 1095 directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to transfer unclaimed monies recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations providing places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and establishes a request for proposals (RFP) process to select such organizations.

Section 44945 of title 49, U.S.C., enacted as part of Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2005 (Pub. L. 108–334), authorized and directed unclaimed money collected at airport security checkpoints to be used for civil aviation security. According to the report “FY 2012 Unclaimed Money at Airports,” which was prepared TSA, from FY 2009 through FY 2012, TSA has collected an average of $465,285 from airport security checkpoints annually. Just in FY 2012 alone, TSA collected $531,395. However as of March 1, 2013, TSA only expended $6,539 for the purpose of civil aviation security.

The Explanatory Statement contained in the Conference Report (H. Rpt. 112–492) that accompanied the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, (Pub. L. 113–6), required TSA to issue a report on the feasibility of transferring the unclaimed money recovered at airport checkpoints to non-profit organizations that are selected on a competitive basis. According to the report, it would cost the Federal Government approximately $201,000 for the first year alone if TSA was to transfer the money to a nonprofit organization selected on a competitive basis. Further, the report concluded that to minimize administrative overhead, TSA would prefer to award the use of funding to one nonprofit organization. After reviewing TSA’s report, the Committee believes that in order to ensure fairness of opportunity while minimizing administrative overhead, TSA should transfer the funds after a RFP is issued. Currently, United Services Organizations (USO) is the sole non-profit operating airport lounges for military service members and their families. However, any non-profit organization that provides these kinds of services can submit a proposal to TSA to seek these unclaimed funds.

**Legislative History**

112th Congress

H.R. 2179 was introduced in the House on June 14, 2011, by Mr. Miller of Florida and referred to the Committee on Homeland Secu-
rity. Within the Committee, H.R. 2179 was referred to the Sub-
committee on Transportation Security.

On March 7, 2012, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security considered H.R. 2179 and reported the measure to the Full Com-
mittee with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2179 on March 28, 2012, and ordered the measure to be favorably reported to the House, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 2179 to the House on May 8, 2012, as H. Rpt. 112–468.

113th Congress

H.R. 1095 was introduced in the House on March 12, 2013, by Mr. Miller of Florida and Mr. Rogers of Alabama; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1095 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

On October 29, 2013, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Transportation Security from further consideration of H.R. 1095.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1095 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favor-
able recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1095 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–274.

The House considered H.R. 1095 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by voice vote.

H.R. 1095 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

H.R. 1204 (S. 1804)

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Home-
land Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Se-
curity Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1204 authorizes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) and requires Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to consult with the ASAC on aviation security matters, including on the development and implementation of policies, programs, rulemakings and security directives. Additionally, the bill requires the ASAC to submit recommendations to TSA.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established the ASAC in 1989 following the bombing of Pan American World Airways Flight 103. Upon the establishment of the TSA, sponsorship of the ASAC was transferred to TSA. However, despite strong sup-
port from aviation security stakeholders who participated in the ASAC, TSA has allowed the ASAC’s charter to expire. On July 7, 2011, TSA published an announcement in the Federal Register to re-establish the ASAC, providing a setting for the aviation industry to formally communicate with TSA. On October 27, 2011, the Secretary of Homeland Security appointed 24 new members to the ASAC. On June 11, 2013, TSA published a notice of charter re-
newal in the Federal Register to announce the renewal of the ASAC. This legislation not only codifies current Department and TSA policy but also ensures that the ASAC remains intact.

In this budgetary environment, it is imperative that the TSA interact with industry stakeholders for input on security procedures and technology to ensure that the Administration is spending its limited resources on initiatives that will enhance aviation security for the traveling public.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 1447 was introduced in the House on April 8, 2011, by Mr. Thompson of Mississippi and Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1447 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

On September 21, 2011, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Transportation Security from further consideration of H.R. 1447. The Committee proceeded to the consideration of H.R. 1447 and ordered the measure to be reported to the House, without amendment, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1447 to the House on November 4, 2011, as H. Rpt. 112–269.

The House considered H.R. 1447 under Suspension of the Rules, on June 26, 2012, and passed the bill on June 28, 2012 by voice vote.

H.R. 1447 was received in the Senate on June 29, 2012, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

113th Congress

H.R. 1204 was introduced in the House on March 14, 2013, by Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Richmond, Ms. Jackson Lee, and Mr. Swalwell of California and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1204 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The Subcommittee considered H.R. 1204 on July 24, 2013, and forwarded H.R. 1204 to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1204 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1204 to the House on December 2, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–278.

The House considered H.R. 1204 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by a 2/3 record vote of 411 yeas and 3 nays (Roll Call Vote No. 617).

H.R. 1204 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1804, the Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on December 11, 2013.
To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1417 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain situational awareness and operational control of the border, and sets the requirement of achieving operational control in high traffic areas within two years and nine months of enactment and across the entire Southwest border within five years. Operational Control of the border, as defined by the bill, means a condition where there is a 90 percent effectiveness rate for the apprehension of illegal border crossers and a significant reduction in the movement of illicit drugs and other contraband.

This legislation sets the requirements for the Secretary to consider when developing the strategy; outlines the benchmarks and timetables for achieving situational awareness and operational control; and requires metrics to measure effectiveness. H.R. 1417 also requires the Secretary to issue a baseline assessment of the current level of situational awareness and operational control of the border and periodically thereafter until the border is deemed to be under operational control. Following the baseline assessment, the Secretary would be required to submit a comprehensive strategy and subsequent plan to gain situational awareness and operational control. The plan would be comprised of implementation plans for each of the Department's border security components and a comprehensive border security technology plan outlining a justification for technology choices and a timetable for procurement and deployment. This legislation also calls for periodic updates of the strategy and implementation plan following the publication of future Quadrennial Homeland Security Review.

The Secretary must implement a series of metrics to measure the effectiveness of security between the ports of entry, at ports of entry, and in the maritime environment. H.R. 1417 also requires a Department of Homeland Security National Laboratory and a Department of Homeland Security Center of Excellence to provide an independent assessment of the suitability of the metrics the Department develops, and to make recommendations for additional metrics to measure border security effectiveness.

Finally, the legislation requires the Government Accountability Office to review and report to Congress on the suitability and validity of the Secretary's strategy, plan, metrics, and the certification of operational control.

Legislative History

H.R. 1417 was introduced in the House on April 9, 2013, by Mr. McCaul, Mrs. Miller of Michigan, Ms. Jackson Lee, and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1417 was referred to the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security. S. 683, the
Senate companion measure was introduced on April 9, 2013, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security considered H.R. 1417 on April 24, 2013, and ordered the measure reported to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee on Homeland Security considered H.R. 1417 on May 15, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1417 to the House on May 20, 2013 as H. Rpt. 113–87, and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 62.

WMD INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2013

H.R. 1542

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1542 amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–296) to direct the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to conduct information sharing activities relevant to threats from weapons of mass destruction (WMD). H.R. 1542 requires the Department to support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials against the Nation and of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues. The act also requires DHS to support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of such homeland security hazards by providing relevant quantitative and qualitative threat information. Additionally, the act requires DHS to leverage homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack. Furthermore, the act requires DHS to share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to state, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders.

H.R. 1542 requires coordination within the Department and with the Intelligence Community, Federal, State, local, and Tribal authorities where appropriate. The act also directs the Secretary of DHS to report annually on: (1) Intelligence and information sharing activities to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction, and (2) DHS’s activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

Legislative History

112th Congress
H.R. 2764 was introduced in the House on August 1, 2011, by Mr. Meehan, Ms. Speier, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Marino, Mr. King of New York, and Mr. Rogers of Alabama, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2764 was referred to the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.

The Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence considered H.R. 2764 on November 15, 2011, and ordered the measure to be reported to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2764 on March 28, 2012, and ordered the measure to be favorably reported to the House, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 2764 to the House on May 8, 2012, as H. Rpt. 112–466.

The House considered H.R. 2764 on May 30, 2012, under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by voice vote.

H.R. 2764 was received in the Senate on June 4, 2012, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

113th Congress

H.R. 1542 was introduced in the House on April 24, 2013, by Mr. Meehan, Ms. Speier, Mr. McCaul, Mr. King of New York, and Mr. Higgins, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1542 was referred to the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.

The House considered H.R. 1542 on July 22, 2013, under Suspension of the Rules and passed the measure by a 2/3 record vote of 388 yeas and 3 nays, (Roll No. 375).

H.R. 1542 was received in the Senate on July 23, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS ALLOWABLE USE ACT

H.R. 1791

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities.

Summary

H.R. 1791 amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–296) to ensure that grants funds may continue to be used for medical preparedness activities.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 5997 was introduced in the House on June 21, 2012, by Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Clarke of Michigan, Mr. Turner of New York, and Mr. Rogers of Alabama; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 5997 was referred to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.
The House considered H.R. 5997 under Suspension of the Rules on November 27, 2012, and passed the bill, amended, by a 2/3 recorded vote of 397 yeas and 1 nay (Roll No. 609).

H.R. 1791 was introduced in the House on April 26, 2013, by Mr. Bilirakis, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, and Mr. King of New York; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1791 was referred to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.

On October 29, 2013, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications from further consideration of H.R. 1791.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1791 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1791 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–273.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

H.R. 2719

To require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 2719 was developed with valuable input from stakeholders across the Federal Government and industry. The bill introduces greater transparency and accountability for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) spending decisions through a series of commonsense reforms. Specifically, it requires TSA to develop and share with the public, for the first time: A strategic, multiyear technology investment plan; share key information with Congress on technology acquisitions, including cost overruns, delays, or technical failures within 30 days of identifying the problem; establish principles for managing equipment in inventory to eliminate expensive storage of unusable or outdated technologies; and report on its goals for contracting with small businesses.

H.R. 2719 requires TSA to do a better job of not only managing its own resources, but also leveraging resources outside of the Department of Homeland Security.

Legislative History

H.R. 2719 was introduced in the House on July 18, 2013, by Mr. Hudson, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Richmond, and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2719 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The Subcommittee considered H.R. 2719 on July 24, 2013, and forwarded H.R. 2719 to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2719 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.
The Committee reported H.R. 2719 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–275.

The House considered H.R. 2719 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by a ⅔ record vote of 416 yeas and 0 nays (Roll Call Vote No. 616).

H.R. 2719 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2013
(CIRDA ACT OF 2013)
H.R. 2952

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 2952 directs the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the development of a Research and Development (R&D) strategy for critical infrastructure security technologies. This strategy will help our nation prioritize its investments in those aspects of the infrastructure that are most at risk. H.R. 2952 also directs the Secretary to explore the feasibility of expanding the use of public-private R&D consortiums to accelerate new security technologies and spur innovation and economic competitiveness. In addition, CIRDA will designate a ‘Technology Clearinghouse’ where proven security tools for protecting infrastructure can be rapidly shared amongst government and private partners.

Legislative History

H.R. 2952 was introduced in the House on August 1, 2013, by Mr. Meehan, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2952 was referred to the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies.

On September 18, 2013, the Subcommittee considered H.R. 2952 and reported the measure to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2952 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY BOOTS-ON-THE-GROUND ACT
H.R. 3107

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes.

Summary
H.R. 3107 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications and to ensure that such classifications may be used throughout the Department and are made available to other federal agencies. H.R. 3107 also requires the Secretary to create a workforce strategy that enhances the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) cybersecurity workforce, including a multi-phase recruitment plan and a 10-year projection of federal workforce needs. This legislation would also create a process to verify that employees of independent contractors who serve in DHS cybersecurity positions receive initial and recurrent information security and role-based security training commensurate with assigned responsibilities.

Legislative History

H.R. 3107 was introduced in the House on September 17, 2013, by Ms. Clarke, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 3107 was referred to the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies.

On September 18, 2013, the Subcommittee considered H.R. 3107 and reported the measure to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 3107 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 3107 to the House on December 12, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–294.

Oversight Activities of the Committee

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush declared: “We’re fighting a new kind of war against determined enemies. And public servants long into the future will bear the responsibility to defend Americans against terror.” Over a decade later, our enemies continue to evolve and we must continue to adapt. The Department of Homeland Security’s structure and capabilities continue to mature. The Department has a large role in defending our Nation from vulnerabilities our enemies wish to exploit. It is this Committee’s responsibility pursuant to House Rule X, Clause 3(g) to “review and study on a continuing basis all Government activities relating to homeland security, including the interaction of all departments and agencies with the Department of Homeland Security.” In addition, the Committee is to “review and study on a primary and continuing basis all Government activities, programs and organizations related to homeland security that fall within its primary legislative jurisdiction.”

Threats to the Homeland

The Committee has continued to focus on the present and persistent threat of terrorism. Scattered across the map are an increasing number of individuals and organizations sympathetic to
al-Qaeda’s message, reaching out to al Qaeda operatives, and embracing their radical view.

On February 13, 2013, the Committee held a hearing entitled “A New Perspective on Threats to the Homeland.” The Committee received testimony from ADM Thad Allen (Ret. USCG), Senior Vice President, Booz Allen Hamilton; Mr. Shawn Henry, President, CrowdStrike Services; Hon. Michael E. Leiter, Private Citizen; Hon. David M. Walker, Founder and CEO, The Comeback America Initiative; and Mr. Clark Kent Ervin, Partner, Patton Boggs, LLP. The Committee will maintain its heightened focus on the threat of terrorism from both within the Homeland and abroad, and will continue to conduct rigorous oversight of efforts to combat those threats.

The National Network of Fusion Centers (Network) was developed in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks to close the gaps in information sharing between Federal, State, and local law enforcement and emergency responders. Currently, the Network includes 78 fusion centers across 49 states, three territories and the District of Columbia. On July 26, 2013, the Committee released a Majority Staff Report entitled “The National Network of Fusion Centers,” detailing the Committee’s findings and recommendations developed from a comprehensive study of fusions centers across the Nation. The report concludes months of work by the Committee which included visits to 32 fusion centers, in addition to briefings and discussions with Federal partners and the National Fusion Center Association. The Committee’s review concludes that the Network is not functioning as cohesively as it should be and fusion centers are facing numerous challenges that prevent the Network from realizing its full potential to help secure the Homeland. The Committee will continue to work with Federal, State, and local stakeholders in an effort to further mature and develop the Network as a national homeland security asset.

Boko Haram is an Islamic jihadist militant organization based in the northeast of Nigeria, north Cameroon and Niger that seeks to establish a “pure” Islamic state ruled by sharia law, putting a stop to what it deems “Westernization.” Boko Haram has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to waging violent jihad. The organization’s growing capacity and alliance with al-Qaeda make it a threat to the Homeland and U.S. interests abroad. In September, The Chair of the Full Committee and the Chairs of the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Intelligence, released a report entitled “Boko Haram: Growing Threat to the U.S. Homeland.” The Committee concluded that designating Boko Haram Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) will ensure support for the group’s activities is prohibited by law. The Department of State designated Boko Haram a FTO on November 13, 2013.

Throughout the First Session, Members of the Committee received regular monthly classified briefings from the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), the Department of Homeland Security, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to stay current on the latest intelligence and threats to the homeland.
THE BOSTON BOMBINGS

On April 15, 2013, two improvised explosive devices detonated near the finish line of the Boston Marathon. This attack killed three innocent victims and injured an estimated, 260 others. Local police, fire departments, medical personnel, members of the National Guard, as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) responded to the scene, and began the hunt for those responsible.

The suspects, identified several days later as Tamerlan and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, were eventually cornered in Watertown, Massachusetts in the early hours of Friday, April 19, 2013. Tamerlan Tsarnaev sustained fatal injuries during his attempt to flee authorities, while his younger brother evaded capture for another several hours by hiding in a nearby boat. In the aftermath of Dzhokhar Tsarnaev’s arrest and his brother’s death, the Committee—responding to public reports that Tamerlan Tsarnaev had been previously identified as a potential terrorist threat—initiated an investigation into what Federal agencies knew about the danger he posed and what was done with that information.

Though this review continues, the Committee is preparing to release a report to document findings and recommendations based on this attack to improve the security of the United States Homeland. This effort has resulted in multiple briefings from representatives of DHS, and FBI, as well as other Federal officials, discussion with State and local law enforcement, document requests and multiple Committee hearings and site visits.

On May 9, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Boston Bombings: A First Look.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Joseph I. Lieberman, former Senator from the State of Connecticut; Mr. Edward F. Davis, III, Commissioner, Boston Police Department; Hon. Kurt N. Schwartz, Undersecretary, Executive Office of Public Safety and Security, The Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and Dr. Erroll G. Southers, Professor and Associate Director of Research Transition, DHS National Center for Risk & Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events (CREATE), Sol Price School of Public Policy, University of Southern California. After the initial assessment from the hearing, the Committee traveled twice to Boston to meet with representatives from the Boston Police Department, DHS, and the Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF). Additionally, the Committee met with the Intelligence Community Inspector General to coordinate investigative efforts.

The Committee continued its examination into the Boston bombings with a hearing on July 10 and 11, 2013, entitled “Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Rudolph “Rudy” W. Giuliani, former Mayor, New York City; Hon. Michael Leiter, former Director, National Counterterrorism Center; Dr. Bruce Hoffman, Professor and Director, Center for Peace and Security Studies and Security, Georgetown University; Hon. John Cohen, Deputy Counterterrorism Coordinator and Senior Advisor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Hon. Matthew G. Olsen, Director, National Counterterrorism Center. Due to the sensitive
nature of some of the testimony, portions of this hearing were held in Executive Session.

The Committee on Homeland Security continues its investigation into the actions of the Federal Government prior to the Boston bombing and post bombing. The Committee has sent a series of letters to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the National Counterterrorism Center on their particular actions and insights into the terrorists and events that occurred prior to the attack. Additionally Members of the Committee and staff have received a series of briefings regarding the bombing and information sharing between agencies. Committee staff traveled to Moscow, the Russian Federation and Georgia to investigate Tamerlan Tsarnaev’s travel and speak with officials on the ground to gain insight into the radicalization of the suspects. The Committee’s investigation is on-going.

IMPLICATIONS OF SYRIA CRISIS ON HOMELAND SECURITY

In August 2013, the Syria government used chemical agents on civilians in the Ghouta area of Damascus. As the United States and its allies considered an international military response, the Committee held numerous meetings and briefings to understand what happened and what this meant for the security of the Nation. On September 10, 2013, the Committee held a hearing entitled “Crisis in Syria: Implications for Homeland Security.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Christopher Shays, Former Representative in Congress from the 4th District of Connecticut; Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr. (Ret. U.S. Army), former Commandant of the U.S. Army War College; Mr. Thomas Joscelyn, Senior Fellow, Foundation for Defense of Democracies; and Dr. Stephen Biddle, Adjunct Senior Fellow for Defense Policy, Council on Foreign Relations. The Committee will continue to closely monitor the Syrian crisis, particularly to understand potential threats to the Homeland from foreign fighters and the possibility of chemical weapons falling into extremists’ hands.

EFFECTS OF WESTERNERS JOINING TERROR GROUPS

In September 2013, Americans watched as hundreds ran for cover and 68 people were murdered by vicious terrorists invading a shopping mall in the Republic of Kenya. Terrorizing these innocent people were al-Shabaab militants, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization. The most striking concern for Americans is that within the ranks of al-Shabaab are Americans, including 40 to 50 known fighters who have previously resided in the U.S. to fight alongside these jihadists in Africa and the Middle East. More than one hundred Americans are known to be fighting overseas in support of terrorist organizations, from the Middle East and Africa.

On October 9, 2013, the Committee held a hearing entitled “From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland.” The Committee received testimony from Prof. Michael Scheuer, Adjunct Professor, Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University, testifying on his own behalf; Ms. Lauren Ploch Blanchard, Specialist in African Affairs, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Con-
gress; Mr. Brett Lovegrove, Chief Executive, City Security and Resilience Network (CSARN); Mr. Richard W. Stanek, Sheriff, Hennepin County, Minnesota; Mr. Richard Mellor, Vice President, Loss Prevention, National Retail Federation; and Ms. Stephanie Sanok Kostro, Senior Fellow and Acting Director, Homeland Security and Counterterrorism Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

BORDER SECURITY

Border security is about much more than illegal immigration; it is about safeguarding this country from terrorism, drug cartels, weapons and human smuggling and protecting the free flow of legitimate trade. It is more important than ever to know who and what is coming into the United States. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), has never created a national strategy to secure our borders. In the absence of a complete border security strategy that encompasses the entire border, illicit cross-border activity quickly adapts and moves when isolated areas are secured. Throughout the First Session, the Committee has actively examined the key elements of border security including the definition of a secure border, border security metrics and measures, visa security and overstays, the implementation of a biometric exit system, cargo security, maritime security, and the future of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC).

As the Senate considered reform of the U.S. immigration system, the Committee examined proposals to enhance border security. S. 7.44, the Senate’s immigration bill included some provisions related to border security. The Senate’s approach puts a heavy emphasis on spending resources, with limited accountability or ability to measure outcomes of those applied resources. The Senate bill spends an additional $46 billion dollars to: Double the size of the U.S. Border Patrol; build additional miles of fence; and purchase new technology. H.R. 1417, the Committee’s border security legislation, calls for a strategy and an implementation plan to be produced prior to the expenditure of additional resources. It also requires metrics to increase accountability, and applies a standard of no less than 90 percent effectiveness to hold the Department accountable. For further action on H.R. 1417, see discussion above.

Members of the Committee conducted a site visit to the Southwest Border from August 3 through 6, 2013. The purpose of the site visit was to examine current border security conditions, including the maritime environment. Members experienced operations in the maritime domain, urban environment border security infrastructure, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) operations, and border security challenges in the Rio Grande Valley. In San Diego, California, Members examined U.S. Coast Guard port security operations, conducted an aerial tour of the international border, and a ground operational environment and infrastructure tour.

While in Tucson, Arizona, Members toured various facilities including: the Tucson Joint Field Command and Predator Operations Center; a demonstration of advanced Integrated Fixed Tower technologies, in Sasabe; and received an overview of UAV operations at Fort Huachuca.
Members then traveled to Texas to the Rio Grande Valley to participate in border terrain tours with local law enforcement, receive briefings on the South Texas Campaign and the Texas National Guard on RC–26 fixed-wing aerial detection and monitoring operations supporting the Department of Homeland Security.

During this session, the Committee received updates on the Arizona Technology Plan and successfully pushed for the Department of Defense to re-deploy aerostats DHS for assessment in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. The Committee is optimistic that Mexican government reforms will provide new economic opportunities so that its citizens will choose stable, viable jobs, especially in the energy industry, instead of joining criminal cartels operating along the Mexico-United States Border. The Committee will continue to push the Department to secure our borders in the North, South, and the Caribbean region.

PROTECTING THE NATION’S CYBERSECURITY

Other threats to our Nation do not cross our physical borders—they instead invade our digital networks. Cyber-attacks are becoming an increasing threat to the homeland. Countries steal our military and intelligence information; there are threats of cyber-warfare from terrorists, economic cyber attacks from the Islamic Republic of Iran and the People’s Republic of China and, even the possibility of an attack upon our utilities is a growing vulnerability. Yet, while threats are imminent, no major cybersecurity legislation has been enacted since 2002. The Secretary of Homeland Security, was made responsible for “coordinating the overall national effort to enhance the protection of our critical infrastructure” when the Department itself was established. The National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) and Executive Order 13636, Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity issued in February 2013 solidified the Department’s role as the lead Federal entity in protecting domestic critical infrastructure.

Upon issuance of Executive Order 13636 and Presidential Policy Directive (PPD)-21, Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience, the Committee received briefings on these documents from DHS. On March 13, 2013, the Committee held a hearing entitled “DHS Cybersecurity: Roles and Responsibilities to Protect the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Jane Holl Lute, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Anish B. Bhimani, Chairman, Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center; Mr. Gary W. Hayes, Chief Information Officer, Centerpoint Energy; and Ms. Michelle Richardson, Legislative Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.

The Committee spent considerable time developing cybersecurity legislation. Members and staff held hundreds of stakeholder meetings with the Department as well as technology and privacy organizations to get their insights and perspectives. The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held numerous hearings on Executive Order 13636, the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC), the Cybersecurity Framework, sharing threat information while en-
suring privacy and civil liberties, partnering with the privacy sector, and coordinating a cyber incident response.

As the Nation approached key Affordable Care Act milestones during 2013, the Committee raised security and privacy concerns prior to problems as healthcare.gov went live in October. The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held hearings in July and September on healthcare.gov and the Health Exchange Data Hub. On November 8, Committee staff also received a briefing from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services and the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications on Department of Homeland Security roles in the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. On November 13, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Cyber Side-Effects: How Secure is the Personal Information Entered into the Flawed Healthcare.gov?” The Committee received testimony from Ms. Roberta “Bobbie” Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Soraya Correa, Associate Director, Enterprise Services Directorate, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Luke Chung, President, FMS, Inc.; and Mr. Waylon Krush, Chief Executive Officer, Lunarline, Inc. In preparation for this hearing, Committee staff met with stakeholders to discuss technical flaws with healthcare.gov.

DHS MANAGEMENT

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Committee actively monitored the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) management and operations to ensure that it is functioning more efficiently and is accountable to the American people. The Committee met with DHS headquarters and many components to examine management practices in acquisition, financial management, information technology, human capital, and employee integrity. During the First Session, the Department had to navigate the complex impacts of sequestration, the first government shutdown in the Department’s young history, and significant senior leadership resignations. The Committee has been vocal about the need for key Department leadership positions to be filled. On March 5, 2013, the Chairman and Ranking Member sent a letter the President urging him to swiftly appoint an Inspector General at DHS. With over 40 percent of the senior leadership positions vacant, the Chairman wrote an opinion editorial discussing DHS leadership vacancies that appeared in the Monday, November 11, 2013, edition of The Wall Street Journal.

On December 12, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Help Wanted at DHS: Implications of Leadership Vacancies on the Mission and Morale.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Tom J. Ridge, Former Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Max Stier, President and CEO, Partnership for Public Service; Mr. David C. Maurer, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Colleen M. Kelley, National President, The National Treasury Employees Union.
As part of the Committee's oversight responsibilities, Committee staff reviewed the President's budget request for the Department of Homeland Security for Fiscal Year 2014, and on April 18, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s FY 2014 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Janet Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

In light of the Government Accountability Office’s (GAO) 2013 High-Risk report which identified financial management within the Department as high risk, on February 20, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, sent a letter to DHS's Chief Financial Officer regarding the Department's financial management systems and efforts to obtain a clean audit opinion on its financial statements. The Department provided a response to this letter on March 8, 2013. On March 11, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS's Chief Financial Officer. The GAO issued its report DHS Financial Management: Additional Efforts Needed to Resolve Deficiencies in Internal Controls and Financial Management Systems on September 30, 2013, [GAO-13-561]. The report contained four recommendations for executive action. On July 8, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS's Chief Financial Officer regarding DHS's efforts to modernize its financial systems. To further examine these issues, on November 15, 2013, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled “DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS's Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Asif Khan, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, U.S. Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of the hearing was to examine relevant GAO and Inspector General findings on DHS financial practices, including steps to obtain a clean audit opinion and implement financial management systems.

On August 1, 2013, the Undersecretary for Management, the Chief Procurement Officer, the Acting Chief Information Officer, and other senior officials briefed Committee staff on the status of the Department’s acquisition management efforts. As a follow up, on September 19, 2013, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled “DHS Acquisition Practices: Improving Outcomes for Taxpayers Using Defense and Private Sector Lessons Learned.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Rafael Borras, Undersecretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Michele Mackin, Director, Government Accountability Office; Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, DHS Office of Inspector General; Mr. William C. Greenwalt, Visiting Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; Mr. Stan Soloway, President and CEO, Professional Services Council; Mr. David Berteau, Senior Vice President, Center for Strategic and International Studies. The purpose of the hearing was to examine DHS's acquisition practices to determine if the Department is effectively implementing its policies and to assess whether DHS could leverage best practices and lessons learned from the De-
fense Department and the private sector. On November 5, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency raised concerns, in a letter to the Chief Procurement Officer, over the Department’s Enterprise Acquisition Gateway for Leading Edge Solutions II (EAGLE II) and requested additional information. The Department provided a written response on December 2, 2013.

The Committee reviewed the authorities and activities of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to ensure the effective management and coordination of key IT systems planning, investment management, cloud computing, data consolidating, operations, policy development, and related personnel management. The Committee also examined component CIOs—particularly Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and United States Customs and Immigration Services (USCIS)—and their efforts to modernize and implement critical IT systems supporting our border agents and immigration officers. On February 21, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS Office of Inspector General concerning their ongoing IT Audits and IT management issues. Committee staff also received briefings from representatives from DHS, including: The DHS Chief Information Officer; USCIS, including the USCIS Chief Information Officer; CBP; and ICE, including the ICE Chief Information Officer. The Committee reviewed the Department’s efforts to address information technology (IT) challenges, including the management and integration of the Department’s IT systems. The Committee monitored the Department’s progress in IT architectural planning, investment management, and cloud computing. On March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Information Technology: How Effectively Has DHS Harnessed IT to Secure Our Borders and Uphold Immigration Laws?” The purpose of the hearing was to assess how IT resources are being effectively utilized to help secure our borders and uphold immigration laws and how the Department is exercising proper management and oversight of its IT investments. The Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency additionally requested on May 23, 2013, to sign onto an ongoing GAO review of the TECS modernization program—the Treasury Enforcement Communication System. Committee staff also received a briefing from the Office of Inspector General regarding its investigation related to the DHS Chief Information Officer. On August 22, 2013, Committee staff were briefed by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) on its transportation infrastructure modernization efforts, which seeks to update TSA IT infrastructure in maritime, surface, and aviation environments.

On November 14, 2013, DHS officials briefed the Committee on their approach to Integrated Investment Life Cycle Management (IILCM). The IILCM is the Department’s transformational concept to integrate all phases of the Department’s multi-billion dollar budget and investment/acquisition management process. The framework provides critical linkages between Strategy, Capabilities and Requirements, Programming and Budgeting, and Investment Oversight phases to ensure the effective execution of Federal funds to support strategic priorities. The IILCM was signed into policy by
Secretary Napolitano in February 2013 and the framework is being piloted through March 2014 using the cybersecurity, biodefense, and common vetting portfolios. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress of these pilot initiatives.

On November 15, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittees sent a letter to the Acting Secretary to ensure the second Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) addresses critical homeland security issues and relevant recommendations. During the second session, the Committee eagerly awaits the completion of the second QHSR to set the priorities and direction of the Department in the coming years.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

As part of the Committee’s oversight responsibilities, Committee staff reviewed the President’s budget request for the Department of Homeland Security for Fiscal Year 2014, and on April 18, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s FY 2014 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Janet Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Based on a Committee staff review of the President’s budget request for FY 2014 and testimony received, the Committee completed its Views and Estimates of the President’s budget request and submitted them to the House Budget Committee for its consideration.

2014 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES SECURITY

On November 6 and 7, 2013, the Committee sent a staff delegation to visit Sochi, Russian Federation, to investigate security at the 2014 Olympic game venues and determine how the Department of Homeland Security may support this event. Because of the heightened security concerns surrounding the Olympic games, the Committee is considering a future hearing on DHS’ role in supporting the security of approximately 15,000 Americans, both athletes and visitors, at the Olympics. The Committee is also investigating the threats from the Caucasus Emirate (Imarat Kavkaz—Russian name), a Chechnyan terrorist group affiliated with al-Qaeda, which has threatened the 2014 Winter Olympic games.

FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“A New Perspective on Threats to the Homeland.” February 13, 2013. (Serial No. 113–1)

“DHS Cybersecurity: Roles and Responsibilities to Protect the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure.” March 6, 2013. (Serial No. 113–4)

“The President’s FY 2014 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security.” April 18, 2013. (Serial No. 113–11)

“The Boston Bombings: A First Look.” May 9, 2013. (Serial No. 113–16)

“Assessing Attacks on the Homeland: From Fort Hood to Boston.” July 10 and 11, 2013. (Serial No. 113–16)

“From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland.” October 9, 2013. (Serial No. 113–38)

“Cyber Side-Effects: How Secure is the Personal Information Entered into the Flawed Healthcare.gov?” November 13, 2013. (Serial No. 113–41)

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held four hearings, receiving testimony from 19 witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

WMD INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2013

H.R. 1542

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes.

Summary

This legislation requires the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis to support the analysis and dissemination of information regarding threats involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons throughout the Department and among other Federal, State, local, and private sector partners.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 2764 was introduced in the House on August 1, 2011, by Mr. Meehan, Ms. Speier, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Marino, Mr. King of New York, and Mr. Rogers of Alabama, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2764 was referred to the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.

The Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence considered H.R. 2764 on November 15, 2011, and ordered the measure to
be reported to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2764 on March 28, 2012, and ordered the measure to be favorably reported to the House, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 2764 to the House on May 8, 2012, as H. Rpt. 112–466.

The House considered H.R. 2764 on May 30, 2012, under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by voice vote.

H.R. 2764 was received in the Senate on June 4, 2012, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

113th Congress

H.R. 1542 was introduced in the House on April 24, 2013, by Mr. Meehan, Ms. Speier, Mr. McCaul, Mr. King of New York, and Mr. Higgins, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1542 was referred to the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.

The House considered H.R. 1542 under Suspension of the Rules and passed the measure by a 2/3 record vote of 388 yeas and 3 nays, (Roll No. 375).

H.R. 1542 was received in the Senate on July 23, 2014, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

U.S. COUNTERTERRORISM STRATEGY

The Subcommittee continued its review of homeland security and counterterrorism efforts across the Federal Government to counter the threat from al-Qaeda and other terrorist networks.

The Committee conducted a series of meetings, briefings, and site visits to review U.S. counterterrorism efforts aimed at disrupting and reducing threats to the U.S. homeland from al-Qaeda and other Islamic terror groups.

On May 21, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from New York City, New York (NYC) to discuss ongoing counterterrorism activities and coordination efforts between NYC and the Department of Homeland Security.

On June 4, 2013, Committee staff met with former U.S. Government intelligence officials regarding counterterrorism strategies, as well as current and potential future terror threats.

On July 30, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Department of Homeland Security, Office of Bombing Prevention to discuss their role and capability in providing training and information to State and local law enforcement regarding identifying and disabling improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The tragic events of April 15, 2013, where terrorists exploded two IEDs at the Boston Marathon, as well as the growing use of vehicle-born improvised explosive devices, highlight the need for the Nation to increase efforts to detect and disable these devices.
On September 10, 2013, Committee staff attended a conference hosted by the American Enterprise Institute on the current capabilities of al-Qaeda and what changes are necessary to the current counterterror strategies moving forward.

On October 28, 2013, Committee staff received a classified briefing from Department of Homeland Security officials regarding the Department’s roles and responsibilities related to terrorism detainees held at Naval Station at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba.

**THREATS TO THE U.S. HOMELAND FROM AL-QAEDA**

The Committee has examined the continued threat to the U.S. homeland from: Al Qaeda core; al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP); al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM); and other emerging allied and affiliated organizations.

On May 22, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Threat to the Homeland from al-Qaeda Operations in Iran and Syria.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Seth G. Jones, Ph.D., Associate Director, International Security and Defense Policy Center; Mr. Robin Simcox, Research Fellow, The Henry Jackson Society; Mr. Thomas Joscelyn, Senior Fellow, Foundation for the Defense of Democracies; and Mr. Barak Barfi, Research Fellow, New America Foundation.

In preparation for the May 22nd hearing, Committee staff met with a number of outside experts on the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and potential threats to the Nation. These meetings include the Institute of the Study of War on May 8, 2013, the RAND Corporation on May 10, 2013, and the Henry Jackson Society on May 14, 2013.

On June 27, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee received a classified briefing on terror threats to the Homeland. Members were briefed by representatives from the Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

The Subcommittee conducted oversight after an al-Qaeda-linked threat report in August 2013, lead to the closure of nearly two-dozen U.S. Embassies across the Middle East and North Africa for approximately one week with the U.S. Embassy in Sanaa, the Yemeni Republic remaining closed for two weeks. Committee staff met with numerous Government and private sector experts on the threat information and the relationship between al-Qaeda senior leadership and the affiliate organizations, particularly AQAP.

On September 18, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Understanding the Threat to the Homeland from AQAP.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Frank J. Cilluffo, Associate Vice President, Director, Homeland Security Policy Institute and Co-Director, Cyber Center for National and Economic Security, The George Washington University.; Ms. Katherine Zimmerman, Senior Analyst Critical Threats Project, The American Enterprise Institute; and Mr. Brian Katulis, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress.

**AL QAEDA IN THE SINAI**

On October 21 and 22, 2013, Committee staff met with outside experts from the Washington Institute for Near East Policy on the
presence and capability of jihadist entities in the Arab Republic of Egypt, particularly in the Sinai Peninsula. The meetings included a discussion of the impact of Administration’s decision to limit military aid to Egypt.

On October 30, 2013, Committee staff met with experts from the Council on Foreign Relations regarding security concerns in the Sinai and the potential threat to the U.S. Homeland and western interests from terrorist groups operating in the region.

MUMBAI-STYLE ATTACKS AND LASHKAR-E-TAIBA

On June 12, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Protecting the Homeland Against Mumbai-Style Attacks and the Threat from Lashkar-e-Taiba.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Joseph W. Pfeifer, Chief of Counterterrorism and Emergency Preparedness, Fire Department of New York; C. Christine Fair, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Georgetown University, Security Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service; Stephen Tankel, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, American University and Nonresident Scholar, South Asia Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; and Jonah Blank, Ph.D., Senior Political Analyst, The RAND Corporation.

In preparation for the June 12th hearing, Committee staff met with a number of outside experts regarding the capability and intentions of Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT). Additionally, the Committee staff received a classified briefing on June 5, 2013, and met with representatives from the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point U.S. Military Academy regarding the threat to the homeland posed by LeT.

AL SHABAAB

The Subcommittee continued its review of the terror threat posed by Somali-based al–Shabaab. On September 21, 2013, terrorists entered the Westgate mall in Nairobi, the Republic of Kenya and killed almost 70 and injured over 200 people during a four-day period. Al-Shabaab has claimed responsibility for the attack.

On September 30, 2013, Committee staff met with an expert from the Atlantic Council regarding threats from al-Shabaab and lessons learned regarding the intentions and capability from the group after the Westgate Mall terror attack.

BOKO HARAM

The Subcommittee has conducted extensive oversight over the Nigerian terror group Boko Haram and the U.S. process for designating foreign terrorist organizations (FTO).

On September 13, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee, and the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, sent an oversight letter to the Department of State urging the Department to move forward with a FTO designation for Boko Haram and Ansar al Sharia, a splinter group.
On September 11, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Department of Defense’s African Command regarding capabilities and threats to the Nation from Boko Haram.

On September 13, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies released a report on the growing threat to the homeland from Boko Haram. The Members shared a copy of the report in a letter to the Secretary of State.

On September 30, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee and the Chair of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, requested the Government Accountability Office conduct a review of the FTO designation process. The Department of State designated Boko Haram as an FTO on November 13, 2013.

THREAT TO THE HOMELAND FROM IRAN AND HEZBOLLAH

In February 2013, Committee staff met with a number of individuals from the Lebanese-American community to discuss the capability and threat posed by Hezbollah to the U.S. Homeland.

On May 22, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Threat to the Homeland from al-Qaeda Operations in Iran and Syria.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Seth G. Jones, Ph.D., Associate Director, International Security and Defense Policy Center; Mr. Robin Simcox, Research Fellow, The Henry Jackson Society; Mr. Thomas Joscelyn, Senior Fellow, Foundation for the Defense of Democracies; and Mr. Barak Barfi, Research Fellow, New America Foundation.

In preparation for the May 22nd hearing, Committee staff met with a number of outside experts on the situation in Syria and potential threats to the U.S. Homeland. These meetings include the Institute of the Study of War on May 8, 2013, the RAND Corporation on May 10, 2013, and the Henry Jackson Society on May 14, 2013.

HOMEGROWN TERRORIST THREAT

The Subcommittee continued oversight over the threat from homegrown extremists. On May 6, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Bipartisan Policy Center regarding online radicalization recruitment. On July 8, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Bipartisan Policy Center regarding the role the internet played in the radicalizing the terrorists involved in the Boston Bombings.

ECONOMIC THREATS

The Subcommittee conducted oversight over the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) process, including review of a proposal by a state-owned foreign company to build a factory in the United States. Committee staff met with officials from CFIUS and the Intelligence Community, as well as representatives from the state where the factory was under consideration.
TERRORIST TRAVEL

On January 17, 2013, Committee staff conducted a conference call with Department of Homeland Security personnel stationed overseas regarding the Visa Security Program and counterterrorism concerns.

On February 25, 2013, Committee staff met with Department of Homeland Security personnel from Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regarding their databases used to track travel into and out of the United States, as well as CBP's policies and procedures for creating and removing terrorist alerts.

TERROR FINANCE

On January 17, 2013, Committee staff met with personnel from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regarding past and IRS investigations into terror finance cases. Additionally, the meeting included an overview of IRS policy and procedures for investigating non-profit entities with potential ties to terrorist organizations.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS

On March 28, 2013, Committee staff met with the Defense Security Service within the Department of Defense regarding their annual classified trends analysis on counterintelligence threats across the Federal Government, including the Department of Homeland Security. This session, several individuals have damaged National security or committed tragic acts of violence, emphasizing the need for reforms and rigorous oversight over the security clearance process and programs to detect insider threats. In May 2013, Edward Snowden, a contractor with the National Security Agency, fled the U.S. to Hong Kong and later to the Russian Federation leaking a large amount of information on classified surveillance programs. On September 16, 2013, Aaron Alexis, a contractor with the Navy shot his way into the Washington D.C. Navy Yard and killed 12 people. Both of these individuals were vetted, trusted U.S. security professionals who abused that trust and committed heinous acts.

The Department of Homeland Security has over 120,000 employees holding security clearances. The Subcommittee conducted oversight over the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Federal processes for investigating and adjudicating security clearances.

On September 27, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from the DHS Office of Security on the Department's process for requesting and adjudicating security clearances and suitability checks for employees, and how the Office coordinates with Department component agencies.

On October 28, 2013, Committee staff received a classified briefing from the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis on their Counter Intelligence program.

On October 24, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Assistant Commissioner for Internal Affairs regarding CBP programs. The briefing provided staff with information as to how the Department determines the
suitability of employees, adjudicates security clearances, and manages the polygraph program.

On November 1, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Government Accountability Office regarding vulnerabilities in the security clearance process.

On November 12, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from a private company with contracts to conduct security clearance background investigations for the Office of Personnel Management and DHS.


HOMELAND THREAT FROM A CBRN ATTACK

On March 5, 2013, Committee staff received a classified briefing from the Federal Bureau of Investigations regarding the threat that weapons of mass destruction pose to the Nation.

On April 12, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) to examine resources in their FY 2014 budget request.

On April 25, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Counterterrorism Efforts to Combat a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Attack on the Homeland.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Richard Daddario, Deputy Commissioner for Counterterrorism, New York City Police Department; Dr. Huban Gowadia, Acting Director, Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Scott McAllister, Deputy Under Secretary, State and Local Program Officer, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Dr. Leonard Cole, Newark, New Jersey.

On May 16, 2013, Committee staff met with experts from Sandia National Laboratories regarding the threat from biological pathogens and the threat to the Homeland.

The Subcommittee discharged H.R. 1542, the WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013, legislation designed to address the issue of CBRN attacks. This bill passed the House on July 22, 2013, for further information, see the discussion of this measure listed above.

On September 6, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Bipartisan Policy Center regarding a new report on emerging threats.
The Subcommittee held multiple briefings with officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) to examine the structure, mission, and capability of the office, as well as I&A’s role in coordinating intelligence within DHS and State and local law enforcement.

On March 22, 2013, Committee staff received a classified briefing with officials from I&A regarding the DHS Intelligence Enterprise and how intelligence analysis responsibilities are divided between components of the Department.

On April 12, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the Office of Operations regarding their FY 2014 budget request and the mission, resources, and capabilities of their respective offices.

On May 17, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regarding the capabilities and policies related to the primary database used by CBP to track travel in and out of the U.S. and identifying potential terrorists.

On June 6, 2013, Committee staff received a classified briefing from officials at the National Counterterrorism Center regarding terrorist watchlisting protocols and information sharing.

On July 12, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Government Accountability Office regarding a Committee requested report on the DHS Intelligence Enterprise.

On July 16, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from Immigration and Customs Enforcement regarding the agency’s analytic framework for intelligence.

On July 17, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Federal Bureau of Investigations regarding the network of Joint Terrorism Task Forces.

INFORMATION SHARING

The Subcommittee conducted extensive oversight over information sharing between Federal, State, and local law enforcement.

On March 28, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the National Fusion Center Association.

On April 15, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Department of Homeland Security regarding the National Network of Fusion Centers.

On May 17, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Government Accountability Office regarding their ongoing work reviewing information sharing and counterterrorism activities between the Joint Terrorism Task Forces and Fusion Centers.

On June 17, 2013, Committee staff met with the Director of Analysis for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis within the Department of Homeland Security to receive a briefing on the size and mission of the office. The briefing included an overview of new intelligence products and information sharing efforts with State and local law enforcement.

On June 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a classified threat briefing for Members on terror threats to the Homeland. Representatives from the Department of Homeland Security, Office of Intelligence and Analysis provided the threat briefing and an over-
view of the analytical products produced by their office, as well as discussed the process by which threat information is shared with State and local law enforcement officials.

On July 26, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee released a Majority Staff Report entitled “The National Network of Fusion Centers,” detailing the Committee’s findings and recommendations developed from a comprehensive study of fusion centers across the country. In developing the report, Committee staff conducted numerous briefings and site visits with Fusion Centers, the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigations, and other entities.

On September 25, 2013, Committee staff met with officials from the Department of Homeland Security regarding the 2012 National Network of Fusion Centers Assessment.

On November 14, 2013, Committee staff met with Federal, State, and local law enforcement regarding security measures and information sharing efforts in advance of Super Bowl XLVIII to be played on February 2, 2014.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAKS

Following up on a Committee investigation into the homeland security impacts of national security leaks that began in the 112th Congress, the Subcommittee held numerous briefings and oversight letters. This includes February 13, 2013 and a June 18, 2013 meetings with the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General’s Office regarding their review of the DOD policies and procedures for working with the media and movie producers.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“Counterterrorism Efforts to Combat a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Attack on the Homeland.” March 23, 2013. (Serial No. 113–12)

“Assessing the Threat to the Homeland from al-Qaeda Operations in Iran and Syria.” May 22, 2013. (Serial No. 113–19)

“Protecting the Homeland Against Mumbai-Style Attacks and the Threat from Lashkar-e-Taiba.” June 12, 2013. (Serial No. 113–21)

“Understanding the Threat to the Homeland from AQAP.” September 18, 2013. (Serial No. 113–34)

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held seven hearings, receiving testimony from 29 witnesses, and considered one measure.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

BORDER SECURITY RESULTS ACT OF 2013

H.R. 1417 (S. 683)

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1417 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain situational awareness and operational control of the border, and sets the requirement of achieving operational control in high traffic areas within two years and nine months of enactment and across the entire Southwest border within five years. Operational control of the border, as defined by the bill, means a condition where there is a 90 percent effectiveness rate for the apprehension of illegal border crossers and a significant reduction in the movement of illicit drugs and other contraband.

This legislation sets the requirements for the Secretary to consider when developing the strategy; outlines the benchmarks and timetables for achieving situational awareness and operational control; and requires metrics to measure effectiveness. H.R. 1417 also requires the Secretary to issue a baseline assessment of the current level of situational awareness and operational control of the border.
and periodically thereafter until the border is deemed to be under operational control. Following the baseline assessment, the Secretary would be required to submit a comprehensive strategy and subsequent plan to gain situational awareness and operational control. The plan would be comprised of implementation plans for each of the Department’s border security components and a comprehensive border security technology plan outlining a justification for technology choices and a timetable for procurement and deployment. This legislation also calls for periodic updates of the strategy and implementation plan following the publication of future Quadrennial Homeland Security Review.

H.R. 1417 requires the Secretary to implement a series of metrics to measure the effectiveness of security between the ports of entry, at ports of entry, and in the maritime environment. H.R. 1417 also requires a Department of Homeland Security National Laboratory and a Department of Homeland Security Center of Excellence to provide an independent assessment of the suitability of the metrics the Department develops, and to make recommendations for additional metrics to measure border security effectiveness.

Finally, the legislation requires the Government Accountability Office to review and report to Congress on the suitability and validity of the Secretary’s strategy, plan, metrics, and the certification of operational control.

Legislative History

H.R. 1417 was introduced in the House on April 9, 2013, by Mr. McCaul, Mrs. Miller of Michigan, Ms. Jackson Lee, and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1417 was referred to the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security. S. 683, the Senate companion measure was introduced on April 9, 2013, and referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. The Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security considered H.R. 1417 on April 24, 2013, and ordered the measure reported to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee on Homeland Security considered H.R. 1417 on May 15, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1417 to the House on May 20, 2013 as H. Rpt. 113–87, and placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 62.

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

SECURE BORDER

Security of the Nation hinges in large part on how well the Department of Homeland Security can control who and what comes into this country. A porous border is a conduit for not only drug smugglers and human traffickers, but is also a vulnerability that terrorists may exploit. The Department’s lack of a comprehensive
national strategy to secure the border and no defined measurable goals limits its ability to fulfill this critical mission. The number of Border Patrol agents, miles of fence, and various technology that Congress has funded to help shore up security at the border is a means to an end. The border is not necessarily “secure” because 21,370 agents are on the border, nor is it necessarily secure because apprehensions are the lowest they have been since the 1970s. Instead, the Department must define the characteristics of a secure border and establish a desired border security end-state the Department can plan for and execute against.

On February 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “What Does a Secure Border Look Like?” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Michael J. Fisher, Chief, Border Patrol, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Kevin McAleenan, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; RAdm William D. Lee, Deputy For Operations Policy and Capabilities, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Rebecca Gambler, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and Marc R. Rosenblum, PhD, Specialist in Immigration Policy, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress. The purpose of this hearing was to take a holistic look at the border to define what a secure border looks like, assess what the Department needs to do to achieve a secure border and how to measure border security progress.

STATE OF BORDER SECURITY

More than ten years after the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department does not have a comprehensive national strategy to secure the border. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to enhance border security, primarily through new investments in personnel, technology, and infrastructure. These investments were made without the benefit of a national border security strategy, so funds were often expended in an ad hoc way, without a well-defined end state. Achieving greater border security must be based on a solid understanding of current border threats, particularly as they relate to illegal border crossings and trafficking of contraband, and the coordination of components.

Committee staff met with representatives from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations and Office of Air and Marine, Border Patrol, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Government Accountability Office, to discuss topics related to border security including: technology, strategy, metrics, and reuse of DoD equipment.

On March 13, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee received a briefing on the state of border security. Representatives from U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the U.S. Coast Guard were present to provide Members with an update on border security efforts and respond to Member concerns. The purpose of this briefing was to better understand the current state of border security efforts from all the Department of Homeland Security components with a role in
border security and to identify the need for a National strategy to secure the border.

**BORDER SECURITY MEASURES**

In 2010, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) stopped reporting the number of miles border under “operational control.” Since that time, DHS has failed to introduce the “Border Condition Index” (BCI), a new measure intended to demonstrate border security in a more holistic way, or another, alternative metric. Instead, the Department has relied on incomplete or inconsistent measures of border security progress, such as the resources sent to the border or the number of people apprehended. The development of outcome-based border security metrics at and between the ports of entry and in the maritime environment are necessary to increase confidence that the Nation’s border security efforts are based on measurable data.

Committee staff met with representatives from U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations and Office of Air and Marine, Border Patrol, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Government Accountability Office to discuss how the Department’s border security components measure effectiveness.

On March 20, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Measuring Outcomes to Understand the State of Border Security.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Michael J. Fisher, Chief, Border Patrol, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Kevin McAleenan, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Mark Borkowski, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Technology Innovation and Acquisition, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Hon. Veronica Escobar, County Judge, El Paso County, Texas. The purpose of this hearing was to examine the status of the Border Condition Index (BCI), and further examine outcome-based ways to measure the state of border security.

**VISA SECURITY AND OVERSTAYS**

Much of the focus on border security is devoted to the southwest border; however, estimates show approximately 40 percent of the estimated 11–12 million aliens unlawfully present in the United States entered legally and subsequently overstay their visas. According to the Department of Justice, approximately 10 percent of all the individuals who have been convicted on terrorism-related charges in the decade since the attacks of September 11, 2001, were legal visitors who overstayed their visas demonstrating a significant vulnerability. All of the 9/11 hijackers entered the United States on legally valid visas and at least four had overstayed or were in violation of their status.

Committee staff met with representatives from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Government Accountability Office to receive briefs as to how the Department accounts for the
population of persons who overstay their visas and how to make progress in providing for exit data.

On May 21, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. John Wagner, Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. James Dinkins, Executive Associate Director, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Rebecca Gambler, Director of the Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and Mr. Shonnie Lyon, Acting Director, Office of Biometric Identity Management, National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of this hearing was to examine the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to secure the border by addressing challenges in identifying individuals who overstay their visas.

THE FUTURE OF THE TWIC PROGRAM

Implementation of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) continues to be plagued by challenges due to poor planning, technological hurdles, and lack of leadership by the Transportation Security Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). Pilot programs that were designed to assist the USCG to issue the required regulatory rules to make the program operate as envisioned by the Congress have been less than successful. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has issued several reports on the shortfalls of the TWIC program and called into question the overall security value of the program stating, “DHS has not demonstrated how, if at all, TWIC will improve maritime security.” [GAO–13–198]. Millions of dollars of previously allocated and future grant spending are predicated on the TWIC providing a tangible security benefit at the Nation’s ports and maritime facilities.

Committee staff met with representatives from TSA, USCG and GAO to discuss the challenges facing the TWIC program and what the intent is for future deployment of technologies and improved customer service. On June 18, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Threat, Risk and Vulnerability: The Future of the TWIC Program.” The Subcommittee received testimony from RADM Joseph A. Servidio, Assistant Commandant for Prevention Policy, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Steve Sadler, Assistant Administrator, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen M. Lord, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Services, U.S. Government Accountability Office; and Capt. Marcus Woodring, USCG (ret), Managing Director, Health, Safety, Security and Environmental, Port of Houston Authority. The purpose of this hearing was to reexamine the security value of the TWIC card and determine the future of the program.
BORDER SECURITY

It is imperative that lessons learned from prior immigration reform efforts inform current proposals for immigration reform. The Senate's immigration bill, S. 744, emphasizes resources, with limited accountability or requirements to measure outcomes of those resources. The Senate bill spends an additional $46 billion dollars to: Double the size of the U.S. Border Patrol; build additional miles of fence; and purchase new technology.

H.R. 1417, the Committee's border security legislation, calls for a strategy and an implementation plan to be produced prior to the expenditure of additional resources. It also requires metrics to increase accountability, and applies a standard of no less than 90 percent effectiveness to hold the Department accountable.

Committee staff met with U.S. Customs and Border Protection Office of Field Operations, U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Government Accountability Office for briefings on the effect that various border security bills would have on their components.

On June 23, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “A Study in Contrasts: House and Senate Approaches to Border Security.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. John Cornyn, Senator, State of Texas; Hon. Xavier Bercerra, a Representative in Congress from the 34th District, State of California; Mr. Jayson Ahern, Principal, Chertoff Group; Mr. Edward Alden, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations; and Mr. Richard M. Stana, Former Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office. The purpose of this hearing was to assess the two disparate border security approaches of the House and Senate, and to better inform the legislation that is presented to the Congress which seeks to achieve the outcome of a secure border.

For further action on H.R. 1417, see discussion above.

BIOMETRIC EXIT

Mandates for an electronic exit system designed to verify when aliens on a valid visa depart the United States have existed since 1996. While progress has been made on the collection of fingerprints and photographs of aliens entering the United States, the Department still does not collect biometric information from individuals exiting the country. Despite longstanding Congressional mandates, DHS has not implemented a biometric exit system. Instead the Department has focused on a less expensive “biographic” (matching names of airline manifests) option. As a result, DHS has more than one million “unmatched” records—records where the U.S. Customs and Border Protection has entry, but no exit information on aliens who entered into the country on a valid visa. Estimates indicate that as many as 40 percent of all individuals unlawfully present in the U.S. enter the country on a valid visa and overstay their period of admittance. Any attempt to fully secure the border must also address the challenge of identifying and then removing visa overstays.

Committee staff met with representatives from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Office of Field Operations to receive brief-
ings on the implementation of a biographic exit program at air, land, and sea ports of entry/exit.

On September 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Fulfilling A Key 9/11 Commission Recommendation: Implementing Biometric Exit.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. John Wagner, Acting Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations, Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. John Woods, Assistant Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Ms. Rebecca Gambler, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, U.S. Government Accountability Office. The purpose of this hearing was to engage the Department of Homeland Security leadership on the current state of biometric exit and to chart a path forward to implement a system that is both a counterterrorism and border security tool.

MARITIME SECURITY

As progress is made preventing illegal border crossings along the land borders of the United States, Transnational Criminal Organizations and have sought the path of least resistance and have been utilizing maritime means to enter the country. A serious threat to homeland security continues to be the movement of illegal drugs in bulk through the Transit Zone from South America through the Eastern Pacific and Caribbean. Trafficking organizations are using advanced methods of smuggling such as semi-submersibles and small vessels that are increasingly difficult to detect. In constrained fiscal environment, cooperative efforts to gain intelligence, situational awareness across the Department’s maritime agencies is critical to securing the vast maritime borders of the Nation.

Committee Staff met with representatives from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Office of Air and Marine, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), and the Government Accountability Office, to discuss the following topics related to maritime security: maritime domain awareness, threats in the maritime environment, USCG and CBP asset recapitalization, maritime strategy, and metrics.

On November 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “What Does a Secure Maritime Border Look Like?” The Subcommittee received testimony from RADM William D. Lee, Deputy For Operations Policy and Capabilities, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen L. Caldwell, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and Capt. Marcus Woodring, (Ret. USCG), Managing Director, Health, Safety, Security and Environmental, Port of Houston Authority. The purpose of this hearing was to examine: what DHS maritime components are doing to interdict maritime threats before they arrive on shore or in U.S. ports; what is being done to increase the Nation’s understanding of illicit networks that move in the maritime domain; DHS’ layered approach to secure the maritime environment; and how progress is being measured.
SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“What Does a Secure Border Look Like?” February 26, 2013. (Serial No. 113–3)
“Measuring Outcomes to Understand the State of Border Security.” March 20, 2013. (Serial No. 113–8)
“Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?” May 21, 2013. (Serial No. 113–18)
“Threat, Risk and Vulnerability: The Future of the TWIC Program.” June 18, 2013. (Serial No. 113–23)
“What Does a Secure Maritime Border Look Like?” November 19, 2013. (Serial No. 113–45)
During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held eight hearings, receiving testimony from 34 witnesses, and considered two measures.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

H.R. 2952

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 2952 directs the Department of Homeland Security to facilitate the development of a Research and Development (R&D) strategy for critical infrastructure security technologies. This strategy will help our nation prioritize its investments in those aspects of the infrastructure that are most at risk. H.R. 2952 also directs the Secretary to explore the feasibility of expanding the use of public-private R&D consortiums to accelerate new security technologies and spur innovation and economic combativeness. In addition, CIRDA will designate a 'Technology Clearinghouse' where proven security tools for protecting infrastructure can be rapidly shared amongst government and private partners.
Legislative History

H.R. 2952 was introduced in the House on August 1, 2013, by Mr. Meehan, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2952 was referred to the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies.

On September 18, 2013, the Subcommittee considered H.R. 2952 and reported the measure to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2952 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY BOOTS-ON-THE-GROUND ACT

H.R. 3107

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 3107 directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications and to ensure that such classifications may be used throughout the Department and are made available to other federal agencies. H.R. 3107 also requires the Secretary to create a workforce strategy that enhances the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) cybersecurity workforce, including a multiphased recruitment plan and a 10-year projection of federal workforce needs. This legislation would also create a process to verify that employees of independent contractors who serve in DHS cybersecurity positions receive initial and recurrent information security and role-based security training commensurate with assigned responsibilities.

Legislative History

H.R. 3107 was introduced in the House on September 17, 2013, by Ms. Clarke, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 3107 was referred to the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies.

On September 18, 2013, the Subcommittee considered H.R. 3107 and reported the measure to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 3107 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 3107 to the House on December 12, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–294.
OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

CYBER THREATS FROM CHINA, RUSSIA, AND IRAN

American critical infrastructure is under persistent cyber attack from criminals, activists, and nation states intent on compromising sensitive data or causing damage. One of the most consequential cyber threats is a concentrated attack by a nation state against key segments of American critical infrastructure. In late 2012 and early 2013 a series of cyber attacks, reportedly emanating from the Islamic Republic of Iran, targeted the American financial services sector and compromised the integrity and operation of several banks.

The Chair of the Subcommittee and Committee staff traveled to New York, New York from February 7 through 8, 2013, to receive briefings from representatives of the financial services sector to examine the extent of the attacks and effective remediation strategies, including improved Federal cooperation.

On March 20, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Frank J. Cilluffo, Director, Homeland Security Policy Institute and Co-Director, Cyber Center for National and Economic Security, The George Washington University; Mr. Richard Bejtlich, Chief Security Officer and Security Services Architect, Mandiant; Mr. Ilan Berman, Vice President, American Foreign Policy Council; and Mr. Martin C. Libicki, Senior Management Scientist, RAND Corporation. The purpose of this hearing was to examine the cybersecurity threats to American critical infrastructure from key nation states.

DHS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORATE

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Science and Technology (S&T) Directorate is the primary research and development arm of the Department and manages science and technology research, from development through transition, for the Department’s operational components and first responders to protect the homeland.

On March 21, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee received a briefing from representative from the Department’s Science and Technology Directorate. The purpose of this briefing was to examine S&T’s efforts to develop and promulgate new technologies. As a result of this briefing, the Chair of the Subcommittee introduced H.R. 2952, the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development Advancement (CIRDA) Act of 2013, which requires DHS to develop a strategic research and development plan. See discussion of H.R. 2952, listed above.

CYBERSECURITY AND PRIVACY

The Subcommittee’s effort to improve the Department of Homeland Security’s ability to oversee the cybersecurity of Federal networks and other critical infrastructures is driven by the paramount importance of protecting the integrity of sensitive data, including personally identifiable information (PII).
On April 25, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Striking the Right Balance: Protecting Our Nation’s Critical Infrastructure from Cyber Attack and Ensuring Privacy and Civil Liberties.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Mary Ellen Callahan, Partner, Jenner & Block and Former Chief Privacy Officer, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Cheri F. McGuire, Vice President, Global Government Affairs & Cybersecurity Policy, Symantec; and Ms. Harriet Pearson, Partner, Hogan Lovells. The purpose of this hearing was to inform Members of the various privacy issues to be addressed in crafting cybersecurity policy and proposed legislation.

