

**WHY CAN'T DHS BETTER COMMUNICATE WITH
THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
**SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT
AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY**
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 14, 2013

Serial No. 113-22

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

85-687 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	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
PETER T. KING, New York	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia	YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan, <i>Vice Chair</i>	BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina	WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	RON BARBER, Arizona
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah	DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., New Jersey
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
CHRIS STEWART, Utah	FILEMON VELA, Texas
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina	STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
STEVE DAINES, Montana	ERIC SWALWELL, California
SUSAN W. BROOKS, Indiana	
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	
MARK SANFORD, South Carolina	

GREG HILL, *Chief of Staff*

MICHAEL GEFFROY, *Deputy Chief of Staff/Chief Counsel*

MICHAEL S. TWINCHEK, *Chief Clerk*

I. LANIER AVANT, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCY

JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina, *Chairman*

PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia	RON BARBER, Arizona
LOU BARLETTA, Pennsylvania	DONALD M. PAYNE, JR., New Jersey
RICHARD HUDSON, North Carolina	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
STEVE DAINES, Montana	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (<i>Ex Officio</i>)
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas (<i>Ex Officio</i>)	

RYAN CONSAUL, *Staff Director*

DEBORAH JORDAN, *Subcommittee Clerk*

TAMLA SCOTT, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Jeff Duncan, a Representative in Congress From the State of South Carolina, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency:	
Oral Statement	1
Prepared Statement	4
The Honorable Ron Barber, a Representative in Congress From the State of Arizona, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency:	
Oral Statement	5
Prepared Statement	7
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security:	
Prepared Statement	9
WITNESSES	
PANEL I	
Mr. Robert Jensen, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	10
Prepared Statement	11
Ms. Tamara Kessler, Acting Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, U.S. Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	16
Prepared Statement	18
PANEL II	
Mr. William Braniff, Executive Director, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism:	
Oral Statement	35
Prepared Statement	37
Mr. Douglas G. Pinkham, President, Public Affairs Council:	
Oral Statement	45
Prepared Statement	47

WHY CAN'T DHS BETTER COMMUNICATE WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?

Friday, June 14, 2013

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:05 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Jeff Duncan [Chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Duncan, Hudson, Barber, Payne, and O'Rourke.

Mr. DUNCAN. The Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency will come to order.

The purpose of this hearing is to examine the Department of Homeland Security's ability to effectively communicate with the American people. I appreciate our panelists' being here today.

I will now recognize myself for an opening statement.

Whether it is with Members of Congress, the press, or directly to the American people, 10 years after its establishment the Department of Homeland Security seems to have developed serious challenges communicating its goals, priorities, tactics, and missions. This administration specifically has an increasing sense of a bunker mentality in responding to the public, engaging with stakeholders, and collaborating with industry and advocacy groups.

Perhaps more disturbing is the Department's lackadaisical approach to addressing legitimate questions and concerns raised by the American people on a host of issues, from TSA's screening policies to DHS ammunition purchases to the impact that the sequester would have on the Department and on its components. When DHS officials or their colleagues at the components do respond to legitimate questions concerning Departmental policies or actions, responses are often defensive and condescending.

I found this out first-hand when I raised serious visa security issues with Secretary Napolitano in April, only to be told that my question was not worthy of an answer because, and I quote: "It is so full of misstatements and misapprehensions that it is just not worthy of an answer." You know, that is a heck of a way to speak to a Member of Congress who represents almost 700,000 American taxpayers who help foot the bill for the Department's \$60 billion budget.

DHA's inability to connect with the American people has been a running theme through the first four Oversight Subcommittee hearings we have held so far this Congress. The former Governor of Virginia and chairman of the Gilmore Commission, Jim Gilmore, raised concerns with DHS's ability to share information at our February subcommittee hearing. He said that one of the primary goals of the Department should be to have an actual discussion with the American people.

The inability of DHS to sufficiently address concerns raised by the general public or even to engage in a discussion erodes trust in the Department, and that is my concern. An uncommunicative Department of Homeland Security that is seen as consistently stonewalling increases people's skepticism of DHS, it strains the institution's credibility, and it makes people question the motivations of the Department's leadership. How does this serve DHS's critical mission to defend the homeland?

Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 calls on the Secretary of the Department to ensure that information related to domestic incidents is gathered and shared with the public, the private sector, and with State and local authorities. To this end, FEMA uses a variety of tools to communicate with the public on disaster response and emergency preparedness.

But it is disappointing to me that a country that leads the world in effective advertising and marketing cannot be as effective in communicating with its own citizenry on even the most basic policies related to homeland security. For example, DHS ignored questions regarding the Department's ammunition purchases for weeks, if not months. The Secretary acknowledged in the committee's April hearing on DHS's budget that the Department could have gotten ahead of the ball on this issue. However, the prolonged silence led many in the public to come up with their own conclusions and scoff at the official DHS explanation.

In February 2013, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, released 2,000 illegal aliens into communities across Texas and the United States without rhyme or reason, only to subsequently blame the effects of the sequestration despite the fact that it had yet to go into effect.

DHS aggressively and proudly promotes its "See Something, Say Something" campaign, including at events all over the country attended by Secretary Napolitano. Yet a DHS-sponsored report released only hours before the Boston Marathon bombings found that almost 60 percent of Americans said they have never heard anything about the program.

DHS's Blue Campaign, which seeks to promote public awareness of human trafficking within the United States, could also be a game-changer if DHS did a better job communicating its message and working with key stakeholders.

Undoubtedly, social media has changed the game for the Federal Government in the terms of the number of outlets and issues it has to be aware of and responsive to. However, the Federal agencies now have unprecedented opportunities to interact with the very people they serve on a daily basis, which is critical when it concerns matters of health, safety, and emergency response. I often

use social media to communicate with my constituents, and I know that DHS has an array of social media.

My question is: How does DHS or its components decide which issues are worthy of a response or exactly what information is important enough to push to the general public via this media? What exactly is the Department's strategy in communicating its missions and policies?

For instance, TSA's Twitter account could be a boon for the agency by pushing out real-time information to travelers or in clearly communicating travel tips to expedite air travel screening. Instead, you find tweets about travel tips for campers and fishers and TSA's "weirdest finds."

As Douglas Pinkham, one of our witnesses here today, explained in his prepared testimony, "Social media programs could be launched because they represent the highest strategic use of corporate resources, not because everyone else seemed to have a social media program."

Look, Americans don't want to distrust their Government. Americans don't want to believe that Big Brother is listening to their phone calls or reading their private correspondence. Americans don't want to believe that the Government is buying up ammo so that it won't be available to them when they go to their sporting goods store. Americans don't want to believe that their Government is buying mine-resistant armored personnel carriers, or MRAPs, for use by law enforcement in huge quantities. But they do distrust Government when there is a failure to communicate. Americans still believe in the concept of innocent until proven guilty, but, you know, they don't feel that way when they go through a TSA screening. In light of the recent IRS targeting and NSA snooping and the AP-Fox News-Justice Department issue, Americans are beginning to distrust their Government more and more.

So we can do better. You can do better, we can do better in communicating with the American people and trusting them with the truth, trusting them with the facts, not by waiting over 3 months to respond to questions about procurement contracts, as an example, or failing to respond to a Member of Congress when he asks a legitimate question, but by trusting the American people with the facts and the truth.

It seems to me that, more than a decade after the September 11 attacks and especially in light of April's Boston Marathon bombings, that the American people are resilient and receptive and are more than willing to do their part in securing the homeland. It is my hope that the Department will try to capitalize on this through enhancing its responsiveness and communication with the public and their stakeholders. Doing so would enhance DHS's credibility, it would help build trust, and it would strengthen the relationship between the Department and the American people.

The Chair will now recognize the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Barber, for any statement he may have.

[The statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JEFF DUNCAN

JUNE 14, 2013

Whether it is with Members of Congress, the press, or directly to the American people, 10 years after its establishment, the Department of Homeland Security seems to have developed serious challenges communicating its goals, priorities, tactics, and missions.

This administration specifically has an increasing sense of a bunker mentality in responding to the public, engaging with stakeholders, and collaborating with industry and advocacy groups. Perhaps more disturbing is the Department's lackadaisical approach addressing legitimate questions and concerns raised by the American people on a host of issues from TSA's screening policies to DHS ammunition purchases, to the impact the sequester would have on the Department and its components.

When DHS officials or their colleagues at the components do respond to legitimate questions concerning Departmental policy or actions, responses are often defensive and condescending. I found this out first-hand when I raised serious visa security issues with Secretary Napolitano in April only to be told that my question was not worthy of an answer because—and I quote: "It is so full with misstatements and misapprehensions that it's just not worthy of an answer." That is a heck of a way to speak to a Member of Congress who represents almost 700,000 American taxpayers who help foot the Department's \$60 billion budget.

DHS's inability to connect with the American people has been a running theme through the first four Oversight Subcommittee hearings we have held so far this Congress. Former Governor of Virginia and Chairman of the Gilmore Commission, Jim Gilmore, raised concerns with DHS's ability to share information at our February subcommittee hearing. He said that one of the primary goals of the Department should be to have an actual discussion with the American people.

The inability of DHS to sufficiently address concerns raised by the general public—or even to engage in a discussion—erodes trust in the Department, and that is my concern. An uncommunicative Department of Homeland Security that is seen as consistently stonewalling increases people's skepticism of DHS, strains the institution's credibility, and makes people question the motivations of the Department's leadership. How does this serve DHS's critical mission to defend the homeland?

Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 calls on the Secretary of the Department to ensure that information related to domestic incidents is gathered and shared with the public, the private sector, and with State and local authorities. To this end, FEMA uses a variety of tools to communicate with the public on disaster response and emergency preparedness.

But it is disappointing to me that a country that leads the world in effective advertising and marketing cannot be as effective in communicating with its own citizenry on even the most basic of policies related to homeland security. For example:

- DHS ignored questions regarding the Department's ammunition purchases for weeks, if not months. The Secretary acknowledged in the committee's April hearing on DHS's budget that the Department could have gotten ahead of the ball on this issue. However, the prolonged silence led many in the public to come up their own conclusions and scoff at the official DHS explanation.
- In February 2013, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) released about 2,000 illegal aliens into communities across Texas and the United States without rhyme or reason, only to subsequently blame the effects of sequestration, despite the fact that it had yet to go into effect.
- DHS aggressively and proudly promotes its "See Something Say Something" campaign, including at events all over the country attended by Secretary Napolitano. Yet a DHS-sponsored report released only hours before the Boston Marathon bombings found that almost 60 percent of Americans said they'd never heard anything about the program.
- DHS's Blue Campaign which seeks to promote public awareness of human trafficking within the United States could also be a game changer if DHS did a better job communicating its message and working with key stakeholders.

Undoubtedly, social media has changed the game for the Federal Government in terms of the number of outlets and issues it has to be aware of and responsive to. However, Federal agencies now have unprecedented opportunities to interact with the very people they serve on a daily basis, which is critical when it concerns matters of health, safety, and emergency response.

I often use social media to communicate with my constituents and know that DHS also has an array of social media. My question is: How does DHS or the components decide which issues are worthy of a response or exactly what information is impor-

tant enough to push to the general public? What exactly is the Department's strategy in communicating its missions and policies?

For instance, TSA's Twitter account could be a boon for the agency in pushing out real-time information to travelers, or in clearly communicating travel tips to expedite air travel screening. Instead, you find Tweets about "Travel Tips for Campers and Fishers" and "TSA's Weirdest Finds." As Douglas Pinkham, one of our witnesses here today, explained in his prepared testimony: "Social media programs should be launched because they represent the highest strategic use of corporate resources, not because everyone else seems to have a social media program."

It seems to me that more than a decade after the September 11 attacks, and especially in light of April's Boston Marathon bombings, that the American people are resilient and receptive and more than willing to do their part in securing the homeland. It is my hope that the Department will try to work to capitalize on this through enhancing its responsiveness and communication with the public and their stakeholders. Doing so would enhance DHS's credibility, build trust, and strengthen the relationship between the Department and the American people.

Mr. BARBER. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for convening this hearing.

Thanks to the witnesses for being with us this morning.

Every day, approximately 280,000 employees in the Department of Homeland Security work diligently to carry out the mission and functions of the Department, and they very often do this job without thanks and public acknowledgment of their efforts to keep our country safe from harm.

Just on a personal level, I can tell you, when I go through checkpoints—and we have a couple in my district, interior checkpoints—I always make a point, after I have been cleared, of saying to the agents, "Thank you for your service." They look at me like, "Who are you? What is going on?" I never identify myself as a Member, but I just want to thank them. The look on their face tells me that very few people ever do that. We need to do better. These men and women are putting their lives on the line every single day for our country.

But I believe it is also the role of the Department's Office of Public Affairs to communicate effectively with the public the programs and policies of the Department and to provide the public with necessary homeland security information in a timely and open manner.

It has been, at times, disappointing to see that the dissemination of this information to the public has not always been handled in an effective manner. The Department has struggled sometimes to communicate to the public, not only when things have gone wrong, but also when things have gone right.

Just recently, for example, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized nearly \$1 million in methamphetamine and heroine when a Mexican man and a Tucson woman were arrested as they attempted to smuggle those drugs into the country. Just this past week in southern Arizona, CBP officers arrested two people as they attempted to smuggle more than \$1.67 million in currency going south into Mexico.

Now, these are examples, actually, of successes. I am pleased to say that both of them were covered locally and the credit was given where credit was due. We need more of this kind of public information, and we need more of these success stories being told, because there are a lot of them.

But the Department also needs to be transparent with the public they serve, and that means communicating effectively at all times.

Unfortunately, the Department has struggled to address its shortfalls in this area.

For example, conflicting information about the impact of sequestration and the handling, as the Chairman pointed out, of the release of detainees are two examples of the Department's failing to get ahead of the story in an effort to avoid public fallout.

In the case of the released detainees, it is particularly troublesome. ICE first reported that only a few hundred detainees had been released. ICE later admitted that more than 2,000 detainees were released but did not provide details about their release. In fact, Members of Congress did not find out until it was in the newspapers that these detainees had been released. Then DHS waited months before actually disclosing that 622 detainees had criminal records and 32 of those had multiple felony convictions.

Not only does ICE's action and the lack of transparency create confusion among the public, but it also puts citizens at risk. I might add, the sheriff in the adjoining county to my district, where many of these detainees were released, did not know that they had been released until he, too, read it in the newspaper.

Unfortunately, there are times when the Department seems to put image before information flow. According to an article published earlier this year in the *Arizona Daily Star*, the main paper in Tucson, Arizona, CBP public affairs officers in southern Arizona and along the Southwest Border were told to deny requests for information, ride-alongs, and visits to the border.

CBP officials were told by their branch chief that if anyone on the local, regional, National, or international level made such a request, they must inform the reporter that "you will see what you can do and get back to them and then send it to me." When the same reporter asked CBP for their use-of-force policy, he was flat-out denied the ability to obtain a copy.

This caused, I think, great harm to the image of the Department, even as it was trying, I suppose, to protect it. Subsequently, when this newspaper article was published, the information officer reversed the policy and said that they would be able to accommodate local media requests. This kind of confusing back-and-forth, I think, does not help DHS in its mission.

This type of information management is problematic, especially considering DHS may have more daily contact with the American public than any other agency. Approximately 50,000 transportation security officers, TSA officers, screen 1.8 million passengers every day at more than 450 airports across the country. On a typical day, over 960,000 passengers and pedestrians interact with Customs and Border Patrol personnel by air, land, and sea. Furthermore, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, assists thousands of individuals affected by natural disasters and other hazardous situations.

Let me just comment here that, when FEMA goes to work, I believe it manages public information very well. It seems to me that whatever is going on in FEMA makes sense. What is going on, perhaps, in CBP does not. We need to make sure that we replicate the approach that FEMA takes with the CBP officers and agents on the ground.

Given the broad scope of the Department's interaction with the public, it is imperative that it communicates effectively with the American public not only about what the Department has done but what it plans to do. One way the Department could improve its public image or interactions is, where applicable, hold open meetings with the public about new policies and programs before they are implemented—before they are implemented.

I believe input directly from constituents and communities affected by policy is critical. That is why I introduced an amendment to H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act of 2013, which was passed ultimately unanimously by the full committee, which directs the CBP to conduct public meetings with border community members to get their input into how we can best secure our borders. The people who live on the border or near the border or work on the border or near the border have eyes and ears unlike anyone else. They could be very helpful; we need to include them in any kind of policy development going forward.

Having such meetings have proved to be very beneficial in my district. Through such meetings, the Department personnel speak directly and hear directly from individuals who live and work along the border. This dialogue not only aids in informing policy, it also improves the Department's communication with the public.

My predecessor, Congresswoman Giffords, urged the Border Patrol, when she was in office, to establish stakeholder meetings in our district. We now have five functioning stakeholder groups. They meet every month. Interactions between them, the citizens, and the Border Patrol is constant, and it has definitely improved communications in my district. I urge other sectors in the Border Patrol to do the same.

Last, I would like to address an issue that I have addressed here before, and that is the unfortunate low morale in the Department. Low morale affects every aspect of an organization, and DHS consistently, unfortunately, ranks at the bottom when it comes to employee morale. In a 2012 study, DHS was ranked 19th out of 19 large agencies in the Federal Government when it came to employee satisfaction.

Low morale causes a number of problems, including a high rate of turnover, which leads to complications in both internal and public communications. I urge the Secretary and the Department to take a very close look at the causes of low morale and high turnover in the agency and to institute the appropriate reforms in leadership development to stem this tide.

I look forward to hearing specific steps the Department will take to improve the way it communicates information and policies to the general public.

I thank the witnesses for their participation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[The statement of Mr. Barber follows:]

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER RON BARBER

JUNE 14, 2013

Every day approximately 280,000 employees at the Department of Homeland Security work diligently to carry out the mission and functions of the Department.

Very often they do this job without thanks and public acknowledgement of their efforts to keep our country safe from harm.

It is the role of the Department's Office of Public Affairs, to communicate to the public the programs and policies of the Department and to provide the public with necessary homeland security information.

It has been at times disappointing to see that the dissemination of this information to the public has not always been handled in an effective manner.

