AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 18, 2013

Serial No. 113–11

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

82–585 PDF WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: 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

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas, *Chairman*

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

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

GREG HILL, *Chief of Staff*
MICHAEL GEFFROY, *Deputy Chief of Staff/Chief Counsel*
MICHAEL S. TWINCHEK, *Chief Clerk*
I. LANIER AVANT, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

STATEMENTS

The Honorable Michael T. McCaul, a Representative in Congress From the State of Texas, and Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security:
Oral Statement 1
Prepared Statement 2
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security:
Oral Statement 3
Prepared Statement 4

WITNESS

Hon. Janet Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:
Oral Statement 5
Prepared Statement 9

FOR THE RECORD

The Honorable Jeff Duncan, a Representative in Congress From the State of South Carolina:
Excerpt 44

APPENDIX

Questions From Honorable Jeff Duncan for Janet Napolitano 63
Questions From Honorable Susan W. Brooks for Janet Napolitano 63
Questions From Honorable Scott Perry for Janet Napolitano 64
Questions From Ranking Member Bennie G. Thompson for Janet Napolitano . 65
Question From Honorable Loretta Sanchez for Janet Napolitano 73
Questions From Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee for Janet Napolitano 73
Questions From Honorable Yvette D. Clarke for Janet Napolitano 73
Question From Honorable Brian Higgins for Janet Napolitano 73
Question From Honorable Ron Barber for Janet Napolitano 73
Questions From Honorable Donald M. Payne, Jr. for Janet Napolitano 73
Questions From Honorable Beto O'Rourke for Janet Napolitano 75

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Thursday, April 18, 2013

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
WASHINGTON, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:09 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Michael T. McCaul [Chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives McCaul, Smith, King, Rogers, Miller, Meehan, Duncan, Chaffetz, Barletta, Stewart, Hudson, Daines, Brooks, Perry, Thompson, Sanchez, Jackson Lee, Clarke, Higgins, Barber, Payne, O'Rourke, Vela, Horsford, and Swalwell.

Chairman MCCAUL. The Committee on Homeland Security will come to order.

The committee is meeting today to hear testimony from Secretary Janet Napolitano, related to the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security. I now recognize myself for an opening statement.

Secretary Napolitano, I want to thank you for being here today during this difficult time for our country. Events like the Boston bombing, transcend politics. Today as we search for answers, and we remember those who were lost and injured, we are reminded of how vulnerable we are in a free society.

We also realize the truths about the core of this country. That we are strong, resilient, and committed to continuing our way of life. In the moments following the explosions, we felt tremendous heartbreak, but also witnessed tremendous acts of heroism. From the first responders who arrived on the scene and saved lives, to the marathoners who ran towards the victims, instead of away from the blast.

The courage of the people in this country in the face of great evil inspires us all to not be intimidated, but instead carry on, and care for each other. The spirit of the people of Boston make us all proud to be Americans. The tragic images of that day will stay with us. However, if there is a silver lining in times like these, it is that we as a country become united. After the explosions ceased, I received a call from the White House. It was clear from that conversation that we were not Republicans or Democrats, but we are all Americans who stand together in this fight against terrorism.

As our Nation comes together to embrace the families affected by the tragedy, we re-commit ourselves to never returning to a pre-9/11 mentality. We will never forget this heartbreak of losing our

own, and we owe them our commitment to never become complacent. While our intelligence, military, and law enforcement are the best in the world, we as citizens must always remain vigilant. For every event like the one in Boston, many are thwarted.

Hearings like this one today, are meant to improve our prevention of these attacks, and ensure that if they occur, we have the best knowledge, and resources to respond. I want to commend the Department for its involvement in trying to find the terrorist behind this plot. I appreciate the assurances I have received, that we are putting the full weight of the Federal Government behind this search. I am confident that we will succeed in bringing these terrorists to justice.

I think I speak for the committee and tell you that, when it comes to Boston, we are all in this together. We are all equally committed to finding who did this, and to ensuring that they will receive swift justice. As we witnessed this week, this country is still a target for terrorism. I look forward to discussing how we can best use our resources to combat the many threats against us. While we may not always agree on the best way to ensure homeland security, today we can all agree that our highest calling is to serve the people and to ensure their safety.

Today as we examine the fiscal priorities of the Department, I hope we can identify ways to improve our National security by ensuring DHS agencies are working together and for a common purpose. From securing our borders to ensuring resources aren't wasted, and all of the decisions at DHS that play a critical role in safeguarding the Nation. I hope that you, Madam Secretary, can discuss the administration's plans to continue to support DHS's counterterrorism and disaster preparedness and response efforts in addition to the other many issues.

The Department was created out of the combination of 22 independent agencies after 9/11. Therefore, it has great challenges from its inception. I hope that this hearing 10 years after the creation can be a constructive forum, and I look forward to hearing the Secretary's assessment of the proposed budget today. Finally, I want to add my concern about what happened in my home State in West, Texas yesterday evening. As you know, these types of explosions are extremely hard to contain, and we know that there were many injured, and our thoughts and prayers go out to them.

If you have anything you can share with us today, Madam Secretary, on those events, and what is being done now, we would all appreciate your insight. With that, I now recognize the Ranking Member of the committee, Mr. Thompson.

[The statement of Chairman McCaul follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN MICHAEL MCCAUL

Secretary Napolitano, I want to thank you for being here during this difficult time for our country.

Events like the Boston bombing transcend politics. Today, as we search for answers and remember those who were lost and injured, we are reminded of how vulnerable we are as a free society. We also realize the truths about the core of this country—that we are strong, resilient, and committed to continuing our way of life.

In the moments following the explosions, we felt tremendous heartbreak, but also witnessed tremendous acts of heroism. From the first responders who arrived on the scene and undoubtedly saved lives, to the marathoners who ran towards the victims instead of away from the blasts. The courage of the people in this country in the

face of great evil inspires us all to not be intimidated—but to instead carry on and to care for each other. The spirit of the people of Boston makes us all proud to be Americans.

The tragic images of that day will stay with us. However, if there is a silver lining in times like these, it is that we as a country become united. After the explosions ceased, I received a call from the White House. It was clear from that conversation that we were not Republicans or Democrats, but we are all Americans who stand together in the fight against terrorism.

And as the Nation comes together to embrace the families affected by the tragedy, we recommit ourselves to never returning to a pre-9/11 mentality. We will never forget this heartbreak of losing our own, and we owe them our commitment to never become complacent. While our intelligence, military, and law enforcement are the best in the world, we as citizens must always remain vigilant.

For every event like the one in Boston, many are thwarted. Hearings, like this one today, are meant to improve our prevention of these attacks—and ensure that if they occur, we have the best knowledge and resources to respond.

I want to commend the Department for its involvement in trying to find the terrorists behind this plot. I appreciate the assurances I've received that we are putting the full weight of the Federal Government behind this search, and I have confidence that we will succeed.

I think I can speak for the committee and tell you that when it comes to Boston, we are all in this together. We are all equally committed to finding who did this and to ensuring they receive swift justice.

As we witnessed this week, this country is still a target for terrorism, and I look forward to discussing how we can best use our resources to combat the many threats against us.

While we may not always agree on the best way to ensure homeland security, today we can all agree that our highest calling is to serve the people, and to ensure their safety.

Today, as we examine the fiscal priorities of the Department, I hope we can identify ways to improve our National security by ensuring DHS agencies work together, and for a common purpose. From securing our borders to ensuring resources aren't wasted—all of the decisions at DHS play a critical role in safeguarding our Nation.

I hope that you, Madame Secretary, can discuss the administration's plans to continue to support DHS's counterterrorism and disaster preparedness and response efforts in addition to the many other issues facing the Department.

The Department was created out of the combination of 22 independent agencies after 9/11, therefore it has had great challenges from its inception. I hope that this hearing, 10 years after the creation of DHS, can be a constructive forum, and I look forward to the Secretary's assessment of the Department's proposed budget today.

Finally, I want to add my concern about what happened in West, Texas, yesterday evening. As you know—these types of explosions are extremely hard to contain—and we know that there were many injured. If you have anything you can share with us today on those events and what's being done now, we would all appreciate your insight.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for setting this hearing to hear from the Secretary on the proposed 2014 budget. Good morning Madam Secretary. I am appreciative that you are here to discuss the budget. However, before I begin I would like to take a moment to express my sincere condolences to those who have lost loved ones, or were injured in Boston. Our thoughts are with them today. As a former volunteer firefighter, I want to commend the Boston police, firefighters, and medical personnel for their heroic response.

Also, I would like—be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the lives lost, and destruction out in West, Texas. Our prayers also go out to that community. As authorizers, we bear special responsibility to make sure that the Government is working to prevent attacks like the one that happened on Monday. Madam Secretary, your job has certainly not been an easy one. When you arrived at the Department 4 years ago, it was in bad shape. There were problems with acquisitions. There were problems with morale. Despite significant investment in preparedness, we had no idea if, as a Na-

tion, we were better prepared to respond to a natural disaster, or a terrorist attack.

To add to that, over the past 3 years, the Department's budget has been reduced. Meanwhile, the periodic logjams in the Congressional budget process have certainly made future budget planning much more difficult. So to be clear, I understand that you have a very difficult job. That said, I am concerned about the lack of progress on many of the fundamental problems that have plagued your agency since its inception.

For example, the Department continues to be on the Government Accountability Office's high-risk list, and employee morale continues to be among the lowest of all Federal agencies. After $430 million of investment in interoperable communications, Departmental components are still not interoperable. With respect to the fiscal year 2014 budget request, I appreciate your efforts to achieve savings through efficiencies, but I have some serious reservations about some of your proposals. I am concerned that many of the critical new investments are dependent upon Congress approving new revenues.

In the current Congressional environment, that strikes me as a very heavy lift. Additionally, I have questions about the proposal to let CBP to accept money from outside stakeholders to defray costs. In particular, I would like to know how this proposal relates to plans to extend the pre-clearance program to Abu Dhabi, UAE. With respect to preparedness, I am concerned that the Department has yet again proposed to consolidate 16 targeted Homeland Security grant programs into a single pot.

It has been over a year since grant consolidation was first proposed, and the Department still has not articulated how the capabilities gained through existing grant programs will be maintained under the new program. With the limited resources available to the Department, we must ensure that the Federal, State, and local programs are adequately funded. Yet, before I close I would note that the administration has two major initiatives where the Department is expected to play a central role: Immigration reform and cybersecurity.

I am interested to hear what resources you need in order to undertake the anticipated advances in these two key areas. Again, I thank you for being here today, and I look forward to your testimony, and I yield back my time.

[The statement of Ranking Member Thompson follows:]

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON

Before I begin, I would like to take a moment to express my sincere condolences to those who lost loved ones or were injured in Boston. Our thoughts are with them today. As a former volunteer firefighter, I want to commend the Boston police, firefighters, and medical personnel for their heroic response.

Also, I would be remiss if I didn't also acknowledge the lives lost and destruction we are seeing out of West, Texas. Our prayers go out to that community.

As authorizers, we bear a special responsibility to make sure that the Government is working to prevent attacks like the one that happened on Monday.

Madame Secretary, your job has certainly not been an easy one. When you arrived at the Department 4 years ago, it was in bad shape.

There were problems with acquisitions. There were problems with morale. Despite significant investments in preparedness, we had no idea if, as a Nation, we were better prepared to respond to a natural disaster or terrorist attack.

To add to that, over the past 3 years, the Department's budget has been reduced; meanwhile, the periodic logjams in the Congressional budget process have certainly made future budget planning much more difficult. So, to be clear, I understand that you have a very difficult job.

That said, I am concerned about the lack of progress on many of the fundamental problems that have plagued your agency.

For example, the Department continues to be on the Government Accountability Office's "High-Risk List" and employee morale continues to be among the lowest of all Federal agencies.

After $430 million of investment in interoperable communications, Departmental components still are not interoperable.

With respect to the fiscal year 2014 budget request, I appreciate your efforts to achieve savings through efficiencies, but I have some serious reservations about some of your proposals.

I am concerned that many of the critical, new investments are dependent upon Congress approving new revenues. In the current Congressional environment, that strikes me as a very heavy lift.

Additionally, I have questions about the proposal to allow CBP to accept money from outside stakeholders to defray costs. In particular, I would like to know how this proposal relates to plans to extend the preclearance program to Abu Dhabi, UAE.

With respect to preparedness, I am concerned that the Department has, yet again, proposed to consolidate 16 targeted homeland security grant programs into a single pot.

It has been over a year since grant consolidation was first proposed, and the Department still has not articulated how the capabilities gained through existing grant programs will be maintained under the new program.

With the limited resources available to the Department, we must ensure that the Federal, State, and local programs are adequately funded.

Before I close, I would note that the administration has two major initiatives where the Department is expected to play a central role—immigration reform and cybersecurity.

I am interested to hear what resources you need in order to undertake the anticipated advances in these two key areas.

Chairman MCCAUL. I want to thank the Ranking Member. Other Members of the committee are reminded that opening statements may be submitted for the record. I would like now to introduce the Secretary. Secretary Napolitano is beginning her fifth year of service in one of the most important Cabinet positions in our Government. Prior to her service at the Department of Homeland Security, Secretary Napolitano served as Governor and attorney general in the State of Arizona and as a former justice department prosecutor. She was also a United States attorney.

I remind our witness her entire written statement will appear in the record, and ask our witness to summarize her statement at this time. I now recognize the Secretary. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET NAPOLITANO, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, thank you Chairman McCaul and Ranking Member Thompson, Members of the committee. Before I begin discussion of the fiscal year 2014 budget request, if I might, just a few words both about West, Texas, and about Boston. I will begin with West, Texas as the more recent event, and give you the most current information that we have about the explosion. Of course our sympathies and concerns go out to the families of those who have lost loved ones, or who have had a loved one who has been injured.

But, as of right now, the FAA has issued a temporary flight restriction over the area. The Texas Commission on Environmental

Quality is providing air monitoring, and technical assistance. Texas Task Force–1 has been alerted to provide structural collapse support. The Union Pacific Railroad has halted freight service, and local utilities have turned off utility service in the area, including gas and electricity. There is an Incident Command Center, and a Triage Center, but they have been recently moved due to fears that additional tanks could be at risk. FEMA, part of the department has been activated, and stands ready to assist Texas upon request.

The State Fire Marshall's Office, the Texas DPS, the Waco Fire and Hazmat and other State agencies are also responding. The American Red Cross is working with local Emergency Management to identify shelter management assistance. We have within FEMA, activated an Incident Management Assistance Team, three preliminary Damage Assessment Teams, and we are also standing by to assist in any other way. Our EOC remains at level 3, which is at increased readiness. We will continue to monitor events over the course of today, and provide you with updates as they are relevant.

I might add, Mr. Chairman that many of the things I have just gone through are examples of the kinds of activities that have been supported by the committee, through FEMA, through the various grants that we supply. Urban Search and Rescue being a good example of the kinds of things that grants have been supporting, increasing or capacity for response and resilience as a Nation. So, that is the most recent on West, Texas. With respect to Boston, we are—in the FBI's lead, we are investigating this as an act of terror. We are assisting.

ICE is part of the JTTF. We have over four dozen ICE agents now assigned to the Boston office, helping in the investigation. CBP is assisting in a number of ways. Immediately after the attack, we worked to close Logan, to ground air for a few hours and to institute special targeting rules, both in the air environment, and at the Canadian border environment, in case there were those seeking to escape the scene.

With respect to FEMA, again when you saw the response in Boston and how coordinated it was even given the level of destruction, I would remind the committee that just last November, Boston held a massive exercise on how to deal with a mass casualty event. That exercise was the kind of exercise, and exercises supported by the committee through FEMA to local areas, again increasing our ability for response and resilience.

We have worked with the FBI and provided several intel products and briefings to State and local law enforcement across the country. Critical infrastructure owners and operators, and we have been reaching out to faith-based organizations, community organizations, and others who want to know what they can do. We are implementing a number of security measures, both seen and unseen at airports, transit hubs, within the maritime environment, and at ports of entry.

The Coast Guard is providing security on the ferries in the Boston area. VIPR teams are doing surges in terms of ground transportation and the like. Finally, with respect to the public, we do urge the public to remain vigilant. We are all in this together. Security is a joint responsibility. The "see something, say something"

message is something that all of us can emphasize. Events such as Boston remind us of the importance of that.

This is an all-hands-on-deck effort by the entire Federal Government, led by the President. We are committed to making sure that we bring the perpetrators to justice.

Moving on to the budget, this marks the 10th anniversary of the creation of DHS. It is the largest reorganization of the Federal Government since the creation of the Department of Defense. In 10 years, we have transformed 22 legacy agencies into a single integrated Department. We have built a strengthened homeland security enterprise and a more secure America better equipped to confront the range of threats we face.

The President's fiscal year 2014 budget request allows us to build on our progress by preserving core front-line operational priorities. At the same time, given the current fiscal environment—this is the third straight year that our budget request reflects a reduction from the previous year. Specifically, the budget request is 2.2 percent, or more than $800 million dollars below the fiscal year 2013 enacted budget. While our missions have not changed, and we continue to face evolving threats, I think, we have become more strategic in how we use our resources, focusing on a risk-based approach.

This is coupled with a commitment to fiscal discipline, which has led to over $4 billion in cost avoidances and reductions through our efficiency review. The recent, 4-year appropriations bill enables DHS to mitigate, to some degree, the projected sequester impacts under the Continuing Resolution on our operations and work force. But there is no doubt that these cuts, totaling more than $3 billion over 6 months, will affect our operations in the short and long term.

Sustained cuts at sequester levels will result in reduced operational capacity, breached staffing floors, and economic impacts to the private sector through reduced and canceled contracts. Nonetheless, we continue to do everything we can to minimize impacts on our core mission and employees, consistent with the operational priorities in the 2014 budget.

Let me, if I might, briefly highlight those. First, to prevent terrorism and enhance security, the 2014 budget continues to support risk-based security initiatives, like TSA PreCheck, Global Entry, other trusted traveler programs. As a result, we expect 1 in 4 travelers to receive some form of expedited screening by the end of the year. The budget supports the administration efforts to secure maritime cargo in the global supply train by strengthening efforts to interdict threats at the earliest possible point.

We continue our strong support for State and local partners through training, fusion centers, and information sharing on a wide range of homeland security issues. We also fund cutting-edge research and development to address evolving biological, radiological, and nuclear threats, including construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, the NBAF.

To secure and manage our borders, the budget continues the administration's robust border security efforts, while facilitating legitimate travel and trade. It sustains historic deployments of personnel along our borders, as well as continued utilization of proven,

effective surveillance technology along the highest-trafficked areas of the Southwest Border.

To expedite travel and trade, while reducing wait times at the ports of entry, the budget requests an additional 3,500 port officers, 1,600 paid for by appropriation, the remainder by an increase to the immigration user fees that have not been adjusted since 2001.

To secure maritime borders, the budget invests in recapitalization of Coast Guard assets, including the 7th National Security Cutter and fast response cutters. The budget also continues the Department's focus on smart and effective enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws. It supports the unprecedented effort to more effectively focus the enforcement system on public safety threats, border security, and the integrity of the immigration system through initiatives such as deferred action for childhood arrivals and greater use of prosecutorial discretion.

At the same time, the budget makes significant reductions to inefficient programs like 287–G task force agreements while supporting more cost-efficient initiatives like the Nation-wide implementation of secure communities.

The budget invests in monitoring in compliance, promoting adherence to work-site related laws, Form I–9 inspections, and enhancements to the E-Verify program while continuing to support alternatives to detention, detention reform, and immigrant integration efforts.

Comprehensive immigration reform will help us continue to build on these efforts and strengthen border security by enabling DHS to further focus its resources on criminals, human smugglers and traffickers, and National security threats.

Next, to safeguard and secure cyberspace, this budget makes significant investments to strengthen cybersecurity, including funds to secure our Nation's information and financial systems and to defend against cyber threats to private sector and Federal systems, the Nation's critical infrastructure, and our economy. It supports the President's Executive Order on improving critical infrastructure, cybersecurity, and the Presidential Policy Directive on critical infrastructure, security, and resilience. It expedites the deployment of the EINSTEIN–3 to prevent and detect intrusions on Government computer systems.

Finally, to ensure continued resilience to disasters, the President's budget focuses on a whole-of-community approach to emergency management. It includes resources for the Disaster Relief Fund, the DRF, to support Presidentially-declared disasters or emergencies. The administration is again proposing the consolidation of 18 grant programs into one National preparedness grants program to create a robust National response capacity while reducing administrative overhead. This competitive risk-based program will use a comprehensive process to identify gaps, identify and prioritize deployable capabilities, put funding to work quickly, and require grantees to regularly report on their progress.

It is, as I mentioned before, precisely this kind of funding that has enhanced preparedness and response capabilities in cities like Boston and locations like West, Texas. Since 2002, the Boston urban area has received nearly $370 million in Federal grant funding, which has been used to equip and train tactical and specialize

response teams, specifically, in IED detection, prevention, response, and recovery.

Grants have supported increased coordination, particularly with respect to joint exercises and training, including more than a dozen exercises involving the city of Boston over the past several years. As I mentioned, this included a large-scale mass casualty exercise with more than 1,800 first responders just last November.

Due to the investments made over the past 10 years, our State and local jurisdictions now have greater capabilities to prevent and respond to incidents. In sum, our communities are better prepared, and we must continue this support.

In conclusion, the fiscal year 2014 budget proposal reflects this administration's strong commitment to protecting the homeland and the American people through the effective and efficient use of DHS resources.

Chairman McCaul, Ranking Member Thompson, Members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Napolitano follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JANET NAPOLITANO

Chairman McCaul, Ranking Member Thompson, and Members of the committee: Let me begin by saying thank you to this committee for the strong support you have provided me and the Department over the past 4 years. I look forward to continuing to work with you in the coming year to protect the homeland and the American people.

I am pleased to appear before the committee today to present President Obama's fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the creation of DHS, the largest reorganization of the U.S. Government since the formation of the Department of Defense. After 10 years of effort, DHS has transformed 22 agencies from across the Federal Government into a single integrated Department, building a strengthened homeland security enterprise and a more secure America better equipped to confront the range of threats we face.

Our workforce of nearly 240,000 law enforcement agents, officers, and men and women on the front lines put their lives at risk every day to protect our country from threats to the homeland, securing our land, air, and maritime borders; enforcing our immigration laws; and responding to natural disasters. Our employees are stationed in every State and in more than 75 countries around the world, engaging with State, local, and foreign partners to strengthen homeland security through cooperation, information sharing, training, and technical assistance. Domestically, DHS works side-by-side with State and local[1] law enforcement (SLLE) and emergency responders in our communities, along our borders, and throughout a National network of fusion centers. The Department also collaborates with international partners, including foreign governments, major multilateral organizations, and global businesses to strengthen the security of the networks of global trade and travel, upon which our Nation's economy and communities rely.

DHS employs a risk-based, intelligence-driven approach to help prevent terrorism and other evolving security threats. Utilizing a multi-layered detection system, DHS focuses on enhanced targeting and information sharing, and on working beyond our borders to interdict threats and dangerous actors at the earliest point possible. Each day, DHS screens 2 million passengers at domestic airports; intercepts thousands of agricultural threats; expedites the transit of nearly 100,000 people through trusted traveler and known crewmember programs; and trains thousands of Federal, State, local, rural, Tribal, territorial, and international officers and agents through more than 550 basic and advanced training programs available at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC). We conduct vulnerability assessments of key infrastructure, disseminate intelligence regarding current and developing threats, and provide connectivity to Federal systems to help local law enforcement

[1] "Local" law enforcement includes all law enforcement at the municipal, Tribal, and territorial levels.

and homeland security agencies across the country in reporting suspicious activities and implementing protective measures.

Our borders and ports are stronger, more efficient, and better protected than ever before. At the Southwest Border, apprehensions have decreased to the lowest point in more than 30 years. We have significantly invested in additional personnel, technology, and infrastructure, leading to historic progress along the border. We have deepened partnerships with Federal, State, local, and international law enforcement to combat transnational threats and criminal organizations to help keep our border communities safe. We have strengthened entry procedures to protect against the use of fraudulent documents and the entry of individuals who may wish to do us harm. And we have made our ports of entry (POEs) more efficient to expedite lawful travel and trade. Each day, almost 1 million people arrive at our POEs by land, sea, and air. In fiscal year 2012, DHS processed more than 350 million travelers at our POEs, including almost 100 million international air travelers and $2.3 trillion dollars of trade, while enforcing U.S. laws that welcome travelers, protect health and safety, and facilitate the flow of goods essential to our economy.