On November 1, 2013, Subcommittee staff received a briefing from representatives of the National Cybersecurity & Communications Integration Center to examine the policies and procedures used by the Department to protect PII.

Additionally, Committee staff held a series of meetings with privacy experts, advocates, and other stakeholders to inform oversight and craft legislative language to ensure the Department adequately protects private information.

**Cyber Threat Information Sharing**

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has the declared mission, and an FY 2013 budget of $896 million, to oversee the security of Federal civilian networks (the “.gov” domain) and aid private sector owners and operators of critical infrastructure in protecting their systems from cyber threats. The Subcommittee examined the existing cybersecurity information sharing and response capabilities at DHS used to fulfill these roles and evaluated the budget for the DHS Office of Cybersecurity and Communications (CS&CC) to determine whether resources were being effectively utilized. The Subcommittee emphasized reviewing the authorities and activities of the CS&CC National Cybersecurity & Communications Integration Center (NCCIC), which includes DHS information sharing and incident response units, in order to inform legislation currently in draft form.

On May 16, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Facilitating Cyber Threat Information Sharing and Partnering with the Private Sector to Protect Critical Infrastructure: An Assessment of DHS Capabilities.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Roberta Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Larry Zelvin, Director, National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Mr. Charles K. Edwards, Acting Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of this hearing was to inform Members of the cybersecurity authorities, capabilities and limitations at DHS.

On May 21, 2013, the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications held a joint classified Member tour and briefing at the Department of Homeland Security’s National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC). This briefing provided
Members an opportunity to assess the capabilities and impediments of operations at the NCCIC in order to inform authorizing legislation.

CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) offers technical assistance to owners and operators of critical infrastructure, including State and local governments, on a voluntary basis in the event of cyber incidents. The Subcommittee is concerned about the adequacy and effectiveness of DHS’s efforts, including education and outreach efforts to State and local emergency planners.

On October 30, 2013, the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a joint hearing entitled “Cyber Incident Response: Bridging the Gap Between Cybersecurity and Emergency Management.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Roberta “Bobbie” Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Charley English, Director, Georgia Emergency Management Agency, testifying on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association; Mr. Craig Orgeron, Chief Information Officer and Executive Director, Department of Information Technology Services, State of Mississippi, testifying on behalf of the National Association of State Chief Information Officers; Mr. Mike Sena, Deputy Director, Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, testifying on behalf of the National Fusion Center Association; and Mr. Paul Molitor, Assistant Vice President, National Electrical Manufacturers Association.

This hearing examined the extent of cyber threat information sharing and response capabilities to a cyber incident with physical consequences. The purpose of the hearing was to examine ways to improve the ability of DHS to aid state and local emergency responders in the event of a significant cyber incident.

In preparation for this hearing, Committee staff met with stakeholders to discuss information sharing related to cyber threats and cyber incident response capabilities. On September 18, 2013, Committee staff also received a briefing from representatives from DHS’s Office of Cybersecurity and Communications on the Department’s efforts to share cyber threat information with emergency response providers.

PRIVACY CONCERNS WITH OBAMACARE

The implementation of systems associated with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA or Obamacare), including healthcare.gov, the Federal Health Insurance Exchange (HIX) and the Federal Data Services Hub, raised concerns that these systems do not properly secure sensitive personal data.

On July 17, 2013, the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a joint hearing entitled “Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with
ObamaCare's Information Sharing Apparatus.” The Subcommittees received testimony from Mr. Alan R. Duncan, Assistant Inspector General for Security and Information Technology Services, Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury; Mr. Terence V. Milholland, Chief Technology Officer, Internal Revenue Service; Hon. Danny Werfel, Principal Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; Hon. Marilyn B. Tavenner, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Mr. Henry Chao, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Deputy Director of the Office of Information Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and Mr. John Dicken, Director, Health Care, U.S. Government Accountability Office.

On September 11, 2013, the Subcommittee continued to examine the issue of the security of personal information through a hearing entitled “The Threat to Americans' Personal Information: A Look into the Security and Reliability of the Health Exchange Data Hub.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Michael Astrue, Former Social Security Commissioner, Former U.S. Department of Health and Human Services General Counsel; Stephen T. Parente, Ph.D., Minnesota Insurance Industry Chair of Health Finance, Director, Medical Industry Leadership Institute and Professor, Department of Finance, Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota; Ms. Kay Daly, Assistant Inspector General, Audit Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and Mr. Matt Salo, Executive Director, National Association of Medicaid Directors.

In preparation for these hearings, Subcommittee staff met with stakeholders to examine what measures were being taken by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to protect personal identifiable information and whether those measures were adequate. Despite assures from CMS, the Subcommittee continues to be concerned that adequate security measures and certifications have yet to be implemented.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 13636

Executive Order 13636, Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity, has directed the National Institutes for Standards and Technology (NIST) to work with stakeholders to develop a voluntary framework for reducing cyber risks to critical infrastructure.

On July 18, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of Executive Order 13636 and Development of the Cybersecurity Framework.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Robert Kolasky, Director, Implementation Task Force, National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Charles H. Romine, PhD, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce; and Eric A. Fischer, PhD, Senior Specialist, Science and Technology, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

From July 10 through 12, 2013, Committee staff attended the third Cybersecurity Framework workshop in San Diego, California
hosted by the University of California, San Diego and the National Health Information Sharing and Analysis Center (NH-ISAC). At this workshop, NIST presented an annotated outline of the initial draft Cybersecurity Framework for discussion.

From September 11 through 13, 2013, Committee staff attended the fifth Cybersecurity Framework workshop in Richardson, Texas hosted by the University of Texas at Dallas. At this workshop, NIST presented the draft Preliminary Cybersecurity Framework for discussion. The purpose of attending the workshops was to participate in the development of the framework and meet with other stakeholders to inform continuing oversight of the development of the EO framework.

In preparation for the hearing and workshops, Subcommittee Members and staff held a series of meetings with stakeholders participating in the development of the framework.

CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has the statutory authority, which currently expires on January 15, 2014, to regulate chemical facilities for security purposes. While the Subcommittee supports reauthorizing Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS), a number of concerns exposed by Congress and reports from both the DHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) must be addressed. Concerns include the adequacy and effectiveness of DHS efforts including program management.

The explosion on April 17, 2013, at the West Fertilizer Company fertilizer distribution facility in West, Texas, led to additional focus on DHS’s ability to identify noncompliant facilities as the company had not reported to DHS under the CFATS program even though it appeared to have possessed more than threshold quantities of chemicals of interest. DHS had no knowledge of the facility’s existence.

On August 1, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “West Fertilizer, Off the Grid: The Problem of Unidentified Chemical Facilities.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. David Wulf, ISCD Director, National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen L. Caldwell, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, U.S. Government Accountability Office; Mr. Donnie Dippel, President, Texas Ag Industries Association; Mr. Paul Derig, Environmental Health and Safety Manager III, J.R. Simplot Company, testifying on behalf of the Agricultural Retailers Association; Mr. Timothy J. Scott, Chief Security Officer, Corporate Director, Emergency Services and Security, The Dow Chemical Company; and Mr. Sean Moulton, Director, Open Government Policy, Center for Effective Government. The purpose of this hearing was to examine DHS efforts to improve their ability to identify other “outlier” facilities not currently identified.

Subcommittee staff received two bicameral, multi-Committee briefings from DHS, Infrastructure Security Compliance Division. In addition, Subcommittee staff held a series of meetings with stakeholders to inform efforts to draft reauthorization legislation.
DOMINO

The DHS National Protection and Programs Directorate, Network Security Deployment Branch is currently in the process of developing an approximately $920 million Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Development, Operations and Maintenance (DOMino) Federal Enterprise Network Security Program. The Subcommittee has concerns regarding the size, scope, effectiveness and cost of the program. On August 6, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security on this acquisition to update timeline for the release of the RFP.

CONTINUOUS DIAGNOSTIC AND MITIGATION (CDM) PROGRAM

The Subcommittee examined the progress of the Government-wide adoption of the $6 billion the Continuous Diagnostic and Mitigation Program, which will consolidate Federal cybersecurity practices under one set of requirements. On October 30, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security on the CDM program to ascertain contract awards and timelines for deployment.

DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

The Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) has the mandate to develop technologies to detect radiological threats within the United States. On March 14, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee received a briefing from representatives from the DNDO to investigate the adequacy of the office’s $200 million and the effectiveness of technologies under development.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure.” March 20, 2013. (Serial No. 113–9)

“Striking the Right Balance: Protecting Our Nation’s Critical Infrastructure from Cyber Attack and Ensuring Privacy and Civil Liberties.” April 25, 2013. (Serial No. 113–13)

“Facilitating Cyber Threat Information Sharing and Partnering with the Private Sector to Protect Critical Infrastructure: An Assessment of DHS Capabilities.” May 16, 2013. (Serial No. 113–17)

“Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with ObamaCare’s Information Sharing Apparatus.” Joint hearing with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements. July 17, 2013. (Serial No. 113–25)

“Oversight of Executive Order 13636 and Development of the Cybersecurity Framework.” July 18, 213. (Serial No. 113–27)

“West Fertilizer, Off the Grid: The Problem of Unidentified Chemical Facilities.” August 1, 2013. (Serial No. 113–30)

“The Threat to Americans’ Personal Information: A Look into the Security and Reliability of the Health Exchange Data Hub.” September 11, 2013. (Serial No. 113–33)
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, Chairman
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana, Vice Chair
MICHAEL T. MCCaul, Texas
(ex officio)
RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held 10 hearings, receiving testimony from 40 witnesses.

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

PRIVACY ISSUES

The protection of the privacy of American citizens is critically important especially when implementing programs and policies to secure the Nation. Specifically, ensuring that the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) information gathering and analysis functions and other programs across its components adhere to established standards is a critical responsibility of DHS through its Chief Privacy Officer. On February 6, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee received a classified briefing on privacy issues and the role of the Department and the National Counterterrorism Center in collecting, analyzing, and storing intelligence on U.S. persons. The Members learned how the Center is implementing its new “Guidelines for Access, Retention, Use, and Dissemination of U.S. Persons Information.”

On June 19, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from officials from the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties on civil liberties concerns at border checkpoints.

DHS SPENDING

The terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, forced the United States to fundamentally rethink the threats it faces and its approach to defending the Nation. Today, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has a budget of almost $60 billion, employs more than 225,000 people, operates in more than 75 countries, and is the third largest Federal agency. At a time when the Nation stands at over $17 trillion in debt, a rigorous assessment is needed
to review how the Department spends taxpayer dollars. On February 15, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Assessing DHS 10 years later: How Wisely is DHS Spending Taxpayer Dollars?” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. James Gilmore, III, President Free Congress Foundation; Mr. Shawn Reese, Analyst, Emergency Management and Homeland Security Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Mr. Rick “Ozzie” Nelson, Vice President for Business Development, Cross Match Technologies; Ms. Cathleen Berrick, Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office. The purpose of the hearing was to address the Department’s progress and shortcomings in implementing its various missions 10 years after its creation, integrating its components, and diligence in making sure taxpayer dollars are being spent efficiently.

In addition, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter on February 28, 2013, to the Undersecretary for Management on the Department’s conference spending. The letter noted concerns over DHS’s conference spending and previous data provided to the Committee. The Department provided a response on May 28, 2013. Additionally, on November 6, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee requested the Comptroller General of the U.S. review DHS’s management of fee based programs.

In light of egregious waste related to Internal Revenue Service training videos uncovered by the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter on June 6, 2013, to the Undersecretary for Management, requesting that the Department provide the cost and types of internal training materials, especially videos, created by DHS and its components. To date, the Department has not provided a response.

TSA’S PASSENGER SCREENING TECHNOLOGIES

After the 2009 Christmas Day Northwest Flight 253 bombing attempt, deployment of the Advanced Imaging Technology (AIT) machines at airports Nation-wide accelerated, resulting in a total of 841 such machines being deployed to 208 airports. These machines were deployed to enhance TSA’s capability to identify non-metallic and liquid explosives, akin to the bomb used in the Flight 253 bombing attempt. Due to privacy concerns, in January 2012, Congress mandated in the FAA Modernization Act of 2012 (Pub. L. 112–95) that all advanced imaging technology be equipped with Automated Target Recognition. Because of this, all backscatter AIT units, which were unable to meet the new mandate, were removed from airports at the vendor’s expense.

In an effort to review the TSA’s Passenger Screening Technologies, on February 5, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency received a joint classified briefing. The Subcommittees were briefed by representatives from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Inspector General (OIG). The briefing addressed the development of the technology, challenges with the acquisition process, among other issues. Subsequent to the briefing,
the OIG released a report on TSA’s deployment and use of AIT machines [OIG–13–120]. The OIG Report found that TSA did not develop a comprehensive deployment strategy to ensure all AIT units were effectively deployed and fully used for screening passengers due to the agency failing to have a policy or process requiring program offices to prepare strategic deployment plans for new technology that align with the overall goals of its Passenger Screening Program and lacking adequate internal controls to ensure accurate data on Advanced Imaging Technology utilization.

As a result of the briefing, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Administrator of TSA. The TSA provided the Subcommittee with a response on March 15, 2013. The Subcommittee Chair also signed onto ongoing GAO work evaluating TSA’s AIT program. The Subcommittee intends to further review and monitor TSA’s Passenger Screening Technologies in conjunction with the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

DHS HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION AT ST. ELIZABETHS

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) stands as the third largest department in the Federal Government, with its components scattered at over 50 locations throughout the National Capital Region. In an effort to consolidate locations and increase a unified organization, construction is currently underway for a new headquarters facility. The construction of the Department’s Headquarters at the St. Elizabeths campus, in Washington, D.C. is the largest Federal construction project to occur in the National Capital Region since the construction of The Pentagon. To date, over $1 billion has been appropriated for this project.

On March 1, 2013, officials from the Department briefed Committee staff on construction efforts at the St. Elizabeths facility and discussed budget requests. On March 15, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the Department of Homeland Security Consolidated Headquarters at St. Elizabeths. While on campus, Members toured the facility and were briefed by the Department on construction progress and the status of consolidation efforts. As a follow up to this site visit, on March 20, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conduct a comprehensive review of the consolidation project. GAO acknowledged receipt of this request. On May 30, 2013, Committee staff were briefed by officials from the General Services Administration (GSA) on the St. Elizabeths consolidated headquarters effort. Committee staff received separate briefings related to GSA contracts awarded for this project. On July 29, 2013, Committee staff attended the ribbon cutting ceremony on the St. Elizabeth’s campus for the United States Coast Guard Headquarters. The Subcommittee will continue to closely monitor this major project.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

The Subcommittee examined the homeland security operations of the United States Secret Service (USSS), including its critical role of protecting the President of the United States, particularly during the Presidential inauguration, and other duties. The Committee is
also monitoring the upgrading and modernizing of USSS information technology (IT) capabilities, and issues related to employee integrity and morale. On January 18, 2013, the Committee staff traveled to the U.S. Secret Service, James J. Rowley Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland to receive a briefing on preparations for the 2013 Presidential inauguration. Committee Staff visited the Multi-Agency Communications Center and received a briefing on the planning and logistical details of the inauguration from cognizant Secret Service officials.

On April 17, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee received a briefing with the Secret Service Director to discuss: The Director's goals and priorities; budget issues; the Cartagena, Columbia, employee misconduct investigation; among other topics.

Committee staff received a briefing from Secret Service officials on June 27, 2013 on the agency's information technology modernization efforts. On August 8, 2013, Committee staff also received a briefing on the next generation Presidential limousine program and conducted a site visit at the Secret Service mail screening facility in Washington D.C. On November 12, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the Secret Service training facility in Beltsville, Maryland. Members toured the facility and were briefed by Secret Service officials on their training programs.

DHS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Subcommittee reviewed the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) overall efforts to address information technology (IT) challenges, including the management and integration of the Department’s IT systems. The Committee reviewed the authorities and activities of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to ensure the effective management and coordination of key IT systems planning, investment management, cloud computing, data consolidating, operations, policy development, and related personnel management. The Subcommittee also examined component CIOs—particularly Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and United States Customs and Immigration Services (USCIS)—and their efforts to modernize and implement critical IT systems supporting our border agents and immigration officers. On February 21, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS Office of Inspector General concerning their ongoing IT Audits and IT management issues. From March 13 through 15, 2013, in preparation for the March 19, 2013 hearing, Committee staff received briefings from representatives from DHS, including: The DHS Chief Information Officer; USCIS, including the USCIS Chief Information Officer; CBP; and ICE, including the ICE Chief Information Officer. On August 22, 2013, Committee staff were briefed by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) on its transportation infrastructure modernization efforts, which seeks to update TSA IT infrastructure in maritime, surface, and aviation environments.

On March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Information Technology: How Effectively Has DHS Harnessed IT to Secure Our Borders and Uphold Immigration Laws?”
The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Margaret H. Graves, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Mr. Charles K. Edwards, Deputy Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of the hearing was to assess how IT resources are being effectively utilized to help secure our borders and uphold immigration laws and how the Department is exercising proper management and oversight of its IT investments.

As a follow up to this hearing, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee requested on March 21, 2013, that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examine the Department's tactical communication acquisition programs. The Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee additionally requested on May 23, 2013, to sign onto an ongoing GAO review of the TECS modernization program—the Treasury Enforcement Communication System. Committee staff also received a briefing from the Office of Inspector General regarding its investigation related to the DHS Chief Information Officer.

**DHS FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

The Subcommittee conducted oversight of the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) progress to properly manage financial systems and data to minimize inefficient and wasteful spending, make more informed decisions to manage its programs and implement Department policies. The Subcommittee also reviewed the Department's efforts to enhance its managerial cost accounting, address internal control weaknesses in financial reporting, achieve a clean audit opinion on its financial statements, and reduce the reliance on manual data calls to collect cost information from the various components and compile consolidated, reliable data. In light of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) 2013 High-Risk report which identified financial management within the Department as high risk, on February 20, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, sent a letter to DHS's Chief Financial Officer regarding the Department's financial management systems and efforts to obtain a clean audit opinion on its financial statements. The Department provided a response to this letter on March 8, 2013. On March 11, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS's Chief Financial Officer. The Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General on June 6, 2013, to sign onto an ongoing review of DHS financial management efforts being performed at the request of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. GAO issued its report *DHS Financial Management: Additional Efforts Needed to Resolve Deficiencies in Internal Controls and Financial Management Systems* on September 30, 2013, [GAO–13–561]. The report contained four recommendations for executive action. On July 8, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS's Chief Financial Officer regarding DHS's efforts to modernize its financial systems.
To further examine these issues, on November 15, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS’s Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Asif Khan, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, U.S. Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of the hearing was to examine relevant GAO and Inspector General findings on DHS financial practices, including steps to obtain a clean audit opinion and implement financial management systems.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The Subcommittee is concerned with, and is monitoring, the safety and security of Federal buildings and facilities, including: The lead role and effectiveness of the Federal Protective Service (FPS); its implementation of a risk-assessment Modified Infrastructure Survey Tool; its collaboration with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Science and Technology (S&T) Directorate; its use of and documenting of qualifications for contracting officers; and other issues related to its best practices in management and conducting effective risk assessment reviews. As part of ongoing FPS oversight, the Committee requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examine the sources that inform how Federal agencies conduct their physical security programs, and the management practices that agencies use to oversee physical security activities and allocation physical security resources. In response to this request, on January 24, 2013, GAO issued its report entitled Facility Security: Greater Outreach by DHS on Standards and Management Practices Could Benefit Federal Agencies [GAO–13–122]. The report contained two recommendation. The GAO also released a supplement to the report [GAO–13–22SP], which presented the results of GAO’s web-based survey of Executive Branch agencies about how they approach the physical security of facilities that FPS is not responsible for protecting. The Chair of the Subcommittee signed onto ongoing work by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examining FPS contract guard management, Federal facility risk assessment process, and Federal facility evacuation preparedness. The GAO issued its report on FPS contract guard management on September 17, 2013, Federal Protective Service Challenges with Oversight of Contract Guard Program Still Exist, and Additional Management Controls are Needed [GAO–13–694]. The report contained three recommendations for executive action. The GAO issued its report on Federal facility evacuation preparedness on October 25, 2013, Federal Facilities: Selected Facilities Emergency Plans Generally Reflect Federal Guidance [GAO–14–101].

On February 13, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from the GAO concerning their ongoing work related to the FPS. On March 4, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from the Federal Protective Services Union. On March 20, 2013, Subcommittee Majority Staff received a briefing from FPS, DHS Deputy Director for Policy and Planning, and Deputy Director for Operations at the Federal Protective Service. On April 4, 2013, Committee staff vis-
ited FPS headquarters to receive a briefing on FPS's risk assessment process and toured security operations at a local federal facility. On May 23, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee, requested the GAO to review physical and information security efforts at Federal facilities. On June 12, 2013, Chairs and Ranking Members of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee, requested the Comptroller General of the United States review the coordination and sharing of Federal facility security and threat information. On July 18, 2013, Committee staff visited FPS operations at its C St. Facility in Washington D.C. to learn more about how FPS protects Federal buildings. Committee staff received a separate briefing from FPS officials related to its activities based cost modeling efforts.

In light of the tragic shooting at the Washington Naval Yard on September 16, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing on October 30, 2013, entitled "Facility Protection: Implications of the Navy Yard Shooting on Homeland Security." The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. L. Eric Patterson, Director, Federal Protective Service, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Greg Marshall, Chief Security Officer, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Caitlin Durkovich, Assistant Secretary, Infrastructure Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, testifying on behalf of the Interagency Security Committee; and Mr. Mark Goldstein, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, U.S. Government Accountability Office. The purpose of the hearing was to examine the state of physical security at Federal facilities and identify opportunities to prevent similar tragedies in the future.

SEQUESTRATION

In March 2013, sequestration took effect resulting in a series of automatic, across the board spending cuts. The Department provided conflicting public statements on the impacts of these cuts. Initial plans to furlough Department employees were later avoided yet public statements from the Department on compromised border security and impassable airport screening lines caused undue alarm among the American people. As a result of these concerns, on April 12, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “The Impact of Sequestration on Homeland Security: Scare Tactics or Possible Threat?” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Rafael Borras, Under Secretary for Management, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Thomas S. Winkowski, Deputy Commissioner, Performing the duties of the Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. John Halinski, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Daniel H. Ragsdale, Deputy Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; and Mr. Brandon Judd, President, National Border Patrol Council. The purpose of this hearing was to examine the Department’s preparations for sequestration and its conclusions on the possible impacts to homeland security.
DUPLICATION AND WASTEFUL SPENDING

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have issued numerous reports identifying duplication and waste within DHS. Private sector best management practices also offer opportunities for DHS to improve operations. With the National debt at about $17 trillion, rigorous oversight to identify and eliminate duplicative and wasteful programs is essential. As a result, on April 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Cutting DHS Duplication and Wasteful Spending: Implementing Private Sector Best Practices and Watchdog Recommendations.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Cathleen Berrick, Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office; Ms. Anne L. Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Paul G. Stern, Ph.D., Board Director, Business Executives for National Security; Mr. Craig Killough, Vice President, Organization Markets, Project Management Institute; and Henry H. Willis, Ph.D., Director, RAND Homeland Security and Defense Center. The purpose of this hearing was to assess the findings of the GAO and the Inspector General related to duplication and waste within the Department and examine best practices identified by the private sector to improve DHS’s efficiency and effectiveness. As a follow up to this hearing, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter on May 17, 2013, to the Secretary of Homeland Security summarizing the hearing’s findings and requesting additional information on steps the Department has taken to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its programs. The Department provided a response on December 15, 2013.

Committee staff also received a briefing on March 26, 2013, from Department officials on DHS’s “See Something, Say Something” campaign to examine the campaign’s effectiveness and ensure taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

On September 23, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from GAO officials on the Department’s progress in addressing GAO’s High-Risk List area of “Strengthening Department of Homeland Security Management Functions.” The area includes issues related to DHS acquisition management, financial management, information technology management, human capital management, and management integration. The GAO’s High-Risk List includes areas at high risk due to vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. The GAO has included DHS management functions in its High-Risk List since 2003.

DHS WORKFORCE MORALE

Rigorous oversight of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) efforts to improve workforce morale has been conducted since the Department continues to perform poorly in the Office of Personnel Management’s Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department’s own personnel surveys. As a result, the Chair of the Subcommittee signed onto ongoing Government Accountability Office (GAO) work assessing the Department’s recruitment and hiring strategies. The GAO issued its report on September 17, 2013, “DHS
Recruiting and Hiring: DHS Is Generally Filling Mission-Critical Positions, but Could Better Track Costs of Coordinated Recruiting Efforts, [GAO–13–742]. The report included one recommendation for executive action. On May 7, 2013, Committee staff were briefed by the Chief Human Capital Officer on the Employee Engagement Executive Steering Committee and Department leadership training to address the morale issues at the Department.

On September 11, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from officials of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. On September 12, 2013, the Institute of Medicine released a report titled *A Ready and Resilient Workforce for the Department of Homeland Security: Protecting America’s Front Line*. The report contained seven recommendations to improve the readiness and resilience (the ability to withstand, recover, and grow in the face of stressors and changing demands) of DHS.

### Employee Integrity

Strong employee integrity within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is essential to homeland security. Although the vast majority of Department employees reflect the Department’s core values, even one corrupt employee represents a management challenge. As a result, the Chair of the Subcommittee signed on to GAO work evaluating employee misconduct issues at the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). On July 30, 2013, GAO issued its report entitled “Transportation Security: TSA Could Strengthen Monitoring of Allegations of Employee Misconduct” [GAO–13–624]. The report contained four recommendations for executive action.

To examine these findings, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency and the Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a joint hearing on July 31, 2013, entitled “TSA Integrity Challenges: Examining Misconduct by Airport Security Personnel.” The Subcommittees received testimony from Mr. John Halinski, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen M. Lord, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Services, Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Deborah Outten-Mills, Acting Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland. The purpose of the hearing was to examine the scope of misconduct within TSA and determine to what extent the Administration is taking action to address employee integrity issues. On August 19, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Secretary of Homeland Security requesting an update on the Department’s mandated report on investigating corruption in DHS. The Department provided a response on December 5, 2013.

### Federal Law Enforcement Oversight

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is the largest law enforcement agency in the Federal Government. According to the 2008 Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers, DHS had more than 45 percent of all Federal law enforcement officers with arrest and firearms authority—with the number of officers totaling ap-
approximately 60,000. On May 23, 2013, Member of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Cheltenham, Maryland. The site visit provided Members the opportunity to tour the facility and receive briefings on FLETC operations. As a follow up to this visit, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Director of FLETC on June 14, 2013, related to FLETC training, the letter specifically requested information on the types of training FLETC provided to agencies outside DHS. FLETC provided a response to the Subcommittee on July 22, 2013. In addition, the Chair of the Subcommittee met with the Director of FLETC on June 19, 2013, to obtain an overview of FLETC’s operations. On July 26, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from FLETC officials regarding training provided to the Department of State.

In response to concerns regarding the Federal Flight Deck Officer program, the Chairs of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency and the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, sent a letter to the Secretary of Homeland Security on June 6, 2013, requesting obtain information on the future of the program, including to what extent the Department plans to use FLETC to continue this essential training for pilots. A response was provided to the Subcommittees on July 29, 2013.

Media reports of ammunition and weapons acquisitions by DHS spurred public interest and led to wide-ranging questions regarding the amounts of ammunition purchased by the Department. As a result, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee requested GAO to examine the Department’s ammunition and weapons procurements.

**DHS COMMUNICATIONS**

Effective communication is critical to implementing the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) mission of defending the Nation. However, numerous recent incidents indicated the Department was unresponsive to certain concerns from the American people. A sound communication strategy is important to help DHS’s credibility, implement policy, respond to natural disasters, and protect the homeland. On June 14, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Why Can’t DHS Better Communicate with the American People?” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Robert Jensen, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Tamara Kessler, Acting Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Bill Braniff, Executive Director, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, University of Maryland; and Mr. Doug Pinkham, President, Public Affairs Council. The purpose of this hearing was to assess the Department’s strategy for communicating on issues of importance and concern to the general public and key stakeholders.

With continued concerns over the Department’s transparency with the American people, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to DHS’s Acting Chief Privacy Officer on June 13, 2013, requesting information on how the Department manages requests submitted under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The De-
partment provided a response on July 22, 2013. Due to the importance of this issue, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States on August 6, 2013, requesting a comprehensive review of DHS’s management of FOIA.

On June 21, 2013, Committee staff were briefed by Assistant Secretary for the Office of Policy for Strategy, Planning, Analysis, and Risk regarding the Department’s strategic planning efforts as part of the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review. Officials from the Department responded to questions regarding to what extent the Department is seeking input from the public, industry, and other groups regarding the strategy, among other things. As a follow up, on November 15, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittees sent a letter to the Acting Secretary to ensure the review addresses critical homeland security issues and relevant recommendations.

IRAN IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The Intelligence Community and the Department of Defense has previously raised significant concerns regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran’s presence in Latin America and the threat this presence poses to National security. A June 2013 State Department report responding to the Countering Iran in the Western Hemisphere Act of 2012 (Pub. L. 112–220) conflicted these findings by stating that the Iranian presence in the hemisphere is “waning.” To examine these important issues, on July 9, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Threat to the Homeland: Iran’s Extending Influence in the Western Hemisphere.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Ilan Berman, Vice President, American Foreign Policy Council; Mr. Joseph M. Humire, Executive Director, Center for a Secure Free Society; Mr. Blaise Misztal, Acting Director of Foreign Policy, Bipartisan Policy Center; Mr. Douglas Farah, President, IBI Consultants. The purpose of the hearing was to examine these findings and assess the threat to U.S. homeland security from Iran’s presence in the Western Hemisphere.

Additionally, the Chair of Full Committee and the Chair of the Subcommittee requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examine the extent to which the Department of Homeland Security conducts covert testing to determine weaknesses in border security. In February 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to GAO to sign onto on-going work being conducted for the Chair of the Full Committee related to Iran’s presence in Latin America and DHS’s international counterterrorism activities. The GAO issued its report on DHS’s international counterterrorism activities on September 25, 2013, Combating Terrorism: DHS Should Take Action to Better Ensure Resources Abroad Align with Priorities, [GAO–13–681]. It contained three recommendations for executive action.

DHS ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) invests extensively in major acquisition programs to develop new systems that help the Department execute its many critical missions. The Department is acquiring systems to help secure the border, facilitate
trade, screen travelers, enhance cyber security, and improve disaster response, among other things. Oversight and accountability of these important acquisition programs is critical to ensure taxpayer dollars are not wasted. In February 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee requested to sign onto on-going Government Accountability (GAO) work related to U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP) acquisition of border surveillance technology and DHS’s multiyear acquisition planning process. On March 21, 2013, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee requested GAO conduct a review of the tactical communication acquisition programs underway in DHS.

The Assistant Commissioner for Customs and Border Protection briefed Committee staff on July 15, 2013, on the status of several acquisition programs related to border security. On August 1, 2013, the Undersecretary for Management, the Chief Procurement Officer, Chief Information Officer, and other senior officials briefed Committee staff on the status of the Department’s acquisition management efforts. As a follow up, on November 5, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee raised concerns, in a letter to the Chief Procurement Officer, over the Department’s Enterprise Acquisition Gateway for Leading Edge Solutions II (EAGLE II) and requested additional information. The Department provided a written response on December 2, 2013.