The Department has struggled to communicate to the public, not only when things have gone wrong, but also when things have gone right.

Just recently, U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized nearly \$1 million in methamphetamine and heroin when a Mexican man and Tucson woman were arrested as they attempted to smuggle these drugs into the country.

And just this week, in southern Arizona, CBP officers arrested two people when they attempted to smuggle more than \$1.67 million in currency into Mexico.

The Department needs to be transparent with the public they serve, and that means communicating effectively at all times.

Unfortunately, the Department has struggled to address its shortfalls in this area.

Conflicting information about the impact of sequestration and the handling of the release of detainees are but two examples of the Department failing to "get ahead of the story" in an effort to avoid public fallout.

The case of the released detainees is particularly troublesome. ICE first reported that only a few hundred detainees had been released. ICE later admitted that more than 2,000 detainees were released, but did not provide details about the released detainees. DHS waited months before disclosing that 622 detainees had criminal records, and 32 of those had multiple felony convictions. Not only does ICE's action and lack of transparency create confusion among the public, but also puts citizens at risk.

Unfortunately, there are times when the Department seems to put image control before information flow.

According to an article published earlier this year in the *Arizona Daily Star*, CBP public affairs officers in southern Arizona and along the Southwest Border were told to deny requests for information, ride-alongs, and visits to the border.

CBP officials were told by their Branch Chief that if anyone—on the local, regional, National, or international level—made such a request, that they must "inform the reporter that you will see what you can do and get back to them. Then send it to me."

When the same reporter asked CBP for their use-of-force policy, he was flat-out denied the ability to obtain a copy.

This type of information management is problematic, especially considering DHS may have more daily contact with the American public than any other agency.

Approximately 50,000 Transportation Security Officers screen 1.8 million passengers everyday at more than 450 airports across the country.

And on a typical day, over 960,000 passengers and pedestrians interact with Customs and Border personnel, by air, land, and sea.

Furthermore, the Federal Emergency Management Agency assists thousands of individuals affected by natural disasters and other hazardous situations.

Given the broad scope of the Department's interaction with the public, it is imperative that it communicates effectively with the American public; not only about what the Department has done, but also about what it plans to do.

One way the Department should improve its public interactions is, when applicable, hold open meetings with the public about new policies and programs before they are implemented.

I believe input directly from constituents and communities affected by policy is critical, that's why I introduced an amendment to H.R. 1417, the Border Security Results Act of 2013, directing CBP to conduct public meetings with border community members to get their input into how we can best secure our borders.

This amendment passed out of the committee and I am hopeful that it will ultimately become law.

Having such meetings have proved to be very beneficial in my district.

Through these meetings Department personnel speak with and hear from individuals who live and work on the border.

This dialogue not only aids in informing policy it also improves the Department's communication with the public.

Last, I would like to address an issue I have addressed here before. Low morale affects every aspect of an organization and DHS consistently ranks at the bottom when it comes to employee morale. In a 2012 study DHS was ranked 19th of 19 large agencies in the Federal Government when it came to employee satisfaction.

Low morale causes a number of problems, including a high rate of turnover which leads to complications in both internal and public communications.

I urge the Secretary and the Department to take a close look at the cause of low morale and high turnover in the agency and to institute appropriate reforms and leadership development to stem this tide.

I look forward to hearing specific steps the Department will take to improve the way it communicates information and policy to the general public, and I thank the witnesses for their participation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Barber.

Other Members of the subcommittee are reminded that opening statements may be submitted for the record.

[The statement of Ranking Member Thompson follows:]

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON

JUNE 14, 2013

When the Department of Homeland Security was established, it was clear that this newly-created agency would interface with the American people and serve as a source of public information.

In fact, included in the original documentation that laid the framework for the Department was the statement that DHS would serve as "One department to coordinate communications with State and local governments, private industry, and the American people about threats and preparedness."

To that end, how the Department communicates with the public and whether the American people are fully-informed is important.

The purpose of the Office of Public Affairs is to coordinate the public affairs activities of all of the Department's components and offices, and serve as the Federal Government's lead public information office during a National emergency or disaster.

Unfortunately, much like other areas throughout the Department, there is a lack of cohesion between the Department's headquarters-based Public Affairs personnel and public affairs personnel operating in the components.

Each Department component has its own Office of Public Affairs that handles component-level communication strategies and press releases.

This structure runs afoul of the "One DHS" concept.

Too often, this has resulted in component-level Public Affairs offices and the headquarters Office of Public Affairs disseminating different messages.

To make matters worse, the high turnover in leadership at the Office of Public Affairs has resulted in a further divide.

Since January 2003, there have been ten Assistant Secretaries of Public Affairs, serving in either an Acting or Permanent role.

This turnover has left the office in a constant state of influx and has affected its ability to effectively carry out its mission.

Public Affairs is also responsible for communicating many of the Department's public campaigns.

One such campaign is "If You See Something, Say Something," which was the brainchild of the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA).

The Department receives some funds to carry out this campaign; however, the campaign and slogan is owned by MTA.

I am interested in determining how funding for the campaign is shared and whether taxpayer dollars from the Department's scarce budget are paid to New York for the use of a slogan that, according to testimony that we will soon hear, is not widely-recognized.

Finally, I am also interested in hearing testimony from the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties on how they address the public's civil rights and civil liberties concerns, as they relate to the Department's programs and policies.

Mr. DUNCAN. We are pleased to have today two very distinguished panels of witnesses on this important topic.

The first panel, I will introduce both of you, and then I will recognize you.

Mr. Robert Jensen is currently the principal deputy assistant secretary for public affairs at the Department of Homeland Security, coordinating public affairs activities of all the Department's components and offices, and serves as the Federal Government's

lead public information officer during a National emergency or disaster.

I understand you just got back in the country. Well, welcome home, sir.

In 29 years of civil service, Mr. Jensen has served in numerous positions in civilian and military capacities, most recently as the acting director of external affairs for the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In addition to serving 2 years in Iraq, he has been deployed to support the communications efforts during Deep-water Horizon, the massive earthquake in Haiti, Hurricane Ike in 2008, and Hurricane Sandy in 2012.

Ms. Tamara Kessler is the acting officer for civil rights and civil liberties at the Department of Homeland Security. Prior to this position, Ms. Kessler served as deputy officer. As acting officer, Ms. Kessler is responsible for integrating civil rights and liberties into all of the Department activities through promoting respect for civil rights and liberties in policy creation, investigating and resolving complaints, and leading the Department's equal employment opportunity programs.

Before joining CRCL, Ms. Kessler spent 20 years as an attorney for the Department of Justice Inspector General and associate counsel at the Office of Professional Responsibility.

I thank you both for being here today.

The Chairman will now recognize Mr. Jensen to testify.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT JENSEN, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. JENSEN. Good morning. Thank you, Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the committee.

I am Bob Jensen, as was just introduced, and I serve as the principal deputy assistant secretary for public affairs for the Department of Homeland Security. I am the senior career civil servant in the Office of Public Affairs. You also mentioned that I was detailed back to FEMA last year to serve on the ground as the lead for communications efforts in New York for the month after Sandy hit.

I am here today to talk to you about the role of DHS Office of Public Affairs. We are responsible for the oversight and management of all external and internal communications for the Department, including during major incidents that range from terrorist attacks, natural disasters, and mass casualties shootings to other threats impacting the United States.

We provide timely, accurate information to a wide range of stakeholders, and this includes the American public, the media, Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial government officials, the private sector, and the Department's more than 240,000 employees. We also provide strategic guidance and support to more than a dozen DHS component public affairs offices to ensure consistent, coordinated messages, procedures, and outreach.

We take these responsibilities very seriously. Our outreach helps keep the public informed about our efforts to combat terrorism and violent extremism. It supports effective disaster preparedness and response activities. It helps to promote transparency in how we are using taxpayer resources in the Department.

The Office of Public Affairs use a variety of ways to communicate about the Department's programs, policies, and procedures. For example, we provide information directly to the public through our Department and component websites as well as through our blogs and social media accounts and Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube.

The Office of Public Affairs also manages or provides oversight and inputs several of the Department's public outreach programs. These include the "If You See Something, Say Something" public awareness campaign, which encourages the public to contact local law enforcement if they see suspicious behavior or activity; the Ready campaign, which is designed to educate and empower the public to prepare for and respond to emergencies, including natural and man-made disasters; National Preparedness Month, held each September to encourage Americans to take simple steps to prepare for emergencies in their homes, businesses, and schools; and, also, the Stop.Think.Connect campaign, designed to increase public understanding of cyber threats and how individual citizens can develop safer cyber habits that will protect themselves on-line.

We have significant responsibilities in the event of a major domestic incident or crisis. Building on lessons learned from 9/11 and subsequent major National incidents, the Federal Government and DHS developed instant communication procedures to coordinate through the interagency and communicate with the American public. These include prearranged communication protocols as well as three communication networks that include approximately 1,300 key communicators across the Nation. These are from Federal, State, and local agencies and even the private sector. These networks can be activated within minutes and are used to develop and distribute public information and coordinate and deconflict information and activities.

Since 2003, for example, we have activated our National Incident Communications Conference Line, which brings together all the Federal communicators, nearly 450 times. In addition, we have developed resources for use during major threats, including the National Joint Information Center, which is located in our headquarters building, and the Domestic Communications Strategy, which provides senior Federal communicators with options for use during a domestic attack, serious threat, or other incident.

DHS is fully committed to communicating information to our many partners in a way that is timely, accurate, transparent, and helps maintain confidence in the Department's work.

Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss DHS communications, and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jensen follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT JENSEN

JUNE 14, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Good morning, Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the subcommittee: My name is Robert Jensen and I am the principal deputy assistant secretary for public affairs at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Public Affairs. In this role I support the Department's efforts to communicate our policies and programs to the American people and our many partners across the

public and private sectors, and I support senior leadership communication across DHS.

Prior to this position, I served as acting director of external affairs at the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and also as its deputy director. I have held a variety of public affairs-related positions throughout my 29 years of Federal service, including director for public affairs and communications at the National Security Council; director for communications operations for Iraq and Afghanistan and director of the Iraq communications desk at the Department of Defense; director of National media outreach and senior communications advisor for the multi-national force—Iraq; and acting spokesman for the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

In addition to serving 2 years in Iraq, I also deployed to set-up and support U.S. Government communications during the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, the Joint Information Center after the earthquake in Haiti in January 2010, and I served as external affairs operations director for more than 30 major disasters, including Hurricane Ike in 2009 and Hurricane Sandy in 2012.

DHS OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The DHS Office of Public Affairs is responsible for the oversight and management of all external and internal communications for the Department, including communications during major incidents that range from terrorist attacks, natural disasters, mass casualty shootings, and other threats or hazards impacting the United States.

The Office of Public Affairs provides timely, accurate information to a wide range of stakeholders, including the American public, media, Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial Government partners, the private sector, and the Department's more than 240,000 employees. We work directly with offices across the Department to coordinate public affairs outreach and messaging, including the Office of the Secretary, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of Legislative Affairs, and the Private Sector Office.

In addition, the Office of Public Affairs provides strategic guidance and support to more than a dozen DHS component public affairs offices, including the Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Secret Service, and FEMA, among others. Through regular interaction with these offices, we ensure consistent, coordinated communications procedures and outreach.

We take our communications responsibilities very seriously. Communicating timely, accurate information to the public supports cooperation with security measures and keeps our constituencies informed of changes or requirements with Departmental programs and policies. An engaged and vigilant public also remains critical to our efforts to combat terrorism and violent extremism. The public is often the first to recognize an emerging threat in communities and notify the appropriate authorities.

Timely, accurate communications outreach also directly supports effective disaster preparedness and response activities. By providing information to the public on appropriate steps to take before, during, and after disasters, we can often lessen their impact, build more ready and resilient communities, and save lives. Effective communications also help maintain public confidence in the Department's activities and promote transparency in how taxpayer resources are being put to use.

DHS COMMUNICATIONS TOOLS

The Office of Public Affairs uses a variety of means to communicate the Department's programs, policies, and procedures to the American people and our partners.

The DHS Press Office is the primary point of contact for news media seeking information about DHS. The function of the office is proactive in pushing out stories and policies about DHS, and reactive in responding to media inquiries pertaining to activities of the Department. The Press Office coordinates media relations and serves as the spokespersons for the Secretary, senior leadership, and the Department. In addition, the office is responsible for identifying and executing strategic, proactive media opportunities. Press Office staff also coordinate TV, radio, print, and new media (blogs, podcasts) opportunities for DHS principals and provide general communications counsel and support to the Secretary, deputy secretary, assistant secretary for public affairs, and other DHS leadership.

The DHS Office of Strategic Communications provides overall management for implementation of communications plans related to DHS programs and policies, rules and regulations—including branding initiatives—and complex domestic and international issues requiring outreach and public education. The Office of Strategic Communications also coordinates and supports public appearances by DHS officials,

including the Secretary, deputy secretary, and other senior leadership. Through the DHS Speaker's bureau, we ensure Departmental representatives with the appropriate level of subject matter expertise appear on the Department's behalf at public events, conferences, and stakeholder engagement.

The DHS Office of Multimedia serves as the Department's official point of contact for entertainment-oriented motion picture, television, advertising, video, and multimedia productions or enterprises. The multimedia office ensures that DHS speaks with one voice in working with the industry and provides formal support to multimedia production sources to ensure that DHS missions, personnel, and services are truthfully and accurately represented.

DHS Web Communications streamlines access to DHS services on-line and executes a cohesive strategy for web-content management and web-hosting services for all DHS public-facing websites. The Department maintains a very active on-line presence, leveraging a variety of digital tools to reach our audiences. This includes the DHS website (www.dhs.gov) and extensive use of social media, such as Facebook and Twitter.

In April 2013, the DHS website had more than 1.28 million visits and more than 1 million unique visitors. We currently have approximately 211,000 Twitter followers and more than 72,000 Facebook fans. We regularly leverage these outlets to promote DHS initiatives and programs, provide information regarding our mission and the missions of DHS components, and to communicate directly to the public during incidents. Information provided through DHS social media channels is often shared broadly by Federal, State, and local government and law enforcement agencies, as well as ordinary citizens, further amplifying DHS outreach efforts.

The Office of Public Affairs also plays an active role in communicating with the Department's employees. Our Internal Communications team coordinates, integrates, and synchronizes employee communications efforts, ensuring key policy, procedural, and operational information from DHS headquarters is disseminated to all 240,000 of the Department's employees.

The Office of Public Affairs works closely with DHS component agencies and program offices to organize in-person or video teleconference employee town hall meetings, facilitates employee engagement with DHS leadership, and leads the Department-wide Internal Communications Committee to promote a shared internal communication vision and develop products that can serve as tools for all internal communicators. The Office of Public Affairs also actively supports and updates the DHS intranet—DHS Connect—an internal web-based portal that provides a range of information and resources to DHS employees and enables them to access their respective component intranets.

KEY OUTREACH PROGRAMS

"If You See Something, Say Something™" Campaign

Homeland security begins with hometown security. An informed, alert public is vital to our efforts to protect our communities, and DHS has continued our Nation-wide expansion of the "If You See Something, Say Something™" public awareness campaign, which encourages the American public to contact local law enforcement if they see something that is a potentially suspicious behavior or activity, such as an unattended backpack. The campaign was originally used by New York's Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which licensed the use of the slogan to DHS for terrorism and terrorism-related crime awareness efforts. "If You See Something, Say Something™" is a Department-wide initiative that is managed by the Office of Public Affairs.

To date, DHS has expanded the campaign to States, cities, 9,000 Federal buildings across the United States, transportation systems, universities and institutes of higher education, professional and amateur sports leagues and teams, entertainment venues, some of the Nation's largest retailers, as well as local law enforcement. Most recently, DHS has partnered with sports leagues such as the National Football League, Major League Soccer, Major League Baseball, the National Basketball Association, National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Hockey League, NASCAR, U.S. Golf, and the U.S. Tennis Association, to promote public awareness of potential indicators of terrorism and terrorism-related crime at sporting events. To this end, the "If You See Something, Say Something™" campaign is now a regular fixture at the Super Bowl, NBA All-Star game, and other major sporting events.

Public Service Announcements (PSAs), including a Spanish language version, also have been distributed to television and radio stations across the country to promote the campaign's messages. We will continue to expand the campaign in the coming months and years to additional partners.

Ready.Gov and National Preparedness Month

Launched in February 2003, *Ready* is a National public service advertising campaign designed to educate and empower Americans to prepare for and respond to emergencies including natural and man-made disasters. The goal of the campaign is to get the public involved and ultimately to increase the level of basic preparedness across our Nation.

Ready and its Spanish language version, *Listo*, ask individuals, businesses, families, and children to do three key things: (1) Build an emergency supply kit, (2) make a family emergency plan, and (3) be informed about the different types of emergencies that could occur and their appropriate responses.

The campaign's messages have been distributed through television, radio, print, outdoor, and web (PSAs) developed and produced by The Advertising Council; brochures; the *www.Ready.gov* and *www.Listo.gov* websites; toll-free phone lines 1-800-BE-Ready and 1-888-SE-Listo; and partnerships with a wide variety of public and private-sector organizations.

In addition to the *Ready* campaign, DHS also highlights emergency preparedness through National Preparedness Month (NPM), held each September to encourage Americans to take simple steps to prepare for emergencies in their homes, businesses, and schools. In 2011, FEMA had a record number of nearly 9,000 NPM coalition members. By hosting events, promoting volunteer programs, and sharing emergency preparedness information, coalition members help ensure that their communities are prepared for emergencies.

Stop.Think.Connect

The "Stop.Think.Connect.TM" campaign is a National public awareness initiative designed to increase public understanding of cyber threats and how individual citizens can develop safer cyber habits that will protect themselves on-line and thus help make networks more secure. The campaign fulfills a key element of President Obama's 2009 Cyberspace Policy Review, which tasked DHS with developing a public awareness campaign to inform Americans about ways to use technology safely.

