

are also faced with unique challenges, particularly when it comes to healthcare. S. 2278 will enable States to maintain and improve upon healthcare in rural areas by reauthorizing grants to State Offices of Rural Health.

Grantees will be required to maintain a clearinghouse for collecting and disseminating information on rural healthcare issues, research related to rural healthcare, as well as innovative approaches to rural healthcare delivery. The grantees will also be tasked with identifying both Federal and State programs to address rural health and to provide technical assistance to public and nonprofit private entities regarding participation in these programs.

State Offices of Rural Health provide much value to the 57 million Americans that live in these areas around the country. Many of us represent towns and counties that are largely dependent upon the strength of rural Members of Congress. For these reasons, I ask Members to join me in supporting S. 2278.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, again, of the legislation before us.

I want to commend Congressmen SCHRADER and MULLIN for their great work on this important legislation. It shows great sensitivity to the healthcare needs of rural America and to the corresponding health delivery systems. For that reason alone, this is worthy of our unanimous support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle, my colleagues who have worked so hard on this legislation, and, frankly, our friends in the Senate, as well, who worked with us on this. We are glad to bring this to a conclusion and another very important healthcare bill will make its way to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2278.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 7279) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for an integrated planning process, to promote green infrastructure, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Water Infrastructure Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) MUNICIPALITY.—The term “municipality” has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362).

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED PLANS.

(a) INTEGRATED PLANS.—Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) INTEGRATED PLANS.—

“(1) DEFINITION OF INTEGRATED PLAN.—In this subsection, the term ‘integrated plan’ means a plan developed in accordance with the Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework, issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012.

“(2) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator (or a State, in the case of a permit program approved by the Administrator) shall inform municipalities of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan that may be incorporated into a permit under this section.

“(3) SCOPE.—

“(A) SCOPE OF PERMIT INCORPORATING INTEGRATED PLAN.—A permit issued under this section that incorporates an integrated plan may integrate all requirements under this Act addressed in the integrated plan, including requirements relating to—

“(i) a combined sewer overflow;

“(ii) a capacity, management, operation, and maintenance program for sanitary sewer collection systems;

“(iii) a municipal stormwater discharge;

“(iv) a municipal wastewater discharge; and

“(v) a water quality-based effluent limitation to implement an applicable wastewater allocation in a total maximum daily load;

“(B) INCLUSIONS IN INTEGRATED PLAN.—An integrated plan incorporated into a permit issued under this section may include the implementation of—

“(i) projects, including innovative projects, to reclaim, recycle, or reuse water; and

“(ii) green infrastructure.

“(4) COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A permit issued under this section that incorporates an integrated plan may include a schedule of compliance, under which actions taken to meet any applicable water quality-based effluent limitation may be implemented over more than 1 permit term if the schedule of compliance—

“(i) is authorized by State water quality standards; and

“(ii) meets the requirements of section 122.47 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection).

“(B) TIME FOR COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the requirement of section 122.47 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, for compliance by an applicable statutory deadline under this Act does not prohibit implementation of an applicable

water quality-based effluent limitation over more than 1 permit term.

“(C) REVIEW.—A schedule of compliance incorporated into a permit issued under this section may be reviewed at the time the permit is renewed to determine whether the schedule should be modified.

“(5) EXISTING AUTHORITIES RETAINED.—

“(A) APPLICABLE STANDARDS.—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation to comply with applicable technology and water quality-based effluent limitations under this Act.

“(B) FLEXIBILITY.—Nothing in this subsection reduces or eliminates any flexibility available under this Act, including the authority of a State to revise a water quality standard after a use attainability analysis under section 131.10(g) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), subject to the approval of the Administrator under section 303(c).

“(6) CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in section 301(b)(1)(C) precludes a State from authorizing in the water quality standards of the State the issuance of a schedule of compliance to meet water quality-based effluent limitations in permits that incorporate provisions of an integrated plan.