To more closely examine challenges related to DHS acquisition management, on September 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Acquisition Practices: Improving Outcomes for Taxpayers Using Defense and Private Sector Lessons Learned.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Rafael Borras, Undersecretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Michele Mackin, Director, GAO; Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, DHS Office of Inspector General; Mr. William C. Greenwalt, Visiting Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; Mr. Stan Soloway, President and CEO, Professional Services Council; Mr. David Berteau, Senior Vice President, Center for Strategic and International Studies. The purpose of the hearing was to examine DHS’s acquisition practices to determine if the Department is effectively implementing its policies and to assess whether DHS could leverage best practices and lessons learned from the Defense Department and the private sector.

---

**SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD**

“Assessing DHS 10 years later: How Wisely is DHS Spending Taxpayer Dollars?” February 15, 2013. (Serial No. 113–2)


“The Impact of Sequestration on Homeland Security: Scare Tactics or Possible Threat?” April 12, 2013. (Serial No. 113–10)

“Why Can’t DHS Better Communicate with the American People?”
June 14, 2013. (Serial No. 113–22)

“Threat to the Homeland: Iran’s Extending Influence in the Western Hemisphere.” July 9, 2013. (Serial No. 113–22)


“DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS’s Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars.” November 15, 2013. (Serial No. 113–44)
During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security held six hearings, receiving testimony from 18 witnesses, and considered two measures.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

HELPING HEROES FLY ACT

PUB. LAW 113–27, H.R. 1344 (S. 1367, S. 1403)

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Summary

This law directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop and implement a process to ease travel and, to the extent possible, provide expedited passenger screening services for severely injured or disabled Armed Forces members and veterans, and their accompanying family members or non-medical attendants. The TSA is required to maintain an operations center to provide for the movement of such members and veterans through screening before boarding a domestic or foreign passenger aircraft. Additionally, the law requires TSA to establish and publish certain protocols to contact the operations center to request expedited screening services for the service member or veteran. Furthermore, the TSA is directed to annually report to Congress on the implementation of the program. The TSA retains its flexibility to require additional screening of any individual if intelligence or law enforcement information indicates that additional screening is necessary.

As of March 2013, TSA began implementing the policies codified in this law at security screening checkpoints. This law seeks to facilitate the screening of our Nation’s wounded warriors through airports and free up TSA screeners to focus on real threats to our
aviation systems. The Committee has long advocated for less onerous airport screening for our men and women in uniform. In fact, this bill builds upon past legislation promoted by the Committee, including the Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of the Armed Forces Act (Pub. L. 112–86), which requires TSA to provide expedited screening to active duty military traveling on official orders.

Legislative History

H.R. 1344 was introduced in the House on March 21, 2013, by Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Joyce, and Mr. Richmond, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1344 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The House considered H.R. 1344 on May 21, 2013, under Suspension of the Rules and passed the measure by a 2/3 recorded vote of 413 yeas with none voting “nay”, (Roll No. 166)/

H.R. 1344 was received in the Senate on May 22, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

On August 1, 2013, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1344 by unanimous consent. The Senate then passed H.R. 1344, with an amendment, by unanimous consent.

The House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1344, on August 2, 2013, by unanimous consent.

H.R. 1344 was presented to the President on August 6, 2013, and signed into law on August 9, 2013, as Public Law 113–27.

S. 1367, a Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on July 25, 2013, by Mr. Pryor and Ms. Ayotte; and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1403, a Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on July 31, 2013, by Mr. Pryor and Ms. Ayotte; and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. The text of S. 1403 was adopted by the Senate during consideration of H.R. 1344 on August 1, 2013.

TSA LOOSE CHANGE ACT

H.R. 1095

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1095 directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to transfer unclaimed monies recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations providing places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and establishes a request for proposals (RFP) process to select such organizations.

authorized and directed unclaimed money collected at airport security checkpoints to be used for civil aviation security. According to the report “FY 2012 Unclaimed Money at Airports,” which was prepared by TSA, from FY 2009 through FY 2012, TSA has collected an average of $465,285 from airport security checkpoints annually. Just in FY 2012 alone, TSA collected $531,395. However as of March 1, 2013, TSA only expended $6,539 for the purpose of civil aviation security.

The Explanatory Statement contained in the Conference Report (H. Rpt. 112–492) that accompanied the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, (Pub. L. 113–6), required TSA to issue a report on the feasibility of transferring the unclaimed money recovered at airport checkpoints to non-profit organizations that are selected on a competitive basis. According to the report, it would cost the Federal Government approximately $201,000 for the first year alone if TSA was to transfer the money to a nonprofit organization selected on a competitive basis. Further, the report concluded that to minimize administrative overhead, TSA would prefer to award the use of funding to one nonprofit organization. After reviewing TSA’s report, the Committee believes that in order to ensure fairness of opportunity while minimizing administrative overhead, TSA should transfer the funds after a RFP is issued. Currently, United Services Organizations (USO) is the sole non-profit operating airport lounges for military service members and their families. However, any non-profit organization that provides these kinds of services can submit a proposal to TSA to seek these unclaimed funds.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 2179 was introduced in the House on June 14, 2011, by Mr. Miller of Florida and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2179 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

On March 7, 2012, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security considered H.R. 2179 and reported the measure to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2179 on March 28, 2012, and ordered the measure to be favorably reported to the House, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 2179 to the House on May 8, 2012, as H. Rpt. 112–468.

113th Congress

H.R. 1095 was introduced in the House on March 12, 2013, by Mr. Miller of Florida and Mr. Rogers of Alabama; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1095 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

On October 29, 2013, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Transportation Security from further consideration of H.R. 1095.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1095 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.
The Committee reported H.R. 1095 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–274. The House considered H.R. 1095 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by voice vote.

H.R. 1095 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

H.R. 1204

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 1204 authorizes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) and requires Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to consult with the ASAC on aviation security matters, including on the development and implementation of policies, programs, rulemakings and security directives. Additionally, the bill requires the ASAC to submit recommendations to TSA.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) established the ASAC in 1989 following the bombing of Pan American World Airways Flight 103. Upon the establishment of TSA, sponsorship of the ASAC was transferred to TSA. However, despite strong support from aviation security stakeholders who participated in the ASAC, TSA has allowed the ASAC’s charter to expire. On July 7, 2011, TSA published an announcement in the Federal Register to re-establish the ASAC, providing a setting for the aviation industry to formally communicate with TSA and on October 27, 2011, the Secretary of Homeland Security appointed 24 new members to the ASAC. On June 11, 2013, TSA published a notice of charter renewal in the Federal Register to announce the renewal of the ASAC. This legislation not only codifies current Department and TSA policy but also ensures that the ASAC remains intact.

In these dire budgetary times, it is imperative that TSA interact with industry stakeholders for input on security procedures and technology to ensure that the Administration is spending its limited resources on initiatives that will enhance aviation security for the traveling public.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 1447 was introduced in the House on April 8, 2011, by Mr. Thompson of Mississippi and Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1447 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

On September 21, 2011, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Transportation Security from further consideration of H.R. 1447. The Committee proceeded to the consideration of H.R. 1447 and ordered the measure to be reported to the House, without amendment, by voice vote.
The Committee reported H.R. 1447 to the House on November 4, 2011, as H. Rpt. 112–269.

The House considered H.R. 1447 under Suspension of the Rules, on June 26, 2012, and passed the bill on June 28, 2012 by voice vote.

H.R. 1447 was received in the Senate on June 29, 2012, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

113th Congress

H.R. 1204 was introduced in the House on March 14, 2013, by Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Richmond, Ms. Jackson Lee, and Mr. Swalwell of California and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1204 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The Subcommittee considered H.R. 1204 on July 24, 2013, and forwarded H.R. 1204 to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1204 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1204 to the House on December 2, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–278.

The House considered H.R. 1204 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by a 2/3 record vote of 411 yeas and 3 nays (Roll Call Vote No. 617).

H.R. 1204 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1804, the Senate companion measure, was introduced in the Senate on December 11, 2013.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

H.R. 2719

To require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

Summary

H.R. 2719 was developed with valuable input from stakeholders across the Federal Government and industry. The bill introduces greater transparency and accountability for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) spending decisions through a series of commonsense reforms. Specifically, it requires TSA to develop and share with the public, for the first time: A strategic, multiyear technology investment plan; share key information with Congress on technology acquisitions, including cost overruns, delays, or technical failures within 30 days of identifying the problem; establish principles for managing equipment in inventory to eliminate expensive storage of unusable or outdated technologies; and report on its goals for contracting with small businesses.
H.R. 2719 requires TSA to do a better job of not only managing its own resources, but also leveraging resources outside of the Department of Homeland Security.

Legislative History

H.R. 2719 was introduced in the House on July 18, 2013, by Mr. Hudson, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Richmond, and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 2719 was referred to the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

The Subcommittee considered H.R. 2719 on July 24, 2013, and forwarded H.R. 2719 to the Full Committee with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 2719 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 2719 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–275.

The House considered H.R. 2719 under Suspension of the Rules, and passed the measure by a 2/3 record vote of 416 yeas and 0 nays (Roll Call Vote No. 616).

H.R. 2719 was received in the Senate on December 9, 2013, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Oversight Activities of the Subcommittee

TSA’s Passenger Screening Technologies

On February 5, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency received a joint classified briefing on the Transportation Security Administration’s (TSA) Passenger Screening Technologies. The Subcommittees were briefed by representatives from the Government Accountability Office and the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of the Inspector General.

The Subcommittee on Transportation Security continued to examine this issue with a second classified Member briefing on March 18, 2013. Representatives from TSA were present to respond to Member questions.

TSA’s Risk-Based Security Initiatives

Since 2011, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has launched a series of risk-based security (RBS) initiatives aimed at improving passenger experience and security, including but not limited to Pre-Check, an expedited screening program for certain domestic travelers. In addition, TSA has applied a risk-based strategy to achieve the 100 percent screening of international inbound cargo on passenger aircraft, and continues to work with the air cargo industry on implementing RBS initiatives. Unfortunately, to date, TSA has not made similar efforts to streamline and reform its surface transportation programs, such as the Visible Intermodal
Prevention and Response (VIPR) Program or develop a method by which the agency can display the value or cost-effectiveness of the programs.

On March 14, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. John S. Pistole, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of the hearing was to provide an opportunity for the TSA Administrator to discuss efforts of applying a risk-based approach to TSA’s aviation and surface transportation programs and ongoing efforts to make TSA more effective and efficient.

The Subcommittee continued its oversight with a hearing on April 11, 2013, entitled “TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security: Stakeholder Perspectives.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Ken Dunlap, Global Director, Security & Travel Facilitation, International Air Transport Association; Ms. Sharon L. Pinkerton, Senior Vice President, Legislative and Regulatory Policy, Airlines for America; Mr. Geoff Freeman, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President, U.S. Travel Association; Mr. Michael C. Mullen, Executive Director, Express Association of America; Mr. Christopher U. Browne, Airport Manager, Washington Dulles International Airport, testifying on behalf of the American Association of Airport Executives; and Mr. David A. Borer, General Counsel, American Federation of Government Employees. This hearing was the second in a two-part series focused on TSA’s RBS initiatives. This hearing provided an opportunity to hear from industry stakeholders on their perspectives of the initiatives. In addition, on April 9, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the President of the Association of Professional Flight Attendants, regarding the association’s concerns on TSA’s changes to the Prohibited Items List.

The Subcommittee held a Member briefing on June 19, 2013, on TSA’s PreCheck Program.

TSA PROCUREMENT REFORM

Technology procurement missteps have a large quantifiable cost to taxpayers. The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) must take immediate steps to address its technology procurement challenges and implement necessary reforms in order to eliminate the wasteful technology expenditures that do not make Americans safer.

this hearing was to address how TSA can improve and streamline its internal processes for procurement and increase small business participation while engaging the private sector in the research and development of new security technologies.

The TSA expends significant funds each year on developing, purchasing, and maintaining screening technology. For example, in FY 2012, TSA spent more than $550 million for explosives detection screening technology, about two-thirds of which was for equipment procurements, and the rest for maintenance. The TSA is by far the largest purchaser of detection equipment in the Department of Homeland Security, with approximately $3 billion in inventories, deployed across all major U.S. airports and multiple storage locations. The Government Accountability Office and the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General have found, through numerous studies, that TSA is not effectively implementing government best practices and DHS policy for acquiring new security capabilities. This has resulted in acquisitions that have failed to meet security performance objectives and have wasted taxpayers dollars.

The Subcommittee held a hearing on July 17, 2013, entitled “Stakeholder Perspectives on TSA Acquisition Reform.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Marc Pearl, President & CEO, Homeland Security & Defense Business Council; Ms. Shéné Commodore, Government Contracts & Business Manager, Intertek, testifying on behalf of the Security Industry Association; and Mr. Dolan P. Falconer, Jr., Co-Founder, Chairman & General Manager, Scan Tech Holdings. The focus of this hearing was to obtain industry perspective on how TSA can improve and streamline its internal processes for technology acquisition.

PASSENGER EXIT LANES

During the first week of June 2013, each affected airport received a proposed amendment to its Airport Security Program (ASP) shifting access control responsibilities to the airport operators at an estimated taxpayer savings of $100 million annually, according to the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Following delivery of the proposed amendment, each airport operator was provided a 45-day Notice and Comment period to share its thoughts and concerns on how the amendment affects its particular operations. The TSA reviewed comments from each airport and responded to individual concerns. After the review, TSA changed the language before issuing the amendments to clarify some matters in response to the comments. In accordance with TSA rules, some airports submitted petitions asking that TSA reconsider the amendments. Under its current plan, TSA will provide a one month extension to February 1, 2014, to certain airports, while others will be notified to staff their exit lanes beginning January 1, 2014. The Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (H.J. Res. 59) which passed the House on December 12, 2013, and the Senate on December 19, 2012, contains a provision requiring TSA to continue monitoring passenger exit points from the sterile area of airports which the agency provided such monitoring as of December 1, 2013. H.J. Res. 59 has been presented to the President and is awaiting signature.
The Subcommittee held a Member briefing on June 27, 2013, on TSA’s plans to transfer the responsibility of monitoring passenger exit lanes to local airport operators. Representatives from TSA were present to respond to Member questions.

The Department of Homeland Security’s Fiscal Year 2014 budget request included a proposal to shift the responsibility for exit lane monitoring from TSA to the Airport Operators at certain locations.

The TSA decided to transfer the responsibility through an amendment to the airport’s Airport Security Program rather than through the formal rulemaking process. On October 18, 2013, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Administrator of TSA regarding the process the Administration chose to follow to implement the transition. The TSA provided a response on November 4, 2013.

TSA PERSONNEL MISCONDUCT

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) is one of the most publicly visible components of the Department of Homeland Security. With TSA assuming a front-line, high-profile position in the fight against terrorism, the agency is often in the spotlight when allegations of misconduct arise.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency and the Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a joint hearing on July 31, 2013, entitled “TSA Integrity Challenges: Examining Misconduct by Airport Security Personnel.” The Subcommittees received testimony from Mr. John Halinski, Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen M. Lord, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Services, Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Deborah Outten-Mills, Acting Assistant Inspector General for Inspections, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of this hearing was to examine how TSA handles allegations of misconduct among its employees including its investigation and adjudication process and to discuss the hiring practices, policies and training it has in place to deter criminal or negligent behavior.

DHS RESEARCH LABORATORIES

On November 6, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to Duke University in Durham, North Carolina to examine the University’s homeland security research laboratories and receive a briefing by researchers on their on-going Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate-funded research, which seeks to develop future generations of airport screening technologies.

AVIATION SECURITY

The leadership of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) receives a daily classified aviation intelligence briefing at the TSA headquarters in Arlington, Virginia every morning. On February 14, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee attended this brief-
ing to better understand the terrorist threats to U.S. transportation systems.

On March 7, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. requesting to be a co-requestor of the Government Accountability Offices (GAO) review of TSA’s Secure Flight Program.

On March 20, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee received an update from the Administrator of TSA on TSA’s Screening Partnership Program.

In 2003, Congress directed the Department of Homeland Security through the Vision 100-Century Aviation Reauthorization Act (Pub. L. 108–176) to develop a program to ensure security of domestic and international aircraft repair stations. After no action was taken, in 2007 Congress mandated through the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Pub. L. 110–53), that TSA issue a final rule on aircraft repair station security by August 2008, otherwise the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would no longer be authorized to certificate new foreign repair stations for U.S.-bound aircraft, Implementing. The TSA missed the deadline, and FAA certifications of new foreign repair stations were halted. In November 2009, TSA published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for repair station security, with the comment period ending on February 19, 2010. Although the comment period ended over three years ago, TSA has yet to issue a final rule. On March 14, 2013, the TSA Administrator announced to the Subcommittee at the hearing entitled “TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security,” that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) received the rule. In response to the announcement, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter on April 18, 2013, to the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget regarding the status of the Aircraft Foreign Repair Station Rulemaking.

The Department of Homeland Security’s FY 2014 budget request eliminated funding for TSA’s Federal Flight Deck Officer (FFDO) program. On June 6, 2013, the Chairs of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency sent a letter to the Secretary of Homeland Security expressing concern over the proposed elimination of funding for the FFDO program. The Department provided a response on July 29, 2013.

On September 25, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. requesting to be a co-requester of GAO’s review of TSA’s Pre-Check trusted traveler program.

TSA’s Behavior Detection and Analysis Program

The Transportation Security Administration’s (TSA) Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) program involves Behavior Detection Officers (BDO) observing passenger behavior inside the airport. BDOs are trained to detect individuals exhibiting suspicious behaviors that indicate they may be a threat to transportation security.
The Subcommittee held a hearing on November 14, 2013, entitled “TSA’s SPOT Program and Initial Lessons From the LAX Shooting.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. John S. Pistole, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Dr. Daniel Gerstein, Acting Under Secretary, Science and Technology Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Stephen M. Lord, Managing Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office; and Mr. Charles K. Edwards, Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of this hearing was to examine challenges with TSA’s SPOT Program and to gauge whether SPOT is a scientifically valid program.

On May 29, 2013, the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued a report on the SPOT program entitled Transportation Security Administration’s Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques [OIG–13–91]. The OIG concluded in its report that: TSA did not assess the effectiveness of the SPOT program; have a comprehensive training program for SPOT; ensure outreach to its partners regarding the implementation and operation of SPOT; or have a financial plan for the SPOT Program prior to Nation-wide implementation.

On September 9, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. requesting to be a co-requester of a Government Accountability Office (GAO) review of TSA’s SPOT program.

On November 13, 2013, GAO released a report entitled, TSA Should Limit Future Funding for Behavior Detection Activities. [GAO–14–158T] The report found, among other things, that available evidence does not conclusively support whether behavioral indicators, which are used in the SPOT program, can be used to identify persons who may pose a risk to aviation security.

**CANINE BREEDING PROGRAM**

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) canceled its explosive detection canine breeding program at Lackland Air Force Base based on a determination that the program was not producing enough explosives detection canines to justify the annual costs. In response to TSA’s decision, on June 18, 2013, the Chair and Vice Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Secretary of Homeland Security expressing concerns about how the research and development that was achieved under the program would be used in the future. The Department provided a response on July 15, 2013.

**SHOOTING AT THE LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

On November 1, 2013, a gunman entered Terminal 3 of the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), approached the passenger screening area and shot and killed Gerardo I. Hernandez, a Transportation Security Officer (TSO) who was checking passenger boarding passes. After shooting and killing Officer Hernandez, the first TSA employee to be killed while performing his duties, the gunman shot and injured two additional TSOs and one passenger, none of whom were fatally wounded. Upon engaging, shooting, and
taking the gunman down, Officers of the Los Angeles World Airport’s Police Division found a note on the gunman’s person expressing anti-government views and his intent to target and kill TSA employees.

On November 15, 2013, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Full Committee, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee and Representatives Waters and McKeon introduced H.Res. 415, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the tragic shooting at LAX and honoring the dedicated public service of the TSO killed and the TSOs injured in the incident.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security.” March 14, 2013. (Serial No. 113–5)

“TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security: Stakeholder Perspectives.” April 11. (Serial No. 113–5)


“Stakeholder Perspectives on TSA Acquisition Reform.” July 17, 2013. (Serial No. 113–26)


“TSA’s SPOT Program and Initial Lessons From the LAX Shooting.” November 14, 2013. (Serial No. 113–43)
During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held six hearings, receiving testimony from 31 witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS ALLOWABLE USE ACT

H.R. 1791

To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to codify authority under existing grant guidance authorizing use of Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program funding for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities.

Summary

H.R. 1791 amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–296) to ensure that grants funds may continue to be used for medical preparedness activities.

Legislative History

112th Congress

H.R. 5997 was introduced in the House on June 21, 2012, by Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Clarke of Michigan, Mr. Turner of New York, and Mr. Rogers of Alabama; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 5997 was referred to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.

The House considered H.R. 5997 under Suspension of the Rules on November 27, 2012, and passed the bill, amended, by a 2/3 recorded vote of 397 yeas and 1 nay (Roll No. 609).

113th Congress
H.R. 1791 was introduced in the House on April 26, 2013, by Mr. Bilirakis, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, and Mr. King of New York; and referred to the Committee on Homeland Security. Within the Committee, H.R. 1791 was referred to the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications.

On October 29, 2013, the Chair discharged the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications from further consideration of H.R. 1791.

The Full Committee considered H.R. 1791 on October 29, 2013, and ordered the measure to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, as amended, by voice vote.

The Committee reported H.R. 1791 to the House on November 21, 2013, as H. Rpt. 113–273.

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

SUPERSTORM SANDY

Superstorm Sandy made landfall in New Jersey on October 29, 2012. Impacting the East Coast from Florida to Maine, the National Hurricane Center cites damage estimates of $50 billion, the second costliest disaster in U.S. history. In response to the storm, Congress passed the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, which the President signed on January 29, 2013 (Pub. L. 113–2). This Act appropriated $50 billion to fund response and recovery efforts related to the storm. To date, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has provided more than $1.4 billion in Individual Assistance to disaster survivors and $3.2 billion in Public Assistance to state, local, and tribal governments for emergency protective measures, debris removal, and repair and replacement of infrastructure in the hardest hit areas. Throughout the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee has conducted oversight of Federal efforts to assist states, localities, tribes, and individuals impacted by the storm.

On January 11, 2013, Committee staff attended the FEMA Office of Response and Recovery's quarterly briefing and received an update on changes to the National Flood Insurance Program and Hurricane Sandy recovery.

On February 12, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to FEMA's National Response Coordination Center in Washington, D.C. This visit provided Members with an overview of FEMA's mission, operations, and efforts to work with its State, local, and private sector partners as well as ongoing Superstorm Sandy recovery efforts. Members met with the FEMA Administrator and other officials from throughout the agency. Following the briefing, Members toured the National Response Coordination Center.

The Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the American Red Cross' Disaster Operations Center and Digital Disaster Operations Center on March 12, 2013. The visit provided information on the Red Cross' role in disaster response and services it provides through its local chapters, including an update on the Red Cross' response to Superstorm Sandy.
On March 15, 2013, Committee staff attended the FEMA Office of Response and Recovery’s quarterly briefing and received an update on implementation of the Sandy Recovery Improvement Act of 2013 (Pub. L. 113–2), changes to the National Flood Insurance Program, and Tribal declarations.

On March 25, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Inspector General to discuss oversight of Hurricane Sandy response and recovery efforts.

The Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. on April 22, 2013, requesting that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review Individual Assistance provided by FEMA after Superstorm Sandy to ensure there were no improper payments. The GAO has agreed to this request and the review is ongoing.

On June 10, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. requesting that GAO conduct a review of FEMA’s response to Superstorm Sandy, including a comparison with the Agency’s response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The GAO has agreed to this request and the review is ongoing.

Committee staff attended the FEMA Office of Response and Recovery’s quarterly briefing on June 28, 2013, and received an update on the implementation of the Sandy Recovery Improvements Act and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

On August 26, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from GAO to discuss their review of improper Individual Assistance payments made by the FEMA in the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy.

The Chair of the Subcommittee met with representatives of the American Red Cross on October 2, 2013 to discuss ongoing Red Cross response and recovery efforts to Superstorm Sandy.

On October 21, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response regarding its efforts in response to Superstorm Sandy and lessons learned for future response efforts.

Since the beginning of the 113th Congress, states and localities have experienced a string of disasters including: a successful terrorist attack in Boston, tornadoes in multiple states, wildfires, and flooding. It is imperative that the Federal Government, along with its partners at the State and local levels and the private sector, work to prepare for and respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

Members of the Subcommittee attended a briefing conducted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on March 21, 2013, to obtain information on National Flood Week.

On March 28, 2013, Committee staff attended a briefing on the implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Subtitle A of Title II, of Pub. L. 113–41).

On June 10, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. requesting that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the use of disaster assistance funding for direct administrative costs. The GAO has agreed to this request and the review is ongoing.

On June 21, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, the Chair and Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Chair of the Senate Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Management, Intergovernmental Affairs, and the District of Columbia, sent a letter to the Administrator of FEMA, regarding its Public Assistance program. The Committee received an interim response to this letter on November 26, 2013.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security’s National Protection and Programs Directorate and the United States Secret Service, the Department of Education, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation on July 31, 2013 on interagency school security efforts.

On August 6, 2013, the Subcommittee held a field hearing in Carmel, Indiana entitled “Assessing Central Indiana’s Preparedness for a Mass Casualty Event.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Andrew Velasquez, III, Regional Administrator, FEMA Region 5, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. John Hill, Executive Director, Indiana Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Mark Bowen, Sheriff, Hamilton County, Indiana; Mr. Steven Orusa, Fire Chief, Fishers, Indiana; Ms. Diane Mack, University Director, Emergency Management and Continuity, Indiana University; Mr. Chad Priest, Chief Executive Officer, MESH Coalition, Inc.; Dr. Virginia Caine, Director, Public Health Administration, Marion County (IN) Public Health Department; Louis Profeta, M.D., F.A.C.E.P., Medical Director of Disaster Preparedness, St. Vincent Hospital, Indianapolis, Indiana; Dr. H. Clifton Knight, Chief Medical Officer, Community Health Network; R. Lawrence Reed, II, M.D., F.A.C.S., F.C.C., Director of Trauma Services, Indiana University Health Methodist Hospital; and Dr. Mercy Obeime, Director, Community and Global Health, Franciscan St. Francis Health, Indianapolis, Indiana. This hearing explored ongoing efforts at the Federal, State, local, and non-profit level to secure our most vital assets from a wide range of threats, including mass casualty events.

The Chair of the Subcommittee addressed the Hazus Users Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana on August 7, 2013.

On August 28, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives from FEMA regarding preparations for addressing the needs of children during disasters.

On September 4, 2013, Committee staff conducted a site visit of the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center in Virginia to
receive a tour and briefing of the Federal Government’s continuity of operations programs.

Committee staff participated in a conference call held by the FEMA on September 17, 2013, regarding the response to the wildfires in Colorado.

On September 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Assessing the Nation’s State of Preparedness: A Federal, State, and Local Perspective.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Timothy Manning, Deputy Administrator, Protection and National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Mark Ghilarducci, Director, California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services, testifying on behalf of the National Governors Association and the Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council; Mr. Jeffrey W. Walker, Senior Emergency Manager, Licking County, Ohio, testifying on behalf of the International Association of Emergency Managers; Chief James H. Schwartz, Fire Chief, Arlington County Fire Department, Arlington, Virginia, testifying on behalf of the International Association of Fire Chiefs; Ms. Kathy Spangler, Vice President, U.S. Programs, Save the Children. This hearing provided Subcommittee Members with an opportunity to reflect on the gains the nation has made in preparedness over the past 12 years and the challenges that still remain.

Committee staff received a classified briefing from representatives from FEMA regarding its continuity of operations and continuity of government operations on September 23, 2013.

On November 19, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee participated in a panel discussion hosted by POLITICO in Washington, D.C. on emergency and disaster response.

MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS

The mission of the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Health Affairs is to provide health and medical expertise in support of the Department’s mission to prepare for, respond to, and recover from all hazards impacting the Nation’s health security. As a result, the Subcommittee conducted a number of oversight activities related to the Office of Health Affairs and other vital medical preparedness activities.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Office of Health Affairs (OHA) on February 28, 2013, on OHA’s mission and programs, including BioWatch, the National Biosurveillance Integration Center, and workforce health initiatives.

On April 3, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the American College of Emergency Physicians.

On April 11, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from OHA to discuss the President’s Fiscal Year 2014 budget request for OHA.

The Chair of the Subcommittee met with the Director, Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on April 18, 2013, to discuss medical preparedness and the Strategic National Stockpile (SNS).
On May 6, 2013, Committee staff met with the DHS Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs to discuss medial preparedness and OHA priorities.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response to receive a briefing on current operations.

The Chair of the Subcommittee gave the keynote address at the National Emergency Support Function 8 conference in Indianapolis, Indiana on June 25, 2013.

On July 2, 2013, Committee staff participated in a conference call held by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention regarding the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) virus and H7N9 influenza.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Emergency Services Coalition on Medical Preparedness on July 9, 2013, to discuss medical countermeasures for first responders.

On September 3, 2013, Committee staff met with the Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs to discuss ongoing activities within the Office of Health Affairs.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Institute of Medicine on September 11, 2013 regarding their report on the resilience of the Department of Homeland Security workforce.

OUTREACH TO STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS, AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Throughout the 113th Congress, Committee staff met with various Federal agencies and stakeholder groups representing the first responder and emergency management communities to discuss issues of concern to their membership. These meetings included the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Emergency Management Association, the International Association of Emergency Managers, the National Sheriff’s Association, the Major Cities Chiefs, the Jewish Federations of North America, and the American Red Cross.

On February 11, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee visited the Indiana Intelligence Fusion Center to learn more about their mission and their experience sharing information with Federal, State, and local partners.

On February 15, 2013, Committee staff conducted a conference call with the Executive Director of the Indiana Department of Homeland Security to receive an update on the Department’s priorities.

On March 20, 2013, Committee staff participated in a panel discussion at the National Emergency Management Association’s (NEMA) Mid Year Conference. Subsequently, on March 21, 2013, Committee staff attended a briefing with NEMA leadership to receive an update on their priorities.

The Chair of the Subcommittee addressed a roundtable held by the Congressional Fire Services Institute on May 9, 2013.

The Chair of the Subcommittee visited emergency management officials within Indiana on numerous occasions throughout the
EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND INDIVIDUALS

The Department of Homeland Security has distributed nearly $40 billion in grants to States and localities since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Administered by Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Grant Programs Directorate, this funding is used to help jurisdictions prevent, prepare for, mitigate, and respond to terrorist attacks.

In furtherance of the Subcommittee’s work to ensure that grant expenditures are appropriately measured and monitored, on February 22, and 28, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from FEMA to learn about its grants monitoring procedures and efforts to measure the effectiveness of these grants.

Subsequent to these meetings, on March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Homeland Security Grants: Measuring Our Investments.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Tim Manning, Deputy Administrator, Protection and National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; and Mr. David C. Maurer, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office. This hearing examined the effectiveness and efficiency of homeland security grants and provided Members an opportunity to examine: The impact of these grants; how these grant dollars are utilized; how the impact is being measured and how the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and FEMA are ensuring that grants are being used in a manner appropriate to their intent.

