

**SNIFFING OUT TERRORISM:  
THE USE OF DOGS IN HOMELAND SECURITY**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON PREVENTION OF  
MANAGEMENT, INTEGRATION, AND  
OVERSIGHT**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS**

**FIRST SESSION**

SEPTMBER 28, 2005

**Serial No. 109-42**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

31-902 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2007

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER T. KING, New York, *Chairman*

DON YOUNG, Alaska	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOHN LINDER, Georgia	JANE HARMAN, California
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana	PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
TOM DAVIS, Virginia	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada	ZOE LOFGREN, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut	SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	BILL PASCRELL, JR., New Jersey
STEVAN PEARCE, New Mexico	DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, U.S. Virgin Islands
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida	BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
BOBBY JINDAL, Louisiana	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
DAVE G. REICHERT, Washington	KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MICHAEL MCCAUL, Texas	
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania	
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, FLORIDA	

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT, INTEGRATION, AND OVERSIGHT

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut	KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
JOHN LINDER, Georgia	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
TOM DAVIS, Virginia	ZOE LOFGREN, California
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida	SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas
DAVE G. REICHERT, Washington	BILL PASCRELL, JR., New Jersey
MICHAEL MCCAUL, Texas	DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, U.S. Virgin Islands
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi <i>Ex Officio</i>
PETER T. KING, New York <i>Ex Officio</i>	

# CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Mike Rogers, a Representative in Congress from the State of Alabama, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Management, Integration and Oversight:	
Oral Statement .....	1
Prepared Statement .....	2
The Honorable Kendrick B. Meek, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Management, Integration and Oversight .....	3
The Honorable Peter T. King, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, and Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security:	
Prepared Statement .....	5
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress from the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security .....	4
The Honorable Michael McCaul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas .....	25
The Honorable Jackson-Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas .....	22
The Honorable Bill Pascrell, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York .....	27
WITNESSES	
PANEL I	
Special Agent Terry Bohan, Chief, National Canine Training and Operations Support Branch, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice:	
Oral Statement .....	16
Prepared Statement .....	17
Mr. David Kontny, Director, National Explosives Detection Canine, Team Program, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement .....	11
Prepared Statement .....	13
Mr. Lee Titus, Director of Canine Programs, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement .....	6
Prepared Statement .....	9
PANEL II	
Dr. C. Michael Moriarty, Associate Provost and Vice President for Research, Auburn University:	
Oral Statement .....	36
Prepared Statement .....	38
Ms. Terri Recknor, President, Garrison and Sloan Canine Detection:	
Oral Statement .....	43
Prepared Statement .....	46

IV

	Page
Chief Ralph Eugene Wilson, Jr., Chief of Police, Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit, Authority (MARTA):	
Oral Statement .....	33
Prepared Statement .....	35

## **SNIFFING OUT TERRORISM: THE USE OF DOGS IN HOMELAND SECURITY**

---

**Wednesday, September 28, 2005**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT,  
INTEGRATION, AND OVERSIGHT,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:14 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Mike Rogers [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Rogers, McCaul, Dent, Meek, Thompson, Jackson-Lee, and Pascrell.

Mr. ROGERS. [Presiding.] The Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight, will come to order.

I would first like to welcome our witnesses and thank them for taking time out of their schedules to be here today.

We are holding this hearing today to examine how dogs are being used to assist Federal law enforcement officers in homeland security missions.

The hearing follows a live demonstration and a closed briefing earlier this morning, during which Members had an opportunity to raise issues with our Federal witnesses that were law-enforcement sensitive.

I wish to first welcome our distinguished witnesses and thank them for taking the time out of their busy schedules to be with us today.

Dogs may be considered not only man's best friend but also one of our best defenses against terrorism. They have a keen sense of smell and a strong ability to process smell. Research shows that while humans have 5 million olfactory cells in their noses, dogs have over 300 million.

Research also shows that the part of the brain responsible for processing smell is up to 40 times larger in dogs than in humans. As we will hear from our witnesses today, dogs are used to detect explosives, narcotics, bulk cash and concealed humans.

Dogs are also being used in search and rescue operations such as those taking place in areas ravaged by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

After the London bombings in July, dogs were deployed throughout London's subway system, as well as in mass transit systems here at home. In a mass transit setting, dogs are one of the best tools available to screen passengers and their bags for explosives,

primarily because dogs can move easily through crowds and can be moved quickly from one location to another.

Dogs are also an important complement to the explosive detection technologies that may be too cumbersome, less mobile and more costly to use.

Dogs, however, have inherent limitations, most of which were explored during our closed hearing. While it is important to expand the use of dogs where appropriate, it is not the panacea that some have suggested for protecting our subway systems or detecting concealed weapons.

Today's public session will explore a range of other issues related to the use of dogs in homeland security. Our specific questions include: how are dogs trained? Are the multiple Federal training programs coordinated effectively?

What are the costs associated with training and can they be reduced? And should better guidelines be developed to ensure the effectiveness of dogs that state and local agencies buy from private dog trainers?

On our first panel today we are pleased to welcome experts in the training and deployment of dogs from two agencies in the Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Transportation Security Administration.

And I would also like to mention that today the Transportation Security Administration is announcing an expansion of its national explosive detection canine team program to 10 mass transit and commuter rail systems across the country.

One of those systems is right here in the nation's capital, which will see three bomb dogs. We look forward to hearing more about this initiative from TSA witnesses.

We also have a representative from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in the Department of Justice.

On our second panel, I am especially pleased to welcome a representative from Auburn University, which operates the Canine Detection Training Center located near my hometown in Anniston, Alabama. Auburn University's canine training program has been chosen by a number of Federal, state and local agencies to train their dogs because of the range of training services it offers.

We also will hear from the chief of police for the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, which has two dogs trained by Auburn University.

And finally, we will hear from a representative from a private canine training company in Florida which works extensively with the cruise line industry.

Once again, I would like to thank the witnesses for joining us today. I look forward to their testimony on this important topic.

#### PREPARED OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MIKE ROGERS

We are holding this hearing today to examine how dogs are being used to assist Federal law enforcement officers in homeland security missions.

The hearing follows a live demonstration, and a closed briefing earlier this morning, during which Members had an opportunity to raise issues with our Federal witnesses that were law-enforcement sensitive.

I would first like to welcome our distinguished witnesses, and thank them for taking time out of their busy schedules to be with us today.

Dogs may be considered not only man's best friend, but also one of our best defenses against terrorism.

They have a keen sense of smell, and a strong ability to process smell. Research shows that while humans have *five* million olfactory cells in their noses, dogs have over *300* million.

Research also shows that the part of the brain responsible for processing smell is up to 40 times larger in dogs, than in humans.

As we will hear from our witnesses today, dogs are used to detect explosives, narcotics, bulk cash, and concealed humans.

Dogs also are being used in search and rescue operations, such as those taking place in areas ravaged by Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

After the London bombings in July, dogs were deployed throughout London's subway system, as well as in mass transit systems here at home.

In the mass transit setting, dogs are one of the best tools available to screen passengers and their bags for explosives, primarily because dogs can move easily through crowds and can be moved quickly from one location to another.

Dogs are also an important complement to explosives detection technologies that may be too cumbersome, less mobile, and more costly to use.

Dogs, however, have inherent and significant limitations, most of which were explored during our closed session.

While it is important to expand the use of dogs where appropriate, it is not the panacea that some have suggested for protecting our subway systems, or detecting concealed explosives.

Today's public session will explore a range of other issues related to the use of dogs in homeland security.

Our specific questions include: How are dogs trained? Are the multiple Federal training programs coordinated effectively? What are the costs associated with this training, and can they be reduced?

And, should better guidelines be developed to ensure the effectiveness of dogs that state and local agencies buy from private dog trainers?

On our first panel today, we are pleased to welcome experts in the training and deployment of dogs from two agencies in the Department of Homeland Security—U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Transportation Security Administration.

We also have a representative from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives in the Department of Justice.

On our second panel, I am especially pleased to welcome a representative from Auburn University, which operates the Canine Detection Training Center located in my hometown of Anniston, Alabama.

Auburn University's canine training program has been chosen by a number of Federal, state, and local agencies to train their dogs because of the range of training services it offers.

We also will hear from the Chief of Police for the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, which has two dogs trained by Auburn University.

And finally, we will hear from a representative from a private canine training company in Florida, which works extensively with the cruise line industry.

Once again, I thank the witnesses for joining us today, and look forward to their testimony on this important topic.

I now yield. . .

Mr. ROERS. I now would like to yield to the Ranking Member, my friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. Meek.

Mr. MEEK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I pretty much made my opening statement during the demonstration end, but I just want to say again that any testimony that will be helpful for us to be able to explain to not only colleagues here in the Congress but on the local and state level the reason why handler and canine officer has to have the kind of training, the kind of down time, so that they can be effective while they are in service.

I think it is important. I think Americans also have to go through, and we in the Congress have to go through, quite a bit of education, of understanding why we have to have so many canines and officers and handlers in a particular area to cover a train station or to cover an airport gate.

And that understanding, because I believe that the key to defending the homeland—and I hope that you can talk about this a little bit more—is to make sure that the American public is comfortable with securing themselves, that we have—we get a lot of complaints about the TSA and TSA officers because they are doing their jobs.

I believe that our canine officers can help us not only at airport gates but also in train stations and cruise ship areas of doing a thorough search, doing a search that, one, does not feel that it is intrusive, and so I feel the expansion of this program is going to be paramount to protecting America.

I look forward to hearing your testimony, and I definitely have some questions afterwards.

I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member of the full committee, my friend and colleague from Mississippi, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As we struggle to make our transportation systems and critical infrastructure more secure, canine detection systems are an invaluable tool in that effort.

As we saw in the canine demonstration, dogs are indeed versatile, mobile explosive detection systems. I firmly believe that greater utilization of these four-legged inspectors make a lot of sense.

In dense, dynamic environments such as airports and train platforms, trained explosive detection dogs are able to not only screen passenger and bags but serve as a deterrent to would-be terrorists.

I am particularly interested in hearing how they would enhance security in the rail and transit environment and can help screen air cargo. With respect to air cargo, the 9/11 Commission put securing planes from explosive cargo on its unfinished agenda.

How do we close the air cargo gap, given the vastness and variation of air cargo? Every day the U.S. air cargo supply chain handles more than 50,000 tons of cargo. There are few technological solutions for screening cargo, which is often palletized and shrink-wrapped.

I understand that TSA's pilot with explosive detection dogs indicated that canines show great promise as a screening tool in the air cargo environment. I look forward to hearing from our witness from TSA about how TSA is doing to ensure that dogs are integrated into our layer approach to cargo security.

I am also interested in seeing greater utilization of dogs in the rail and transit environment. We know from both the 9/11 attackers and now the London bombers that terrorists generally do a run-through before committing their attack.

Increased visibility of explosive detection dogs together with surveillance cameras and a perceptible law enforcement presence may well make a terrorist think twice.

With all that dogs can do, the impulse may be there to use them to the exclusion of other technology and approaches. That would be a mistake. When it comes to securing our power plants, rail systems and other vital infrastructures, we need layered approaches



that integrates different technologies, surveillance and detection dogs.

Like with any explosive detection system, dogs need maintenance. The key distinction is that dogs rely on their handlers for care, not engineers. Also, like explosive detection systems, dogs perform differently depending on heat, cold and other environmental factors.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses on what dogs can and cannot do. I know that all around this nation, in communities large and small, there is a great deal of interest in getting more dogs to do explosive detection.

Given that federal resources are far too limited to meet the need, they are forced to look to private vendors. However, finding a reputable canine detection company is not as easy as you would think. There are no federal standards and a whole lot of associations out there that are happy to certify a dog, for a fee, I might add.

State and local governments and private firms that oversee critical infrastructures, like oil refineries and water treatment plants, need to trust that if they acquire a dog team it can do the job.

With the growth in interest in explosive detection dogs, we must start looking at national standards and certification.

Again, thank you to the witness who joined us, and I look forward to your testimony.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank the gentleman.

I would remind other members of the committee that their opening statements may be submitted for the record.

PREPARED OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PETER T. KING

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this important hearing today.

As we saw after the July terrorist bombings in London, and more recently in the recovery efforts for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, dogs are a versatile resource not only for the Department of Homeland Security, but also for law enforcement officials at all levels of government.

In the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, U.S. Customs and Border Protection was among other Federal agencies that deployed urban search and rescue dogs to the area, as well as cadaver detection dogs. CBP sent three of its specially trained dogs to assist in locating the deceased.

In my home State of New York, dogs are an integral part of the daily activities of the New York Police Department (NYPD) and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. The NYPD has three units that use canine teams—the Narcotics Unit, the Bomb Squad, and the Patrol Unit. The Narcotics Unit has eight drug detection dogs; the Bomb Squad has 19 explosives detection dogs; and the Patrol Unit has 38 dogs, several of which are search and rescue and cadaver dogs that are certified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

This morning's hearing will offer an opportunity to learn more about these dogs' capabilities and how they contribute to the Federal government's layered defense against terrorism. While dogs are not a perfect solution, they can be easily and quickly deployed to a variety of venues, and they support homeland security as well as non-homeland security missions.

This hearing will also offer an opportunity to examine the status of the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to consolidate some of its overlapping programs. CBP announced last month that, effective October 1, 2005, it will be consolidating its two canine training programs under one office. I look forward to hearing more about how this effort will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of CBP's canine training programs.

I am pleased to see that the panelists today represent a range of perspectives regarding the use of detection canines. We have several agencies that train dogs for use at the Federal, state, and local level; we have researchers who are working to improve dogs' detection capabilities; and we have a local law enforcement agency that uses the dogs trained by two agencies here today.

I look forward to hearing more about how dogs are helping protect the homeland every day, and how we can further improve the training and coordination of Federal canine programs to make the most of these dogs' special talents.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. We are pleased to have two panels of distinguished witnesses before us today on this important topic.

I would like to remind the witnesses that their entire statements may be submitted, but we would ask that you try to limit your opening statements to 5 minutes so that we can move on to questions.

The Chair now calls the first panel and recognizes Mr. Lee Titus, Director of Canine Programs at the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Titus?

#### **STATEMENT OF LEE TITUS**

Mr. TITUS. Good morning, Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Meek, members of the subcommittee. It is a privilege to appear before you today to discuss the training of canine teams within U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

I want to begin by expressing my gratitude to the committee for holding this hearing on canine teams, helping us to bring attention to the accomplishments to the forefront of this important program and the issues facing the program.

CBP's canine law enforcement program, one of several Department of Homeland Security canine programs that protects life and property, contributes to the department's law enforcement and antiterrorism missions and is the largest federal canine law enforcement program in the United States.

CBP has trained and deployed thousands of canine teams in support of our antiterrorism and traditional missions over the years. Working together at and between our nation's official ports of entry, our canine teams are a critical component in CBP's layered approach to border protection and our ability to secure our border, protect our homeland and defend against the threats posed by potential terrorists, explosives, chemical weapons, illegal aliens, narcotics and harmful agricultural pests and products.

The canine enforcement program is responsible for a significant portion of narcotics seizures made by Customs and Border Protection at ports of entry, checkpoints and between official ports of entry, accounting for more than 11,600 narcotics seizures, totaling over 1,804,000 pounds of narcotics for fiscal year 2004.

The canine enforcement program was responsible for detecting over 40,000 concealed humans and seizures of U.S. currency. It detected U.S. currency worth more than \$33 million in fiscal year 2004.

During fiscal year 2004, the canine enforcement program was accountable for over 68,000 quarantine material interceptions of plant materials and over 17,900 quarantine material interceptions of animal products with a combined weight of over 6,500 pounds.

Beginning next month, CBP canine team training will be realigned and consolidated under CBP's Office of Training and Development. It is important to note that the operational control in the

field will be retained by the Offices of Field Operations and Border Patrol.

This consolidation of canine training is a major step for CBP toward our goal of forging a single, unified border enforcement agency for the United States and gaining efficiencies whenever possible. It is a good fit and it makes sense.

CBP's Office of Training and Development already manages most of CBP's training, including basic and advanced training for CBP officers at the port of entry and border patrol agents and between the ports.

The merging of the canine training program will not only contribute to the efficiency of the training program, but it will ultimately contribute to the operational efficiency and the training nomenclature, training processes and certification process will be unified, as appropriate.

Migration of the CBP canine training program toward common language in training processes will enhance the ability of the Office of Border Patrol or Office of Field Operations' canine teams to jointly respond to major threats or initiatives.

CBP has invested a lot of time and effort in examining how best to manage its two legacy canine team programs. Over a period of several months, subject matter experts from the Office of Field Operations and the Office of Border Patrol, as well as other senior staff from throughout CBP, examined all aspects of CBP's canine programs and identified a number of best practices from across our agency.

Under CBP's new model, operators retain control of canine field operations and training assets are consolidated under a single canine team training program.

As a result, CBP's capacity to train canine teams will increase, and canine team training will be improved by promulgating state of the art training techniques and the best practices that evolved in both historically separate training programs.

Currently CBP has approximately 1,187 canine teams deployed around the country. Our canine teams consist of about 50 percent human detection narcotic teams, approximately 40 percent narcotic detector dog teams, and the remaining teams are of other disciplines.

CBP estimates that its new consolidated training program will train 246 teams in fiscal year 2006, expandable to some extent with the addition of resources.

Although CBP's canine teams came from legacy agencies, all the teams receive formal training and certification through fully mature, highly respected courses of instruction.

Canine teams are trained and certified and deployed in one or more of the following disciplines: field human detection, narcotic detection, explosive detection, detection of U.S. currency, cadaver detection, detection of prohibited agriculture products, open field tracking and trailing, and the detection of chemicals associated with weapons of mass destruction.