DHS has focused on smart and effective enforcement of U.S. immigration laws while streamlining and facilitating the legal immigration process. We have established clear enforcement priorities to focus the enforcement system on the removal of individuals who pose a danger to National security or a risk to public safety, including aliens convicted of crimes, with particular emphasis on violent criminals, felons, and repeat offenders, while implementing a comprehensive worksite enforcement strategy to reduce demand for illegal employment and protect employment opportunities for the Nation's lawful workforce. DHS has implemented major reforms to the Nation's immigration detention system to enhance security and efficiency and protect the health and safety of detainees while expanding Nation-wide the Secure Communities program, which uses biometric information to identify criminal aliens in State and local correctional facilities. Over the past 4 years, the Department has also improved the legal immigration process by streamlining and modernizing immigration benefits processes; strengthening fraud protections; protecting crime victims, asylees, and refugees; updating rules to keep immigrant families together; and launching new initiatives to spur economic competitiveness.

Today, our borders are more secure and our border communities are among the safest communities in our country. We have removed record numbers of criminals from the United States, and our immigration laws are being enforced according to sensible priorities. We have taken numerous steps to strengthen legal immigration and build greater integrity into the system. We are using our resources smartly, effectively, responsibly.

Despite these improvements, however, our immigration system remains broken and outdated. That is why the Department stands ready to implement commonsense immigration reform that would continue investments in border security, crack down on companies that hire undocumented workers, improve the legal immigration system for employment-sponsored and family-sponsored immigrants, and establish a responsible pathway to earned citizenship. Comprehensive immigration reform will help us continue to build on this progress and strengthen border security by providing additional tools and enabling DHS to further focus existing resources on preventing the entry of criminals, human smugglers and traffickers, and National security threats.

Our Nation's critical infrastructure is crucial to our economy and security. DHS is the Federal Government's lead in securing unclassified Federal civilian government networks as well as working with owners and operators of critical infrastructure to secure their networks and protect physical assets through risk assessment, mitigation, forensic analysis, and incident response capabilities. In 2012, DHS issued warnings and responded to an average of 70 incidents per month arising from more than 10,000 daily alerts. The President also issued an Executive Order on cybersecurity and a Presidential Policy Directive on critical infrastructure security and resilience to strengthen the security and resilience of critical infrastructure against evolving threats through an updated and overarching National framework that acknowledges the interdependencies between cybersecurity and securing physical assets.

In support of these efforts, DHS serves as the focal point for the U.S. Government's cybersecurity outreach and awareness activities and is focused on the development of a world-class cybersecurity workforce as well as innovative technologies that sustain safe, secure, and resilient critical infrastructure. We work hand-in-hand with our private-sector partners, recognizing the importance of public-private partnerships to build resilience through a whole-of-community approach. In addition to these responsibilities, DHS combats cybercrime by leveraging the skills and re-

sources of the law enforcement community and interagency partners to investigate and prosecute cyber criminals.

DHS has fundamentally changed how we work with our State and local partners to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the effects of disasters. Through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), we have implemented innovative practices to transform our disaster workforce through the creation of FEMA Corps and the DHS Surge Capacity Workforce. Working closely with State and local officials, we preposition resources before disasters hit and have 28 National urban search-and-rescue teams on standby in addition to dozens of State and local teams to support response efforts. We train more than 2 million emergency management and response personnel annually at the Emergency Management Institute, National Fire Academy, and through Community Emergency Response Teams to improve capabilities across all hazards. Additionally, we have deployed new capabilities to help disaster survivors recover and communities rebuild.

MAXIMIZING EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

The fiscal year 2014 budget for DHS is $60.0 billion in total budget authority and $48.5 billion in gross discretionary funding. These two amounts include $5.6 billion in Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) appropriations for recovery from major disasters, pursuant to the Budget Control Act. Excluding the $5.6 billion funding within the DRF, the net discretionary total is $39 billion.

Realizing Efficiencies and Streamlining Operations

The Department has implemented a variety of initiatives to cut costs, share resources across components, and consolidate and streamline operations wherever possible. In fiscal year 2014, these initiatives will result in $1.3 billion in savings from administrative and mission support areas, including contracts, information technology (IT), travel, personnel moves, overtime, directed purchasing, professional services, and vehicle management.

Through the Department-wide, employee-driven Efficiency Review (ER), which began in 2009, as well as other cost-saving initiatives, DHS has identified more than $4 billion in cost avoidances and reductions, and redeployed those funds to mission-critical initiatives across the Department.

Strategic Sourcing

Through ER and component initiatives, DHS has used strategic sourcing initiatives to leverage the purchasing power of the entire Department for items such as language services, tactical communications services and devices, intelligence analysis services, and vehicle maintenance services. In fiscal year 2012, we achieved $368 million in savings, and we project $250 million in savings for fiscal year 2013. We expect a comparable level of savings as we continue forward with this approach in fiscal year 2014.

Travel and Conferences

In support of the administration's Campaign to Cut Waste, DHS strengthened conference and travel policies and controls to reduce travel expenses, ensure conferences are cost-effective, and ensure both travel and conference attendance is driven by critical mission requirements. During 2012, DHS issued a new directive that establishes additional standards for conferences and requires regular reporting on conference spending, further increasing transparency and accountability. The Department's fiscal year 2014 budget projects an additional 20 percent reduction in travel costs from fiscal years 2013–2016.

Real Property Management

DHS manages a real property portfolio of approximately 38,000 assets, which spans all 50 States and 7 U.S. territories. The Department has adopted strategies to achieve greater efficiencies in the management of its real property portfolio that includes expediting the identification and disposal of under-utilized assets as well as improving the utilization of remaining Department inventory. These efforts will result in reductions in the size of our civilian real estate inventory, annual operating and maintenance costs, and energy usage. DHS anticipates that the amount of space and cost per full-time equivalent employee will continue to decline as spaces are reconfigured or new space is acquired on the basis of new workplace planning assumptions. DHS is committed to continuing to improve the management and alignment of its real property with advances in technology, mission, and work requirements.

Management and Integration

Over the past 4 years, DHS has significantly improved Departmental management, developing and implementing a comprehensive, strategic approach to enhance Department-wide maturation and integration. We have improved acquisition oversight, ensuring full consideration of the investment life cycle in cost estimates, establishing procedures to thoroughly vet new requirements and alternative solutions, and supporting full funding policies to minimize acquisition risk. The fiscal year 2014 budget includes key investments to strengthen the homeland security enterprise, increase integration, address challenges raised by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), and continue to build upon the management reforms that have been implemented under this administration.

Modernization of the Department's financial management systems has been consistently identified as critical by the Office of Management and Budget, the GAO, and Congress, and is vital to our ability to provide strong stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Over the past several years, we have made significant progress improving financial management practices and establishing internal controls. In 2012, DHS earned a qualified audit opinion on its Balance Sheet, a significant milestone and a pivotal step toward increasing transparency and accountability for the Department's resources. This full-scope audit opinion is a result of DHS's on-going commitment to instituting sound financial management practices to safeguard taxpayer dollars.

Although DHS continues to maximize cost efficiencies and savings wherever possible, new investment must be made to improve our outdated financial systems and tools. The fiscal year 2014 budget supports financial system modernization at the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), which also provides financial management services to two other DHS components.

DHS is also implementing a coordinated management approach for strategic investments and resource decisions involving multiple components through the Integrated Investment Life Cycle Model. This initiative will help the Department enhance mission effectiveness while achieving management efficiencies by providing a broader, enterprise-wide perspective and ensuring DHS investments address the greatest needs of the Department.

Strategic Re-Organizations

In today's fiscal environment, the Department has challenged its workforce to fundamentally rethink how it does business, from the largest to the smallest investments. To help reduce costs, DHS conducted a formal base budget review, looking at all aspects of the Department's budget to find savings and better align resources with operational requirements.

United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US–VISIT)

To better align the functions of US–VISIT with the operational components, the Budget re-proposes the transfer of US–VISIT functions from the National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD) to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), consistent with the President's fiscal year 2013 budget. Currently, CBP operates numerous screening and targeting systems, and integrating US–VISIT within CBP will strengthen the Department's overall vetting capability while also realizing operational efficiencies and cost savings.

State and Local Grants

Given the fiscal challenges facing the Department's State and local partners, DHS is also approaching these partnerships in new and innovative ways. The budget re-proposes the National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP), originally presented in the fiscal year 2013 budget, to develop, sustain, and leverage core capabilities across the country in support of National preparedness, prevention, and response, with appropriate adjustments to respond to stakeholder feedback in 2012. While providing a structure that will give grantees more certainty about how funding will flow, the proposal continues to utilize a comprehensive process for assessing regional and National gaps; support the development of a robust cross-jurisdictional and readily deployable State and local assets; and require grantees to regularly report progress in the acquisition and development of these capabilities.

Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Delegation

Beginning in fiscal year 2013, the General Services Administration (GSA) will work with DHS to delegate the operations of LPOE facilities to CBP. The distinctive nature of LPOEs as mission-oriented, 24/7 operational assets of CBP, as well as National trade and transportation infrastructure, differentiates this part of the portfolio from other Federal buildings managed by GSA. The delegation facilitates faster

delivery of service tailored to the specific needs of CBP's mission and will be more responsive to changing priorities and critical operations.

DHS Commonality Efforts

The successful integration of 22 legacy agencies into DHS was an important and ambitious undertaking that has increased the Department's ability to understand, mitigate, and protect against threats to the Nation. Further integration of the Department and of the development of a "One DHS" culture will strengthen effectiveness, improve decision making to address shared issues, and prioritize resources in an era of fiscal constraint. The fiscal year 2014 budget continues this emphasis and supports on-going efforts aimed at furthering integration, some of which are highlighted as follows.

Common Vetting

It is estimated that DHS spends approximately $1.8 billion annually on information-based screening. Consequently, DHS has established a Common Vetting Initiative to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of vetting operations within the Department. Although this work is on-going, it is expected that this effort will identify opportunities for streamlining operations and strengthening front-end assessment of requirements as part of an integrated investment life cycle.

Additionally, DHS is leveraging existing capabilities and its research and development (R&D) capabilities at the Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) to enhance the Department's exit program, and to identify and sanction those who overstay their lawful period of admission to the United States. This initiative is focused on aggregating information within existing data systems, enhancing review of potential overstays, increasing automated matching, and incorporating additional biometric elements to provide the foundation for a future biometric exit solution. The transfer of US–VISIT functions to CBP and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) supports this effort and better aligns mission functions.

Aviation Commonality

The Department is projected to spend approximately $1.2 billion over fiscal years 2014–2018 on procurement of aviation assets. In 2011, DHS stood up an aviation commonalities working group to improve operational coordination in acquisition, facilities, maintenance, and logistics between CBP and USCG. The Department also launched an Aviation and Marine Commonalities Pilot Project in the fall of 2012 to test the unified command and control of Departmental aviation and marine forces. Complementing this effort, DHS recently began an ER initiative, which will increase cross-component collaboration for aviation-related equipment and maintenance by establishing excess equipment sharing, maintenance services, and contract teaming agreements, as well as other opportunities for aviation-related efficiencies.

Investigations

A recent partnership between ICE's Homeland Security Investigations and the U.S. Secret Service (USSS) demonstrates the Department's commitment to leveraging capabilities across components and finding efficiencies. Both ICE and USSS are expanding participation in the existing Secret Service Electronic Crimes Task Forces (ECTFs), which will strengthen the Department's cybercrimes investigative capabilities and realize efficiencies in the procurement of computer forensic hardware, software licensing, and training. This collaboration will integrate resources devoted to investigating transnational criminal organizations; transnational child exploitation; financial crime, including money laundering and identity and intellectual property theft; and network intrusions by domestic and international threats. This will further enhance the response capability of the Department to a cyber event by leveraging the assets of the Secret Service's 31 ECTFs, which bring together more than 2,700 international, Federal, State, and local law enforcement partners; 3,100 private-sector members; and 300 academic partners.

CBP Staffing and Mission Integration

Given the administration's strong and continued focus on border security, DHS has undertaken a series of initiatives to ensure that CBP's operations are integrated and that Border Patrol Agents (BPAs) and CBP Officers (CBPOs) are optimally deployed. As part of its mission integration efforts, CBP has applied complementary BPA and CBPO deployments to enhance mission sets both at and between the POEs. Toward this goal, CBP has identified numerous mission areas where BPAs can substantially support: Port operations, including canine detection operations for drugs and concealed humans; outbound operations that target currency, firearms, and fugitives; port security, counter-surveillance, and perimeter enforcement operations; inbound secondary conveyance inspections for narcotics and human smug-

gling. CBP has also identified mission areas where BPAs secure and transport seized contraband.

CBP is realizing significant operational and force-multiplying benefits from deploying BPAs to support POE requirements. Over the last year, these efforts have augmented POE operations, enabling CBP to more effectively address the threat of money and weapons being smuggled southbound into Mexico for use by transnational criminal organizations. In 2013, CBP is expanding these efforts by synchronizing mission integration efforts across the four key Southwest Border operational corridors: South Texas, El Paso/New Mexico, Arizona, and Southern California. The harmonization of current efforts will increase rapid response capability, develop unified intelligence and targeting approaches, and identify additional areas for on-the-ground operational collaboration.

Supporting Economic Growth and Job Creation

In support of the President's Executive Order on travel and tourism and to continue building upon the administration's significant investments in border security, the fiscal year 2014 budget includes several proposals to invest in the men and women on the front lines of our 329 POEs along the border and at airports and seaports across the country. Processing the more than 350 million travelers annually provides nearly $150 billion in economic stimulus, yet the fees that support these operations have not been adjusted in many cases for more than a decade. As the complexity of our operations continues to expand, the gap between fee collections and the operations they support is growing, and the number of workforce hours fees support decreases each year. Accordingly, the budget supports 3,477 new CBPOs to reduce growing wait times at our POEs and increase seizures of illegal items (guns, drugs, currency, and counterfeit goods). This includes appropriated funding for 1,600 additional CBPOs and, with Congressional approval, 1,877 new CBPOs through adjustments in immigration and customs inspections user fees to recover more of the costs associated with providing services. These fee proposals will also help address the staffing gap outlined in CBP's Resource Optimization at Ports of Entry, Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress, submitted with the President's budget. In addition, CBP and the U.S. Department of Agriculture are evaluating financial models to achieve full cost recovery for agricultural inspectional services provided by CBP.

Beyond the additional front-line positions, the President's budget also provides direct support for thousands of new jobs through major infrastructure projects such as the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) and a consolidated departmental headquarters at the St. Elizabeths Campus. Investment in USCG recapitalization projects supports more than 4,000 jobs as well in the shipbuilding and aircraft industries. Through our grant programs we will continue helping local communities to create and maintain jobs, while strengthening the resiliency of important economic sectors and infrastructure. The budget additionally supports CBP and ICE efforts to combat commercial trade fraud, including intellectual property law infringement, estimated to cost the economy up to $250 billion each year.

Continued investment in Coast Guard front-line operations and recapitalization of its aging fleet helps to protect the Nation's Exclusive Economic Zone, a source of $122 billion in annual U.S. revenue, and to secure 361 ports and thousands of miles of maritime thoroughfares that support 95 percent of trade with the United States. Through CBP and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), we continue to promote safe and secure travel and tourism, supporting a $2.3 trillion dollar tourism industry. These programs, among others, enhance our Nation's safety and security while fostering economic growth and job creation.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

The fiscal year 2014 budget prioritizes programs and activities within the homeland security mission areas outlined in the Department's 2010 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, the 2010 Bottom-Up Review, and the fiscal year 2012–2016 DHS Strategic Plan, undertaken by the Department to align its DHS resources with a comprehensive strategy to meet the Nation's homeland security needs.

The budget builds on the progress the Department has made in each of its mission areas while strengthening existing capabilities, enhancing partnerships across all levels of government and with the private sector, streamlining operations, and increasing efficiencies.

Mission 1: Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security.—Protecting the United States from terrorism is the cornerstone of homeland security. DHS's counterterrorism responsibilities focus on three goals: Preventing terrorist attacks; preventing the unauthorized acquisition, importation, movement, or use of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials and capabilities within the United States; and

reducing the vulnerability of critical U.S. infrastructure and key resources, essential leadership, and major events to terrorist attacks and other hazards.

Mission 2: Securing and Managing Our Borders.—The protection of the Nation's borders—land, air, and sea—from the illegal entry of people, weapons, drugs, and other contraband while facilitating lawful travel and trade is vital to homeland security, as well as the Nation's economic prosperity. The Department's border security and management efforts focus on three interrelated goals: Effectively securing U.S. air, land, and sea borders; safeguarding and streamlining lawful trade and travel; and disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal and terrorist organizations.

Mission 3: Enforcing and Administering Our Immigration Laws.—DHS is focused on smart and effective enforcement of U.S. immigration laws while streamlining and facilitating the legal immigration process. The Department has fundamentally reformed immigration enforcement, focusing on identifying and removing criminal aliens who pose a threat to public safety and targeting employers who knowingly and repeatedly break the law.

Mission 4: Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace.—DHS is responsible for securing unclassified Federal civilian government networks and working with owners and operators of critical infrastructure to secure their networks through risk assessment, mitigation, and incident response capabilities. To combat cybercrime, DHS leverages the skills and resources of the law enforcement community and interagency partners to investigate and prosecute cyber criminals. DHS also serves as the focal point for the U.S. Government's cybersecurity outreach and awareness efforts to create a more secure environment in which the private or financial information of individuals is better protected.

Mission 5: Ensuring Resilience to Disasters.—DHS coordinates the comprehensive Federal efforts to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate a terrorist attack, natural disaster, or other large-scale emergency, while working with individuals; communities; the private and nonprofit sectors; faith-based organizations; and Federal, State, local, territorial, and Tribal (SLTT) partners to ensure a swift and effective recovery. The Department's efforts to help build a ready and resilient Nation include fostering a whole community approach to emergency management Nationally; building the Nation's capacity to stabilize and recover from a catastrophic event; bolstering information sharing and building unity of effort and common strategic understanding among the emergency management team; providing training to our homeland security partners; and leading and coordinating National partnerships to foster preparedness and resilience across the private sector.

In addition to these missions, DHS strives to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of its operations while strengthening the homeland security enterprise. The collective efforts of Federal, SLTT, non-Governmental, and private-sector partners, as well as individuals and communities across the country are critical to our shared security. This includes enhancing shared awareness of risks and threats, building capable, resilient communities, and fostering innovative approaches and solutions through cutting-edge science and technology.

The following are highlights of the fiscal year 2014 budget.

Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security

Guarding against terrorism was the founding mission of DHS and remains our top priority. To address evolving terrorist threats and ensure the safety of the traveling public, the budget safeguards the Nation's transportation systems through a layered detection system and continues to support risk-based security initiatives, including TSA Pre✔™, Global Entry, and other trusted traveler programs. The budget supports administration efforts to secure maritime cargo and the global supply chain by strengthening efforts to prescreen and evaluate high-risk cargo. Investments in DHS's intelligence and targeting programs coupled with the expansion of the National Targeting Center, supported by the budget, will increase operational efficiencies and enhance our ability to interdict threats and dangerous people before they reach the United States.

Funding is included for cutting-edge R&D to address evolving biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. Among the important research investments is the construction of NBAF, a state-of-the-art bio-containment facility for the study of foreign animal and emerging zoonotic diseases that will replace the inadequate facility at Plum Island. The budget funds the Securing the Cities (STC) program to protect our highest-risk cities from radiological or nuclear attack and continues National biopreparedness and response efforts. The budget also continues strong support for State and local partners through the NPGP, training, fusion centers, and intelligence analysis and information sharing on a wide range of critical homeland security issues.

- *Strengthening Risk-Based Aviation Security*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget supports DHS's effort to employ risk-based, intelligence-driven operations to prevent terrorist attacks and to reduce the vulnerability of the Nation's aviation system to terrorism. These security measures create a multi-layered system to strengthen aviation security from the time a passenger purchases a ticket to arrival at his or her destination. The fiscal year 2014 budget:
  - Continues expansion of trusted traveler programs, such as TSA Pre✔™ and Global Entry, which are pre-screening initiatives for travelers who volunteer information about themselves before flying in order to potentially expedite screening at domestic checkpoints and through customs. By 2014, TSA anticipates that one in four members of the traveling public will be eligible for expedited domestic screening.
  - Continues enhanced behavior detection in which interview and behavioral analysis techniques are used to determine if a traveler should be referred for additional screening at the checkpoint. Analyses from pilots in fiscal year 2013 will inform the next steps on how larger-scale implementation in fiscal year 2014 could improve capabilities in a risk-based security environment.
  - Expands Secure Flight to perform watch list matching for passengers before boarding large general aviation aircraft. An estimated 11 million additional Secure Flight Passenger Data sets are expected to be submitted by general aviation operators per year.
  - Supports, as part of its multi-layered security strategy, the Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew program as a fully reimbursable program under FLETC's existing authorities.
  - Prioritizes TSA's mission-critical screening functions, and proposes the transfer of all exit lane staffing to local airports pursuant to Federal regulatory authorities. Airports will be responsible for integrating exit lane security into their perimeter security plans, which are assessed regularly by TSA.
- *Enhancing International Collaboration*.—To most effectively carry out our core missions, DHS continues to engage countries around the world to protect both National and economic security. The fiscal year 2014 budget supports DHS's strategic partnerships with international allies and enhanced targeting and information-sharing efforts to interdict threats and dangerous people and cargo at the earliest point possible. The Secretary's focus on international partnerships includes elevating the Office of International Affairs to a stand-alone office and a direct report. The fiscal year 2014 budget:
  - Supports the Immigration Advisory Program and the continued growth of the Pre-Departure Vetting, which have experienced a 156 percent increase in the number of no-board recommendations since 2010. Through these programs, CBP identifies high-risk travelers who are likely to be inadmissible into the United States and makes recommendations to commercial carriers to deny boarding.
  - Continues to modernize the IT capability for screening visa applications to support the expansion of Visa Security Program (VSP) coverage at existing overseas high-risk visa adjudication posts. The VSP represents ICE's front line in protecting the United States against terrorists and criminal organizations by preventing foreign nationals who pose as a threat to National security from entering the United States. In fiscal year 2014, VSP will enhance visa vetting by increasing automated data exchange with the Department of State and CBP's National Targeting Center. ICE will leverage modernization to increase investigations of visa applicants who pose a potential high risk for terrorism and are attempting to travel to the United States.
  - Supports the bilateral Beyond the Border Action Plan with Canada, including CBP's pre-inspection efforts in rail, land, and marine environments. Pre-inspection is a precursor to preclearance, which supports DHS's extended border strategy through the identification and prevention of terrorists, criminals, and other National security threats before they enter the United States. Pre-inspection/preclearance also helps protect U.S. agriculture from the spread of foreign pests, disease, and global outbreaks.
- *Supporting Surface Transportation Security*.—The surface transportation sector, due to its open access architecture, has a fundamentally different operational environment than aviation. Accordingly, DHS helps secure surface transportation infrastructure through risk-based security assessments, critical infrastructure hardening, and close partnerships with SLLE partners. The fiscal year 2014 budget supports DHS's efforts to bolster these efforts. Specifically, the budget:
  - Includes the NPGP, described in more detail on the following pages. This proposal focuses on building National capabilities focused on preventing and re-

sponding to threats across the country, including the surface transportation sector, through Urban Search and Rescue teams, canine explosives detection teams, and HAZMAT response as well as target hardening of critical transit infrastructure.
  - Funds surface transportation security inspectors and canine teams who work collaboratively with public and private-sector partners to strengthen security and mitigate the risk to our Nation's transportation systems.
  - Supports compliance inspections throughout the freight rail and mass transit domains, critical facility security reviews for pipeline facilities, comprehensive mass transit assessments that focus on high-risk transit agencies, and corporate security reviews conducted in multiple modes of transportation to assess security.
  - Funds 37 Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response (VIPR) teams, including 22 multi-modal Teams. VIPR teams are composed of personnel with expertise in inspection, behavior detection, security screening, and law enforcement for random, unpredictable deployments throughout the transportation sector to prevent potential terrorist and criminal acts.
  - Helps secure critical infrastructure and key resources located on or near the water through patrols, enforcing security zones and security escorts of certain vessels (e.g., vessels containing hazardous cargo) in key U.S. ports and waterways.
- *Strengthening Global Supply Chain Security*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget continues to support the administration's Global Supply Chain Security Strategy, which provides a National vision for global supply chain security that is secure, efficient, and resilient across air, land, and sea modes of transportation. The budget:
  - Supports increased targeting capability through enhanced automated systems providing CBP with real-time information to focus its enforcement activities on higher-risk passengers and cargo.
  - Supports the consolidation of CBP's separate cargo and passenger targeting locations, which will promote increased targeting efficiencies and reduced delays of travelers and cargo.
  - Strengthens the Container Security Initiative, enabling CBP to prescreen and evaluate high-risk containers before they are shipped to the United States.
  - Continues support to improve the coordination of international cargo security efforts, accelerate security efforts in response to vulnerabilities, ensure compliance with screening requirements, and strengthen aviation security operations overseas.
  - Supports on-going assessments of anti-terrorism measures in the ports of our maritime trading partners through the Coast Guard International Port Security Program.
  - Supports enhanced system efficiency through continued development and deployment of the International Trade Data System. This important resource provides a single automated window for submitting trade information to the Federal agencies responsible for facilitating international trade and securing America's supply chain.
- *Research, Development, and Innovation (RD&I) at S&T*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget includes $467 million for RD&I, a $200 million increase from fiscal year 2012 enacted levels. This funding includes support for unclassified cybersecurity research that supports the public and private sectors and the global internet infrastructure. It also allows S&T to resume R&D in areas such as land and maritime border security; chemical, biological, and explosive defense research; disaster resilience; cybersecurity; and counterterrorism.
- *Support to SLLE*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget continues support for SLLE efforts to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to pre-operational activity and other crimes that are precursors or indicators of terrorist activity through training, technical assistance, exercise support, security clearances, connectivity to Federal systems, technology, and grant funding. The budget supports efforts to share intelligence and information on a wide range of critical homeland security issues. The budget continues to build State and local analytic capabilities through the National Network of Fusion Centers, with a focus on strengthening cross-Department and cross-Government interaction with fusion centers. It also elevates the Office of State and Local Law Enforcement to a stand-alone office. The budget:
  - Enables DHS to continue to assess capability development and performance improvements of the National Network of Fusion Centers through an annual assessment, collection of outcomes-based performance data, and targeted exercises. Resources also enable the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, in part-

nership with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and the Privacy Office, to provide privacy and civil rights and civil liberties training and technical assistance support for fusion centers and their respective liaison officer programs. Additionally, unique partnerships with FEMA, NPPD, USCG, and ICE have facilitated additional analytic training for fusion center analysts on a variety of topics.

