

Kevin Petrasic, Managing Director of External Affairs, at 2012-906-6452.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN M. REICH,
Director.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL BANKS,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2007.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: Thank you for having introduced H.R. 1066, the Depository Institution Community Development Investments Enhancement Act, which would restore the preexisting, longstanding authority of national and state member banks to make investments "designed primarily to promote the public welfare, including the welfare of low- and moderate-income communities or families."

Returning to this standard will restore several major categories of public welfare investments in areas determined by federal, state and local governments to be in need of such investments. These categories of investments, which were eliminated with passage of The Financial Services Regulatory Relief Act of 2006, include investments that:

Revitalize or stabilize designated disaster areas, including areas devastated by hurricanes.

Revitalize or stabilize underserved or distressed middle-income rural communities.

Utilize New Markets Tax Credits to promote development in middle-income census tracts with greater than 20 percent poverty rates.

Finance mixed-income affordable housing in government targeted areas for revitalization.

Since 1992, the preexisting standard has been implemented by the OCC in a transparent manner to generate national bank community development investments in every state of the nation amounting to over \$16 billion. Every approved public welfare investment made by a national bank is posted by the OCC on our public website. Further, all public welfare investments made by national banks have been, and will continue to be under the provisions of H.R. 1066, subject to key controls designed to protect against risks to the safety and soundness of the bank and to the deposit insurance fund.

Restoring the previously qualifying categories of investments, in combination with the recent increase in allowable investments to 15 percent of capital and surplus, can potentially generate as much as \$30 billion in national bank investment to help revitalize local communities across the nation—without the use of any taxpayer funds. I urge prompt passage of H.R. 1066 to help achieve this significant impact.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. DUGAN,
Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Dugan's letter, for example, he says giving this flexibility would allow "finance mixed-income affordable housing in government targeted areas for revitalization." It maintains the purpose of helping low and moderate income people, but it provides the flexibility in doing it, which we would all support.

I know of no opposition to the bill. People might have raised the question, well, the groups that are the primary advocates, the low and moderate income people, do they think it might hit them? No, the answer is they do not. And several groups that try to promote

this kind of mixed economic benefit development think this would be useful.

As I said, it is a bill the House passed last year. It is supported by banks. We have banks that want to be socially responsible, within the context of making a profit and meeting their safety and soundness requirements. We should not unduly burden them when they try to do that.

So I hope that the House will once again pass this, and that this time, looking at them alone with a little more leisure, the Senate will go along.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1066, the Depository Institution Community Development Investments Enhancement Act, and I want to commend Chairman FRANK for introducing this legislation.

The regulatory relief legislation that was signed into law last October increased the authority of banks to invest in projects that benefit low and moderate income communities. The legislation increases the allowable percentage of public welfare investments from 10 to 15 percent of a thrift's capital and surplus. Banks currently have this authority.

H.R. 1066 would expand this authority in allowing thrifts to invest in distressed areas, as well as the low and moderate income communities. This enhanced authority is important because the need for investment in government-designated disaster areas may not necessarily be confined to low to moderate income areas.

H.R. 1066 also would make it easier for banks to invest in projects in devastated and abandoned communities on the gulf coast or to revitalize rural areas that are underserved or distressed. This legislation allows greater opportunities for banks and thrifts to provide housing, community services and jobs to communities throughout our Nation. It also helps these institutions meet their obligations under the Community Reinvestment Act. Since the law was enacted in 1992, existing authority has already generated more than \$16 billion of investments.

Twice last year legislation similar to H.R. 1066 passed the House overwhelmingly. H.R. 6062, the Community Development Investment Enhancement Act of 2006 passed the House by voice vote in September. The same language also was included in the House passed version of regulatory relief legislation, H.R. 3505, which cleared this body last March by a vote of 415-2, as Chairman FRANK noted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1066.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1066.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 644) to facilitate the provision of assistance by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the cleanup and economic redevelopment of brownfields.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 644

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 "Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) returning the Nation's brownfield sites to productive economic use could generate more than 550,000 additional jobs and up to \$2,400,000,000 in new tax revenues for cities and towns;

(2) redevelopment of brownfield sites and reuse of infrastructure at such sites will protect natural resources and open spaces;

(3) lack of funding for redevelopment is a primary obstacle impeding the reuse of brownfield sites;