"Stop.Think.Connect.TM" includes cyber forums hosted in collaboration with the National Centers of Academic Excellence to bring together diverse groups of community, private, and Government participants for dialogues on cybersecurity issues; opportunities for members of the public to get involved by leading or hosting campaign activities; and a coalition for public and private-sector organizations. As part of the campaign, DHS launched and maintains a "Stop.Think.Connect.TM" website that provides a variety of free, downloadable resources and materials to help the public increase their safety and security on-line.

Each October, DHS also actively supports National Cybersecurity Awareness Month, a coordinated effort between the Department, the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and the National Cyber Security Alliance to raise awareness about the importance of cybersecurity and help Americans establish smart cyber habits that will lead to increased protection on-line.

DHS INCIDENT COMMUNICATIONS

The Office of Public Affairs has significant responsibilities in the event of a major domestic incident or crisis. The Secretary of Homeland Security is responsible for keeping the public informed during incidents requiring a coordinated Federal response. DHS coordinates Federal incident communications efforts, as stipulated in HSPD 5, with the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and other interagency partners, and supports the directly affected State(s), depending on the type of incident.

The DHS strategy synchronizes processes and information between a wide range of entities in order to inform the public and provide updates on the situation or ongoing threats, and, when applicable, response and recovery activities. In response to a terrorist threat or incident, DHS also coordinates public messaging with the Department of Justice, FBI, and other departments and agencies to ensure the accuracy of information and that the messaging appropriately safeguards on-going law enforcement activity.

Building on lessons learned from the 9/11 attacks and subsequent major National incidents, the Federal Government and DHS developed incident communications procedures within the National Response Plan (NRP) and its successor, the National Response Framework (NRF), to coordinate jointly and communicate with the American public.

This interagency communications effort involves synchronization of two key elements: Process and information coordination.

During an incident requiring a coordinated Federal response, our communications priorities are:

- Lifesaving and life-sustaining communications, in coordination with the State and local authorities;
- Timely and frequent information updates and public recommendations from the Secretary, Cabinet members, and security officials;
- Employment of risk communications and transparency to gain and maintain public confidence and trust; and
- Where necessary or appropriate, engagement and integration of non-Governmental organizations, faith-based communities, private-sector, media, other communications platforms to support public communications and allay concerns or potential bias against ethnic minorities in the United States.

FEDERAL INCIDENT COMMUNICATIONS PROCESSES AND MESSAGING

Pre-arranged interagency processes, pre-scripted messaging, and Federal standard operating procedures help support public communications response effort.

In 2008, DHS developed the first Domestic Communications Strategy, or DCS, to provide senior Federal communicators with public communications options for use during a domestic attack, serious threat, or other major incident. DHS also created Emergency Support Function 15 (ESF-15) for coordination of Federal external affairs within the overall NRF. ESF-15 brings unity of effort for Federal communicators during an incident requiring a coordinated Federal response. Once activated, ESF-15 provides the oversight and coordination for all Federal external affairs activities supporting an incident response in the field.

As part of this effort, DHS has developed pre-arranged communications protocols for information sharing and coordination with our key communications stakeholders and counterparts. These protocols are networks that form the backbone of our coordination efforts, and have been instrumental in achieving unity of effort during major domestic incidents and events. They provide the simplified means to coordinate with the right communicators at the right time.

We have three primary counterpart networks that include approximately 1,300 key communicators across the Nation. The networks are:

- The National Incident Communications Conference Line, or NICCL, which is used to coordinate communications with, the Federal Executive Branch interagency, the Capitol Police and Supreme Court, and directly affected State and local communicators;
- The State Incident Communications Conference Line, or SICCL, which is used to share information with State and local communications counterparts; and
- The Private Sector Communications Conference Line, or PICCL, which is used to share information with communicators for critical infrastructure or key resources.

These networks can be activated within minutes, subject to notification about an incident and determining there is a need for a call. They are also used to develop and distribute updated public information during an incident. The calls also help to coordinate or de-conflict activities by determining the following:

- Basic information on the incident and situation;
- Lead communications roles and authority, e.g., Federal or State and local;
- Communications plans and coordination actions in the hours and days following the incident; and
- Communications and public information activities.

Since 2003, DHS has conducted nearly 450 NICCL calls with our Federal, State, local, Tribal, and territorial partners to coordinate communications outreach in response to National incidents or events. The first use of the NICCL occurred in February 2003—1 month before DHS became fully operational—in response to the Space Shuttle Columbia disaster. This marked the first use of an incident communications conference line strategy by the Department. Since that time, the NICCL has been activated for a range of incidents, including the 2006 aviation security threat involving liquid explosives, the 2009 H1N1 flu pandemic, the “miracle on the Hudson” aviation water landing, the Christmas day bomb plot on Northwest Flight No. 253, the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, the 2010 Times Square plot, other security incidents, and a host of floods, tornadoes, wildfires, hurricanes, and other natural disasters.

In addition to these communications networks, DHS has developed supporting capabilities and planning resources for use during major incidents. For example, in major incidents or when required by the volume of communications, DHS can activate the National Joint Information Center or NJIC, a capability located within DHS headquarters that includes participants physically present as well as those

connected through virtual means, such as conference lines. The NJIC is a flexible resource that can incorporate any communicator to support an incident, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Through experience, we also know that communications activities in the first hours and follow-on phases of an attack or incident cannot be focused solely on the affected locations or attack sites. In security incidents or threats, we often say that “every incident can affect every State.” Therefore, authorities in other States and cities may need to take precautionary measures in another location. In such cases, the SICCL network and its ability to convey updates has proven extremely useful to our communications counterparts.

In addition, we fully recognize the significant effects of social media during a major incident. Twitter and other social media have the ability to widely communicate eyewitness accounts, accurate information, and rumors or misleading data. This will continue to present challenges and opportunities for communicators at all levels of government.

THE BOSTON MARATHON ATTACK

The attack in Boston on April 15, 2013 fully engaged the communications processes and capabilities DHS has put in place over the past 10 years. Within minutes of notification of the attack, the Office of Public Affairs began mobilizing its resources and our Federal incident communications processes.

DHS activated the NJIC within minutes, convened a NICCL call shortly after 3 p.m., and employed the DCS as our resource guide for communications options, including the sharing of key public information and updates.

The U.S. Attorney’s Office in Boston, FBI Boston Field Office, Massachusetts State Police, Boston Police Department, and the Suffolk County Sheriff’s Office served as the lead on-scene communicators and participated in NICCL calls. These calls, which included the Federal interagency, provided participants with a coordinated communications path in the immediate aftermath of the attack.

From April 15 to 19, the Office of Public Affairs:

- Conducted 3 NICCL calls with key Federal, State, and local communicators;
- Distributed 19 communications and coordination advisories or updates to NICCL, SICCL, and PICCL counterparts; and
- Conducted or supported approximately 80 percent of the options suggested in the Domestic Communications Strategy that applied to this particular situation.

CONCLUSION

Chairman Duncan and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Department’s public affairs activities. The DHS Office of Public Affairs is fully committed to communicating information to our many partners in a way that is timely, accurate, transparent, and helps maintain confidence in the Department’s work. I would be happy to answer your questions.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Jensen.

The Chairman will now recognize Ms. Kessler.

Am I pronouncing that right? “Kessler”?

Ms. KESSLER. Absolutely. “Kessler.”

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF TAMARA KESSLER, ACTING OFFICER FOR CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. KESSLER. Thank you.

Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and distinguished Members of the panel, I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to appear today as the acting officer for civil rights and civil liberties, which we call CRCL, within the Department of Homeland Security. At your request, my testimony will be about DHS’s engagement with diverse ethnic and religious communities.

Congress established the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties to assist the Secretary and the Department in periodically reviewing and developing policies and procedures to ensure the pro-

tection of civil rights and civil liberties and to make sure that they are appropriately incorporated into Department activities and programs. We also review and assess information concerning the abuses of civil rights, civil liberties, and profiling on the basis of race, ethnicity, or religion by employees and officials of the Department.

Both of these functions are improved by, and even depend on, our communication and engagement with diverse communities. Engaging communities, soliciting their views, explaining our policies, and seeking to address any complaints or grievances they may have is a basic part of good and responsible Government and is vital to the Department's mission.

Our community engagement efforts build crucial channels of communication, educating us about the concerns of communities affected by DHS activities and giving those communities reliable information about policies and procedures. The Department builds trust by facilitating resolution of legitimate grievances, while reinforcing a sense of shared American identity and community and demonstrating collective ownership of the homeland security project.

I thank you for the opportunity to share our work in this area.

CRCL devotes substantial effort to engage with diverse ethnic and religious communities, including American Arab, Muslim, Sikh, Southeast Asian, Latino, Jewish, and South Asian and many other interfaith communities, to help ensure that all these communities are active participants in the homeland security effort. We do so through community leader roundtables, youth roundtables, specific subject community town halls, and a rapid response communication network.

Over the past 8 years, CRCL has established regular community engagement roundtable meetings for community and Government leaders in 13 metropolitan cities: Houston; Chicago; Boston; Los Angeles; Minneapolis; Columbus, Ohio; Seattle; Atlanta; Tampa; Denver; New York; and Washington, DC. In addition, CRCL has developed relationships with Somali-American leaders in San Diego and Lewiston, Maine, and includes them in the regular roundtables where possible and in bimonthly community conference calls.

In addition to DHS components, Government participation also includes the U.S. Attorneys offices, the FBI, State and local law enforcement, and other Federal and local officials.

Government contact with diverse community leaders in the hours and days after a terrorist incident can be extraordinarily helpful because community leaders can calm tensions, share information with their communities, and perhaps assist law enforcement. Accordingly, my office has established the Incident Community Coordination Team, or ICCT. This conference-call mechanism connects Federal officials with key leaders in the event of a situation in which that contact would be productive.

During the most recent ICCT calls for the Boston bombings, approximately 180 community stakeholders representing various organizations, faith-based groups, and community affinities, participated. Most community participants were from the Boston area, but many joined the call from elsewhere in the country to hear

timely information from the U.S. Government and to provide information back from their communities.

In addition, CRCL conducts training for law enforcement personnel on cultural competency relating to diverse ethnicities, cultures, and religious practices. This kind of training is a precondition for honest communication and trust between officers and the communities they serve and protect.

Topics usually include misconceptions and stereotypes of Arab and Muslim cultures, diversity within Arab and Muslim communities, effective policing without using ethnic or racial profiling, and best-practices approach to community outreach and intervention. Much of this training is provided live, usually on site, to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials around the country.

In conclusion, frequent, responsive, and thoughtful engagement with the first communities is imperative to effective Government. Such engagement gathers and shares information, builds trust, informs policy, and enables prompt response to legitimate grievances and needs.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today, and I welcome your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kessler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TAMARA KESSLER

JUNE 14, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and distinguished Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today as the acting officer for civil rights and civil liberties (CRCL) for the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS). At your request, my testimony will be about DHS's engagement with diverse ethnic and religious communities.

Congress established the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, to, among other things, "assist the Secretary, directorates, and offices of the Department to develop, implement, and periodically review Department policies and procedures to ensure that the protection of civil rights and civil liberties is appropriately incorporated into Department programs and activities," and to "review and assess information concerning abuses of civil rights, civil liberties, and profiling on the basis of race, ethnicity, or religion, by employees and officials of the Department." 6 U.S.C. § 345(a). Both of these functions are improved by—even depend upon—our engagement with diverse communities.

Engaging communities—soliciting their views, explaining our policies, and seeking to address any complaints or grievances they may have—is a basic part of good and responsible Government and is vital to the Department's mission.

Our community engagement efforts build crucial channels of communication, educating us about the concerns of communities affected by DHS activities and giving those communities reliable information about policies and procedures. The Department builds trust by facilitating resolution of legitimate grievances, while reinforcing a sense of shared American identity and community, and demonstrating the collective ownership of the homeland security project. I thank you for the opportunity to share with you our work in this area.

THE DHS OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL) carries out four key functions to integrate civil rights and civil liberties into Department activities:

- Advising Department leadership, personnel, and partners about civil rights and civil liberties issues, ensuring respect for civil rights and civil liberties in policy decisions and implementation of those decisions.
- Communicating with individuals and communities whose civil rights and civil liberties may be affected by Department activities, informing them about policies and avenues of redress, and promoting appropriate attention within the Department to their experiences and concerns.

- Investigating and resolving civil rights and civil liberties complaints filed by the public.
- Leading the Department's equal employment opportunity programs and promoting personnel diversity and merit system principles.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

CRCL devotes substantial effort to engage with diverse ethnic and religious communities including American Arab, Muslim, Sikh, Southeast Asian, Latino, Jewish, South Asian, and other including interfaith communities helping to ensure that all communities in this country are active participants in the homeland security effort. Many other DHS offices also conduct outreach to these communities. For example, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), has held Naturalization Information Sessions in these communities, and has published its guide "Welcome to the United States" in 14 languages, officials from the Office of Policy and the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs have met repeatedly with members of these communities as well. However, CRCL is the Office within DHS that conducts the most extensive regular community engagement effort involving the many diverse communities across the Nation through several types of regular events or programs: Community leader roundtables; youth roundtables; subject-specific community town halls; and a rapid response communication network. CRCL has developed sophisticated mechanisms for engagement including many best practices to ensure productive communication and dialogue both with the community and within the Federal Government.

Roundtables.—Over the past 8 years, CRCL has established or managed regular community engagement roundtable meetings for community and Government leaders in 13 metropolitan areas across the country: Houston, Chicago, Boston, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Columbus (Ohio), Seattle, Atlanta, Central Florida (Tampa), Denver, New York City, and Washington, DC. In addition, CRCL has developed relationships with Somali American leaders in San Diego, and Lewiston (Maine), and includes them in the regular roundtables where possible and in bi-monthly community conference calls.

These roundtable events include DHS components relevant to the issues placed on the agenda by our community partners, most often U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Government participation also includes U.S. Attorneys' Offices, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), State and local law enforcement, and other Federal and local officials.

The roundtables cover a range of homeland security, civil rights, and other areas including rules governing remittances to foreign relatives; immigration and naturalization policies; access to information about basic Government services in different languages; roles and responsibilities of law enforcement; detention of National security suspects; how Government can work with communities to promote civic engagement; services for newly-arrived refugees; crime prevention; how communities can work with Government to counter violent extremism; protection of civil rights in employment, voting, housing, and other areas; prosecution of hate crimes; and border searches among others.

The meetings provide opportunities for community leaders to set the agenda, learn about significant Government policies, as well as to raise specific issues of concern in a format that emphasizes accountability for answers—the Government participants will be back again the following quarter or communicate in the interim. For our engagement efforts to be sustainable, it is important that the grievances of these communities be heard by policy decision makers, so we collect inquiries and issues from the communities and encourage participation of senior Department leadership, and CRCL keeps them apprised of the impact of DHS policy and operations.

An example is our engagement efforts related to DHS immigration and border security policies. We hold quarterly meetings with a broad-based non-governmental organization (NGO) coalition of National civil rights and immigrant-rights organizations; have established an inter-agency Immigrant Worker Roundtable to bring together DHS components, other Federal agencies, and NGOs; and facilitate an immigration Incident Coordination Call, which provides immigrant community leaders with vital information about CBP and ICE enforcement posture during emergencies. In the past it has been used only to prevent loss of life by encouraging immigrant communities to evacuate dangerous areas during hurricanes by alleviating undue fear of enforcement.

We also participate in engagement activities of other DHS components; over the past several months, for example, my staff served as the designated facilitators for subject-specific stakeholder meetings about CBP's Language Assistance Policies

with local law enforcement agencies in the Pacific Northwest and spearheaded Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and Community Engagement training for local law enforcement and diverse communities.

Youth roundtables.—CRCL has hosted four “Roundtables on Security and Liberty” in Washington, DC; Houston; and Los Angeles to connect with 150 young leaders ages 18–25 from American Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian communities. These events offer opportunities for youth to share their thoughts with senior DHS leadership and for Government officials to learn from a population whose perspectives are invaluable to homeland security efforts. Additionally, CRCL has hosted three similar youth town halls with Somali youth groups in Minneapolis and Columbus; events attended by the U.S. Attorneys and coordinated with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement and other officials.

Incident Community Coordination Team.—Government contact with diverse community leaders in the hours and days after an incident can be extraordinarily helpful, because community leaders can calm tensions, share information with their communities, and perhaps assist law enforcement. Accordingly, my office has established the Incident Community Coordination Team (ICCT). This conference call mechanism connects Federal officials with key leaders in the event of a situation in which contact would be productive. DHS participant components and offices include TSA, ICE, CBP, USCIS, the Office of Public Affairs, and the Office of Intelligence & Analysis. We are also joined when relevant by the White House Office of Public Engagement, the DOJ Civil Rights Division, the FBI, the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), and the Department of State, among others. Community participants include representatives of National organizations, community leaders from key cities, and religious and cultural scholars.

Our ICCT has been used 11 times since we established it in 2006, and has been an effective device in several ways:

- It allows participating agencies to get community leaders the information they need in the aftermath of an incident. The information shared—which is not classified or restricted—is valuable because of its reliability and timeliness.
- It gives community leaders a channel to speak to Federal officials in a timely and effective way. They can share reactions to Governmental policies or enforcement actions, and provide information about hate crimes that should be investigated, about the mood of communities in the aftermath of a homeland security incident and, possibly, about how the Government might improve its effectiveness in investigating the incident.
- It facilitates development of a common understanding about the messages that Government and community leaders will send to these communities, the country, and the world.

The ICCT has convened following: The London arrests in August 2006, the Ft. Dix and JFK arrests in June 2007, the London and Glasgow terror attacks in late June 2007, the release of the National Intelligence Estimate in July 2007, the Fort Hood shootings in November 2009, and the December 25, 2009 Northwest Airlines bombing attempt. In 2011, the ICCT was activated to address the death of Osama bin Laden and the tenth anniversary of the September 11 attacks. In 2012, it was activated in the aftermath of the attack on the Sikh Gurdwara (Temple) in Oak Creek, Wisconsin. In 2013, it was activated twice in 1 week following the Boston Marathon terrorist attacks.

During the most recent ICCT calls for the Boston bombings, approximately 180 community stakeholders representing various organizations, faith-based groups and community affinities participated. Most community participants were from the Boston area, but many joined the call from elsewhere in the country to hear timely information from the U.S. Government and to provide information back from their communities.