“(B) TRANSITION RULE.—In any case in which a discharge is subject to a judicial order or consent decree, as of the date of enactment of this subsection, resolving an enforcement action under this Act, any schedule of compliance issued pursuant to an authorization in a State water quality standard may not revise a schedule of compliance in that order or decree to be less stringent, unless the order or decree is modified by agreement of the parties and the court.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED PLANS THROUGH ENFORCEMENT TOOLS.—Section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In conjunction with an enforcement action under subsection (a) or (b) relating to municipal discharges, the Administrator shall inform a municipality of the opportunity to develop an integrated plan, as defined in section 402(s).

“(2) MODIFICATION.—Any municipality under an administrative order under subsection (a) or settlement agreement (including a judicial consent decree) under subsection (b) that has developed an integrated plan consistent with section 402(s) may request a modification of the administrative order or settlement agreement based on that integrated plan.”.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, a report on each integrated plan developed and implemented through a permit, order, or judicial consent decree pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act since the date of publication of the “Integrated Municipal Stormwater and Wastewater Planning Approach Framework” issued by the Environmental Protection Agency and dated June 5, 2012, including a description of the control measures, levels of control, estimated costs, and compliance schedules for the requirements implemented through such an integrated plan.

SEC. 4. MUNICIPAL OMBUDSMAN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office of the Administrator an Office of the Municipal Ombudsman, to be headed by a Municipal Ombudsman.

(b) GENERAL DUTIES.—The duties of the Municipal Ombudsman shall include the provision of—

(1) technical assistance to municipalities seeking to comply with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(2) information to the Administrator to help the Administrator ensure that agency policies are implemented by all offices of the Environmental Protection Agency, including regional offices.

(c) ACTIONS REQUIRED.—The Municipal Ombudsman shall work with appropriate offices at the headquarters and regional offices of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that a municipality seeking assistance is provided information regarding—

(1) available Federal financial assistance for which the municipality is eligible;

(2) flexibility available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(3) the opportunity to develop an integrated plan under section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

(d) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Municipal Ombudsman shall publish on the website of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(1) general information relating to—

(A) the technical assistance referred to in subsection (b)(1);

(B) the financial assistance referred to in subsection (c)(1);

(C) the flexibility referred to in subsection (c)(2); and

(D) any resources developed by the Administrator related to integrated plans under section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(2) a copy of each permit, order, or judicial consent decree that implements or incorporates such an integrated plan.

SEC. 5. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘green infrastructure’ means the range of measures that use plant or soil systems, permeable pavement or other permeable surfaces or substrates, stormwater harvest and reuse, or landscaping to store, infiltrate, or evapotranspire stormwater and reduce flows to sewer systems or to surface waters.”.

(b) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.—Title V of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 519 as section 520; and

(2) by inserting after section 518 the following:

“SEC. 519. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall promote the use of green infrastructure in, and coordinate the integration of green infrastructure into, permitting and enforcement under this Act, planning efforts, research, technical assistance, and funding guidance of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(b) COORDINATION OF EFFORTS.—The Administrator shall ensure that the Office of Water coordinates efforts to increase the use of green infrastructure with—

“(1) other Federal departments and agencies;

“(2) State, tribal, and local governments; and

“(3) the private sector.

“(c) REGIONAL GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTION.—The Administrator shall direct each regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate based on local factors, and consistent with the requirements of this Act, to promote and inte-

grate the use of green infrastructure within the region, including through—

“(1) outreach and training regarding green infrastructure implementation for State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, and the private sector; and

“(2) the incorporation of green infrastructure into permitting and other regulatory programs, codes, and ordinance development, including the requirements under consent decrees and settlement agreements in enforcement actions.

“(d) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION-SHARING.—The Administrator shall promote green infrastructure information-sharing, including through an internet website, to share information with, and provide technical assistance to, State, tribal, and local governments, tribal communities, the private sector, and the public, regarding green infrastructure approaches for—

“(1) reducing water pollution;

“(2) protecting water resources;

“(3) complying with regulatory requirements; and

“(4) achieving other environmental, public health, and community goals.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7279.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to express strong support for my bill, H.R. 7279, the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act, and ask my colleagues to join the bipartisan coalition that worked on this legislation to pass it.