All canine enforcement teams are certified prior to field deployment and are subject to regular training maintenance requirements and undergo performance evaluations to maintain certifi-

cation of their detection capability, with the exception of CBP's explosive dogs that undergo a semiannual certification.

CBP maintains accurate records on the performance of each team, and CBP canine teams answer to the same rules, regulations and supervisory chain of command as the rest of the operational workforce.

Each supervisor exercising control over canine enforcement teams is required to observe detector dog performance and proficiency training during employment. Supervisors responsible for canine enforcement teams ensure that each officer conducts mandatory proficiency training.

CBP has also developed a training course designed for CBP's first and second line supervisors on all aspects of the proper use and deployment of canine teams. Canine teams assigned to airports and seaports examine vessels, baggage, cargo, mail and passengers. Teams stationed at land border crossings devote their time to examining vehicles and merchandise entering the United States.

Canine teams can be utilized to search for a trained odor in almost any area imaginable. During every work day, canine teams conduct training exercises to enhance the dogs' performance in the work environment.

Canine teams are a wonderful tool able to detect potential terrorists or concealed contraband hidden from view, using only the most basic tools of common sense at one end of the leash and amazing sense of smell at the other end.

It is important to note that our canine teams have a special niche in our border enforcement strategy and is so far unchallenged by any competing technology. No machine can match the speed, accuracy and flexibility of a canine team searching for hidden narcotic, humans, currency, explosives or pests in the hectic environment that exists in airports, seaports, land ports or border patrol checkpoints.

For example, at border ports, the canine team can examine a vehicle in five to six minutes. Even a cursory search by a CBP officer without a canine would require at least 20 minutes. Canines can check packages in a fraction of the time needed by mail examiners. A canine team can process 400 or 500 packages in approximately 20 minutes to 30 minutes.

For all their strengths, canine teams also have their limitations. Canine teams are also partnerships bonding one human and one animal. The strength of that partnership makes them effective, but canines and humans are live creatures and not interchangeable machine parts.

That is, handlers and canines are not instantly interchangeable with other handlers and other canines. No part of CBP works harder or achieves more spectacular results than our enthusiastic, energetic effective canine teams. As canine handlers would tell you, this is not a job, it is a passion.

Any factor that can affect a human or a canine, including heat, cold, fatigue, illness or age, can affect canine team performance. CBP's canine program is well known in the community as the benchmark by which other canine programs are measured.

During fiscal year 2004, Customs and Border Protection signed a memorandum agreement with the United States Coast Guard.

Under this MOA, CBP has already trained explosive dogs for the U.S. Coast Guard, and CBP stands ready to train all future Coast Guard narcotic and explosive detector dog teams.

Throughout 2005, CBP's canine enforcement program will continue to work with other federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies to develop training strategies and protocols based on real-world threats and intelligence trends.

Most notable were CBP's sustained cooperative efforts with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Transportation Security Administration and the United States Coast Guard.

CBP recognized canine teams serve in an important role in CBP's enforcement operations. CBP is continuously evaluating the efficiency of all its tools and making informed choices about the right mix of personnel, technology, equipment and infrastructure.

Based on CBP's recent review of canine operations and canine team training, it is certain that canine teams will continue to play an important role in CBP for the foreseeable future.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify. I will be happy to answer any of your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Titus follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LEE TITUS

Good Morning, Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Meek, Members of the Subcommittee, it is a privilege to appear before you today to discuss the training of canine teams within U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).

I want to begin by expressing my gratitude to the Committee for holding this hearing on canine teams, helping us to bring attention to the accomplishments of this important program and the issues facing the program, to the forefront.

CBP's canine law enforcement program—one of several such Department of Homeland Security canine programs that both protects life and property and contributes to the Department's law enforcement and anti-terrorism missions—is the largest federal canine law enforcement program in the United States. CBP has trained and deployed thousands of canine teams in support of our anti-terrorism and traditional missions over the years. Working together at and between our Nation's official ports of entry, our canine teams are a critical component in CBP's layered approach to border protection and our ability to secure our border, protect our homeland and defend against the threats posed by potential terrorists, explosives, chemical weapons, illegal aliens, narcotics, and harmful agricultural pests and products.

The canine enforcement program is responsible for a significant proportion of narcotic seizures made by Customs and Border Protection at ports of entry, checkpoints, and between official ports of entry, accounting for more than 11,600 narcotic seizures totaling over 1,804,196 pounds of narcotics in FY 2004. The canine enforcement program was also responsible for detecting 40,296 concealed humans and the seizures of U.S. currency worth \$33 million in FY 2004. During FY 2004 the canine enforcement program was accountable for over 68,512 Quarantine Material Interceptions of plant products and over 17,956 Quarantine Material Interceptions of animal products with a combined weight of 6,552 pounds.

Beginning next month, CBP canine team training will be realigned and consolidated under CBP's Office of Training and Development. It is important to note that operational control in the field will be retained by the Offices of Field Operations and Border Patrol. This consolidation of canine training is a major step for CBP toward our goal of forging a single, unified border enforcement agency for the United States and gaining efficiencies wherever possible. It is a good fit, and it makes sense; CBP's Office of Training and Development already manages most of CBP's training, including basic and advanced training for CBP Officers at the ports of entry and Border Patrol.

Agents in between the ports. The merging of the canine training program will not only contribute to the efficiency of the training program but will also ultimately contribute to operational efficiency in that the training nomenclature and training processes will be unified as appropriate. Migration of the CBP Canine Training program toward common language and training processes will enhance the ability of Office

of Border Patrol or Office of Field Operations Canine Teams to jointly respond to major threats or initiatives.

CBP has invested a lot of time and effort in examining how best to manage its two legacy canine team programs. Over a period of several months, subject matter experts from the Office of Field Operations and the Office of Border Patrol as well as other senior staff from throughout CBP, examined all aspects of CBP's canine programs and identified a number of best practices from across our agency. Under CBP's new model, operators retain control of canine field operations, and training assets are consolidated under a single canine team training program. As a result, CBP's capacity to train canine teams will increase, and canine team training will be improved by promulgating state-of-the-art training techniques and the best practices that evolved in both historically separate training programs.

Currently, CBP has approximately 1,187 canine teams deployed around the country. Our K-9 teams consist of 50% human detection/narcotic teams, approximately 40% are narcotic detection teams, and the remaining teams are other disciplines. CBP estimates that its new consolidated training program will train 246 teams in FY 2006, expandable to some extent with the addition of resources.

Although, CBP's canine teams came from legacy agencies, all of the teams receive formal training and certification through fully mature, highly respected courses of instruction. Canine teams are trained, certified and deployed in one or more detection disciplines: concealed human detection, narcotic detection, explosive detection, detection of currency, cadaver detection, detection of prohibited agricultural products, open field tracking and trailing and the detection of chemicals associated with weapons of mass destruction.

All canine enforcement teams are certified prior to field deployment; are subject to regular training maintenance requirements, and undergo annual performance evaluations to maintain certification of their detection capability. CBP maintains accurate records on the performance of each team, and CBP canine teams answer to the same rules, regulations and supervisory chain-of-command as the rest of the operational workforce.

Each supervisor exercising control over canine enforcement teams is required to observe detector dog performance during employment and proficiency training. Supervisors responsible for canine enforcement teams ensure that each officer conducts mandatory proficiency training.

Canine Teams assigned to airports and seaports examine vessels, baggage, cargo, mail, and passengers. Teams stationed at land border crossings devote their time to examining vehicles and merchandise entering the United States. Canine teams can be utilized to search for a trained odor in most any area imaginable. During every workday, canine teams conduct training exercises to enhance the dog's performance in the work environment. Canine teams are a wonderful tool, able to detect potential terrorists and concealed contraband hidden from view, using only the most basic of tools, common sense at one end of the leash and an amazing sense of smell at the other end.

It is also important to note that our canine teams have a special niche in our border enforcement strategy, a niche that so far is unchallenged by any competing technology. No machine can match the speed, accuracy and flexibility of a canine team searching for hidden narcotics, humans, currency, explosives, or pests in the hectic environment that exists in airports, seaports, land ports or Border Patrol checkpoints. For example, at border ports a canine team can examine a vehicle in 5 to 6 minutes. Even a cursory search by a CBP Officer without a canine would require at least 20 minutes. Canines can check packages in a fraction of the time needed by mail examiners. A canine team can process 400 to 500 packages in approximately 30 minutes.

For all their strengths, canine teams also have limitations. Canine teams are also partnerships bonding one human and one animal. The strength of that partnership makes them effective; but canines and humans are live creatures and not interchangeable machine parts. That is, handlers and canines are not instantly interchangeable with other handlers and other canines. No part of CBP works harder or achieves more spectacular results than our enthusiastic, energetic, and effective canine teams. As canine handlers will tell you, this is not a job, it's a passion. Any factor that can affect a human or a canine, including heat, cold, fatigue, illness or age can affect canine team performance.

CBP's Canine program is well known in the canine community as the benchmark that other canine programs are measured. During FY 2004, Customs and Border Protection signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the United States Coast Guard. Under this MOA, CBP stands ready to train all future Coast Guard narcotic and explosive detector dog teams. Throughout 2005 the CBP's Canine Enforcement Program continued to work with other federal law enforcement and intel-

ligence agencies to develop training strategies and protocols based on real-world threats and intelligence trends. Most notable were CBP's sustained cooperative efforts with the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the Transportation and Security Administration, and the United States Coast Guard.

CBP recognizes canine teams serve an important role in CBP's enforcement operations, but CBP is continuously evaluating the efficacy of all its tools, and making informed choices about the right mix of personnel, technology, equipment, and infrastructure. Based on CBP's recent review of canine operations and canine team training, it is certain that canine teams will continue to play an important role in CBP for the foreseeable future.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Titus.

The Chair would once again remind the witnesses that your full statement can be submitted for the record. We just ask you to give us a synopsis in 5 minutes or less, because we really want to get to questions. You know a lot of answers that we would like to probe.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. David Kontny, Director of the National Explosives Detection Canine Team Program at the Transportation Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, for his statement.

Mr. Kontny?

#### **STATEMENT OF DAVID KONTNY**

Mr. KONTNY. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Representative Meek and members of the subcommittee. I am pleased to have the opportunity today to discuss our efforts relating to the National Explosives Detection Canine Team Program.

Explosive detection canine teams are a proven, reliable and cost-effective solution to the detection of explosives. They form a vital component in our system of systems to detect and deter against terrorist acts upon our nation's transportation systems.

One key advantage of deploying canines is that this is a flexible, omnimodal capability. The canine teams could move throughout the system and they can also post at multiple points during periods that vary from shift and day by day.

This variability in locations and times for the use of canine teams adds an important element of unpredictability to enhance security.

TSA has worked aggressively to expand the explosive detection capabilities in the civil aviation environment by doubling capacity since the September 11th attacks.

Currently, TSA deploys 345 detection canine teams at 66 of the nation's busiest airports. With our continuing expansion, we expect by the end of the year 420 canine teams will be authorized at 82 airports around the country.

TSA is also working to greatly expand the use of explosive detection canine teams in the mass transit environment, especially in light of the March 2004 attacks in Madrid and the July 2005 bombings in London.

Since 1998, we have partnered with the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority to deploy teams there, and we are pleased to announce that we have selected an additional 10 transit and light rail systems to receive three TSA-certified detection canine teams each, for a total of 30 teams.

TSA is currently in the final stages of signing cooperative agreements with these mass transit and light rail systems which outline the terms and conditions under which they will participate.

Partnership with stakeholders, especially law enforcement and transportation authorities where TSA-certified explosive detection canine teams are deployed, is key to the program's success. Each canine team is composed of a dog provided by TSA and a handler who is actually employed by the local law enforcement agency or transportation authority.

TSA enters into a cooperative agreement with the local law enforcement and transportation authorities under which TSA provide the dog, associated training of the handler, explosive training aids and technical assistance at no cost to the participating agency.

In turn, the local jurisdiction agrees to utilize TSA canine teams at least 80 percent of the time in the transportation environment and to maintain a minimum of three certified teams available for around-the-clock incident response.

TSA also provides monetary reimbursement for the local jurisdiction in the amount of \$40,000 per canine team per year to help defray costs such as provision of proper kennel facilities, vehicles to transport the canines, and veterinary care for the canines as well as a portion of the handler's salary.

Prior to actual deployment, canines and their handlers undergo an extensive training course at the TSA Explosives Detection Canine Handler Course located with the Department of Defense Military Working Dog School at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas.

During the 10-week-long course, handlers develop handler skills, learn about explosives handling, safety and transportation requirements and explosives contamination issues while operating in their environment and become familiar with the administrative requirements of the program, including proper use of online applications designed to monitor day-to-day canine performance.

Once a team graduates from the initial training course, the team is given an initial certification and an assigned airport. Each newly deployed canine team must then complete a 14-day training mission in the operational environment.

Training does not stop upon graduation and initial certification. The teams undergo several hours of recurrent proficiency training each week in their operational environment. The results of each training exercise are recorded in the TSA canine Web site and are reviewed by TSA headquarters staff for compliance.

TSA also requires that each team go through an extensive annual certification process conducted onsite in an operational environment. The certification is one of the most rigorous operational tests administered and is designed to evaluate the team's ability to perform the day-to-day mission of securing the nation's transportation system.

The high standards we have set and the mechanisms which we put in place ensure that proper training, certification and oversight of the canine teams have enabled the National Explosives Detection Canine Team Program to become recognized as a leader in the canine community with whom other federal agencies, such as the Federal Protective Service, United States Coast Guard and Cus-



toms and Border Protection and their counterparts from abroad, are eager to partner.

TSA greatly appreciates the funding that Congress has provided to support the efforts I have described above in the airport and mass terminal environment.

In addition, Congress also has provided funding this fiscal year to support our efforts in the air cargo area, which include, among other things, an analysis of an operational test and evaluation of TSA-certified canine teams' ability to detect explosives in various cargo and mail configurations and the installation of a new cargo training lab in San Antonio, Texas.

For 2006, the president's budget requests \$19 million to continue support of the program in the airport environment. TSA is eager to work with Congress to ensure the explosive detection canine programs relating to air cargo and mass transit will continue to be adequately supported.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Meek and other members of the subcommittee, this concludes my prepared remarks, and I would be pleased at this time to answer any of your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Kontny follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID KONTNY

Good morning Mr. Chairman, Congressman Meek, and Members of the Subcommittee. I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you with my colleagues from U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATFE) to discuss the use of canines in deterring, detecting, and preventing potential terrorist attacks.

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) administers the National Explosives Detection Canine Team Program (NEDCTP), one of the largest explosives detection canine programs in the Federal government, second only to the Department of Defense (DOD). The purpose of this program is to deter and detect the introduction of explosives devices into the transportation system. TSA has worked aggressively to expand canine explosives detection capabilities in the civil aviation environment by doubling capacity since the September 11 attacks. While these efforts will continue, we are also working to expand our capabilities in other modes of transportation. TSA recognizes that canine teams are one of our most mobile explosives detection tools and is working steadfastly to take full advantage of the multifaceted capabilities that canine teams provide.

Currently TSA has deployed 345 explosives detection canine teams at 66 of the Nation's busiest airports (Category X and Category I) and one mass transit system (Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)). Our on-going Phase III expansion within the aviation sector will bring this total to 82 airports and 420 canine teams. These teams are deployed in support of day-to-day activities within the airport and mass transit environment (MARTA) to search aircraft, vehicles, terminals, warehouses (cargo), checked baggage, and subway systems.

Each canine team is composed of one dog provided by TSA and one handler employed by the local law enforcement or transportation authority that has volunteered and partnered to participate with the NEDCTP. Under a Cooperative Agreement executed with each local law enforcement or transportation authority with whom TSA has agreed to provide certified canines, the local jurisdiction agrees to utilize TSA-certified canine teams at least 80% of the time in the transportation environment and to maintain a minimum of three TSA-certified canine teams available around-the-clock for incident response. The remaining 20% of the time allows local agencies to use these resources to execute other community activities such as response to bomb threats, searches for high profile events, and other law enforcement activities that would require the use of an explosives detection canine team. TSA provides the dog, associated training of the handler, explosives training aids, and technical assistance at no cost to the participating agency and provides monetary reimbursement to the local jurisdiction, in the amount of \$40,000 per canine team per year to help defray costs such as the provision of proper kennel facilities, vehicles to transport canine teams, and veterinary care for the canines, as well as a portion of the handlers' salaries.

The NEDCTP supports an extensive infrastructure in order to accomplish required training of explosives detection canine teams and to monitor their performance. The program requirements, which include an intensive training regimen, periodic evaluation, and annual certification, are essential to assuring quality control over the program. The high standards that we have set and maintained and the mechanisms we have put in place to ensure thorough oversight have enabled the NEDCTP to become recognized as a leader in the canine community with whom other Federal agencies and our counterparts from abroad are eager to partner.

Handlers and canines undergo initial training at the TSA Explosives Detection Canine Handler Course co-located at the DOD Military Working Dog School, at Lackland Air Force Base, in San Antonio, TX. Under this arrangement, TSA has shared use of U.S. Air Force training facilities and the United States Army Veterinarian Medical facilities. TSA controls the course curriculum and the certification requirements of the teams to meet TSA-certification standards. This results in a tremendous cost savings for TSA. The training course and facilities in San Antonio are considered to be the "Center of Excellence" for canine training.

TSA has adopted a three-prong approach to canine procurement in order to ensure an adequate number of canines are available for training and subsequent deployment. This three-prong approach includes partnering with DOD during canine "buy trips", use of U.S. canine vendors, and the TSA Puppy Program. The TSA Puppy Program is a direct result of our consultation with the Australian government and is modeled after the successful Australian Customs Service National Breeding Program. The Puppy Program could not be accomplished without the support of the San Antonio and Austin Texas communities as each of the puppies are placed in a foster home with local community members. I would like to publicly acknowledge their outstanding support to this program. In addition, as a reminder of the legacy of the victims of the 9/11 attacks and our continued efforts in the fight against terrorism, each puppy is named after a victim of those attacks.