- Continues to support SLTT efforts to counter violent extremism, including the delivery of Building Communities of Trust initiative roundtables, which focus on developing trust between community leaders and law enforcement officials so they cooperatively address the challenges of crime and terrorism.
- Expands, in partnership with the Departments of Justice (DOJ), Education, and Health and Human Services, on-going efforts to prevent future mass casualty shootings, improve preparedness, and strengthen security and resilience in schools and other potential targets while working with partners at all levels of government.

- *Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threat Detection*.—Countering biological, nuclear, and radiological threats requires a coordinated, whole-of-Government approach. DHS, through the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) and the Office of Health Affairs, works in partnership with agencies across Federal, State, and local governments to prevent and deter attacks using radiological and nuclear (rad/nuc) weapons through nuclear detection and forensics programs and provides medical and scientific expertise to support bio-preparedness and response efforts.

The fiscal year 2014 budget supports the following efforts:

- *Global Nuclear Detection Architecture (GNDA)*.—DNDO, in coordination with other DHS components, the Attorney General, and the Departments of State, Defense, and Energy, leads the continued evolution of the GNDA. This comprehensive framework incorporates detector systems, telecommunication, and personnel, with the supporting information exchanges, programs, and protocols that serve to detect, analyze, and report on rad/nuc materials that are not in regulatory control.
- *STC*.—$22 million is requested for the STC program to continue developing the domestic portion of the GNDA to enhance the Nation's ability to detect and prevent a radiological or nuclear attack in our highest-risk cities.
- *Transformational R&D*.—Funding is requested to develop and demonstrate scientific and technological approaches that address gaps in the GNDA and improve the performance of rad/nuc detection and technical nuclear forensic capabilities. R&D investments are made on the basis of competitive awards, with investigators in all sectors—Government laboratories, academia, and private industry—encouraged to participate.
- *Rad/Nuc Detection*.—Supports the procurement and deployment of Radiation Portal Monitors and Human Portable Radiation Detection Systems, providing vital detection equipment to CBP, USCG, and TSA to scan for rad/nuc threats.
- *BioWatch*.—Continues operations and maintenance of the Federally-managed, locally-operated, Nation-wide bio-surveillance system designed to detect the release of aerosolized biological agents.
- *NBAF*.—The budget provides full funding for the construction of the main laboratory at NBAF when coupled with the increased cost share from the State of Kansas. This innovative Federal-State partnership will support the first Bio Level 4 lab facility of its kind, a state-of-the-art bio-containment facility for the study of foreign animal and emerging zoonotic diseases that is central to the protection of the Nation's food supply as well as our National and economic security.

  In partnership with the State of Kansas, DHS is committed to building a safe and secure facility in Manhattan, Kansas. The main laboratory facility includes enhanced safety and security features to ensure research conducted within the facility will be contained, ultimately protecting the surrounding region and the Nation's food supply. These features, which are incorporated into the current NBAF design and address safety recommendations of the National Academies of Sciences, include specialized air and water decontamination systems, new technologies to handle solid waste on site, and structural components to strengthen the laboratory against hazardous weather conditions.

  Funding is also provided for life and safety infrastructure repairs at Plum Island Animal Disease Center while NBAF is being built, to ensure an appropriate transition of research from Plum Island, New York, to Manhattan, Kansas.

Securing and Managing Our Borders

The budget continues the administration's robust border security efforts, while facilitating legitimate travel and trade. It sustains historic deployments of personnel along U.S. borders as well as the continued utilization of proven, effective surveillance technology along the highest-trafficked areas of the Southwest Border to continue achieving record levels of apprehensions and seizures. In support of the President's Executive Order on travel and tourism, the budget funds a record number of CBPOs through appropriated funds and proposed increases to user fee rates, to expedite travel and trade while reducing wait times at more than 300 POEs along the border and at airports and seaports across the country. Increased POE staffing of 1,600 CBPOs funded through appropriations and 1,877 CBPOs funded through user fee increases will have a direct impact on the economy. On the basis of a study conducted by the National Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events—University of Southern California, initial estimates indicate that for every 1,000 CBPOs added, the United States can anticipate a $2 billion increase in gross domestic product. That research indicates that these additional CBPOs may result in approximately 110,000 more jobs and a potential increase of $6.95 billion in gross domestic product.

To secure the Nation's maritime borders and 3.4 million nautical square miles of maritime territory, the budget invests in recapitalization of USCG assets and provides operational funding for new assets coming on-line, including National Security Cutters (NSCs), Fast Response Cutters (FRCs), Response Boats-Medium, Maritime Patrol Aircraft, and Command and Control systems.

- *Law Enforcement Officers*.—The budget supports 21,370 BPAs and a record 25,252 CBPOs at POEs who work with Federal, State, and local law enforcement to target illicit networks trafficking in people, drugs, illegal weapons, and money and to expedite legal travel and trade. This includes funds from proposed increases to inspection user fees.
- *Travel and Trade*.—In 2012, President Obama announced new administrative initiatives through Executive Order 13597 to increase travel and tourism throughout and to the United States, and DHS plays an important role in this work. As discussed in the highlights section, DHS is continuing to develop new ways to increase the efficiency of our port operations and to make international travel and trade easier, more cost-effective, and more secure.
- *Technology*.—Funding is requested to support the continued deployment of proven, effective surveillance technology along the highest-trafficked areas of the Southwest Border. Funds will be used to procure and deploy commercially-available technology tailored to the operational requirements of the Border Patrol, the distinct terrain, and the population density within Arizona.
- *Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS)*.—DHS will take over operations of TARS beginning in fiscal year 2014. TARS is a multi-mission capability that supports both the counterdrug and air defense missions, providing long-range detection and monitoring of low-level air, maritime, and surface narcotics traffickers.
- *Targeting and Analysis*.—The budget includes additional investments in CBP's targeting capabilities, which will enable CBP to develop and implement an enhanced strategy that more effectively and efficiently divides cargo and travelers according to the potential threat they pose.
- *POE Infrastructure*.—CBP, working with its various partners including GSA, continues to modernize and maintain border infrastructure that both facilitates trade and travel, and helps secure the border. In fiscal year 2014, CBP will work with GSA to complete the last phase of the Nogales-Mariposa inspection facility and initiate the site acquisition and design for the south-bound phase of the San Ysidro modernization project. Additionally, CBP will work with GSA to initiate construction of a new bus processing terminal at the Lincoln-Juarez Bridge and renovation of the passenger and pedestrian processing facility at the Convent Street inspection facility in Laredo, Texas. Beginning in late fiscal year 2013 and continuing in fiscal year 2014, CBP will assume responsibility for the building operations, maintenance, and repair of the land port inspection facilities from GSA to streamline administrative processes and improve the responsiveness to CBP mission requirements. Finally, CBP proposes legislative authority in the fiscal year 2014 budget to accept donations from the private sector.
- *CBP Air and Marine Procurement*.—Funding is requested for two KA–350CER Multi-Role Enforcement Aircraft (MEA), which provide direct support to CBP efforts to secure our Nation's borders. Unlike the older, less-capable aircraft they are replacing, MEA has the capabilities to detect, track, and intercept general aviation threats; detect and track maritime threats over a wide area; and sup-

port ground interdiction operations through a variety of sensors and advanced data and video down-link.

- *Collect Customs Revenue*.—Funds are requested to support CBP's role as a revenue collector for the U.S. Treasury; customs revenue remains the second-largest source of revenue for the Federal Government. CBP relies on bonds to collect duties owed when importers fail to pay and efforts to collect from the importer are not successful. This funding will support improvements to increase the efficacy of CBP's bonding process, including the delegation to a centralized office the responsibility for developing and implementing Single Transaction Bond (STB) policy, approving bond applications, reporting on activities, and monitoring results. These resources will fund the automation of STB processing and record-keeping and provide effective internal controls that protect the duties and taxes (more than $38 billion in 2012) collected by CBP. Specifically, CBP will automate and centralize into one location processing of all STBs, resulting in enhanced program oversight, consistent processing, and reduced write-offs and delinquencies.
- *Protect Trade and Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement*.—Funding is requested to support intellectual property and commercial trade fraud investigations within ICE's National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center (IPR Center). With 21 partners and the expertise of the Federal Government's largest law enforcement agencies, the IPR Center brings together the full range of legal authorities and law enforcement tools to combat intellectual property theft, including medical regulation; patent, trademark, and copyright protection; border enforcement; organized crime investigations; and undercover operations. ICE will also increase collaboration with CBP through a joint fraud enforcement strategy to coordinate commercial fraud enforcement operations. The fiscal year 2014 budget also supports CBP's enforcement programs to prevent trade in counterfeit and pirated goods, and to protect consumers and National security from harm from counterfeit goods through special enforcement operations to increase IPR seizures and referrals for criminal investigation. In addition, the fiscal year 2014 budget supports technology and training to increase the efficiency of targeting IPR infringing merchandise.
- *USCG Recapitalization*.—The fiscal year 2014 request fully funds a seventh NSC; supports patrol boat recapitalization through the FRC acquisition; continues acquisitions of the Offshore Patrol Cutter and a new polar ice breaker; and provides for critical upgrades to command, control, and aviation sustainment. The total request for USCG Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements is $951 million.
- *USCG Operations*.—The fiscal year 2014 request funds nearly 50,000 full-time personnel and nearly 7,000 reservists to maintain safety, security, and stewardship of our Nation's waters and maritime borders. Funds will support a full range of Coast Guard cutters, aircraft, and boats to address threats from inside the ports, within customs waters and out on the high seas.

Enforcing and Administering our Immigration Laws

In the area of immigration, the budget supports the administration's unprecedented efforts to more effectively focus the enforcement system on public safety threats, border security, and the integrity of the immigration system while streamlining and facilitating the legal immigration process. Initiatives such as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals and greater use of prosecutorial discretion, where appropriate, support DHS efforts to focus finite resources on individuals who pose a danger to National security or a risk to public safety, and other high-priority cases. At the same time, the budget significantly reduces inefficient 287(g) task force agreements, while supporting more cost-efficient initiatives like the Secure Communities program. Nation-wide implementation of Secure Communities and other enforcement initiatives, coupled with continued collaboration with DOJ to focus resources on the detained docket, is expected to result in the continued increase in the identification and removal of criminal aliens and other priority individuals.

The budget provides the resources needed to address this changing population, while continuing to support Alternatives to Detention, detention reform, and immigrant integration efforts. Resources are also focused on monitoring and compliance, promoting adherence to worksite-related laws, Form I–9 inspections, and enhancements to the E-Verify program.

- *Secure Communities*.—In fiscal year 2013, the Department completed Nationwide deployment of the Secure Communities program, which uses biometric information and services to identify and remove criminal and other priority aliens found in State prisons and local jails. Secure Communities is an important tool in ICE's efforts to focus its immigration enforcement resources on the highest-

priority individuals who pose a threat to public safety or National security, and the budget continues support of this program. ICE is committed to ensuring the Secure Communities program respects civil rights and civil liberties, and works closely with law enforcement agencies and stakeholders across the country to ensure the program operates in the most effective manner possible. To this end, ICE has issued guidance regarding the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in appropriate cases, including in cases involving witnesses and victims of crime; implemented enhanced training for SLLE regarding civil rights issues; and released new guidance that limits the use of detainers to the agency's enforcement priorities and restricts the use of detainers against individuals arrested for minor misdemeanor offenses such as traffic offenses and other petty crimes, among other recent improvements. The budget also includes $10 million for 73 ICE attorney positions that will continue prosecutorial discretion reviews of new cases to ensure that resources at the Executive Office for Immigration Review and ICE are focused on priority cases.

- *Immigration Detention*.—Under this administration, ICE has focused its immigration enforcement efforts on identifying and removing priority aliens, including criminals, repeat immigration law violators, and recent border entrants. As ICE focuses on criminal and other priority cases, the agency continues to work to reduce the time removable aliens spend in detention custody, going from 37 days in fiscal year 2010 to fewer than 32 days in fiscal year 2012. Consistent with its stated enforcement priorities and guidance to the field, ICE will continue to focus detention and removal resources on those individuals who have criminal convictions or fall under other priority categories. For low-risk individuals, ICE will work to enhance the effectiveness of Alternatives to Detention, which provides a lower per-day cost than detention. To ensure the most cost-effective use of Federal resources, the budget includes flexibility to transfer funding between immigration detention and the Alternatives to Detention program, commensurate with the level of risk a detainee presents.
- *287(g) Program*.—The budget reflects the cancelation of inefficient task force officer model agreements, reducing the cost of the 287(g) program by $44 million. The 287(g) jail model agreements, as well as programs such as Secure Communities, have proven to be more efficient and effective in identifying and removing criminal and other priority aliens than the task force officer model agreements.
- *Detention Reform*.—ICE will continue building on on-going detention reform efforts in fiscal year 2014. In fiscal year 2013, ICE implemented its new Risk Classification Assessment Nation-wide to improve transparency and uniformity in detention custody and classification decisions and to promote identification of vulnerable populations. ICE will continue to work with DOJ to reduce the average length of stay in detention by working to secure orders of removal before the release of criminal aliens from DOJ custody. In addition, ICE will continue implementation of the new transfer directive, which is designed to minimize long-distance transfers of detainees within ICE's detention system, especially for those detainees with family members in the area, local attorneys, or pending immigration proceedings. ICE will also continue implementation of revised National detention standards designed to maximize access to counsel, visitation, and quality medical and mental health care in additional facilities. Finally, DHS anticipates that the rulemaking applying the Prison Rape Elimination Act to DHS confinement facilities will be finalized in fiscal year 2013 and implemented in fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2014.
- *Worksite Enforcement*.—Requested funds will continue the Department's focus to promote compliance with worksite-related laws through criminal prosecutions of egregious employers, Form I–9 inspections, civil fines, and debarment, as well as education and compliance tools.
- *E-Verify*.—The budget provides $114 million to support the continued expansion and enhancement of E-Verify, the administration's electronic employment eligibility verification system. This funding will also continue support for the expansion of the E-Verify Self-Check program, a voluntary, free, fast, and secure online service that allows individuals in the United States to confirm the accuracy of Government records related to their employment eligibility status before formally seeking employment. These enhancements will give individuals unprecedented control over how their social security numbers are used in E-Verify and will further strengthen DHS's ability to identify and prevent identity fraud. In fiscal year 2014, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) also plans to phase in an enhanced enrollment process for E-Verify that reduces the enrollment burden on the employer and the Federal Government, and that will provide more-detailed user information for compliance assistance activities. Addi-

tionally, USCIS will finalize the requirements for the electronic I–9 and its supporting processes for E-Verify. These enhancements will deploy in phases in fiscal year 2014 and subsequent years.

- *Verification Information System (VIS)*.—The budget includes $12 million to fund the VIS Modernization initiative, a major redesign of the system that supports E-Verify that will transform the current E-Verify system, and improve usability and overall ease of operations.
- *Immigrant Integration*.—The budget includes $10 million to continue support for USCIS immigrant integration efforts—a key element of the President's immigration principles—through funding of citizenship and integration program activities including competitive grants to local immigrant-serving organizations to strengthen citizenship preparation programs for permanent residents.
- *Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget continues support for USCIS SAVE operations and enhancements to assist local, State, and Federal agencies in determining the immigration status of benefit applicants. This effort is funded through the Immigration Examinations Fee Account.
- *USCIS Business Transformation*.—The budget continues the multi-year effort to transform USCIS from a paper-based filing system to a customer-focused electronic filing system. This effort is funded through the Immigration Examinations Fee Account. In fiscal year 2013, USCIS will deploy additional functionality into the agency's Electronic Immigration System (ELIS) to allow processing of 1 million customer requests annually. USCIS is committed to adding functionality and benefit types until all workload is processed through ELIS.

Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace

The budget supports initiatives to secure our Nation's information and financial systems and to defend against cyber threats to private-sector and Federal systems, the Nation's critical nfrastructure, and the U.S. economy. It also supports the President's Executive Order on improving critical infrastructure cybersecurity and the Presidential Policy Directive on critical infrastructure security and resilience. Taken together, the administration's initiatives strengthen the security and resilience of critical infrastructure against evolving threats through an updated and overarching National framework that acknowledges the linkage between cybersecurity and securing physical assets.

Included in the fiscal year 2014 budget are enhancements to the National Cybersecurity Protection System (NCPS) to prevent and detect intrusions on Government computer systems, and to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to protect against and respond to cybersecurity threats. The budget also leverages a new operational partnership between ICE and USSS through the established network of USSS ECTFs to safeguard the Nation's financial payment systems, combat cybercrimes, target transnational child exploitation including large-scale producers and distributors of child pornography, and prevent attacks against U.S. critical infrastructure.

- *Federal Network Security*.—$200 million is included for Federal Network Security, which manages activities designed to enable Federal agencies to secure their IT networks. The budget provides funding to further reduce risk in the Federal cyber domain by enabling continuous monitoring and diagnostics of networks in support of mitigation activities designed to strengthen the operational security posture of Federal civilian networks. DHS will directly support Federal civilian departments and agencies in developing capabilities to improve their cybersecurity posture and to better thwart advanced, persistent cyber threats that are emerging in a dynamic threat environment.
- *NCPS*.—$406 million is included for Network Security Deployment, which manages NCPS, operationally known as EINSTEIN. NCPS is an integrated intrusion detection, analytics, information sharing, and intrusion-prevention system that supports DHS responsibilities to defend Federal civilian networks.
- *US-Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US–CERT)*.—$102 million is included for operations of US–CERT, which leads and coordinates efforts to improve the Nation's cybersecurity posture, promotes cyber information sharing, and manages cyber risks to the Nation. US–CERT encompasses the activities that provide immediate customer support and incident response, including 24-hour support in the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center. As more Federal network traffic is covered by NCPS, additional US–CERT analysts are required to ensure cyber threats are detected and the Federal response is effective.
- *SLTT Engagement*.—In fiscal year 2014, DHS will expand its support to the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS–ISAC) to assist in

providing coverage for all 50 States and 6 U.S. territories in its managed security services program. MS–ISAC is a central entity through which SLTT governments can strengthen their security posture through network defense services and receive early warnings of cyber threats. In addition, the MS–ISAC shares cybersecurity incident information, trends, and other analysis for security planning.

- *Cybersecurity R&D.*—The fiscal year 2014 budget includes $70 million for S&T's R&D focused on strengthening the Nation's cybersecurity capabilities.
- *Cyber Investigations.*—The fiscal year 2014 budget continues to support ICE and USSS efforts to provide computer forensics support and training for investigations into domestic and international criminal activities, including computer fraud, network intrusions, financial crimes, access device fraud, bank fraud, identity crimes and telecommunications fraud, benefits fraud, arms and strategic technology, money laundering, counterfeit pharmaceuticals, child pornography, and human trafficking occurring on or through the internet. USSS ECTFs will also continue to focus on the prevention of cyber attacks against U.S. financial payment systems and critical infrastructure.

Ensuring Resilience to Disasters

The Department's efforts to build a ready and resilient Nation focuses on a whole-community approach to emergency management by engaging partners at all levels to build, sustain, and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all hazards. In the event of a terrorist attack, natural disaster, or other large-scale emergency, DHS provides the coordinated, comprehensive Federal response while working with Federal, State, local, and private-sector partners to ensure a swift and effective recovery effort.

To support the objectives of the National Preparedness Goal (NPG) and to leverage limited grant funding in the current fiscal environment, the administration is again proposing the NPGP to create a robust National response capacity based on cross-jurisdictional and readily deployable State and local assets, with appropriate adjustments to respond to stakeholder feedback received in 2012. While providing a structure that will give grantees more certainty about how funding will flow, the proposal continues to utilize a comprehensive process for assessing regional and National gaps, identifying and prioritizing deployable capabilities, and requiring grantees to regularly report progress in the acquisition and development of these capabilities.

The budget also funds initiatives associated with the NPG; FEMA's continued development of catastrophic plans, which include regional plans for response to earthquakes and hurricanes and medical countermeasure dispensing; and training for 2 million emergency managers and first responders.

State and Local Grants: The budget includes $2.1 billion for State and local grants, consistent with the amount appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 2012. This funding will sustain resources for fire and emergency management programs while consolidating all other grants into the new, streamlined NPGP. In fiscal year 2014, the NPGP will:

- Focus on the development and sustainment of core National emergency management and homeland security capabilities.
- Utilize gap analyses to determine asset and resource deficiencies and inform the development of new capabilities through a competitive process.
- Build a robust National response capacity based on cross-jurisdictional and readily deployable State and local assets.

Using a competitive, risk-based model, the NPGP will use a comprehensive process for identifying and prioritizing deployable capabilities, limit periods of performance to put funding to work quickly, and require grantees to regularly report progress in the acquisition and development of these capabilities.

- *Firefighter Assistance Grants.*—The budget provides $670 million for Firefighter Assistance Grants. Included in the amount is $335 million for Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grants to retain and hire firefighters and first responders, and $335 million for Assistance to Firefighter Grants, of which $20 million is provided for Fire Prevention and Safety Grants. The administration re-proposes $1 billion for SAFER grants as part of the First Responder Stabilization Fund, which was originally proposed in the American Jobs Act.
- *Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPGs).*—Also included in the budget is $350 million to support emergency managers and emergency management offices in every State across the country. EMPG supports State and local governments in developing and sustaining the core capabilities identified in the

NPG and achieving measurable results in key functional areas of emergency management.