The U.S. Attorney from Boston, Carmen Ortiz, and officials from DHS, including from CBP, TSA, ICE HSI, ICE ERO, joined the call. Other officials from the FBI, the National Counterterrorism Center, and elsewhere in the administration also joined the call.

All Government partners updated community participants on the nature of the on-going investigation and also provided resources such as community hotline information and points of contact in case community members wished to report instances of retaliation or backlash violence in the wake of the Boston attack.

Community stakeholders engaged in a robust Q&A session asking questions about DHS’ various alert mechanisms and offered feedback on how Government and law enforcement agencies could better manage public messaging as events continue to unfold. Terminology and messaging was also a focus of the discussion.

CRCL has since received specific follow-ups on this issue from community stakeholders in a number of cities Nation-wide and will have this topic on the agenda at all upcoming community engagement roundtables and other follow-up meetings.

FACILITATING LOCAL ENGAGEMENT

There are millions of American Arab, Muslim, Sikh, Southeast Asian, Latino, Jewish, South Asian, and other including interfaith communities, living in thousands of towns and cities across the Nation. By necessity, Governmental engagement with these and other diverse communities has to be local.

CRCL conducts training for law enforcement personnel on cultural competency relating to diverse ethnicities, cultures, and religious practices. This kind of training is a precondition for honest communication and trust between officers and the communities they serve and protect. Topics include: Misconceptions and stereotypes of Arab and Muslim cultures; diversity within Arab and Muslim communities; effective policing without the use of ethnic or racial profiling; and a best-practices approach to community interaction and outreach. Much of this training is provided live, usually on-site, to Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials around the country.

It is worth noting, in addition, that it is our community partners—reliably informed by engagement activities about Government policy and practices, and consistently empowered by those same engagement activities to highlight for policymakers their experiences, concerns, and grievances and to obtain reasonable responses—who bear the responsibility to counter violent extremist ideologies that subvert their values and may pave a path for young people towards violence. Extremist beliefs, after all, are protected by the Constitution. Our proper sphere of concern and intervention is violence, not extremism.

CIVIL LIBERTIES ENGAGEMENT

As particular topics warrant civil liberties considerations, CRCL reaches out to obtain the views of leading civil liberties advocates. In particular, when a new DHS program, activity, or policy change leads to concerns from the public on civil liberties, CRCL makes an effort to engage with its civil liberties partners for feedback. For example, CRCL has discussed its training for fusion center personnel and its recently-published civil liberties impact assessment on the DHS support to fusion centers with civil liberties organizations. We participated in a forum on fusion centers hosted by the Constitution Project and invited the ACLU and the Constitution Project to address all fusion center privacy officers at a DHS-led conference. CRCL and the DHS Privacy Office have recently begun bi-weekly Cybersecurity Engagement Meetings to discuss the new Cybersecurity Executive Order. On other topics, ranging from Unmanned Aerial Systems to border searches of electronic devices, CRCL has maintained an open-door policy for discussing the concerns of civil liberties specialists.

CONCLUSION

DHS envisions a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards, and where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive. The American way of life prominently includes our cherished civil rights and civil liberties. Even so, our Department—and the Federal Government as a whole—cannot possibly do all that needs to be done in this area of endeavor. States and local governments are beginning to become active in this area, and some are doing terrific work. We must promote more local efforts, by modeling constructive engagement; providing in-person and scalable training and training materials; coordinating community-oriented activities; and promulgating community engagement best practices. We need to ensure that our State, local, and Tribal partners have the knowledge, methods, skills, and resources to productively engage their communities.

Frequent, responsive, and thoughtful engagement with diverse communities is an imperative of effective Government. Such engagement gathers and shares information, builds trust, informs policy, and enables prompt response to legitimate grievances and needs.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify today. I welcome your questions.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you.

The Chairman will now recognize himself for 5 minutes for questioning.

The delay to get the truth out really feeds the fire of distrust, so I am going to focus on that for just a minute.

DHS's ammunition and MRAP purchases and incidents of TSA's security officers at screening checkpoints—it seems the Department would simply not answer questions from certain groups of people. So how does DHS decide which issues to engage in? Why can't the DHS be more proactive in responding to questions from the public?

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you for that question, Chairman Duncan.

I think you are absolutely right, in the sense that there is the requirement to respond to important issues. Specifically on the ammo issue, we could have done a better job.

That said, when asked about responding, we make it a point—and with that ammo issue, we responded to every single media and blog inquiry that came to us. I know that they took a little bit of time to get the accurate information, to make sure what we put out was factually correct, but we did respond to every media inquiry.

I also understand that my colleagues in Legislative Affairs provided every Congressional office that asked them for information on it with that information. I noticed that on Senator Coburn's website that he actually posted the response on there, which I think is a very good thing for us and also very helpful to all of you, because you need to show your constituency what the information is from DHS.

Can we do better? Yes. We are always looking at ways to improve our processes. We want to take things that I call "lessons identified" and make them lessons learned. That is something that, for example, I was brought into the Department to try and do, to put a little bit of infrastructure into how we do things and to do a better job of making our processes and procedures across the Department more consistent.

Mr. DUNCAN. Just going back to the ammo thing for just a second, when the story first broke that there was this huge procurement contract, there was at least a 3-month delay, from my recollection and doing a little research, on that.

So when we went out to FLETC recently, we had this conversation with DHS officials about this ammo purchase. I asked at that time about the contract, and I was told it was a 70-million-round contract over a 5-year period of time. But in my questioning of that, I also found out that, well, FLETC isn't the only procurement agency, that ICE actually has a procurement contract as well.

So I requested at that time for a copy of the request for proposal to the ammo companies to provide the ammo and a copy of the 5-year contract from every procurement agency or sub-agency that has the ability to procure ammo. I also wanted to see the last 5-year contract so I could compare and see if it is out of whack from what we had done in the past. Because I think the American people need to know the facts and they can deal with the facts. Let's just be honest with them. I think we have a responsibility there.

That was on May 23. Are the copiers broken at DHS? Because we haven't received that yet. That is almost a month, coming up. So I throw that out there.

Then I want to just shift gears, because earlier this year the media reported about an aggressive TSA pat-down of a young child who was wheelchair-bound and heading to Disney World with her family. Now, this video incident was heartbreaking. It quickly went

viral across the internet. TSA later apologized but blamed ineffective guidance for the incident.

What would DHS do differently if this was to occur again in, specifically, communicating with the American people? Why does it seem so difficult for the Department to relate to the traveling public's frustration and concerns on a human level?

I go back to my opening statement. We still prescribe to the innocent-until-proven-guilty concept, but Americans don't feel that way. When they go through TSA, they feel like they are guilty of something, they feel like they are being accused of something when they have to go through an invasive TSA screening.

So when we see instances like this child being, you know, aggressively patted down, and all she wanted to do was go to Disney World, it is heart-wrenching, but we can relate to that because we may have seen that personally or we may have gone through something like that.

So I go back to the question: What would you do differently if this were to occur again? How can you relate differently to the American people about TSA screening?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, sir, I think that we want to make sure that folks know that TSA's No. 1 concern is safety of the traveling public and that our security procedures are constantly evolving as our adversaries are trying to get around the security, you know, systems that we have in place.

One of the things I know that they are trying to do is they are trying to evolve that security system so they have a balance between the security—we have a multilayered security system—and making the experience better for the traveling public. We totally understand that it is not always a nice experience.

If that happened again, obviously we need to ask more than just what we are going to say about it. What was the cause for our TSA officers not to have the correct training? That is not necessarily a public affairs issue; it is a training issue. But it definitely was the right thing to do to apologize publicly. I think we would always make sure that we let the public know when we are not doing something right, because there is no reason to try and make an excuse for something that is inexcusable.

I do want to say again that, overall, TSA has millions of travelers every day going through without incident, and there will be, unfortunately, incidents at times, which doesn't excuse it, but we need to make sure we are clear with the public on what we are doing and why we are doing it.

I think something that usually comes up is: What can I or can I not, you know, bring onto a plane? That is another issue that comes up. I think we have done a pretty good job of having an app, a TSA app, that I think has gotten pretty good reviews that tells people what they can and can't bring. It is also on our website, as well.

So, again, we are just trying to look at moving away from a one-size-fits-all approach, which is what we started off with, and we are trying to evolve it to where we balance out the risks and focus more on those families we know less about. Those that we do, we need to, for example, change the rules in making sure little kids

don't have to take off shoes. Just, how do we evolve that so it is a better experience for the public.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, I appreciate that. Being proactive in a communication realm is much better than being reactive. I want to encourage you to do that.

I go back to the social media aspect. It is a great way to communicate proactively. In a time of emergency, it is a different ball game. I understand you are tweeting now and are putting out things to allow folks to understand where to go, how to react, where they can get help. But on an on-going basis.

Ms. Kessler, going back to the TSA screening, because of the civil liberties issue there, how would you respond to that incident of the wheelchair-bound child heading to Disney World and her civil liberties and what DHS or TSA did?

Ms. KESSLER. Well, we get complaints like that frequently, and the normal response is to check whether the policy needs to be redone and the SOP needs to be redone in terms of how procedures are put in place for searching of people in wheelchairs. I, myself, have a daughter in a wheelchair, and I travel frequently and try and educate the TSA agents as I go through, and generally have a very good experience.

We have put a number of things in place, including there is a TSA Cares line, where people with disabilities or any kind of special vulnerabilities that will affect their travel can call in advance and talk through what will happen and how it will work and, if they have any special needs, how they would arrange them with the airlines.

But we do see quite a few of these cases, all different kinds of allegations from people with disabilities. Most of them result in more training and a review of the policy to make sure that it is really going to be helpful for whatever kind of person comes through when you are dealing with the general public.

Mr. DUNCAN. All right. Well, thank you for that.

I could ask questions about Chewbacca, the Wookiee, and his cane and the lightsaber and all that other stuff, but I am going to reserve that. I won't go there.

My time is up, so I will yield to Mr. Barber for questioning.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to those questions. I am intrigued.

Mr. Jensen, let me just make a comment and then ask you some questions.

As I said in my opening statements, I strongly believe the Federal Government has a major responsibility to effectively communicate and be transparent with the public. I understand that within the Department of Homeland Security there are some issues that have to be kept closer to the chest, in terms of, you know, protecting our ability to secure the Nation and the safety of its citizens.

But, having said that, I want to ask you a little bit about how it is that the Department's headquarters coordinates at component-level offices. Because I think this is where I see the breakdown occurring. For example, the ICE detainee released. For CBP, for example, I thought the misplaced email, which was given to the re-

porter by someone in the Department who obviously didn't like the tone that it was establishing.

So how does the Department headquarters coordinate with component-level offices to ensure continuity of messaging? Who has the final say in the components or headquarters on what will be disseminated to the public? How does the flow of communication work within the Department?

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you for that question, Ranking Member Barber.

There are multiple ways that we coordinate. On a daily tactical level, we have calls with all the component media offices, in which we are sharing what is going to go out that day, what events are happening, and what are the expected press releases. On a longer-range basis, we look in terms of strategic communications, strategic planning, and we try and look out, you know, weeks, months in advance to see what is coming up. Many times, we do know what is coming up, because we are the ones who are pushing the new policies and, you know, are working on the messaging for that.

In terms of how the components work, okay, most of the subject-matter experts in the programs that are being operational are at the component level. So they are putting together the first talking points, public affairs guidance in the plans that are going to go out, and then that floats up to the headquarters, where we review it. What we are trying to review for is making sure that it is consistent with what our headquarters policy is, because the policy is for the entire Department, and making sure that the messaging is consistent.

The final say does come from the headquarters, in terms of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, which doesn't mean that that is the end. I mean, if there is a disagreement, I guarantee you that the administrators of the different components will speak up and raise the issue, and there has been discussions about how we do things.

One of the things that I think is important to note is that—and I think you kind of bring it up in terms of policies and procedures and standard operating procedures, that—again, that is one of the reasons I was brought into FEMA, when I first came to FEMA, was to put those SOPs in place. I am trying to do the same thing at the headquarters, in terms of our training of all of our component public affairs offices.

There does not exist now a DHS-wide training strategy. I am putting that together, along with a DHS public affairs workforce development plan so that we actually know how many public affairs officers we have, what skill levels, you know, what do they need to be able to do.

That training strategy, along with the recruiting, retention, and leadership development plan, are going to be part of that. Again, that doesn't exist now. We are working on that. I have a group that includes senior representatives from all the components to come together and have a say and have input.

Another way that we are trying to do things is that—many of our issues go across the Department. So, for example, cybersecurity, every component has a little piece of that. So, many times, a component might be focused on one program, and we need to make

sure that whatever they are saying fits what the entire Department is doing.

So, to do that, we created a cross-Department steering committee that has representatives, both policy and subject-matter experts as well as communicators, to create a “One DHS” communication strategy for cybersecurity. That way, all of the components have that. They have a starting point, which doesn’t mean that that is the only thing people can say, but it is a starting point, and it is a common messaging across the Department.

We probably need to do a lot more of that. That is one of the things that we are seeing as we mature the agency.

Mr. BARBER. I appreciate that. It sounds like very important and hopefully successful steps are being taken.

From what I have seen—and I think most of us would agree with this—what was done in FEMA was really an exceptional piece of work. Progress was made there, in terms of communicating effectively at a time when people really need it more than just about other time. So I wish you success with bringing the same kind of coordinated and rapid communication and messaging to the public.

Let me—you know, FEMA is a great example of how it works. You said, I think, your Department is responsible for the protocols agency-wide now?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BARBER. Okay.

Let me turn to Ms. Kessler.

First of all, I want to commend you and your office for what it is trying to do and what it is doing, actually, to engage with minority groups that otherwise might be treated poorly, I think, at the local level or sometimes at a National level. We don’t need to demonize people because of the actions of extremists that might be part of that general community, and I appreciate what you are doing.

TSA has a program where 2,800 staff are involved, I believe, in airport scanning/screening of people. They kind of float around, I am told. They are essentially, it seems to me, profiling—I don’t know if there is a better word to describe it—to pick out people who might be suspicious.

How does the work of your office intersect or interact or coordinate with that? Isn’t it somewhat at cross-purposes?

Ms. KESSLER. Well, the program is actually the behavioral detection officers, and it is called the SPOT program. My office has been very involved in ensuring that the way that the officers are trained is appropriate, that the factors—they have sort of a point system—that the factors that trigger suspicion are appropriate, that they are not based on race or ethnicity, that they are based on behaviors, suspicious behaviors, and not who you are but how you are acting.

So we have had quite a bit of oversight on that program, including revamping their policies, helping TSA to revamp their policies and currently helping them to revamp the training.

There was an incident in Boston, as you know, that was reported in *The New York Times* about some of the actual officers up there complaining. That is under investigation by the Inspector General, currently under investigation still.

But we have been working in the mean time, at the Secretary's request, to ensure that the program is very carefully structured with a lot of oversight.

Mr. BARBER. Well, I didn't appreciate it until you said it, that your office is helping to train those officers. I think that is well-taken.

I just want to say in closing—and we will hopefully have second round for the other questions—that I really commend the Department for how it has handled communication with the public. In natural disaster Sandy, it worked very well; Boston bombing, very well. I just want to make sure that we apply those approaches and those techniques and that coordination to the day-to-day communication with the public.

We should never have found out about the detainee release from the newspapers. We should never have found out, as Members of Congress, about the proposed knife policy on airlines from the media. I mean, these things have to be improved.

Personally, I want to see the Department succeed. I very much believe in its mission, particularly the Border Security and Customs piece of it. Just, you need to work more closely with us to make sure that we are armed with the information we need to be proactive and effective in supporting the men and women who do this difficult job.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Barber.

The Chairman will now recognize the Chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the witnesses for being here today.

I think it has been said, the essence of America's greatness is our goodness. I certainly share the Ranking Member's concerns and I think what makes us a great country is that we respect the rights and dignity and freedom of all people. But the concern I hear when I go home a lot is: Are we going too far? Are we allowing political correctness to get in the way of our ability to keep ourselves safe?

One example I would cite, just to sort of ask, I guess, Ms. Kessler or either one who would like to respond, your take on this, but I saw in media reports a 2011 countering violent extremist training video that, Ms. Kessler, your office I believe put out, that suggested do's and don'ts when organizing CVE, cultural awareness for counterterrorism training.

One of the suggested don'ts was, "Don't use training that equates radical thought, religious expression, freedom to protest, or other Constitutionally-protected activity, including disliking the U.S. Government, with being violent." That was a quote.

Yet media reports have indicated that Tamerlan Tsarnaev, one of the suspects in the Boston bombing, made extremist outbursts at his mosque that upset the folks there enough that they said something about it. But, on the other hand, DHS pleads with the public, you know, "If You See Something, Say Something."

So I wonder if, you know, on the one hand folks are being told, ignore this kind of language, and then on the other hand we are telling the public, if you hear this type of thing, let us know. You

know, are we sending mixed messages? Are we erring too far in one direction or the other? I would love to hear your thoughts on that.

Ms. KESSLER. I think that is a great question.

I think the “See Something, Say Something” campaign is really focused on behaviors as opposed to speech and as opposed to appearances. So we have worked hard to make sure that it really is aimed at not profiling people and not putting people into categories based on who they are.

It is true that I think it is very important in the context of countering violent extremism that there is a differentiation between speech and activities. We talk all the time about radicalization to violence, rather than just radicalization. Because it is part of the American tradition that people are allowed to express their thoughts and feelings even if we don’t agree with them.

So part of this is not to control thought and it is not to tamp down the ability to express that thought, but to watch for when it crosses the line, when behavior starts to indicate that there might be a bigger problem than just the philosophical opinion of that person.

Mr. HUDSON. So in the example I was asking about specifically, where you have someone in a mosque whose radical speech alarms those in the mosque, who are of the same culture, of the same religious background, how do you weigh that sort of information?

Ms. KESSLER. For most of our work, we really focus on empowering the community to be able to take care of that internally so that they recognize the signs and that they know that they can come to Government. So, building that community of trust by holding our roundtables and doing very targeted engagement and very intense engagement with groups in the cities that we have chosen.