The initial training of the handler and canine consists of a 10-week training course, during which handlers develop handler skills; learn about explosives handling, safety and transportation requirements, and explosives contamination issues within the operating environment; and become familiar with administrative requirements of the program, including proper use of on-line applications designed to monitor day-to-day canine performance. Once a team graduates from the initial training course, the team is given an initial certification at an assigned airport. Each newly deployed canine team must then complete a 14-day training mission in the operating environment before given full certification.

Training does not stop upon graduation and initial certification. The teams undergo several hours of recurrent proficiency training each week in their operational environment, which includes all the smells and distractions associated with a busy transportation system. This training is "objective based" where the handler/trainer must set a training problem up that enhances the team's capabilities or is used to correct a minor discrepancy that was noted during an evaluation or previous training scenario. The training is conducted utilizing canine training aids procured and prepared by TSA, which characterize real threats. The results of each training exercise are recorded in the TSA Canine Web Site (CWS) and are reviewed by TSA headquarters staff for compliance.

TSA also requires each team to go through an intensive annual certification process. These certifications are conducted on site in an operational environment within a three-four day period. The certification is one of the most rigorous operational tests administered and is designed to evaluate the team's ability to perform their day-to-day mission of securing the nation's transportation system.

For FY 05, TSA has been appropriated \$22 million to administer the NEDCTP. Within this amount, \$17 million is dedicated to steadily increase the number of teams deployed at airports. As indicated earlier, we currently have 345 explosives detection canine teams deployed at 66 airports and one mass transit system, and we are continuing our progress to attain an authorized strength of 420 canine teams deployed at 82 airports by the end of this calendar year.

TSA also recognizes the importance of dedicating explosives detection canine teams to provide a timely and mobile response option to threats arising in other modes of transportation, especially in light of the March, 2004, attacks in Madrid and the July, 2005, bombings in London. Within the \$22 million appropriated for FY 05, \$2 million is dedicated to supporting expansion of the NEDCTP into additional mass transit/light rail systems. Currently TSA is working towards providing ten mass transit systems with three TSA-certified explosives detection canine teams each, for a total of 30 teams. The ten systems have been identified based on a comparative analysis of the size of the systems according to passenger ridership, location of the nation's critical infrastructure in the transit sector, threats in the transit

sector, and other security criteria. Additional information on this initiative was provided to potential participants at the Mass Transit Stakeholders Summit held on August 10, 2005. TSA is in continuing discussions with stakeholders to finalize the terms and conditions under which the transit agencies would participate in the NEDCTP. These agreements would closely mirror those that TSA has entered into with airports.

Explosives detection canine teams bring technical capability, mobility, and flexibility to security—attributes essential in protecting network systems. The canine teams can move throughout the system, and they can also post at multiple points during time periods that vary by shift and by day. This variability in locations and times for use of canine teams adds an important element of unpredictability to enhance security. TSA is working to take full advantage of the flexible, omni-modal capability that canine teams afford. We have worked with all participants in the NEDCTP to acclimate their teams to various transportation systems that they may be asked to support so that teams can be rapidly re-deployed to other transportation sectors should threat conditions deem such measures appropriate. This has enabled TSA-certified explosives detection canine teams to be shifted as a Rapid Deployment Force to support security efforts at mass transit systems, bus terminals, and general aviation locations during National Special Security Events, including the G-8 Summit, both national political conventions in 2004, and the Inauguration festivities.

In addition, the FY 05 appropriations contained \$3 million to support TSA canine explosives detection activities relating to air cargo. In 2004, TSA conducted an Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) of a TSA-certified canine team's ability to detect explosives in various cargo and mail configurations. The OT&E concluded in August, 2004, and the preliminary results were promising. TSA is further analyzing the data from the OT&E and will make recommendations on whether explosives detection canine teams should be incorporated, along with other systems and technologies, into the screening of cargo and mail transported on passenger aircraft. As a result of the OT&Es, the NEDCTP has partnered with our Aviation Cargo section to develop a comprehensive list of activities to enhance canine detection capabilities and deployment options within the cargo environment. One of these activities is our new Cargo Training Lab in San Antonio, which is designed to replicate a cargo warehouse environment.

For FY 06, the President's budget includes \$19 million, which will permit continued support of the NEDCTP in the airport environment. TSA greatly appreciates Congress' assistance in funding the NEDCTP, particularly those activities relating to mass transit and air cargo. As indicated earlier, canine teams will be deployed at 10 transit systems in the very near future. TSA will work with Congress to ensure that explosives detection canine programs relating to air cargo and mass transit will continue to be adequately supported. The TSA Canine Support Branch currently has the physical capacity to train 108 new canine teams during each calendar year.

Explosives detection canine teams are a proven, reliable, and cost-effective solution for the detection of explosives, and they form a key component of the Department's threat-based risk management approach to homeland security. In close partnership with airport and other stakeholder operators, TSA has worked to steadily increase the number of teams available to address the threat of explosives being introduced into the transportation sector. While this work will continue, special emphasis is now being placed to rapidly increase the number of canine teams that are deployed to modes other than aviation and to maximize the flexible, multi-modal capability that canine teams afford. The formation of the Department of Homeland Security Rapid Deployment Force for mass transit canine and our recent efforts to co-sponsor regional training sessions with the ATFE are examples of Federal agencies working together to leverage both training and operational resources. The recent completion of the TSA Canine Explosives Storage and Characterization Facility and the centralized procurement, packaging and delivery of canine training aids are other examples of departmental leveraging. In addition, TSA has partnered with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and National Institute of Justice to sponsor the Scientific Working Group on Dog and Orthogonal Detection Guidelines to enhance the performance of detector dog teams.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Meek, and other Members of the Subcommittee, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be pleased at this time to answer any questions.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Kontny.

The Chair now recognizes Special Agent Terry Bohan, Chief of the National Canine Training and Operations Support Branch at

the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives of the Department of Homeland Security, for his statement.

#### **STATEMENT OF TERRY BOHAN**

Chief BOHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Meek, and members of the subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on behalf of the men and women of ATF.

ATF has over 500 canine handler teams deployed with federal, state, local and law enforcement agencies. We have trained explosives detection canines, or EDCs, for the FBI, the U.S. Marshals Service, the IRS, FEMA and 16 foreign countries. ATF has placed trained canines in 41 states and the Virgin Islands.

The trademark of ATF's canine program is the exclusive use of Labrador Retrievers. ATF acquires the canines from various guide dog foundations and trains the animals as EDCs. The program also combines ATF's specialized experience in explosives investigations with the knowledge of our forensic chemists and accredited national laboratory.

The annual certification that our canines must pass has been independently validated by Oak Ridge National Laboratories. Our canines also routinely participate in in-service training and evaluations.

ATF's canine training facility is located in rural Virginia with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection facility. This year ATF will train approximately 26 foreign canine teams and 36 teams for federal, state and local agencies.

ATF is reimbursed by the State Department's Antiterrorism Assistance Program for all costs associated with training foreign countries. U.S. agencies receive their canines and training at no charge in exchange for assisting ATF when needed.

ATF's EDC program supports multiple missions working closely with other federal, state and local agencies to ensure national security. ATF is often called upon to deploy a large number of canine teams to both national security events and other venues.

ATF canines also support ATF's mission in enforcing criminal statutes, combating explosives and firearms violence. From January of 2000 to December of 2003, there were nearly 3,000 bombings in the United States, causing 334 injuries, 51 deaths and nearly \$27 million in damage.

Since the beginning of fiscal year 2004, ATF canine teams have handled over 800 deployments to prevent or investigate terrorism or violent crimes, including providing assistance to the Iraqi police service and the U.S. military in Iraq.

Since September 11th, 2001, the need for a national standard for EDCs became more important. ATF developed a national odor recognition standard in 1996 at the direction of Congress. ATF has been working with various organizations to more widely implement those standards.

Following ATF's move to the Department of Justice under the Homeland Security Act, then-Attorney General John Ashcroft issued a directive regarding explosives jurisdiction which, among other things, directed that as soon as practicable all Justice Department components that use explosives detection canines are to use only canines certified by ATF.

ATF's national odor recognition testing, or NORT, is a critical aspect of fulfilling the attorney general's directive. More than 50 percent of all law enforcement canine teams are not associated with a federal canine training program or certification. In fact, there is no consistent definition of what even constitutes an explosives detection canine or training.

Furthermore, the National Bomb Squad Commanders Advisory Board has acknowledged the need for testing of EDCs and has asked ATF to address this issue. ATF is in a unique position to address this public safety issue, and we hope to make the test available to all canine teams in the future.

NORT will develop and nurture collaborative partnerships through training with other agencies, all of whom are, in one form or another, responsible for protecting the public against the threat of violent crime and terrorism.

Finally, ATF continues to combat terrorism and ensure public safety by supporting the efforts of other agencies currently that use EDCs that are not trained by ATF. During this past year, ATF has provided training to non-ATF trained canines by holding seminars and training sessions.

Additionally, ATF has provided training on peroxide explosives for Washington, D.C.-area canines and at this moment is conducting the same training in New Jersey for canines of the New York City area.

We continue to work on other training issues such as safe handling of explosives and canine deployment techniques to improve the human side of the equation and increase public safety in the process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

[The statement of Chief Bohan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TERRY BOHAN

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Meek, and members of the Subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on behalf of the men and women of ATF and ATF's National Canine Training and Operations Support Branch.

By way of background, ATF has been training canines since 1984, dating from our relationship with the Connecticut State Police and the training of the first accelerant detection canine, "Nellie." Since 1995, ATF has trained 36 classes of explosives detection canines at our National Canine Training Center in Front Royal, Virginia. Currently, we have deployed over 500 explosives detection canines worldwide with State, local, Federal, and foreign law enforcement agencies. We have trained explosives detection canines for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Marshals Service, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, other government agencies, and 16 foreign countries through the State Department's Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program. Training canines for other Federal, State, local and foreign law enforcement agencies is a major component of our mission, which in turn supports our Strategic Goals of protecting the public and reducing violent crime.

ATF's explosives detection canines training methodology was developed and is overseen by ATF's forensic chemists and our nationally accredited explosives lab. The testing of the methodology has been independently validated by the Department of Energy's Oak Ridge National Laboratories. It is estimated that there are more than 19,000 known explosives compositions worldwide. This number makes it impossible to train a canine on all these compositions individually. However, the vast majority of explosives are composed of a relatively small number of explosive chemicals or ingredients. Because of this, ATF trains on five basic families of explosive chemicals, enabling ATF explosives detection canines to detect a very wide range of explosives formulations. This ensures that the canines can detect explosives com-

pounds to which they have never previously been exposed. For example, in the case of water gel or emulsion type explosives, whether the explosive is Tovex® Austin Emulex, or any of several thousand commercial blasting or improvised explosive ANFO mixtures of this type, the one common ingredient is ammonium nitrate. Rather than concentrate just on individual brands, which may contain proprietary formulas, by training the canine to detect ammonium nitrate, we can, in effect, cover the whole family of products which might contain ammonium nitrate. In fact, during the final certification, the canines are tested on some explosive materials they have not seen in training. Moreover, ATF systematically trains canines on peroxide explosives, which have been used in several terrorist attacks.

To ensure the canine's continued high level of performance, ATF hosts a mandatory annual recertification/training seminar for each U.S.-based ATF-trained canine team (handler and canine). During this recertification, the team's proficiency is tested and the handler's extensive training log for the previous year is reviewed. The canine teams are also continually evaluated for their operational proficiency by ATF during in-service training sessions.

While other breeds of canines may possess the temperament and qualities for explosive detection, ATF only uses the Labrador retriever. We have found that they are a hearty, intelligent breed that is readily adaptable to changing environments and they possess a gentle disposition which allows for multiple teams to work in close proximity to each other. This allows for teams to work in crowds and around children, for example, which we find to be highly complementary to ATF's diverse and worldwide mission.

ATF obtains its canines from guide dog foundations. Volunteers called "puppy raisers" keep the canines in their homes from 8 weeks to 14 months of age. These families give their time and love to the puppies so they can be properly socialized and acclimated to the family environment. The families housebreak the canines, expose them to real world environments, and ensure that they receive all their vaccinations. Occasionally, however, a canine does not meet the requirements of a guide dog. Undesirable traits in a guide dog, such as curiosity and eagerness, are precisely the qualities that ATF seeks for an explosives detection canine. The guide dog organization then notifies ATF, and ATF trainers examine the canine to identify its potential as an explosives detection canine. The excellent quality of canines procured and the training methodology ATF uses have resulted in a proven track record of a 7—to 9—year working life of the canine. Throughout the canine's working career and beyond in retirement, the canine resides in the handler's home as a trusted partner and family member.

The ATF Canine Training Facility and Kennel are located in Front Royal, Virginia, on the grounds of the 250-acre U.S. Customs and Border Protection Canine Training Facility. The 14,000-square-foot training building allows for climate controlled, year-round training. The state-of-the art kennel can accommodate 100 canines and incorporates the latest technology in kennel design. ATF's canine training program trains both explosives detection and accelerant detection canines. In addition to the basic canine and handler training programs that occur throughout the year, this facility is used as the site of annual recertification training for all ATF-trained canines operating domestically. This facility also provides an appropriate location for the continuing development and enhancement of testing, operational and tactical protocols for our canine teams.

This year, ATF will train approximately 26 foreign explosives detection canines for the State Department's Anti-Terrorism Assistance program and 34 such teams for Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies. The student handler classes are mixed to foster greater relationships and collaboration among domestic and foreign law enforcement agencies. Domestically, ATF evaluates applicant State and local agencies to ensure that they have the need for and the means to physically support a canine/handler team when selecting students for the program. Federal, State, and local law enforcement trainees attend training and receive a canine at no charge to their agency. Foreign law enforcement agencies receive canines through a reimbursable agreement between ATF and the State Department's Anti-Terrorism Assistance program. Critical in this arrangement is the agreement made between ATF and the student's agency that the agency receiving the training will assist ATF with investigations, when called upon, for a period of 5 years. In fact, foreign ATF-trained canine/handler teams responded to assist with security for the 2002 Salt Lake City and 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games, as well as Olympics held in other countries.

While a number of Federal agencies utilize explosives detection canines, each is unique to its own particular missions, such as protecting the Nation's airports or enforcing border security. ATF's explosives detection canines program supports multiple missions and works in an impressive variety of venues: from scouring bomb

scenes to assisting in search warrant executions; and supporting State and local law enforcement with canine teams for major sporting events. ATF is also able to deploy large numbers of canines, when requested, to National Special Security Events and other major gatherings, such as the G-8 Conference, Presidential inaugurations, Super Bowls, and the World Series. ATF canines, of course, also support ATF's mission in enforcing criminal statutes combating explosives and firearms violence. From January 2000 to December 2003, there were nearly 3,000 bombings in the United States, with 334 injuries, 51 deaths, and nearly \$27 million in damage. Many times ATF explosives detection canines or accelerant canine detection of evidence in explosives, firearms, or arson investigations has contributed to successful prosecutions. These canines are stationed throughout the United States in ATF offices, local police department and bomb squads, other Federal agencies, and foreign government agencies. Since the beginning of FY 2004, ATF canine teams have handled over 800 deployments domestically and internationally to prevent or investigate terrorism and violent crimes, including providing assistance to the Iraqi Police Service and the U.S. military in Iraq. ATF explosives detection canines are providing support to other U.S. government agencies in Iraq to protect American lives and property.

In supporting the Department of Justice in its goal of combating terrorism, ATF canines have played a significant role. While deployed on missions, ATF canine teams have recovered improvised explosive devices, explosives materials, post-blast evidence, firearms, shell casings, and ammunition. ATF canine teams have made recoveries and contributed to recent high profile cases such as the Washington, DC, area sniper investigations, when an ATF canine team was instrumental in finding shell casings.

With the increased levels of security in the United States since September 11, 2001, the country has seen a dramatic increase in the number of explosives detection canines being used by law enforcement and private companies. A common question is whether there is a need for national standards for explosives detection canines. In 1996, Congress directed ATF, through the Treasury Secretary, to develop national odor recognition standards for explosives detection canines. ATF set interim standards in 1997, and has been working with various organizations since then to more widely implement the standards. With ATF's move to the Department of Justice under the Homeland Security Act, then-Attorney General John Ashcroft issued a memorandum on August 11, 2004, regarding explosives investigation jurisdiction which, among other things, directed that as soon as practicable, all Justice Department components that use explosives detection canines are to use only ATF-certified canines. ATF's National Odor Recognition Testing ("NORT") is a critical aspect of fulfilling the Attorney General's directive.

In response to the growing demand nationwide for explosives detection canines, as well as concerns about the quality of canines being procured by law enforcement agencies from non-governmental sources, ATF is taking steps to provide more assistance to other State, local, and Federal law enforcement agencies. This includes providing training and knowledge to help law enforcement agencies have proficient explosives detection canines and give them the ability to evaluate and rectify shortcoming.

More than 50 percent of all law enforcement canine teams are not associated with a recognized Federal canine training program or certification. There are numerous private vendors selling explosives detection canines that have trained those dogs according to a variety of inconsistent standards and under various conditions. In fact, there is no consistent definition as to what even constitutes an explosives detection canine. Because of this lack of consistency, and for safety reasons, the National Bomb Squad Commanders Advisory Board has stated that they would like every explosives detection canines working in conjunction with a bomb squad in the United States to have passed a standard certification. ATF is in a unique position to address this public safety issue. The formal implementation of ATF's NORT, backed by hard science in the form of chemistry and administered by experienced trainers, will greatly enhance public safety as well as help validate the capabilities of explosives detection canines being used nationally and internationally as antiterrorist tools. Informal testing began earlier this year with the use of non-ATF trained explosives detection canines in order to assess how they would perform. These initial tests were promising, and as a result, additional EDCs were tested. Based on these results, ATF offered a successful pilot NORT at our Canine Training Center on September 20, 2005, with further testing scheduled in the future.