(4) the Department of Housing and Urban Development is the agency of the Federal Government that is principally responsible for supporting community development and encouraging productive land use in urban areas of the United States;

(5) grants under the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provide local governments with a flexible source of funding to pursue brownfields redevelopment through land acquisition, site preparation, economic development, and other activities;

(6) to be eligible for such grant funds, a community must be willing to pledge community development block grant funds as partial collateral for a loan guarantee under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and this requirement is a barrier to many local communities that are unable or unwilling to pledge such block grant funds as collateral; and

(7) by de-linking grants for brownfields development from section 108 community development loan guarantees and the related pledge of community development block grant funds, more communities will have access to funding for redevelopment of brownfield sites.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide cities and towns with more flexibility for brownfields development, increased accessibility to brownfields redevelopment funds, and greater capacity to coordinate and collaborate with other government agencies—

(1) by providing additional incentives to invest in the development and redevelopment of brownfield sites; and

(2) by de-linking grants for brownfields development from community development loan guarantees and the related pledge of community development block grant funds.

SEC. 3. BROWNFIELDS DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 123. BROWNFIELDS DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants under this section, on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 3545), only to eligible public entities (as such term is defined in section 108(o) of this title) and Indian tribes for carrying out projects and activities to assist the development and redevelopment of brownfield sites, which shall include mine-scarred lands.

“(b) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—Amounts from grants under this section—

“(1) shall be used, as provided in subsection (a) of this section, only for activities specified in section 108(a);

“(2) shall be subject to the same requirements that, under section 101(c) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 104(b), apply to grants under section 106; and

“(3) shall not be provided or used in a manner that reduces the financial responsibility of any nongovernmental party that is responsible or potentially responsible for contamination on any real property and the provision of assistance pursuant to this section shall not in any way relieve any party of liability with respect to such contamination, including liability for removal and remediation costs.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall not require, for eligibility for a grant under this section, that such grant amounts be used only in connection or conjunction with projects and activities assisted with a loan guaranteed under section 108.

“(d) APPLICATIONS.—Applications for assistance under this section shall be in the form and in accordance with procedures as shall be established by the Secretary.

“(e) SELECTION CRITERIA AND LEVERAGING.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for awarding grants under this section, which may include the extent to which the applicant has obtained other Federal, State, local, or private funds for the projects and activities to be assisted with grant amounts and such other criteria as the Secretary considers appropriate. Such criteria shall include consideration of the appropriateness of the extent of financial leveraging involved in the projects and activities to be funded with the grant amounts.

“(f) DEFINITION OF BROWNFIELD SITE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘brownfield site’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(39) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(39)). Such term includes a site that meets the requirements under subparagraph (D) of such section for inclusion as a brownfield site for purposes of section 104(k) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)).

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.”

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT AS ELIGIBLE CDBG ACTIVITY.

(a) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Subsection (a) of section 105 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (24) and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting the new paragraph (24) inserted by section 2(3) of Public Law 108-146 (117 Stat. 1883);

(2) by adding at the end (after the paragraph added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the new paragraph (20) added by section 907(b)(1)(C) of Public Law 101-625 (104 Stat. 4388) and redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (25); and

(3) by adding at the end (after the paragraphs added by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) the new paragraph (21) added by section 1012(f)(3) of Public Law 102-550 (106 Stat. 3905) and redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (26).

(b) BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Section 105(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)), as in effect pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24) (as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (25) (as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (26) (as added by subsection (a)(3) of this section), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(27) economic development and redevelopment activities related to projects for brownfields sites (as such term is defined in section 123(f)), in conjunction with the appropriate environmental regulatory agencies, except that assistance pursuant to this paragraph shall not be provided in a manner that reduces the financial responsibility of any nongovernmental party that is responsible or potentially responsible for contamination on any real property and the provision of assistance pursuant to this paragraph shall not in any way relieve any party of liability with respect to such contamination, including liability for removal and remediation costs.”

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO ALLOW USE OF CDBG FUNDS TO ADMINISTER RENEWAL COMMUNITIES.

Section 105(a)(13) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(13)) is amended by inserting “and renewal communities” after “enterprise zones”.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to amounts made available for fiscal year 2008 and fiscal years thereafter for use under the provisions of law amended by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to give more flexibility to our municipalities. They are allowed to use Community Development Block Grant funds for cleaning up brownfields.