I introduced this bill to help codify into law a useful tool our communities should have at their disposal called integrated planning. Integrated planning provides flexibility for communities when they are confronted with the realities of managing wastewater and stormwater systems. Cities and other municipalities are charged with delivering those water utility services to their residents.

Those same municipalities face the challenges of regulatory mandates from the Environmental Protection Agency for wastewater and stormwater systems. They also face the rising costs of these mandates, which can become severe financial burdens in repairing or replacing aging water infrastructure.

These financial burdens ultimately fall on the ratepayers: the residents of those municipalities, many of whom cannot afford dramatic and immediate increases in their monthly bill. Without flexibility and the ability to prioritize projects so public health and environmental benefits can be maximized, local governments may be forced into costly consent decrees.

Integrated planning helps communities sequence their water projects to meet regulatory or safety obligations more affordably. Cities can use integrated planning to focus on projects that will actually deliver safe and affordable water utility services rather than simply focusing on regulations and red tape.

The Water Infrastructure Improvement Act also creates an important position inside the EPA, the Office of Municipal Ombudsman, to assist municipalities in implementing Agency policy and ensuring local governments are adhering to their responsibilities under the Clean Water Act while utilizing integrated planning.

This bill enjoys bipartisan support in Congress and support from the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the American Public Works Association, the National Association of Counties, and the National Association of Regional Councils.

The Water Infrastructure Improvement Act offers a way forward for our communities to take a comprehensive approach to repairing or replacing outdated water systems, to delivering clean and sustainable water services, and to keeping it affordable for the ratepayers and taxpayers.

We all tend to get wrapped up in the headlines of the day. The nonstop calls for outrage dominate cable news, and partisan differences grab everyone's attention. Because of that, the American people very rarely hear or see the real bipartisan work on issues important to their everyday lives like easy access to safe, affordable, and efficient water utilities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for her work on this issue. This is an example of the many issues in Congress that affect the lives of all Americans and that find bipartisan support, yet fly under the radar.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LATTA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mrs. BUSTOS in passing the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act so America's municipalities and their residents can maintain access to safe water.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7279, the very bipartisan, as my colleague was saying, Water Infrastructure Improvement Act.

Let me first start by thanking the primary sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), for his great cooperation on this. Let me say that it was a pleasure doing it, and I associate myself with his remarks. It is very bipartisan and something that we all agree on that needs to happen for the people of this Nation to finally reach a bipartisan agreement on this

very important issue after more than 4 years.

This legislation codified the concept from the Obama administration known as integrated planning that can assist communities in meeting their requirements under the Clean Water Act, while maintaining their obligation to achieve improvements in local water quality.

EPA's integrated planning framework provides communities with a voluntary opportunity to prioritize local clean water investments with the greatest benefit to human health and the environment. This is incredibly important to communities in my congressional district, as well as many others, as they meet the challenges of the Los Angeles County MS4 stormwater permit, and also across the Nation.

To be clear, the integrated planning is not about diminishing communities' existing obligations under the Clean Water Act; rather, it provides an opportunity for communities to work with Federal and State regulators to optimize their clean water infrastructure investments.

The sad reality is that, until the Federal Government increases its investment under the Clean Water Act, communities will still struggle with affordability challenges. We can and must do better.

First, we need to reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, known as SRF, and I am hopeful that this is one of the first things we will accomplish next year on, again, a very bipartisan basis. We passed similar reauthorization of the drinking water program by voice vote in September. Now is the time for a similar effort to protect local water quality.

Second, we need to address the cost of water and sewer services to these households with the least ability to pay. No hardworking American family should be forced to go without water and wastewater services simply because their local rates are too high. Clean water is a basic human right.

Yes, utilities should be able to recover the costs necessary to upgrade their local systems, but when those costs disproportionately affect individual households, we can and must do much more to help struggling families afford these basic services.

That will be another issue I hope this next Congress will address in the coming year: protecting our Nation's clean water and making it affordable for all American families.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7279, the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have worked on legislation to give our

Nation's communities more flexibility to comply with costly regulations in regards to their wastewater infrastructure improvements. In each Congress since 2008, I have introduced legislation that addresses these issues and provides relief to our local communities.