- *DRF*.—A total of $6.2 billion is provided for the DRF. Of this, $586 million is included in the Department's base budget with the remainder provided through the Budget Control Act budget cap adjustment. The DRF provides a significant portion of the total Federal response to victims in Presidentially-declared disasters or emergencies. Because of recently-passed legislation, Native American tribes can now request Presidential major or emergency declarations. Two tribes, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and the Navajo Nation, have already received declarations in 2013.
- *National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)*.—The NFIP is fully funded by policy fees. This program helps to reduce the risk of flood damage to existing buildings and infrastructure by providing flood-related grants to States, communities, and Tribal nations. The fiscal year 2014 budget reflects implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. The Act improves fiscal soundness by phasing out subsidies for structures built before their flood risk was identified on a Flood Insurance Rate Map. In addition, the Act establishes a reserve fund to be used for the payment of claims and claims-handling expenses as well as principal and interest payments on any outstanding Treasury loans. The budget includes a $3.5 billion mandatory budget authority, of which $100 million will be used for three interrelated mitigation grant programs to increase America's resiliency to floods.
- *Training/Exercises*.—The budget includes $165 million for training and exercise activities to support Federal, State, and local officials and first responders. In fiscal year 2014, the Department expects to train more than 2 million first responders and, under the revised National Exercise Program, will conduct more than a dozen exercises across the country to help improve National preparedness. The budget also supports conducting a Spill of National Significance exercise, and continues development of equipment and techniques that can be used to detect, track, and recover oil in ice-filled waters.
- *Emergency Management Oversight*.—The budget includes $24 million in base resources for the Office of the Inspector General to continue its Emergency Management Oversight operations.
- *Incident Management*.—The budget enables the Coast Guard to achieve Full Operational Capability for the Incident Management Assist Team, providing an immediate, highly proficient, and deployable surge capacity to Incident Commanders Nation-wide for response to threats and other disasters.

Maturing and Strengthening the Department and the Homeland Security Enterprise

- *St. Elizabeths Campus*.—The budget includes $92.7 million to support construction at the St. Elizabeths Campus. Currently, the Department's facilities are scattered in more than 50 locations throughout the National Capital Region, affecting critical communication and coordination across DHS components. USCG will move to St. Elizabeths in fiscal year 2013. To support the incident management and command-and-control requirements of our mission, the Department will continue development of the DHS Consolidated Headquarters at St. Elizabeths Campus. The requested funding will support Phase 2 renovation of the Center Building Complex for the Secretary's Office and key headquarters functions for command, control, and management of the Department.
- *Data Center Consolidation*.—The fiscal year 2014 budget includes $54.2 million for data center consolidation funding, which will be used to migrate FEMA, USCIS, TSA, and CBP to the enterprise data centers. A recent study performed by the Department's Office of the Chief Financial Officer analyzed 10 of the first completed migrations to enterprise data centers and determined that an average savings of 14 percent, about $17.4 million in annual savings, had been achieved.

CONCLUSION

The fiscal year 2014 budget proposal reflects this administration's strong commitment to protecting the homeland and the American people through the effective and efficient use of DHS resources. As outlined in my testimony today, we will continue to preserve core front-line priorities across the Department by cutting costs, sharing resources across components, and streamlining operations wherever possible.

Thank you for inviting me to appear before you today. I look forward to answering your questions and to working with you on the Department's fiscal year 2014 budget request and other homeland security issues.

Chairman MCCAUL. Thank you, ma'am. Secretary, I now recognize myself for 5 minutes.

Let me first say, I want to thank you for your attention to the tragic events in West, Texas. I look forward to working with you on the response efforts there.

Before I ask a couple of budget questions, I do want to ask you about some reports that have come out, as of just really late last night, that the FBI has photos of two possible suspects in the Boston bombings. I thought—if you could tell us about this development, as to what you may know about these photographs.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, the—we have been collecting video from a variety of sources. As you might imagine, at the finish line at the Boston marathon, there is lots and lots of video. There is some video that has raised the question of those that the FBI would like to speak with. I wouldn't characterize them as "suspects" under the technical term, but we need the public's help in locating these individuals.

Chairman MCCAUL. There are also—there were also reports yesterday that the FBI actually had persons of interests or suspects in custody. My response, based upon the information I have from the Justice Department, is that that was not accurate information. Can you elaborate on that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, Mr. Chairman, you were accurate. There were no arrests made yesterday or persons held in custody. There has been a fair amount of media churn on various things involving the investigation. All I will say is, having spoken repeatedly with the FBI director, having spoken with the police commissioner in Boston, there is very good lash-up between local, State, and Federal resources up there.

The investigation is proceeding the pace, and it just—you know, this is not an "NCIS" episode. Sometimes you have to take time to properly, you know, put the chain together to identify the perpetrators. But everyone is committed to seeing that that gets done in the right way.

Chairman MCCAUL. No, I think, any—these united Federal prosecutors know it is a complex investigation. I think, the video footage and the forensics on the bomb device are probably some of the best evidence we can—we have right now.

Moving on to the budget, the—this pressure cooker IED has really gained a lot of attention. For the first time Americans, sort of, know what that is. We have known about it for quite some time. *Inspire* magazine, essentially, instructs you how to make a bomb—in fact, an article, "How to Make a Bomb in the Kitchen of Your Mom."

Can you tell me what the Department is doing in its budget and—to prevent this occurrence from happening in the future?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It is difficult, Mr. Chairman. Instructions on how to make simple IEDs or even more complex ones are commonly available through *Inspire,* through things like the "Anarchist's Cookbook," on the internet, generally.

So, we run into the issue of speech, writings, versus actual activities. One of the things we have been doing is, through the Office of Bombing Prevention, we have been, we actually now have a joint program office with DOD in terms of combining our efforts to im-

prove the capability to detect something before there is an explosion. Although that is very difficult.

We also through the Directorate on Science and Technology are doing some, I think, very interesting research that down the road may result in some positive developments. But right now as your question I think, presupposes, there is commonly available recipes for making various kinds of IEDs including those made with pressure cookers.

Chairman MCCAUL. Let me just, I have said from the beginning, we do not, we can't reach to conclusions. At this point in time we do not know whether this was a Federal, I mean a foreign terrorist plot or a domestic terrorist plot.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right now we cannot say one way or the other.

Chairman MCCAUL. You mentioned the Bomb Prevention fund and that is important because the Office of Bombing Prevention leads the Department's efforts to implement the National policy for countering IED devices responsible for the Tripwire IED Information Sharing Network for bombing squads, law enforcement, and the like.

My concern about the budget that in your budget you have decreased it by 8 percent and overall, over time it seems like every year it has gone down and had a decrease. In light of the Boston bombings, would you reconsider this budget request?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You know, we are obviously able to do that. I think two points, No. 1 is, if you look at the budget, one of the things we have done is convert much of the, some of the in-person training to on-line training. That saves a lot of cost. As I also mentioned we have begun participation in a joint program office with DOD, State, I think Justice, and that helps mitigate costs as well. Then some of the Bombing Prevention work, you will also find embodied in the research being done in the Science and Technology Directorate.

Chairman MCCAUL. My question is, it has decreased over the years, some say 45 percent, 8 percent in this budget. I mean in light of the bombings, wouldn't you reconsider that request?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We will take a look and make sure that it is properly resourced, yes sir.

Chairman MCCAUL. My understanding is you did request, did OMB deny your request for additional funding on this?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. There is a lot of exchange between the Department and OMB, but I will go back and look at this, yes sir.

Chairman MCCAUL. Okay. Last question, my time is limited. You know, look, when we talk about the border, that is really the last line of defense, defending the homeland is keeping the threat out of this country. I have been a big proponent of border security for a long time. The missing piece is the technology piece. We don't have the technology we need down there, as you know.

We are getting ready to unveil a lot of good technology. Yet I was disappointed to see that your budget does decrease funding for border technology. If you would answer that question and I will ask an additional one. Thank you.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You are right. Technology is the force multiplier for our manpower. The budget looks, we are on track to

implement our technology procurement. As you know, what I did last year, a year-and-a-half ago was stop the investment in having one integrated fixed tower plan across the entire border because it was too expensive and it wasn't working. It works in some areas like Arizona. We will finish it there.

But for the other sectors of the border, we want to use more off-the-shelf technology that fits the particular terrain.

Chairman MCCAUL. Let me just say, I agree, leveraging existing technologies is important, off-the-shelf.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is right.

Chairman MCCAUL. But I will say, if we are going to talk about Comprehensive Immigration Reform, we have to, No. 1, get operational control of the border and we are not going to be able to do that if we don't have the technology. So the decrease in your budget on this issue, I think is important.

The last point is I went over to Afghanistan with Henry Cuellar. We talked to General Allen about the technologies they have. Bringing that technology back to the Southwest Border. Now he is very much in agreement with it. There are 18 aerostats, excess, surplus, military property, they are willing to share with your Department to put down on the Southwest Border. Where are with this, this development?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well the budget does include $43 million for the TARS Program which is from DOD. I will tell you frankly Mr. Chairman, some of those aerostats are not in the best of shape. The O&M for them is pretty significant. They don't, it is not a perfect solution. But the point is an important one, which is to say, to the extent we have already invested in R&D on the Defense side that we can transfer over to the border, that is what I mean when I say, that is the kind of off-the-shelf thing that we are investing in.

Chairman MCCAUL. I hope you are looking towards a lot of military technologies that can be redeployed to the Southwest Border. We have already paid for them and we have already put the R&D into them. In these tough budgetary times, to me, it just makes a lot of sense. So with that, I will now recognize the Ranking Member for his questions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary in light of what we are dealing with in Boston and with respect to the resources that we are putting there, do you feel that this proposed budget will be adequate to address that situation and any on-going probability for the next fiscal year?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think the President's proposed budget meets the core mission responsibilities of the Department, yes sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. So you can do your job with the money?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you. There have been issues about morale in the Department, I made reference to in my opening statement. How do you plan to address the reports that have come out about that we are last in effective leadership, teamwork, training and development, and support for diversity?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We have done a number of things in that regard Representative Thompson, including forming an Executive Steering Committee just on morale. We have actually gone back

and re-questioned some of our employees, because the Morale Survey is pretty generic, so we want to get down below it.

So one of the things we found out for example is, in the Department, many people have been promoted to be a first-line supervisor, because they were good at their operational front-line job, but they hadn't necessarily received any training on how to be a supervisor. Well that makes a big difference. It is a different skill set, or an additional skill set. So now we are providing that kind of training.

We have instituted ways to get more employee input into the decisions of the Department. I will share with you frankly, budget uncertainly, pay uncertainly, furlough uncertainty, sequester, has been a difficult field in which to make people feel better about their jobs. But we are going to do all that we can. Our employees really are the engine of the Department.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, but you can still do your job?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Have to do the job.

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely. One of the challenges that we identified a number of years ago, spoke with interoperability. We require State and locals to be able to communicate with each other. The Inspector General said that we don't have interoperability within DHS. We spent several hundred million dollars trying to do that. What is your proposal to get interoperability in fact within DHS?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, not referencing that particular I.G. report, but we have enough interoperability to get the job done. Overall with respect, I have dealt with interoperability issues for years. Throughout the country, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on interoperable systems.

The best thing that has happened, quite frankly, is when Congress set aside a public safety spectrum, a broadband spectrum. And established the First Net Board. And set aside a fund source for that. That Board has private and public-sector, Federal, State, and local representatives. They are coming up, in my judgment with what ultimately will be a comprehensive answer that will be more comprehensive and cheaper than anything that has ever been looked at before.

They are on a very tight time line so I would suggest that we keep you informed on the progress of the First Net Board. But I must say it is one of the most encouraging things I have seen in Government in a long time.

Mr. THOMPSON. So are you at issue with the Inspector General's——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I don't know which report you are referring to?

Mr. THOMPSON. The one that came out the——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. There are so many. I will be happy to follow up on that with you.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well it spoke to emergency communications. It is the last I.G. report, came out the fall of last year, that said we had spent $430 million on interoperability and within the Department, we still can't cross-communicate with each other. I mean I, if this First Net is your response to it, I just need to know some time table as to when we can expect, as Members of Congress, for that to happen.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We will be happy to brief you on that. But it is a very aggressive time table.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well if you would provide it to the committee in writing, I think that would be most helpful. With respect to what happened in West, Texas, can you tell us whether or not that fertilizer facility or chemical plant facility was regulated by CFAC?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We don't know yet. We don't know whether the quantities of material there fell within the TSCA rule or not, but we are drilling down on that.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't have a list of, I mean that should be kind of easy, I would think.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Sir we have been engaged over the past hours in making sure that the response is all that it can be in dealing with the immediate aftermath of the fire and explosion. I would be happy to——

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Secretary, I understand that. All I am saying is either it was presently under CFACS or it wasn't. That is just a matter of looking on the record. Now, if you can get—ask somebody here, look and see whether it is covered, or not. That is all I am asking. I am not asking for any details.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You should know that early this morning, I asked the very same question. I just don't have the answer for you yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is what I am looking for.

Thank you.

Chairman MCCAUL. The Chairman now recognizes the former chairman of the full committee, Mr. King from New York.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Secretary for your service and for the work that all the components of your Department are doing in Boston, and will be doing in Texas.

I have three questions. I will ask them up front, and then just let you answer them as you do.

They all basically come from Boston.

The question of jamming technology—I think the use of IEDs in Boston demonstrates that this could be the weapon of choice for terrorists, whether foreign or domestic in the future.

I know last year, we had two subcommittees—I believe Chairman McCaul's subcommittee was one of them—which held hearings into the use of jammers. That is to stop these IEDs, at least by remote control.

Now, whether these turn out to be remote control or not, if you could tell us to the extent you can in a public setting what progress we have made as far as jamming, and what cooperation there can be between the military and civilian. First question.

The second question is on "see something, say something." I agree with you. I think it serves a real purpose. That began in New York with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It did.

Mr. KING. The only real criticism I have heard—and it is really a question—is that different localities and States—some of them use complex e-mail addresses and phone numbers—is there any way that the Federal Government can urge them to use like a basic 9–1–1, or something which makes it easier so that in times of crisis, it can be used?

Then second—third, I think it is a general consensus that there was no Federal intelligence—at least as of now, there was no chatter. There was no intelligence out there indicating that something was going to happen. It would seem to me that as we are getting a much better hold on al-Qaeda from overseas, or terrorist groups foreign and domestic are getting more sophisticated, that really the Federal role in intelligence, as important as it is, we also need an important local role.

Do you believe there is enough funding in the budget, for instance, for something like the Boston Police Department, or other police departments, to start building up more local intelligence, as far as it involves terrorism? Because what we use prior—using chatter, using Federal intel may not be sufficient in the future.

With that, I look forward to your questions.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. On the jamming question, there is a—one of the key differences between military use of jamming equipment and using it in a domestic-civilian environment is, it is difficult to jam only bad stuff. So you end up interfering with signals more generally in a civilian environment.

So, there were two early pilots, I think, in—I want to say 2006 and 2007 in the Department to look at whether that anti-jamming technology used in theater could be used in a civilian way. They were not successful. But I don't know whether there is any current or new research being done in that regard.

On "see something, say something"——

Mr. KING. If you could get back to us—if there is any progress or chance for progress—because I can understand the problems you are talking about, but also, it would go a great way towards, you know, minimizing the issue—the problem.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Exactly, exactly. Again, as you say, we don't know whether or not a jam—this was remotely detonated.

With respect to see-say, we encourage State and locals who are part of the program, and religious organizations and others to tie into a simple line.

The majority use either 9–1–1 or whatever the tip line is for that particular department. But I think your point is well taken, because we want it to be as simple and memorable as we can. Excuse me, the third question was—oh, the intel.

Mr. KING. That was on the intel, yeah.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. The intel.

Mr. KING. More use of local intel.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. I think—that is an interesting question. In part, because we don't know whether this was domestic or international, particularly where domestic is concerned, I think there is a particularly valuable role for intelligence that is collected and analyzed at the local level.

So irrespective of Boston, this is something that we have been, and want to look at. We are using the fusion centers, and hope to build a capacity there in this regard. The Boston fusion center turns out to be one of the strongest ones in the country. We have been using them the last couple of days as a way to exchange information. But your point is well-taken.

Mr. KING. Also, my own parochial bias in that in view of the fact the NYPD has 1,000 cops going out seeking intelligence, despite

the fact they had—unfairly attacked by *The New York Times* and The Associated Press.

With that, I yield back.

[Laughter.]

Chairman MCCAUL. Nicely done.

The Chairman recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Sanchez.

Ms. SANCHEZ. What a way to use your last second.

Good morning, Madam Secretary.

I have several things to ask you about.

First of all, I want to thank you for having reconstructed SBInet and redone it. I just want to say that because I think it is going to be important for your Department to educate Congress on what really can be done with respect to technology, especially as we move forward on this border security piece of a possible immigration plan.

I think those of us who live that, fight, understand, but the rest of the Congress, in some ways, doesn't have a good idea of what can and cannot be done with technology.

I would hope that you would help us with that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Indeed.

Ms. SANCHEZ. And interoperability, I would like to see at the Federal level. I would like to see it all over the place.

As you know, Orange County is one of the few—probably the largest regional area that has interoperability between 34 cities—State, Federal, regional, et cetera—and it cost us quite a bit of money: $800 million about 15 years ago. So the price tag is very heavy on that, and I know that that has been one of the problems with respect to trying to get that underway. But we need to get it, I think, especially if we are going to be asking States to do it for the Federal Government.

So, I have a question about Coast Guard, because I am one of the few Members, I think, that sits both on the Armed Services Committee and on the—on this committee.

So, when you testified in front of the House Appropriations Committee, you say that the Coast Guard now has a different production path for vessel acquisition in order to meet the mission needs. On Tuesday, Coast Guard Commandant Papp testified that this budget request reduces Coast Guard's drug interdiction because it cannot maintain operations while rebuilding its fleet.

So, my question to you is: What is the different production path you referenced in your previous testimony? Is this a different plan—has this different plan been submitted to the Congress? Is Coast Guard going to reduce mission capabilities in order to modernize its fleet? If so, can you provide the committee on documentation of that? Because this seems to me a different path, and it is sort of like, "Well, we are going to not do as much because we need to rebuild over here."

Secretary NAPOLITANO. The point I was making in Approps was—in the Appropriations Committee was that we use a different production path to the fast response cutter.

We fully fund the commandant's top priority, which is the completion of the National security cutter fleet. The National security cutters have a lot of uses, but they can also—they don't require as

many billets to operate as some of the smaller vessels because they have more technology on them.

With respect to drug interdiction operations, I will tell you, we are already effective. We have had to reduce—and I was very public about this—those operations because of sequester, to meet the number that we were given.

As you know, sequester was account-by-account, so we didn't have any flexibility to move around that.

How do we compensate for that? We are working with DOD in areas like JATO–South. We are trying to leverage more with State and local entities. But make no mistake, if sequester continues, by definition, there will be effect on drug interdiction capability of the Coast Guard.

Ms. SANCHEZ. So, Madam Secretary, if you could—if your Department could provide us a plan of this vessel that—new vessel plan, if it is different than what we have seen before, I would appreciate it. Or maybe we just haven't seen it in the last year or 2.

The other question I had for you—first of all, US–VISIT, the exit part. I mean, that is another thing that we see on the tenant side coming forward. I know the last time that you were before us—maybe a year or 2 ago—and I have been asking all along—I know that you all didn't have a plan to implement it.

So I would just say, you know, it is coming up. It is going to be something that is going to require it if we do get an immigration plan. So I hope that you all will begin, if you haven't, to figure out how we are going to get that exit piece of US–VISIT in there.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, representative—one of the things we are re-requesting this year is to move US–VISIT to CBP, which is where we have all of our other databases and targeting capabilities. It is—it would be a much better place to central all of the—centralize all of those in one place, as opposed to keeping US–VISIT by itself over at MPPD. So I would ask you to look at that request.

Second, with respect to exit, we have submitted a plan on enhanced biographic and long-term biometric.

My understanding—and I am—we are still going through the bill that has been introduced in the Senate. My understanding is, the way the exit part of that is written is ultimately doable.

Ms. SANCHEZ. That would be great, because, again, that bill will change quite a bit, I think, as we move back and forth between the House and—you know, I have been one that has said, "We need to find those people who are not leaving when they are supposed to because they have overstayed their visa," and that is a major problem. That is 40 percent of the people who don't leave our country. That is something I am going to be looking for when I go to vote for an immigration bill.

Thank you.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. I am in total agreement with that. I think 40 percent of the illegals here are here by overstays on visas. So, with that, the Chairman now recognizes the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here and for your service to our country.

I was very pleased to hear you acknowledge with Ranking Member Thompson that we are spending an enormous amount of money on emergency communications, and still haven't achieved an acceptable degree of interoperability, and that we have to find a different approach.

As a former member of the Emergency Communications Subcommittee, that is just an enormous frustration to me, so I do hope that you do plow ahead in a different direction and try to make that happen. Because events like this week are reminders why we have got to achieve it.

Mr. ROGERS. But also, events like this week, I think, are a great reminder of why we have made such an important investment in preparing first responders. I had the privilege of having you visit the Center For Domestic Preparedness, as well as former Chairman King, who has been there, and seen that facility, which trains the first responders from all over the world, who have been there for the folks in Boston this week, and as well in Texas today. Also the hospital personnel. As you saw, that facility there to train for mass casualties. They are state-of-the-art, and that has been a wise investment by the Department, and I appreciate it.

Weeks like this are sad, but it is a good reminder to us why we make those investments. So, those are appreciated. One of the concerns I have got is that DHS is—and their science and technology department over the last several years has made a significant investment in advanced explosive detection K–9 research out in Texas at Lackland Air Force Base. That program was shuttered at the end of last year by Administrator Pistole. Very disappointed about that because, as you know—I know you are a big supporter of the explosive detection K–9 activities, and its ability to protect us in—not only in the airports, but in events like Boston if we had had them there, sweeping that area.

By closing the only breeding and genetic research facility, which was doing some cutting-edge work, we are now at the mercy of the private market. Can you tell me why that was closed? Given that it was closed, do you intend to at least contract with some folks to do that kind of research and breeding, so that we can produce our own assets here domestically, and not be subject to world markets for those core assets that we didn't train up?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, Congressman. As you know, you and I are both big fans of K–9s and their capabilities. Recognizing that they are not the only answer in these situations.

Mr. ROGERS. Right. Just one of the layers.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. My understanding is we do intend to follow up on that research in another way, but if I might give you some separate information about that, I think it would be more useful to you.

Mr. ROGERS. I would appreciate that. I think that research is pretty important. Because as I have seen in the last several years that I have been really focused on this, we have come a long way in what their capability is. But also talking about that—partnerships outside of the Department, one of my frustrations as Chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee was, I don't see enough interaction with the private sector and the Department.

Like Ms. Sanchez, I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee, and the Armed Services Committee, and we see a lot public-private partnerships between DOD and the private sector to achieve technological capabilities that we just couldn't do without them. There seems to be a reluctance in the Department to have that kind of interaction. Can you tell me what, if anything, you are doing on the procurement side, on the acquisition side to reach out to the private sector? To bring them in as a partner, to help us achieve some capabilities that we don't know have?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Oh, I think we have very aggressive outreach. One difference between DHS and DOD is their research budget is infinitely larger than ours, and so as a result, their public-private partnerships are more numerous than ours. Plus there are more long-standing relationships because they have been in existence so long. But, I believe very firmly in partnerships outside the Department, in the R&D world, private sector, academia, Centers of Excellence, other places. So we will push as much as we have resources.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, you know while I was chairing that committee, and I know that Mr. Hudson who now chairs it, is following up. We have been bringing in private-sector folks to talk with Department folks about what we can do to improve communications. That has been difficult in the past. These folks have come to us as members regularly and say: We can't talk to anybody in the Department. Not just TSA, but in other segments of the full Department. So, anything you could do to try to drill down to your management folks that they need to try to create some real open access to the private sector to communicate with them, I think it would be beneficial to both parties. And thanks——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I will drill down on that. I am sorry to hear that.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. Thank you.