By the way, I do want to comment for a minute on brownfields. We hear a great deal about public sector-private sector, and I believe that people have unwisely seen this as if there was an opposition. In fact, we need to cooperate, and I particularly here want to call attention to an aspect of this bill that is relevant to those who tend to see the private sector as the fountain of all benefits and the public sector as somehow a source of negative activity.

What we are doing here is giving local governments the right to use Federal money to clean up messes that were left behind by the private sector. Brownfields overwhelmingly are the result of industrial activity that was once profitable and no longer is. That doesn't mean that the people that did it were bad people, necessarily. It does mean given the change in economics, private sector entities walked away in many cases and left the public sector responsible for these cleanups.

What we are doing here is giving more flexibility to local communities so that they don't have to take out a section 108 loan, which can tie up their Community Development Block Grant funds for a long time. It does give in to local judgment.

I do want to note one very important point that the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, has stressed, and a point on which I am in complete agreement with him, namely that the funding flexibility here should be for brownfields, not for Superfund sites.

In the Superfund situation, we have provisions for those who polluted to have to pay in to cleaning up the messes they left behind. We do not want the brownfields money here to be used in any way to diminish that liability.

So I very much agree with the point that was made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). In fact, when we sent this bill previously to the Senate, they removed the restriction that we had put in there that would have prevented this from happening, and we then would not pass the bill. We will send this again to the Senate and we hope they will accept that this is for brownfields, it is not for Superfund. It should be used in this very strict way so as to not become a substitute for private contributions that ought to be coming.

If we limit this to CDBG money for the brownfields situation, we will be doing it right. This bill is entitled the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act. We want moneys that are freed up here to be used only for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 644, the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act of 2007. I want to commend Congressman MILLER of California for introducing this legislation for the fourth time.

This bill aims to provide local communities greater access to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's brownfields program to clean up and redevelop contaminated sites. More importantly, the bill will help local communities create new jobs and expand their tax base.

The revitalization of brownfields sites has always been a familiar topic in Illinois, as my home State has thousands of these underused or vacant

properties. Brownfields are those sites where redevelopment is complicated by potential environmental contamination. They are less seriously contaminated than those covered under the Superfund Act, and there are an estimated 500,000 of them across the country.

HUD administers a brownfields program called the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative, or BEDI. The main purpose of BEDI is to spur economic and community development of the brownfields sites. The problem is that due to a loan guarantee requirement, the program has been underutilized. Over the past 5 years, the Financial Services Committee has sought to make HUD's program more effective, specifically the BEDI program.

At hearings, we learned that many communities had been shut out of the BEDI program because they can't get a grant without going through the cumbersome process of applying for a section 108 loan. That is very hard on those smaller communities.

Under current law, HUD's brownfields redevelopment projects must be backed by those section 108 guaranteed loans. The section 108 loans require a local community to provide loan security by collateralizing its BEDI project with that community's current and future CDBG allocations. Therefore, many small communities have been hesitant to reply for BEDI because they are unwilling or unable to pledge their block grants as collateral for the guaranteed loans. In short, H.R. 644 amends the HUD Act of 1974 to permit HUD to issue BEDI grants independent of the section 108 loan guarantees.

This bill does not create a new program and would not trigger new spending or receipts. This bill will facilitate brownfields redevelopment in thousands of communities across the country, thereby encouraging economic development, expanding communities' tax bases and, most importantly, creating new jobs.

I applaud the bill's sponsors for introducing H.R. 644. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chair of the Housing Subcommittee, from which this bill came.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 644, the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act, a bill of which I am an original cosponsor. I certainly applaud the distinguished chairman of Committee on Financial Services, Mr. FRANK, for working to get this bill to the floor. I also want to thank Mr. GARY MILLER, who introduced the bill and who has been working on this subject for quite some time, as well as all of the other cosponsors of this bill.

The House passed a bill identical to H.R. 644 in the 109th Congress because many of us recognized the importance of preserving a means of remedying the numerous hazardous sites that remain in this country.

Under the Brownfields Act, the Environmental Protection Agency awards grants for the assessment and cleanup of sites that pose a serious threat to human health and the environment than sites addressed by the Superfund.