We feel that we are giving them a feeling of being integrated into the community rather than ostracized, and that that feeling of integration, the feeling that they have someone to go to and to talk with about these issues, is a really good thing, in the sense of them being able to take their own internal steps to prevent these kinds of problems.

Mr. HUDSON. All right.

Well, I have a little over a minute left. I guess I will direct a question to Mr. Jensen.

As was alluded to, you know, we have just gone through this process of removing items from the prohibited items list. I think we can all agree the process was broken. There are good folks on both sides of the issue of whether those items should have been removed from the list, whether that was a good move for risk-based security. I happen to think there is a way to do that safely and it was a smart move.

But, as my colleague said, I learned about it in the media. If we had had—and, obviously, I have talked to the administrator about this—and, you know, given us a little more time in advance to process these decisions, give feedback, it puts us in a position to defend things we agree with much better. But I think, also, that part of the larger point is the stakeholders not being included in the front end on this decision.

You know, I hope that from your point of view and the Department’s point of view, that was a mistake that we can learn from.

I would love to hear from you, Mr. Jensen, sort of what lessons were learned from that, the “knife flip-flop,” it is being called.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, sir.

Yeah, we definitely could have done that a little bit better, and I think that has been acknowledged. My understanding is that stakeholders were engaged before the announcement of the proposal to change the policy. Again, it was just looking for a way to evolve the policy, to move away from this one-size-fits-all.

But at the point that this came out, before it was enacted, TSA decided to have a pause, and then they re-engaged their stakeholders, including the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, law enforcement officials, passenger advocates, et cetera, and, based on their feedback and concerns, made the decision not to change the policy.

So, again, the point here is that—

Mr. HUDSON. Well, if I could interrupt you, I am way out of time—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the leeway—but I think that the statement that stakeholders were involved in the front end is not factual. I know you have a different role, and maybe—

Mr. JENSEN. Sure.

Mr. HUDSON [continuing]. This is something you may want to look at a little closer, but the stakeholders were not included in the front end. Again, I am someone who supported the policy. I think it was a smart move from a risk-based standpoint. But to say stakeholders were engaged in the front end is just simply not true.

I think, if you will take a look at that, there are some lessons that need to be learned. Because, from my point of view, we need to move towards more risk-based. I think the administrator and the Secretary are exactly right. I want to support that. But if we are going to ever be about to remove anything from that prohibited items list, we need to do a better job on the front end of involving stakeholders and doing it the right way so that people understand why we are doing what we do.

So I would just, since I am completely out of time, would just ask you to please take that into consideration going forward.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely. I think you are exactly right, sir.

Mr. HUDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leeway.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you.

The Chairman now recognizes the gentleman from south Texas, Mr. O'Rourke, for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess my question is for Ms. Kessler.

How do we communicate with people who are crossing into the United States? The instance that I am most interested in, across our Southern Border from Mexico. In El Paso alone, we have 6 million crossings a year. The majority of those crossers are primarily speaking Spanish; in many cases, they only speak Spanish.

What are we doing to effectively communicate with this population, who are customers of our bridges, who are in many ways keeping our economy alive in El Paso and throughout the State of Texas and this country?

Ms. KESSLER. Well, a good example of this recently has been with the unaccompanied alien children. We have been creating videos to be played in Central America, where most of them are com-

ing from now. It is much slower on Mexicans and much higher on Central Americans. We have the “dangers of the crossing” video, which has, I think, been effective in people understanding how dangerous this can be. For the children, doing a real outreach project on them understanding what could happen to them on the journey and the fact that they may end up in HHS custody if they cross.

We have also been doing a lot of different videos for the children after they are in custody. A lot of them actually come across the border and turn themselves in because of the stress of the journey. Those kind of videos help them to know what will happen to them after they come into custody.

So I think there is more and more outreach to discuss both the dangers of coming and the process once you are in it.

Mr. O’ROURKE. We have heard in previous hearings that, you know, somewhere close to 99 percent of those who are crossing our ports of entry into the United States are crossing for legitimate purposes, have the appropriate documentation, and, again, are huge net contributors to our economy and to our communities.

How are we communicating with that population?

Ms. KESSLER. I think the Secretary has been very strong on the efficiencies at the border and trying to make sure that people really understand that the border is open for business. There has been quite a bit of outreach—I think Mr. Jensen can speak to you better than I can—on the fact that we want to smooth people’s transition and that the economy is the border is very valuable.

Mr. O’ROURKE. But before Mr. Jensen takes that question, I want to follow up on something that the Chairman said, you know, that many at airports going through the TSA process feel like there is a presumption that they are guilty until proven innocent. I will tell you that the people who are using our ports of entry coming into our community, the community I represent in El Paso, Texas, feel that same way.

In many cases, they have been waiting—it was 106 degrees in El Paso yesterday—they have been waiting hours in the heat, on foot, on these bridges to cross in. Many times, when they get to the front of that line, they feel as though they are harassed and don’t often feel like they can pursue that harassment or that mistreatment because they have already been waiting for hours, they want to get into the community and do their business, go to school, you know, reach their destination.

How are we communicating with that population about the recourse that they have if they feel like they have been treated unfairly, they have had their civil liberties violated? What is the plan there?

Ms. KESSLER. Well, currently, we are working on a—I think it will end up to be a brochure and possibly a poster that would be in the ports of entry called “Know Your Rights and Responsibilities,” which would really lay out what happens in the process, what is appropriate, what is inappropriate, and where you can file a complaint.

Mr. O’ROURKE. Then for Mr. Jensen, related to that, the CBP officers, the Border Patrol agents have among the toughest jobs in public service and some of the most dangerous jobs in public serv-

ice. So I understand how difficult that is, to strike that balance between security and mobility and ensuring that we are respecting people's Constitutional rights and their civil liberties.

But what are we doing internally to communicate the fact that 99-percent-plus of these travelers are traveling for legitimate purposes, have legitimate documentation, and that, while we should ensure that we are securing the border, that we have more of a welcoming posture? These are customers; these are, in many cases, U.S. citizens returning back into the country.

What is the internal communication strategy to make sure that we do a better job going forward?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I know that, you know, for any organization, the internal workforce is one of our main areas that we need to have a better communication effort on. You are exactly right, in the sense that they need to understand what our posture is and the fact that, you know, our job is to be welcoming.

I know that we are doing a lot right now—in fact, this afternoon I am going to be working with our colleagues in Canada. I am part of a “Beyond the Border” announcement that is coming out. We are looking at ways to streamline the trusted traveler program.

I think it really comes down to better training, which is not necessarily a public affairs viewpoint; that is a training viewpoint. But we certainly, in public affairs, in our internal communications, whether it is on our intranet, which is called Connect, whether it is through employee messaging, whether it is through other means, that we can help support that training and help support that mindset among our workforce.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Thank you.

Mr. DUNCAN. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman will now recognize Mr. Payne from New Jersey for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say that I know, with our busy schedules here in the halls of Congress, I was a little concerned about the absence of Members on the other side. I was hoping it wasn't because of the baseball game last night and the 22-nothing score.

Mr. DUNCAN. Congratulations on that. I hope it wasn't either, but thank you.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you.

I want to first say thank you to the Department of Homeland Security, in particular FEMA, for its incredible response to Hurricane Sandy. By and large, I am very pleased with the response in New Jersey during that terrible disaster. Nevertheless, you know, I continue to keep my eye on the response efforts. There are still really too many families that are homeless in New Jersey, along with small businesses that have not yet received the help they need to get running again.

But I do want to recognize DHS for its response efforts. They seem to get better and better with each unfortunate event. This continued improvement tells me that the Department is doing a good job learning from each disaster. So I want to thank you, your Department, for the good work.

Having said that, Mr. Jensen, I would ask that you please describe in depth the DHS's communications response and strategy

during Hurricane Sandy, including traditional communication, social media and efforts alike. Also, could you please educate me and the subcommittee on what strategies and outreach efforts worked and what didn't work?

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Congressman, for that question. I appreciate the kudos to FEMA.

I absolutely believe that FEMA has done a really good job and has learned a lot of lessons after Katrina, not least of which surrounded communication. One of the biggest things that we learned out of Katrina is that we needed to combine all of the external communication efforts into one. They created the external affairs office, of which I was acting director before I moved up to headquarters at DHS.

What this does is this makes sure that, when we are communicating with Congress, intergovernmental, with the States and local, with the private sector, which we hadn't done very well before Katrina, and our communities, interfaith, faith-based organizations, et cetera, that it was all in one organization so there was coordinated, integrated, and synchronized messaging and that it was all consistent. That was one of the biggest lessons learned out of that.

I think that was part of why there was success there in New York and New Jersey and all throughout the areas impacted by Sandy. Because the biggest thing that we found out is that any communication plan that is media-centric is not going to work, because the media, traditional media, has lost audience. With the explosion of social media, of course, video-on-demand, on-line streaming, everyone has a greater choice, and the sources of information that people have is bigger today than it ever has been.

I mean, for example, if you look at the combined audience for the three nightly news for ABC, NBC, and CBS, it is only about 22 million, average, right? Which means that the other 300 million people in America aren't watching it or they are watching something else or they are not watching anything at all, right? So that is just a small example of the challenges that we face in, not only Government, but I think the corporate world, the business world, is facing that same exact challenge.

That is what we learned, that we had to not be media-centric. We needed to look at all channels of communication, and we needed to be consistent.

So, in New York, I think what happened, we used the Whole Community approach. I give a great deal of credit to Craig Fugate, Administrator Fugate, and the folks at FEMA for changing their culture and really embracing this Whole Community approach, in which we are providing information to community leaders, faith-based, the private sector, as well as media and using social media itself. So we have to look at the entire spectrum of media channels, of the way people get information.

Oh, by the way, using those local leaders who are trusted leaders. Sometimes groups might not trust us, but they will trust their local leaders. That is a really important thing that we have learned that we are doing.

We also needed to plan up-front to work much harder to reach what I call the traditionally underserved populations—the multi-

lingual, the multicultural, the disability community, the disadvantaged. We knew going in there that we had to do a better job. So, for example, I led in New York. I had 143 languages I had to deal with. I had a great deal of diversity across the city there in New York. Then we merged what we were doing with New Jersey, because the media markets were the same. So we had to use a wide range of channels to reach all those populations.

I did not have the ability to translate everything into 143 languages, which did not mean I didn't have the responsibility. I had the absolute responsibility for reaching out. So we did. We used every means we could, whether it was—we did reach out to multilingual media. We translated things into 20 languages. I created a second toll-free number because of feedback from the multilingual community that they weren't able to get through on the main number or they didn't understand.

Of course, we used the private sector, including minority groups like the Chinese American Business Association, to reach out in every way we could to reach all those people.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you.

I know my time is up. I did have a question for Ms. Kessler, if—

Mr. DUNCAN. Go ahead.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because Mr. Jensen answered my first and second question, so—thank you.

Ms. Kessler, due to either the actual or perceived fears, many racial and ethnic minority communities are reluctant to communicate with the Department of Homeland Security officials due to their fears that range from anything from deportation to unwanted Government attention or concerns about becoming victims of unlawful surveillance.

How does your office combat these fears? Even more importantly, how does your office take steps to ensure that unlawful surveillance or intrusions do not result from communicating with the Department?

Ms. KESSLER. That is a great question.

I think part of our effort is through our roundtables and educating people that they can come and that—building a trust relationship with our office and having people—that if they have concerns about specific things that the Department does, have people from the Department come and, in this community-type setting, really talk through what their concerns are and get the real information from the Department. That is incredibly helpful.

A great example of that was with the AIT machines. When they first went into use, there was a lot of concern by religious communities about modesty for women. So we arranged a chance for them to come to the airport, look at the AIT machine, really understand how it worked. Then that problem just sort of went away. We didn't hear any more concerns about it. So we were able to really work through that.

In terms of where there are bad actors in the world, we take complaints, we investigate those complaints. My office's role is mainly to do policy recommendations and try to change policy where that is the problem. If it is misconduct, that is more handled by the Inspector General.

But we have started to work very collaboratively in the past year, so that where the Inspector General is looking at misconduct and whether the complaint of profiling or a civil liberties complaint has a foundation, we are at the same time working on policy, how to prevent, training, new procedures, so that we have more oversight in the first place.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to thank Mr. Jensen and Ms. Kessler for being here today. I want to echo the words of the Ranking Member earlier. Thank you for your service to our Nation and within the Department that is charged with a tremendous mission: To keep our Nation safe. We understand that. But I think the hearing has shown that communications, proactive communications, work better than reactive, and that is really the gist of it.

So, before I dismiss the panel, I would just suggest that you guys hang around for the next panel. You might be able to pick up some tips from the private sector.

But thank you for your service, thank you for your testimony. We look forward to working with you.

We will dismiss the panel and get started with the second.

Members are advised that votes will be about 11:15, so we have about an hour for the second panel.

So we will dismiss the panel. Thank you.

All right. The Chairman will now recognize the second panel. We are pleased to have additional witnesses before us today on this important topic.

Let me remind the witnesses that their entire written statement will appear in the record. I will introduce each of you individually, and then we will recognize you for your opening statement.

The first witness is Mr. Bill Braniff, the executive director of the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, or START. Previously, Mr. Braniff served as the director of practitioner education and instructor at West Point's Combating Terrorism Center, where he led the practitioner education program, the Nation's largest provider of counterterrorism education to the Federal, State, and local governments.

Mr. Braniff frequently lectures for counterterrorism audiences. In addition, he has consulted with the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the National security staff, playing a key role in the inter-agency working group.

Mr. Doug Pinkham is the president of Public Affairs Council, a leading international association for public affairs professionals. Mr. Pinkham was elected to head the Council in 1997. Before joining the Council, Mr. Pinkham was vice president of communications for the American Gas Association. Mr. Pinkham is an accredited member of the Public Relations Society of America, serves on the board of the Institute for Public Relations, and previously served on the International Advisory Board of the Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship. He is a member of the Arthur W. Page Society, an association of senior-level corporate communications executives.

The Chairman will now recognize Mr. Braniff for an opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BRANIFF, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL CONSORTIUM FOR THE STUDY OF TERRORISM
AND RESPONSES TO TERRORISM**

Mr. BRANIFF. Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and esteemed Members of the committee, I would like to thank you on behalf the START center for inviting us to speak with you today.

I have been scheduled to discuss our research findings on U.S. attitudes towards terrorism and counterterrorism and to provide recommendations on steps DHS can take to better engage with the American people. This testimony is based primarily on a National panel survey of 1,567 adults issued in the fall of 2012 and the resulting analytical report authored by START researchers and sponsored by the Resilient Systems Division of the DHS Science and Technology Directorate.

In the final section of the survey, we asked about two specific programs focused on increasing communication between members of the public and the Government on topics related to terrorism, one of which was the “If You See Something, Say Something” campaign, which I will just refer to as “the campaign”; the other of which reflects Governmental community outreach strategies to counter violent extremism.

While my written testimony goes into greater detail on the findings regarding the earlier sections of the survey, I will limit this testimony to discussion of the Department’s engagement with the public, but with the caveat that this project was not designed to provide extensive analysis on that more focused topic, although future research certainly could do that.

Results of the most relevant questions from the survey are as follows: More than 56 percent of respondents said they had not heard anything about the campaign. Just over 20 percent were not sure whether they had heard anything about it. However, of the 24 percent of respondents who had heard of the campaign, 85 percent thought it would be very or somewhat effective.

The respondents least familiar with the campaign included the 18- to 29-year-old demographic, those from the Midwest, and those from nonmetropolitan statistical areas. Those most familiar with the campaign include respondents from the Northeast, respondents over 60 years of age, and those from metropolitan statistical areas, as well as those who made over \$75,000 per year.

When asked, clear majorities of respondents said that they would be willing to meet with people from DHS, 57 percent, and with local police, 58 percent, to talk about terrorism. People who saw the Government as very effective, 33 percent, or somewhat effective, 54 percent, in preventing terrorism were more likely to say that they were willing to meet with authorities than those who saw the Government as ineffective.

Taking the survey as a whole, I arrive at eight conclusions and recommendations.

No. 1, the survey found that Americans think about the prospect of terrorism more frequently than they think about hospitalization or being the victims of violent crime, suggesting that Americans are not complacent regarding the threat of terrorism. These results suggest that Americans will perceive awareness campaigns and

town hall meetings as relevant, a finding reinforced by these survey results.

No. 2, fewer respondents indicated that they would be very likely to call the police if they saw or heard about a person joining a terrorist group than if they saw or heard about a person planning to break into a house. Therefore, a public education campaign focusing on the criminality of behaviors such as joining a terrorist group may help highlight the significance of those activities and result in higher reporting levels in the future.

No. 3, approximately 24 percent of respondents from the National sample indicated that they had heard of the campaign, a program created in 2002 by the Metropolitan Transit Authority in New York and adopted for roll-out across the Nation by DHS only in 2012. Awareness of the campaign in the Northeast, where a version of the program has been implemented for over a decade, was significantly greater than the National average, at nearly 43 percent. This suggests merely that continued implementation of the program over time may increase the public's awareness of it in other regions of the country.

No. 4, it is not clear what a realistic expectation for awareness of the program should be, however. According to the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, only 4.99 percent of commuters use mass transportation as their primary means of commuting to work. Reaching significantly higher percentages of atomized Americans outside of the mass transit infrastructure, therefore, may be costly or unrealistic. However, this research effort does not speak to that question.

No. 5, trying to increase awareness of the program is, however, a cost-effective—in a cost-effective manner is, of course, a worthwhile goal. To address the communities least familiar with the campaign, DHS can consider focusing on population centers in the West, Midwest, and South, focusing on Americans making less than \$75,000 per year, and increasing its use of social media and its presence on college campuses to reach younger citizens.

No. 6, given their willingness to do so, DHS and its Federal, State, local, and Tribal partners should take advantage of the opportunity to meet with Americans to raise awareness of the campaign and to educate Americans about criminal behaviors related to terrorism.

No. 7, when a majority of respondents opined that terrorist groups will eventually succeed in carrying out an attack despite Government efforts, the respondents did not see this as a failure of the Government. This is a powerful indicator of societal resilience as well as evidence that Americans do not expect the Government to interdict every plot on their own, suggesting that there is a role for citizens in saying something.