The Chairman now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Barber.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, it is great to see you here today. You know, oftentimes when you come to this committee, and when your staff come, we rain criticism on the Department. I would like to start in a different fashion, and talk about what I believe is the most challenging and unenviable one in the Cabinet, the one that you hold. Trying to integrate 22 different agencies who are not always rowing the boat in the same direction. Merging contact management, IT, financial accountability into a single process, moving quickly and effectively to respond to natural disasters, guarding our country against terrorist attacks, which has been very successful, until of course, the tragedy in Boston.

We still don't know the cause, but over the last 5 years, we have had a lot of prevention in that area. So, I want to just acknowledge the progress that has been made before I ask some questions about the challenges that are remaining for the Department. Of course, highest on the list, at least for many of us, is the impact of sequestration on the Department. As you know from previous conversations, sequestration and its initial look is going to hit very hard on

Border Patrol Agents, and the men and women who are at the ports of entry.

Initially it was suggested, or proposed, that 40 percent of the Border Patrol Agent's salaries would be cut, due to the loss of overtime, and furloughs. I appreciate the Department's willingness to delay that. As you know, under the CR, we gave additional money back to the Department, some flexibility. I know in conversations with you, that you are currently working on some reprogramming requests. I guess I would just like to know, what progress is being made? Additionally, how your communicating with the men and women who are affected, or likely to be affected, and their families?

There is a great deal of uncertainty. As you pointed out in your remarks, this is adding to the morale problems. So, if you could just speak to us about progress that is being made towards reducing. I know you can't eliminate these cuts, but reducing them significantly so that we can both secure the border, expedite the flow of legal commercial traffic, and give some certainty back to the lives of these people who we ask every day to protect our homeland?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Indeed. Congressman as you also know, the pay systems for Customs are different than the pay systems for Border Patrol, and they have never been unified. That makes a difference where sequestration is concerned, unfortunately. Here is what we are doing: We have already gone through the sequestration legislation. The budget that was finally appropriated with the add-on for CBP, we have identified some reprogramming requests that we would like to add to that.

We hope to get those complete and into OMB by the end of the week, and move that process along as quickly as we can. Our goal is to absolutely minimize the effect on AUO premium pay for Border Patrol, and furlough days generally throughout CBP. We have been communicating regularly by e-mail and other messages about what our goal is, asking—and it is a difficult ask, asking for patience to try to figure out ultimately how much we can pay our men and women. But our—like I said, our goal is to minimize the disruption in their compensation.

Mr. BARBER. What might we, and they expect to be the earliest possible time when some certainty would be given to the situation?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Boy, I wish I could give you a definite date. I do not know, except that—I was just at the border. I mean I was just in south Texas, and I was down in, as you know, the Douglas area, and I know the effect this uncertainty is having on our men and women. So we are moving as quickly as we can.

Mr. BARBER. Well in the remaining time, I just want to move quickly to the—an issue we have often discussed here, and you and I have discussed as well, and that is how it is that we measure border security? It is a key element in moving immigration reform forward. At a hearing Chairman Miller, some of us said DHS needs to get in the game of giving us solid metrics that we can really have a common understanding of what border security improvements mean. The GAO study, as you know, was critical of the lack of metrics in the latest roll-out plan. Can you tell us what progress is being made towards getting those metrics?

Second, how you are going to gather information from agents, from ranchers, business people, others who are living and working daily on the border, who know so much about what the border is really like?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, on the metrics question is frustrating for everybody. Because in our view, we have provided metrics up the wazoo.

[Laughter.]

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I don't know how to spell that. But—and the GAO study uses our metrics. They just calculate—then they use them in a different way than we use them. The goal, however, is to see: Well, is this a safer and more secure border than it was last year, the year before and so forth? What is the trend? If you look at things like apprehensions, and crime rates, and contraband seizures, and gun seizures, and things like property values in communities along the border, the trend line is all positive. We know we are making significant progress and have made significant progress along the border.

We know we are not done. We know there is more work to do. We want to sustain and build on that. So, we will work with the Congress and what have you. But as I mentioned yesterday in a hearing, there is no one magic number. You really have to look at the whole picture, and then inform it with real-life experience. So, it does require, you know getting down to the border, talking not only with agents, but with police chiefs and sheriffs and mayors of the little towns that line our border, and so forth. That is what we attempt to do as well.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. Yes. I mean—let me thank Mr. Barber, the gentleman from Arizona, for his support on the Border Security Results Act, co-sponsoring that bill. That will be the bill coming out of this committee. I think it is important that we have metrics. There are some who assert it is never been more secure, I know as you have Madam Secretary. But I would argue that in my home State, that the numbers are increasing in terms of apprehensions. Particularly the Brownsville sector, 50 percent.

So, with that, the Chairman now recognizes the Vice Chair of the full committee, Ms. Candice Miller.

Mrs. MILLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary, thank you so very much for your attendance here today. I have been listening carefully and I think I will—as the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I will pick up right where Mr. Barber left off, and Chairman McCaul added some comments as well. I am very appreciative of your trying to quantify, or give us your best estimate of what border security actually looks like, in regards to metrics. I will say this, I think there is always a moment in time in politics where something can happen, and that moment in time is probably now for comprehensive immigration reform.

I think we have a small window of time, and if something doesn't happen, that window is going to close. I do think that, absent some sort of accountability or a metric system that we can quantify in some way that the American people, through their Congress, has a high degree of confidence that we are moving toward an adequate

amount of border under operational control or whatever term we want to utilize it—absent that, I think the immigration reform will be a heavy lift.

I mentioned to your staff, Mr. Borkowski, when he testified before our subcommittee that it would be too bad if the Department of Homeland Security became the stumbling block for comprehensive immigration reform because we are not satisfied with what we are getting. There is no one else to ask. I know it is a difficult thing. I know that securing the border with a layered approach as we have been doing, as there has been progress made.

Still as was mentioned to us, by you, a couple of years ago, the term operational control was antiquated, you said it was an antiquated term. I have an open mind to that. But then what? Then we were told that the BCI, the Border Control Index would be the term that would be used, and the matrix that we utilized and we were anticipating actually several weeks ago in this hearing room, that we would be hearing what the construct of that actually was, where we were with it, et cetera. Looking at GAO with the various components of whether it is operational control or BCI index or whatever it is, under operational control, boots on the ground, strategic fencing, utilization of various kinds of technology as the Chairman had mentioned about UAVs, or land systems or you know, the next version of SBInet. All of these kinds of things.

Also recognizing that sometimes you can secure a portion of the border and then 6 months later you have a different situation. Believe me, I think all of us do understand that. It is not a static kind of a thing. It is a dynamic situation that you are always dealing with there. But you mentioned yesterday some comments you made at a hearing. I was looking at some of that as well, and have a press release you put out which you said, every metric that we use to measure border security shows significant progress.

Yet really the only, it feels like the only thing we are hearing is about apprehensions. That is a component in my mind, that is the component it can't be, it is something that we need to know, what is happening with regard to apprehension, but then we are not really measuring how many did we not apprehend? Other kinds of things that have happened there. So I guess I would like to have you flesh that out a little bit more about the matrix because I appreciate your position and what you are saying. But in my observation and opinion, if we don't get something pretty darn, much more specific than what we have had so far from your Department, I do believe that your Department can be the stumbling block to comprehensive immigration reform. We don't want that to happen, I am sure.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well we certainly don't want that because, as you know, I have been advocating for CIR since my first day here in Washington, DC. Two things: No. 1 is on the apprehensions, you know, the missing piece has been a better ability to identify the denominator. I mean we know how many we apprehend. Really being able to track the attempts has been difficult.

Looking at the Senate-proposed CIR and how that is drafted, if the technology piece is supplied to us, as that bill provides, with the funding mechanism for that, so that we can sustain the efforts we already have and build on them. One of the problems with bor-

der security has always been, we secure an area and then we leave it. Then the border changes. But I think that the way that is written and how it is informed by technology is a do-able deal.

Mrs. MILLER. I do, and I appreciate that. Because as you mentioned, along with funding, I think, I feel your Department needs to tell us, as the Congress, what it is you actually need in regards to resourcing. It is for us to determine whether or not we have the political will, as a Congress, to insure that that happens. You know that is part of one of our enumerated responsibilities under the Constitution. Border security again, is such an important thing, in every way.

So we want to work with your Department to make sure, again, that we have some sort of system, metrics, accountability, whatever term you want to utilize. Our bill that we have dropped though does use the term operational control. We have fallen to that as a default position since we have had nothing from DHS. I know my time is I guess it is expired. So I will leave it at that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. I thank the gentle lady for all your hard work as Chairwoman of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee and I absolutely agree. You need to tell us. These are tough budgetary times but we can authorize. It is important we get this done right. So with that I now recognize the gentleman, Mr. Payne, from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Secretary Napolitano thank you for your service to this Nation over the past 5 years. I know it has been a difficult journey but we appreciate everything you do every single day. It has really been good to see you in the last 2 weeks three times. So you are keeping us abreast of what is going on.

You know, I have a question in reference to regarding the proposal to consolidate the 16 grants under a single National Preparedness Grant Program. My district includes Newark, New Jersey, Jersey City, and Bayonne, and we sit across from New York City. It includes an airport, a seaport, rail lines, bus lines, and chemical plants all in between. So my district relies heavily on many of these individual grants including UASI and the Port & Transit Security Grants. How do you think the consolidation of those grants will impact a district such as mine?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Our goal is to move from you know so many of these grant programs we either inherited or were part of the 9/11 Act. As we can see from response capabilities that happen after Sandy, now after Boston and so forth, we have built a fair amount of capacity and resilience around the country.

We want to move to a risk-based approach for further funding of grants. We want to consolidate in an effort so that we can unify grant guidance and reduce administrative overhead. We want to make sure that areas that have lots of critical infrastructure and critical ports and the like, that we can really fund those according to risk as opposed to having to use formula grants through many of our programs.

So it really will depend, but our whole goal is, now let's identify risk and gaps and where the monies best should go.

Mr. PAYNE. Well you know in the past, funding for State and local grant programs have been cut considerably. In addition to the funding cuts, you know, for port security grants. So I am very concerned about this consolidation effort. Let me——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might Congressman, Congress has cut the grants over the President's objection. One of the things the Congress did do when it passed the budget for the Department was restore some grant funding.

Mr. PAYNE. Okay. You know, New Jersey, let's get back into interoperability. New Jersey is currently without a State-wide interoperability coordinator. I understand that the same thing is happening to other States as this grant winds down. I believe it ends in September. You know that is of great concern, moving towards First Net, which I understand is still in the planning process and getting up to speed.

So as these coordinators, the SWIX, are leaving, the one in New Jersey left this past month and I believe several other States are experiencing the same thing. How do we move towards getting First Net up when we are losing the coordinators that would be an integral part of that system?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well part of that is what the State wants to support on its own. Not everything should be paid for by Federal grant money. But if I might, my experience as a Governor on this interoperability issue, was every bit as frustrating as I think as being expressed by Members of the committee.

We have not, we have spent way too much money for far too little coverage. I think part of the reason was we didn't have adequate private/public partnerships going on. It was more a vendor-buyer type situation as opposed to a true partnership. I think that is where we need to move. I think we will move there. I think the States by themselves can identify how they want to manage that. But we really have to change the whole way we look at building a National interoperability capacity.

Mr. PAYNE. As my time winds down, you know, I have several chemical facilities in my district that could experience the same thing that we have seen in West, Texas. So from what I understand, FEMA's monitoring the situation and prepared to assist State and local authorities as needed. Is DHS personnel on the scene in Texas?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. They are nearby. I don't know if they are physically on the scene. They will be if requested.

Mr. PAYNE. How are they prepared to assist?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We can do a number of things. But we have an Instant Management Assistance Team that is standing, that is on stand-by right now.

Mr. PAYNE. Okay thank you. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. I have to depart. I have an amendment on the floor to the CISPA bill, the intel cybersecurity bill, that provides a civilian interface to the private sector for threat information, that being the primary interface the Department of Homeland Security, which I think is the right way to go with cybersecurity, and also with the robust Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, that we have within your Department. I believe that is the best way to

protect the privacy of the American people. So I have to depart for that.

Let me also say, commend you for the increase in your budget for cybersecurity. We plus that up in our CR as well as you know, this is one of the biggest threats in the virtual world.

So with that segue, the Chairman of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, Mr. Meehan.

Mr. MEEHAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman for that tee up.

Thank you, Secretary, for your being here.

Let me start at the outset. I see in you as someone who is symbolic of the many people in Boston who are on the front lines today with their dedication and resilience. So, through you, I express our appreciation for the great work that you are doing.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Thank you.

Mr. MEEHAN. I have another issue, just briefly, as well. The Ranking Member raised an issue about the pre-clearance facilities in Abu Dhabi. I had been circulating, along with Representative DeFazio, a letter of concern. I thought we would get about 25 signatures on it. In a very short period of time, we are already over 70. I am going to be forwarding that to you probably in a day or so, because of many more.

I hope that at some future time we can discuss that issue. Because I am worried about the fact that what we are doing there is creating a real competitive imbalance for America-based airlines, in which foreign countries are able to, in effect, put into position a benefit for their foreign-based airlines.

But I am also very appreciative of the great work that you are doing on cyber. Your colleague, Mr. Mueller at the FBI, in testimony not so long ago, notwithstanding what we are seeing in Boston, had said that cyber may soon replace terrorism as the No. 1 issue and threat to the United States. I was struck by the Secretary of Defense, former, Mr. Panetta. One of the first things that he did after leaving that was to go to New York and talk about a cyber Pearl Harbor. I think, it is an issue, which is significantly greater than many Americans have an appreciation for. I know that you do. But many Americans out there do not appreciate the extent of the vulnerability.

Ninety percent of our cyber structure is in the private sector. When we have something that is an issue, there is also cross sectors. We are paying a lot of attention to what is going on to the banking sector, but as the banking folks said to me, if our grid, electrical grid goes down, we are affected in that way, as well. So there is a lot of cross-sectional issues.

We are also dealing with instantaneous communication.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Mm-hmm.

Mr. MEEHAN. So things are happening by the second. Those kinds of things make a difference. Can you explain to me how the investments that you are making are enabling homeland security to be on the forefront and then the cutting edge of helping us, as the Nation, to prepare to defend ourselves and to utilize the relationships with the private sector to encourage them to become partners with us in protecting our critical infrastructure?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, I will try to keep my answers short, because there is so many things that we are doing. But that inter-

section with the private sector where core critical infrastructure is concerned, absolutely key if we are serious about cybersecurity.

We are interested in real-time information sharing, because the more quickly information is shared, the better we are able to help with response and mitigation. We are asking for money to increase our CERT teams, to increase our industrial control system teams, to fund the NCAMP, which is a 24–7 watch center where we have private-sector partners on the floor with us.

Mr. MEEHAN. That is a place in which you are talking about, the—communication and the private sector can participate directly, as was—Mr. Rogers was asking questions about how we can encourage private-sector participation. This is a place where it actually takes place, is it not?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is correct, and I invite any Member who wishes to come out and see the floor and how it is arranged. But we know it will have to expand over time as our responsibilities increase, both pursuant to the Executive Order, the Presidential Policy Directive, and hopefully through the amendment that Chairman McCaul was speaking about.

Mr. MEEHAN. Isn't it accurate that we would be able to include numbers of the private sector, and when we talk about R&D and other kinds of things, while we would like to do more, but the fact of that matter is, a lot of private sectors, in many ways, at or above the best that the Government can do in the form of technologies and other kinds of things. So, inviting them in, doesn't that enhance our capacity overall?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, to the extent that is shared, obviously. But, you know, just the ability to discuss ideas and get the relevant people in the same place, there is a value to that. So we are encouraging that kind of co-location. The NCIC is a very vital place. It—through the NCIC and the CERT, we have literally responded to hundreds of thousands of cyber incidents, just this past year. That number is only going up.

Mr. MEEHAN. May I ask one last question? It is, as we deal with the imminent nature of, and changing threat, of cyber because of the fact that technology changes so quickly, how about your acquisition regulations and the ability for you to be able to work through the acquisition of the highest and greatest technology?

Are you bogged down at all by requirements that may take weeks if not months to get something approved, and, therefore, many times the technology may be obsolete by the time we put it in place?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think, that is a problem throughout the Government, Representative. I think, acquisition is too slow for the cyber world.

Another area, if I might, where we had asked for legislative help last year in a Senate cyber bill that ultimately didn't pass, the so-called Collins-Lieberman bill or Lieberman-Collins bill, was statutory authority to allow us to hire in the cyber world to the same degree NSA can, so that we are relieved from some of the normal hiring restraints and salary restraints that confine us. Because cyber professionals are very—it is very competitive market place for them.

Mr. MEEHAN. Well, thank you——

Mrs. MILLER. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you. I look forward to working with——

Mrs. MILLER. Thank the gentleman for his comments.

At this time, the Chairwoman recognizes Mr. O'Rourke from Texas.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Madam Secretary, I also want to thank you for your work, and through you, the men and women who keep our country safe, who have helped make the community I represent the safest in America for the last 3 years in a row, despite living next to one of the most dangerous cities in the world, bar none, in Ciudad Juárez.

I want to touch on a statement that you made in your opening comments about reduced operational capacity at our ports of entry as it relates to the sequester. I believe, in a previous hearing, you talked about, because of the sequester, 4- and 5-hour wait times at our ports of entry that can become the norm going forward.

So I want to ask you where we are now, given the additional flexibility included within the Continuing Resolution as it pertains to wait times at our ports and where we will be should this budget be approved, and you get the resources that you are asking for. What kind of wait times can we expect given the importance of our ports of entry to the National economy and local economies like mine?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think, even without sequester, we were short of port officers and staffing. Part of that was because they were paid for out of user fees, and user fees were diminished during the recession, and so, it got to be this gap. Those land ports are incredibly important and are responsible for hundreds of thousands of jobs in the United States.

The President has asked for 3,400 more port officers. We believe that will meet our staffing model needs for the future and keep wait times to a minimum. In the mean time, we are going to do everything we can to mitigate those times. I can't give you precise hours right now.

Mr. O'ROURKE. One request I would make related to that is, as you know, communities like El Paso, that I represent, are willing to commit resources, millions of dollars from local tax payers to compliment the investment that you are making at our ports.

What we don't have, that would help us make better decisions about this, is your workload staffing model, understanding how you staff the different ports of entry in our communities.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Mm-hmm.

Mr. O'ROURKE. We want to know those answers so that we can make a wise investment at the local level. I also want to be able to get back to constituents who, you know, send us or text us photos when they have been waiting on the port for——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Oh, I know.

Mr. O'ROURKE [continuing]. Three and 4 hours, get to the front of the line, and of 11 potential lanes, only see four of them staffed and open.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is right.

Mr. O'ROURKE. So just being able to be transparent and responsive and communicate to our constituents about how you staff those ports would be important. Can you commit to getting us your

workload staffing model? Would it be possible to commit to a date to do so?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We will provide you with the workload staffing model, because it forms the basis for the request for 3,400. So I will ask my staff to get that to you as quickly as possible.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I would also like to address some comments you made about comprehensive immigration reform. I really appreciate what you said, and what I think I heard you say, which is, if we are able to pass immigration reform, that, in itself, will help make the border more secure. You will be able to focus resources and attention on our highest, greatest priority threats, the existential threats, the people who want to come in, kill American citizens, do us harm, disrupt our economy, as well as the other criminal activity that we should be focusing on. So I appreciate you saying that.

Within this budget that you are proposing, do you have the resources necessary to carry out your obligations as it relates to comprehensive immigration reform? In your answer, do you want to touch on what was proposed from the Senate or the Senate plan, with, I think, an additional $3 billion towards border surveillance and another $1.5 billion towards extending the border wall?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, I think, my answer would be that, under CAR, and we are still going through it, as you might imagine, but if those resources are provided and sustained, and, I think, that is a key thing—they need—there needs to be a commitment to sustain the border security measures that are there.

But—assuming that, and assuming we fund the technology plans we have already provided to the Congress, I believe we can build on the efforts we have already done. I believe the manpower we have at the border is adequate. I believe that, yes, we can meet the measures that we have seen.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Real quickly, could I get you to respond to the request within that legislation to extend the wall? Do you think it is necessary to add additional mileage in the border wall between the United States and Mexico?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You know, I have never been a big fan of just, kind of, arbitrary, "build more fence." I have said, you know, "Show me a 10-foot wall, I will show you a 12-foot ladder." But, I think—again, we are looking at that, but there are different kinds of fencing. There is real. There is virtual, and other kinds of infrastructure.

So we are looking at what would go into that, but it needs to be part of our comprehensive strategic plan for the border itself, which includes the technology, the aerial, and the manpower as well.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Mrs. MILLER. Thank the gentleman.

The Chairwoman now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Duncan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Madam Secretary, first off, let me say thank you for what you and your Department do to try to keep America safe. I certainly appreciate it.

First off, let me also thank you for answering Senator Johnson's questions yesterday in the hearing about the ammo purchases that DHS is making and trying to refute some of the rumors. We get

a lot of those questions as Members of Congress back in my district, really from all over the country.

So as part of that, Chairman McCaul and I have asked GAO to do an audit just so we can deal with the facts and we can answer those questions for the American people, not only on the ammo but also on the MRAPs.

The question I have for you, you know, when *Forbes* magazine or Drudge or some reputable news sources start to repeat the numbers of 1.6 million or 2,700 MRAPs, they cease to be internet rumors and they start having some credibility.

So I would just ask, why was there a long delay or silence from the DHS for a period of time, almost 3 months, before you all came forth saying these numbers aren't correct, these are the actual facts? Why was there a delay or a silence from your Department?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I don't know about that there was that kind of delay, but I will tell you we found it so inherently unbelievable that those statements would be made, it was hard to ascribe credibility to them. I don't know if I would put *Forbes* and Drudge in the same sentence, but I—let me be as clear as I can be.

Mr. DUNCAN [continuing]. Leave Drudge out of it. I wouldn't. I think they are credible, but *Forbes* is definitely a credible magazine. So when they use that number and then we hear silence from the Department and Americans see the ammo shelves empty, all that feeds that——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well like I said, it got into the blogosphere and it went viral. We understand that. As I was with Senator Johnson, let me be clear as I can be. This was a 5-year strategic sourcing contract for up to those 1-point-whatever rounds—billion rounds. It is an up-to number. We usually use 150 million, 160 million rounds a year.

We do all the Federal law enforcement training, qualifying. We do a lot of the training and so forth for State and locals, plus our own operational needs. We are the largest Federal law enforcement agency.

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes ma'am. In the absence of time, you did a great job. I ask to submit for the record her testimony yesterday in the Senate.

Mrs. MILLER. Without objection.

[The information follows:]

EXCERPT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY HON. JEFF DUNCAN

RON JOHNSON (WI). OK. Let me turn to a question I'm getting all the time, and we certainly appreciate the information you've given us, but let's just kind of lay the rumors to rest. We hear reports that DHS is, you know, buying 1.6 billion rounds of ammunition. We contacted your office and apparently a purchase order for 650 million rounds over 5 years. I mean, is that the correct number? Can you just kind of speak to that, because I know a lot of people are concerned about that.

NAPOLITANO. Yes. We are in no way buying up the ammunition of the country for any nefarious purpose. We have what we call strategic source contracting where we can purchase up to at a certain per unit cost over time. We use about 150 million rounds a year. We train almost all of Federal law enforcement, plus a lot of State and locals at FLETC. By contracting this way we save almost 80 percent in a per unit basis. So it's really just smart contracting and nothing more.

JOHNSON. Even the 150 million sounds like a lot. But can you just kind of break that down, how many people are trained, how many practice rounds are fired? I mean——

NAPOLITANO. Well yeah, I mean it's—CBP probably uses 60 million, 65 million there. Secret Service, many of our services require qualifying multiple times a year. FLETC probably uses another 20 million, 30 million rounds. We can give you the actual inventory. We know where the rounds are used.

JOHNSON. I'm actually just giving you the opportunity to try and dispel the rumors.

SPEAKER. If I can interrupt. We've actually made an inquiry and they've been very good, the second inquiry is in the process of being processed by Homeland Security. We're going to have all that available for all the Members so they can answer the questions.