The NORT will be of tremendous benefit to Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign explosives canine programs that choose to participate. The NORT initiative will allow for the continued enhancement of explosives investigation expertise within the law enforcement community. Additionally, NORT will both develop and nurture collaborative partnerships through training with other agencies, all of whom are, in

one form or another, responsible for protecting the public against the threat of violent crime and terrorism. This is truly government at its best.

Finally, ATF continues to combat terrorism and ensure public safety by supporting the efforts of other agencies that currently lack ATF-trained canines but utilize explosives detection canines. During this past year ATF has offered and delivered training to non-ATF trained canines, by holding seminars and training sessions during meetings of the International Association of Bomb Technicians and Investigators (including training on dangerous peroxide explosives). In August of 2005, ATF hosted a training day for Washington, D.C., area canines for the purpose of exposing the teams to peroxide explosives. As we speak, ATF is delivering peroxide explosives training to canine teams in New York City and will conduct the same training next week for the United States Capitol Police. We have also scheduled explosives safety training in FY 2006 for canine teams to expose them to a wide array of live explosives, explosive products, and detonators. We also will cover safe handling of explosives, improving the human side of the equation and increasing public safety in the process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Bohan. And I want to correct an error. You are with the Department of Justice, not the Department of Homeland Security as I stated in your introduction.

I would like to start off with a few questions. How many dogs did you say that you all train in ATF a year?

Chief BOHAN. This year, we will train 26 teams for foreign countries and 36 canine teams for state and local agencies.

Mr. ROGERS. So 36 for domestic use.

Chief BOHAN. For domestic use, yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Does that meet the demand? Is there more of a demand than that for your canine teams?

Chief BOHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. How much more of a demand, just within your department?

Chief BOHAN. I know we have a backlog in requests. Our schools are full through this next fiscal year and into the next.

#### ATTACHMENT #1

Agency note: We have 68 qualified applicants pending from Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies, and can accommodate 50 of those in Fiscal Year 2006.

Mr. ROGERS. And those are two schools, right? How many schools do you have?

Chief BOHAN. Three schools.

Mr. ROGERS. Three schools. And I heard you mention the one in Virginia. Where are the other two?

Chief BOHAN. Excuse me, I thought you were talking classes. We have one canine training facility.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. And three classes within that school?

Chief BOHAN. We have scheduled three explosives detection courses for this fall.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. But you only have that one facility.

Chief BOHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. All right.

And, Mr. Titus, now, you all have your training program in El Paso, is that correct?

Mr. TITUS. Sir, we have two facilities. We do have the Canine Enforcement Training Center at Front Royal. That is a 250-acre facility that we own.



Mr. ROGERS. And that is where yours is, Mr. Bohan?

Chief BOHAN. Yes, sir. We are co-located on Customs and Border Protection's canine facility.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. But you have separate training programs in the same facility.

Chief BOHAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

I am sorry, Mr. Titus. You have that one and what else?

Mr. TITUS. Yes, sir. We have the National Canine Facility in El Paso, Texas, as well.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. And I heard you state earlier that you have trained 1,189 dogs, or that is how many you have in service now?

Mr. TITUS. That is how many we have in service, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. How many have you trained through your two facilities?

Mr. TITUS. Between the two facilities, we have probably trained a little over 200, 220 this year. And for fiscal year 2006 we are looking at about 230.

Mr. ROGERS. And that is your capacity each year to turn out.

Mr. TITUS. That is what we are training for CBP. We do have some additional dogs we are going to be training for state and locals, and we are doing some training, I believe next month, for the Brazilian federal police. We are training explosive dogs for them.

Mr. ROGERS. You have 1,189 dogs now in use. Does that meet your demand with just CBP?

Mr. TITUS. That gives us a good edge out there as part of our layered enforcement approach for canines out there. We are at 73 ports of entry and 69 checkpoints. That is what we have today, and that is what we are projecting—we are training another 230 for next year.

Of the 1,100 we also have to project how many of those dogs are going to retire the upcoming year and how many dogs we may have for medical proficiency problems as well.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

Mr. Kontny, how many dogs do you all have in service?

Mr. KONTNY. Right now, sir, we have 345 teams deployed across the country.

Mr. ROGERS. That is just domestically.

Mr. KONTNY. That is domestically, sir, and that includes San Juan, and we have some over in Hawaii, as well.

Mr. ROGERS. And how many do you think you need?

Mr. KONTNY. It depends, sir, on what our expansion is. Obviously, we are going to add the additional 30 teams to the mass transit systems, as well. It is predicated upon where we place those allocations and the resources we have available to train and deploy the teams.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, you mentioned 30 teams for mass transit. Now, I made reference a little while ago of the fact that here in D.C. we are going to have a team stationed.

Mr. KONTNY. Yes, sir, and that will augment the teams that are already here in place.

Mr. ROGERS. All right. I guess my question is, given this new entire or foray into mass transit venues, do you see the 30 new

teams meeting that new demand? It seems an ominous challenge to me.

Mr. KONTNY. Sir, that is the initial deployment opportunity we had based on the funding that Congress gave us for fiscal year 2005.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. Can you tell me, Mr. Kontny, how you determine which agencies will receive your dogs?

Mr. KONTNY. Yes, sir. The mass transit systems are based on a threat analysis. We do it on a threat basis. It is a model that is similar to ODP. We also look at passenger throughput, the amount of stations that are at each one of those locations.

In the aviation sector, we actually look at the passenger throughput, again the threat-based matrix on where those airports are located and how many teams would be responsible to cover that particular airport.

Mr. ROGERS. Does TSA have any plans to expand their canine training capabilities?

Mr. KONTNY. Right now, sir, we have just expanded it. We actually went from 64 students a year to 108. And we have additional capacity to be able to expand slightly more.

Mr. ROGERS. How quickly can you increase that capacity?

Mr. KONTNY. Again, we would have to work through our partners and with the Department of Defense, but we have allocated some space and resources to be able to do that in the future.

Mr. ROGERS. But you do not know how quickly you could ramp up?

Mr. KONTNY. No, sir, not a specific time frame.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

I see my time is about to expire, but I have got a lot more questions. But I will at this time yield to my friend and colleague, the Ranking Member from Florida, Mr. Meek, for any questions he may have.

Mr. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to pass at this time on my questioning so some of the other members can ask their questions. If you can come back to me, I would appreciate it.

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member of the full committee, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, for any questions he may have.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, it looks like we are going to do the—I am going to pass until the second panel also.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Texas for any questions that she may have.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me thank the distinguished chairman. Both of us were on a CODEL that was enormously informative.

And I want to say to the presenters here I do not think there is anyone opposing that. I have an enormous respect for the utilization of the canine, the man's and woman's best friend, in the service of their country.

And I ask your indulgence for a moment. I will be here throughout the entire hearing and offer my comments on it. But let me, Mr. Chairman, offer some further comments that I think are appropriate at this time.

In fact, let me make the nexus of the utilization of these animals in homeland security—that is, that in the search and rescue of Hurricane Katrina victims and even survivors the canine units have been enormously effective. We have seen the Coast Guard being out front. We thank them very much.

But I think that if you would indulge me again, coming now from the region of Hurricane Rita and having just been on the ground in some of the most hardest-hit areas—I was invited to go into those areas—a number of elected officials—and because of my service on the Homeland Security Commission—Mr. Chairman and the ranking member, I really want to make an official request that in spite of the committee that is now looking at what happened, I cannot think of a more important responsibility for the Homeland Security Committee than to immediately get moving on this disaster.

And I say that for this subcommittee having the key responsibility—I might to the ranking member, who has been a leader on this issue, and the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, ranking member of the full committee—leaders, because we have worked together.

But let me cry out for those who died, family members who still do not have access to corpses, do not know whether the individuals are missing or dead. Let me cry out for the people that I went to heated buildings, not because it was 100 degrees outside, but because they had no generators, they had no opportunity to reach anyone to get generators, and they were the command station.

Let me reach out for people who had to commandeer a hotel because there was no one to give instructions that this hotel should be open so that they could have their emergency center.

And let me just say, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I really am tired of those who are not on the scene to talk about who should have evacuated. Everybody that was able to evacuate tried to evacuate.

But what we do not have in our portfolio is to realize that there is always going to be someone left behind. That is a new experience for us, because I think Homeland Security was thinking that if we organize and we get an evacuation plan, we are just going to be moving with all pistons going.

Some ones are left behind. And so what I confronted were local officials with no resources and ability to communicate, no ability to get satellite phones, no ability to get generators, no ability to get food, no ability to get water, no ability to get ice.

FEMA personnel on the ground to be commended, flying from all over the country. But if I might give you a keystone cops scenario, which is why this management—this committee is so vital, why the Homeland Security Committee is so vital—because we live with this all the time.

Let me give you the keystone cops. The FEMA personnel saying I am in charge of generators but I have got to get the order from the state in order to move the generators, even though the county judge is in maybe 150 degree temperature, with hospitals not functioning, obviously evacuated, some still left behind.

People gathering around neighborhoods, if you will, trolling for food, trolling for water, trolling for ice, and they can not move it because there is nobody to give an order.

Cell phones going dead while we are talking to H-E-B—that happens to be a food chain—who is saying I can send you bread and water, and those trucks getting lost because all the signage is down—so a 30-minute trip may take 1 hour to 2 hours. I wish the canines could help us lead them in.

Mr. Chairman, if there is ever a time now for the new chairman and yourself and other subcommittees with our ranking member to say we are in charge—and when I say that, I do not say it arrogantly. What I am suggesting to you—I left behind local officials who did their best on the evacuation.

If my city had been hit, I cannot tell you without exaggerating the loss of life. Why? Because we had people that were still trying to get out as Hurricane Rita was hitting. We had to close freeways and say you cannot go up 59 North anymore because it is getting too close.

Obviously, Hurricane Rita went another direction, but, frankly, if she had not, we had people on the road—a staff person with two children and a wife that I told to get out—32 hours—if anybody's from Texas, from Houston to Fort Worth, 32.

So therefore, we would have had—what you saw on CNN was true. And they would have still been there if Hurricane Rita and/or Katrina of that magnitude had have come and stayed for a while. That is a management question.

We have a letter that has come to my attention, and I will share it with this committee, and I ask unanimous consent to submit it into the record, dated September 28th from the secretary of Homeland Security, who is preparing to go forward with his plan for something called a preparedness directorate and limiting FEMA to be a recovery and—let me get the words correct.

Let me keep going. I ask the indulgence of the chair. I would just simply like to call out what I am seeing here as to what this is going to be—including infrastructure, cybersecurity. They are going to be something called a recovery unit. And there is something called a preparedness directive.

Mr. Chairman, this committee should be engaged. Though we are not in the business of micromanaging, we have got a crisis here. So I simply ask this committee, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, to make the request for us to look closely at what is happening.

I would almost ask the chairman to get a response from Director Paulison, and I will say this as I close. I want to give him a compliment. Director Paulison was accessible. He was new on the job but he suffers from the same issue. Who is in charge?

Maybe the state system is not the best system, because while we were asking the state, Mr. Chairman, to open the contraflow lanes, they were in a meeting trying to decide whether they could open the lanes. And they were in a meeting deciding whether the military was appropriate vehicle to come in to help them evacuate persons. Who was in charge?

Who is in charge to get ice and water to a county official who is calling for it? Who is in charge to release the generators? I am not going to blame FEMA on this issue. They were looking for an order. No order came through to them.

So let me just put this in the record: I am writing to reiterate the department's strong conviction that our proposal to create a consolidated directorate for preparedness will greatly strengthen DHS.

I think we should be looking at that, because it wants to strip FEMA from what I think is an appropriate role for FEMA, either a leadership cabinet position or certainly a leadership position, where they can command the respect with the skilled personnel, Mr. Chairman, professionals who know about emergency response, such as Mr. Paulison, who is a firefighter of many, many years.

And I can not imagine that FEMA would simply be a recovery entity, throwing all those expert staff persons to the ground. And I only say to you that we are still struggling in the region with no electricity, schools closed, evacuees still evacuated, Katrina victims returning, places like East Texas still inoperable.

Mr. Chairman, I think Homeland Security has got right now to convene meetings and begin the assessment that I think we can do. And I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentlelady yields back. And with unanimous consent, the memo is put into the record.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. McCaul, for any questions he may have for the panelists.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a member of the Texas delegation, I would like to echo some of the comments made by the gentlelady from Texas. I know that at the appropriate time that this committee, our committee, will exercise its oversight responsibilities.

As a former federal prosecutor, I have worked with BATF personally, firsthand. I have seen the great benefit that the canines and canine units have delivered. And I wanted to explore a couple other areas of use, if I can.

Primarily I know they are used for explosives. There is some research out there that canines can now be used to detect biological and chemical weapons. As you know, this very capital was under a threat after the 9/11 attacks from anthrax and ricin.

Apparently that is a reality now, that canines can be trained to detect that. My first question is does BATF have any, or Homeland Security have any, intention to explore that possibility and use canines for that purpose?

There is also a new age explosive called TATP that was used in Israel, has been used by insurgents in Iraq, and I know that detections are difficult for this type of new age explosive. If you could comment on that in terms of where are we with using canines to detect TATP.

And then finally, I am on a border state. I know we have sensors for radiological items that may come across the border. If you could also comment—and this is my last question—on the use of canines on the border.

Chief BOHAN. The peroxide explosives which you refer to are something ATF has trained continually and certified on since 2002. Currently we are working to make that training available to other agencies.

As we speak, we are conducting training right now in New Jersey and the New York City area. So canines, in fact, are successful with finding the peroxide explosives.

As far as the other substances, I would defer to Mr. Titus on that.

Mr. TITUS. Sir, we do have chemical detector dogs in the CBP. We have had them for the last couple years. It is a very difficult process to teach the dogs. We have developed a lesson plan to do that.

We were very successful when taking the dogs into a laboratory environment with the live agent doing a double blind test on the dogs and handlers. And therefore, we were able to prove that the dogs could detect certain trained odors that we expect in a chemical weapon of mass destruction.

We have just obtained some new machines that we are going to be using to take the live agent out into the work field environment to expand our research and to make sure that what we say they can do in a laboratory environment they can actually do in the field environment as well.

So we do have the chemical dogs out there. We are planning more research right now rather than expanding it, to make sure we are on the right path.

And lastly, in regards to TATP, our detector dogs are trained to detect triacetone triperoxide. We work very closely with the FBI in Quantico. Because it is a highly volatile substance, what we do is we go out to Quantico. One of the FBI's chemists makes it for us. And then we run it out their explosive—because of the sensitivity of the explosive.

Mr. MCCAUL. Could you comment on the biological agents, if there are canines that are out there that can detect anthrax, for instance? Would that would be of use or do you have that capability currently?

Mr. TITUS. We have explored that. We know that we are comfortable and that we can go down that path if necessary. We have not received that direction.

I would like to point out, though, that as I understand it, with the first responder, they would rather know if it is a chemical alert or a biological alert. Therefore the term chembio is probably not appropriate. We say it would be a single-focus detector dog.

Mr. MCCAUL. And I have seen the demonstration. I have seen the canines detect inactive, inert anthrax, so I know that it is out there.

Lastly, use on the border. Any comments on that?

Mr. TITUS. We have detector dogs all along the southwest border, I would venture to say over 350 dogs from Brownsville, Texas, all the way up to San Diego. So we do have dogs out there.

What our new focus is this fiscal year and the upcoming fiscal years is predominantly—our traditional mission has always been narcotic detection, and now we are looking at our antiterrorism mission.

And what we are doing is training our—retraining some of our detector dogs to detect not only narcotics but also to be able to intercept concealed humans inside of vehicles or in these other

types of conveyances, like trains or something like that, coming across the border.

Mr. MCCAUL. Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman yields back.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pascrell, for his questions.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of short questions, and then I would like to get into a different matter that has not been discussed yet.

My first question is to Special Agent Bohan, and it is this: Can the dogs that are trained in your particular program detect unscented explosives?

Chief BOHAN. Sir, again, the canine can detect what odors are available. If, in fact, there is an explosive that has a signature, the canines will detect it. Unscented explosives—personally, I am not familiar with that.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Kontny, Director Kontny, to what extent could dogs be used to close any security gaps as it relates to the screening of air cargo?

Mr. KONTNY. Sir, we have done some testing on that, operational test and evaluation was conducted, to look at the different configurations of cargo that we can use. Obviously, we want to take a systematic approach on that, because there are certain types of cargo or certain ways that cargo is presented where the dog would be beneficial, and there are other ways that the cargo would come through, configurations, commodities, that technology would be more efficient.

So I think as a result of our operational tests and evaluations, we are looking at which commodities the dogs are doing best and how we can actively deploy them in the cargo facilities.

Mr. PASCRELL. As you know, there has been great discussions here—I do not know how great they are, but there have been many discussions about air cargo and what our responsibilities will be. And I am sure we will get around to that sooner or later.

Mr. Titus, you are training dogs to be chemical detector dogs, you have explosive detector dogs, you have currency detector dogs. You have concealed human, narcotic detector dogs, and you have agriculture detector dogs.

I would like you to tell me if those agricultural detector dogs which are trying to find vegetables and foods that are coming into this country that have been spoiled or have chemicals on them that we do not want to come into this country—I want you to just very briefly describe what is happening along those lines.

And then the second part of my question is are these dogs being used to scent the trucks that are coming into this country, 95 percent of which over the Mexican border are not inspected even? I mean, I do not know what the heck are in those trucks. You do not know it either, do you?

Mr. TITUS. Sir, just so that I clarify your question, are you referring to knowledge about the agriculture dogs as a whole, and also the trucks that come across the border in regards to agriculture or other contraband?