On March 28, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the National Fusion Center Association regarding the use of grants by fusion centers.

Committee staff met with representatives of numerous local stakeholder groups on April 26, 2013, to discuss the proposed National Preparedness Grant Program.

On May 9, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the National Governors’ Association to discuss grants.

Committee staff received a briefing from the FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate on May 20, 2013 on the Fiscal Year 2013 guidance for the Homeland Security Grant Program and other FEMA administered programs.

On June 13, 2013, Committee staff met with the Assistant Administrator of FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate to discuss FEMA’s preparedness grants.
Committee staff participated in a conference call held by FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate on June 17, 2013 regarding Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments.

On June 18, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee received a classified briefing on the risk formula employed by FEMA to allocate State Homeland Security Grant Program and Urban Areas Security Initiative grants. Representatives from the FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, the Office of Infrastructure Protection, and Customs and Border Protection were present to respond to Member questions.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives from FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate on Fiscal Year 2013 grant awards on August 22, 2013.

Committee staff participated in a panel discussion at the National Governors Association Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council annual meeting on September 20, 2013, regarding homeland security grants.

On September 25, 2013, Committee staff attended a briefing with representatives DHS’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis regarding the National Network of Fusion Centers Assessment, including the use of grants to fund fusion centers.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate on efforts to monitor grant funds on November 12, 2013.

PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE TO CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR THREATS

Terrorists actively plot and have attempted to use weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to attack the United States. At a 2010 Committee on Homeland Security hearing with the Commissioners of the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism (WMD Commission), the Commissioners noted that “it is more likely than not that there will be a weapon of mass destruction used someplace on earth by a terrorist group before the end of the year 2013 and that it is more likely that the weapons will be biological rather than nuclear.” In the WMD Commission’s report card on the Nation’s efforts to protect the Nation for WMD terrorism, the Government received a grade of “F” on its efforts to enhance the Nation’s capabilities for rapid response to prevent biological attacks from inflicting mass casualties.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives from Sandia National Laboratory regarding BioWatch and Generation—3 on January 29, 2013.

On February 1, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to receive a briefing on agricultural security.

On February 25, 2013, Committee staff met with the Director of Texas A&M University’s Foreign and Zoonotic Disease Defense (FAZD) Center to receive a briefing of FAZD’s biosurveillance efforts.

On March 5, 2013, the Subcommittee held a Member briefing on the Office of Health Affairs’ BioWatch program. The Assistant Sec-
Secretary, Office of Health Affairs conducted the briefing and responded to Member questions. On March 25, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from GAO to discuss their work on BioWatch. Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Office of Health Affairs on April 3, 2013, regarding the National Biosurveillance Integration Center.

On May 6, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives from FEMA on the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Sandia National Laboratory regarding the release of their report, *A Biological Threat Prevention Strategy*.

The Chair of the Subcommittee met with the DHS’s Undersecretary for Science and Technology to discuss chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats.

On September 25, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Office of Health Affairs regarding its Chemical Defense Program.

The Chair and Ranking Member of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Comptroller General of the U.S. on September 25, 2013, requesting that GAO review the progress made by the National Biosurveillance Integration Center, including an update of its December 2009 report, *Biosurveillance: Developing a Collaboration Strategy is Essential to Fostering Interagency Data and Resource Sharing*.

On November 15, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee received a classified briefing on the Office of Health Affairs Chemical Defense Program. Representatives from the Office of Health Affairs, along with representatives from DHS’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis, were present to brief the Members and respond to their questions.

**EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, exposed communications failures with catastrophic implications. Communications challenges persisted during Hurricane Katrina. Since that time, great strides have been made in interoperable communications, including through the National Emergency Communications Plan and its associated goals and the establishment of the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet). However, communications challenges remain.

On January 28, 2013, Committee staff attended a roundtable to get stakeholder perspectives on the FirstNet and the development of the National Public Safety Broadband Network (PSBN).

Committee staff met with representatives of the Office of Emergency Communications on February 22, 2013, to discuss the Department of Homeland Security’s role on the FirstNet board and with the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

On April 11, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials (APCO)
International to discuss SAFECOM and the National Public Safety Broadband Network.

On April 12, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from the Office of Emergency Communications to receive a briefing on the President’s Fiscal Year 2014 budget request for the Office.

The Subcommittee held a Member briefing on April 16, 2013, on the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Emergency Communications. The Director of the Office of Emergency Communications, provided Members with an overview of OEC and its role in the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet).

Committee staff met with representatives of the Interagency Communications Interoperability System on May 22, 2013 regarding the Public Safety Broadband Network and the T–Band.

On July 18, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Commerce’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Emergency Communications on FirstNet and the development of the Public Safety Broadband Network.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Office of Emergency Communications regarding OEC’s efforts to update the National Emergency Communications Plan on September 6, 2013.

On September 24, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of APCO International to discuss public safety communications issue.

On November 21, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee sent a letter to the Director of the Office of Emergency Communications, regarding the need to update the National Emergency Communications plan and requesting additional information on the Office of Emergency Communications’ efforts to do so.

SOCIAL MEDIA AND NEW TECHNOLOGY

In today’s technology driven world, social media and other types of new technology are becoming one of the primary ways people receive, process, and relay information. Studies have shown that more than 60 percent of the people in the United States have at least one social media account, with many having multiple accounts including Facebook pages, Twitter profiles, and Pinterest boards. While social media originally started out as a way to share information among friends, it is evident that it has evolved to serve other functions, and is a prevalent source for news, advertising, and entertainment. There were numerous stories from Hurricane Sandy, the Boston Bombings, and the Oklahoma tornados of how citizens used Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram to relay information to first responders, communicate with love ones, and request assistance. The management of “big data” and the use of social media can provide enormous opportunities for efficiencies in emergency management.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on April 11, 2013, to discuss the Agency’s use of social media, particularly as an aid in disaster response operations.
On June 4, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part1 #Privatesector.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Matthew Stepka, Vice President, Technology for Social Impact, Google.org; Mr. Jason Matthew Payne, Philanthropy Lead, Palantir Technologies; Mr. Michael Beckerman, President and CEO, The Internet Association; and Mr. Jorge L. Cardenas, Vice President, Asset Management and Centralized Services, Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc. This hearing examined advances in social media and technology and their applications for disaster preparedness, response, and recovery.

The Subcommittee continued its hearing on Emergency Management 2.0, with a hearing on July 9, 2013, entitled “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Shayne Adamski, Senior Manager of Digital Engagement, Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Suzanne C. DeFrancis, Chief Public Affairs Officer, American Red Cross; Mr. Albert Ashwood, Chairman, NEMA Legislative Committee, Director, Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management, testifying on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association; and Sergeant W. Greg Kierce, Director, Jersey City Office of Emergency, Management and Homeland Security. This hearing continued the discussion that began at the June 4th hearing and examined how emergency management practitioners are leveraging social media and new technology and working with the private sector to enhance their preparedness, response, and recovery capabilities, particularly through the lens of recent disasters.

In preparation for these hearings, Committee staff met with various stakeholders in the public and private sectors to learn more about the applications of social media and new technology for disaster response and recovery.

On June 12, 2013, the Chair of the Subcommittee met with the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Undersecretary and the Director of the First Response Division to discuss advancements in technology for disaster preparedness and first responders.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Department of Homeland Security’s Science and Technology Directorate on June 27, 2013, to discuss the Virtual Social Media Working Group.

On July 31, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives from FEMA to discuss FEMA’s implementation of Executive Order 13642, Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information.

Committee staff attended the Social Media in Emergency summit at George Washington University on August 13, 2013.

As a result of testimony about the need for open and machine readable disaster related data received by the Subcommittee at the June 4th Emergency MGMT 2.0 hearing, on November 19, 2013, the Chair and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, the Chair of the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, the Rank-
ing Member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, and other Members of the Committee, sent a letter to the Administrator of FEMA, regarding implementation of the requirements of Executive Order 13642.

ALERTS AND WARNINGS

Terrorist attacks and natural disasters can occur at any time, often with little-to-no notice. Alerts and warnings provided in advance of potential threats and hazards can help to direct the public to seek safety. The benefit of alerts and warnings were evident during the November 2013 outbreak of tornadoes in the Midwest. Messages through sirens, television, radio, and cell phones alerted citizens to seek shelter from the storm and many noted that those messages got them out of harm's way.

On April 22, 2013, Committee staff held a conference call with representatives of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to discuss the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System (IPAWS).

On May 7, 2013, the Subcommittee held a Member briefing on FEMA's IPAWS. The Assistant Administrator of FEMA's National Continuity Programs (NCP) Directorate responded to Member concerns.

Committee staff also met with stakeholders regarding alerts and warnings on numerous occasions throughout the 113th Congress.

Committee staff participated in a conference call with representatives from FEMA to discuss IPAWS and the application of new technologies.

Committee staff met with stakeholders to discuss legislation to authorize the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System on November 19, 2013.

TRAINING AND EXERCISES

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), through its National Exercise Division and partners such as the National Preparedness Consortium, supports training and exercises for emergency response providers. As terrorist continually change their tactics, these programs are vital for emergency response providers so they are prepared for the threats and hazards they face.

On February 11, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of Texas A&M University, a member of the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium, to receive an update on current operations and training programs.

On February 15, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of New Mexico Tech's Center for Explosives Research and Education, a member of the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium, to receive an update on its training programs.

Committee staff attended a briefing held by member universities in the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium on April 29, 2013.

On July 15, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of FEMA's National Exercise Division on the National Exercise Program.
Committee staff visited Texas A&M University on August 14 and 15, 2013 to observe homeland security and emergency management training programs at the Texas Engineering Extension Service and learn about other homeland security programs conducted by Texas A&M. The visit included a tour of Disaster City.

On November 1, 2013, Committee staff visited the Maryland Fire Rescue Institute to observe and participate in firefighter training and response activities.

**CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE**

A cyber attack on critical infrastructure could have damaging cascading physical effects, and as such, state and local emergency management officials must be prepared to respond. While gains in cyber incident response capabilities have been made, the 2013 National Preparedness Report again highlights States' concerns about their cybersecurity capabilities. It is vital that the Federal Government share information with emergency response providers about the cyber threat so they are prepared to respond.

On April 25, 2013, Committee staff attended a workshop held by CNA on cyberpreparedness.


Committee staff attended a briefing held by the National Governors Association’s Resource Center for State Cybersecurity on September 26, 2013 on the release of its report, *Act and Adjust: A Call to Action for Governors for Cybersecurity*.

On October 30, 2013, the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies held a joint hearing entitled “Cyber Incident Response: Bridging the Gap Between Cybersecurity and Emergency Management.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Ms. Roberta “Bobbie” Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Charley English, Director, Georgia Emergency Management Agency, testifying on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association; Mr. Craig Orgeron, Chief Information Officer and Executive Director, Department of Information Technology Services, State of Mississippi, testifying on behalf of the National Association of State Chief Information Officers; Mr. Mike Sena, Deputy Director, Northern California Regional Intelligence Center, testifying on behalf of the National Fusion Center Association; and Mr. Paul Molitor, Assistant Vice President, National Electrical Manufacturers Association. This hearing examined the extent of cyber threat information sharing and response capabilities to a cyber incident with physical consequences.

In preparation for this hearing, Committee staff met with stakeholders to discuss information sharing related to cyber threats and
cyber incident response capabilities. On September 18, 2013, Committee staff also received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Cybersecurity and Communications on the Department's efforts to share cyber threat information with emergency response providers.

DEFENSE SUPPORT TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES

In times of emergency, Federal, State, and local civilian response agencies can greatly benefit from the experience and capabilities of the United States Military, be it active duty, National Guard, or reserve forces. It is vital that civilian agencies are aware of and can leverage the support that the military is willing and able to provide.

Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Defense on April 2, 2013, regarding the use of the Defense Production Act (Pub. L. 81-774) for disaster response activities.

On October 3, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives of the National Governors Association regarding the issue of dual status command.

Committee staff attended a briefing with the United States Army Reserve on November 20, 2013 to discuss the role of the military in disaster response and the military's response to Superstorm Sandy.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Efficient and effective management of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is vital to ensuring its ability to meet its mission. Without the successful execution of management and operations, the Agency will not be able to fulfill its mission.

On April 8, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from representatives from FEMA on its Qualification System and other workforce initiatives.

Committee staff met with representatives of the Federal Emergency Management Agency on April 12, 2013 to receive a briefing on the President's Fiscal Year 2014 budget request for FEMA.

On November 21, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of FEMA's Mission Support Bureau to receive a briefing on the Bureau's functions and operations.

Committee staff met with representatives of FEMA’s Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer on December 6, 2013, to receive a briefing on issues related to hiring, training, performance management, and employee morale.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS HELD

“Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part1 #PrivateSector.” June 4, 2013. (Serial No. 113–20)

“Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.” July 9, 2013. (Serial No. 113–20)

“Assessing Central Indiana’s Preparedness for a Mass Casualty Event.” Field hearing in Carmel, Indiana, August 6, 2013. (Serial No. 113–31)


Clause 2(d), Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress requires each standing Committee to adopt an oversight plan for the two-year period of the Congress and to submit the plan to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and House Administration not later than February 15th of the first session of the Congress.

Rule XI, clause 1(2)(d)(1) requires each Committee to submit to the House of Representatives not later than January 2, of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of that committee under Rule X and Rule XI during the Congress ending on January 3 of such year. Clause 1(2)(d)(3) of Rule XI also requires that such report include a summary of the action taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan; and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

Part A of this section contains the Committee on Homeland Security Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress which the Full Committee considered and adopted by unanimous consent on January 23, 2013, a quorum being present.

Part B of this section contains a summary of the actions taken by the Committee on Homeland Security to implement the Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress and the recommendations made with respect to this plan. Part B also contains a summary of the additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and the recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

**PART A—COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY OVERSIGHT PLAN**

This is the oversight plan for the Committee on Homeland Security for the 113th Congress. It includes the areas in which the Committee expects to conduct oversight during the 113th Congress, but does not preclude oversight or investigation of additional matters as needs arise. The Full Committee will examine the following four key priorities, among other issues.

**PREVENTING A TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE HOMELAND**

Our enemies continuously plot to harm Americans. As we saw warning signs prior to the 9/11 attacks including the bombings of our embassies in Africa and attack on the USS Cole, we are experiencing events today, which should cause concern. The Arab spring has brought some welcome changes to the Middle East. However, the region has also witnessed some dangerous warning signs, such as the assassination of our US Ambassador in Benghazi along with
three other Americans. We now see radical and dangerous groups achieving political prominence in the Middle East. This is a dangerous time for our nation and we cannot become complacent about the threats against us.

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the persisting threats to Americans and American interests from Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and new and emerging threats such as Iran and Hezbollah in the Western hemisphere. The Committee will assess the various vulnerabilities of our nation’s systems and mechanisms that dangerous people and entities aspire to exploit, such as our aviation and other transit systems, our cyber networks, and critical infrastructure control systems. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has the responsibility to protect Americans from these dangers and the Committee intends to examine the Department’s relevant strategies and capabilities.

The Committee will also continue to evaluate the Obama Administration’s policy concerning the Detention Center at the US Naval Station Guantánamo Bay, Cuba. This oversight will include a review of the Secretary of Homeland Security’s role as a member of the President’s Guantánamo Detention Task Force, as outlined in Executive Order 13492. Furthermore, the examination will include a review of the potential risk of holding high-value detainees, such as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and other co-conspirators of the attacks of September 11th on domestic soil; the risk of inadvertent disclosure of sensitive information during the trial; and the recommendations delivered by the Department as part of the Guantánamo Review Task Force.

SECURING OUR BORDERS

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will continue to examine the Department’s efforts to secure land and maritime borders of the United States. The Committee will assess programs and technologies used to secure U.S. land borders on the north and the south, as well as the Caribbean region. The Committee will also examine how the Department is leveraging defense technologies to effectively secure the borders and how best to utilize equipment coming re-deployed from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Committee will continue to monitor the threat of spill-over violence stemming from the rise of drug cartels and the violent conflict throughout Mexico.

PROTECTING AGAINST CYBER ATTACKS

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the Department’s role in hardening our national critical infrastructure against cyber attacks by fortifying Federal and civilian networks and collaborating with the private sector to reduce vulnerabilities. The Committee will review the integration of the various cyber missions carried out across the Federal government and will monitor the Department’s role in fulfilling its goals in order to prevent a catastrophic cyber attack. The Committee will ensure that the Department facilitates the improved security of our Nation’s critical infrastructure while earning and building on the trust of the owners and operators of that infrastructure.
MANAGING DHS WITH A BUSINESS-MODEL APPROACH

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will oversee the Department of Homeland Security’s management and operations to ensure that it is functioning in the most efficient manner possible and accountable to the American people. The Committee will work to identify potential opportunities to leverage proven private sector best practices, find efficiencies that will contribute to the Department’s ability to meet its vital missions, and identify areas for cost savings. The Committee intends to conduct oversight and ensure better business practices in areas, such as acquisition, financial management, information technology, and employee morale.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

COUNTERTERRORISM

The security of the American homeland is linked to international security as vulnerabilities in one part of the world can quickly become security threats in another. During the 113th Congress, the Committee will review the Department’s international counterterrorism activities. This review will include examining the roles, responsibilities, and resources devoted by the Department and its components to achieving United States goals to combat terrorism overseas.

The Committee will examine the counterterrorism policies of the US government, with a focus on the Department of Homeland Security. This examination will include an assessment of the worldwide threat against the US homeland from various groups, such as Al Qaeda core, Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM), al Shabab, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP), Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), Boko Haram, and other emerging terrorist groups. The Committee will also examine Iran’s sponsorship of terrorism via its proxies, most notably Hezbollah, including expanding ties in the western hemisphere. This examination will include the extent to which the Department’s strategic planning efforts address these threats. The Committee will monitor the homeland security ramifications of potential military action against the illicit Iranian nuclear program and the geopolitical ramifications across the Middle East and North Africa. The Committee will also monitor issues related to homegrown terrorist threats, economic threats, and terrorist travel and financing issues.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

Throughout the 113th Congress, the Committee will track the development of the Department of Homeland Security Counterintelligence Program, to ensure it is fully meeting the Department’s needs. DHS’s counterintelligence efforts are intended to prevent adversaries from penetrating the Department to exploit sensitive information, operations, programs, personnel, and resources.
UNCONVENTIONAL AND EMERGING THREATS

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the capabilities and efforts of the Department to identify, prevent, deter, and respond to emerging future threats. For example, GPS navigation systems have a significant impact on the daily lives of most Americans but these systems are highly susceptible to being jammed and hijacked. These threats could disrupt civil aviation and emergency communications, attack global financial exchanges, and corrupt the energy grid. The Committee will monitor the extent to which the Department effectively coordinates and collaborates with other relevant US agencies to mitigate these threats to the homeland.

HOMELAND SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ENTERPRISE

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will conduct oversight of the Department of Homeland Security’s Intelligence Enterprise, including intelligence activities throughout the Department and component agencies. This will include a focus on the coordination and collaboration across intelligence offices and personnel within the Headquarters’ elements and component agencies. Additionally, the Committee will review efforts to build the intelligence, analytical, and assessment capabilities of the Department and to ensure its full participation in the Intelligence Community as part of its homeland security mission. This will include an examination of the hiring authorities, practices, and career-development of intelligence analysts and professionals within Headquarters elements and component agencies. The Committee will examine the Department’s role in managing, distributing, and otherwise using terrorist threat information in furtherance of its homeland security mission. The Committee will also examine national security clearance policies and processes within the Department.

INFORMATION SHARING

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the progress being made to improve terrorist and homeland security information sharing efforts among Federal, state, and local governments, law enforcement entities, first responders, emergency management personnel, and the private sector. The Committee will examine the Department of Homeland Security’s efforts to coordinate information sharing efforts from across the Federal government to and from state and local fusion centers throughout the country. As part of this examination, the Committee will review the efficacy and efficiency of state and local fusion centers to determine their impact on securing the homeland.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY

BORDER SECURITY

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will continue to examine the Department’s efforts to secure land and maritime borders of the United States, including but not limited to personnel, technology, infrastructure, and coordination. The Committee will also assess the status of programs and international agreements to
secure US land borders on the north and the south, as well as the Caribbean region, from illegal entry by persons or contraband. The Committee will monitor the extent to which the Department can measure its performance in securing the borders and how these measures reflect the state of border security.

The Committee will also examine the technologies used to secure the borders. Specifically, the Committee will conduct oversight of the Department’s acquisitions of border technologies, such as those used in the Arizona Border Surveillance Technology Plan, and examine the extent to which the Department is leveraging defense technologies, such as unmanned aerial systems, to effectively secure the borders. This oversight will also include the Department’s use of aerial assets in support of border security. The Committee will continue to monitor the threat of spill-over violence stemming from the rise of drug cartels and the violent conflict throughout Mexico. The Committee will also examine the Department’s efforts to identify, detain, prioritize, and remove criminal aliens from the United States, including those apprehended at or near US borders and ports of entry who are subject to deportation, particularly those from special interest countries.

BORDER SCREENING AND TERRORIST TRAVEL

In the 113th Congress, the Committee intends to review efforts to ensure the deployment and implementation of training and infrastructure enhancements to assist border and consular officials in identifying, intercepting, and disrupting terrorists or others who would do our Nation harm and who are attempting to enter or travel within the United States. The Committee will address security-related deficiencies in the immigration and naturalization process that terrorists could use to gain entry to or remain in the country for illegitimate purposes. These weaknesses have and will continue to be exploited by terrorists and those seeking to commit terrorist acts. The Committee intends to continue to explore challenges associated with visa security.

The Committee will also examine the integration, security, and reliability of criminal, immigration, and terrorist databases used to screen persons seeking to enter and exit this country, to include advanced passenger information and the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) program. The Committee will also assess the development of secure travel documents. In addition, the Committee will examine the integration and effectiveness of transportation and border security screening systems at ports of entry for detecting high-risk passengers and cargo transported within the United States and across our borders, including efforts to better facilitate travel and trade such as implementation of “trusted traveler” programs and the Beyond the Border Agreement. The Committee will also examine the Department’s security efforts between ports of entry and the extent to which it collaborates with other federal, state, and local agencies regarding border security.
PORT AND MARITIME SECURITY

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine various aspects of port and maritime security, including the security of port facilities; the screening of vessels, passengers, cargo, and crew for potential terrorists, terrorist weapons, and contraband; nuclear detection efforts; the development of international security standards for shipping and containers; and the implementation and operation, including technology utilized, of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential. The Committee also plans to review how the Department manages risk emerging from maritime threats and vulnerabilities such as small boats and semi-submersible submarines.

The Committee plans to review the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department’s supply chain security programs, such as the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) and the Container Security Initiative (CSI), to ensure a proper balance between the facilitation of lawful trade and the security of the homeland. This will include an assessment of implementation of the Maritime and Transportation Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–295), the Security and Accountability for Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–347), relevant provisions of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (P.L. 108–458), and the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (P.L. 110–53).

U.S. COAST GUARD

During the 113th Congress, the Committee plans to review the Coast Guard’s homeland security missions, to include ports, waterways, and coastal security; drug interdiction; migrant interdiction; law enforcement; and defense readiness. The Committee will examine Coast Guard afloat, aviation, and shore-based operations in support of these missions to ensure that the service is using a risk-based, layered strategy to enforce laws and keep America’s waters secure. This will include a specific assessment of the Coast Guard’s anti-terrorist capabilities, most notably those found within the Deployable Operations Group and its units, including Maritime Safety and Security Teams, Port Security Units, Tactical Law Enforcement Teams, and the Maritime Security Response Team.

The Committee will monitor the Coast Guard’s efforts to address threats from small vessels, issues from offshore oil rigs, and essential vulnerable vessels such as tankers. Additionally, the Committee will review resource and asset needs within the Coast Guard to determine whether the service is operationally ready to address threats and emergencies while pursuing a long-term sustainable path of fleet recapitalization. The Committee will specifically examine the progress, efficiency, and efficacy of acquisitions programs to ensure major procurements remain on schedule without a reduction in readiness throughout the service.

Furthermore, the Committee will investigate the Coast Guard’s specific maritime security operations and initiatives, such as the International Port Security Program and the inspection of vessels originating from ports with inadequate anti-terrorism measures. The Committee will examine these and other programs to ensure
that the service is developing a full sense of maritime domain awareness and executing all of its missions in the most effective manner possible to keep America secure.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

AVIATION SECURITY

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the risks to the aviation system, as well as the development and implementation of security measures to reduce or mitigate such risks. The Committee's oversight will review programs and procedures implemented by the Department of Homeland Security related to the security of all types of aircraft, including commercial passenger, air cargo, and general aviation aircraft. In addition, the Committee will examine airport perimeter and access controls and technology for limiting access to the secure areas of commercial and general aviation airports. The Committee will also examine the training and management of the Federal Air Marshal Service.

In addition, the Committee will examine the Department's global strategy for securing the aviation system including its cooperation with foreign countries on security procedures and technologies and the harmonization of aviation security standards worldwide. The Committee will identify international best practices to aviation security that could result in efficiencies in the United States. The Committee also remains concerned about weaknesses in the Alien Flight Student program and will continue to monitor the Department's progress in correcting these weaknesses. The Committee will continue to pursue options for strengthening the security process for US citizens enrolled in flight training.

PASSENGER AND BAGGAGE SCREENING

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will review TSA's deployment of technology and implementation of procedures related to the screening of passengers in all modes of transportation and will examine TSA's balancing security interests with the need for the efficient flow of travel, including privacy and civil liberties safeguards. The Committee will conduct oversight on the cost and effectiveness of technology related to the screening of baggage; transportation security information sharing within the Federal interagency process; and the effectiveness of the credentialing process. The Committee will also review TSA's passenger search policies and pre-screening programs, including the screening of passengers against no-fly and selectee lists, the performance of the Secure Flight program, and other measures that affect the security of domestic and international air travelers.

REFORMING TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine additional options for the Department to allow the private sector more flexibility to innovate transportation security including the Screening Partnership Program. The Committee will explore the costs and benefits of these options. The Committee will continue to examine
the extent to which a risk-based security approach can increase efficiencies in the TSA workforce without compromising security. This examination will include the effectiveness of the Department’s outreach to the public on its transportation security measures. The Committee will also monitor the progress of the Department to implement risk-based screening initiatives, such as TSA’s Pre-Check program, at airports nationwide to increase efficiencies in the screening process. This includes assessing the effectiveness of these initiatives.

The Committee will review the Department’s acquisition and procurement policies, practices, and procedures for screening technologies to ensure the efficient use of taxpayer dollars. The Committee will continue to seek input from independent groups outside the Department to help ensure a leaner, smarter, more efficient organization. In addition, the Committee will monitor the extent to which the Department enlists the private sector to modernize and, to the extent feasible, automate the passenger screening process to reduce invasive pat-downs; implements privacy software on all Advanced Imaging Technology machines; sponsors an independent analysis of the potential health impacts of AIT machines; and further validates the Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques program and assesses the value added to aviation security.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will review the Transportation Security Administration’s efforts to secure surface transit systems, including the most at-risk mass transit systems, buses, subway light rail, and passenger rail, freight rail, pipelines, and highway systems. Moreover, in examining the security of surface transportation systems, the Committee will consider options to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the surface transportation inspection program. The Committee will also examine the efficacy and impact of Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response teams. The Committee will also monitor the extent to which the Department effectively coordinates with other Federal partners, such as the Department of Transportation, the Federal Rail Administration, and the Federal Aviation Administration to secure our nation’s transportation systems. The Committee will continue to monitor the implementation of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential and its impact on those required to obtain the credential.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY REGULATIONS

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine transportation security regulations in order to reduce the burden on the economy and improve American global competitiveness. The Committee will examine the challenges to finalize guidance related to foreign-aircraft repair-station security. The Committee will continue to seek perspectives from the private sector on the impact of transportation security regulations and options for the Department to become more efficient and effective.
During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the Administration’s efforts to implement Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8), and the required National Preparedness System, which includes the various frameworks and the National Preparedness Goal. Additionally, the Committee will review the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) response and recovery efforts for declared disasters to ensure capabilities are enhanced by lessons learned and Federal resources are used appropriately. The Committee will investigate issues, if any, of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with FEMA’s disaster response efforts.

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND FIRST RESPONDERS

Throughout the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine FEMA’s allocation and administration of grants to enhance the ability of state and local governments and emergency response providers to prevent, prepare for, respond to, mitigate, and recover from a terrorist attack, including proposals for reforms to these programs. The Committee will review the coordination of grant programs across the Federal government; coordination within the Department of Homeland Security in developing guidance and administering grants; the ability of state and local governments to access, obligate, and expend funds; strength of regional partnerships developed through grants; and the risk-based distribution and expenditure of such grants at the state and local levels. The Committee will examine options to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of grant programs. The Committee will also review ongoing efforts to comprehensively assess these investments and the impact on preparedness capabilities through the lens of the National Preparedness Goal, National Preparedness Report, State Preparedness Reports, and other related measures.

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR PLANNING, PREPAREDNESS, AND RESPONSE

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the significant challenges posed by chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) weapons to homeland security and assess the Department’s progress in implementing security strategies including prevention, preparedness, and response approaches that utilize multiple tools and policies to reduce the likelihood and impact of CBRN attacks and, thus, the CBRN risk to the Nation. The Committee will oversee the Department’s efforts to predict and respond to the evolving CBRN threat landscape, and ensure that CBRN expenditures are risk-based, coordinated, and in general represent wise use of taxpayer dollars. The Committee will examine the Department’s capability to mitigate CBRN risks through appropriate means including detection of, preparedness for, and response to CBRN threats. The Committee will continue its oversight of those activities needed to ensure the safety of the public and the first re-
sponder community in the event of an attack, such as through the development of medical countermeasures programs. The Committee will also oversee preparedness for agricultural terrorism events.

COMMUNICATIONS

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the coordination of the various communications programs and offices within the Department of Homeland Security. The Committee will monitor activities of the First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) and the development of the public safety interoperable wireless broadband network. In addition, the Committee will review the Department’s programs in the establishment of the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System to ensure timely and effective alerts and warnings are provided to the public in the event of an emergency.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROVIDER Training

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will review the Department’s terrorism preparedness training programs, including awareness of these resources among first responders and state and local governments and the level of coordination among Federal, state, and local training programs. The Committee will also review existing training centers and determine whether the Department is optimally utilizing these facilities to enhance first responder terrorism preparedness.

EXERCISES AND SIMULATIONS

The Committee will examine the Department’s efforts to streamline and improve the National Exercise Program to ensure the program enhances the preparedness of the Nation. The Committee will monitor the extent to which FEMA is incorporating lessons learned from national exercises into future training, planning, and response, recovery, and mitigation activities.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, AND SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

CYBERSECURITY

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the Department’s role in hardening our national critical infrastructure against cyber attacks by fortifying Federal civilian networks and collaborating with the private sector to develop the means to detect and prevent cyber attacks, reduce vulnerabilities, provide incident response, and facilitate recovery. That oversight will consider the Department’s ability to detect the incursion of malicious activity; attribute the source of that activity; and promote best practices, risk assessments, and sharing of threat information across all levels of government and the private sector.