JOHNSON. OK, great. That's great.

NAPOLITANO. Right, but—but to just be as firm as I can be, the rumors are unsubstantiated and totally without merit.

Mr. DUNCAN. You answered those questions yesterday, and I appreciate that. I guess I was just asking about the silence, why there was a delay in you guys saying, you know, these numbers aren't right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. Like I said, it really didn't start getting to us as a question until I think we started getting Congressional inquiries. That was some time after the reports had first surfaced. So if we could have been quicker to the ball, perhaps, but again, in the press of things—if I might say in our own defense—we just couldn't believe that anyone would believe those allegations. So let me be very clear. Absolutely not true.

Mr. DUNCAN. I appreciate that. Let's shift gears a little bit because I am very concerned about this person of interest that was detained at the hospital in Boston following the marathon madness. He is, I believe, scheduled to be deported next week. Now I understand he has been cleared of any wrongdoing in the involvement in Boston, but he is being deported due to National security concerns.

CBS says this. This gentleman is here on a student visa. He was at the scene, along with many other people, when the blasts happened. As everybody is standing in shock, three Boston P.D. detectives see this guy moving quickly out of the crowd. As they are watching him, he seems to be moving very deliberately, which could be a very natural thing after a bombing. They stop him because he is covered with blood. They end up taking him to the hospital. That is straight off CBS.

We are asking average Americans to help ID and assist law enforcement in identifying who the bomber was. See something, say something. Now we have someone who is being deported due to National security concerns, and I am assuming he has got some sort of link to terror or he wouldn't be being deported.

He was at the scene. He could possibly ID the bomber, just like we are asking every other American that was on the scene to provide your pictures, help us identify who may have been acting funny. Everybody we are asking that that was in Boston, and we have got this guy who was there.

We know he was there. He was arrested—or wasn't arrested, was detained in the hospital covered with blood. He was at the scene, and yet we are going to deport him. So we are going to——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, Representative——

Mr. DUNCAN. We are going to remove him from the scene.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I am unaware of anyone who is being deported for National security concerns at all related to Boston. I don't know where that rumor——

Mr. DUNCAN. I am not saying it is related to Boston, but he is being deported.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Like I said, again, he—I don't even think he was technically a person of interest or a suspect. That was a wash. I am unaware of any proceeding there. I will clarify that for you, but I think this is an example of why it is so important to let law enforcement do its job.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want them to do their job, and that is why I say wouldn't you agree with me that it is negligent for us as American administration to deport someone who was reportedly at the scene of the bombing and we are going to deport him, not to be able to question him anymore? Is that not negligence?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I am not going to answer that question. It is so full with misstatements and misapprehensions that it is just not worthy of an answer.

Mr. DUNCAN. CBS reports the gentleman was there. We did detain him at the hospital. He was covered with blood. We have cleared him of any wrongdoing, but it has been reported he is being deported.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. There has been so much reported on this that has been wrong, I can't even begin to tell you, Congressman. We will provide you with accurate information as it becomes available.

Mr. DUNCAN. I look forward to that. Thank you. I yield back.

Mrs. MILLER. Thank the gentleman.

The Chairwoman now recognizes the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the Chairwoman, and I thank the Ranking Member for this hearing. I thank the Secretary as well. I will be fleeting and asking some of my questions to be in writing. I too have an amendment on the floor dealing with the cybersecurity bill.

I do want to thank you and reannounce again, "See something, say something." You were in my district a year or 2 ago. We spoke about it. Certainly we remember the Times Square bomber and the good Americans, good New Yorkers who saw something and said something. I want to remind everybody of that.

Madam Secretary, may I just again—this has been a week—and go straight to West, Texas, and say this: That if they are not under the CFATS process, can we galvanize resources under Homeland Security, which is the anchor of help when there is a devastation, as well even in light of them not having—maybe not having a security plan? What kind of resources could we quickly galvanize for them working with the State of Texas?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. We will look into that immediately.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you so very much. I know that there are first responders who lost their life. I offer them my deepest sympathy.

I want to go straight to the question of the border security. I thank you for reviewing the legislation that myself, Chairman McCaul, Thompson, Chairwoman Miller, and Cornyn has been on.

Let me tell you where we are going with that, and if I can get a specific answer.

We want to be a partner. This is a road map. This is an answer to I think a $1.5 billion fence. You were very careful in your answer about that virtual fence. I don't know if that is what is being perceived in that $1.5 billion. It looks to me like they want to put up a fence.

We know that that does not work. What kind of resources or input can you give us so that we can get the kind of defined way that we should be looking and assessing the border?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think the No. 1 thing you want to see is do we have the situational awareness of the highly-trafficked areas of the border and the ability to respond. That takes into account infrastructure and ground technology, air technology, manpower, all the rest.

But when I look at the border and I kind of step back and say: Well, what do we need? I really focus on: All right, what is our—do we have awareness of the area? If not, why not? What do we need to get that? That is where our technology plans come into play, and that is why we are asking that those be—that is what is kind of comprehended in CIR, among other things. Our technology plans are there and that we have the ability to respond.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Well, what we have offered in this legislation is for, as I have said in a very inspirational way, for DHS to be in the game with us. We want to draw out, and I think that that will be very helpful to this committee. Again, I have always said when a tragedy happens, they look to you, Madam Secretary. I know that the FBI's investigating Boston, but they are also looking to us.

Can I quickly note whether there was a fusion center in that area? We worked very hard to get these centers in terms of having people work together. My concern is—and are we going to get a briefing—my concern was seemingly the lack of credible threat chatter. That seemed surprising to me. Will we be able to get a briefing to determine what might have been happening and how the fusion center is working?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You are talking about Boston?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Boston. I am sorry. I have jumped——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. Yes. Without going into all of the things in the investigation, I will say there is a very good fusion center there. They have been actively involved. We will be happy to provide a briefing on how the fusion center has been used and is operating in the Boston case.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to hope that we can have a briefing on—with Homeland Security and Secretary and others, and very quickly. Let me just finish. I will just say again, Madam Secretary, we have given every opportunity for Administrator Pistole to delay, if you will, his moving on the knives. Everywhere I go, people are horrified. We don't want to have a confrontation. We would like to have a reasoned opportunity for more stakeholders to be heard.

I would just ask whether or not it would not be reasonable—you have agreed with him, but here is a question. A extension in light of—the TSOs are going to be short-changed. We are going to have

long lines at DCA. I already know that because I travel in and out of it, and I think that that is something—I ask you to make request or the inquiry or to give me an answer back.

Last, let me just say that having met with Border Patrol Agents, I want to make sure—I want to thank you for I think retracting the furlough, but I do think it is important in the comprehensive immigration reform to not underestimate the need for more patrol agents. I know there is some funding in this budget, the President's budget, but I support more funding for it even though they have a higher number.

Do you have just a quick comment on the knives and any opportunity for more stakeholders to be involved and more opportunity for discussion?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think with respect to that, as you and I have discussed, I think it is the right policy. I think, however, we can always look at how better to improve stakeholder outreach. I will talk with the administrator about that.

With—and the second part of your question? I am sorry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Was it Border Patrol Agents——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Agents, yeah.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. You are taking away the furlough, as I understand. You are taking away the furlough.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, we are trying to mitigate any furloughs and effect on AUL. We don't have a final answer yet.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask that you look at that very carefully. I yield back. I thank you very much.

Mrs. MILLER. Thank the gentlelady. The Chairwoman now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Barletta.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Madam Secretary, on April 8 in a Federal lawsuit in Dallas, Jessica Von who is the director of policy studies at the Center for Immigration Studies, gave testimony that focused on internal DHS statistics showing a significant decline in the number of deportations. She also described how the administration has cooked its removal statistics in a way that gives lawmakers and the public, the false impression that enforcement has improved.

She was asked to analyze a set of mostly unpublished statistics and documents on DHS enforcement activity over the last 5 years. In her testimony, she said the materials show that contrary to the administration's claims that have achieved record levels of enforcement, the number of removals is now 40 percent lower than in June 2011. Removals of convicted criminals are also running at 40 percent lower now than in June 2011. Removals generated by ICE's Enforcement and Removals Division, which carries out most of what little interior immigration enforcement, are 50 percent lower now than in June 2011.

This decline has occurred despite the expansion of ICE's Secure Communities Program. If ICE is removing so few people now than before, than how can DHS claim that they set a record number of deportations last year?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I don't know how she does her math, but I know how I do mine. The way I do my math is look at removals from the country. We have removed more people from the United States than any prior administration. So I can't respond

to an individual and how she cooks her books, but I can tell you what I look at.

I look at implementation of Secure Communities. I look at how many convicted felons we are removing. I look at how many repeat violators we are removing. I get the complaints Representative from the other side who say we are removing too many. That is also a sign, I guess I get them from both sides. Maybe we hit the sweet spot at some point.

But we are very committed to the rule of law where immigration is concerned. That is border security and its interior enforcement.

Mr. BARLETTA. But are we now counting Border Patrol cases, the turnarounds at the border, as part of our deportations? Rather than the criminal on the interior of the country? Aren't we now adding the Border Patrol cases, the turnarounds, as part of the deportations?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If there is a removal, but not, there is not always a removal. Like I said, you know, we can get into the weeds on statistics. The plain fact of the matter is, is that ICE ERO has been extremely active. I will tell you, when Representative Miller talked about this is the window of time on immigration. This is the window of time. We need to be looking at our worksite enforcement, because that is a real driver of illegal immigration.

We need some more tools. I mean the statutes governing how you prosecute somebody who continually brings over illegals, incredible. We need to unclog the visa process. These all go to the migration——

Mr. BARLETTA. I am familiar with cases right in my hometown and right outside of my hometown, where criminal aliens have been caught and turned over by local police, multiple access cards, committing fraud, aggravated assault charges, and left go.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I can't tell you, I don't know about a particular case. I don't know who they were turned over to. But I will tell you this, somebody who has that record, that we have, will be a priority removal.

Mr. BARLETTA. Well, I will give you another case just recent. There was actually a warrant for this man's arrest in New York City and he was let go. So I am going to disagree that we are deporting people or apprehending, the people that are being turned over and they are being deported. I am going to take issue also that Comprehensive Immigration Reform that has been proposed will make our borders more secure.

I couldn't disagree with that more. I believe we have now made our borders less secure because millions, millions of people are now being encouraged to come to the United States illegally with the hope of getting amnesty in the future. We saw that in 1986 when 1.5 million turned out to be 3 million. We have already seen, in testimony last week by Border Control Chief Michael Fisher, where they are seeing an increase already at the border, and some of it, he believes, is due to this policy.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Let me be very clear on this. Because this is a very important public message. Under any immigration reform proposal, you need to have a cutoff date.

Mr. BARLETTA. Oh I know, I know about the December 11——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, if I might complete my answer. So December 31, 2011, was chosen by the Gang of Eight as the cut-off date. We are already working, State Department and others, to get that message out so that we do not have any repeat.

By the way, this bill and the bills that are being considered that I have seen, are very different from 1986.

Mr. BARLETTA. Well, we all know that anyone can use false documents to claim they were here any day they want to say they are here. It happens all the time.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is not accurate either.

Mrs. MILLER. Appreciate the gentleman's comments. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chairwoman now recognizes Mr. Swalwell from California.

Mr. SWALWELL. Thank you Madam Chairwoman, and thank you Madam Secretary for being here. The Boston tragedy reminds us that the threat continues to be real as far as what we face with respect to terrorism. Whether it is domestic or international terrorism. I have to say in light of what we have seen, whether it is the blogosphere, the twittersphere, and all the rumors that are out there. I think that the administration, and you particularly, have done a very fine job and had a very measured response and have not chased many of the rumors that are out there.

Having been a former prosecutor myself, coming from a family of law enforcement, I agree it is very important right now in these early stages of investment, to just simply let law enforcement do its job. There is so much to learn right now. I appreciate that DHS is focused on that.

I have a couple questions based on my experience as a prosecutor, when I was a prosecutor, I worked in our office, and our office still works at the Alameda County District Attorney's Office with the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, which created what is called Urban Shield. Urban Shield is a full-scale training exercise developed in Alameda County to test and evaluate the region's ability to respond to any kind of man-made or natural disaster.

It involves first responders, businesses, law enforcement, communication systems, intelligence, critical infrastructure, and so on. Our former Sheriff Charlie Plumber and current Sheriff Greg Ahern continue to work on this and it is now an international and National program. We know from that program and we know from attacks in our country and across the world, that we are only as good as our game on the ground.

Meaning that local law enforcement will be the first responders. So as we are looking at our budget, what is DHS doing to publicize the training effort, or encouraging other major metropolitan areas to develop programs like this, or assist them with funding?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, we think the Urban Shield-type program, that is exactly what Boston used last November. That was an Urban Shield-type program. That is the kind of thing we want to support through our grants, and grant guidance. It improves, as you say, our ability to respond and to do with as minimum of chaos as possible in the wake of a terrible event like a Boston.

So yes we work with the major city chiefs, with the Sheriffs Association, with the IACP and others, really to encourage participation and design of things like Urban Shield.

Mr. SWALWELL. Great, also I believe these attacks also magnify our transit risks. In an article this week in *Politico* both Chairman McCaul and Ranking Member Thompson agreed on the threat to mass transit. I have circulated a letter asking for robust funding for the Transit Security Grant Program, which is administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in fiscal year 2014.

In that letter I explained what I believe to be our transit risks. In the Bay Area, we have Bay Area Rapid Transit also known as BART. What can you tell me that the Department of Homeland Security is doing now to step up protection around mass transit? Does Congress need to do a better long-term job as far as our budgeting to secure our transit areas and how would sequester affect this?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, sequester has not been helpful in a number of respects. But with respect to Boston, we have increased our security around transit hubs, working with Boston City Police, and the State of Massachusetts. We have VIPR teams that have been deployed into that general area and up through the New England corridor.

We also put the Coast Guard on the ferries. That is also a mass transit in some areas, and it is in San Francisco Bay. So all of those things have been increased for the time being.

Mr. SWALWELL. That is great. My final question has to do with immigration. The number of removals, you are correct, have increased under this administration, and I believe our borders have never been more secure.

However as we move toward Comprehensive Immigration Reform in my district, we have a very diverse area, and as a prosecutor I know that when you are looking at criminal removals, there is a broad range of types of criminals. You mentioned a convicted felon is much different than the person who is arrested for driving with a suspended license. However you could classify both of them as a criminal. Is the Department taking steps to prioritize the removals so that we are removing the most violent and serious offenders and the lower-class offenders who pose a lesser risk and many types their crimes are associated with being here in an undocumented fashion, are not being removed at the same rate?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, and one of the adjustments we made to Secure Communities in response to comments in that regard was to remove the automatic issue of a Notice of Detainer for low-level, misdemeanors and others, who pose no public safety threat.

Mr. SWALWELL. Great, and thank you Madam Secretary, and again I am confident that with your leadership and the way the administration has been responding to this tragedy in Boston, that we will find the persons responsible and we all need to just be patient and trust that law enforcement will do its job.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Indeed. Thank you.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson.

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Good morning to you. I appreciate you being here. I also would like to thank you for all the personnel of DHS who are working so diligently and tirelessly in Boston, as well as West, Texas. There were several victims in Boston from Charlotte, North Carolina, and so we were watching with a personal interest and really appreciate what your folks are doing.

I also wanted to echo at the outset, and sort of associate myself with the border metrics discussion we have had here. For my standpoint, I understand how important reforming our immigration system is to our economy, and our National security. But, I can't support any immigration reform if we can't be satisfied that we have secured the border. So getting those metrics where we can definitively talk about how we are doing on securing that border, and making sure that border security is a piece of comprehensive immigration reform will be critical to getting my support and others, I think, in our conference.

So we look forward to working with you to try and come up with definitive metrics, and move in that direction.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Indeed.

Mr. HUDSON. As Chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I am particularly interested in the TSA's budget, and would love to discuss—sort of directing my questions in that direction. It seems logical as we are moving towards risk-based security at TSA, which is something I fully support. I think it is the exact right thing to do. I support the administrator. It seems to me that as we move those towards more risk-based security, there ought to be significant cost savings for the taxpayer. For example, as we do risk-based screening, we start focusing more on threats, that ought to free up resources.

As we look at some of the new high-tech value screen, it ought to mean that we need less screeners for baggage. As we look at some of the privacy software upgrades for AIT again, ought to be able to reduce some of the workforce and screeners there was well. But it doesn't seem that in the budget, we are reflecting a lot of those cost savings. Why are we not seeing those?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think, Representative, I think because those cost savings will be more long-term than experienced immediately in fiscal year 2014. You are seeing some savings. For example, the AITs have basically been installed, and so we don't, you know have to buy as many and install as many AITs. The same with baggage systems. You know, the basic equipment has been installed, and now it is a matter of continual upgrades. I do believe as we move to more risk-based, those long-term savings will accrue. But, it is hard to say whether they will happen immediately.

Mr. HUDSON. I understand. What other costs and personnel efficiencies do you think that we—can be gained by expanding PreCheck, for example and implementing some of these other risk-based policy decisions? What kind of—how much savings do you think we are looking at?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think it all depends, but you know, in a PreCheck regime you don't, obviously need as many TSOs before an individual gets on a plane. So, there will be personnel savings with that. On the other hand, we do need to make sure that we fund the operation of the PreCheck program itself and

our, you know our ability to do background checks, and so forth on the members.

Mr. HUDSON. Absolutely. Well, I understand that obviously we need to put these systems in place before we start seeing some of the reductions in personnel that we are talking about, but what do you think the time frame is on that, particularly when we talk about PreCheck?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You know I would defer to the administrator on that. You known I think we have set an aggressive goal of having 1 in 4 passengers be in some sort of expedited program by the end of the year. If we meet that goal, I think we will start seeing some reduction in, certainly in growth of personnel shortly thereafter.

Mr. HUDSON. Right. I appreciate that. Shifting a little bit, initiatives that we have talked about in private. You know my concerns about us looking long-term at threats of an EMP attack. You know, one of the things that I brought up with you is that when we look at St. Elizabeths and we prepare to move to the new DH headquarters—DHS headquarters there, my concern is that we are spending a lot of money on that facility. But I am not sure we are doing what we need to do, to harden the electric grid there. I would just ask, has there been any other thought put into that? I guess behind that question I would just say, I think it would be important that there is.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I understand the concern. What I would suggest, if you have the time, is a classified briefing on St. E's? On what is happening. But, I would also like to say that, you know given now I am only going into my fifth year, but we really need a headquarters. It is very difficult to efficiently manage a Department as diverse as ours when we are in 50-plus locations around the Capitol region. So, I hope that is something the committee can support.

Mr. HUDSON. Absolutely. I know I am running out of time here, but I just wanted to say again, we do have a classified briefing scheduled that I have requested, and so I look forward to following up with you on that. But I think again, this is a long-term situation, and we need to be working on together when we look at the threat of EMP attack.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Indeed.

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you. I yield back the time I don't have.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman for giving back what he didn't have.

The Chairman now recognizes the distinguished Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, the gentlelady from New York, Ms. Clarke.

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

Let me add my voice to that of all of the colleagues who have commended you for your leadership, Madam Secretary. You know, from responses to the multiple natural disasters during your tenure, to the response to the Boston bombing, and the Texas plant explosion, it is becoming more, and more clear to all Americans, the critical mission of Homeland Security—the Department of Home-

land Security. I think that your leadership is emblematic of how robust we need to be as this agency grows from strength to strength.

That is why it is a bit challenging for us who recognize the missions to see that agency go through such a painful period where sequestration has now become, sort of a binding of hands in meeting these very critical missions. I want to move to the area of cybersecurity because I have been a bit concerned about the public level of awareness, where really understanding what it means to protect ourselves in the virtual world, actually means.

I guess the bandwidth of understanding can go from a person using a flip-phone, to a child using an iPad in the public sphere. But, what I recognize is that in this budget, there was a substantial cut to the cyber education program. While I recognize that Einstein–3 is a very important tool that we need, I noticed that, we are kind of trying to rob Peter to pay Paul, in order to manage the sequestration. I wanted to ask, you know: How we can meet our commitment to the public with such a drastic cut to the one area that we have that actually educates the public? Is there no way to slightly decrease funding for top-priority programs to fully fund education?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Representative, I understand the concern. I don't know how I can address it right now. I think pitting Einstein against education is probably not the way to go because Einstein is the fundamental system we are putting in place across the Federal Government for continuous monitoring and diagnostics, which is going to be critical to cybersecurity. But I understand your concern. Maybe there is a way through some other areas to plug cyber education, even if we can't specifically increase that account.

Ms. CLARKE. Yes. I—you know again we recognize that these vulnerabilities that we all have in the civil society makes it even more difficult to use the tools that you are establishing. So it is a—you know it is a delicate balancing act. I think the more that Americans become sensitized to the battle ahead of us, the more that we can all put our shoulders to the wheel. I wanted to also raise the issue of the new office that is requested in the President's budget, requesting $27 million.

This is the Office of Cyber and Infrastructure Analysis, which would synthesize the analytical—the analytic efforts of the Office of Infrastructure Protection, the Office of Cyber Security and Communications. Can you talk about why this new office was considered necessary? How quickly you think the office will get off the ground?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, it is really designed to help us meet our responsibilities under the Executive Order, and the PPD, and that is the information, and the information sharing in the private sector, and the also with the Government. So, you know, part of that is in NPPD, parts if it are in other parts of the Department, I&A for example. We really want a central—it centralized in one place given our central role, the analytics involved in cyber. So, you know the office probably be able to actually be larger than a $27 million office, but that is the number we have put on what we want to make sure that we have.

Ms. CLARKE. Do you have a time table, Madam Secretary?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, we already are moving on implementation, but we would like to be able to form the office as soon as we have a budget.

Ms. CLARKE. Very well. Thank you so much, Madam Secretary. I yield back.

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you.

The Chairman now recognizes the distinguished former United States attorney from Indianapolis, the gentlelady from Indianapolis, Mrs. Brooks.

Mrs. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, thank you, Madam Secretary, for your service, not just as head of the Department of Homeland Security, but for your longtime service to the Federal Government, as well as to your State.

It has been 10 years since the Department was stood up. I know there has been, just so much to bring all of the different legacy agencies together, and continue to train, but I remain concerned as the Ranking Member of my subcommittee brought up, with the consolidation of all of those grants that have been so critically important in the last 10 years to train our local and State law enforcement, and first responders. I am a bit concerned that the grants, which currently go to States, urban areas, ports, and so forth, that the new National Preparedness Grant Program as I understand it to be, is going to step away from a terrorism focus specifically to an all-hazards approach. Would you comment on that?

Because I am very concerned if we are not focusing in—on both, quite frankly, and that we remain very focused on terrorism. So by that consolidation, it is my understanding that even in the continuing resolution there was a prohibition and—assuring that this type of proposal, which has been brought forth in the past, would not go forward.

So what is different now than what has been proposed in the past, the past couple of budget cycles? I am all for efficiencies in administration and so forth, but what can you share with us more specifically about the details as to how this grant program is going to make sure that we are getting the funding to the agencies that are—that need it the most?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think one of the things that is different is we have held over 70 stakeholder outreach meetings and conferences in the last year. We did make some adjustments to the proposal in response to that.

But, you know, the basic problem is that, you know, if we are really going to say we want to cover risk and we want to do that in the best possible way, but we also want to be efficient, continuing to administer 18 grant programs that really all ought to be looked at holistically based on each State doing their own threat and hazard identification and risk assessment, and an ability to identify gaps, fill those gaps, et cetera, well, it is very difficult to do that when everything is kind of isolated in its own program. Plus, the administrative overhead—I can say this at the State level where everybody has their own grant, grant writer, and so forth—is obvious. So the notion is: Let's base more on risk. Let's do more by way of gap analysis and filling gap analysis. Let's try to get rid of some of this legacy overhead and make this a more streamlined consolidated proposal.

So in addition to the outreach we have done and the adjustments we have made in response to that, I am hoping what is different now is I can be more persuasive.

Mrs. BROOKS. With that, can you please share with us the BioWatch program? The President's fiscal year 2014 budget requests a little over $90 million for the BioWatch program to continue funding Gen–2 operations. No funding, as I understand, has been put in the budget for the acquisition of Gen–3.