Mr. PASCRELL. First agriculture, and then other contraband, yes.

Mr. TITUS. Okay, sir. We do have agriculture detector dogs, and these dogs are trained on five basic odors. That is, apples, mangoes, citrus, beef and pork.

Mr. PASCRELL. Right.

Mr. TITUS. And what these dogs are looking for—we do have our dogs working in the airport and seaport environment, and they are looking primarily at people bringing these prohibited items coming across our border.

It is not just because there may be some chemical sprayed on the fruit, but we are looking primarily at, for example, in Florida, if you should have a mango come in Miami International Airport, which has happened before, and these are infected with certain pests, that could actually come into the country and then infect the crop down in South Florida and wipe out the—

Mr. PASCRELL. So your dogs are not used primarily for the trucks that are coming across the border.

Mr. TITUS. We are expanding the program this year. We are looking at putting more agriculture detector dogs on the southwest border, yes, sir.

Mr. PASCRELL. How many more trucks are going to be inspected now than before, then?

Mr. TITUS. I do not have that information, sir.

Mr. PASCRELL. The American people, Mr. Chairman, have a right to know these questions. And we have asked those questions for 3.5 years. We do not have an answer for those questions.

Thank you for your answers, and thank you for your service.

I want to add something to what the gentlelady from Texas talked about. Now, we are going to be taking a vote in a few moments on the floor, as you well know, and we are going to be taking that vote on whether or not we support the secretary of Homeland Security from my state, Mr. Chertoff, or whether we are going to support the further minimization of FEMA.

And we, the Homeland Security Committee, this subcommittee—we have not discussed that, to my knowledge. Or did I miss something? Did I miss anything? So let me say this in conclusion, because, you know, you do not want to hear me in a 4th of July speech.

We have had enough Hail Mary passes in the last 3 weeks, and it is leaning to the debilitation, the further debilitation, of FEMA. We can not accept this. I am going to vote for the amendment from Mr. Sabo, the gentleman from Minnesota.

But apparently this is going to be—this is going to come down to a partisan vote. I thought that we had an obligation and responsibility to the American people to get beyond politics and work together.

And if Mr. Chertoff is throwing down the gauntlet today, then he better understand what is at stake, unless we are going to be complicit in this, Mr. Chairman. Now, I want this to be a non-partisan thing, and I believe you do, too. And our ranking member, I know, is committed to that.

We had no discussions on this. That is a disgrace. And then you wonder why we asked for an independent review. These phony hearings are a rash of scapegoats. You know, the Greeks have a great saying. When the fish stinks, cut the head off.



We have serious problems here, and we are fooling the American people. We are trying to fool them. The only thing is they are a lot smarter than we are. We really are, Mr. Chairman—very disappointed at this move. Every action I have ever taken on this committee is bipartisan. Look at the record.

And I am not going to accept this from Chertoff, Tertoff, I do not care, any of them. This is wrong. It is immoral. And we are not going to accept it. So you better tell your leadership what is going to happen. I am serious.

Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman yields back. I thank him for his questions and statements.

I would like to kind of wrap up this panel by revisiting what I think—I am sorry. The gentleman from Florida does have some questions.

Mr. MEEK. Now, I wanted the other members to have an opportunity to ask their questions, and I know that we are about to go into a vote, and I know we are going to segue into the second panel after the vote.

First of all, so I do not—I have a serious question as it relates to coordination to the response of a natural disaster, as it relates to the canine issue. I know that a couple of my colleagues have brought up issues as it relates to oversight responsibility of this committee.

This actual panel, Mr. Chairman, if I am correct, has been postponed immediately after the Katrina incident due to the fact that we all needed the kind of response and get our head together on what we should do.

This is what we call regular order, where we are doing the things that we need to do. Meanwhile, we have a natural disaster to respond to, but we also have the responsibility of making sure that we still conduct oversight functions of the overall department.

I would also like to state that there are a lot of sideshows that are going on. We are a 365-day-a-year subcommittee that is supposed to be looking into oversight of the department and making sure the American people are protected.

This is a serious battle, Mr. Chairman. You know and other members on this committee know on a bipartisan end, being a member of both Armed Services and Homeland Security, which should be always a non-partisan effort in protecting the American people.

Unfortunately, there are some other things that are going on now that is making it more partisan, and that means that it is making us more vulnerable. I want to get back to the question. I just wanted to make that statement.

The question as it relates to your assets—all of you have assets out there through the United States, and in the event like a Katrina or an event of a terrorist attack, some of you have canine officers or, I mean, dogs working on the borders, some of you—customs, border protection, you have—and transportation security, you have canine and handlers working in international airports.

Something happens, we know that the local law enforcement agencies have partnered with the federal agencies, but they are, quote, unquote, your assets, am I correct, or am I incorrect?

You can give me a yes or no on that.

Mr. KONTNY. Correct. Sir, all the assets, the canine assets, within the TSA program—the dogs are actually government-furnished equipment. They belong to the Government. But all the handlers are actually law enforcement officers assigned to that particular airport or that particular community.

Mr. MEEK. Okay. This leads me into my question. Terrorist attack, natural disaster, first thought of local law enforcement, we want to help our brother or our sister agency, we are going to send our canines, they are needed, the explosive detectors in an issue of a threat of terrorist attack in a geographical area.

Is there a plan or has there been some discussion of making sure that we do not leave ourselves vulnerable in another area because we do not have enough canines to cover the assets that we know that is either the number one or number two?

I am asking this question because in the case of the natural disaster in New Orleans, we all knew through top-off programs and exercises that New Orleans could be flooded, and that it was not a serious priority in other parts of the agency.

I just want to make sure in this area that either there has been some thought or there is some level of coordination, and we do not have to necessarily wait on someone to say well, you really need to call them and tell them they may not want to send half of their team because we need to be able to make sure that we cover the Boston Airport, for instance.

Mr. KONTNY. If I may, sir—and lessons learned from Katrina and Rita—because we knew there was a heavy volume of traffic that was going to go through Houston, we actually took in a coordinated effort, at the request of the assistant secretary—we actually moved assets, protection assets, from Dallas–Fort Worth Airport into Houston to be able to move the passengers through and be able to add that presence there—lessons learned, again, from Katrina.

Also, as far as the mass transit, after we saw Madrid and after we saw the attacks in London, the Department of Homeland Security put together what is Phase One of our mass transit system, which is a rapid deployment force using defense resources. Again, that was Phase One, where we can look and see what resources are available that are already there, and can we augment those resources to be able to negate whatever that threat is.

Mr. MEEK. So what happens—let us say, for instance, in my case, we have one of the best search and rescue teams with our fire department there at Miami Dade County. They usually work together with the Miami Dade Police Department, which—you have assets down there.

Let us say, for instance, there is a team—I am just pulling a number out of the air—of 20 dogs and 20 handler. The director of the public safety department is saying we are sending 12 of our canines there, even though half of that team is ours, and also I would assume that we paid for some of the handlers' training.

But we know that MIA is on the list of airports, the largest international—it has the most international-international traffic, and a lot of the 9/11 hijackers came from the South Florida area.

Is there some sort of calling you or your agency and saying we would like to do this? But as it relates to overall in securing Amer-

ica, we want to send teams: we want to send 12. Is that fine with you, or are these decisions just made on the local level that are not necessarily looking at the bigger picture of our mission?

Mr. KONTNY. Speaking only, sir, for the Transportation Security Administration, under our cooperative agreement with our partners, the local law enforcement agencies, it is a cooperative effort. They can not arbitrarily deploy those resource without coordinating with our office and vice versa.

We are not going to actually take their resources without coordinating with the airport director.

Mr. MEEK. That is the answer I needed.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I know that we have a vote.

I look forward to working with you in the future.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman yields back. I would like to close with a couple of questions.

It has been my sense leading into this hearing and in hearing each of you talk that we have a much greater demand for canine assets than we have canine assets to meet that demand.

Would each of you give me a yes or no whether you agree with that statement, starting with you, Mr. Bohan?

Chief BOHAN. Yes, I agree with that.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Kontny?

Mr. KONTNY. Yes, sir, but a caveat would include quality and highly trained canines.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree with that.

Mr. Titus?

Mr. TITUS. Sir, would you ask your question again, please?

Mr. ROGERS. We have a much greater demand for canine assets than we have canine assets to meet that demand. That has been my observation. And I am particularly interested in your response to that after my visit to the border in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona.

Mr. TITUS. Well, sir, I am a canine trainer, and I do not look at the operational side of the house. But certainly, we can get an answer back to you on what our direction's going to be on that.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, your counterparts on the border tell me they need a lot more dogs, so that might be a good group to talk with.

Next, I would like to ask—and this will be my final set of questions—where do you get your dogs, and how much do you pay for them to obtain them, and how much do you pay to train them?

Mr. Bohan?

Chief BOHAN. We get our dogs from various guide dog foundations and vendors.

Mr. ROGERS. Domestically or foreign?

Chief BOHAN. We get our dogs domestically. We only use Labrador Retrievers.

Mr. ROGERS. How much do you pay for them?

Chief BOHAN. I believe somewhere around \$2,000 for—

#### ATTACHMENT #2

Agency note: ATF pays approximately \$2,150 per canine. We estimate the training cost per canine to be roughly \$60,000, not including salaries.

Mr. ROGERS. How much does it cost to train them?

Chief BOHAN. I would not have that figure right in front of me. I can get back to you, on the record, with that.

Mr. ROGERS. If you would, I would appreciate that.

Mr. Kontny?

Mr. KONTNY. Yes, sir. We take a three-prong approach into our procurement of canines. One, partnering with the Department of Defense to obtain assets through their services; local vendors throughout the United States; and our breeding program or what we call our puppy program down at Lackland Air Force Base, which is part of a global colony. As a matter of fact, the Customs and Border Protection has some. Auburn University has them as well.

So by taking that approach, if one of those prongs suffers because of access, we are able to facilitate further development to meet our needs.

Mr. ROGERS. So how much do you pay for your dogs?

Mr. KONTNY. Well, it averages, sir, again, probably between \$2,500 and \$3,000 per dog, and then we are looking at the costs associated with the breeding program, as well, as that matures.

Mr. ROGERS. Right. And how much is the training of that dog?

Mr. KONTNY. I will have to get back to you with the specific figures on that, sir, because our training process is—we actually pay for the handler, the local law enforcement officer, that goes down there. So if we could look and dissect the question on how much the training costs are and how much—

Mr. ROGERS. If you could get that for us for the record, I would appreciate it.

Mr. KONTNY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. And the dogs that you receive, are any of them obtained from foreign sources?

Mr. KONTNY. In some cases, sir, when we partner with the Department of Defense, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

Mr. Titus, where do you obtain yours?

Mr. TITUS. Historically, sir, we have been getting our dogs from animal shelters, SPCAs and the like. What has happened since 9/11 is—and plus, the fact in the past we have trained so many other law enforcement agencies, and they have picked up on the same way that we train our dogs.

There are a great many officers out there looking at those traditional sources for detector dogs or potential detector dogs, and therefore what is happening is that there is a very high supply and demand need. So we are actually buying more dogs today than we ever have before.

We get our dogs from domestic and foreign sources. We have some vendors that we work with. We pay approximately \$4,500 for an untrained dog. We do not have the tuition costs for our officers because it is officers training officers.

However, we do have a per diem cost of about \$10,000 to \$11,000 per officer for their per diem while they stay in Front Royal or in the national canine facility.

Mr. ROGERS. I would ask you to do the same thing the other two witnesses have offered to do, and that is, for the record, submit to this committee the percentage of dogs that you get from foreign

sources as opposed to domestic sources, what their costs are to buy them, and then what the costs are to train them.

I thank all of you. You have been very helpful to us. This is a very important subject for our nation, I think, going forward, particularly with the challenges that we have in our mass transit systems, as well as other challenges. These assets are going to be very important in our national security.

Thank you for your time.

At this time, I am going to dismiss this panel. We have been called for a vote. We will be back at about 1 o'clock and convene the second panel.

Thank you very much.

[Recess.]

Mr. ROGERS. The Chair will now call up the second panel.

And I would like to recognize Chief Gene Wilson, Chief of Police for the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, for his statement.

#### STATEMENT OF RALPH WILSON

Chief WILSON. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for the invitation. The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Police Department is the law enforcement agency primarily responsible for protecting the system, its customers, employees and physical assets.

We have police jurisdictions in the two counties that Atlanta is located in, Fulton and DeKalb. We interact with 23 different police jurisdictions. We carry 500,000 people a day, have a force of 296 people and 43 civilians.

Both the U.S. and the Georgia Department of Homeland Security have identified MARTA as a critical infrastructure. Historically, transit systems throughout the world have been targets of terrorist attacks.

The recent attacks against transit systems in Madrid and London illustrate the successful tactics of targeting a public transit facility with many potential casualties and the subsequent political and economic consequences.

The MARTA Police Department, in an attempt to deter terrorist acts, has developed specialized response units, a system of threat assessment, and a system of public education and notification of potential threats. The specialized response teams include the bomb squad, the special operations response team, and the canine explosives unit detection team.

MARTA is a typical U.S. transit system, in that free movement into and out of the system is by design, for the convenience of our customers. Unfortunately, the design handicaps the securing of the facility during times of heightened alert. Unlike airports, each transit station can be accessed by the public through multiple entrances.

Rather than restrict the entry method, transit systems depend upon our security measures to deter a terrorist attack. The explosive detection canine program is a vital tool in this deterrence. Dogs are highly visible, flexible in their position, and cost effective.

It is expected that a terrorist attack would be preceded by reconnaissance of a potential target by members of a terrorist group. If

you look at the video that has come out of the London bombing, you see the three suspects days earlier wandering through the system.

We tell the public, we tell our officers, we tell our employees, look for something suspicious. You look at those videos, there is nothing suspicious. They look like anybody else in the transit system going from Point A to Point B.

Visible security measures are intended to convince the potential attacker that the likelihood of a successful attack is minimal. The unpredictable and high-visibility presence of dog teams is an important component of that strategy.

The cost of a single canine team, while significant, is still cost effective. Detection machines, as currently available, must be placed either at strategic stations and entry points, or at all stations and all entry points. The cost of installing detection equipment at every entry point in a system is cost prohibitive.

Unlike technology detection equipment, canine teams can change locations randomly, as threats develop, or during special events with large crowds.

Visibility, flexibility, and cost effectiveness are some of the reasons for the deployment of canine teams in the MARTA system. Reliability of these teams' ability to detect explosives is another.

During the 1996 Olympics, of course, the venue of the Centennial Park was bombed. After that, even though we had numerous bomb detection teams in the Atlanta area, if every backpack, every briefcase that was left turned into the potential to be a bomb, and these teams were stretched beyond their capabilities—we found that what happened to us in the transit system is that we literally almost had to close the system down waiting for these resources to be allocated back to transit.

What we did after the Olympics—we developed our own bomb team and our own bomb detection dogs capabilities. That is how in 1998 we started working with the—it was then the FAA, now it is the TSA.

The Madrid bombings raised additional concerns about the vulnerability of transit systems to suicide bombers and man-transported explosives. It was felt that this tactic, having been proven successful, would probably be used in the future.

We started doing research in-house and realized that our bomb detection dogs would detect a stationary object. If a person was standing still or if they had placed a briefcase down, our dogs would react. But if you move it, if you walk by it—if you noticed the demonstration earlier, when the—I believe it was customs had the dog check the lady.

The lady stood still. If she had walked by the dog, the dog would not have—he would not have reacted, because they have been trained not to be interfered with by people's movements.

So we realized that if we were going to try to be proactive on a suicide bomber, we had to do something more than the TSA dogs. And that is how we became involved with the Auburn program. We have now got a total of eight dogs, two Auburn, six TSA.

We have now got people both in the—we have got two people scheduled for the Auburn school. One will go in 2006. And then we have got another one scheduled for the TSA school.

We feel that this partnership between the two types of dogs, the TSA and the Auburn dogs, along with good training, gives us what we feel to be a potent—or at least potentially to be a potent deterrence against any sort of terrorism.

I notice that my time is up, so I will conclude my statement. If you have any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

[The statement of Mr. Wilson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RALPH EUGENE WILSON, JR.

The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) Police Department is the law enforcement agency responsible for protection of persons and property on transit system properties and in transit vehicles. The transit system encompasses approximately twenty-three political jurisdictions in two counties. The Police Department is authorized 296 sworn and 43 civilian positions.

The U.S. and Georgia Departments of Homeland Security have identified MARTA as a critical infrastructure component. Historically, transit systems throughout the world have been targets of terrorist attacks. The recent attacks against transit systems in Madrid, Spain and London, Great Britain illustrate the successful tactic of targeting a public transit facility with many potential casualties and the subsequent political and economic consequences.

The MARTA Police Department, in an attempt to deter terrorist attacks, has developed specialized response teams, a system of threat assessment, and a system of public education and notification of potential threats. Specialized response teams include the Bomb Squad, the Special Operations Response Team, and the Canine Explosives Detection Unit.

MARTA is typical of U.S. transit systems, in that free movement into and out of the system is by design, for the convenience of customers. Unfortunately, this design handicaps the securing of those facilities during times of heightened alert. Unlike airports, each transit station can be accessed by the public through multiple entrances.

Rather than restricted entry methods, transit systems depend upon other security measures to deter terrorist attacks. The explosive detection canine program is a vital tool in that deterrence. Canines are highly visible, flexible in their positioning, and cost effective.

The presence of a canine team, one uniformed police officer paired with one dog, is highly visible to anyone entering a transit facility. The team is mobile, with the ability to move around a large facility or to board transit vehicles, increasing their visibility as they move. Customers at MARTA often express their appreciation for the presence of the teams, indicating that the public is reassured by this security measure.