The Department has been delegated authority by the White House to develop cybersecurity policy across the civilian government agencies. The Committee will monitor that this policy is effective, efficient and scalable to ensure the security of government
networks. In addition, the Committee will examine the Department’s ability to foster research and development cybersecurity technology as well as developing a substantial and capable professional cybersecurity workforce. The Department has recently reorganized the offices tasked with carrying out its cybersecurity mission so the Committee will review the efficiencies in these offices to make sure that the bureaucracy enables, and doesn’t hinder, the mission. The Committee will also examine the resiliency of national critical infrastructure to withstand cyber attacks and the need to optimize supply chain risk management in order to protect against manipulation without unnecessarily impeding commerce.

The Committee will also review the integration of the various cyber missions carried out across the Federal government, including its collaboration with the defense and intelligence agencies. Similarly the Committee will monitor the Department’s role in fulfilling the goals of the Homeland Security blueprint for cybersecurity, as well as the development and the implementation of the National Cyber Incident Response Plan, which expands upon the National Response Framework. The Committee will ensure that the Department facilitates the improved security of our Nation’s critical infrastructure while earning and building on the trust of the owners and operators of that infrastructure.

**CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION**

Pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7 (HSPD-7), the Department is responsible for integrating sector specific strategies into a National Strategy for Critical Infrastructure Protection, and for coordinating Federal efforts across all such infrastructure sectors. During the 113th Congress, Committee oversight will focus on the Department’s national coordination responsibilities and its sector specific critical infrastructure protection responsibilities. The Committee will also examine the Department’s efforts to assess national critical infrastructure priorities.

In addition, the Committee will review the Department’s progress in identifying, prioritizing, recommending, and implementing protective measures to reduce vulnerabilities for critical infrastructure and key resources, including its administration of programs to promote private sector sharing of critical infrastructure threat and vulnerability-related information, and its administration of systems and programs to provide timely warnings of potential risks to critical infrastructure.

**CHEMICAL FACILITY SECURITY**

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will continue to review the Department’s efforts to secure chemical facilities and take action, as appropriate, to optimally balance the program’s effectiveness in reducing risk posed by certain chemical facilities and the everyday demands for chemicals in commerce. The Committee will review the management challenges associated with the Department’s related chemical facility security program and the progress in increasing its efficiency and effectiveness.
During the 113th Congress, the Committee will oversee the capability of the Department's Science & Technology Directorate to rapidly develop and deliver products and technology solutions to its customers, including the operating components of the Department, and state and local emergency responders and officials, to help them secure the homeland by preventing, protecting against, and responding to terrorist threats and natural disasters. The Committee will examine, in particular, the Department's progress in developing a more rigorous process to identify, prioritize, and fund research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) opportunities that balances risk to the homeland with cost, impact, and time to deliver.

The Committee will review the Department's efforts to coordinate the homeland security research and development agenda and leverage scientific knowledge and technical expertise, research, and facilities at relevant universities, research institutions, government and national laboratories, and the private sector, including the Homeland Security Centers of Excellence and Federally Funded Research and Development Centers. The Committee will also assess the status of the Department's technical infrastructure and workforce to ensure current and future homeland security RDT&E needs will be met. The Committee will review the Department's activities relating to evaluation, testing, and certification of private sector homeland security technologies.

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will also continue to review the Directorate's implementation of the Support Anti-terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies Act (the SAFETY Act), to determine its impact on homeland security and facilitation of jobs in the private sector.

TECHNOLOGY TO COUNTER CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR THREATS

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the Department's progress in improving the Nation's capability to counter the threat of terrorist use of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons in the United States through multi-layered approaches at the Federal, state, and local levels. The Committee will review the Department's chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear analysis capabilities and information sharing mechanisms to provide actionable information and an integrated operating system to guide decision makers in carrying out appropriate responses, including interdiction.

To enhance the ability to interdict chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear smuggling across US borders (land, air, and sea), the Committee will oversee the Department's progress in employing risk-based methods for developing, testing, certifying, deploying, and operating current and next generation chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear detection equipment. The Committee will also examine the Department's ability to detect chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials in the interior of the United States and the Department's coordination with state and local partners to reduce the risk of these threats. Finally, the
Committee will examine the Department’s chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear forensic activities to support national priorities for deterrence, attribution, and prosecution.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

DEPARTMENTAL EFFICIENCY AND WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE, AND DUPLICATION

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will oversee the Department of Homeland Security’s day-to-day operations to ensure that it is operating in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Pursuant to Rule X, clause 2(d)(F) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee will work to identify potential opportunities to eliminate duplicative or unnecessary programs, find efficiencies that will contribute to the Department’s ability to meet its vital missions, and identify areas for cost savings. The Committee will also conduct rigorous oversight to ensure departmental regulations enhance security without posing an unnecessary barrier to private sector job creation. The Committee will investigate homeland security programs and practices, as warranted. For example, the Committee will continue to monitor the safety and security of Federal buildings and facilities, including the role and effectiveness of the Federal Protective Service. The Committee’s oversight will include monitoring the extent to which the Department is responsive to the Committee’s requests.

ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will review the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to improve acquisition outcomes, and to ensure that effective management controls are put in place to prevent contract waste, fraud, and abuse while promoting efficiency and effectiveness. The Committee will review the authorities and activities of the Undersecretary for Management and Chief Procurement Officer to ensure the effective management of these key functions. The Committee will monitor the cost, schedule, and performance status of major Department acquisition programs. The Committee will also examine the impact of the Department’s acquisition initiatives to enhance processes and improve outcomes related to its major acquisition programs.

The Committee also will review the Department’s implementation of Section 831(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, which grants the Secretary authority with respect to research and development projects to use more flexible contracting mechanisms in an effort to attract “nontraditional government contractors” for needed homeland security technologies, as well as the Secretary’s use of other streamlined acquisition practices. The Committee will continue to monitor the Department’s efforts to leverage strategic sourcing, as outlined in Federal guidance, to increase efficiencies.
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will continue its oversight of the Department of Homeland Security’s progress to properly manage financial systems and data to minimize inefficient and wasteful spending, make more informed decisions to manage its programs and implement Department policies. The Committee will also review the Department’s efforts to enhance its managerial cost accounting, address internal control weaknesses in financial reporting, achieve a clean audit opinion on its financial statements, and reduce the reliance on manual data calls to collect cost information from the various components and compile consolidated, reliable data.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT

During the 113th Congress, the Committee will review the Department’s efforts to address information technology (IT) challenges, including the management and integration of the Department’s IT systems. The Committee will review the authorities and activities of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and component CIOs to ensure the effective management and coordination of these key functions. The Committee will also monitor the Department’s progress in IT architectural planning, investment management, cloud computing, policy development, operations, and related personnel management.

DEPARTMENTAL WORKFORCE

Throughout the 113th Congress, the Committee will monitor the Department’s efforts to recruit and retain personnel and to address employee concerns set forth in the Office of Personnel Management’s Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department’s own personnel surveys, which have indicated morale problems across the Department. In addition, the Committee will continue to examine the Department’s Balanced Workforce Initiative, which seeks to convert contractor positions into Federal positions, to ensure an appropriate balance is struck between Federal employees and private contracts and guard against any unnecessary elimination of private sector jobs.

The Committee will continue to monitor the Department’s efforts to effectively and efficiently consolidate its headquarters from more than 40 locations throughout the National Capital Region, known as the St. Elizabeth’s Headquarters Consolidation Project.

EMPLOYEE INTEGRITY

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine employee corruption and misconduct issues and their effect on homeland security. Although the vast majority of Department employees reflect the agency’s core values, even one corrupt employee represents a significant management challenge. The Committee will review Department statistics and case studies associated with employee integrity issues, as well as, the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and practices the Department utilizes to address such issues.
UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

In the 113th Congress, the Committee will examine the homeland security operations of the United States Secret Service, including its critical role of protecting the President of the United States, among other duties. The Committee will also monitor issues related to employee integrity.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Section 222 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (the Act) created a Privacy Officer for the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that the Department’s information gathering and analysis functions and other programs across its components adhere to established standards for the protection of privacy. Section 705 of the Act also established an Officer for Civil Rights and Liberties to review and assess information alleging abuses of civil rights or civil liberties by employees and officials of the Department of Homeland Security. During the 113th Congress, the Committee will continue to monitor the Department’s efforts under such laws to strike an appropriate balance between the need to combat terrorist attacks against the United States with the privacy expectations and civil rights of US citizens. For example, the Committee will continue to monitor the Department’s role in oversight of the domestic use of unmanned aerial systems.
PART B—IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY OVERSIGHT PLAN FOR THE 113TH CONGRESS

Part B of this section contains a summary of the actions taken by the Committee on Homeland Security to implement the Oversight Plan for the 113th Congress and the recommendations made with respect to this plan. Part B also contains a summary of the additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and the recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

PREVENTING A TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE HOMELAND

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the Committee continued its focus on the security of the United States Homeland. On April 15, the landscape of American security was greatly impacted when two American persons who used improvised explosive devices (IED), killed three people and injured approximately 260 others at the finish line of the Boston Marathon. Since this attack, the Committee has been working on a report on the events that led to the attack as well as recommendations for how the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and other U.S. Governmental agencies can make adjustments to their operating procedures to reduce the likelihood this atrocity could be repeated. The Committee held two hearings on the Boston Marathon Bombing, one on May 23 and the other on July 10, sent Committee staff to Moscow, Russia, and twice to Boston, Massachusetts to obtain additional details on the bombing and the suspects. The Committee expects a report, one classified and one open version to be released in early 2014.

This major national security event continued to drive the Committee to conduct preemptive oversight of other major Homeland security events and issues. In August 2013, the Committee conducted oversight after al-Qaeda-linked threat to United States' interests throughout the Middle East and North Africa. During this threat, Committee staff met with Government officials and private sector experts on al-Qaeda’s growing spider web of affiliates and the threat they pose to the Homeland. This continued into September when the Committee, raised awareness of the growing level of al-Qaeda and Islamist extremists in the Syrian conflict. The Committee conducted a hearing on the subject entitled “Crisis in Syria: Implications on the Homeland” on September 10, 2013. This hearing affected the national debate of the Syrian conflict and its impact on homeland security.

During the Committee’s investigation into the Syrian conflict, the Committee became increasing concerned, as Syria was the world’s third largest holder of chemical weapons. As parts of Syria fell to the opposition, the Committee, working with DHS and intelligence organizations, as well as private companies, raised the National debate on the affects of chemical weapons falling into the growing
hands of Islamist extremists. The Committee held classified meetings with DHS, FBI, and Intelligence Community members to discuss this issue and raise awareness. The Committee held meetings and attended meetings with government officials from intelligence organizations from August to November 20, 2013 on issues related to Syria that have the potential to affect the Homeland. The Committee is continuing to monitor the impact from this crisis.

International tragedy continued in September when al-Shabaab, a Somali based al-Qaeda linked terrorist organization attacked a mall in Kenya. The soft target or Mumbai-style attack was quickly recognized by the Committee as having implications on the Homeland and a hearing was held on October 9, entitled “From al-Shabaab to al-Nusra: How Westerners Joining Terror Groups Overseas Affect the Homeland.” Experts from private industry attended speaking of the threat to the Homeland and Sheriff Stanek from Minneapolis area of Minnesota spoke as a senior law enforcement official dealing with citizens who have participated in al-Shabaab.

The Committee continued to investigate and push the Administration on the Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) designation for Western Africa (Nigeria) terrorist group, Boko Haram. The Committee issued letters to the Secretary of State on 13 and 30 September urging the Department to rethink its stance on the terrorist organization and issued an update to the Committee’s report from the 112th Congress on Boko Haram. On November 13 2013, the Department of State issued the FTO designation making it more difficult for Boko Haram to obtain support. The Committee, during the 113th Congress, will continue to move the Administration to isolate terrorist organizations such as al-Shabaab and Boko Haram, in order to better safeguard the homeland.

Designating these groups as FTOs provides the Federal Government with additional tools to fight terrorism and to protect the Homeland, something this Committee has continued to do in the First Session of this Congress. Ensuring information sharing from the highest levels to the lowest has been a priority, and another key to preventing attacks on the Homeland. On July 26, 2013, the Committee issued its year long investigative report on the National Network of Fusion Centers, the hub of information sharing for State and Local law enforcement and emergency management. The Committee’s evaluation found that while the Network of fusion centers is a vital part of our Nation’s counterterrorism efforts, it is not currently functioning at its full potential. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress of the Fusion Centers to ensure that they continue to improve and add to the national collection, analysis and sharing of critical information that will protect the Homeland.

In the beginning of 2014, the Olympic Games will be held in Sochi, Russia, close to the Caucus region. The Caucuses have been a hot bed of extremism, and have connections to conflict zones throughout the world, as well as the suspects believed responsible for the Boston Marathon bombing. In November 2013 sent staff members to Sochi, as well as neighboring Georgia, to further investigate the region and the Islamist extremists there. The Committee released a report in late November detailing the unclassified portion of the trip and plans to continue monitoring these groups as
well as the threat they pose to the nearly 15,000 American athletes and attendees at the Olympic Games.

SECURING OUR BORDERS

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Committee examined the Department’s efforts to secure the Nation’s land and maritime borders. As a result of this oversight, the Committee unanimously approved legislation that would require the Department to develop a comprehensive border security strategy to gain and maintain situational awareness and operational control of the border. The legislation requires tangible metrics for the apprehension of illegal border crossings and a significant reduction in the movement of illegal drugs and contraband.

From August 3 through 6, 2013, the Committee conducted a site visit to the southwest border. The purpose of the site visit was to examine current border security conditions, including the maritime environment. Members witnessed border security operations in the maritime domain, urban environment, border security infrastructure, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) operations, and border security challenges in the Rio Grande Valley. In San Diego, Members examined United States Coast Guard port security operations, conducted an aerial tour of the international border, and examined tactical infrastructure and counter tunneling operations. In Tucson, Arizona Members toured various facilities including: the Tucson Joint Field Command and Predator Operations Center; a demonstration of advanced Integrated Fixed Tower technologies, in Sasabe; and received an overview of UAV operations at Fort Huachuca. Members then traveled to the Rio Grande Valley to participate in border terrain tours with local law enforcement, receive briefings on the South Texas Campaign, and the Texas National Guard on RC-26 fixed-wing aerial detection and monitoring operations supporting the Department of Homeland Security.

Throughout the First Session, the Committee has actively examined the key elements of border security including the definition of a secure border, border security metrics and measures, visa security and overstays, the implementation of a biometric exit system, cargo security, maritime security, and the future of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC).

From August 3 through 6, 2013, the Committee conducted a site visit to the Southwest border. The purpose of the site visit was to examine current border security conditions, including the maritime environment. Members witnessed border security operations in the maritime domain, urban environment, border security infrastructure, UAV operations, and border security challenges in the Rio Grande Valley. In San Diego, Members examined United States Coast Guard port security operations, conducted an aerial tour of the international border, and examined tactical infrastructure and counter tunneling operations. In Tucson, Arizona Members toured various facilities including: the Tucson Joint Field Command and Predator Operations Center; a demonstration of advanced Integrated Fixed Tower technologies, in Sasabe; and received an overview of UAV operations at Fort Huachuca. Members then traveled to the Rio Grande Valley to participate in border terrain tours with local law enforcement, receive briefings on the South Texas Cam-
paign, and the Texas National Guard on fixed-wing aerial detection and monitoring operations supporting the Department of Homeland Security.

During the First Session, the Committee received updates on the Arizona Technology Plan and successfully pushed for the Department of Defense to re-deploy aerostats to DHS for assessment in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. The Committee is optimistic that Mexican government reforms will provide new economic opportunities so that citizens will choose stable, viable jobs, especially in the energy industry, instead of joining criminal cartels. The Committee will continue to recommend to the Department to secure our borders in the north, south, and the maritime domain.

PROTECTING AGAINST CYBER ATTACKS

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the Committee met extensively with the Department and various stakeholders to examine the Department’s role in the hardening our national critical infrastructure against cyber attacks by fortifying Federal and civilian networks and collaborating with the private sector to reduce vulnerabilities.

The National Infrastructure Protection Plan and Executive Order 13636, *Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* solidified the Department’s role as the lead Federal entity in protecting domestic critical infrastructure. The Committee held numerous briefings to understand the role of the Department in implementing the Executive Order. Upon issuance of Executive Order 13636 and Presidential Policy Directive—21 on Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience, the Committee received briefings from DHS to understand the role of the Department in implementing these documents. On March 13, 2013, the Committee held a hearing entitled “DHS Cybersecurity: Roles and Responsibilities to Protect the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure.” The Committee received testimony from Hon. Jane Holl Lute, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Anish B. Bhimani, Chairman, Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center; Mr. Gary W. Hayes, Chief Information Officer, Centerpoint Energy; and Ms. Michelle Richardson, Legislative Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.

As the Nation approached key Affordable Care Act milestones during 2013, the Committee raised security and privacy concerns prior to problems as healthcare.gov went live in October. The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies held hearings in July and September on healthcare.gov and the Health Exchange Data Hub. On November 8, Committee staff also received a briefing from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services and the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications on Department of Homeland Security roles in the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. On November 13, 2013, the Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Cyber Side-Effects: How Secure is the Personal Information Entered into the Flawed Healthcare.gov?” The Committee received testimony from Ms. Roberta “Bobbie” Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Soraya Correa, Associate Di-
rector, Enterprise Services Directorate, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Luke Chung, President, FMS, Inc.; and Mr. Waylon Krush, Chief Executive Officer, Lunarline, Inc. In preparation for this hearing, Committee staff met with stakeholders to discuss technical flaws with healthcare.gov.

MANAGING DHS WITH A BUSINESS-MODEL APPROACH

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the Committee has been actively monitoring the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) management and operations to ensure that it is functioning more efficiently and is accountable to the American people. The Chairman and Ranking Member have attended Subcommittee hearings on management issues. The Committee met with DHS headquarters and many components to examine management practices in acquisition, financial management, information technology, human capital, and employee integrity.

Integrated Investment Life Cycle Management (IILCM) is the Department’s transformational concept to integrate all phases of the Department’s multi-billion dollar budget and investment/acquisition management process—more like a business would do. The framework provides critical linkages between Strategy, Capabilities and Requirements, Programming and Budgeting, and Investment Oversight phases to ensure the effective execution of federal funds to support strategic priorities. IILCM was signed into policy by Secretary Napolitano in February 2013 and the framework is being piloted through March 2014 using the cybersecurity, biodefense, and common vetting portfolios. On November 14, 2013, DHS officials briefed the Committee on their approach to IILCM.

On August 1, 2013, the Undersecretary for Management, the Chief Procurement Officer, Chief Information Officer, and other senior officials briefed Committee staff on the status of the Department’s acquisition management efforts. As a follow up, on September 19, 2013, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled “DHS Acquisition Practices: Improving Outcomes for Taxpayers Using Defense and Private Sector Lessons Learned.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Hon. Rafael Borras, Undersecretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; Ms. Michele Mackin, Director, Government Accountability Office; Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. William C. Greenwalt, Visiting Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; Mr. Stan Soloway, President and CEO, Professional Services Council; Mr. David Berteau, Senior Vice President, Center for Strategic and International Studies. The purpose of the hearing was to examine DHS’s acquisition practices to determine if the Department is effectively implementing its policies and to assess whether DHS could leverage best practices and lessons learned from the Defense Department and the private sector.

In light of the Government Accountability Office’s (GAO) 2013 High-Risk report which identified financial management within the Department as high risk, on February 20, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, and the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infra-
structure Protection, and Security Technologies, sent a letter to DHS’s Chief Financial Officer regarding the Department’s financial management systems and efforts to obtain a clean audit opinion on its financial statements. The Department provided a response to this letter on March 8, 2013. On March 11, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS’s Chief Financial Officer. The GAO issued its report DHS Financial Management: Additional Efforts Needed to Resolve Deficiencies in Internal Controls and Financial Management Systems on September 30, 2013, [GAO-13-561]. The report contained four recommendations for executive action. On July 8, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS’s Chief Financial Officer regarding DHS’s efforts to modernize its financial systems. To further examine these issues, on November 15, 2013, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled “DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS’s Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars.” The Subcommittee received testimony from Mr. Asif Khan, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, U.S. Government Accountability Office; and Ms. Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The purpose of the hearing was to examine relevant GAO and Inspector General findings on DHS financial practices, including steps to obtain a clean audit opinion and implement financial management systems.

The Committee reviewed the authorities and activities of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to ensure the effective management and coordination of key IT systems planning, investment management, cloud computing, data consolidating, operations, policy development, and related personnel management. The Committee also examined component CIOs—particularly Customs and Border Protection (CBP), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and United States Customs and Immigration Services (USCIS)—and their efforts to modernize and implement critical IT systems supporting our border agents and immigration officers. On February 21, 2013, Committee staff received a briefing from DHS Office of Inspector General concerning their ongoing IT Audits and IT management issues. Committee staff also received briefings from representatives from DHS, including: The DHS Chief Information Officer; USCIS, including the USCIS Chief Information Officer; CBP; and ICE, including the ICE Chief Information Officer. The Committee reviewed the Department’s efforts to address information technology (IT) challenges, including the management and integration of the Department’s IT systems. The Committee monitored the Department’s progress in IT architectural planning, investment management, and cloud computing. On March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Information Technology: How Effectively Has DHS Harnessed IT to Secure Our Borders and Uphold Immigration Laws?” The purpose of the hearing was to assess how IT resources are being effectively utilized to help secure our borders and uphold immigration laws and how the Department is exercising proper management and oversight of its IT investments. The Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee on Oversight & Management Efficiency additionally requested on May 23, 2013, to sign onto an ongoing GAO review of the TECS modernization program—the Treasury Enforcement
Communication System. Committee staff also received a briefing from the Office of Inspector General regarding its investigation related to the DHS Chief Information Officer.

The Committee has been vocal about the need for key Department leadership positions to be filled as vacancies lead to ineffective government. On March 5, 2013, the Chairman and Ranking Member sent a letter the President urging him to swiftly appoint an Inspector General at DHS.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

COUNTERTERRORISM

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence examined the counterterrorism efforts of the U.S. Government across the government to counter the threat from al-Qaeda and other terror networks with a focus on the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Committee conducted a series of meetings, briefings, and site visit from DHS and component agencies, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), and the Department of State (DOS).

Subcommittee Members and staff received classified briefing from the above agencies, as well as others, on the threat posed by al-Qaeda core and affiliates, as well as the emerging al-Qaeda threats in Syria, North Africa, and the Sinai. The Subcommittee held oversight hearings on the threat to the Homeland from Syria and Iran, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, and Lashkar-e-Taiba.

The Subcommittee conducted oversight over the Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) designation process. While DOS handles this process, the designation of entities as FTOs has a direct impact on homeland security. The Chairs of the Full Committee and Subcommittee, along with the Chair of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, sent a letter to DOS and issued a report urging a FTO designation for Boko Haram.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Subcommittee conducted oversight over the programs within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) focused on detecting insider threats, including counterintelligence, polygraph, and security clearance programs. The Subcommittee staff met with representatives from the Defense Security Service within the Department of Defense, the DHS Office of Security, the Customs and Border Protection Internal Affairs Office, the Intelligence and Analysis Counterintelligence Program, and the Government Accountability Office. The Subcommittee held a hearing on insider threats and the security clearance process.

UNCONVENTIONAL AND EMERGING THREATS

The Subcommittee held a hearing on U.S. counterterrorism efforts to combat a chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear
Additionally, Subcommittee staff received classified and unclassified briefings on CBRN threats from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Federal Bureau of Investigations, Sandia National Laboratory, and outside entities.

HOMELAND SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ENTERPRISE

The Subcommittee has had multiple classified and unclassified briefings with officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) to examine the structure, mission, and capability of the office, as well as I&A’s role in coordinating intelligence within DHS and State and local law enforcement. Subcommittee staff also met with Customs and Border Protection, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the National Counterterrorism Center, the Government Accountability Office, and the Federal Bureau of Investigations regarding the network of Joint Terrorism Task Forces.

INFORMATION SHARING

Subcommittee Members received classified and unclassified briefings on DHS intelligence and information sharing efforts. Members received additional briefings on the mission and capabilities of the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis. Subcommittee Members and staff received threat briefings from the Department of Homeland Security and reviewed new intelligence products and information sharing efforts. In addition, Subcommittee staff met with representatives from the National Fusion Center Association, Government Accountability Office, and multiple State and local law enforcement jurisdictions regarding the quality, quantity, and timeliness of information shared between Federal, State, and local law enforcement.

The Chair of the Full Committee and the Chair of the Subcommittee released a Majority Staff Report entitled “The National Network of Fusion Centers,” detailing the Committee’s findings and recommendations developed from a comprehensive study of fusion centers across the country.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY

BORDER SECURITY

During the First Session of 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security examined the Department of Homeland Security’s efforts to secure the borders of the United States at and between the ports of entry, as well as in the maritime domain. The Subcommittee held hearings on these border security related topics on February 26, 2013, March 20, 2013, and July 23, 2013. The Subcommittee also considered H.R. 1417. The Chair and Ranking member of the Subcommittee sent letters to the Secretary regarding the continuance of the Tethered Aerostat Radar System.

In 2013 the Subcommittee held several oversight hearings regarding border security which addressed personnel, technology, infrastructure, coordination and assessed the status of programs and agreements to secure U.S. international borders from illegal entry.
by persons or contraband. The first hearing was held on February 26, 2013, and was entitled “What Does a Secure Border Look Like?” The hearing took a holistic look at the border and called upon the Department to define what a secure border looks like, assess what needs are to achieve a secure border and how to measure border security progress.

The Subcommittee reviewed the available technologies used to secure the borders by hosting a briefing from Department of Homeland Security Officials on the state of border security on March 13, 2013. The purpose of this briefing was to better understand the current state of border security efforts from all the Department of Homeland Security components with a role in border security and to identify the need for a national strategy to secure the border.

The second hearing the Subcommittee held further explored the technologies currently employed and the future recourse plans of the Department. This hearing was held on June 23, 2013, and was entitled “A Study in Contrasts: House and Senate Approaches to Border Security.” The purpose of this hearing was to assess the disparate border security approaches of the House and Senate, and to better inform the legislation that is presented to the Congress which will finally seek to achieve the outcome of a secure border.

The Department has struggled to convey metrics that measure performance in securing the borders and reflect the state of border security. On March 20, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Measuring Outcomes to Understand the State of Border Security.” The purpose of this hearing was to examine the status of the Border Condition Index (BCI), and further examine outcome-based ways to measure the state of border security.

The Subcommittee considered legislation to require a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain situational awareness and operational control of the border, and sets the time requirements to achieve operational control. H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act of 2013, was introduced on April 9, 2013; considered by the Subcommittee on April 24, 2013. The Full Committee considered the measure on May 15, 2013, and reported H.R. 1417 to the House on May 20, 2013.

In the Second Session the Subcommittee will be further examining the threat of spill-over violence stemming from the rise of drug cartels and the violent conflict throughout Mexico. The Subcommittee will also examine the Department’s efforts to identify, detain, prioritize, and remove criminal aliens from the United States, including those apprehended at or near U.S. borders and ports of entry who are subject to deportation, particularly those from special interest countries.

BORDER SCREENING AND TERRORIST TRAVEL

In the first session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee reviewed efforts to ensure the deployment and implementation of training and infrastructure enhancements to identify, intercept, and disrupt terrorists or others who would do our Nation harm and who are within the United States.

The Subcommittee held hearings on these border screening and terrorist travel related topics on May 21, 2013, and September 26, 2013. The Chair of the Full Committee and Chair of the Sub-
committee sent a letter to: The Secretary of Homeland Security regarding the expansion of the Global Entry trusted traveler program to the Republic of Saudi Arabia; The Secretary of Homeland Security regarding Customs and Border Protection pre clearance operations to the United Arab Emirates Abu Dhabi International Airport; The Director of Immigrations and Customs Enforcement and the Deputy Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection regarding the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) in the aftermath of the Boston Marathon Bombing; The Director of Immigrations and Customs Enforcement regarding the release of detainees.

As part of their efforts to address border screening and terrorist travel the Subcommittee held several oversight hearings. The Subcommittee explored the security-related deficiencies of the visa security program that terrorists could use to gain entry to or remain in the country for illegitimate purposes. The first hearing which addressed this issue was held on May 21, 2013, entitled “Visa Security and Overstays: How Secure is America?” The purpose of this hearing was to examine the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to secure the border by addressing challenges in identifying individuals who overstay their visas and explore ways to be more effective.

The second hearing the subcommittee closely examined the integration, security, and reliability of criminal, immigration, and terrorist databases used to screen persons seeking to enter and exit this country. The subcommittee closely assessed the development of the Department’s comprehensive biometric exit system. On September 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Fulfilling A Key 9/11 Commission Recommendation: Implementing Biometric Exit.” The purpose of this hearing was to engage with Department of Homeland Security Leadership on the current state of biometric exit and to chart a path forward to implement a biometric system at the nation’s ports of entry/exit that is both a counter-terrorism and border security tool.

On March 13, 2013 the Subcommittee received a briefing from Department of Homeland Security Officials on the state of border security which examined the collaborative security efforts between ports of entry with other federal, state, and local agencies. This briefing was held to better understand the current state of border security efforts including the integration and effectiveness of transportation and border security screening systems at ports of entry for detecting high-risk passengers and cargo transported across our borders, including efforts to better facilitate travel and trade such as implementation of “trusted traveler” programs.

PORT AND MARITIME SECURITY

In the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee has examined various aspects of port and maritime security, including the security of port facilities and the implementation and operation, including technology utilized, of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC). The Subcommittee held hearing on these port and maritime security related topics on June 18, 2013 and November 19, 2013.
The subcommittee held its first maritime focused hearing on June 18, 2013, entitled “Threat, Risk and Vulnerability: The Future of the TWIC Program.” The purpose of this hearing was to re-examine the security value of the TWIC card and determine the future of the program.

The Subcommittee held a second maritime related hearing to review how the Department manages risk emerging from maritime threats and vulnerabilities such as drug and undocumented migrant smuggling via small boats and semi-submersible submarines. On November 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “What Does a Secure Maritime Border Look Like?” The purpose of this hearing was to examine what DHS maritime components are doing to interdict maritime threats before they arrive on shore or in U.S. ports, what is being done to increase the Nation’s understanding of illicit networks that move in the maritime domain, and examine the Department’s layered approach to secure the maritime environment, and how progress is being measured.

In the Second Session of the 113th Congress the Subcommittee will be further examining the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department’s supply chain security programs, such as the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C–TPAT) and the Container Security Initiative (CSI), to ensure a proper balance between the facilitation of lawful trade and the security of the homeland. This will include an assessment of implementation of the Maritime and Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Pub. L. 107–295), the Security and Accountability for Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 (Pub. L. 109–347), relevant provisions of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Pub. L. 108–458), and the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007(Pub. L. 110–53). Furthermore, the Subcommittee plans to be more robust in the review of the Department’s efforts in the screening of vessels, passengers, cargo, and crew or potential terrorists, terrorist weapons, and contraband; nuclear detection efforts; the development of international security standards for shipping and containers.

U.S. COAST GUARD

During the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee reviewed the Coast Guard’s homeland security missions, which included the ports, waterways, and coastal security; drug interdiction; migrant interdiction; and law enforcement missions. The Subcommittee held hearings U.S. Coast Guard related topics on November 19, 2013.