Further, Government authorities and DHS across the spectrum should be cautious of adopting zero-tolerance rhetoric with respect to counterterrorism lapses, as eroding the public's trust in the Government or intimating that the Government should be able to thwart every attack on its own may actually decrease the public's willingness to engage with Government through community outreach and awareness programs.

No. 8, finally, the willingness of DHS to fund an independent research project that gives voice to the opinions of the American citizen, which this survey did, and serves as an objective assessment tool to help Federal, State, local, and Tribal leaders allocate finite resources more effectively, as this project has done, is one final example of what DHS should continue to do. Not doing so or encouraging them not to do so would have a chilling effect on the self-appraisal and research and development processes which are so important for a professional organization trying to improve.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Braniff follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BRANIFF

21 MAY 2013

Chairman McCaul, Subcommittee Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and esteemed Members of the committee, I would like to thank you on behalf of the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, known as START,¹ for inviting us to speak with you today.

I've been asked to discuss the START Consortium's findings on U.S. attitudes toward terrorism and counterterrorism and to provide recommendations on steps the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) can take to better engage with the American people.

This testimony is based primarily on a National panel survey and the resulting analytical report² authored by investigators from START and the Joint Program on Survey Methodology (JPSM),³ and sponsored by the Resilient Systems Division of the DHS Science and Technology Directorate.⁴

The survey was developed by two leading survey methodologists following a thorough review of past surveys on attitudes toward terrorism and counterterrorism, consultations with a research team of experts who study the dynamics of terrorism and counterterrorism, as well as consultations with officials from the homeland security community.

The questions were administered to members of a national panel by the on-line survey firm Knowledge Networks, and a second wave of the survey has been deployed 6 months after the first wave to allow for analysis of attitudes over time. The first wave of the questionnaire, which included approximately 60 items, was completed from September 28, 2012 to October 12, 2012 by 1,576 individuals 18 years of age and older.⁵

¹START is supported in part by the Science and Technology Directorate Office of University Programs of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security through a Center of Excellence program based at the University of Maryland. START uses state-of-the-art theories, methods, and data from the social and behavioral sciences to improve understanding of the origins, dynamics, and social and psychological impacts of terrorism.

²LaFree, Gary, and Stanley Presser, Roger Tourangeau, Amy Adamczyk, "U.S. Attitudes toward Terrorism and Counterterrorism," Report to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Science and Technology Directorate's Resilient Systems Division. College Park, MD: START, 2013. www.start.umd.edu/start/publications/START_USAttitudesTowardTerrorismandCounterterrorism_March2013.pdf. I am especially grateful for the generous support of Dr. Amy Adamczyk in running additional analyses on survey results specific to the "If You See Something, Say Something" campaign (see Table 3). However, any errors or omissions within this testimony are mine alone.

³The Joint Program in Survey Methodology (JPSM) is the Nation's oldest and largest program offering graduate training in the principles and practices of survey research. It is sponsored by the Federal Interagency Consortium on Statistical Policy. Its faculty is drawn from the University of Maryland, the University of Michigan, Westat, and other organizations.

⁴Award Number 2010ST108LR0004. This testimony reflects the opinions of the author and not necessarily those of the START Consortium or the Department of Homeland Security.

⁵The first wave of the study involved providing self-administered questionnaires to a random sample of computer users from the National panel created by Knowledge Networks (KN). The KN National panel consists of a probability sample of non-institutionalized adults residing in the United States. (Members of the sample who did not own a computer were given one when they joined the panel.) Of the panel members invited to participate in our survey, 62 percent completed it. To account for nonresponse and noncoverage, the estimates presented in this report were weighted to 2012 totals from the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) for seven variables: Age, sex, region, race, Hispanic ethnicity, education, and income. This stand-

Continued

To provide preliminary information about the results of the survey, we have divided the responses into three broad sections. In the first section respondents were asked whether they had thought about terrorism, how much it worried them and how likely they thought it was to occur in the future. The second section of the questionnaire posed questions about how likely respondents would be to call the police in response to various actions potentially related to terrorism. It then assessed respondents' awareness, and evaluation, of Government efforts related to terrorism in the United States. In a final section, we asked about two specific programs focused on increasing communication between Members of the public and the Government on topics related to terrorism.

THINKING ABOUT TERRORISM

About 15 percent of the sample said they had thought about the prospect of terrorism in the preceding week, more than the fraction who said they had thought about hospitalization (10 percent) and violent crime victimization (10 percent), but about the same fraction as those who said they had thought about job loss (16 percent). Just over 20 percent of those who had thought about terrorism in the preceding week said they had done something differently in the past year due to the possibility of an attack compared to 4 percent of those who had not thought about it. Among all respondents, about 5 percent said a terrorist attack was extremely or very likely to happen in the United States in the next year.⁶ Slightly fewer respondents said it was extremely or very likely that they would experience hospitalization (3 percent), violent criminal victimization (2 percent) or a job loss (3 percent). Even fewer respondents assigned these chances to a terrorist attack in their own community (1.5 percent).

Toward the end of the questionnaire we measured whether respondents had direct experience with the more personal negative events. Fourteen percent of those who had not been victims of violent crime had thought about terrorism in the last week, whereas 31 percent of the violent crime victims had thought about terrorism. The very small number of people who reported such victimization (4 percent) means that it cannot explain most of the variation in whether people said they thought about terrorism. Thus, we next considered whether where respondents lived was related to reporting such thoughts.

Surprisingly, we found no evidence that living in a metropolitan area increased the odds of having thought about terrorism. And although metropolitan area residents were 3 percentage points more likely to say a terrorist attack was extremely or very likely in the next year, they were also 6 percentage points more likely to say it was extremely or very unlikely to occur. Likewise, although we have too few cases in the metro Washington, DC or New York areas to make inferences about their residents, there was little sign that respondents in the States of New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut differed from respondents living in other States in thinking about terrorism or in judging its likelihood.

Table 1 shows the relationship of thinking about terrorism and respondents' gender, age, education, and race/ethnicity. Men and women answered the question in a similar fashion. Likewise, education was largely unrelated to reports of having thought about terrorism. Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were all significantly less likely to have said they thought about terrorism. Finally, older respondents were more likely to say they thought about terrorism.

TABLE 1.—PERCENT HAVING THOUGHT ABOUT TERRORISM BY GENDER, AGE, EDUCATION, AND RACE/ETHNICITY

	Amount
Men	13.6% (745)
Women	15.8% (810)
18–29	7.4% (324)
30–44	13.2% (403)
45–59	15.7% (426)
60+	21.3% (402)
Less than HS	11.1% (186)
High School	15.8% (474)

ard survey procedure ensures that the distributions of these background variables for the 1,576 cases match those in the CPS and is likely to improve the survey estimates to the extent the survey variables are related to the background variables.

⁶[Sic.]

TABLE 1.—PERCENT HAVING THOUGHT ABOUT TERRORISM BY GENDER, AGE, EDUCATION, AND RACE/ETHNICITY—Continued

	Amount
Some College	14.1% (444)
BA or More	15.7% (451)
White	17.2% (1049)
Black	11.9% (176)
Hispanic	8.8% (223)
Other	5.7% (88)

RESPONDENTS' VIEWS OF TERRORISM AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO TERRORISM

In a second section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked how likely they would be to call the police in response to various actions potentially related to terrorism (see Table 2) and how concerned they felt the Government should be about these actions. In general, responses to these two items were strongly correlated. Respondents indicated they would be more likely to call the police or think that the Government should be very concerned about someone “talking about planting explosives in a public place” than any other activity.

As a benchmark for these items, we asked respondents how likely they would be to call the police if they overheard people talking about breaking into a house in their neighborhood. About 70 percent of the respondents said they would be very likely to call the police in this situation; a somewhat higher percentage said they would be very likely to call the police if they heard someone talking about planting explosives in a public place (76 percent). At the other end of the spectrum, about 21 percent of the respondents said they would be very likely to call the police if they heard about someone reading material from a terrorist group. Respondents who said they had thought about a terrorist attack in the last week were more likely than other respondents to say they were likely to call the police in response to the various situations described to them.

TABLE 2.—LIKELIHOOD OF CALLING POLICE

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Too Likely	Not at All Likely	Total
A Person:					
... talking about breaking into a house	69.6%	18.9%	5.3%	6.2%	100% (1542)
... talking about joining a terrorist group	41.4%	28.7%	20.8%	9.1%	100% (1545)
... talking about planting explosives	76.1%	13.1%	4.6%	6.1%	100% (1543)
... reading material from terrorist group	20.6%	28.5%	35.4%	15.5%	100% (1544)
... stockpiling guns	38.7%	24.9%	23.4%	13.0%	100% (1542)
... traveling overseas to join terrorist group	52.0%	23.4%	14.7%	9.9%	100% (1547)
... distributing handouts in support of terrorism	46.2%	28.4%	17.4%	7.9%	100% (1540)

The questionnaire also included three items asking respondents about their overall views about the threat of terror, the effectiveness of the Government counterterrorism efforts, and their confidence in the people running the Executive branch of the Federal Government.

A large majority of the respondents said that the U.S. Government has been very effective (33 percent) or somewhat effective (54 percent) at preventing terrorism; less than 13 percent characterized the Government as not too effective or not effective at all. Despite this positive view of the Government's efforts to prevent terrorism, a large majority (69 percent) endorsed the view that "terrorists will always find a way to carry out major attacks no matter what the U.S. Government does."

"IF YOU SEE SOMETHING, SAY SOMETHING" AND WILLINGNESS TO MEET WITH
AUTHORITIES

The survey also asked respondents about two specific programs focused on increasing communication between members of the public and the Government on topics related to terrorism.

The first was the "If You See Something, Say Something" campaign.⁷ Most respondents (more than 56 percent) said they had not heard anything about this campaign, and a substantial number (more than 20 percent) were not sure whether they had heard anything about it. Of those who had heard something about the campaign, most thought it would be very (18 percent) or somewhat (67 percent) effective.

TABLE 3.—PERCENT HAVING HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THE "SEE SOMETHING, SAY SOMETHING" CAMPAIGN BY GENDER, AGE, INCOME, REGION AND METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA

	Yes	No	Not Sure	Total
Men	26.6%	55.1%	18.4%	100% (817)
Women	21.9%	56.9%	21.2%	100% (735)
18–29	18.9%	58.0%	23.1%	100% (243)
30–44	24.4%	56.4%	19.3%	100% (353)
45–59	23.4%	57.8%	18.8%	100% (479)
60+	28.1%	52.6%	19.3%	100% (477)
Less than \$40k	21.6%	56.3%	22.2%	100% (487)
Between \$40k–\$75k	19.2%	60.4%	20.4%	100% (427)
Over \$75k	29.9%	52.7%	17.4%	100% (638)
Midwest	16.1%	67.5%	16.4%	100% (360)
Northeast	42.6%	37.9%	19.5%	100% (298)
South	20.9%	58.3%	20.9%	100% (542)
West	22.7%	55.7%	21.6%	100% (352)
Metropolitan Statistical Area	26.5%	53.4%	20.1%	100% (1303)
Non-Metropolitan Stat. Area	13.3%	69.1%	17.7%	100% (249)

The respondents least familiar with the campaign include the 18–29 year old demographic, those from the Midwest, and those from non-Metropolitan Statistical Areas.⁸ Those most familiar with the campaign include respondents from the Northeast, respondents over 60 years of age, those from Metropolitan Statistical Areas, and those who made over \$75,000 per year.

The survey also asked respondents whether they would be willing to attend a meeting with local police or with people from the Department of Homeland Security

⁷In July 2010, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), at Secretary Janet Napolitano's direction, launched a National "If You See Something, Say Something" campaign—a program to raise public awareness of indicators of terrorism and terrorism-related crime, and to emphasize the importance of reporting suspicious activity to the proper State and local law enforcement authorities.

⁸A geographic entity, defined by the Federal OMB for use by Federal statistical agencies, based on the concept of a core area with a large population nucleus, plus adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that core. Qualification of an MSA requires the presence of a city with 50,000 or more inhabitants, or the presence of an Urbanized Area and a total population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). The county or counties containing the largest city and surrounding densely settled territory are central counties of the MSA. Additional outlying counties qualify to be included in the MSA by meeting certain other criteria of metropolitan character, such as a specified minimum population density or percentage of the population that is urban. MSAs in New England are defined in terms of cities and towns, following rules concerning commuting and population density. MSAs were first defined and effective June 30, 1983." <http://www.census.gov/geo/lv4help/cengeoglos.html>.

to talk about terrorism. Clear majorities of respondents said they would be willing to meet with people from DHS (57 percent) and with local police (58 percent) to talk about terrorism. Most people (88 percent) gave the same answer to the two questions; that is, the same people who were willing to attend a meeting with people from DHS were also willing to attend a meeting with local police to talk about terrorism. People who saw the Government as very or somewhat effective in preventing terrorism were more likely to say they were willing to attend such meetings than those who saw the Government as not too or not at all effective at preventing terrorism (see Table 4).

TABLE 4.—WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND A MEETING WITH LOCAL POLICE OR DHS, BY PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT IN PREVENTING TERRORISM

	Willing To Attend Meeting With Local Police		Willing To Attend Meeting With People From DHS		Total
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Effectiveness of Government at preventing terrorism:					
Very effective	63.0%	37.0%	62.7%	37.30%	100% (515)
Somewhat effective	61.0%	39.0	58.6%	31.4%	100% (829)
Not too or not at all effective	36.8%	63.2	39.3%	60.7%	100% (194)
Total	58.5%	41.5%	57.4%	42.6%	100% (1548)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This survey found that Americans think about the prospect of terrorism more frequently than they think about hospitalization or being the victims of violent crime, suggesting that Americans are not complacent regarding the threat of terrorism. These results suggest that Americans will perceive awareness campaigns like “If You See Something, Say Something” as relevant, a finding reinforced by the fact that 85 percent of respondents who had heard of the campaign indicated they thought it would be very or somewhat effective.

The survey results also revealed that respondents who said that they had thought about a terrorist attack in the last week were more likely than other respondents to say they were likely to call the police in response to various scenarios described to them, and were also more likely to indicate that they had altered their behavior over the previous year because of the possibility of an attack. These findings do not demonstrate causality, that priming people to think about terrorism results in a change in behavior, but do suggest that heightened awareness and security-conscious behavior of the citizenry may be correlated. Fewer respondents indicated that they would be “very likely” to call the police if they saw or heard about a person joining a terrorist group than if they saw or heard about a person planning to break into a house. Public education on the criminality of behaviors such as joining a terrorist group, which would constitute material support for a designated terrorist organization, may help highlight the significance of those activities and result in higher reporting levels in the future.

Interestingly, there was no evidence that living in a metropolitan area increased the odds of having thought about terrorism in the previous week, despite the fact that 10 cities account for 40.6 percent of all U.S. attacks from 1970–2011.⁹ Given the greater frequency of terrorist incidents within cities, and the greater number of citizens available to engage with efficiently, DHS should continue to focus on metropolitan areas even though respondents were significantly more likely to have heard of “If You See Something, Say Something” in those areas.

Approximately 24 percent of respondents from the National sample indicated that they had heard of the “If You See Something, Say Something” campaign, a program created in 2002 by the Metropolitan Transit Authority in New York and adopted for roll-out across the Nation by the Department of Homeland Security in 2010. Awareness of this campaign in the Northeast, where a version of the program has been implemented on various forms of mass transit for over a decade, was significantly greater at nearly 43 percent. This suggests that continued implementation of the program over time may increase the public’s awareness of it in other regions of the country.

It is not clear what a realistic expectation for awareness of the program should be, however. According to the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, only 4.99 percent of commuters in 2009 used mass transportation as their primary means of commuting to work.¹⁰ This suggests that while mass transportation infrastructure provides an efficient marketing platform to capture a percentage of Americans, increasing awareness of “If You See Something, Say Something” is not simply a matter of more marketing on buses and subways. It is likely that this commuter population is already highly represented in the current awareness figures given the centrality of mass transit to the campaign, and reaching significantly higher percentages of atomized Americans outside of aggregators like mass transit infrastructure may be costly.

Trying to increase awareness of the program in a cost-effective manner is a worthwhile goal, however. To address the communities least familiar with the “If You See Something, Say Something” campaign, DHS can consider focusing on population centers in the West, Midwest, and South, focusing on marketing material that will reach those Americans making less than \$75,000 per year, and increasing its use of social media¹¹ and its presence on college campuses to reach younger citizens.

⁹ LaFree, Gary, and Laura Dugan, Erin Miller, “Integrated United States Security Database (IUSSD): Terrorism Data on the United States Homeland, 1970 to 2011.” Final Report to the Resilient Systems Division, DHS Science and Technology Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, College Park, MD: START, 2012. The 10 cities include: New York City, NY; San Juan, PR; Los Angeles, CA; San Francisco, CA; Miami, FL; Washington, DC; Chicago, IL; Seattle, WA; Berkeley, CA; and Denver, CO.

¹⁰ “Transit Commuting Reported in the American Community Survey,” American Public Transit Association summary document, December 22, 2010. http://www.apta.com/resources/statistics/Documents/2009_ACS_Transit_Commuter_Data.pdf.

¹¹ For a discussion of the efficacy of social media with respect to a different Government awareness effort, see the forthcoming START case study: Fraustino, Julia Daisy, and Liang Ma. “If You’re Ready for a Zombie Apocalypse, then You’re Ready for Any Emergency: The CDC’s

A large majority of the respondents said that the United States Government has been very effective (34 percent) or somewhat effective (53 percent) at preventing terrorism, and a majority indicated a willingness to meet with Federal and local authorities to discuss terrorism. Respondents were more likely to indicate the willingness to meet when they also indicated a higher opinion of the Government's effectiveness at preventing terrorism. While a majority of respondents opined that terrorist groups will eventually succeed in carrying out an attack despite Government efforts, the respondents did not see this as a failure of the Government. These are powerful indicators of societal resilience, as well as evidence that Americans do not expect the Government to interdict every plot on its own.