It is expected that a terrorist attack would be preceded by reconnaissance of a potential target by members of the terrorist group. Visible security measures are intended to convince the potential attacker that the likelihood of a successful attack is minimal. The unpredictable and highly visible presence of canine teams is an important component of that strategy.

The cost of a single canine team, while significant, is cost effective. Detection machines, as currently available, must be placed either at strategic stations and entry points, or at all stations and entry points. Machines are not easily moved, and a prepared terrorist will know where the machines are on any given day. Their planning would include entering the system that does not deploy machines at every entry point. The cost of installing detection equipment at every entry point in a system is cost prohibitive. Unlike technological detection equipment, canine teams can change locations randomly, as threats develop, or during special events with large crowds.

Visibility, flexibility, and cost effectiveness are some of the reasons for the deployment of canine teams in the MARTA system. Reliability of the teams' ability to detect explosives is another.

The decision was made immediately after the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta, to form the MARTA Police Bomb Squad and Explosive Canine Detection Unit. Research of canine programs revealed that reliability of a canine team's ability was critical. Vendors of dogs and training were plentiful; proven programs were not. It was decided that only two programs, the FAA and the ATF, were of sufficient quality and could show quantifiable reliability. MARTA chose the FAA program, and over the years since, has become a full partner in the FAA/TSA program.

The Madrid bombings raised additional concerns about the vulnerability of transit systems to suicide bombers and man-transported explosives. It was felt that this tactic, having been proven successful, would probably be used in the future. An investigation into the ability of our dogs to detect explosives carried by moving people revealed a deficiency in that area.

The TSA dogs were conditioned to ignore people as a distraction. The dogs, although they sometimes showed interest in persons carrying explosives, would not “alert” to them. They would search persons who were presented to them by their handler, as in a stationary group, but would ignore a moving crowd.

A search was made for agencies, training facilities or individuals who had the same concerns or who were actively training dogs to search moving persons, which we had begun to term “personnel search dogs.” There was only one positive response to our search; Auburn University Canine Research Center.

The Auburn facility had embarked on a program that met the needs of our department. Funds from an Office of Domestic Preparedness grant were obtained for the purchase and training of two personnel search canines. One of those dogs has been deployed at MARTA for a year, and the second team is presently in training at Auburn.

The MARTA Police Canine Explosive Detection Unit currently consists of eight handler/K-9 teams. Two of those teams are from the Auburn Canine program. The other six teams are in the TSA program, and they are currently the only public transit TSA teams in the country. The TSA is in the process of deploying canine teams to the top 10 transit systems in the U.S.

The MARTA Police Department, along with many police departments in the Atlanta area, is under severe budget constraints. Subsequently, manpower shortages affect the mission of protecting against terrorist attack. The intensive training regimen of explosive detection canine teams requires that officers assigned to the Unit be taken off regular beat assignments. The result is a critical shortage of uniformed patrol officers.

The TSA canine program includes an annual reimbursement to the participating department of \$40,000 for each team the department fields. Although the amount does not cover all expenses associated with a team, it does help when requesting replacement officer positions from the governing Board. Continuing reimbursement is the most effective means to sustain a substantial canine deterrence.

In late 2004, MARTA and Auburn University hosted representatives from the Sussex County Police, Great Britain, Los Angeles Police Department, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security. The Sussex County and Los Angeles representatives were canine unit supervisors and each department was in the process of forming a personnel search canine program. The participants exchanged training and operational information, and an ongoing network of communication has been established. All representatives agreed that the personnel search K-9 concept, combined with standard canine explosives detection teams, is an effective means of addressing changing trends in terrorist tactics.

#### **STATEMENT OF MICHAEL MORIARTY**

Mr. MORIARTY. Mr. Chairman, Representative Meek, thank you very much. Fifteen years ago, Auburn University established the Canine and Detection Research Institute. Its mission was and still is to carry out research and development in canine detection to protect both people as well as critical national infrastructure.

We have conducted more than 15 federally funded multi-component research projects ranging from a laboratory assessment of canine olfaction—how well can they smell—to odor detection signature analysis—how do they know how to do it.

To complement the research efforts that we have been engaged in, we have established a canine detection training center at Fort McClellan, Alabama to transfer the lessons learned from the research into the training programs for both dogs, handlers, trainers and program managers.

Fort McClellan provides the ideal location and the logistical partners for our canine program and the university embellished this



and has built a 40-run state-of-the-art kennel and breeding facility there.

Collectively, Auburn University has now about 200 years of canine training experience in our staff members, and we have invested \$5 million to bring the program to where it is. Three of our staff, as an example, more than any other entity, were chosen to serve on the recently established 55-member scientific working group for dogs and orthogonal detectors.

Historically, canine detection has been practiced more at a craft level than a science. The purpose in our focusing on teaching handlers some basic behavioral principles and the associated technical language is to move the canine detection in the direction of a science.

Handlers who are equipped with a basic understanding of behavioral principles and consistent technical knowledge are better armed to maintain the performance of their dog and meaningfully collaborate with their colleagues and instructors to improve the performance of their dogs.

Our explosive detection course requires 10 weeks. The drug detection course requires 6 weeks. Both include extensive training in operational environments and they conclude with a realistic scenario-based evaluation and videotape certification of each team's operational qualifications.

The varied experiences of our skilled staff and the associated research that we conduct allow our program to rapidly develop new applications for bringing canines to bear on problems of national needs.

For example, our canine program conducted research and developed training procedures in support of the Department of Energy in fielding the first-ever operational chemical warfare agent detector dog teams.

Our current efforts in prototyping focus on applications of immediate relevance to homeland security and force protection, and one of these, as the chief has just mentioned, is person screening for explosive material, particularly in a mass transit theater.

Other applications involve remote and relatively autonomous detector dog operations. For example, remote screening of vehicles with the occupants by the dogs, with the handler being hundreds of yards away and in a safe environment provides a much safer environment for the handler to operate at particular checkpoints.

We are also developing remote position locating and command issuing equipment with which to equip dogs for remote autonomous applications including border protection. The dog can also serve as a remotely guided platform for other sensors—radiological, chemical, biological, cameras, listening devices and so forth.

Our program, having no operational mandate of its own, and having an experienced instructional staff and R&D capabilities, provides a resources for specialized mission curriculum development and novel applications of canines. We are unique, and to that end, a sample of our customers includes the Coast Guard, MARTA, Federal Protective Service and many others.

An example of some of our graduates—we have had two Coast Guard teams from Seattle using our dogs who have assisted the ATF and local law enforcement in recovering bomb-making mate-

rials on two separate occasions that were not able to be located by the agents using physical means.

Auburn and the TSA are only two satellites of the highly successful Australian customs dog breeding program, and we are the only non-federal program. That gives us opportunities to breed detector dogs at Auburn University.

Nationally, the attention to enhancing canine detection resources and capabilities has been, in my opinion, disproportionately low given the immediate potential to support homeland security, particularly in relationship to the attention and funding allotted to the development of static electronic detection devices. We need both, I would argue.

We have the institutional capacity to ramp up our personnel and facilities at McClelland if the external support is available.

In conclusion, despite the significant advances in electronic sensors—and there has been significant advances—the use of dogs is still widely regarded as the most capable tool for the interdiction of hazardous materials such as explosives.

Dogs can interrogate articles in large areas with rapidity unmatched by any other means of detection. And dogs can detect concentrations of an odor as low as one part in 100 trillion. Now, aside from the national debt, 100 trillion is a number that we typically think of. But put it in terms—that is like detecting an ounce if you dilute it in 800 billion gallons. Dogs are good.

A well trained detector dogs handling team is a vital weapon for safeguarding the nation against terrorism. But again, as I posed, I think canine detection is underutilized because of the limited number of top quality training programs, a limited supply of high quality dogs, and sparse funding of the detection research and development that must underlie the this technique.

Auburn's canine detection program is uniquely capable and positioned to provide an asset responsive to these needs. I thank you for your attention.

[The statement of Mr. Moriarty follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. C. MICHAEL MORIARTY

Auburn University's Canine and Detection Research Institute (CDRI) mission is to conduct research, development, and training activities to enhance canine and other substance detection technologies. These activities focus on the detection of hazardous materials to protect people and critical national infrastructure. Auburn has provided basic research, technological development, and education to the detector dog community for the last 15 years.

Auburn has conducted more than 15 federally funded multi-component research projects ranging from behavioral laboratory assessment of canine olfactory sensitivity and odor detection signature analysis to a year-long applied examination of the effective working duty-cycle of detector dogs under different environmental conditions. The performance of prototype detection instrumentation has been examined using the Institutes behavioral laboratory preparation for studying olfaction, which is the only time the performance of such devices has been examined in a manner allowing direct comparison to the olfactory sensitivity of a dog. Auburn is the U. S. Government's primary source of research related to canine detection and information from this research established the scientific precedent supporting the use of detector dogs for the detection of explosive and other hazardous materials. Furthermore, the Institute is a primary source of information and problem solving for the detector dog community responding to 100 or more e-mail, phone, and mail request for information or guidance regarding the use of detector dogs each year.

Auburn established the Canine Detection Training Center at Ft. McClellan, AL to further the technology transfer and training components of the Institute's mission. The Center trains dogs, handlers, trainers, and program managers in the per-

formance of all facets of canine detection work. A unique aspect of the Center is that it provides an operational context in which applied research is conducted and, in turn, results from that research are incorporated into training programs forming a continuous loop of quality and capability enhancement. Instruction at the center blends the craftsmanship of expert canine training professionals, behavioral and veterinary sciences, and the most recent technological advances.

Auburn and the Transportation Security Administration, Explosive Detection Dog program, are the only two U.S. satellites of the highly successful Australian Customs Service Detector Dog Breeding Program and Auburn is the only non-federal government and academic veterinary science satellite of this program. This program selectively breeds dogs to be successful at detection work to enhance the quality of detector dogs and ensure a resource for such dogs amidst increased demand and ever more consolidated sources for working dogs, which is typically north-western Europe. Auburn has produced 21 litters of Labrador Retriever Puppies from which more than 50 successfully trained detector dogs have been paired with law enforcement handlers. This program is made possible through the support dozens of volunteers to house, care for, and provide these puppies with particular experiences to enhance their trainability. Recent collaborations with correctional institutions to employ low-risk inmates for raising of puppies make this program capable of very rapid expansion should demand warrant. The Labrador Retriever breed makes for an excellent detector dog, is adaptable to many applications, and is generally perceived as non-threatening by the public. The center also has established relationships with domestic and international vendors of the highest quality working dogs to fulfill the mission specific needs of any canine detection scenario.

Auburn's program is the only detector dog and handler training with the combination of direct support from a college of veterinary medicine, behavioral science—based research and development activity and academic instructional design. The Auburn Canine Program is a unique, full service, state the art provider of canine detection research, development, training, and technology transfer. Program staff and resources provide the capabilities, technical expertise, and experience to address a myriad of canine detection challenges. Our guiding principals are a commitment to scientific understanding, quality, and responsiveness to the needs of practitioners.

Ft. McClellan provides ideal infrastructure, location, and logistical partners for the mission of Auburn's Canine Program. Auburn has a 99-year lease of several buildings and over 250 acres of land on the recently closed Army post. Included are the previous post veterinary clinic and a relatively new 24,000 square foot instructional building. Additionally, the University has constructed a 40-run kennel/breeding complex. McClellan contains several firing ranges, a driving course, airstrip, warehouses, multi-use buildings, and extensive personnel housing capacity typical of a large military training facility. Ample infrastructure is available to ramp-up to any conceivable level of training operations. Located between Atlanta and Birmingham and within 15 minutes of Interstate 20, McClellan is readily accessible. A collaborative atmosphere exists among the AU Canine Program, the ODP—Center for Domestic Preparedness and the FEMA—Noble Training Hospital in executing their respective Homeland Security Support missions making McClellan an ideal integrated hub for homeland defense/emergency preparedness training and technology development.

Paul Waggoner is the overall director of the Auburn Canine Research and Training Programs. Paul has a doctoral degree in behavioral science and 15-years of experience in conducting research and development related to canine olfaction, detector dog training, handler instruction, and operational deployment of detector dogs. Thomas (Ed) Hawkinson is director of Training Activities. Ed's experience includes managing the U.S. Secret Service Canine Program, Military Working Dog Program Operations Branch Chief and Senior Canine Instructor, and tours of duty as a Military Police Canine Handler and Kennel Master in Korea and Vietnam. John Pearce is the deputy director of training activities. John's previous position was with the Military Working Dog Training Center assigned as branch chief for the TSA Canine Training Program. These two individuals have a myriad of experiences in training dogs, handlers, trainers, and supervisors as well as in employing canine detection for both military and law enforcement applications. Hawkinson and Pearce have recruited an eclectic ensemble of canine training / handler instructional staff with varied law enforcement, federal agency, and private investigation backgrounds. For example, staff member Jeanne Brock holds two masters degrees, is a certified veterinary technician, was proprietor of a canine training and canine arson / cadaver private investigation firm and is currently the President of the Canine Arson Detection Association. Auburn has over 200 person-years of experience in canine detection.

Auburn has attracted instructors that are leaders in the field of canine detection who share the vision of applying behavioral science and canine training craftsman-

ship to enhance the practice of canine detection. Auburn's canine training methods are based on the well-established principles of animal learning from academic behavioral science. Handlers are required to demonstrate mastery of over 80-hours of classroom instruction in our standard explosive and drug detection courses. The classroom instruction is comprehensive providing handlers with information ranging from health and sanitation of kennels to operational tactics; however, instruction in basic behavioral principles and the use of the correct behavioral terminology in the course is uniquely intensive. To date, canine detection has been practiced at more of a craft level than a technology. The purpose in our focusing on teaching handlers basic behavioral principles and its associated technical language is to move canine detection in the direction of a technology. Handlers equipped with a basic understanding of behavioral principles and consistent technical language are better armed to maintain the performance of their dog and communicate meaningfully with their colleagues and instructors in diagnosing and correcting performance problems. Our explosive detection course is 10-weeks long and our drug detection course is 6-weeks long. Both include extensive training in operational environments and conclude with realistic scenario based evaluations and video—taped certification of operational competence.

Auburn welcomes and supports the establishment of national best practice guidelines for training, evaluation, certification, and operational practices in canine detection. Best practice guidelines are critically needed to reduce the extreme variability in the quality with which canine detection is practiced. Such guidelines will also provide a common set of technical and operational terms to aid communication across practitioners. Perhaps the most immediate importance of such guidelines is to make it possible for the Department of Homeland Security to identify and maintain a database of canine detection teams and their specific operational capabilities for effective utilization of local, regional, and federal canine detection resources in response to terrorist threat situations and critical incidents. Such guidelines must accommodate the diverse operational missions of different agencies. Therefore, we prefer the concept of guidelines, which may provide the basis for "standards" promulgated by a specific segment of the responder community or certification of an agency of the Federal Government to conduct particular tasks, as opposed to overarching "national standards or certifications" to which all applications under all circumstances must comply. Auburn has encouraged the development of the *Scientific Working Group on Dog and Orthogonal Detectors (SWG DOG)*, which had its first meeting this month. This scientific working group (SWG) follows in the tradition of other successful working groups sponsored by the Department of Justice, such as the "SWG on DNA Evidence" and "SWG on Finger Printing" as well as the "Bomb Squad Commander's EOD Technician Training Guidelines". Auburn was honored to have 3 members (more than any other agency or institution) chosen to serve on the 55 member SWG DOG committee: Paul Waggoner (Unification of Terms and Research & Technology sub-committees); Robert Gillette (Breeding and Dog Care & Physical Conditioning) and; John Pearce (SWG Executive Committee Member, Chair of the Handler Selection & Training sub-committee, and Certification Procedures sub-committee).

Instruction of handlers at the Training Center is also enhanced by affiliated subject matter experts at the University. For example, instruction regarding canine health, fitness, feeding, housing, and first aid is under the guidance of Robert Gillette, Professor of Veterinary Medicine and Director of the Sports Medicine Center within Auburn University's College of Veterinary Medicine. Dr. Gillette also serves as the primary veterinary consultant to the Center's detector dog breeding activities. Auburn's program is also unique in that its operational training program is monitored internally by an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and externally by the U. S. Department of Agriculture as mandated for University's by the Animal Welfare Act. Our R&D, training, and breeding activities the approval of and our housing and veterinary care of dogs is overseen by the Auburn University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and is monitored for compliance with the Animal Welfare Act by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The varied experiences of Auburn's Canine Program staff and R&D support allow the Auburn program to rapidly develop new applications for canine detection. For example, the AU Canine program conducted research, developed training procedures, and supported the Department of Energy in fielding the first ever operational chemical warfare agent detector dog teams. Our current development and prototyping efforts focus on applications of immediate relevance to homeland security and force protection. One of these is person-screening for explosive material particularly in the mass transit theater. The appropriately prepared dog and handler team can effectively screen large numbers of persons and their carried items entering or exiting a mass transit theatre with little to no retarding of the flow of transit users,

which is a significant concern regarding instrumental detection devices. Additionally, extensive observation of an Auburn trained operational detector dog person-screening team in the Metro Atlanta Transit system across the last 6-months suggests that very few people consider screening activities by a Labrador Retriever handled by a uniformed Transit Authority officer to be threatening or intrusive. Other applications being prototyped involve several remote and relatively autonomous detector dog operations. For example, remote screening of vehicles and their occupants by dogs with the handler or operator being hundreds of yards in distance from the vehicle provides a safer stand-off distance for officers in the case vehicle check points. We are also collaborating with AU Engineering in developing inertia enhanced global positioning systems and remote command issuing / reporting equipment with which to equip dogs for non line-of-sight applications such as building searches, search and rescue, long-range autonomous tracking of persons and surveillance for intruders along perimeters of critical infrastructure and for border protection. In such remote and autonomous applications, the dog can also serve as a highly mobile and adaptively directed platform for sensors, cameras, and listening devices. Auburns canine program's ability to engineer the behavior of dogs for such applications has the potential to provide for many innovative applications for dogs that support homeland security and force protection.