The Subcommittee held a hearing focusing on the Coast Guard and the other maritime Components of the Department in the collaborative effort to secure the border. On November 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “What Does a Secure Maritime Border Look Like?” The purpose of this hearing was to understand what is being done to increase maritime domain awareness and interdict maritime threats before they arrive on shore or in U.S. ports. It examined the illicit networks that move in the maritime domain, and examined the Department’s layered approach to secure the maritime environment, and how progress is being measured.
In the Second Session of the 113th Congress the Subcommittee will be further examining Coast Guard related topics. The Subcommittee will investigate the Coast Guard’s specific maritime security operations and initiatives, such as the International Port Security Program and the inspection of vessels originating from ports with inadequate anti-terrorism measures. The Subcommittee plans to assess the Coast Guard’s anti-terrorist capabilities, most notably the Deployable Specialized Forces, including Maritime Safety and Security Teams, Port Security Units, Tactical Law Enforcement Teams, and the Maritime Security Response Team. Additionally, the Subcommittee will review Coast Guard resources needed to ensure the service is operationally ready to address threats and emergencies while pursuing a long-term sustainable path of fleet recapitalization. The Committee will specifically examine the progress, efficiency, and efficacy of acquisitions programs to ensure major procurements remain on schedule without a reduction in readiness throughout the service.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY
AVIATION SECURITY

Pursuant to the Committee Oversight Plan, the Subcommittee examined risks to the aviation system, as well as the development and implementation of security measures to reduce and mitigate such risks through a series of classified and unclassified briefings, hearings, general oversight, and legislation. For example, Subcommittee Members received a classified briefing on November 20, 2013, to discuss current threats to the nation’s aviation systems with the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Administrator. A number of other briefings pertaining to aviation security technologies, policies, and the Department of Homeland Security’s global strategy for securing the aviation system were received on February 5, 2013, June 19, 2013, and June 27, 2013, respectively. The Subcommittee also conducted meetings and held six hearings to receive testimony from TSA, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the DHS Inspector General, and private sector stakeholders pertaining to TSA’s risk-based security initiatives, Federal Air Marshal Service operations, and air cargo security.

In addition to these briefings and hearings, Subcommittee Members sent oversight letters to TSA and GAO regarding aviation security risks. A letter was sent on March 7, 2013, by the Chair of the Subcommittee to the Comptroller General of the United States requesting to be a co-requester of the GAO’s review of TSA’s Secure Flight program, which is expected to be completed in FY 2014. The Chair and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee also sent a letter to the TSA Administrator on October 18, 2013, seeking additional information and clarification on TSA’s decision to shift the responsibility of monitoring exit lanes to airport operators.

Finally, Subcommittee Members and Staff developed and refined legislation to improve TSA’s ability to protect the Nation’s aviation systems. H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, would help improve security technology planning and, ultimately, performance in the field. H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security
Stakeholder Participation Act, would ensure that industry stakeholders continue to have a voice in TSA policy decisions through the existing Aviation Security Advisory Committee. With passage of this legislation, TSA would not be able to allow the Committee’s charter to expire, which has happened in the past and has prevented the private sector from having a formal body to engage the agency and make recommendations.

PASSenger and Baggage Screening

Committee staff visited the Transportation Security Administration Systems Integration Facility on August 28, 2013, to observe current and future security screening technology research and testing.

Pursuant to House Rule X, clauses 2(n) and (p), on November 14, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing to examine TSA’s Screening Passengers by Observable Techniques (SPOT) Program. This hearing looked into the cost effectiveness and overall security effectiveness of the SPOT program, based on a report from the Government Accountability Office.

On November 6, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee visited the campus of Duke University to observe research being done to advance current and future passenger screening technology. While in the area, staff also toured Raleigh Durham International Airport to observe security operations at the airport’s security check point.

REFORMING TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

The House passed H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, introduces greater transparency and accountability for TSA spending decisions through a series of commonsense reforms. Specifically, it requires TSA to develop and share with the public, for the first time, a strategic, multiyear technology investment plan; share key information with Congress on technology acquisitions, including cost overruns, delays, or technical failures within 30 days of identifying the problem; establish principles for managing equipment in inventory to eliminate expensive storage of unusable or outdated technologies; and report on its goals for contracting with small businesses.

H.R. 2719 is budget neutral, and simply requires TSA to do a better job of not only managing its own resources, but also leveraging resources outside of the Department of Homeland Security.

Further, the House passed H.R. 1204. This bill authorizes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) and requires TSA to consult with the ASAC on aviation security matters, including on the development and implementation of policies, programs, rulemakings and security directives. In addition, the bill requires the ASAC to submit recommendations to TSA.

Staff also continued to monitor the progress of the Department to implement risk-based screening, such as the expansion of TSA’s Pre-Check program.
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

In keeping with the Oversight Plan’s intent to review the Transportation Security Administration (TSA)’s efforts to secure surface transit systems, the chairman of the Full Committee, along with the chairmen of the Subcommittees on Transportation Security; Counterterrorism and Intelligence; and Emergency Preparedness Response and Communications sent a letter to the TSA, DHS, and FBI on October 4, 2013, seeking information on how state, local, and federal agencies collaborate and share information on surface transportation security matters.

Moreover, on September 12, 2013, Committee staff visited Washington, D.C.’s Union Station to observe K9 explosives detection teams, TSA surface passenger screening, and other passenger rail security efforts.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY REGULATIONS

Staff visited the Transportation Security Administration Systems Integration Facility (TSIF) on August 28, 2013, to observe current and future security screening technology research and testing.

Pursuant to House Rule X, clauses 2(n) and (p), on November 14, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing to examine TSA’s Screening Passengers by Observable Techniques (SPOT) Program. This hearing looked into the cost effectiveness and overall security effectiveness of the SPOT program, based on a report from the Government Accountability Office.

On November 6, 2013, Members of the Subcommittee visited the campus of Duke University to observe research being done to advance current and future passenger screening technology. While in the area, staff also toured Raleigh Durham International Airport to observe security operations at the airport’s security check point.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND COMMUNICATIONS

PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

During the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee conducted oversight of efforts at the Federal, State, local, tribal, and private sector levels to prepare for, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Through a series of hearings, a field hearing, briefings, and site visits, the Subcommittee worked to ensure that the whole community is engaged in these efforts. The Subcommittee held hearings to assess the state of preparedness through the lens of the National Preparedness Report; assess preparedness for mass casualty events; and examine cyber incident response capabilities. Subcommittee Members visited the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s National Response Coordination Center, the American Red Cross’ Disaster Operations Center, and the National Protection and Programs Directorate’s National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to observe response capabilities and operations. The Subcommittee will continue its oversight of these vital issues during the second session of the 113th Congress.
The Department of Homeland Security has awarded nearly $40 billion to State and local governments and first responders since the September 11th terrorist attacks. To ensure the Department is allocating this funding based on risk and effectively monitoring the use of funds, the Subcommittee held a hearing and classified briefing. In addition, Committee staff has held numerous briefings with the Federal Emergency Management Agency representatives on the development of performance metrics to measure the effectiveness of the grants and programmatic and financial monitoring efforts. During the second session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee will continue its oversight of the grant funds, including the Department’s proposal to develop a new National Preparedness Grant Program. The Subcommittee is disappointed that despite repeated requests for additional information and legislative language on this proposal, the Department has failed to provide sufficient information.

CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, RADIOLOGICAL, AND NUCLEAR PLANNING, PREPAREDNESS, AND RESPONSE

Preparedness for and response to chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear events has remained a focus for the Subcommittee in the 113th Congress. The Subcommittee has received numerous briefings on the Office of Health Affairs’ BioWatch, National Biosurveillance Integration Center, and Chemical Defense Programs at both the classified and unclassified levels. At the Subcommittee’s request, the Government Accountability Office is conducting a review of the National Biosurveillance Integration Center to ensure it is meeting its mission and effectively working with interagency partners as intended in the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act (Pub. L. 110–53). In furtherance of oversight conducted in the 112th Congress, the Committee passed legislation, H.R. 1791, that was referred to the Subcommittee, permitting the use of grant funds for medical preparedness activities, including the procurement of vital medical countermeasures.

COMMUNICATIONS

In the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee has continued its oversight of communications issues with a visit to the Department of Homeland Security’s National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, briefings on the Office of Emergency Communications, the First Responder Network Authority and the implementation of the Public Safety Broadband Network, and the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System. A series of hearings on the use of social media and new technology considered new and innovative ways to communicate with the public before, during, and after emergencies. The Subcommittee is considering legislation to authorize the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System and has encouraged the Office of Emergency Communications to update the National Emergency Communications Plan. The Subcommittee will
continue its oversight of this vital issue during the remainder of the 113th Congress.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROVIDER TRAINING

As part of its oversight of first responder training programs, the Subcommittee received numerous briefings on DHS-funded training programs and from Federal and State training providers. Committee staff visited the National Emergency Response and Rescue Training Center and Maryland Fire Rescue Institute and observed training and exercise programs.

EXERCISES AND SIMULATIONS

In the First Session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee received a briefing from the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s National Exercise Division on the implementation of changes to the National Exercise Program. The Subcommittee, through its cyber incident response hearing, also inquired about lessons learned from National Level Exercise 2012 and efforts to address issues raised in the recently released after action report. Committee staff also participated in first responder training. The Subcommittee will continue to examine the extent to which lessons learned are reviewed, incorporated into programs and plans, and shared with State and local exercise participants.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, AND SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee held a series of hearings on the topic of cybersecurity examining the cyber threat, Department of Homeland Security capabilities and resources, privacy and civil liberty concerns, the security of the Federal Data Services Hub and Healthcare exchanges, and the implementation of Executive Order 13636, Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity. Additionally, the Subcommittee held over 300 meetings with stakeholders to determine topics of oversight and need for additional legislation.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Subcommittee held a series of meetings with the Science and Technology Directorate examining the Department’s progress in developing and delivering products and technology solutions to their customers. As a result of these meetings, the Subcommittee drafted and reported favorably H.R. 2952, the Critical Infrastructure Research and Development (CIRDA) Act.

CHEMICAL FACILITY SECURITY

The Subcommittee held a series of meetings with stakeholders, including other committees of jurisdiction in the House and Senate, to conduct oversight and consider possible reauthorization of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In addition, the Sub-
committee held a hearing on August 1, 2013 on the topic of mismanagement of the CFATS program. This hearing was held pursuant to clause 2(n)(1) of the rule as “. . . mismanagement in Government programs which that committee may authorize” and clause 2(p), as DHS Management is a “high-risk” issue identified by the Comptroller General of the U.S.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

DEPARTMENTAL EFFICIENCY AND WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE, AND DUPLICATION

During the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency oversaw the Department of Homeland Security’s day to day operations to ensure that it was operating in the most efficient and effective manner possible. On February 15, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Assessing DHS 10 years later: How Wisely is DHS Spending Taxpayer Dollars?” The purpose of the hearing was to address DHS’s progress and shortcomings in implementing its various missions 10 years after the Department’s creation, integrating its components, and its diligence in making sure taxpayer dollars are being spent efficiently.

Pursuant to Rule X, clause 2(d)(F) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee worked to identify potential opportunities to eliminate duplicative or unnecessary programs, find efficiencies that will contribute to the Department’s ability to meet its vital missions, and identify areas for cost savings. On April 26, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Cutting DHS Duplication and Wasteful Spending: Implementing Private Sector Best Practices and Watchdog Recommendations.” The purpose of this hearing was to assess GAO and Inspector General findings related to duplication and waste within DHS and examine best practices identified by the private sector to improve DHS’s efficiency and effectiveness. On September 23, 2013, Subcommittee staff also received a briefing from GAO officials on the Department’s progress in addressing GAO’s High-Risk List area of “Strengthening Department of Homeland Security Management Functions.” The area includes issues related to DHS acquisition management, financial management, information technology management, human capital management, and management integration. GAO’s High-Risk List includes areas at high risk due to vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. GAO has included DHS management functions in its List since 2003.

The Committee investigated homeland security programs and practices, as warranted. In an effort to review the TSA’s Passenger Screening Technologies, on February 5, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency received a joint classified briefing. The Subcommittees were briefed by representatives from the Government Accountability Office and the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Inspector General. The briefing addressed the development of the technology, challenges with the acquisition process, among other issues. In addition, in light of egre-
gious waste related to Internal Revenue Service training videos uncovered by the Treasury Inspector General, the Subcommittee Chair sent a letter on June 6, 2013 to the Undersecretary for Management. The purpose of the letter was to determine the cost and types of internal training materials, especially videos, created by DHS and its components. To date, the Department has not provided a response.

The Subcommittee will continue to oversee the efficiency of the Department and issues related to waste, fraud, abuse, and duplication.

ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

During the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee reviewed the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to improve acquisition outcomes, and to ensure that effective management controls are put in place to prevent contract waste, fraud, and abuse while promoting efficiency and effectiveness. The Subcommittee reviewed the authorities and activities of the Undersecretary for Management and Chief Procurement Officer to ensure the effective management of these key functions. The Subcommittee also examined the impact of the Department’s acquisition initiatives to enhance processes and improve outcomes related to its major acquisition programs. On September 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Acquisition Practices: Improving Outcomes for Taxpayers Using Defense and Private Sector Lessons Learned.”

The purpose of the hearing was to examine DHS’s acquisition practices to determine if the Department is effectively implementing its policies and to assess whether DHS could leverage best practices and lessons learned from the Defense Department and the private sector. In February 2013, the Subcommittee Chair requested to sign-on to ongoing Government Accountability Office (GAO) work related to CBP’s acquisition of border surveillance technology and DHS’s multiyear acquisition planning process. On March 21, 2013, the Subcommittee Chair, along with the Subcommittee Ranking Member, requested GAO conduct a review of the tactical communication acquisition programs underway in DHS.

The Subcommittee monitored the Department’s efforts to leverage strategic sourcing, as outlined in Federal guidance, to increase efficiencies. The Subcommittee Chair, along with the Chair of the Full Committee, requested GAO to examine the Department’s ammunition and weapons procurements.

The Subcommittee will monitor the cost, schedule, and performance status of major Department acquisition programs.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

In the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee oversaw the Department of Homeland Security’s progress to properly manage financial systems and data to minimize inefficient and wasteful spending, make more informed decisions to manage its programs and implement Department policies. The Subcommittee reviewed the Department’s efforts to enhance its managerial cost accounting, address internal control weaknesses in financial reporting, achieve a clean audit opinion on its financial statements, and reduce the reliance
on manual data calls to collect cost information from the various components and compile consolidated, reliable data. The Subcommittee Chair sent a letter to the Comptroller General on June 6, 2013 to sign-on to an ongoing review of DHS financial management efforts being performed at the request of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. GAO issued its report on September 30, 2013. It contained four recommendations for executive action. On July 8, 2013, Subcommittee Staff received a briefing from DHS's Chief Financial Officer regarding DHS's efforts to modernize its financial systems. On November 15, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Financial Management: Investigating DHS's Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars.” The purpose of the hearing was to examine the financial practices within DHS.

The Subcommittee will continue to monitor how efficiently the Department manages its finances.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT

During the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee reviewed the Department's efforts to address information technology (IT) challenges, including the management and integration of the Department's IT systems. The Subcommittee monitored the Department's progress in IT architectural planning, investment management, cloud computing, policy development, operations, and related personnel management. On March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “DHS Information Technology: How Effectively Has DHS Harnessed IT to Secure Our Borders and Uphold Immigration Laws?” The purpose of the hearing was to assess how IT resources are being effectively utilized to help secure our borders and uphold immigration laws and how the Department is exercising proper management and oversight of its IT investments. The Subcommittee Chair, along with the Chair of the Full Committee, also requested on May 23, 2013 to sign on to an ongoing GAO review of the TECS modernization program at the request of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

The Subcommittee will continue to monitor the Department's management of its information technology.

DEPARTMENTAL WORKFORCE

Throughout the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee monitored the Department's efforts to recruit and retain personnel and to address employee concerns set forth in the Office of Personnel Management's Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department's own personnel surveys, which have indicated morale problems across the Department. The Subcommittee Chair signed on to ongoing Government Accountability (GAO) work assessing DHS's recruitment and hiring strategies at the request of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. The GAO issued its report on September 17, 2013. It included one recommendation for executive action. On May 7, 2013, Subcommittee staff were briefed by the Chief Human Capital Officer on the Employee Engagement Executive Steering Committee and DHS Leadership training to address the morale issues at the Department.
The Subcommittee monitored the Department’s efforts to effectively and efficiently consolidate its headquarters from more than 40 locations throughout the National Capital Region, known as the St. Elizabeth’s Headquarters Consolidation Project. On March 15, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the Department of Homeland Security Consolidated Headquarters at St. Elizabeths. While on campus, Members toured the facility and were briefed by the Department on construction progress and the status of consolidation efforts. As a follow up to this site visit, the Subcommittee Chair requested on March 20, 2013, the GAO to conduct a comprehensive review of the consolidation project.

The Subcommittee will continue efforts to oversee the Department’s human capital management.

**EMPLOYEE INTEGRITY**

In the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee examined employee corruption and misconduct issues and their effect on homeland security. The Subcommittee reviewed Department statistics and case studies associated with employee integrity issues, as well as, the effectiveness of policies, procedures, and practices the Department utilizes to address such issues. The Subcommittee held a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Transportation Security on July 31, 2013, entitled “TSA Integrity Challenges: Examining Misconduct by Airport Security Personnel.” The purpose of the hearing was to examine the scope of misconduct within the Transportation Security Administration and determine to what extent action is being taken to address employee integrity issues. On August 19, 2013, the Subcommittee Chair sent a letter to the Secretary requesting an update on the Department’s mandated report on investigating corruption in DHS.

The Subcommittee will continue its oversight of DHS employee integrity issues.

**UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE**

In the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee examined the homeland security operations of the United States Secret Service, including its critical role of protecting the President of the United States, among other duties. On April 17, 2013, the Subcommittee held a member briefing with the Secret Service Director to discuss the Director’s goals and priorities, budget issues, Cartigena employee misconduct investigation, among other topics.

Subcommittee staff received a briefing from Secret Service officials on June 27, 2013 on the agency’s information technology modernization efforts. On August 8, 2013, Subcommittee staff also received a briefing on the next generation Presidential limousine program and conducted a site visit at the Secret Service mail screening facility in Washington D.C. On November 12, Members of the Subcommittee conducted a site visit to the Secret Service training facility in Beltsville, Maryland.

The Subcommittee will continue to examine operations of the United States Secret Service.
During the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee monitored the Department’s efforts to strike an appropriate balance between the need to combat terrorist attacks against the United States with the privacy expectations and civil rights of U.S. citizens. On February 6, 2013, the Members of the Subcommittee received a classified briefing on privacy issues and the role of the Department of Homeland Security and the National Counterterrorism Center in collecting, analyzing, and storing intelligence on U.S. persons. The Members were briefed by representatives from the Department and the National Counterterrorism Center, and they learned how the Center is implementing its new “Guidelines for Access, Retention, Use, & Dissemination of U.S. Persons Information.”

On June 19, 2013, Subcommittee staff received a briefing from officials from the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties on civil liberties concerns at border checkpoints.

The Subcommittee will continue to examine the Department’s balance between security and privacy and civil liberties.
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RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(A) Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.—The Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the "House") are the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security (the "Committee") and its subcommittees insofar as applicable.

(B) Applicability to Subcommittees.—Except where the terms “Full Committee” and “subcommittee” are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee's subcommittees and their respective Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members to the same extent as they apply to the Full Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(C) Appointments by the Chairman.—Clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the House shall govern the designation of a Vice Chairman of the Full Committee.

(D) Recommendation of Conferences.—Whenever the Speaker of the House is to appoint a conference committee on a matter within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker of the House conferees from the Full Committee. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall do so with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(E) Motions to Disagree.—The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(F) Committee Website.—The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee Members, other Members, and the public at large. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar web site for the same purposes. The official Committee web site shall display a link on its home page to the web site maintained by the Ranking Minority Member.

(G) Activity Report.—Not later than the 30th day after June 1 and December 1, the Committee shall submit to the House a semiannual report on the activities of the Committee. After ad-
journment *sine die* of a regular session of Congress, or after December 15, whichever occurs first, the Chair may file the second or fourth semiannual report with the Clerk at any time and without approval of the Committee provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

**RULE II.—TIME OF MEETINGS.**

(A) *Regular Meeting Date.*—The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Full Committee shall be at 10:00 a.m. on the first Wednesday that the House is in Session each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

(B) *Additional Meetings.*—At the discretion of the Chairman, additional meetings of the Committee may be scheduled for the consideration of any legislation or other matters pending before the Committee or to conduct other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(C) *Consideration.*—Except in the case of a special meeting held under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI, the determination of the business to be considered at each meeting of the Committee shall be made by the Chairman.

**RULE III.—NOTICE AND PUBLICATION.**

(A) *Notice.*—

(1) *Hearings.*—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing before the Full Committee or subcommittee, which may not commence earlier than one week after such notice. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. The names of all witnesses scheduled to appear at such hearing shall be provided to Members no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of such hearing.

(2) *Meetings.*—The date, time, place and subject matter of any meeting, other than a hearing or a regularly scheduled meeting, may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof except in the case of a special meeting called under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. These notice requirements may be waived if the Chairman with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business.
(a) Copies of any measure or matter to be considered for approval by the Committee at any meeting, including any mark, print or amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be provided to the Members at least 24 hours in advance.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter, the text of such measure or matter, including any mark, print or amendment in the nature of a substitute, shall be made publicly available in electronic form and, to the extent practicable, posted on the official Committee web site.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after concluding a meeting to consider a measure or matter, the text of such measure or matter as ordered forwarded or reported, including any adopted amendments, shall be made publicly available in electronic form and, to the extent practicable, posted on the official Committee web site.

(3) Publication.—The meeting or hearing announcement shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record. To the greatest extent practicable, meeting announcements shall be entered into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources.

RULE IV.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS; BROADCASTING.

(A) Open Meetings.—All meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except as provided by Rule XI of the Rules of the House or when the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by recorded vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, compromise sensitive law enforcement information, tend to defame, degrade or incriminate a witness, or violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

(B) Broadcasting.—Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee shall permit that hearing or meeting to be covered by television broadcast, internet broadcast, print media, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House. Priority shall be given by the Committee to members of the Press Galleries. Pursuant to clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the pro-
ceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(C) Transcripts.—A transcript shall be made of the testimony of each witness appearing before the Committee during a Committee hearing. All transcripts of meetings or hearings that are open to the public shall be made available.

RULE V.—PROCEDURES FOR MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.

(A) Opening Statements.—At any meeting of the Committee, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall be entitled to present oral opening statements of five minutes each. Other Members may submit written opening statements for the record. The Chairman presiding over the meeting may permit additional opening statements by other Members of the Full Committee or of that subcommittee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member.

(B) The Five—Minute Rule.—The time any one Member may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration by the Committee shall not exceed five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be extended when permitted by unanimous consent.

(C) Postponement of Vote.—The Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time, provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to notify Members of the resumption of such proceedings, including, when practicable, circulation of notice by the Clerk of the Committee. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(D) Contempt Procedures.—No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress shall be forwarded to the House unless and until the Full Committee has, upon notice to all its Members, met and considered the alleged contempt. The person to be cited for contempt shall be afforded, upon notice of at least 72 hours, an opportunity to state why he or she should not be held in contempt prior to a vote of the Full Committee, with a quorum being present, on the question whether to forward such recommendation to the House. Such statement shall be, in the discretion of the Chairman, either in writing or in person before the Full Committee.

RULE VI.—WITNESSES.

(A) Questioning of Witnesses.—

(1) Questioning of witnesses by Members will be conducted under the five—minute rule unless the Committee adopts a motion permitted by clause 2(j)(2) of House Rule XI.
(2) In questioning witnesses under the five—minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall first be recognized. In a subcommittee meeting or hearing, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee are then recognized. All other Members that arrive before the commencement of the meeting or hearing will be recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee, alternating between Majority and Minority Members. Committee Members arriving after the commencement of the hearing shall be recognized in order of appearance, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, after all Members present at the beginning of the hearing have been recognized. Each Member shall be recognized at least once before any Member is given a second opportunity to question a witness.

(3) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an extension of the period of questioning of a witness beyond five minutes but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority party and the Minority and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(4) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, or the Committee by motion, may permit Committee staff of the Majority and Minority to question a witness for a specified period of time, but the time allotted must be equally apportioned to the Majority and Minority staff and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(B) Minority Witnesses.—Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the Minority party Members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those Minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(C) Oath or Affirmation.—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(D) Statements by Witnesses.—

(1) Consistent with the notice given, witnesses shall submit a prepared or written statement for the record of the proceedings (including, where practicable, an electronic copy) with the Clerk of the Committee no less than 48 hours in advance of the witness’s appearance before the Committee. Unless the 48 hour requirement is waived or otherwise modified by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the failure to comply with this requirement may result in the exclusion of the written testimony from the hearing record and/or the barring of an oral presentation of the testimony. The Clerk of the Committee shall provide any such prepared or written statement submitted to the Clerk prior to the hearing to
the Members of the Committee prior to the commencement of the hearing.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a non—governmental capacity shall include a curriculum vita and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. Such disclosures shall be made publicly available, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

RULE VII.—QUORUM.

Quorum Requirements.—Two Members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence. One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for conducting business, except for (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings to the public, pursuant to Committee Rule IV; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. The Chairman shall make reasonable efforts, including consultation with the Ranking Minority Member when scheduling meetings and hearings, to ensure that a quorum for any purpose will include at least one Minority Member of the Committee.

RULE VIII.—DECORUM.

(A) Breaches of Decorum.—The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, by censure and exclusion from the hearing; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(B) Access to Dais.—Access to the dais before, during, and after a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee shall be limited to Members and staff of the Committee. Subject to availability of space on the dais, Committee Members’ personal staff may be present on the dais during a hearing if their employing Member is seated on the dais and during a markup or other meeting if their employing Member is the author of a measure or amendment under consideration by the Committee, but only during the time that the measure or amendment is under active consideration by the Committee, or otherwise at the discretion of the Chairman, or of the Ranking Minority Member for personal staff employed by a Minority Member.

(C) Wireless Communications Use Prohibited.—During a hearing, markup, or other meeting of the Committee, ringing or audible sounds or conversational use of cellular telephones or other electronic devices is prohibited in the Committee room.

RULE IX.—SUBCOMMITTEES.
(A) Generally.—The Full Committee shall be organized into the following six standing subcommittees and shall have specific responsibility for such measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it:

(1) Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security
(2) Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications
(3) Subcommittee on Transportation Security
(4) Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence
(5) Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies
(6) Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management

(B) Selection and Ratio of Subcommittee Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall select their respective Members of each subcommittee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the Full Committee, except that each subcommittee shall have at least two more Majority Members than Minority Members.

(C) Ex Officio Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall be ex officio members of each subcommittee but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before each subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall only be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(D) Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—Except as otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Full Committee, each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Full Committee on all matters within its purview. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee. To the greatest extent practicable, no more than one meeting and hearing should be scheduled for a given time.

(E) Special Voting Provision.—If a tie vote occurs in a Subcommittee on the question of forwarding any measure to the Full Committee, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for Full Committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the Subcommittee without recommendation.

RULE X.—COMMITTEE PANELS.

(A) Designation.—The Chairman of the Full Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of Members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that warrant enhanced consideration and to report to the Committee.
(B) **Duration.**—No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment.

(C) **Party Ratios and Appointment.**—Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority Members so appointed who does not currently chair another Subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(D) **Ex Officio Members.**—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each committee panel but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before a committee panel and shall not be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for any purpose other than taking testimony.

(E) **Jurisdiction.**—No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(F) **Applicability of Committee Rules.**—Any designated panel shall be subject to all Committee Rules herein.

**RULE XI.—REFERRALS TO SUBCOMMITTEES.**

Referral of Bills and Other Matters by Chairman.—Except for bills and other matters retained by the Chairman for Full Committee consideration, each bill or other matter referred to the Full Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to one or more subcommittees within two weeks of receipt by the Committee. In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Full Committee. Bills or other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned or discharged by the Chairman.

**RULE XII.—SUBPOENAS.**

(A) **Authorization.**—Pursuant to clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued under the seal of the House and attested by the Clerk of the House, and may be served by any person designated by the Full Committee for the furtherance of an investigation with authorization by—

(1) a majority of the Full Committee, a quorum being present; or

(2) the Chairman of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days pursuant to a concurrent resolution when, in the opinion of the Chairman of the Full Committee, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material or testimony set forth in the subpoena. The Chairman of the Full Committee shall notify Members of the Committee of the **authorization and**
issuance of a subpoena under this rule as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(B) Disclosure.—Provisions may be included in a subpoena with the concurrence of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, or by the Committee, to prevent the disclosure of the Full Committee’s demands for information when deemed necessary for the security of information or the progress of an investigation, including but not limited to prohibiting the revelation by witnesses and their counsel of Full Committee’s inquiries.

(C) Subpoena duces tecum.—A subpoena duces tecum may be issued whose return to the Committee Clerk shall occur at a time and place other than that of a regularly scheduled meeting.

(D) Affidavits and Depositions.—The Chairman of the Full Committee, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, or the Committee may authorize the taking of an affidavit or deposition with respect to any person who is subpoenaed under these rules but who is unable to appear in person to testify as a witness at any hearing or meeting. Notices for the taking of depositions shall specify the date, time and place of examination. Depositions shall be taken under oath administered by a Member or a person otherwise authorized by law to administer oaths. Prior consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall include written notice three business days before any deposition is scheduled to provide an opportunity for Minority staff to be present during the questioning.

RULE XIII.—COMMITTEE STAFF.

(A) Generally.—Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of House Rule X and must be eligible to be considered for routine access to classified information.

(B) Staff Assignments.—For purposes of these rules, Committee staff means the employees of the Committee, detailees, fellows, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for, or at the request of, the Committee. All such persons shall be either Majority, Minority, or shared staff. The Chairman shall appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise, and may remove Majority staff. The Ranking Minority Member shall appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise, and may remove Minority staff. In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may appoint, determine remuneration of, supervise and may remove shared staff that is assigned to service of the Committee. The Chairman shall certify Committee staff appointments, including appointments by the Ranking Minority Member, as required.

(C) Divulgence of Information.—Prior to the public acknowledgment by the Chairman or the Committee of a decision to initiate an investigation of a particular person, entity, or subject, no member of the Committee staff shall knowingly divulge
to any person any information, including non—classified information, which comes into his or her possession by virtue of his or her status as a member of the Committee staff, if the member of the Committee staff has a reasonable expectation that such information may alert the subject of a Committee investigation to the existence, nature, or substance of such investigation, unless authorized to do so by the Chairman or the Committee.

RULE XIV.—COMMITTEE MEMBER AND COMMITTEE STAFF TRAVEL.

(A) Approval of Travel.—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any Committee Member or Committee staff shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member or Committee staff only in connection with official Committee business, such as the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and meetings, conferences, site visits, and investigations that involve activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Full Committee.

(1) Proposed Travel by Majority Party Committee Members and Committee Staff.—In the case of proposed travel by Majority party Committee Members or Committee staff, before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following: (a) the purpose of the travel; (b) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (c) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; (d) the estimated total cost of the travel; and (e) the names of Members and staff seeking authorization. On the basis of that information, the Chairman shall determine whether the proposed travel is for official Committee business, concerns a subject matter under the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, and is not excessively costly in view of the Committee business proposed to be conducted.