I have heard from many villages, towns, and cities across my district over the years that struggle to meet wastewater and stormwater improvement demands. This legislation is a key step to build on the work I have previously done to provide relief to our constituents by allowing them to more effectively and efficiently meet their specific water needs.

□ 1615

There are billions of dollars worth of water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure needs in the State of Ohio. It is critical to provide communities with the ability to meet their obligations in a more cost-effective manner.

This legislation will codify the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Integrated Planning Framework and provide additional tools and flexibility for communities to comply with mandated wastewater infrastructure improvement projects.

This is important because it allows municipalities and clean water utilities to decide how best to spend their limited resources. Integrated planning allows communities to allocate funds in a targeted manner, allowing them to focus on the most effective water quality improvements.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague Representative GIBBS, as well as Representatives CHABOT, NAPOLITANO, FUDGE, and BUSTOS for working together to get this bipartisan piece of legislation passed. I will continue to work with my colleagues in both chambers to ensure that this bipartisan bill reaches the President's desk in order to help improve our Nation's water infrastructure and protect the ratepayers.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure, and, again, I thank my colleague for introducing the legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of H.R. 7279, the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act.

I want to thank Congressman GIBBS as well as Congressman LATTA, who just spoke previously, Congresswoman FUDGE, and a number of others with whom we have been working, literally for years now, to move forward integrated planning and provide more flexibility for local communities to meet clean water standards.

The legislation that we are working on and that we have been involved in here, I think, is critical for communities like mine—Cincinnati, Hamilton

County—and communities all over the country.

I want to say a special thanks to Hamilton County Commissioner Todd Portune, who is a Democrat, and County Commissioner Chris Monzel, who is a Republican, in my district. We have been working in a bipartisan manner on this for quite some time now. Commissioner Portune brought this to my attention a number of years ago as Hamilton County dealt with the EPA consent decree that they had entered into many years ago that has literally crippled the sewer system and has caused dramatic price increases for the ratepayers, hundreds of thousands of whom are my constituents.

Commissioner Portune helped to craft the early versions of this legislation, and he and Commissioner Monzel have continued to fight to push this legislation across the finish line.

Oftentimes, when I see Todd Portune back in my area, he will bring this up to me and encourage me. We have been in this together for a long time now, and Commissioner Monzel as well. I, again, especially want to thank Congressman GIBBS for pushing this for many years now. I am so glad that we are actually finally getting there.

The legislation that we are considering today will authorize the EPA to work with local communities on integrated clean water plans that incorporate flexibility and innovative approaches. It will also allow integrated plans to be used to modify administrative orders or consent decrees, and it will allow compliance schedules that are longer than the current permit periods, if the jurisdiction meets its State water quality standards.

That is the important thing. We want more flexibility to give local communities the ability to deal with their problems in a way that makes sense in that community. The problems that New York City has are very different from what a rural Mississippi district or my district, Cincinnati, would have. They are all a bit different.

What we are saying is that you still have to meet those high standards that the EPA sets for clean water. We want our people to drink clean water, but we should give those different communities more flexibility so that they can do what makes sense in their particular community and then save the ratepayers their hard-earned tax dollars.

That is what this is all about, maintaining the high standards that we have, but doing it in a way that allows for more flexibility; the local communities can act according to what is in their best interest.

Together, these commonsense proposals represent a critical first step in addressing this issue as we continue to work on further financial capability guidance so that communities can meet clean water standards in a fiscally responsible manner.

I, again, want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this and for moving this bill

forward. I thank all of the Members who have played a part in this process. It has been a long time coming. A lot of people have worked very hard on this, and I just want to thank all of those who have done this in a bipartisan manner. I would love to see this House work this way even more. We will see.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, first of all, our respective staffs for working together on this. They did a great job, and they did an awful lot of work on it.

Mr. CHABOT is right; it has been a long time coming. I have been on the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment more than 20 years, and this is something that came up over 10 years ago that EPA was forcing California restrictions. And California has the strictest rules on air and water.

So this is really an efficient way of being able to help California and other States deal with it.

This bill before us is a very good first step toward ensuring the protection of our Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams and deserves our very strong support.