In addition to serving as a conduit for technology transfer to the detector dog user community and a vehicle for infusing established behavioral science into the craft of detector dog training and use, part of the vision of the Training Center was to provide a needed resource for high-level detector dog team (i.e., dog and handler) instruction to state, local, and private law enforcement/security agencies as well as federal agencies that did not have inherent training programs. Furthermore, as a program with no operational mandate, an eclectic instructional staff, and R&D capabilities, to provide a resource for specialized mission curriculum development and novel applications of canine detection. To that end, our customers to date have included the following:

*U.S. Department of Energy and Wackenhut Services:* Chemical warfare agent R&D, proof of concept canine training and testing, handler instruction, and operational deployment support

*U. S. Customs Service:* Technical support of prototype chemical agent detection training program on-site at McClellan.

*U.S. Coast Guard Office of Law Enforcement:* Designed maritime operations curriculum and training program, trained first 10 new USCG service-wide unified canine program detector dog teams, assisted in development of USCG Policy and Procedures for detector dog program and performed after-deployment evaluation and program guidance.

*U. S. Secret Service Technical Services Division:* Trained prototype explosive detection person-screening dog and conducted test and demonstration of person-screening capability

*Metro Atlanta Transit Authority:* Developed curriculum and training procedures specifically for screening persons and their hand-carried items for explosive material in a mass transit theatre of operation. Have trained 2 person-screening detection teams for MARTS and anticipate the training of 2 additional teams

*Federal Protective Service, DHS:* Developed specialized curriculum and training program. Over 50 Federal Protective Service detector dog teams have been trained to date. Re-evaluation and re-certification of nearly half of those teams has also occurred.

*Australian Customs Service:* Trained two chemical warfare agent teams and consulted in development of Australian Customs Service firearms detection training program.

*Customs Service of the Territory of the Mariana Islands:* Trained their first and only 4 explosive detector dog teams

*Local Law Enforcement:* Trained several local law enforcement explosive and drug detector dog teams. In all but one case, this training and dogs has been done for free or significantly subsidized by Auburn University

*Private Security Firms:* Have provided trained dogs and other services to two of the Nations preeminent private detector dog services: Explosive Countermeasures Inc., which has several Government (e.g. IRS, Holocaust Museum) and DOD (e.g., Pentagon Perimeter Security) contracts; Wackenhut Services DOE Security Operations and K-9 Search on Site, both of which provide detector dog services for DOE National Laboratory Sites (e.g., Savannah River, Oak Ridge, Sandia, Los Alamos).

Several of our graduate detector dog teams have excelled in their operational missions. For example, two AU trained USCG teams from Seattle have assisted the ATF and local law enforcement in recovery of bombing making materials on two separate occasions by finding materials not able to be located by physical searches. All

of the 7 local area law enforcement drug detection teams we have trained have had multiple significant finds of illegal drugs. One of our FPS trained teams interdicted prohibited propellant (concrete nail gun ammunition—smokeless powder) material in the trunk of a vehicle during routine vehicle screening at the entrance to a Government building parking garage in D.C.

Despite these success and advances, maintaining both R&D and Training Center capabilities have been a challenge for Auburn University financially due to insufficient volume and consistency of R&D and training service income. Auburn has endeavored to provide a critically needed resource for enhancing canine detection to support homeland security. Attention to enhancing canine detection resources, capabilities and innovative uses of canine detection has been disproportionately low given its immediate potential to support homeland security particularly in relation to the to the extensive attention and associated funding allotted to the development and fielding of instrumental detection devices. In particular, state and local law enforcement are unable to afford services at the level offered by Auburn or most other credible training services, thus canine detection, the most readily available tool for their use in detection, is relegated to lowest bidder; and subsequent to 9/11 the number of such low bidders expanded significantly. The cost of training a standard explosive detection team (including provision of a dog) at Auburn is currently \$13,800 not including lodging and per-diem for the trainee. Some of our Government contracts require certain guarantees on dog health and performance, as well as additional elements of training that increase our typical costs for Federal customers to over \$14,000. Drug detection team training cost \$12,800. This price schedule reflects Auburn's actual cost for performing this work including all the overhead, maintenance at McClellan and administration. In order to impact the practice of canine detection at the level of state and local law enforcement, Auburn has subsidized detection team training for state and local law enforcement by 10%; 20% for law enforcement agencies in Alabama.

We offer high quality training at a relatively low price because of Auburn's requisite non-profit business model as a State, Land-Grant University. In comparing these prices to quotes of training costs at Federal Agencies, it is important to consider whether agency quotes truly reflect the extant overhead expenses required to conduct their canine program including administrative costs. It is our opinion that any equal comparison will necessarily support our contention that our prices are very modest for the level of training and quality of facilities provided.

Auburn currently can train about 36-detection teams per year. Owing to nearly 100% retention of previous customers for re-evaluation, re-certification, canine program manager seminar attendees, and additional canine team training, we are nearing maximum utilization of this capacity, thus reducing our present ability to take on new customers for our service. Auburn University has invested on the order of \$5 Million of non-federal funds to provide for personnel support and infrastructure development to reach this current capacity. However, Auburn has the institutional capacity to rapidly ramp up personnel and facility resources at McClellan to accommodate at least double that capacity within 6-months or less given external support.

Despite significant advances in electronic sensors, the use of detection dogs is widely regarded as the most capable tool for the interdiction of hazardous materials such as explosives (1993, Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress). Dogs are known to be capable of detecting concentrations of an odor at least as low as 1-part per 100 trillion parts of clean air, which exceeds the capability of most operational chemical detection devices. Moreover, canines possess amazing olfactory acuity, are capable of operating in "odor-noisy" environments (i.e., capabilities are *not* easily perturbed by extraneous odors), and provide for interrogation of articles and large areas with rapidity unmatched by any other method of detection. Thus, well-trained detector dog and handler teams are vital for safeguarding the Nation against terrorism. However, canine detection is underutilized because of a limited number of competent training programs, a limited supply of high-quality dogs, and sparse funding of canine detection research and development. Auburn University's Canine Detection Program is uniquely capable and positioned to provide an asset responsive to all of these needs.

Mr. ROGERS. The chair recognizes Ms. Terri Recknor, President of Garrison and Sloan Canine Detection Company, for her statement.

Ms. Recknor?

**STATEMENT OF TERRI RECKNOR**

Ms. RECKNOR. Thank you very much for affording me this opportunity to speak in front of you all.

As you know, we have all been talking about canines, whether it is the federal training programs by Auburn, and if there is two things I can stress before I start my speech—is one, we need a standardization in the private industry. The federal agencies have not come together to standardize their programs, and that is first and foremost before they can help us.

But we really need a standardization in the private industry. And the reason we need this is my second point. We can partner with the federal agencies. We have been wanting to partner with the federal agencies. Every 2 years there is an international canine explosive meeting.

Last year, it was held in New Orleans, and it was brought up to TSA and the other federal agencies that if there was a standardization in the private industry and there was some type of a terrorism incident and they had identified private companies that would meet or exceed their standards, they could call upon these private companies.

And we at Garrison and Sloan have been working for a number of years to try and get a standardization because we really need it in this industry. So if I can stress anything, it is standardization and partnership.

Unfortunately, my partner, Tony Guzman, is the trainer in this organization, and he was unavailable today, so hopefully I will be able to answer your questions.

Since the terrorist attacks of 9/11, there has never been such a great need for canines ever before. It is unprecedented. And what we saw was after 9/11 that companies were begun and implemented overnight.

Now, prior to 9/11, you saw mostly narcotics detection out there, because there was no need for explosive detection. So to fully train and certify an explosive canine team does not happen overnight.

Let me emphasize at this point that, again, there is no national standardization. There is no national certification for private companies. When we state at Garrison and Sloan that we are a licensed company, what we mean is that we have an ATF license. We have a bunker at our training facility that houses explosives. We have been certified by the ATF.

We also have a safe at our premises that has drugs that allows us to be certified by the DEA. We also have every state and local license that we need to operate.

And it is interesting that my partner, Tony Guzman, is able to train the local agencies, various police departments, the state canines, but yet we are not permitted to work with them. So it is okay that we train them, we just can not work alongside of them, which I really do not understand.

Another thing that we do that makes us unique in our industry, in the private industry, is that our dogs are all certified by the Florida International University. The reason this is so important is because there is no money to gain here on either side.

A lot of the private companies train their own dogs. They use pseudo-explosives, which are dummy explosives, and they certify

their own dogs. They do this because they could never pass a national certification.

Florida International University has this program, and they have nothing to gain by it. We do not pay for it. If the dog fails, the dog fails. If the dog passes, he passes because he should pass. So I think that is important to note.

And again, getting back to the formation of these companies after 9/11, many of them were formed overnight. And I can tell you, being in Miami, Florida, there was a huge need for dogs. We are the cruise capital of the world. And it was interesting to see how many companies just appeared after 9/11.

And you have seen how hard the dogs here work no matter what agency they work for. You have heard Auburn talk about how long their training program is. You can not manufacture these dogs. You can not train them overnight, which, in essence, means you can not staff overnight and you can not help local companies, local governments or to protect the nation.

With us, our dogs go through a rigorous training. And I think it is interesting to note, too, when we talk about where everybody gets their dogs from, all of our dogs are European-bred. And you may ask yourself why Europe. The interesting thing about Europe is over there it is a sport.

And also, it is expensive to buy these dogs. We do not have any domestic dogs. We do not go to the pound. We do not go to any private breeding source. We have looked at that, but the need has been so great that we go to Europe.

My partner has been going to Europe for over 20 years. Six to eight times a year he goes to Europe. He has been dealing with the same top breeders in Europe, and they know him. They call and they say we are ready, we have dogs to look at. Tony just went to Europe I think 6 weeks ago and only brought back eight dogs, because the demand is so high.

But the interesting thing is when he tests the dogs in Europe, we already know that they are good dogs. Our fail ratio once they dogs come back to Miami is less than 1 percent. And I am sure if you would ask that same question of all these federal agencies, they do not have that type of a number.

Again, we pay for our dogs. And you had asked how much the dogs cost. Depends on where the euro is. I mean, we are at the mercy of the euro. Before 9/11, Tony could go to Europe and buy a dog for \$1,000, \$1,500. Now you are looking at \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 for a dog.

And then you have to bring the dog back, and then you train the dog. We are fortunate in the fact that it is our company, so we can train at a higher ratio. We have dogs dispatched all over the country, and the different thing about our company, why we are trying to set such a high standard, is we do not employ civilians.

Like other companies out there, rogue companies—and we can touch on the Russ Ebersols of the world—they will employ anybody that has a dog and say it is an explosive dog. Is it? No.

I have been in the trenches since 9/11. I know every competitor I have, and I can tell you without a doubt we are the only company that has such a high standard that if you see our dogs work in



Newark, New Jersey, New Orleans, L.A., all these dogs are not only trained on explosives but they are maintained on explosives.

The people that work for us are off-duty canine officers, and we meet with the individual police departments and we get their chief's approval that we will give them our dog, and they will work for us, but they will also maintain our dogs with their explosives. Nobody else does this.

What they will do is they may perhaps train a dog and then send it off to whatever, and use pseudos, or maybe nothing at all. And yet they expect these dogs to find explosives. I can not stress enough they can not find explosives.

So one of the things that I know is kind of an underlying current here is are we keeping the public safe, are we doing what is right. I can only tell you no, we are not. They are trying. The federal agencies are trying, but they are—just like we heard today about what is going on with FEMA and everything, this is the first time in 4 years that we have sat like this.

I have gone to every meeting where they will let me speak, and I tell the people if you are interested in employing a canine company, go to their facility. Chances are they do not have a facility. Everything on their web site is bogus.

We contacted ATF. We contacted DEA. Because if you go on a Web search, you will find all of these home pages that have the DEA license and the ATF license. It is bogus. They put it there, and people assume that if it is there, they must be licensed. Maybe what they have done—what we have seen with a lot of companies—is a company, say, in Houston will say that it is ATF-licensed. Well, it is. It has paid some company in Chicago to use their license.

So, really, how do they maintain these dogs? Perhaps they have trained the dogs in Chicago, shipped them off to Houston. They are not maintained. And as my partner would say if he was here, these dogs could not find a fat man in a phone booth. Not possible.

We need standards, and we need to work with the federal government to do this. And I commend all of you for doing this. Auburn has a great program. And I commend them for trying to breed these dogs. We do not have the time with our company to breed dogs. We would rather pay top dollar, have a dog that works unbelievably long hours.

And something that is different about our teams than the federal teams is that when we work at the seaports—and Congressman Meek, I met you last year when we were at the Port of Miami. We work exclusively with Royal Caribbean and Norwegian Cruise Lines all over the country and basically all over the world.

And the thing that is different about our teams at the port—we have one handler and two canines. What this allows us to do is we alternate canines. We put pallets down. There could be 20 pallets, could be 10 pallets, whatever we do. One dog searches and then it rests. While that is resting, the second dog searches, so there is no down time.

An average day at the port for us is anywhere from 250 pallets to 400 pallets. We do not slow down commerce. We do not do anything. We are actually the quickest way you can screen cargo. It

is proven. They have tried the machines, swabbing, going over testing. You have got to calibrate those machines.

The dogs work because they love to work. They are not calibrating anything. They do not take sick days. They do not take lunch breaks. We train on the toy method, which is that little hose you saw. They either get the hose or the Kong, that little red toy. All they want to do is find that toy. They do not want to eat. They do not want to play with a towel. They just want the toy.

So what we do when we work at the ports—and I think Congressman Meek saw this—is we plant hide, and what that means is we cut a little hole in the plastic on one of the pallets and we place smokeless powder, and we walk the dog around, and we let him find that hide. Then he gets his toy, and he is happy and he is ready to work.

Machines do not do that. Machines break down. Machines are costly. Our dogs work because they love it, and they love it because they have been bred to love it and because it is a sport in Europe.

We also have been fortunate enough to work with FedEx at some of the airports. FedEx primarily mandated dogs for the narcotic industry. But when you think about feed, if FedEx has one plane leaving early or leaving late, it costs them millions of dollars.

So I just would like to stress to you that if we are good enough to work for the cruise lines in all the major seaports, and we are good enough to work for a major air cargo company, then I think it is time to look at the private industry for supporting the federal agencies.

At our kennel we have many dogs. We have actually ramped up for these dogs. So we can help. And if I can stress anything, we really need to partner. Thank you very much.

[The statement of Ms. Recknor follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TERRI RECKNOR

My name is Terri Recknor. I am the President of Garrison & Sloan, Inc., a Canine Detection Company based in Miami, Florida. My partner Tony Guzman was scheduled to appear before you today is unfortunately dealing with a number of family issues and cannot be here. My partner is also the President of Metro-Dade K-9 a canine facility specializing in the training of canines and handlers for state and local law enforcement. Mr. Guzman has been training and working with canines for over 24 years.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there has been an unprecedented need for explosive detection canines, both in law enforcement and the private sector. Prior to 9-11, there were very few private canine detection companies. The majority of those companies worked exclusively in narcotics detection. Garrison & Sloan is unique in that it was one of the few canine detection companies that had an extensive inventory of fully trained and certified explosive canine teams.

Let me emphasize that, at this point, there is no national standard for the licensing and certification of private industry explosive detection companies. When we state that our company is licensed and certified, it means the following. We possess a Federal Department of Justice, Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) license for explosives, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) license for narcotics and all state and local licenses to train and certify our explosive and narcotic canines. Our canines are independently certified by Florida International University. In addition, to my knowledge we are the only privately-owned company in the United States to have its explosive canines certified by the Department of Defense.

Immediately following 9-11 the need was so great for explosive detection canines that private detection canine companies were formed overnight. Many of these companies that were formed overnight claimed to have fully trained canines. It should be noted for the record that the average time it takes Garrison & Sloan to purchase a canine, train and certify an explosive detection canine is usually a minimum of

5 months. The fact of the matter is a newly formed canine detection company that is properly licensed and certified cannot be fully operational for months.

I would be the first to admit that because of the lack of a national standard, our industry has been seriously tainted by a number of fraudulent companies. Within the last two years, a private company in Virginia working for the Federal Government was indicted and found guilty for fraudulent canine services. Their canines were tested with explosives and did not alert. The owner was convicted and is currently serving time in a federal prison.

It should also be noted that as a general rule most Federal State and Local Governmental agencies will not contract with private industry canine companies. Once again, it is my opinion that the reason for this is the lack of a national standard and the potential liability that would be attached by the governmental agency if the dogs should fail.

Today it is my understanding that TSA, Customs and Border Protection Bureau, and the ATF collectively have no more than 1,700 trained canine teams in the United States. The majority of the TSA teams are located at the major metropolitan airports while the CBP teams are located along the U.S. borders. If one were to do the math, the number of federally trained canine teams would amount to approximately 35 per state. Given the most recent events of the train bombings in Madrid, Spain and London, England, I do not believe that this amount of dogs is anywhere near sufficient to protect our airports, seaports, subway systems, train station's and our national treasures.

In order to make an argument as to why governmental agencies should use properly licensed and certified private canine companies I would like to tell you how we obtain, train and certify our canines. My partner Tony Guzman travels to Europe 6—8 times per year to purchase canines. He deals with well-established breeders throughout Europe. Why Europe? Europe is known for breeding the finest working dogs in the world. Once a dog is chosen by our company he must go through a rigorous 12-week training course. Our canines are trained on real explosives and real narcotics, which we obtain legally. ATF has very strict policies that must be adhered to before granting a license. Upon completion of training our canines must be certified. Our certification process is conducted by an independent entity—The Florida International University. After training and certification our canines must be tested weekly with explosives and narcotics to keep their level of proficiency at maximum performance. You should also be aware that it is our opinion for efficiency and effectiveness purposes that canines should not be dual trained. By that I mean our explosive canines are only trained on explosives and our narcotic canines are only trained on narcotics, we do not cross-train.