I think as we continue to see—obviously it has been 11 years since we have had a terrorist attack of this nature, but yet chemical, biological, nuclear, radiological, those are all things that we need to continue to be mindful of. Can you, you know, share with us what is happening with the Gen–3 system?

Why would we be pulling back as, you know, technology and people become more savvy? What are we doing to make sure that we can protect ourselves against chemical, biological, radiological? It seems to me that a pullback from Gen–3 is not moving in the right direction.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We have—Gen–3 is undergoing an assessment as to whether it will ultimately be productive for the money we would put into it. So rather than head into a large acquisition, there were enough problems with it that our acquisitions review board has asked for an individual assessment. That is on a time line.

There is some carryover money that can be deployed, but it is really a matter of: Let's make sure that before we do a large acquisition we really know what we are doing, what we are getting and whether it is going to work. There have been problems with the early stages of Gen–3.

On bio, chem, radiological, nuclear, there is a lot in the budget in different places, but one I would point to is a major request by the President to build the NBAF, which is the National Bio-Agro Facility, in Kansas. We have known for a long time we need a new Level 4 lab. There was a peer-reviewed competition among States. Kansas won. It is at K. State—in conjunction with K. State.

They Kansas legislature has agreed to put in roughly $300 million. We put in $700 million or so. It is about a billion-dollar facility. If this is approved and appropriated, we could begin construction of a major lab and be done by 2020. I think long-term infrastructure for the country, that kind of a facility is going to be very important.

Mrs. BROOKS. When you say appropriated, is that by Kansas? Have they appropriated it yet?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. They have—I don't know whether they have appropriated it, but they have made a commitment to those millions to partner with the Federal Government.

Mrs. BROOKS. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentlelady.

The Chairman now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary. Certainly don't envy your challenges, and I think we all acknowledge the exceptional challenge

that you have in the agency and the size and scope of the things that you have to do on a daily basis.

My questioning will probably revolve mostly around immigration and maybe some of the metrics. I know we have kind of beaten that dead horse, but I just want to get my mind wrapped around some of the concepts here.

The Secure Fence Act of 2006 stated that the Department must take all, as I read here, actions to necessary to achieve operational control of the border. In this section, the term operational control means the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and contraband.

It is my understanding that the Department has stated that this definition is not attainable and must be changed to 90 percent. With that, I think the Department has asked for an increase of 3,477, almost 3,500 agents. We are counting on you to know the correct number to secure, so we are assuming that is correct.

But now I am picturing myself as a—I was a person as a commander of a task force in enemy territory. You know, whether I tell my troops that we are going to secure our perimeter up to 90 percent or whether I tell their families and their other troopers that, you know, 10 percent of you—we are going to try and make sure that 90 percent of you come home is an untenable——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. I think you are mixing apples and oranges, if I might respectfully. So let me back up the bus a little bit. What you are talking about on 90 percent is a number that the GAO uses as an effectiveness ratio. It is a calculation about apprehensions to attempts. As I have said, the technology is really the part that will help us get more confident in the attempts versus apprehensions.

Obviously everybody always wants 100 percent of everything. When you look at a long border, however, that ability to seal the border it is not going to happen. I mean, just—as someone who is from the border, lived the border my whole life, you don't seal it. But you can make it safe and secure as can be with the resources you have. That is the goal that we strive for.

Now the 3,500 additional personnel are for the ports of entry themselves. One of the problems we have had with the border is that the ports have become so clogged and the lines get so long because there aren't enough port officers. That in and of itself becomes an incentive to go around and try to sneak through some other way. So the 3,500 is designed to meet our estimate of what we need to properly staff the——

Mr. PERRY. Manage and staff the ports of entry.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is correct.

Mr. PERRY. So the 90 percent that the GAO is describing is the U.S. border, whether it is south, north, over water, over land, the border period all around the United States. Am I correct on that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It is a number that they used in a recent report. So that is where that comes from.

Mr. PERRY. I just want to—yes. I just want to make sure I am clear. I don't want to be critical——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. No, I am just trying to explain it.

Mr. PERRY. So just to be sure here and to clarify for myself, the Department is still seeking 100 percent. Even though we know it is hard to be perfect with thousands and thousands of miles of border, whether it is over the ocean and the coast line, through the forest or through the desert, we are still seeking 100 percent. We will continue to seek 100 percent.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, the question is difficult. If I were a police chief and you were asking me am I going to seek to eliminate all crime, I could say yes, but everyone would know, well that is not going to happen. Some crime is going to happen. So——

Mr. PERRY. I understand what is——

Secretary NAPOLITANO [continuing]. Our goals are always to do the maximum we can. That is what you want to put as 100 percent, that is. But I will share with you that is really probably not the best way to address the problem.

Mr. PERRY. I am just thinking about—you know, I understand that it might not be practical to get to 100 percent. But you know, I am—like I said, I am picturing myself in my own circumstance where I am trying to safeguard lives and bring folks home and make sure none of the bad guys get in the wire with us. We, you know, we strove for—that was our goal. Our goal was always 100 percent.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We always strive for perfection, but let me, if I might, make an important point here. We want to focus our resources on those who are trying to get into our border for bad activities like terrorism, human smuggling, narcotrafficking, et cetera. The major drivers across that border are the demand for illegal labor and the fact that our overall visa process is so screwed up. That is a technical term.

Mr. PERRY. I understand.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. So when the Congress takes up CIR, and if you deal adequately with those two drivers, that frees us up to focus more on where we should be focusing, which are the bad guys, as you would describe them. So I hope that as you think about this, it is not the border isolated by itself, but see how it fits into the overall problem that we are confronting.

Mr. PERRY. I appreciate your explanation. It is a matter of prioritization as well as seeking as close to you can as perfection. With that, thank you, Madam Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Secretary, just a quick question.

We have a colleague who is also in the military. Actually served during the break and was on the border.

One of the issues that was raised was the rules of engagement. I don't completely understand it, but they would apprehend people at the border, and, in effect, as soon as they went back and put a toe in the water, they were then free sort-of to not be further engaged.

Is there—is—well——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That doesn't sound—I am not sure what he is referring to. Maybe I could follow up with you or your staff?

Mr. MEEHAN. Yes. Well, I—perhaps, because I can put you in touch directly with our colleague.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Why don't you do that?

Mr. MEEHAN. He expressed it from first-hand experience just a week ago, and it surprised me. The question is rules of engagement, and what can be done with regard to people who are effectively, you know, on the river line or on the borderline.

But I will allow him to express it. I don't want to——

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right. There are rules of engagement with respect to the DoD deployment at the border, and there are reasons for that. So we will be happy to follow up as you suggest.

Mr. MEEHAN. I would love to be able to put that together. Thank you.

At this moment, the Chairman recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, I just wanted to—in your 2014 budget request, there is an item in there relative to a Northern Border toll for—study.

Can you provide some background with respect to that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think—I will—let me look into that line item specifically for you, but, you know, the issues of the Northern Border need to be paid attention to in terms of the trade and commerce that happens up there.

We have a number of things underway with Canada on the "be on the borders" initiative. We also—as you know, they are doing some pilot projects with pre-inspection and the like, one of which will be in New York. So—but I don't know whether that particular town is intended for that or elsewhere.

So, I will follow up with you.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes, I would just—for the record, I would just like to say that, you know, the Peace Bridge that connects Buffalo to Southern Ontario I think is the second-busiest border crossing for passenger vehicles and third for commercial vehicles.

It was built 84 years ago with three lanes. So half the time, because they use an alternating lane system, you are down to one line for all that traffic. It causes, obviously, volume delays, but it has an adverse impact on the environment, as well, relative to the air quality in and around that area.

Our emphasis is to expand the American Plaza, but to also pursue a new bridge span, because we are all economic actors. When we are competent, we move. When we are not, we don't.

The mindset in Buffalo and Western New York and Southern Ontario is to avoid the bridge, because it is not reliable, it is not predictable. So the only way you address it is to build in capacity.

So, I would just, you know, want to emphasize that we are trying to remove barriers to access, both physical and in tolls. You know, when you look at, you know, the situation with the Peace Bridge, a lot of the tolls are used to support their debt service, which will be necessary to build and expand the plaza to promote the efficient flow of traffic between the United States and Canada.

So, this is something that obviously would be of concern. Because my sense is that it would be a new agency-imposed toll in addition to the bridge management tolls that are already in place.

So, I just wanted to emphasize that to you. I appreciate all of your help in helping us address the issues of the Northern Border

generally, and the Peace Bridge connecting Buffalo and Southern Ontario, in particular.

I yield back.

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank the gentleman from New York.

Now turn to the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Stewart.

Mr. STEWART. Madam Secretary, thank you for your service. Thanks for what has been, I think for you, probably a long hearing. I am sympathetic because you don't know the line of questioning, and it can kind of come anywhere. It requires you to be an expert on nearly everything, and that is a great challenge, I know, with the tremendous responsibilities that you have.

I do have a couple things I would like to ask you quickly, if I could.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Sure.

Mr. STEWART. As a former Air Force pilot, like most military officers, I am fairly comfortable with handling a weapon, whether it is a weapon system like I flew or, you know, a .9 millimeter handgun. I think that there is something to the idea of self-protection. After 9/11, I think that is particularly true in the cockpit, of course.

I am sure you are familiar with the FFDO—the Federal Flight Deck Officer program.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Mm-hmm.

Mr. STEWART. You know, it has been in place for, I guess, 7 or 8 years, and I think it has been quite effective in training a large number of pilots to carry handguns in the cockpit with them in order to protect themselves and, of course, their passengers.

Yet, I—it is my understanding that that program has been entirely defunded in its late—latest budget request. I—and that troubles me. I am wondering if you could just help me understand your reasoning for not continuing funding for what I think is very effective, and really, quite cost-effective program.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think two things, Congressman.

No. 1 is: We have offered FFDO training if the airlines want to pay for it. The question is: Should the taxpayer pay for it?

So if the air carriers want to pay for it, we are open to that.

The second thing is that it is not a risk-based program. So, in contrast to FAMS—air marshals, where we really look at flights and risk and where we have concerns before we make an assignment for FAM, FFDOs are happenstance. If a qualified FFDO happens to be on a flight, so be it. Because we are moving to a risk-based approach, FFDO didn't pass muster.

Mr. STEWART. You know, and I can accept that explanation if you deem that this is not the highest priority. But the one that I really have trouble with is this idea that the airlines would be—you know, the burden of pay—paying for that would be placed upon them because you could make that argument for any of our security arrangements or costs. You know, that we could defer some of those costs to essentially the customers or the client, and, of course, we don't do that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, we do. Cybersecurity is a great example of where, in—because industry didn't want to be——

Mr. STEWART. Right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO [continuing]. And mandated, they—we are now involved in a public and voluntary process with them, but they will have to pay for——

Mr. STEWART. Right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO [continuing]. Security.

Mr. STEWART. I understand there are examples of that, of course. But, you know, I think the preponderance of it is, this is a Federal responsibility. It is a Governmental responsibility, and therefore, the Government is going to pay for that.

Let me shift, if I could, for just a moment, on an unrelated, but, I think, still important topic. That is the—I used to president of an environmental group. We worked with many different agencies and groups that had interest in that.

One of the things that I became aware of that during that time was that there are examples, in the Southwest, particularly, where environmental concerns seem to outweigh the concerns of border security. There are areas where agents are limited in what they can do and how they can control because of, you know, the desire to protect species or habitat.

It seems to me that that opens the door for incursions. I am wondering if you could just comment on that policy, whether you think that is a good idea, and whether you would continue to support that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think—actually, we have a very good MOU with the Department of the Interior on that. As you know, there are a number of Federal protected lands along that border, as well as Indian country. We have a very good MOU with Interior as to those lands. So we are able to patrol. We are able to do pursuit on those lands without having to stop and ask for permission and the like.

So, I think from an operational standpoint, we have dealt with the issues, but with—you know, cognizant of the fact that there are protected lands in that arena.

Mr. STEWART. Well, and, of course, none of us want to endanger species. But, on the other hand, there is a certain priority here that I think many of us would say, "What is the greater risk? What is the greater danger?" I can tell you, having spoken with them, there is some frustration. Maybe even more than some, but maybe in some cases, a great deal of frustration with some of the agents, and their relationship, and how they feel like they have been constrained because of those environmental concerns.

My time is up, madam. Thank you for your time today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman from Utah.

I thank the Secretary for your professionalism and leadership, as you bring the Department of Homeland Security through its first decade, and for your vision as you lay out the plans for the next important decade, facing the many challenges that we do.

As I had stated in my own questioning, I see you again as a symbol of those who are on the front lines each and every day in this protection of our homeland, and the resilience and courage of those, particularly as we are seeing in Boston. We thank all those on the front lines.

So, I want to thank the witness for her very valuable testimony and the Members for their questions.

The Members of the committee may have some additional questions for the Secretary, and we will ask you to respond to those in writing if they are submitted.

So, pursuant to the committee rule 7E, the hearing record will be held open for 10 days.

Without objection, the committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:34 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE JEFF DUNCAN FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. DHS has asked for almost double the amount of funding for St. Elizabeths from fiscal year 2012 to begin construction of the Center Complex Building, including the Secretary's office. Do you feel it's appropriate that the Secretary's office is one of the top construction priorities for the $4 billion St. E's campus in light of other important items? Did DHS consider increasing priority for operation centers that will be moving to the campus? Would it have cost taxpayers less if the headquarters had not been on a National historic area?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. You said before House Appropriations that St. Elizabeths is a consolidation effort that could save costs in the long run. My understanding, from our Oversight Subcommittee visit in March, is that except for Coast Guard and FEMA headquarters, only primarily the component leadership will be moved to the campus. Couldn't this have a detrimental effect on component morale since their leaders will no longer be seated in the same space as the normal staff?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE SUSAN W. BROOKS FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. Current grants provided to States, urban areas, ports, and transit authorities require projects to have a nexus to the prevention of, preparedness for, response to, mitigation of, and recovery from acts of terrorism. However, the National Preparedness Grant Program proposal seems to step away from that terrorism focus for a more "all hazards" approach. As you well know, and as Boston Marathon attack illustrates, the threat of terrorism has not receded. How will the NPGP ensure that grant funding is allocated to those areas at the greatest risk of attack?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. Under the NPGP how would urban areas, ports, and transit agencies, fusion centers, and non-profits receive funding in the proposed NPGP?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3. For the first time, a peer review process is proposed to evaluate grant applications. Who will be involved in the review panels and how the process will work?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4. How will the process ensure that projects that are identified as a high priority of a State or locality in their THIRA, which may not be as high a priority for FEMA, will be given adequate weight during the review process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5. The NPGP proposal would eliminate the PSGP grant program as a stand-alone program and would require port areas to apply to the State for funding. How would the NPGP proposal account for port areas that cover multiple States? How would we continue to ensure coordinated investments in these port areas, rather than stove-piped investments in these areas by the State in which they reside?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6. When I served as U.S. Attorney General for the Southern District of Indiana, I very proudly helped establish the Indiana Intelligence Fusion Center. I recently had the opportunity to visit it again as a Member of Congress. I was then, and I remain, a firm believer in the value of both individual fusion centers and the National Network of Fusion Centers. Fusion centers are a vital partner in the vast National homeland security mission space including, in many cases, a partner in emergency response and recovery efforts. We're already hearing stories coming out of Massachusetts of the great work being done by its fusion centers in the aftermath of the attack in Boston this week. Does the new NPGP continue to prioritize fusion centers and law enforcement prevention efforts as it has in the past?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7. The budget proposes to eliminate the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium (NDPC) and instead fund a new $60 million competitive Training Partnership Grant Program. The NDPC has been providing training to first responders since 1998 and has curricula and facilities in place. The budget anticipates that new recipients of training funds will receive multi-year funding for curricula development. Considering that there are current programs with robust training curricula already in place, do you believe a reduced amount of training opportunities will be available to first responders in fiscal year 2013 if grant recipients are developing curricula for the first time?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8. President's fiscal year 2014 budget request again proposes to eliminate funding for the Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program within FEMA. According to the budget documents, FEMA does not believe this elimination will impact FEMA's mitigation efforts due to duplication with other FEMA grant programs, including the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). During last year's appropriations cycle, there was bicameral, bipartisan opposition to eliminating the PDM. In a study conducted by the Multihazard Mitigation Council, it was found that for every $1 paid towards mitigation, an average of $4 is saved in future recovery costs. Are there any other mitigation-related grants or programs that FEMA administers to assist States and local governments, universities, and communities with mitigation-related projects prior to a disaster?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9. For fiscal year 2013, Congress appropriated $44 million for the United States Fire Administration (USFA), or approximately $42 million after the mandated rescissions. The administration's budget proposal for fiscal year 2014 requests $41.306 million for USFA. Among the savings outlined in the budget submission, the administration plans to eliminate 18 courses at the National Fire Academy (NFA), discontinuing Wildland/Urban Interface-Fire Adapted Communities and reducing support to the National Wildfire Coordinating Group, and "transferring" the State Fire Training Assistance Grant Program to the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program. As you know, part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Pub. L. 112–239), reauthorized USFA through 2017. Included in this law were instructions for the U.S. Fire Administrator to "conduct a study on the level of compliance with National voluntary consensus standards for staffing, training, safe operations, personal protective equipment, and fitness among the fire services of the United States." Additionally, that same law charged the Secretary of Homeland Security with establishing the Task Force to Enhance Firefighter Safety. With the administration requesting a reduction in USFA's budget, I am concerned with the agency's ability to complete the study mandated by Congress and the ability of the Secretary of Homeland Security to convene the Task Force. Additionally, USFA is charged with providing "National leadership to foster a solid foundation for our fire and emergency services stakeholders in prevention, preparedness, and response." How can USFA provide leadership if it is eliminating courses at the National Fire Academy and reducing support for the National Wildfire Coordinating Group?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 10. Additionally, the administration's proposal to shift the State Fire Training Assistance Grant Program from the National Fire Academy to FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate, as part of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, has caused some concern among stakeholders. In 2012, Congress reauthorized the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program and made State fire training academies eligible applicants for the grants—but only for apparatus, equipment, and personal protective equipment. The administration's proposal essential eliminates funding for the training of firefighters. It is estimated that the elimination of the State Fire Training Assistance Grant Program will result in approximately 45,000 less students trained per year. The amount of funding per State under this program is approximately $26,000. It is an extraordinarily efficient and low-cost training initiative. Can you address each of these concerns and explain how the USFA will continue to meet its mission with a reduced budget?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE SCOTT PERRY FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. Madame Secretary, you continuously state that the border is more secure than ever; however, the Department has yet to produce a successful border security metric and has inflated its deportation statistics since 2007 by including "voluntary removals". Individuals may voluntarily be removed numerous times, with

each case included in your record. How do you expect Congress to appropriate funds adequately to your Department without knowing Custom and Border Patrol's overall effectiveness rate?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. How do we move forward on comprehensive immigration reform without a legitimate understanding of the degree to which our borders are secure?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3. Do you believe that an increase in the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)—like "Vader"—could give us a better understanding as to the efficiency of Custom and Border Patrol and aid in the prevention of illegal immigrants crossing our border?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. Madam Secretary, at the hearing, we discussed a report published by the Office of the Inspector General that indicated that the Department had spent $430 million on developing interoperable communications capabilities, but had failed to achieve cross-component interoperability (OIG–13–06). The problem was not technology; the problem was management and training. What are you doing to ensure interoperability within the Department?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. What entity within the Department is responsible for ensuring cross-component interoperability and enforcing Department interoperable communications policies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3. It is my understanding that the Department has expanded CBP preclearance operations to Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates. In what I believe to be an unprecedented arrangement, the cost of CBP officers and staff for the preclearance location will be paid by a foreign entity. Abu Dhabi has a relatively low volume of travelers to the United States, with only three flights per day, and other locations have a higher number of travelers of potential concern from a security perspective. Given the limited number of personnel, please explain how deploying CBP officers to Abu Dhabi makes sense from a risk-based perspective.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4a. Should we be concerned about a foreign government or entity paying for our security operations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4b. What risks are associated with such an arrangement?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5. The budget proposes an increase of $77.4 million for integrated fixed towers (IFTs) to provide surveillance technology along the highest-trafficked areas of the Southwest Border in Arizona. The committee has long conducted oversight of the Department's efforts to deploy security technology to our Nation's Southwest Border, most recently in the largely failed SBInet program. CBP's efforts to deploy IFTs to Arizona have been delayed, and there is growing concern that the project may suffer from similar issues that plagued its predecessors. What can you tell us about the current status of CBP's efforts to deploy IFTs and other technology to the Arizona border? What is the current time line for deployment of the IFTs? Can you assure us the initiative will not be further delayed?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6a. The budget requests $37.4 million to provide for the continuation of the Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) program, which is currently operated by the Department of Defense, under CBP. The TARS program provides air surveillance in support of DHS's counter-narcotics mission through the deployment of tethered aerostats at sites along the Southwest Border and certain coastal areas. Some have expressed concern that it may cost DHS significantly more than it did DoD to operate the program, and note that not all of the TARS sites are currently operational and utilize older technology and equipment that is difficult and costly to repair or replace. What benefits do the TARS provide to CBP operations that cannot be provided through other means?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6b. Do those benefits justify the cost of the program? Please elaborate.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7. Are there currently negotiations or plans to expand eligibility for the Global Entry Program or any other trusted traveler program to nationals from any country not in the program?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8. The budget proposes to reduce the number of immigration detention beds from 34,000 to 31,800, while increasing the Alternatives to Detention program. Can you assure us that this number of beds would be sufficient for ICE to detain criminal aliens and other priority and mandatory detainees, while utilizing lower-cost alternatives to detention only for low-risk detainees who are most likely to appear for immigration proceedings? Please explain.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9. ICE recently received a great deal of criticism for releasing from detention a significant number of detainees, including a handful of Level 1 criminal violators, ostensibly due to budget concerns. It seems that ICE had been detaining, on average, more than 34,000 individuals per day and needed to bring that number in line with the authorized number of beds. If ICE cannot adequately manage its detainee population when the agency is funded for 34,000 beds, how can we expect it to do so with only 31,800 beds?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 10. Under this budget proposal, what assurances can you provide that no priority or mandatory detainees, including Level 1 criminal aliens, would be put in an alternative to detention rather than being detained?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 11. The President's fiscal year 2014 budget proposes a savings of over $88 million and a reduction of roughly 1,500 Transportation Security Officers by transitioning responsibility for staffing exit lanes from TSA to airports. As justification for this transition, the administration has argued that staffing exit lanes is not a screening function, but rather, falls under the purview of access control, which is the responsibility of the airport operator. When was the determination made that staffing exit lanes is an access control function and thus the responsibility of the airport operator?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 12. Did the Department engage in formal consultation with airport operators and the exclusive representative for TSOs regarding the decision to remove TSA personnel from exit lanes as a cost-savings measure prior to the budget being released?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 13. Was there a risk assessment done on this change and its implications for perimeter security?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 14. In section 1615 of the "Implementing 9/11 Commission Act of 2007," Congress mandated that a law enforcement biometric credential be established to ensure that law enforcement officers (LEOs) needing to be armed when traveling by commercial aircraft would be verified and validated as authorized to do so. It is my understanding that TSA screening efforts of flying LEOs today is currently carried out by a TSO in the exit lane. How does this proposal to transfer exit lane staffing to airports impact this statute?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 15. Has TSA established a program using biometric information to track armed LEOs when flying commercial aircraft?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 16. The fiscal year 2014 Congressional Justification for TSA's aviation security functions states that over $11 million will be saved in fiscal year 2014 due to TSA reducing all non-essential travel by 50 percent.Why would you only reduce non-essential travel by 50 percent rather than eliminating it all together?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 17. According to data provided by TSA, the cost of using contract screeners for passenger and baggage screening at domestic commercial airports is consistently higher than if the screening was conducted by the Federal workforce. Indeed, it cost 46 percent more to use contract screeners at Rochester International Airport in 2012, according the numbers provided to the committee by TSA. At what point, in these tight budgetary times, is the cost of using contract screeners deemed detrimental to the cost efficiency of conducting screening operations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 18. Secretary Napolitano, the President's budget proposes a restructuring of the September 11 Passenger Security Fee. In short, it proposes to replace the current fee structure with a structure that is expected to increase collections by an estimated $25.9 billion over 10 years. Of this amount, $7.9 billion will be applied to increase offsets to the discretionary costs of aviation security and the remaining $18 billion will be treated as mandatory savings and deposited in the general fund for deficit reduction. Can you please elaborate as to why you would have the Amer-

ican public foot the bill on deficit reduction instead of streamlining other expenses at TSA?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 19a. What types of programs and discretionary costs are covered under this fee?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 19b. Can you please provide us with a specific security benefit supported from this fund?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 20. Secretary Napolitano, the President's budget requests that $4.4 million be allocated for use by TSA to continue its assessment of pipeline security efforts. According to the proposal, TSA evaluates the physical security of 90–100 pipeline facilities and conducts 12–15 Corporate Security Reviews of the top 100 natural gas and hazardous liquid transmission pipelines and natural gas distribution systems within the United States. Who conducts these pipeline assessments and the Corporate Security Reviews?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 21. Is it a Transportation Security Inspector or does the Department use a subcontractor for this activity?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 22. In December 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report raising serious concerns regarding TSA's oversight and enforcement of its 2008 incident reporting regulation. The report indicated that there were several inconsistencies with the data collected by stakeholders and that TSA did not offer clear and consistent guidance on what should be reported. The President's budget requests $22 million be allocated for the operational support of the Transportation Security Operations Center, which correlates and integrates real-time intelligence and operational information, ensuring unity of action in the prevention of, and response to, terrorist-related incidents across transportation modes. Without proper administration and guidelines, however, I am concerned that the TSOC will not achieve its full potential.