Many of these sites thwart the development and revitalization of communities in distressed areas of the country, including the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County. In fact, it is these sites that make development efforts impossible because of the potential risks.

The Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act becomes a powerful economic development tool when used in conjunction with other Federal economic redevelopment resources, CDBG and section 108 loan guarantees. It is precisely the kind of leveraging tool that we must utilize to spur development in places where development costs are uncertain given the presence of hazardous materials.

The Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act, if passed, will continue to provide four types of competitive grants: Assessment grants used as planning tools by grantees to conduct due diligence related to the affected sites; revolving loan fund grants to capitalize the loans for the cleanup of the sites; cleanup grants that provide for the recipient to undertake cleanup activities; and job training grants made available to nonprofits and educational entities to develop environmental job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to postpone passage of this bill any longer. It sends a bad signal to the communities across the Nation who are trying to rebuild, reinvest and strengthen their economic local economies. Any Federal tool to leverage private investment must be preserved, particularly in this pay-as-you-go economic environment. The Brownfields Enhancement Act is a tool, and therefore I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1500

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 644. As a former mayor of the third largest city in New Jersey, Paterson, the first planned industrial city in the Nation and home to some of the country's oldest brownfield sites, I know this bill will be beneficial to our Nation's communities.

H.R. 644 authorizes HUD to offer much-needed grants for the environmental cleanup and economic development of brownfield sites, places we

drive by every day of our lives. We want to rehabilitate those sites, including inactive factories, gas stations, salvage yards, abandoned warehouses.

This bill also makes brownfield-related environmental cleanup and economic development activities eligible for Community Development Block Grants assistance. These sites drive down property values, provide little or no tax revenue, and contribute to community blight.

Since the inception of brownfield programs, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has allocated over \$800 million in brownfield assessment and cleanup funds. In addition, this investment has leveraged over \$8 billion in cleanup and redevelopment dollars, a better than 10 to 1 return on investment. It has resulted in the assessment of more than 8,000 properties and helped create over 37,000 jobs. It is a winner.

This is because the EPA and HUD grants work in conjunction with funds that come from both the State and local governments, and of course private sources, to address cleanup of brownfield sites. If we don't do this, those sites will remain abandoned and barren for years ahead of us.

This is an exciting time in the brownfields marketplace. Federal brownfields programs have provided the foundation on which State initiatives have flourished. Throughout the country, there are thousands of abandoned structures that were once thriving businesses, often part of large industrial centers. Economic development matched with environmental cleanup has resulted in the rebirth of many industrial and commercial properties and surrounding neighborhoods.

Anyone who cares about our Nation's cities celebrates these successes. HUD's particular expertise in incorporating brownfields remediation into a larger strategy for economic development and community revitalization is essential to the success we have had and will continue to have in the future. This is a stimulant to the economy, a real stimulant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile legislation.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to make any comments for the RECORD that they wish, and also to include extraneous material on H.R. 644 and H.R. 1066.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker and Chairman FRANK, on behalf of New York City, which I represent, I am pleased that the House is considering the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act.

I am proud to have been an original cosponsor of this legislation in every session since it was first introduced in the 107th Congress.

As you know, the primary purpose of the bill is to increase the flexibility of the Housing and Urban Development Department's Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) and to make the program available to more local Governments.

The legislation eliminates the requirement that communities applying for BEDI grants must pledge their Community Block Development Grant (CBDG) funding as security for the loan—a rule that puts local Governments between a rock and a hard place.

Since its inception, the larger brownfields program has proven an effective Government response to a serious environmental problem, and it is important that we maximize its use.

Brownfields are abandoned, or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where further redevelopment is impeded by environmental contamination. They spot our country from coast to coast, especially in areas with high or formerly high levels of industrial activity, such as older urban areas. New York City, including my district, is full of them.

These locations have potential for economic development but are held back by the environmental problems created by former or current users. The program has successfully used a variety of financial and technical assistance to restore these sites which would otherwise be doomed to further decay.

I am very pleased to support this legislation and thank Representative GARY MILLER for introducing it again this year and Chairman BARNEY FRANK and Ranking Member BACHUS for their leadership on this bipartisan issue.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of the original legislation which created the Brownfields program, I rise in support of H.R. 644, which makes Brownfield Economic Development Initiative, BEDI, grants far more accessible to smaller communities by eliminating a requirement for communities to guarantee their BEDI grant with their Community Development block grant funds.