DHS and its Federal, State, local, and Tribal-level partners should take advantage of the opportunity to meet with Americans to raise awareness of "If You See Something, Say Something," to educate Americans about criminal behaviors related to terrorism, and to engage in a dialogue on how the Government can improve upon the already-high levels of trust with respect to counterterrorism. Governmental authorities across the spectrum should be cautious of adopting "zero tolerance rhetoric" with respect to counterterrorism lapses, as eroding the public's trust in the Government or intimating that the Government should be able to thwart every terrorist plot alone may decrease the public's willingness to engage with Government through community outreach and awareness programs.

The willingness of DHS to fund an independent research project that gives voice to the opinions of American citizens and serves as an objective assessment tool to help Federal, State, local, and Tribal leaders allocate finite resources more effectively is one final example of what DHS should continue to do.¹² Not giving the Department credit for the level of introspection evidenced through this research project may have a chilling effect on the self-appraisal and research and development efforts that are so essential for professional organizations seeking to improve.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Braniff.

The Chairman will now recognize Mr. Pinkham for an opening statement.

STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS G. PINKHAM, PRESIDENT, PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Mr. PINKHAM. Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the subcommittee, my name is Doug Pinkham. I am president of the Public Affairs Council here in Washington. I am pleased and honored to have the opportunity to participate in this hearing to discuss best practices in communications and public affairs and what DHS can learn from the private sector.

The Public Affairs Council is an international organization for public affairs professionals. We work to advance the field of public affairs and to provide our members with expertise that they need to succeed, while maintaining the highest ethical standards. We have roughly 650 member organizations around the world and about 7,000 people active in our programs. While this is unusual in Washington, we are actually both nonpolitical and nonpartisan.

For large companies and large institutions of all types, the last 20 years have brought a world of opportunities and threats. Brands are more powerful than ever, but they are also more fragile than ever. As technology has enabled collection and dissemination of useful data, the burden has shifted onto large institutions to defend why information they have shouldn't be shared. In a democracy, this can be a positive development, but it does present both resource and management issues.

use of Social Media and Humor in a Disaster Preparedness Campaign," College Park, MD: START, 2013.

¹²For example, after publishing the results of this survey, START received a phone call from a State homeland security advisor from the Midwest who informed us of his plans to work with local media to raise awareness of the campaign based on these research findings.

Seismic changes in the media landscape have created major communications challenges for every organization. Finally, high levels of public distrust also hamper the abilities of both companies and Government to operate effectively.

Faced with this environment, communications and public affairs professionals have had to adopt new ways to disseminate information, earn the trust of the public, and manage their overall reputations.

Based on our expertise, we have found that companies with successful communications and public affairs functions demonstrate certain common characteristics. The following is a quick list of 10 such characteristics.

No. 1, senior management support and involvement. It is absolutely essential that senior management personnel are engaged in all major aspects of communications and public affairs.

No. 2, a well-developed issues-management process. Smart companies have internal systems for identifying communications and public affairs issues, setting priorities, carrying out plans, and then, importantly, measuring results.

No. 3, strong collaboration between all external teams. It can be inefficient and even dangerous to build silos that separate people and programs with similar goals.

No. 4, integrated crisis communications planning. Similarly, when a leading company faces a crisis, it communicates to all major stakeholders, including Members of Congress, in ways that resonate with those groups.

No. 5, understanding of risk communication. Companies that understand the psychology of risk perception are often better able to connect with stakeholders and respond to community concerns.

No. 6, strategic use of communications technologies. Most major corporations use social media and related technologies to dialogue with customers, give a voice to brand champions, promote products, and counter negative publicity, among other applications.

No. 7, innovative approaches to media relations. Communications executives are increasingly bypassing traditional media by distributing useful and credible information through a variety of channels both on-line and off-line.

Transparent and on-going communications is No. 8. The challenge is committing to transparency that is sustainable and desirable for the enterprise. Firms that promise to be open and then change their minds are actually worse off than those who never claimed to be transparent in the first place.

No. 9, a focus on employee communications, often an area that doesn't get looked at nearly enough. Leading companies have come to realize that their own employees are often their most important audience.

No. 10, robust performance measurement systems. Measurement systems that focus on counting the number of media articles published, speeches given, website hits received, or tweets made measure activity rather than impact. The most effective evaluation programs define clear communications goals and then measure progress toward those goals.

Finally, I just have a few general observations that can be considered along with these best practices, and I hope they can be of value to DHS and your oversight of DHS.

First, because consumer-facing components of the agency will naturally draw attention from the public and the news media, the mix of communication strategies used at DHS would and should vary substantially among its different branches.

Second, DHS leadership should continue to collaborate with academics, nonprofits, the private sector, and others to ensure that a wide variety of voices are being heard when trying to communicate key messages to the public.

Third, because DHS deals with major National security and civil liberty issues, it has to be diligent about setting the record straight when the public is misinformed. Yet, at the same time, it must do so with compelling stories that are then supported by the facts.

Fourth, when evaluating DHS's performance, it is important for everyone that expectations are set at achievable levels and that the proper metrics are being used.

So thank you once again for this opportunity to appear before this committee to address best practices in both communications and public affairs. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pinkham follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS G. PINKHAM

MAY 21, 2013

Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the subcommittee, my name is Doug Pinkham and I am president of the Public Affairs Council in Washington, DC. I am pleased and honored to have the opportunity to participate in this hearing to discuss "best practices" in communications and public affairs at leading companies and what DHS can learn from the private sector.

The Public Affairs Council is an international organization for corporate and association public affairs professionals. Launched in 1954, the Council works to advance the field of public affairs and to provide members with the executive education and expertise they need to succeed while maintaining the highest ethical standards. The organization has more than 640 member companies and associations, representing 7,000 people working in the public affairs field. The Council is both non-partisan and non-political.

"Public affairs" is a term that means different things to different people. In the Federal Government, it refers to the function that manages communication with the news media and other important stakeholders. In many large corporations, it means the function that is responsible for Government relations. The Council embraces a broader definition. We believe that public affairs represents an organization's efforts to monitor and manage its business environment. It combines communications, Government relations, issues management, and corporate citizenship strategies to improve public policy, build a strong reputation, and find common ground with stakeholders.

MANAGING IN A DIFFICULT ENVIRONMENT

For large companies—and large institutions of all types—the last 20 years have brought a world of opportunities and threats. On the one hand, information technology and globalization have given firms unprecedented access to new markets, new customers, and new ideas that enable them to grow larger and more profitable. Certain popular "brands" now have greater value than most companies. According to *Forbes* magazine, Apple's brand is now worth \$87.1 billion, which is more than 50 percent higher than its level 2 years ago.

On the other hand, brands are also more fragile than they've ever been before. Rightly or wrongly, groups and individuals with a complaint or a political cause have the tools to attack corporate brands directly, by leveraging the influence of

major customers, by launching shareholder campaigns, or by “hijacking” a brand to promote an issue.

A second challenge facing large institutions is the heightened expectation for transparency. As recently as the 1990s, well before social media and Big Data, the public didn’t demand as much openness from corporations or Government. As technology enabled the collection and dissemination of useful data, the burden shifted onto large institutions to defend why information shouldn’t be shared. In a democracy, this is a positive development. But it does present both resource and management issues for organizations trying to determine whether information is non-proprietary, unclassified, accurate, accessible, and distributable.

Seismic changes in the media landscape have created major communications challenges for every organization. These challenges include:

- Decline of many mainstream media companies, which often had the most knowledgeable and experienced journalists;
- The creation of thousands of new, internet-based media outlets, with various levels of accuracy and accountability;
- The end of the news cycle, which used to give communications professionals time to respond more thoughtfully to negative or controversial news;
- The dawn of the age of “truthiness,” when unchecked information sounds like it might be true and is spread throughout the world before large institutions have the opportunity correct the record.

High levels of public distrust also hamper the ability of both companies and Government to operate effectively. Each year the Council publishes the Public Affairs Pulse survey, a major poll that measures public attitudes toward business and Government. In the 2012 survey, two-thirds of Americans (67%) said they have a favorable view of major companies, while only 4 in 10 Americans (41%) said they have a favorable view of the Federal Government.

Yet, while overall attitudes toward business have become more positive in recent years, many Americans don’t have much trust and confidence in major companies to “do the right thing.” For example, the survey found 55 percent of Americans have a lot of trust or some trust in corporations, while 44 percent do not trust major companies. There are substantial variations in trust by industry sector.

Meanwhile, the public has doubts about whether the Federal Government can effectively handle the challenges that face the Nation. Only 41 percent said they have “some” or “a lot” of trust and confidence that the Government can solve the Nation’s most important problems. A majority (58%) said they have “not too much” or no trust at all that the Government can solve these problems.

REDEFINING THE COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS FUNCTIONS

Faced with this environment, communications and public affairs professionals have had to adopt new ways to disseminate information, build rapport with stakeholders, earn the trust of the public and manage their overall reputations. They have had to learn to be more open, engaged, collaborative, and pro-active.

The Arthur W. Page Society, a professional association for senior public relations and corporate communications executives, has developed a new model that explains how a company should define and protect its corporate character, and inspire groups and individuals to become champions.

According to the Page Society, a chief communications officer (CCO) must be:

- *An integrator.*—Working across the C-suite to make the company “think like” and “perform like” its corporate character.
- *A systems designer.*—Not only systems of marketing and communications, but of how these relate to the company’s operations and management systems.
- *A master of data analytics.*—To understand customers, employees, investors, citizens, and other stakeholders as individuals rather than publics, audiences, and segments of populations.
- *A publisher and developer.*—The same tools of information production that are in the hands of the masses are also available to the CCO, who can directly inform, empower, and equip targeted individuals.
- *A student of behavioral science.*—To inform the shaping of belief, action, behavior, and advocacy.
- *A curator of corporate character.*—To ensure that the company’s communications and its people remain true to their core identity.

Needless to say, this model is a far cry from the role of the communications executive of 30 years ago, when many large companies focused their efforts on protecting their image and garnering favorable publicity. These days, firms put at least as much effort into “being good” as they do into “looking good.”

“BEST PRACTICES” OF LEADING COMPANIES

Based on the Public Affairs Council’s research, benchmarking, and executive education experience, we have found that companies with successful communications and public affairs functions demonstrate certain common characteristics. The following is a list of 10 such characteristics, along with a discussion of why each one is important. This list can be adapted for use in evaluating communications and public affairs operations in Government agencies.

1. Senior Management Support and Involvement.—In a *Wall Street Journal* article, penned less than a year before he died in 2005, management guru Peter Drucker argued that the CEO’s first task is to define the outside world. Included in this category are society, the economy, technology, markets, customers, the media, and public opinion. The CEO’s second task is to figure out what information from the outside is meaningful and how to process it effectively. Based on his or her best judgments, the CEO decides business priorities and how to focus resources.

In the 8 years since Drucker wrote that article, business has experienced a blending of the inside and the outside. What goes on within a company increasingly affects outcomes, and costs associated with a firm’s external environment are getting harder to manage.

That’s why it is essential that senior management personnel are engaged in all major aspects of communications and public affairs.

2. Well-Developed Issues Management Process.—Smart companies have internal systems for identifying communications and public affairs issues, setting priorities, carrying out plans and measuring results. These systems tend to have an open architecture that encourages input, ownership and evaluation by others in the enterprise.

While many models are used, one model we particularly like has the following eight steps:

- Interview senior management to determine the reputation and public policy threats/opportunities the company faces;
- Survey key employees, customers, suppliers, community leaders, and other stakeholders to produce a list of current and emerging issues;
- Analyze the issues to determine what is currently known about their current and future impact on the organization (impact can take the form of direct or indirect costs);
- Score issues for importance (based on impact) and affectability (based on one’s ability to affect the outcome);
- Sort out high and low scores and decide where to focus resources—issues with high scores for both importance and affectability should be at the top of one’s priority list;
- Narrow the list down to major priorities (with capacity reserved to handle crises);
- Define objectives, create strategies, and develop cross-functional tactics;
- Set up a measurement and reporting system.

This type of issues plan offers numerous benefits: It keeps staff focused on issues that really matter, eliminates redundant activities, makes it easier to identify common goals, and engages top executives in the prioritization process. Some companies have formal issues management systems, while others have informal processes for setting priorities and coordinating activities. What’s important is that management makes it clear that the company owns the issues and that everyone involved is responsible for supporting key business objectives.

3. Strong Collaboration Between All External Teams.—Many large organizations, in both the private and public sectors, don’t do a good job of integrating the roles and responsibilities of personnel involved in communications and public affairs. In fact, a 2011 study by the Foundation for Public Affairs showed that only 41 percent of 115 surveyed companies had a management structure with fully integrated communications and public affairs functions.

Natural synergies exist among those who manage relationships with Government, the media, local communities, employees, and other stakeholders. It can be inefficient—and even dangerous—to build “silos” that separate people and programs with similar goals.

In recent years, the arguments for joining forces—or at least coordinating forces—have become stronger than ever. First and foremost, public perception and public policy are closely related. News travels fast, and bad news travels

faster. Companies that take an unpopular stand on an issue may find themselves subject to protests and boycotts. Firms that are frequently criticized in the media have a difficult time advocating a legislative agenda. If the smallest business unit in a large multinational makes an unethical business decision, the entire enterprise suffers.

Leading companies, nonprofits, and Government agencies understand the synergies that can be gained by collaborating across divisions and lines of business.

4. Integrated Crisis Communication Planning.—Similarly, when a leading company faces a crisis, it puts in motion a plan to communicate to all major stakeholders in ways that resonate with those groups. Years ago, crisis plans focused primarily on the news media. Now many firms use a wide variety of tools (print, broadcast, social media) to communicate with a wide variety of stakeholders (employees, news media, customers, suppliers, investors, policy-makers, local communities, unions). As smart phones and social media become ubiquitous, this communication is increasingly two-way.

Global corporations are also considering new approaches to crisis communication in light of the fact that different types of spokespeople have different levels of credibility. The 2013 Edelman Trust Barometer, a comprehensive survey of global trust, ranks the credibility of spokespeople in this way:

- Academic or expert—69%
- Technical expert in the company—67%
- A person like yourself—61%
- Financial or industry analyst—51%
- NGO representative—51%
- Regular employee—50%
- CEO—43%
- Government official or regulator—36%.

When a crisis is at the acute stage, the public expects the CEO to play a prominent role. In fact, in the 2012 Public Affairs Pulse survey, 59 percent of respondents said that making top executives available to answer questions about what happened would do “a lot” to make them feel the company is doing the right thing. However, in day-to-day communication or in outreach to local communities, rank-and-file employees, technical experts, or community leaders are often more effective.

5. Understanding of Risk Communication.—“Any given risk has a set of identifiable characteristics that help predict what emotional responses that risk will trigger,” wrote David Ropeik and George Gray of the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis in their 2002 book, *Risk*. Communications professionals working for chemical and nuclear energy companies, along with public health officials, have developed a sophisticated knowledge of these patterns. That’s because they have to deal with questions of risk and safety on a daily basis.

But, increasingly, companies working in a wide array of industries are applying risk communication principles to their public outreach efforts. While an outraged community or group of upset customers may not be facing an actual crisis, they experience many of the same emotions of people in a crisis situation.

According to Ropeik and Gray, major risk perception factors include: Man-made risk versus natural risk; imposed risk versus chosen risk; no-benefit risk versus risk with trade-offs; gruesome risk versus regular risk; distrustful risk versus trustworthy risk; risk with uncertainty versus risk with certainty; and risks to children versus risks to adults.

Companies that understand the psychology of risk perception are often better able to connect with stakeholders, respond to community concerns, and have credibility when they are facing a crisis.

6. Strategic Use of Communications Technologies.—Most major corporations have integrated social media, video, and other technologies into their communications operations. They use them to dialogue with customers, give a voice to brand champions, involve employees in outreach, promote products, create communities of interest, counter negative publicity, and advocate for public policy, among other applications.

Smart companies have a clear understanding of the benefits and limitations of these technologies. While social media can be an effective tool for building rapport with stakeholders, a company can’t embark on a social media strategy with the idea that it will control the conversation. As with all forms of communica-

tion, social media programs should be launched because they represent the highest strategic use of corporate resources, not because everyone else seems to have a social media program.

7. Innovative Approaches to Media Relations.—Corporate communications involves creating a dialogue about a company’s business, the principles behind its brand and what benefits it offers to customers and society. Yet, because of all the changes taking place in the news media, it has become increasingly difficult for companies to tell their story in ways that will reach significant numbers of people. As noted in the summary of the Arthur W. Page Society’s new model, communications executives are increasingly becoming publishers on behalf of their firms. They are bypassing traditional media by distributing useful and credible information through a variety of channels, both on-line and offline.

8. Transparent and On-going Communications.—In the June 2009 edition of *Harvard Business Review*, James O’Toole and Warren Bennis wrote that American business needed “a culture of candor.” “Because no organization can be honest with the public if it’s not honest with itself,” they said, “We define transparency broadly, as the degree to which information flows freely within an organization, among managers and employees, and outward to stakeholders.”

Being transparent about all aspects of company operations is easier said than done, however. Some information is proprietary or confidential for competitive reasons; other information can’t be released for legal reasons. Yet many successful companies have learned to stretch themselves so that they can be more responsive to public demands for openness. While business-to-business firms may not see as much immediate benefit to this approach, consumer-based companies are increasingly incorporating transparency practices into their communications.

The challenge is committing to a level of transparency that is sustainable and desirable for the enterprise. Firms that promise to be open and then change their minds are worse off than those that never claim to be transparent in the first place.

9. Focus on Employee Communications.—In a transparent world, leading companies have come to realize that their own employees are often their most important audience. Much of this is due to the rising influence of word-of-mouth communication. If employees are making authentic, positive statements on-line about where they work, their messages will likely resonate with friends and colleagues. On the other hand, if employees are making negative comments, their messages could have an extremely damaging impact.

Several major studies have been conducted on best practices in employee communication. In a comprehensive study conducted in 2005 by Gay, Mahoney and Graves, four key drivers accounted for 72 percent of variance in aligning employees with business strategy: (1) Employee understanding of how they can help achieve company goals, (2) employee commitment to business strategy, (3) the use of technologies to enhance understanding of strategy, and (4) building trust between leaders/managers and employees.