Unfortunately, what I described to you is not the norm in our industry, it is the exception. The actual norm in our industry is that XYZ Company either purchases a dog from wherever it can find one or it goes to the local pound. Most Customs and Border Patrol dogs, for your information come from animal shelters, humane societies and rescue operations as reported in the Government Executive magazine dated September 1, 2005. Since most private industry companies cannot afford or legally possess an ATF license, they purchase pseudo (substitute) explosives. The canine is then trained on pseudo explosives and the trainer allegedly certifies the dog himself. These dogs cannot go through an independent legitimate certification process because they would fail.

Another scenario that we see in our industry is that canine Company A pays an ATF certified canine Company B to utilize their ATF certification. Company A is located in North Carolina but uses Company B's license which is located in California.

In the past four years we have seen every type of rogue canine company imaginable. Quite possibly, a national standard is still years away but there are steps that can be taken now to ensure the integrity of private industry canine detection companies. These steps include greater oversight by ATF and DEA in the licensing and certification of private canine detection facilities. A quick look on the Internet and you will find all types of canine companies that market their services. You will also see that these companies represent that they possess an ATF or DEA license. When a prospective client researches these companies they "assume" what is printed on the website is fact. However, for the most part, it is fiction.

While the Federal government today, principally TSA and CBP do not use private industry canines, I would respectfully request, given the shortage of canine teams throughout the United States, that private industry canine teams who could meet or surpass the standards set by these government entities be permitted to be hired by the federal government. Should our canines fail to meet the same standards as that of the government then we should be released from the contract. However, it

is my earnest belief that our private canine teams could meet and exceed the standards set by the federal government.

In addition to the above I would like to advise you that after 9–11 the cruise line industry was the first to step up and hire private canine companies. Royal Caribbean and Norwegian Cruise Lines were at the forefront in their industry. They set the standard of insuring that all goods loaded on board their ships were screened by explosive detection canines. Last year, this committee, which was chaired by Congressman Cox, watched our company demonstrate the screening process for Royal Caribbean at the Port of Miami. This Committee observed how quickly a dog could screen a row of pallets to insure that no explosives were present. At that demonstration Congressman Cox asked me why dogs were not being utilized at airports. My answer then remains the same as it is today, and that is “private canine companies are not permitted by TSA to screen cargo at the airports.”

All too often we watch on the nightly news how airline cargo is not screened and how our subways and train stations are not appropriately searched by explosive canine teams. The general consensus is that it would be too expensive and time-consuming to search all the cargo being loaded onto a plane and or packages and individuals boarding subways and trains. Perhaps this is true with electronic searching devices. However, canines could facilitate this screening process in a fraction of the time and for a fraction of the cost compared to utilizing mechanical testing equipment.

You should also be aware that in addition to screening for the cruise lines, we are fortunate to work exclusively for Federal Express. Like Royal Caribbean and Norwegian Cruise Lines, FedEx is a leader in their industry. Shortly after 9–11 FedEx hired us at numerous airports around the country to screen packages being loaded on their aircraft. They chose explosive canines for their thoroughness, accuracy and speed. As you know FedEx is all about speed but they have not forgotten about security.

Screening air cargo by private canine detection companies could be managed the same way that cruise line cargo and FedEx packages are screened.

We appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. While our industry needs national standards and increased oversight of those standards, we welcome the opportunity to work along side and with our federal state and local government counterparts to ensure the safety and security of our nation. I do not believe at the present time that the level of qualified and certified detection teams at the federal state and local level are sufficient to protect the facilities that need to be screened. I would be pleased to answer any questions that the committee has and once again I thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

And I would like to start off with a few questions.

Chief Wilson, I am curious. You said that you use dogs from TSA and Auburn. How did you choose those two sources?

Chief WILSON. When we started first, Mr. Chairman, we looked at the dogs that were available. We really got down and we liked what we found with the TSA dogs, not only on how they were trained, how they train the trainer, but the fact that they have to be re-certified, and that is something we thought was important.

We just did not get the dog in and get it there. The trainer and the dog have to be re-certified.

Mr. ROGERS. How often?

Chief WILSON. Every year. And if my trainer, if my officer that is handling the dog—if they are not re-certified, I put him back in regular patrol and the dog goes back to TSA.

Mr. ROGERS. How many dogs do you have in service?

Chief WILSON. Right now I have a total of eight dogs, six of which are TSA. Two are Auburn.

Mr. ROGERS. How many do you need?

Chief WILSON. I would like to have a total of 20 dogs.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you pay a flat rate to get these dogs? How much do they cost?

Chief WILSON. TSA—they furnish the training, they furnish the dog. They also furnish about a \$40,000 a year supplement for equipment such as the vehicle, the officer's salary, vet bills, food, et cetera.

Auburn, right now we are pretty much paying the full load now. We have done it through funds for ODP, but it is about \$95,000 the startup year because you have got to buy the vehicle and all of that stuff.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

Dr. Moriarty, you talked about your capacity. What is the capacity currently at McClellan for training and what could it be ramped up to?

Mr. MORIARTY. Currently our capacity is to train 36 dog-handler teams a year. We can ramp up and double that in less than 6 months.

Mr. ROGERS. And would you then be at maximum capacity in that facility?

Mr. MORIARTY. No, what we are saying—our anticipation is to provide an additional kennel which would take us up to about 128 dog-handler teams a year.

Mr. ROGERS. A year. And where do you get your dogs?

Mr. MORIARTY. We breed a good deal of ours, as we mentioned. We do have a domestic supplier. We do have a dealer in the Netherlands for European dogs. And the concern, of course, is that it would be unusual if the Europeans are giving us their top dogs. I think they would be tending to keep their top dogs for their own use. They are good dogs, there is no doubt about that.

But also, if this is looked at as a national resource, the ability to provide canines for our domestic needs, then it seems to me that there should be some attention given to breeding and providing our own canine population.

Mr. ROGERS. That was one of the things that disturbed me when I went to the Mexican border, and when I was in El Paso, and I found out that they got almost all of their dogs—well, not all, but a large percentage from Europe. And I heard Ms. Recknor talk about getting hers from Europe.

And I just want to know why do we not have greater capacity here to breed our own lines? Before the demonstration a little while ago, I had the fellow with one of the dogs—it was a Belgian something.

Ms. RECKNOR. Malinois.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. And he was with CBP, and he was telling me that the bloodlines were much more pure over there. My question is can we not establish the same kind of lines over here and create breeding programs that are domestically controlled and not have to rely on European sources? And if not, why not? And if so, what would it take?

Mr. MORIARTY. Mr. Chairman, I think we can do that. I think part of the reasons why we have not done that in greater capacity is that the needs have been so great, the demand has been so high, that to meet the demands you have to acquire the dogs as conveniently as you can in order to address the current issues.

But I would again pose that long term we should have our own supply of high-quality dogs.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you have a breeding program in your—

Mr. MORIARTY. Yes, sir, we do, using the Australian customs dogs, an elite breed that is highly skilled for detection.

Mr. ROGERS. How many can you produce a year?

Mr. MORIARTY. We have had 21 litters so far, and we can—I would have to ask my colleague how many we could get per year. We could get up to 100 working dogs per year in the breeding program.

Mr. ROGERS. That you currently have?

Mr. MORIARTY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Could it be expanded to—

Mr. MORIARTY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. —include these Belgian dogs?

Mr. MORIARTY. The Belgian Malinois. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. And what would it require? What kind of commitment from DHS?

Mr. MORIARTY. The issue is twofold. We would have to expand the infrastructure to accommodate these animals, and then basically—we are a non-profit. We are a university. We are a 501(c)(3). We do not have the profit motive, but we do have full costs that we have to recover.

It would be the dependence that we would have an ongoing partner with the federal agency who would be utilizing these dogs.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

Ms. Recknor, who do you think would be the appropriate entity to establish the certification criteria for all these dogs?

Ms. RECKNOR. That is a very interesting question, because when you looked at the three federal agencies that were here, everybody does something different. So I think it?

Mr. ROGERS. And they all think they are right, too.

Ms. RECKNOR. Yes. One thing I have learned—I do not come from a canine background. The canine people are a unique breed unto themselves because they truly believe that their way is the best way. And they are right that their way is the best way for them. But it is all over the board.

I think what needs to happen is I think the federal agencies need to come together with private entities such as ours and really work at a standardization. I can tell you that our dogs' standards for certification are much higher than what is average for the federal agencies, only because we are working under extreme duress at the ports.

Most of the dogs we have are the Belgian Malinois, and they work harder than most federal agency dogs because they are in the heat and they are working full 8-hour days.

Mr. ROGERS. But what I am hearing you say is that you think TSA, Border Patrol, ATF, as well as private entities such as yours, should collaboratively work to decide what entity would set the criteria—

Ms. RECKNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. —or what the criteria should be?

Ms. RECKNOR. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. ROGERS. What entity.

Ms. RECKNOR. What entity.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. My time has expired.

I now yield to my colleague from Florida for any questions he may have.

Mr. MEEK. Thank you all.

Ms. Recknor, I want to ask you a question. You started talking about quality, and I think that is important, because I know the demand—and Chief, I know that you are going to, as they bill—what do they call it, MARTA?

Chief WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEK. Okay. As they bill your rail system and you start to expand, you are going to need—there is going to be more demand. And I was kind of leading to this on the other panel of the cost savings or the cost savings by using—I call them officers, but—canine officers, by using them versus the personnel.

And if you could answer the question, and then, Chief, you can come in behind her, Chief Wilson, by just talking about some of the personnel issues, because in times outside of a 9/11 kind of thinking, your budget got getter after 9/11.

I mean, you did not have to fight as hard as you used to fight, I am pretty sure, for resources or what you needed. But now after 9/11, not only are there more federal resources, there are also state resources, I am pretty sure, in the counties that you operate.

I am saying that to say that I believe, again, by doing a good job we may run into times again where resources will be hard to come by. But to jeopardize quality is an issue, and I think something is very, very important to all of us as we start looking at protecting America.

The federal agencies that are doing in-house training and providing dogs I know cannot provide—well, canine officers cannot provide and reach the demand alone. I mean, the private sector has to play a role in it.

And like the chairman said, we have to have standards. You advocated we have to have standards. Just can not put up a sign and say we are in business to do business.

Ms. RECKNOR. Right.

Mr. MEEK. We are more into supply and demand, but that quality thing is far in the background, because our lives are dependent on it.

So to sum it up, A, if you could address the issue of a possible way that the private sector can play a role in the issue of helping local law enforcement have more of a variety of what kind of canine dogs that they need, and the officer that they need.

And, Chief, if you can address the issue as it relates to the personnel. Using the canine detector officers, the dogs that I am speaking of—I know when you say canine officer, you think of a person. But I used to be a state trooper, and I see these canines as officers. They are a part of what we do.

Personnel-wise, has it made a difference as it relates to staffing? You say well, I need 10 transit officers here, but no, we have a canine there, we have two canine teams working there, we actually only need six to carry out the mission that we need.

Ms. RECKNOR. I think to answer the subject of quality, the good thing about Garrison and Sloan is that Tony Guzman also owns Metro Dade Canine, and he is a training facility. So there is al-

ways—I do not want to say an abundance, but Tony always has a lot of trained dogs, because he sells them to law enforcement.

He sells to the police departments all over the country. So when you look at quality, we have excellent quality dogs, whether it be Metro Dade waiting to be sold—and some of them we buy because we know the quality of our own dogs.

And it has been interesting. Some of the departments that work for us on a subcontract basis have wound up purchasing Tony's dogs because of the quality that they have seen.

So when it comes to quality, the private sector—again, once there is standards—I can tell you the quality of our dogs is second to none in this industry. But I can not say that about other private companies.

Mr. MEEK. And so let me—I am sorry to cut you off, because time is limited. So I guess your testimony would be if we get into the business of introducing the private sector into playing a role in the Department of Homeland Security's mission in protecting America that, A, there should be a level of standards and certification or a private, quote, unquote, trainer, training facility or training company to make sure that these dogs, these canine potential officers, are up to par, that it is not something that folks get a—I mean, someone goes out and gets incorporated and then—

Ms. RECKNOR. Right.

Mr. MEEK. —they are selling dogs to law enforcement agencies, and we expect for them to be able to detect explosives or what have you.

Ms. RECKNOR. I think one of the reasons why the federal agencies have not partnered with private companies is because they know of all the rogue companies that exist. And I can not blame them. I go up against them every day for contracts with private companies.

And they undercut us because they go to the pound, they get their dogs, and they use pseudo-explosives. We pay top dollar for the dogs and top dollar to maintain them. So I think once the standard's in place, you will see the federal agencies welcome, hopefully, the partnership.

Mr. MEEK. Thank you.

Chief?

Chief WILSON. Representative Meek, what has happened since 9/11 is that there has been additional resources that has flowed toward transit. But internally in transit, because the economy slowed, that our budget actually was cut.

And the way I have staffed the canine positions is I have taken officers from the regular patrol force and put them in the canine function, at the cost of lowering the number, reducing the number, of patrol officers.

And I have been able to live with it to about where I am at this point. What has happened is the time to train the canine handler and to retrain them has taken away from my day-to-day ability to patrol and answer calls, and all those things that you know from being a trooper that you just have to do.

What would help me now is not only the availability of getting good certified dogs that I will be willing to bet people's lives on, but also a way to fund the staff to support those dogs. And when I say



20 more dogs, I am at eight right now. We are going to try to push to 10.

But at that point, I just can not go any further because I have not got any other staffing for the police department. In fact, I have lost staffing. Since 9/11 I have actually reduced the size of the department by 15 people, plus the people I have taken out of patrol to put into dog handling capabilities. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. MEEK. It did. And I am glad you are dealing with it every day. I am glad that you are a part of this panel.

I mean, with that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. But I believe that as this program, Mr. Chairman, continues to get more and more popular and useful to law enforcement in helping us protect America, standards is going go be important.

We can not legislate morals and character, but we can definitely legislate standards. If private companies or public facilities such as our own in-house federal training areas—if they have to reach certain standards, too, they should be the same.

Mr. ROGERS. Right. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to address the same question to the Chief and Dr. Moriarty that I did to Ms. Recknor, and that is who do you think the appropriate certification entity is or should be?

And, Chief Wilson, you first.

Chief WILSON. From my knowledge of working with these programs since 1998, I think the appropriate agency would be the TSA. I think the TSA dogs are—in my opinion, the re-certification is very important.

But I also think that as far as being high profile, in the public view and what they have been able to do, I would think it would be the TSA, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you.

Dr. Moriarty, same question.

Mr. MORIARTY. It was my understanding that one of the missions of this scientific working group that was being established was to address the issue of standards. And I certainly agree with the chief that TSA has a lead role. Whether they should be the only player in that discussion I am having a little bit of a problem with.

I think there should be a mix of those key agencies and representatives from quality programs such as the university and the private sector who should have a seat at the table to make sure the standards and the bar is high.

Mr. ROGERS. But you do think that there should be a uniform set of standards?

Mr. MORIARTY. Absolutely, no argument. Absolutely.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. And you think that it may be some entity that has yet to be fashioned that would establish those standards?

Mr. MORIARTY. I do not know enough on that one, Mr. Chairman, to answer.

Mr. ROGERS. All right. I would like to ask you, Dr. Moriarty, about the cost of your dogs. For you to breed dogs, what does it cost?

Mr. MORIARTY. Okay. It depends if we are training, for example, a drug dog or an explosive dog. Explosive dogs, having longer training, is a little bit more expensive. The cost of that is about \$14,000.

Now, that is full cost. That includes the direct costs of training. It includes the overhead. It includes the administrative costs. So it is full cost accounting. But that is for a 10-week program.

Mr. ROGERS. Of breeding?

Mr. MORIARTY. Well, that includes the breeding. It includes the dog and the canine handler training.

Mr. ROGERS. If Ms. Recknor wanted to purchase a dog from you, how much would it cost?

Mr. MORIARTY. Just purchase a dog without the training?

Mr. ROGERS. Correct.

Mr. MORIARTY. \$3,200 to \$3,600.

Mr. ROGERS. And how does that compare to what you are paying in Europe, Ms. Recknor?

Ms. RECKNOR. Actually, it is pretty close for a dog that is 1.5 years to 2 years and ready to go.

Mr. ROGERS. But now, yours will be trained.

Ms. RECKNOR. Ours are trained just on the seek methods. I mean, we already know that they are going to work because Tony tests them all over there, so we already know that they are going to work.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

And last question, Dr. Moriarty—we have got to be out of here for another hearing that is going to be in this room in about 6 minutes or 7 minutes. Which do you think is the higher priority at your facility? Is it growing the breeding program or growing the training program?

Mr. MORIARTY. Well, it is hard to separate that. What we do best is breeding the animals and training them. We have a very highly trained—as I mentioned, 200 years of collective experience in our senior staffers.

So I would not want to separate the two entities, because breeding the dogs and then distributing them for training elsewhere is a need, but I think the benefits to a university, particularly taking the research, putting that into the training, and then getting the lessons learned out of the training and pulling that back into research to find solutions—that is the value added that we bring.

Mr. ROGERS. Are there any other universities doing what you are doing?

Mr. MORIARTY. No, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay.

I want to thank the panelists. You all have been great. This has been very informative and helpful to us.

I would like to remind the Members that if they would like to submit additional questions—and you may get some additional questions from Members that could not be here because of conflicts—we are going to leave the record open for 10 days.

And if you could reply to those in written responses, I would appreciate that.

And we would, again, ask that you exit quickly since we have to be out of here—me, too—for this next hearing.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:54 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]