(2) Proposed Travel by Minority Party Committee Members and Committee Staff.—In the case of proposed travel by Minority party Committee Members or Committee staff, the Ranking Minority Member shall provide to the Chairman a written representation setting forth the information specified in items (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of subparagraph (1) and his or her determination that such travel complies with the other requirements of subparagraph (1).

(B) Foreign Travel.—All Committee Members and Committee staff requests for foreign travel must include a written representation setting forth the information specified in items (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of subparagraph (A)(1) and be submitted to the Chairman not fewer than ten business days prior to the start of the travel. Within thirty days of the conclusion of any
such foreign travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Chairman a written report summarizing the information gained as a result of the travel in question, or other Committee objectives served by such travel. The requirements of this section may be waived or abridged by the Chairman.

(C) Compliance with Committee Travel Policy and Guidelines.—Travel must be in accordance with the Committee Travel Policy and Guidelines, as well as with House Rules, the Travel Guidelines and Regulations and any additional guidance set forth by the Committee on Ethics and the Committee on House Administration. Committee Members and staff shall follow these rules, policies, guidelines, and regulations in requesting and proceeding with any Committee-related travel.

RULE XV.—CLASSIFIED AND CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(A) Security Precautions.—Committee staff offices, including Majority and Minority offices, shall operate under strict security precautions administered by the Security Officer of the Committee. A security officer shall be on duty at all times during normal office hours. Classified documents and controlled unclassified information (CUI)—formerly known as sensitive but unclassified (SBU) information—may be destroyed, discussed, examined, handled, reviewed, stored, transported and used only in an appropriately secure manner in accordance with all applicable laws, executive orders, and other governing authorities. Such documents may be removed from the Committee's offices only in furtherance of official Committee business. Appropriate security procedures, as determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall govern the handling of such documents removed from the Committee's offices.

(B) Temporary Custody of Executive Branch Material.—Executive branch documents or other materials containing classified information in any form that were not made part of the record of a Committee hearing, did not originate in the Committee or the House, and are not otherwise records of the Committee shall, while in the custody of the Committee, be segregated and maintained by the Committee in the same manner as Committee records that are classified. Such documents and other materials shall be returned to the Executive branch agency from which they were obtained at the earliest practicable time.

(C) Access by Committee Staff.—Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to Committee staff members with appropriate security clearances and a need—to-know, as determined by the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, and under the direction of the Majority or Minority Staff Directors.

(D) Maintaining Confidentiality.—No Committee Member or Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, to any person who is not a Committee Member or authorized Committee staff for any purpose or in connection
with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, any testimony given before the Committee in executive session. Classified information and controlled unclassified information (CUI) shall be handled in accordance with all applicable laws, executive orders, and other governing authorities and consistently with the provisions of these rules and Committee procedures.

(E) Oath.—Before a Committee Member or Committee staff may have access to classified information, the following oath (or affirmation) shall be executed:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will not disclose any classified information received in the course of my service on the Committee on Homeland Security, except as authorized by the Committee or the House of Representatives or in accordance with the Rules of such Committee or the Rules of the House.

Copies of the executed oath (or affirmation) shall be retained by the Clerk of the Committee as part of the records of the Committee.

(F) Disciplinary Action.—The Chairman shall immediately consider disciplinary action in the event any Committee Member or Committee staff member fails to conform to the provisions of these rules governing the disclosure of classified or unclassified information. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not be limited to, immediate dismissal from the Committee staff, criminal referral to the Justice Department, and notification of the Speaker of the House. With respect to Minority staff, the Chairman shall consider such disciplinary action in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE XVI.—COMMITTEE RECORDS.

(A) Committee Records.—Committee Records shall constitute all data, charts and files in possession of the Committee and shall be maintained in accordance with clause 2(e) of House Rule XI.

(B) Legislative Calendar.—The Clerk of the Committee shall maintain a printed calendar for the information of each Committee Member showing any procedural or legislative measures considered or scheduled to be considered by the Committee, and the status of such measures and such other matters as the Committee determines shall be included. The calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes. A copy of such revisions shall be made available to each Member of the Committee upon request.

(C) Members Right To Access.—Members of the Committee and of the House shall have access to all official Committee Records. Access to Committee files shall be limited to examination within the Committee offices at reasonable times. Access to Committee Records that contain classified information shall be provided in a manner consistent with these rules.

(D) Removal of Committee Records.—Files and records of the Committee are not to be removed from the Committee offices.
No Committee files or records that are not made publicly available shall be photocopied by any Member.

(E) **Executive Session Records.**—Evidence or testimony received by the Committee in executive session shall not be released or made available to the public unless agreed to by the Committee. Members may examine the Committee’s executive session records, but may not make copies of, or take personal notes from, such records.

(F) **Availability of Committee Records.**—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action including recorded votes and attendance at hearings and meetings. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of each amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, including the name of the Member who offered the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against each such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, as well as the names of those Members present but not voting. Such record shall be made available to the public at reasonable times within the Committee offices and also made publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site within 48 hours of such record vote.

(G) **Separate and Distinct.**—All Committee records and files must be kept separate and distinct from the office records of the Members serving as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. Records and files of Members’ personal offices shall not be considered records or files of the Committee.

(H) **Disposition of Committee Records.**—At the conclusion of each Congress, non—current records of the Committee shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House.

(I) **Archived Records.**—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of noncurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

**RULE XVII. COMMITTEE RULES.**

(A) **Availability of Committee Rules in Electronic Form.**—Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall make its rules publicly available in electronic form and posted on the official Committee web site and shall submit such rules for publication in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chairman of the Committee is elected in each odd—numbered year.
(B) Changes to Committee Rules.—These rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Full Committee provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each Member at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken and such changes are not inconsistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.
APPENDIX II

Membership Changes

January 2013

On January 3, 2013, Mr. Michael T. McCaul of Texas was elected as Chair, and Mr. Bennie G. Thompson of Mississippi as Ranking Member pursuant to H. Res. 6 and H. Res. 7, respectively. Minority Members were elected to the Committee on January 3, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 7. Majority Members were elected to the Committee on January 4, 2013, pursuant to H. Res. 17.

Ms. Janice Hahn of California resigned as a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security on January 14, 2013; and Mr. Filemon Vela of Texas, Mr. Steven A. Horsford of Nevada, and Mr. Eric Swalwell of California were elected to the Committee pursuant to H. Res. 22.

The Committee on Homeland Security Membership and Subcommittee Membership was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas, Chairman

LAMAR SMITH, Texas
PETER T. KING, New York
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
KEITH J. ROTHFUS, Pennsylvania
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
ERIC SWALWELL, California

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman

PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas

BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
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## Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security

**Candice S. Miller, Michigan, Chairman**

**Jeff Duncan, South Carolina**
**Tom Marino, Pennsylvania**
**Steven M. Palazzo, Mississippi**
**Lou Barletta, Pennsylvania**
**Chris Stewart, Utah**
**Michael T. McCaul, Texas**

(ex officio)

**Sheila Jackson Lee, Texas**
**Loretta Sanchez, California**
**Beto O’Rourke, Texas**
**Tulsi Gabbard, Hawaii**
**Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi**

## Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies

**Patrick Meehan, Pennsylvania, Chairman**

**Mike Rogers, Alabama**
**Jason Chaffetz, Utah**
**Keith J. Rothfus, Pennsylvania**
**Scott Perry, Pennsylvania**
**Michael T. McCaul, Texas**

(ex officio)

**Yvette D. Clarke, New York**
**William R. Keating, Massachusetts**
**Filemon Vela, Texas**
**Steven A. Horsford, Nevada**
**Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi**

## Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency

**Jeff Duncan, South Carolina, Chairman**

**Paul C. Broun, Georgia**
**Keith J. Rothfus, Pennsylvania**
**Richard Hudson, North Carolina**
**Steve Daines, Montana**
**Michael T. McCaul, Texas**

(ex officio)

**Ron Barber, Arizona**
**Donald M. Payne, Jr., New Jersey**
**Beto O’Rourke, Texas**
**Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi**

## Subcommittee on Transportation Security

**Richard Hudson, North Carolina, Chairman**

**Mike Rogers, Alabama**
**Candice S. Miller, Michigan**
**Lou Barletta, Pennsylvania**
**Susan W. Brooks, Indiana**
**Michael T. McCaul, Texas**

(ex officio)

**Cedric L. Richmond, Louisiana,**
**Sheila Jackson Lee, Texas**
**Eric Swalwell, California**
**Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi**

## Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications

**Susan W. Brooks, Indiana, Chairman**

**Peter T. King, New York**
**Tom Marino, Pennsylvania**
**Steven M. Palazzo, Mississippi**
**Scott Perry, Pennsylvania**
**Michael T. McCaul, Texas**

(ex officio)

**Donald M. Payne, Jr., New Jersey**
**Yvette D. Clarke, New York**
**Brian Higgins, New York**
**Bennie G. Thompson, Mississippi**
Mr. Keith J. Rothfus of Pennsylvania resigned as a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security on April 16, 2013.

The Committee on Homeland Security Membership and Subcommittee Memberships was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas, Chairman

LAMAR SMITH, Texas
PETER T. KING, New York
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
VACANCY

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSEFORD, Nevada
ERIC SWALWELL, California

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman

PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
VACANCY

(ex officio)

(sub officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY

CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
VACANCY

(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, AND SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania, Chairman

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
VACANCY
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSEFORD, Nevada
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
VACANCY

(ex officio)

(ex officio)
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SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, Chairman
P A U L  C. B R O U N, Georgia
R I C H A R D  H U D S O N, North Carolina
S T E V E  D A I N E S, Montana
V A C A N C Y
M I C H A E L  T. M C C A U L, Texas
(ex officio)

R O N  B A R B E R, Arizona
D O N A L D  M. P A Y N E, Jr., New Jersey
B E T O  O' R O U B E R, Texas
B R E N N I E  G. T H O M P S O N, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

R I C H A R D  H U D S O N, North Carolina, Chairman
M I K E  R O G E R S, Alabama
C A N D I C E  S. M I L L E R, Michigan
L O U  B A R L E T T A, Pennsylvania
S U S A N  W. B R O O K S, Indiana
M I C H A E L  T. M C C A U L, Texas
(ex officio)

C E D R I C  L. R I C H M O N D, Louisiana,
Ranking Member
S H E I L A  J A C K S O N  L E E, Texas
E R I C  S W A L W E L L, California
B R E N N I E  G. T H O M P S O N, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND COMMUNICATIONS

S U S A N  W. B R O O K S, Indiana, Chairman
P E T E R  T. K I N G, New York
T O M  M A R I N O, Pennsylvania
S T E V E N  M. P A L A Z Z O, Mississippi
S C O T T  P E R R Y, Pennsylvania
M I C H A E L  T. M C C A U L, Texas
(ex officio)

D O N A L D  M. P A Y N E, Jr., New Jersey
Y V E T T E  D. C L A R K E, New York
B R I A N  H I G G I N S, New York
B R E N N I E  G. T H O M P S O N, Mississippi
(ex officio)
June 2013

Mr. Mark Sanford of South Carolina was elected to the Committee pursuant to H. Res. 257 on June 12, 2013.

The Committee on Homeland Security Membership and Subcommittee Memberships was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas, Chairman

LAMAR SMITH, Texas
PETER T. KING, New York
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
ERIC SWALWELL, California

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman

PAUL C. BROWN, Georgia
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas (ex officio)

BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY

CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas (ex officio)

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY, INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION, AND SECURITY TECHNOLOGIES

PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania, Chairman

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas (ex officio)

YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, Chairman

PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
BRINNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina, Chairman

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana,
Ranking Member
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
ERIC SWALWELL, California
BRINNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND COMMUNICATIONS

SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana, Chairman

PETER T. KING, New York
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
BRINNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)
August 2013

On August 1, 2013, the Chair announced the appointments of Vice Chairs for the Subcommittees.

The Committee on Homeland Security Membership and Subcommittee Memberships was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. MCCaul, Texas, Chairman

LAMAR SMITH, Texas, Chairman
PETER T. KING, New York
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
Tom Marino, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Vice Chair
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
ERIC Swalwell, California

BRIAN HIGGINS, New York, Chairman

PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania, Vice Chair
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
MICHAEL T. MCCaul, Texas (ex officio)

BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, Chairman
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STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
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MICHAEL T. MCCaul, Texas (ex officio)

SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)
Mr. Chris Stewart of Utah resigned as a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security on April 16, 2013.

The Committee on Homeland Security Membership and Subcommittee Memberships was as follows:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas, Chairman
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MIKE ROGERS, Alabama                                SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
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TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania                           RON BARBER, Arizona
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah                                DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
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STEVE DAINES, Montana                              STEVEN A. HORSEFORD, Nevada
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana                            ERIC SWALWELL, California
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MARK SANFORD, South Carolina                       VACANCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COUNTERTERRORISM AND INTELLIGENCE

PETER T. KING, New York, Chairman
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MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas                            (ex officio)
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CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman
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STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi                      BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania                         TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
VACANCY                                             BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (ex officio)
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas                            (ex officio)
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MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TIM MURDO, Pennsylvania
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
STEVE DAINES, Montana
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania, Vice Chair
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)
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WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
FILEMON VELA, Texas
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, Chairman

PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina
STEVE DAINES, Montana, Vice Chair
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

RON BARBER, Arizona
DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
BETO O’ROURKE, Texas
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina, Chairman

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, Vice Chair
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana, Ranking Member
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
ERICA SWALWELL, California
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND COMMUNICATIONS

SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana, Chairman

PETER T. KING, New York
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi, Vice Chair
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. McCaul, Texas
(ex officio)

DONALD M. PAYNE, Jr., New Jersey
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
(ex officio)
## APPENDIX III

### List of Public Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Law</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113–27</td>
<td>August 9, 2013</td>
<td>H.R. 1344</td>
<td>&quot;HELPING HEROES FLY ACT&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.
**APPENDIX IV**

**Committee Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.Rpt. 113–87, H.R. 1417</td>
<td>Border Security Results Act of 2013</td>
<td>To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes. Filed May 20, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.Rpt. 113–274, H.R. 1095</td>
<td>TSA Loose Change Act</td>
<td>To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes, with an amendment. Filed November 21, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.Rpt. 113–275, H.R. 2719</td>
<td>Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act</td>
<td>To require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment. Filed November 21, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rpt. 113–294, H.R. 3107</td>
<td>Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act</td>
<td>To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish cybersecurity occupation classifications, assess the cybersecurity workforce, develop a strategy to address identified gaps in the cybersecurity workforce, and for other purposes. Filed December 12, 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

Status of Legislation Referred to the Committee

PUBLIC LAWS

Pub. Law 112–54 H.R. 1444.—Helping Heroes Fly Act. To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes. Referred to Homeland Security Mar. 21, 2013. Rules suspended. Passed House amended May 21, 2013; Roll No. 166: 413-0. Received in Senate and referred to Commerce, Science and Transportation May 22, 2013.

LEGISLATION IN THE SENATE


H.R. 1204.—Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013. To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Ad-


LEGISLATION REPORTED TO THE HOUSE

H.R. 1417 (S. 683).—Border Security Results Act of 2013. To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy to gain and maintain operational control of the international borders of the United States, and for other purposes. Referred to Homeland Security Apr. 9, 2013. Reported amended May 20, 2013; Rept. 113–87.


LEGISLATION ORDERED TO BE REPORTED TO THE HOUSE

APPENDIX VI

Executive Communications, Memorials, Petitions and Presidential Messages

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Executive Communication 651

Executive Communication 2178

Executive Communication 3765

Executive Communication 3782

MEMORIALS

Memorial 38
May 24, 2013—Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4 urging the federal government to fund necessary improvements at the San Ysidro, Calexico, and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry.

Memorial 39
May 24, 2013—Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4 urging the federal government to fund necessary improvements at the San Ysidro, Calexico, and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry.

Memorial 119
July 31, 2013—Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 119 memorializing Congress to establish a task force to study and make recommendations relative to implementation of the Federal REAL ID Act of 2005 in Louisiana.
Presidential Message 8

APPENDIX VII

Committee Staff

MAJORITY STAFF

Greg Hill, Chief of Staff
Paul Anstine, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security
Jennifer Arangio, Sr. Counsel
Diana Bergwin, Professional Staff Member
Kate Bonvechio, Professional Staff Member
Mandy Bowers, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence
Luke Burke, Sr. Professional Staff Member
Robert Carretta, Advisor for Transportation Security / DHS Reauthorization
Alan Carroll, Professional Staff Member
Ryan Consaul, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency
April Corbett, Press Secretary / Director of Digital Media
Brett DeWitt, Sr. Advisor for Cybersecurity
Laura Fullerton, Sr. Advisor for Strategy and Coalitions
Tina Garcia, Staff Assistant
Michael Geffroy, Deputy Chief of Staff / Chief Counsel
Steven Giaier, Parliamentarian / Counsel
Nicole Halavik, Professional Staff Member
Eric Heighberger, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications
Deborah Jordan, Subcommittee Clerk
Joshua Katz, Advisor
Kerry Kinirons, Sr. Counsel
Kyle Klein, Professional Staff Member
Tom Leonard, Advisor for Border Security
Alex Manning, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies
Natalie Matson, Staff Assistant
Dirk Maurer, Counsel
Kyle McFarland, Assistant Security Director
Jason Miller, Sr. Professional Staff Member
Margaret Anne Moore, Special Assistant / Press Assistant
James Murphy, Professional Staff Member
John Neal, Professional Staff Member
Joan O’Hara, Deputy Chief Counsel
R. Nicholas Palarino, Deputy Chief of Staff Member / Policy
Amanda Parikh, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Transportation Security

(185)
Meghann Peterlin, Sr. Professional Staff Member / Security Director
Erik Peterson, Staff Assistant
Michael Rosen, Sr. Advisor
Bradley Saull, Professional Staff Member
Charlotte Sellmeyer, Communications Director
Dennis Terry, Subcommittee Clerk
Jake Vreeburg, Deputy Parliamentarian

MINORITY STAFF
I. Lanier Avant, Staff Director
Moira Bergin, Sr. Professional Staff Member
Cherri Branson, Chief Counsel for Oversight
Rosaline Cohen, Chief Counsel for Legislation
Adam M. Comis, Communications Director
Shante Gauthier, Executive Assistant
Hope Goins, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence Director and Counsel
Claytrice Henderson, Legislative Assistant
Cory Horton, Professional Staff Member
Nicole Wade Johnson, Office Manager
Deborah R. Mack, Professional Staff Member
Alison B. Northrop, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security Director
K. Christopher Schepis, Sr. Professional Staff Member
Tamla T. Scott, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiencies Director
Nicole Tisdale, Sr. Professional Staff Member / Counsel
Brian B. Turbyfill, Subcommittee on Transportation Security Director
Shaun West, Professional Staff Member

SHARED COMMITTEE STAFF
Dawn M. Criste, Chief Financial Officer
Michael S. Twinchek, Chief Clerk
Natalie Nixon, Deputy Chief Clerk / Administrator
Heather Crowell, GPO Detailee, Printer

FORMER MAJORITY STAFF
Ellen Carlin, Professional Staff
Kevin Carroll, Sr. Counsel
Kevin Gunderson, Sr. Professional Staff
Zach Harris, Assistant Security Director / Professional Staff
Michael McAdams, Deputy Press Secretary
James Meek, Advisor for Counterterrorism
Krista Powers, Professional Staff
Mary Rose Rooney, Professional Staff Member
Monica Sanders, Sr. Counsel / Investigator
Michael Spierto, Professional Staff Member
Kerry Ann Watkins, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence
FORMER MINORITY STAFF

Hillary Anderson, Research Assistant
Pizza Ashby, Professional Staff Member
Curtis Brown, Professional Staff Member
Synarus Greene, Professional Staff Member
Marisela Salayandia, Sr. Professional Staff Member
Charles Snyder, Professional Staff Member
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Witnesses

— A —


- EPRC, July 9, 2013, “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.”

AHERN, JAYSON, Principal, Chertoff Group.


ALDEN, EDWARD, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations.


ALLEN, THAD, (ADM, Ret.), Senior Vice President, Booz Allen Hamilton.


ASHWOOD, ALBERT, Chairman, NEMA Legislative Committee, Director, Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management, Testifying on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association.

- EPRC, July 9, 2013, “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.”

ASTRUE, MICHAEL, Former Social Security Commissioner, Former U.S. Department of Health and Human Services General Counsel.


— B —

BARFI, BARAK, Research Fellow, New America Foundation.


BECKERMAN, MICHAEL, President and CEO, The Internet Association.


BEIJTLICH, RICHARD, Chief Security Officer and Security Services Architect, Mandiant.
- CIPST, Mar. 20, 2013, “Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure.”


**BERCERRA, XAVIER,** a Representative in Congress from the 34th District, State of California.

**BERMAN, ILAN,** Vice President, American Foreign Policy Council.
- CIPST, Mar. 20, 2013, “Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure.”
- OME, July 9, 2013, “Threat to the Homeland: Iran’s Extending Influence in the Western Hemisphere.”

**BERNICK, CATHLEEN,** Managing Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues, Government Accountability Office.

**BERTEAU, DAVID J.**, Senior Vice President and Director, International Security Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

**BHIMANI, ANISH B.**, Chairman, Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center.
- FULL, Mar. 13, 2013, “DHS Cybersecurity: Roles and Responsibilities to Protect the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure.”

**BIDDLE, STEPHEN,** Adjunct Senior Fellow for Defense Policy, Council on Foreign Relations.


**BLANK, JONAH,** PhD, Senior Political Analyst, The RAND Corporation.
- CTI, June 12, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Protecting the Homeland Against Mumbai-Style Attacks and the Threat from Lashkar-e-Taiba.”

**BORER, DAVID A.**, General Counsel, American Federation of Government Employees.
- TS, Apr. 11, 2013, “TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security: Stakeholder Perspectives.”


**BOWEN, MARK,** Sheriff, Hamilton County, Indiana.
BRANIFF, BILL, Executive Director, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, University of Maryland.

BROWNE, CHRISTOPHER U., Airport Manager, Washington Dulles International Airport, testifying on behalf of the American Association of Airport Executives.
- TS, Apr. 11, 2013, “TSA’s Efforts to Advance Risk-Based Security: Stakeholder Perspectives.”

— C —

Caine, Virginia, Dr., Director, Public Health Administration, Marion County (IN) Public Health Department.


Callahan, Mary Ellen, Partner, Jenner & Block and Former Chief Privacy Officer, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Cardenas, Jorge L., Vice President, Asset Management and Centralized Services, Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc.

Chao, Henry, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Deputy Director of the Office of Information Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- CIPST and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, Jul. 17, 2013, “Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with ObamaCare’s Information Sharing Apparatus.”

Chung, Luke, President, FMS, Inc.

- CIPST, Mar. 20, 2013, “Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure.”
- CTI, Sep. 18, 2013, “Understanding the Threat to the Homeland from AQAP.”

Cohen, John, Deputy Counterterrorism Coordinator and Senior Advisor to the Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Cole, Leonard, Dr., Newark, New Jersey.
- CTIA, Apr. 25, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Counterterrorism Efforts to Combat a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Attack on the Homeland.”

- TS, Jul. 17, 2013, “Stakeholder Perspectives on TSA Acquisition Reform.”

CORNYN, JOHN, Senator, State of Texas.


— D —

DADDARIO, RICHARD, Deputy Commissioner for Counterterrorism, New York City Police Department.

- CTIApril 25, 2013, the Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Counterterrorism Efforts to Combat a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Attack on the Homeland.”

DALY, KAY, Assistant Inspector General, Audit Services, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.


DAVIS, EDWARD F., III, Commissioner, Boston Police Department.


DeFRANCIS, SUZANNE C., Chief Public Affairs Officer, American Red Cross.

- EPRC, July 9, 2013, “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How #SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.”

DERIG, PAUL, Environmental Health and Safety Manager III, J.R. Simplot Company, testifying on behalf of the Agricultural Retailers Association.


DICKEN, JOHN, Director, Health Care, U.S. Government Accountability Office.

- CIPST and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, Jul. 17, 2013, “Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with ObamaCare’s Information Sharing Apparatus.”


DIPPEL, DONNIE, President, Texas Ag Industries Association.


DUNCAN, ALAN R., Assistant Inspector General for Security and Information Technology Services, Inspector General for Tax Administration, Department of the Treasury.

- CIPST and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, Jul. 17, 2013, “Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with ObamaCare’s Information Sharing Apparatus.”

DUNLAP, KEN, Global Director, Security & Travel Facilitation, International Air Transport Association.
- CIPST, May 16, 2013, “Facilitating Cyber Threat Information Sharing and Partnering with the Private Sector to Protect Critical Infrastructure: An Assessment of DHS Capabilities.”
- OME, Nov. 14, 2013, “TSA’s SPOT Program and Initial Lessons From the LAX Shooting.”

ENGLISH, CHARLEY, Director, Georgia Emergency Management Agency, testifying on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association.

ERVIN, CLARK KENT, Partner, Patton Boggs, LLP.

ESCOBAR, VERONICA, El Paso County Judge, El Paso, Texas.

FAIR, C. CHRISTINE, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Georgetown University, Security Studies Program in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.
- CTI, June 12, 2013, “Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Protecting the Homeland Against Mumbai-Style Attacks and the Threat from Lashkar-e-Taiba.”

FALCONER, DOLAN P., JR., Co-Founder, Chairman & General Manager, Scan Tech Holdings.
- TS, Jul. 17, 2013, “Stakeholder Perspectives on TSA Acquisition Reform.”

FARAH, DOUGLAS, President, IBI Consultants.
- OME, Nov. 9, 2013, “Threat to the Homeland: Iran’s Extending Influence in the Western Hemisphere.”


FISHER, ERIC A., PhD, Senior Specialist, Science and Technology, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

FISHER, MICHAEL J., Chief, Border Patrol, Department of Homeland Security.
FREEMAN, GEOFF, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President, U.S. Travel Association.


GHILARDUCCI, MARK, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES, testifying on behalf of the National Governors Association and the Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council.

GILMORE, JAMES, III, President, Free Congress Foundation.


HAYES, GARY W., Chief Information Officer, Centerpoint Energy.

HENRY, SHAWN, President, CrowdStrike Services.

HILL, JOHN, Executive Director, Indiana Department of Homeland Security.

HOFFMAN, BRUCE, Professor and Director, Center for Peace and Security Studies and Security, Georgetown University.

HUMIRE, JOSEPH M., Executive Director, Center for a Secure Free Society.

HUFFMAN, BRUCE, Professor and Director, Center for Peace and Security Studies and Security, Georgetown University.

JENSEN, ROBERT, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

JONES, SETH G., Ph.D., Associate Director, International Security and Defense Policy Center.

JOSCELYN, THOMAS, Senior Fellow, Foundation for the Defense of Democracies.

JUDD, BRANDON, President, National Border Patrol Council.

KATULIS, BRIAN, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress.

KELLEY, COLLEEN M., NATIONAL PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL TREASURY EMPLOYEES UNION.


• EPRC, July 9, 2013, “Emergency MGMT 2.0: How SocialMedia & New Tech are Transforming Preparedness, Response, & Recovery #Disasters #Part2 #Govt/NGOs.”

KILLOUGH, CRAIG, Vice President, Organization Markets, Project Management Institute.
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Additional Views
ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON

During the 113th Congress, Democratic Members of the Homeland Security Committee have diligently worked to assure that the programs, policies, and practices of the Department of Homeland Security are effective and efficient in: safeguarding the nation from the terrorist threat; addressing the destructive impact of natural disasters; mitigating known and unknown vulnerabilities; and ensuring resiliency in the operation of both publicly- and privately-owned facilities and infrastructures. The Democratic Members are committed to protecting the homeland. In the event of a terrorist attack or other catastrophic occurrence, the Democratic Members of the Committee will work to ensure that the well-being of each impacted American is the paramount interest of Congress.

The work undertaken by the Democratic Members of this Committee has taken various forms, including introducing legislation, arranging briefings from Administration officials, and sending oversight requests to the Department of Homeland Security. Most importantly, these efforts have been a continuation of work done by the Democratic Majority in the 110th and 111th Congresses. Despite minority status, Democrats have found a way to follow through on our earlier efforts designed to protect the American people.

Under the Rules of the House, Activity Reports are intended to reflect a comprehensive review of a Committee's legislative and oversight activities. The goal must be to produce a report of the highest caliber to inform our constituents—the American taxpayer—of the actions we have taken on their behalf.

Unfortunately, in producing the Activity Report, the Majority opted to include meetings and other actions that were neither officially noticed under the rules of the House nor committee proceedings. The report contains several instances of vague, dateless references to meetings between Majority staff and external, non-governmental stakeholders. The Minority was neither invited to these meetings nor informed of their occurrence. These one-party undertakings are referenced in the report as “committee” activities. While the Committee has generally enjoyed bipartisan cooperation, Minority requests that these references be changed to reflect their true nature were rejected.

The occurrence of these one-party meetings raises questions about the influence these non-governmental stakeholders may have had on the work of this Committee. Alternatively, it is unclear whether these meetings had any goal or purpose.

To identify inaccuracies is not intended to raise the implication that the actions were taken for partisan reasons. Given the nature of many of the events, it is likely that if informed, the Minority would have participated.
However, the reality remains that the Minority was not informed. The Activity Report should be an accurate representation of Committee's actions. One-party activities undertaken without appropriate notice should not be re-defined as “Committee” activities. The exclusion of the Minority, either purposely or unintentionally, makes these events ineligible to be considered “Committee” activities:

Below is a sample of the meetings and other events that Minority Members and staff were not invited to attend or were not officially noticed, and therefore, should not be included in the Committee's Activity Report:

On January 28, 2013, Committee staff attended a roundtable to gain stakeholder perspectives on FirstNet and the development of the National Public Safety Broadband Network (PSBN).

On February 7–8, 2013, the Chair of the CIPST Subcommittee and staff traveled to New York City, New York, to receive briefings from representatives of the financial services sector.

On February 22, 2013, Committee staff met with representatives of the Office of Emergency Communications to discuss the Department of Homeland Security's role on the FirstNet board and with the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC).

On February 25, 2013, Committee staff met with the Director of Texas A&M University’s Foreign and Zoonotic Disease Defense (FAZD) Center to receive a briefing of FAZD’s biosurveillance efforts.

On March 20, 2013, the Chairs of the Full Committee and the Subcommittee received an update from the TSA Administrator on TSA’s Screening Partnership Program.

On June 19, 2013, the Chair of the OME Subcommittee met with the Director of FLETC, to obtain an overview of FLETC’s operations.


On August 14–15, 2013, Committee staff visited Texas A&M University to observe homeland security and emergency management training programs at the Texas Engineering Extension Service and learn about other homeland security programs conducted by Texas A&M.

On October 30, 2013, CIPST Subcommittee staff received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Homeland Security regarding the progress of the government-wide adoption of the $6 billion Continuous Diagnostic and Mitigation Program, which will consolidate Federal cybersecurity practices under one set of requirements and to ascertain contract awards and timelines for deployment.

The Minority looks forward to continuing a bipartisan and cooperative relationship with the Majority and hopes that the Second Session of the 113th Congress will not involve one-party meetings and events that should rightfully involve Members of the Committee, regardless of party affiliation.
This Committee’s mission—safeguarding the nation from the terrorist threat; addressing the destructive impact of natural disasters; mitigating known and unknown vulnerabilities; and ensuring resiliency in the operation of both publicly and privately-owned facilities and infrastructures—must not be undermined by partisan division.

Bennie G. Thompson.