What steps has TSA taken to develop a uniformed interpretation of the regulation's reporting requirements for rail and surface transportation operators?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 23. How is TSA making sure that local TSA inspection officials have provided rail agencies with adequate guidance on what TSA needs from operators?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 24. Has TSA standardized a definition for all rail stakeholders on what constitutes a "nexus to terrorism"?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 25. What does TSA believe would include incidents that should be reported to TSOC by rail operators and owners?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 26. The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Coast Guard provides the agency with much-needed funding to replace aging assets, but I want to ensure that there is no gap in security or available personnel during this period of transition. Please explain the extent to which Coast Guard decommissionings are being coordinated with new assets coming on-line.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 27. What, if any, are the operational and response capacity implications of these decommissionings?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 28. This committee has a long-established history of oversight and support of the National Security Cutters. The fiscal year 2014 budget requests $616 million to complete construction of the seventh National Security Cutter. However, no funding is requested for Long Lead Time Materials building materials for the eighth National Security Cutter. I am concerned that the lack of funding will delay the production of the eighth National Security Cutter and increase costs. Please explain why this request makes no requests for future purchases related to the eighth National Security Cutter.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 29. The original Coast Guard recapitalization plan called for eight National Security Cutters. Will Coast Guard still seek to build an eighth National Security Cutter?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 30. The fiscal year 2014 request proposes to cut the size of the Coast Guard's workforce by 931 positions. This includes a reduction of 850 service members and 81 civilians. While I understand that most of these reductions represent

a decline in positions associated with decommissioning assets and the closings and or consolidation of facilities, headquarters, and the Coast Guard Academy, I have concerns that Coast Guard may be losing years of investment in training, service, and institutional knowledge. How will Coast Guard ensure that personnel capabilities remain intact if their workforce is reduced by 931 positions?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 31. Will this personnel reduction take place through attrition or other means? Please explain.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 32. Madam Secretary, the Best Places to Work in the Federal Government survey breaks down numerous categories and ranks Federal agencies against like-sized Departments to determine where each agency stands. One such category is Senior Leaders. According to the survey, this "measures the level of respect employees have for senior leaders, satisfaction with the amount of information provided by management, and perceptions about senior leaders' honesty, integrity, and ability to motivate employees." When compared against other large agencies, the Department only scored 41.4 out of 100 and ranked last at number 19 out of 19. This indicates that any attempt to improve morale and performance must start with changes from the top down.

As the head of the Department, how do you plan on addressing this, either real or perceived, problem with senior leaders at DHS?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 33. Madam Secretary, this year, DHS is required to submit its second Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) to Congress. Presumably, plans are already underway in preparation for the submission. To what extent, if any, did the Department's leadership coordinate with the QHSR team to ensure that the current budget reflects the priorities that will be set forth in the QHSR?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 34. Madam Secretary, in August, the U.S. Coast Guard will be the first component to move to DHS headquarters at St. Elizabeths. If the Headquarters Consolidation project had remained on schedule it would be much further along. The total project completion date is now estimated at 2021, and even that is fluid. Funding delays have added an estimated $500 million to the cost, which has now ballooned to $3.9 billion. The fiscal year 2014 budget request for St. Elizabeths is $92.7 million. How will the current request, along with GSA's funding, position DHS to stay on its current schedule and move forward with this important endeavor?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 35. Please explain how the headquarters consolidation project will aid DHS in fulfilling its mission.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 36. If DHS does not receive the fiscal year 2014 request, what impact will that have on the project?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 37. Madam Secretary, the budget includes a request for $54.2 million to fully complete the consolidation of DHS's 24 data centers to two enterprise-wide locations, led by the Office of the Chief Information Officer. What is the current status of the consolidation effort and when do you expect its completion, based on the current request?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 38. According to the CFO, DHS the consolidation of 10 of the 24 data centers has resulted in a savings of 14%, which is equal to $17.4 million in savings annually. Once the project is closed out—which this request aims to do—how much do you estimate saving on an annual basis?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 39. Madam Secretary, DHS is estimating that it will save $1.3 billion in fiscal year 2014 from management-related areas. Although I applaud this effort, how will this effort, combined with sequester-related cuts, impact operations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 40. Madam Secretary, for far too long DHS has relied on an extraordinary number of contractors to fulfill it homeland security missions. This has resulted in a lack of institutional knowledge at DHS, in addition to waste and abuse resulting from a lack of proper contracting oversight. DHS recently began implementing the Balancing Workforce Strategy (BWS), which will be used to "right-size" the number of Federal employees and contractors at DHS and reduce DHS' overreliance on outside contractors. The budget contains a request for funding and personnel to staff this effort. How will the Department use the requested funds and personnel to implement the BWS program?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 41. It would be extremely counterproductive for the Department to use contractors to determine whether it is over-relying on contractors. Does the Department plan to staff this effort with Federal employees, and to what extent, if any, will contractors be used in the BWS effort?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 42a. Madam Secretary, in early March the Department's Chief Procurement Officer sent a notice to the Department's contractors advising that sequestration may result in both planned and existing procurements being cancelled, reduced in scope, terminated, or partially terminated.

Did the Department have to take this step?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 42b. If so, how many contracts were cancelled and at what dollar amount?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 43. What steps, if any, were taken to ensure that small and minority-owned businesses were not disproportionately harmed?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 44. The fiscal year 2012 Congressional Justification states that Civil Rights and Civil Liberties will begin training efforts for Countering Violent Extremism. Please give us an update on this effort.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 45. In an effort to address its acquisition workforce needs, the Department's fiscal year 2012 budget request included $24.2 million for an acquisition workforce initiative. However, the House Committee on Appropriations declined to provide funding for the initiative, stating that the information it received from DHS was insufficient to enable the committee to understand the basis for the proposed increase. The fiscal year 2014 budget, however, includes a decrease of $14.16 million from the fiscal year 2012 base due to reductions that include scaled back of in-residence course offerings and acquisition workforce programs. Given the need expressed in the last budget and the Department-wide benefit that would be result in an increased acquisition workforce, this appears to be a step in the wrong direction. Why did DHS take this course?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 46. What resources does the Department of Homeland Security have to train State and locals to detect and prevent the detonation of improvised explosive devices (IED)? What resources have you sent to communities through your grants programs to work with preparedness in the event these bombs are detonated?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 47. Has any of that funding been reduced?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 48. Defending our homeland relies on effective information sharing between various intelligence agencies and also from our international partners. Since 9/11 how has information sharing improved amongst the intelligence community and where is there significant room for improvement?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 49. How can DHS improve intelligence sharing with foreign countries in order to ensure that terrorists are not permitted to board a flight to the United States?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 50. How effective has the United States been in ensuring that foreign countries share vital intelligence and implement crucial security measures at their ports and borders?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 51a. In an interview with CNN, President Obama stated that "the biggest concern we have right now is not the launching of a major terrorist operation, although that risk is always there, the risk that we're especially concerned over right now is the lone-wolf terrorist, somebody with a single weapon being able to carry out wide-scale massacres of the sort that we saw in Norway recently." Do you agree with the President?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 51b. Is there anything DHS is doing to prevent these types of lone-wolf attacks?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 52. We have seen a rise of domestic terrorism incidents throughout the country, marked most recently by the events during the Boston Marathon. Earlier this year, several public servants throughout the country have been targeted and killed by people that are presumed to be affiliated with white supremacy. What is DHS doing to help State and local officials identify and prevent domestic terrorism?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 53. This week there have been incidents of letters containing suspicious powders, including ricin, addressed to a United States Senator and the President of the United States. We know that the FBI will be taking the lead on the investigation involving these letters. However, I believe that DHS has a role in preventing attacks such as these. Please tell us how DHS is involved in the prevention of biological attacks. Additionally, if any of these programs are receiving budget cuts, please let us know.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 54. Last Congress, this committee held hearings on weapons of mass destruction, which include attacks from biological agents. One of our witnesses, a former WMD Commissioner, testified that the United States still lacks preparedness for an attack such as these. The Commissioner cited that State and local authorities were not equipped to handle preparedness or response to an attack. Madam Secretary, given the cuts to State and local preparedness from the Department of Homeland Security grants program, do you think that jurisdictions can ever be adequately prepared from an attack from a biological agent or other weapon of mass destruction?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 55. There have been conflicting reports about the explosive devices that were found at the scene in Boston. Could you explain in detail what you know about the devices so far?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 56. DHS has a bomb detection capability. Has DHS been involved in trying to preserve shrapnel for the investigatory process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 57a. It has been widely reported that DHS' Intelligence and Analysis circulated a bulletin back in 2004 warning local law enforcement that pressure cookers could be used to develop an improvised explosive device (IED). Could you provide more background on that document?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 57b. To whom are these disseminated?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 57c. Have officials found these helpful?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 57d. As we face budget cuts, do releases such as these face danger of being reduced?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 58. Recent increases in apprehensions in other areas along the Southwest Border, specifically south Texas, indicate that area may benefit from additional technology. What is being done to send technology and other assets to this increasingly active area of the border?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 59. In 2012, this subcommittee and both House and Senate Appropriations Committees rejected the National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP) proposal for fiscal year 2013, because the proposed program had not been authorized by Congress, lacked sufficient details regarding its implementation, and lacked sufficient stakeholder participation in its development.

Please inform us of the Department/FEMA's stakeholder outreach methods regarding the current fiscal year 2014 NPGP proposal.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 60. Which stakeholder organizations were involved in this process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 61. The goods, services, and jobs from each seaport are relied upon by an average of 15 States across the country. By eliminating the Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) at the Federal level and giving the particular State in which a seaport happens to reside the sole discretion, based on its own State-created THIRA, on how funding for its security is to be allocated, how can we be certain that the other States' reliance on that port is not unduly harmed?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 62. Currently, the Coast Guard Captains of the Port play a key role in prioritizing projects submitted for funding under Port Security Grant Program (PSGP).

What role will they play in the proposed National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP) program?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 63. Unlike the other Homeland Security Grant Programs, the Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) funds commercial entities, marine terminal operators,

to support the Federally-mandated MTSA and the SAFE Port Acts. Are the State Administrative Agencies' (SAA) prepared to deal with these issues?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 64. In the past, funding for State and local grants programs have been cut considerably in addition to funding cuts for port security grants. Is this program going to be funded at an accumulated level that is as low as funding has been for these programs in the past, and if so, how do you expect ports to compete with other entities vying for grants in an environment with such little funding to go around?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 65. The "Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act" established a segregated public transportation security assistance grant program now known as the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP). As you know, under TSGP eligible transit agencies can directly apply for and receive funding from DHS and under the NPGP proposal transit agencies are not eligible applicants and must include their funding requests "along with" State Administrative Agency (SAA) funding applications. Do SAA's have the final say on whether or not a transit agency's individual application is included "along with" a State's larger funding application?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 66. Do you believe that at present, there is NOT sufficient interaction between transit agencies and local and State agencies re: planning, etc.?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 67. Do you believe that transit agencies are best able to determine and prioritize their own security needs?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 68. DHS has struggled to compete with the private sector and other Federal agencies in attracting a skilled cyber workforce. What effect do you anticipate the reduction of cyber vacancies and budget cuts in general having on DHS's ability to attract and retain qualified candidates to work within DHS's cyber workforce?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 69. Madam Secretary, the President's budget requests $17.4 million dollars to purchase commercial cyber threat information. I think the average citizen would wonder why the mighty Federal Government, with all of its access to intelligence, would need to be purchasing commercial cybersecurity products. Can you explain to us why this is necessary?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 70a. The budget requests $197 million dollars for EINSTEIN–3A, which will leverage commercial internet service providers to more quickly extend intrusion prevention coverage to Federal Government agencies. Can you give us an update of how many of our Federal agencies are currently covered by EINSTEIN–2, the previous iteration, and how many are currently covered by EINSTEIN–3?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 70b. What is the path forward to full coverage of the Federal Government?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 71. The President's budget requests $168 million for the continuous diagnostics program, which is DHS's operations to implement Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) compliance across the Federal Government. This funding will enable DHS to develop a suite of programs that will be deployed at Federal agencies to provide DHS with an almost real-time capability to monitor what safeguards are in place to protect the .gov. The budget request is light on implementation details, however, and a workable time line. As of now, what is the time line for implementing this program?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 72a. Both the recent Executive Order, and current and future legislation, are expected to increase DHS' cyber information sharing with State, local, international, and private-sector partners. How does the budget request reflect the Executive Order's new initiatives with respect to DHS, including the greatly expanded Enhanced Cybersecurity Services program and the development of the Cybersecurity Framework?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 72b. Does DHS have the resources it needs to fulfill its new responsibilities?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 73. In late December 2011, a news outlet obtained a leaked copy of an internal memo evaluating the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards (CFATS) program. When we finally saw it here at the committee, we found it to be a frank assessment of the program's shortfalls and helped our understanding of why there

has not been more progress in this program. The memo identified a number of human resources, technical, and organizational challenges that have impeded the program. The process of approving site security plans has been taking longer than anyone would have expected, and GAO in its recent report suggests that it could take another 7–9 years to complete. That GAO report, and another from the DHS Office of Inspector General, brings to light even more disturbing issues involving questions about the risk analysis processes involved in the program, and other sober conditions that point to problems with the capability of the program to achieve any of its goals and core mission. Do you anticipate the CFATS program to be fully implemented in fiscal year 2014? Specifically, when do you anticipate CFATS moving into its compliance phase?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 74. At this time, what are your expectations for this important program?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 75. Do you anticipate needing more resources for the inspector workforce to conduct compliance in fiscal year 2014?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 76a. The fiscal year 2014 budget reflects a funding cut in the on-line reporting system (CSAT) used to submit CFATS information. Does this account reflect the development of the ammonium nitrate sales, registration and verification process, and field enforcement?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 76b. If so, what is the allocation to each process?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 76c. Is DHS proceeding under the assumption that the sales registration and verification process will proceed as stated in the ammonium nitrate rule that will be published by the end of this year or has another process been contemplated?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 77. It is well documented that ammonium nitrate has been exploited by terrorists to create improvised explosive devices to deadly effect. This committee has worked diligently, over the years on legislation authorizing the program and has actively tracked the progress of this rulemaking, and the Department published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on August 3, 2011. I know that during the comment period you heard from a lot of people—particularly in the agricultural, explosives, and mining sectors—about some potential unintended consequences and harmful impacts of aspects of the proposed rule.

Can you give us an update on the status today?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 78. When do you expect to finalize the rule?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 79. The same division that oversees the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Act is responsible for this program. Can you tell us how you intend to ensure that this division issues and implements a final rule, given CFATS' other current distractions and shortcomings?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 80. The President's fiscal year 2013 request contained no funding at all for the construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) to be built in Kansas. This year, the administration is requesting full funding for construction of NBAF in 1 year, $714 million. Given the condition and continued deterioration of the Plum Island laboratory, and the need to have a Level 4 agricultural laboratory in the United States even more necessary, please explain your reasoning for requesting full construction monies in 1 budgetary year?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 81. How do you intend to proceed on NBAF construction, and what are your time lines for completion?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 82. Madam Secretary, there are some discussions about the advisability of merging the BioWatch responsibilities of the Office of Health Affairs with DNDO to form what would essentially be a Weapons of Mass Destruction division or directorate within DHS. The idea is based on combining the technological R&D and acquisition needs of advanced sensor technologies for CBRN—chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear detection—into one concerted program. I personally think we need to examine this policy question with a meaningful and deliberate hearing process. What are your preliminary thoughts on such a merger involving the Office of Health Affairs BioWatch program and DNDO?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTION FROM HONORABLE LORETTA SANCHEZ FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question. At the hearing, we discussed the new production path for Coast Guard's fast response cutter. Please submit the new production plan to the committee for our review.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE SHEILA JACKSON LEE FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. At the hearing, we discussed the Department's role in the response to the chemical facility explosion in West, Texas on April 17, 2013. What resources was the Department able to deploy to the area?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. We also discussed the public outcry regarding Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) decision earlier this year to allow certain knives and sports equipment in the passenger cabin of airplanes. You noted that you would work with the TSA administrator to improve stakeholder outreach in advance of changes in TSA's prohibited items list. How will you ensure that relevant stakeholders are consulted and involved in decisions regarding changes to the prohibited items list and other security policies?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE YVETTE D. CLARKE FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1a. As we discussed at the hearing, although I am supportive of the enhancements to the DHS cybersecurity mission for core programs, such as EINSTEIN, I have been concerned that DHS appears to be placing a lower priority on key "defense-in-depth" strategies such as public outreach, education, and workforce development. You indicated a willingness to work with me to ensure that proper resources are allocated to public outreach, workforce development, and education. Given the relative low cost of these endeavors, how do you justify these cuts?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 1b. Is there no way to slightly decrease funding for the top-priority programs to fully fund education?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. The President's budget requests more than $27 million for the creation of the Office of Cyber and Infrastructure Analysis to synthesize the analytic efforts of the Office of Infrastructure Protection and the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications. Can you talk about why you need this new office and how soon you think the Office will be fully operational?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTION FROM HONORABLE BRIAN HIGGINS FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question. I expressed my concern regarding an item in the fiscal year 2014 budget request which would "study the feasibility and cost related to imposing a crossing fee on pedestrians and passenger vehicles along the northern and southwestern borders." Such an increase could devastate commerce along the Northern Border, and particularly in the Buffalo-Niagara region which is already struggling to rebuild its economy. Please provide any and all materials associated with this proposal.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTION FROM HONORABLE RON BARBER FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question. At the hearing, we discussed the effect of sequestration and the fiscal year 2013 spending bill on Border Patrol Agents. There remains significant uncertainty among the Border Patrol Agents in my district regarding how their employment and compensation will be impacted. When will the Department give Border Patrol Agents concrete information about how sequestration and the fiscal year 2013 spending bill will affect their employment, overtime, and income?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE DONALD M. PAYNE, JR. FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1. As we all saw following the Boston Marathon attack, the efforts of first responders and State and local authorities were integral in saving lives and stabilizing the area. The last appropriations for Homeland Security significantly cut grants to State and local governments, transportation security, as well as other Department areas. Further cuts are now imposed due to sequestration.

Are you concerned that the sequester and cuts to grants to State and locals inhibit our ability to detect and deter possible threats to the homeland?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2a. What resources does DHS have to train State and locals to detect and prevent the detonation of improvised explosive devices (IED)?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2b. What resources have you sent to communities through your grants programs to work with preparedness in the event these bombs are detonated?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2c. And has any of that funding been reduced?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 3. We now have almost a decade of spending money in the homeland security arena. I have heard from many in my district that having the tools and resources is not the problem, but the necessary manpower and training is the problem.

Since you have been Secretary, what have you learned about what spending works and what does not work?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 4. As you continue through the sequester, what areas of homeland security funding have been most successful, and what programs can be cut without damaging our homeland security?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5a. Secretary Napolitano, Newark Liberty International Airport is one of the main engines for economic growth in my District and in the entire region. In fact, I was just at the airport touring the Customs and Border Patrol's inspection facility less than 2 weeks ago, learning more about the work they do. The Customs officers do a remarkable job, but they have a tough job, especially as a result of budget constraints. Considering those problems, I was puzzled when I learned that our Government is establishing a preclearance facility in Abu Dhabi. Although I do wish to facilitate tourism and trade in my district, I nevertheless have concerns regarding whether this is the best use of our resources considering the relatively low volume of travel from Abu Dhabi. Could you please explain how deploying our already-limited CBP officers to Abu Dhabi makes sense considering the present budget constraints being imposed on CBP. Should we be concerned about a foreign government or entity paying for our security operations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 5b. What risks are associated with this arrangement? This matter is of great importance to me and my constituents. I have some reservations about the plan considering the speed at which it is moving and the lack of information so far. I look forward to learning more about it in the weeks and months ahead.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 6. My district sits directly across the river from New York City and includes an airport, a sea port, rail lines, bus lines, and chemical plants. As such, my district relies heavily on several of the Department of Homeland Security's individual grants like UASI, the Port Grant Program, and the Transit Security Grant Program. Therefore, I am particularly concerned about DHS's proposal to consolidate 16 grant programs into a single National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP).

In the past, funding for State and local grants programs have been cut considerably, so I am also concerned about a further reduction in the funds available. How do you expect ports and transit that rely on their specific grant program to compete with other entities vying for grants in an environment with such little funding to go around?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 7. According to data provided by TSA, the cost of using contract screeners for passenger and baggage screening at domestic commercial airports is consistently higher than if the screening was conducted by the Federal workforce. In some airports the cost is close to even 40 or 50 percent more to use contract screeners. At what point, in these tight budgetary times, is the cost of using contract screeners deemed unfavorable to the cost efficiency of conducting overall screening operations?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8a. The administration's fiscal year 2014 budget proposes a reduction in funding for VIPR teams that monitor and detect potential terrorist threats across surface and mass transportation hubs. In light of the events occurring in Boston is this wise?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 8b. And if there is a reduction in the number of VIPR teams, will there be training to the front-line employees of public transit agencies, rail carriers, and intercity bus carriers?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 9. At the hearing, we discussed the impact of grant funding reductions on State-wide Interoperability Coordinators (SWIC), noting that States have lost SWICs as Federal grant funding has become unavailable. As we make significant investments in First Net, I am concerned that interoperability capabilities we have developed over the last decade and the capabilities we hope to achieve with First Net will be undermined by the fact that States are losing their SWICs. What steps is the Department taking to ensure that States without SWICs will continue to maintain State-wide Communications Interoperability Plans?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 10. What resources and guidance will the Department provide to States without SWICs who will be forced to designate another individual—who will likely have primary responsibilities outside of interoperable communications policy—to coordinate the State's communications with FirstNet?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE BETO O'ROURKE FOR JANET NAPOLITANO

Question 1a. At the hearing, we discussed my concerns about CBP staffing levels. I noted that the administration's proposed budget requests funding for 25,252 CBP officers, which includes an increase of 1,600 CBPOs funded by appropriations and up to 1,877 CBPOs funded by a proposed increase to customs and immigration user fees. Adding CBP officers is necessary to enhance security, facilitate legitimate trade and travel, and reduce wait times at our ports of entry. Is this proposed increase sufficient to fully meet the staffing needs identified by CBP's fiscal year 2013 Report to Congress on Resource Optimization at Ports of Entry?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 1b. How would these officers be utilized? Please explain.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

Question 2. I also noted that Members of this committee have repeatedly requested a copy of CBP's staffing model, including staffing information for each port, but that request has never been honored by the Department. At the hearing, you agreed to provide a staffing model to the committee. We anxiously await the transmission of that model.

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.