We have worked with cities, mayors, water agencies, sanitation districts, environmental groups, as well as our colleagues on the other side on this legislation. We are aware of no opposition—none—to this bill.

We thank all stakeholders for their input and support throughout this process.

However, it is my hope that early in the next Congress we can return to the House floor with similar bipartisan legislation to address the funding needs and affordability concerns we discussed earlier. Only then can we say we have delivered on our responsibility to provide clean, safe, and affordable water to all American families, including Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to, again, thank my colleague from California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for all her help on the other side of the aisle to make this a very bipartisan bill. It is a very commonsense bill.

The key to this that I think needs to be mentioned and emphasized is it gives our local communities flexibility and also encourages all levels of government to work together—the Federal EPA, the State EPA, and the local municipalities—to solve the problems they have at the ground level.

Also in this bill, there is a provision that requires that the new position, the EPA ombudsman, in at least 2 years report back to Congress, the T&I Committee, about what happened with the integrated planning, the specific projects, and review that and see if it needs to be tweaked or not. We will see how it works.

It is very important, working together. You see communities that have been under court orders, court decrees,

and they can't get to where they need to get to, and this bill gives them that flexibility and that common sense.

Everybody wants to do the right thing, and this will help them do that and to be working with the EPA in a partnership.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 7279, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7279.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

STRENGTHENING AND ENHANCING CYBER-CAPABILITIES BY UTILIZING RISK EXPOSURE TECHNOLOGY ACT

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7327) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a security vulnerability disclosure policy, to establish a bug bounty program for the Department of Homeland Security, to amend title 41, United States Code, to provide for Federal acquisition supply chain security, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7327

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening and Enhancing Cyber-capabilities by Utilizing Risk Exposure Technology Act" or the "SECURE Technology Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION SECURITY AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 101. Department of Homeland Security disclosure of security vulnerabilities.

Sec. 102. Department of Homeland Security bug bounty pilot program.

Sec. 103. Congressional submittal of reports relating to certain special access programs and similar programs.

TITLE II—FEDERAL ACQUISITION SUPPLY CHAIN SECURITY

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Federal acquisition supply chain security.

Sec. 203. Authorities of executive agencies relating to mitigating supply chain risks in the procurement of covered articles.

Sec. 204. Federal Information Security Modernization Act.

Sec. 205. Effective date.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION SECURITY AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 101. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DISCLOSURE OF SECURITY VULNERABILITIES.

(a) VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE POLICY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish a policy applicable to individuals, organizations, and companies that report security vulnerabilities on appropriate information systems of Department of Homeland Security. Such policy shall include each of the following:

(1) The appropriate information systems of the Department that individuals, organizations, and companies may use to discover and report security vulnerabilities on appropriate information systems.

(2) The conditions and criteria under which individuals, organizations, and companies may operate to discover and report security vulnerabilities.

(3) How individuals, organizations, and companies may disclose to the Department security vulnerabilities discovered on appropriate information systems of the Department.

(4) The ways in which the Department may communicate with individuals, organizations, and companies that report security vulnerabilities.

(5) The process the Department shall use for public disclosure of reported security vulnerabilities.

(b) REMEDIATION PROCESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop a process for the Department of Homeland Security to address the mitigation or remediation of the security vulnerabilities reported through the policy developed in subsection (a).

(c) CONSULTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In developing the security vulnerability disclosure policy under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with each of the following:

(A) The Attorney General regarding how to ensure that individuals, organizations, and companies that comply with the requirements of the policy developed under subsection (a) are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, civil lawsuits, and similar provisions of law with respect to specific activities authorized under the policy.

(B) The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services regarding lessons that may be applied from existing vulnerability disclosure policies.

(C) Non-governmental security researchers.

(2) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any consultation under this section.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall make the policy developed under subsection (a) publicly available.

(e) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(1) DISCLOSURE POLICY AND REMEDIATION PROCESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a copy of the policy required under subsection (a) and the remediation process required under subsection (b).

(2) REPORT AND BRIEFING.—

(A) REPORT.—Not later than one year after establishing the policy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on such policy