I believe the Brownfields program is one of the most successful programs the Federal Government has to help revitalized urban areas. These sites, typically in the heart of urban areas, lie idle because no one wants to incur the large costs associated with Superfund cleanups.

This, in turn should encourage more-environmental cleanup and economic development of brownfield sites. As a result, cities are marked by abandoned buildings and vacant lots while developers construct new buildings on what was previously open space in the suburbs.

Though small, these grants serve as seed money, enabling dozens of communities to leverage millions of State and private dollars to move into the actual cleanup phase.

By reusing Brownfields sites, we not only rebuild blighted communities, but also target development in city centers and avoid unnecessary urbanization on the fringes of metropolitan areas.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 644.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM COOPERATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have a bill, but in our traditional, bipartisan way, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 884) to provide for the establishment of the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 884

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 "Promoting Antiterrorism Cooperation through Technology and Science Act" or the "PACTS Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The development and implementation of technology is critical to combating terrorism and other high consequence events and implementing a comprehensive homeland security strategy.

(2) The United States and its allies in the global war on terrorism share a common interest in facilitating research, development, testing, and evaluation of equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services that will aid in detecting, preventing, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating against acts of terrorism.

(3) Certain United States allies in the global war on terrorism, including Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Singapore have extensive experience with, and technological expertise in, homeland security.

(4) The United States and certain of its allies in the global war on terrorism have a history of successful collaboration in developing mutually beneficial equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services in the areas of defense, agriculture, and telecommunications.

(5) The United States and its allies in the global war on terrorism will mutually benefit from the sharing of technological expertise to combat domestic and international terrorism.

(6) The establishment of an office to facilitate and support cooperative endeavors between and among government agencies, for-profit business entities, academic institutions, and nonprofit entities of the United States and its allies will safeguard lives and property worldwide against acts of terrorism and other high consequence events.

SEC. 3. PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after section 313 (6 U.S.C. 193) the following:

"SEC. 314. PROMOTING ANTITERRORISM THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director selected under subsection (b)(2).

"(2) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ACTIVITY.—The term 'international cooperative activity' includes—

"(A) coordinated research projects, joint research projects, or joint ventures;

"(B) joint studies or technical demonstrations;

"(C) coordinated field exercises, scientific seminars, conferences, symposia, and workshops;

"(D) training of scientists and engineers;

"(E) visits and exchanges of scientists, engineers, or other appropriate personnel;

"(F) exchanges or sharing of scientific and technological information; and

"(G) joint use of laboratory facilities and equipment.

"(b) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY HOMELAND SECURITY INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS OFFICE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Under Secretary shall establish the Science and Technology Homeland Security International Cooperative Programs Office.

"(2) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be headed by a Director, who—

"(A) shall be selected by and shall report to the Under Secretary; and

"(B) may be an officer of the Department serving in another position.

"(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

"(A) DEVELOPMENT OF MECHANISMS.—The Director shall be responsible for developing, in consultation with the Department of State, understandings or agreements that allow and support international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing.

"(B) PRIORITIES.—The Director shall be responsible for developing, in coordination with the Directorate of Science and Technology, the other components of the Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies, strategic priorities for international cooperative activity in support of homeland security research, development, and comparative testing.

"(C) ACTIVITIES.—The Director shall facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of international cooperative activity to address the strategic priorities developed under subparagraph (B) through mechanisms the Under Secretary considers appropriate, including grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts to or with foreign public or private entities, governmental organizations, businesses, federally funded research and development centers, and universities.

"(D) IDENTIFICATION OF PARTNERS.—The Director shall facilitate the matching of United States entities engaged in homeland security research with non-United States entities engaged in homeland security research so that they may partner in homeland security research activities.

"(4) COORDINATION.—The Director shall ensure that the activities under this subsection are coordinated with those of other relevant research agencies, and may run projects jointly with other agencies.

"(5) CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS.—The Director may hold international homeland security technology workshops and conferences to improve contact among the international community of technology developers and to help establish direction for future technology goals.

"(c) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) AUTHORIZATION.—The Under Secretary is authorized to carry out international cooperative activities to support the responsibilities specified under section 302.

"(2) MECHANISMS AND EQUITABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary may award grants to and enter into