10. Robust Performance Measurement System.—Communications and public affairs success can be measured in many ways, but some methods are more reliable than others. Systems that focus on counting—the number of media articles published, speeches given, website hits received, or tweets made—measure activity rather than impact. The most effective evaluation programs define clear communications goals and then measure progress toward those goals.

For companies associated with major brands, surveys and focus groups may be helpful in determining how a company is regarded by important stakeholders—especially in relation to competitors. Some firms analyze customer-generated and other data to determine whether communications activities have had a direct impact on sales, recruitment/retention, the tone of media coverage, or overall reputation.

INSIGHTS AND OBSERVATIONS

While I am not an expert on the Department of Homeland Security’s communications policies and practices, I do have some general insights and observations that can be considered along with the above best practices:

- In developing communications strategies in both the private and public sectors, there’s a natural tension between promoting the identity and services of the parent organization and those of each individual subsidiary. There’s also a tension associated with promoting one “brand” over another. In tackling the chal-

lenge of communicating its mission, DHS takes a hybrid approach, which seems appropriate. Consumer-facing components such as TSA and FEMA, for instance, will naturally draw attention from the public and the news media. Consequently, the mix of communications strategies used—and the resources required to fund those strategies—will vary substantially among the different branches of the agency.

- High levels of public distrust make the job of Government communications especially difficult. As noted earlier, Government officials or regulators don't score well as spokespeople compared to technical experts, NGO representatives, business leaders, or even average citizens. DHS leadership should continue to collaborate with academics, non-profit organizations, the private sector, and others to ensure that a wide variety of "voices" are being heard when communicating key messages.
- Having the facts on one's side isn't enough. In both the private and public sectors, leaders often try to persuade skeptics by offering quantifiable proof of the correctness of their policies and the quality of their performance. This approach underestimates the power and influence of misinformation campaigns and urban legends. Because DHS deals with major National security and civil liberty issues, it has to be diligent about setting the record straight when the public is misinformed. Yet it must do so with compelling stories to supplement its facts.
- Measuring communications performance has become especially difficult because the world has become so noisy. Even major corporate brands feel fortunate when a modest percentage of the public is aware of a new product's features. For Government agencies facing tight budgets, it is especially hard to build widespread awareness of programs, services, or other essential information. Therefore, it's important that expectations be set at levels that are achievable and that the proper metrics are being utilized.

Thank you again for this opportunity to appear before you today to address best practices in communications and public affairs, and what DHS can learn from the private sector. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you so much.

I thank the panelists.

Is anyone left here with DHS's Public Affairs Office in the audience?

You are? Okay. Thank you. Take note of what Mr. Pinkham said, his bullet points. We will try to get you a copy of that, as well. I thought that was very good.

Mr. Braniff, you mentioned and I read in your testimony about the use of the mass transit systems up in the Northeast to communicate the "See Something, Say Something" marketing campaign.

So do you think it is more effective in the Northeast to communicate because of the mass transit? Do you think more people are focused in on the threats than possibly in the South or the Midwest, where we don't have the mass transit systems like they do? Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

Mr. BRANIFF. Certainly, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the question.

Interestingly, the survey results indicated that individuals living in urban centers were actually not any more likely to have thought about terrorism in the week leading up to the survey than those not living in urban centers.

So there does not seem to be a heightened level of consciousness reported in this survey by those living in cities. So that doesn't explain the greater awareness of "See Something, Say Something," just the concern about, general concern about terrorism.

Mr. DUNCAN. What are some of the techniques they could use to raise awareness in the South or the Midwest? You know, is it TV spots, is it commercials, is it what?

Mr. BRANIFF. I certainly don't have data to support any of these opinions. I would suggest that it does make sense to continue to focus on urban centers in the South, Midwest, and West. Forty percent of the terrorism incidents in the United States from 1970 through 2011 occurred in 10 U.S. cities. So while terrorism happens in every State in the Union, it does tend to happen more frequently in urban centers.

So targeting those populations, whether through any of the media you suggested, I would certainly consider a good idea. I wouldn't give up on areas outside of urban centers; that is not what I am suggesting. But for bang for the buck, you will get more targeting those populations.

Mr. DUNCAN. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 happened in the urban areas; Boston Marathon, an urban area. But I would argue that the Southern Border, being a porous Southern Border—we saw the Iran operatives trying to come across our border to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador back in the fall of 2011. We hear of different nationalities being apprehended in Texas and other places that are other than Mexicans, other than Hispanics.

So I think the "See Something, Say Something" program should be, personally, should be applied to the Southwest, and especially in the border counties. So how would you see an effective method of that?

Mr. BRANIFF. Again, sir, thank you for that question.

I actually agree entirely. Terrorism is not just about the terrorism incident, it is not just about where the bomb goes off. Terrorist campaigns are conducted through logistics, travel, procurement. We have a lot of research that looks into where terrorist organizations or individuals have lived, where they have procured, where they have planned, as well as where they have targeted.

So what I would suggest is looking at research that looks into specific incidents historically and then tailoring a "See Something, Say Something" campaign that targets the behaviors in play in geographic regions. So if procurement is happening in more rural settings to purchase ammonia or fertilizer for large explosives, the campaign should be targeted to the actual criminal behaviors conducted in those geographic areas. Whereas, in the urban center's mass transit, you are talking about people leaving a backpack unattended on a platform.

So I think you can tailor the content to the threat in the different geographic regions, and would agree entirely with your assessment.

Mr. DUNCAN. We just saw yesterday, I think, the report came out that one of the NFL stadiums is not going to allow purses and backpacks and coolers and that sort of thing. So there are some challenges.

Mr. Pinkham, over the years, chief executive officers have become increasingly communicators-in-chief. Think about Bill Gates and Steve Jobs, how effective communication transformed the way Microsoft and Apple did business.

But what key communication strategies and techniques should Secretary Napolitano or future Secretaries of DHS employ to improve communication with the public? What other qualities do private-sector CEOs possess that the Secretary should try to emulate?

Mr. PINKHAM. Well, I mean, certainly, when you are in a very senior leadership position like that, especially heading a Government agency, just as you would as a CEO, there is a huge symbolic leadership responsibility which can't be taken lightly. It is, you know, the fact that you are the Secretary, that you are engaged, that you know every aspect of all of your operations and your communications strategies.

So a lot of the, I would imagine, the on-going activities of the Secretary now and what it should be is about bringing people together, making sure relations are strong with all important stakeholders, that the important audiences are aware of programs and priorities. That is an awful lot of what CEOs do on that level of their job responsibilities, is making sure that those, you know, good relationships are built and maintained.

But it is interesting, because Government officials and CEOs also face a common challenge, in that the public doesn't particularly trust them. We do an annual survey on public attitudes toward business and Government, and this is not great news for corporate America, but over 90 percent of the public does not believe that CEOs have inherently good ethics. That is a real problem, because we all know good CEOs and CEOs maybe that aren't so good. The same challenge faces Government.

So one of the most, I think, important strategies is to think about where the Secretary's use is most important, like at a crisis and building those high-level relationships, and where, you know, that relationship should be delegated to someone else who might actually be more trusted in the community. Especially when you are talking to a community that doesn't inherently trust, you know, "I am from Washington, and I am here to help you," it can be important to get people from the community who can represent the same interests you are trying to communicate.

Mr. DUNCAN. All right.

You mentioned in your written testimony, and I think you did verbally as well, that high levels of public distrust also hamper the ability of both companies and Government to operate effectively.

I mentioned in my statement earlier that proactive communication is much better than reactive communication, but sometimes they do have to react. When the internet rumors came out about the ammo purchases, the MRAP purchases, and the numbers were just way out of whack from what reality is and my current belief, and we saw this delay or a failure to communicate from the Department, that builds distrust, wouldn't you agree?

Mr. PINKHAM. Oh, absolutely. I mean, and this is a problem the private sector faces, too, you know, where a company—some rumor is spread on the internet or a disgruntled employee puts out misinformation or accurate information that is an issue but not a huge issue, and there are times when companies are dismissive because they think that, well, they just don't have their facts right, you know, if they knew better, they would understand our point of view. Or they state the point of view one time and expect that everyone is listening. That doesn't happen either.

So you can't assume that just because you are right, you are going to win the day. I mean, that is kind of how we all have to think these days. It certainly happens in politics. You have to have

a compelling story and a narrative that might be, hopefully, more compelling than what the other side is saying in their various conspiracy theories.

But you have to be diligent and get out there the first day. You have to do scenario planning when you are doing something like a major ammo purchase and think, what might go wrong? How might certain groups take this the wrong way? How can we get everyone in the loop to say, if this thing goes south, here is the right message, let's all hang together?

When you see that work well in the public or private sector, it really does work well. But, again, you can't assume, just because you are right and they are wrong, that people will listen to you.

Mr. DUNCAN. Right.

And show of history. As I said on the ammo purchases, they could have rolled out what the last 5-year contract looked like and how an increase in agents may have justified an increase in the need for ammo, but we didn't see any of that. In fact, we saw a failure to communicate for a long period of time.

You mentioned that social media to proactively communicate with customers and counter negative publicity is a great media. I agree. We have all sorts of mechanisms at our disposal now, with Twitter and Facebook and Instagram, all kinds of things that are out there that can reach, you know, millions of people instantaneously. So I appreciate your bringing that up.

My time has expired, and the Chairman will recognize Mr. Barber for questioning.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to both of the witnesses for being here. I thought your testimony was very, very helpful. I believe many of the recommendations that you have made here this morning could certainly help the Department improve communications.

I want to talk, first of all, and talk to you, Mr. Braniff, about the "If You See Something, Say Something" campaign. The Chairman alluded to this. Coming from the Southwest as I do, I have to tell you, I was involved with being the liaison with the CBP for all of my time working for Congresswoman Giffords and since then as a Member, and it wasn't until I got here that I actually understood that that program was happening. I mean, maybe it is a function of how you communicate it. I saw it on the Metro, of course, and then in hearings I have heard about it.

But we do have an issue, as the Chairman pointed out, in the Southwest. We have a border that is porous, in my district very porous, one of the most porous areas of the entire Mexico-United States border.

I would like to ask you for specific recommendations, Mr. Braniff, on how this campaign can be made more effective in those communities. We talked a little bit about it, but could get into more specifics?

I mean, I serve both a rural and an urban district. Tucson is the main urban, and then I have a vast array of small communities in a county called Cochise County.

So could you speak to the rural dissemination of information and how we might be more effective?

Mr. BRANIFF. Ranking Member Barber, thank you for that question. This is not my field per se, but I will offer a few opinions, for what they are worth.

The survey suggests that 57 percent of those polled were willing to meet with DHS representatives, 58 percent willing to meet with local law enforcement. In a smaller rural community, I would empower local law enforcement to have community meetings where they talk about these issues and educate the public.

I think a public that is educated feels empowered. They understand that this isn't a Big Brother campaign; instead, it is a campaign that recognizes the value of the American citizen and their ability to help defend the country that they live in.

So I would probably do a lot more community outreach work with this campaign in mind, among other campaigns. I wouldn't hold a town hall meeting and talk exclusively about terrorism. I would talk about all hazards, terrorism among them, just based on the likelihood of a natural event. I mean, this is not something that happens on a daily basis.

So I would take an all-hazards approach, a community-outreach approach in rural areas.

In urban areas, I would continue to focus on aggregators, things that bring people together, just for the most bang for the buck. That can be the media, that can be subway platforms, as I eluded to earlier.

One thing that Mr. Pinkham suggested is, you know, the need for a compelling narrative. This is something that I would tread on very cautiously. It is an idea I will put on the table. I don't know that it is a good one upon, you know, more sober evaluation.

But the idea that terrorism has occurred in every State in the United States since 1970, it is a fact, means you could tell a story about a local incident in every State of the Union. You know, terrorism affects us, too, in Nebraska, in New Mexico, and tell the story of that incident.

I say that cautiously because you don't want to fear-monger and you don't want to celebrate former acts of terrorism in the continental United States. So you have to thread the needle between advertising on behalf of a terrorist organization but also highlighting to the citizenry that these events, in fact, do happen and they do happen in our backyard, albeit infrequently.

Mr. BARBER. I would absolutely agree that telling stories that resonate with people, farming communities, ranching communities in the district that I represent, for example, could really help people understand the method or the ways in which we might be affected both by terrorism or terrorists and by the drug cartels, which are the major issue that we face in the Southwest.

As I have said before, my district, unfortunately, is the most porous in the country. Fifty percent, 47 percent of the drugs seized in this country by pound are seized right in my district, with 13 percent of the border. The ranchers who live on the border are perhaps the most aware of anything, and yet I am still concerned about how they are engaged by the Department in this effort to detect this kind of invasion.

I want to turn now, if I could, Mr. Pinkham, to ask you about a question that I raised with the first panel, but we unfortunately

didn't get a chance to talk about it a lot. You may have some suggestions.

The Department of Homeland Security, unfortunately, in a recent survey that was conducted of 19 Federal agencies, is at the bottom of the list when it comes to employee morale.

I believe, having worked in a large bureaucracy, having run a State agency with thousands of employees and thousands of customers, that, obviously, information is power, and the more you have it, the more timely you have it, the more you trust the organization you work for and the better you can serve the community and internally feel that you are included.

It is a real problem with DHS. Do you have specific suggestions or recommendations that DHS should pay attention to when it is trying to deal with this very serious problem?

DHS, 22 agencies with their own history and legacy, hard to pull together, I get that. But we have to do better on the employee morale, which I think is connected to information flow and communication.

Mr. PINKHAM. Certainly, I would have to look more specifically at, you know, the survey results and to find out exactly where the issues of employee dissatisfaction were to get a general sense of strategy. But I was shocked by that number, as well, when I heard it, sitting back here, because it is so important.

You know, people are increasingly relying on word-of-mouth communication, not from the traditional media, and they believe what their friends and colleagues say. So if you are a DHS employee and you are saying good things about the agency, and I enjoy working there, it is satisfying, I am helping my Nation, that is going to resonate, not just with their family, but their neighbors and their friends. They say, well, Doug works at DHS, he loves working there, they are doing great work.

But if that same person is always complaining about their job and that they are not taken seriously and they are not treated well and they are dissatisfied, it has a disproportionate impact, because people say, well, I wonder about what they are doing, and I know a guy who works there, and he doesn't even like working there. So it magnifies.

So that is why employee communications has become such a huge priority for big companies and why, for an agency like DHS, in many ways, it is perhaps one of the most important audiences they face. Because you can't communicate credibly to the public if your own employees are, you know, not happy with what they are doing or they feel that they are getting mixed messages or that they are always being criticized for their best efforts.

But I think it sounds like it really ought to become a big priority, you know, from a communications standpoint, not just an employee relations standpoint.

Mr. BARBER. Well, let me just close with this request, if I could, to your point, Mr. Pinkham, that perhaps if we can get you a copy of that study and how it was conducted and what it said, you could, if you are willing, take some time to look at it and give us some recommendations that we could share with the Department. Certainly, I believe my colleagues on this committee would be inter-

ested in having your ideas about how we could improve employee morale and communication.

Mr. PINKHAM. I would be certainly happy to help.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Payne is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Braniff, just a quick question. What do you recommend as the most important step that the Department should take as a result of the START survey?

Mr. BRANIFF. Sir, as a native of New Jersey, thank you for your service, thank you for the question.

I would, again, I think, go back to the community outreach at the local level. I think that is where homeland security happens, I think that is where trust is built, and I think it has demonstrated its value in other realms. Other sorts of community-oriented policing programs have yielded success at a local level because they can be tailored to the local level.

So I think that I would take very positive—I would take the survey results very positively, with respect to over 50 percent of the population would be willing to meet with local authorities and Federal authorities to talk about terrorism, and I would run with that.

Mr. PAYNE. Okay.

Mr. Pinkham, you know, the Department's leadership has taken steps to create "One DHS." I think that is very important, you know, that it operates in a unified fashion, which is really the challenge.

How important is Department-wide unification and the elimination of the legacy of silos and stovepipes in terms of public messaging?

Mr. PINKHAM. It is extremely important in terms of getting everyone on the same page and making sure that you are not operating in silos. Because, again, big companies face the same challenge. You know, you have a huge, multinational company, and business units may not talk to each other and may not coordinate. That is very dangerous these days, for all kinds of reasons. So it is symbolically and organizationally important from an employee relations standpoint, you know, one general message.

Where you have to sort of think about it, because there are nuances here in that there are branches within DHS that are very public-facing, like FEMA and TSA, and they are going to need special attention and a special role in terms of how they communicate, how much they communicate. Their job is to really build rapport with the public, it is not just one-way, because of the level of trust that is needed for their jobs day-to-day. There are other branches that aren't as public-facing. While they all have to have the same messaging, their actual strategies and tactics and budgets and priorities may be a little to the side and handled differently.

But the core principles need to be unified. Hopefully, the core pride in working for the overall enterprise and agency needs to be consistent. You hope people are being cross-trained so that, if necessary, they can switch seats and, you know, support the agency in general.

Mr. PAYNE. Okay. Thank you.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is our challenge, to continue to get everyone on the same page and understand that bringing those 22 entities together and moving forward is the ultimate goal. So thank you.

Mr. DUNCAN. I want to thank the gentleman.

I think the most interesting statistic or fact that I heard today was in Mr. Pinkham's testimony, written testimony.

You said only 4 in 10 Americans, or 41 percent, said they have a favorable view of the Federal Government. A majority, 58 percent, said they had not too much or no trust at all that the Government can solve problems.

I think if you broke that down to this agency, DHS as a whole, and drilled down into certain specific subagencies like TSA, I believe those numbers may be a lot more alarming.

So, we can do better. I think the agency and Government as a whole can do better just by simply communicating better. It is not that difficult to do if you follow some of the best practices that the private sector has talked about today.

So, in conclusion, I will ask that DHS will take these words to heart, will apply some of these techniques. I think you see the concerns on both sides of the aisle with regards to where we are at with communicating with the American people about the issues that are of the day.

So I want to thank the witnesses for your valuable testimony on both panels.

I want to thank the Members for their participation and their questions today.

The Members of the committee may have some additional questions for both panels, and we would ask you just to respond to those in writing.

We will make sure that the agency gets a copy of those answers, as well.

So, without objection, the subcommittee will adjourn. Thank you. [Whereupon, at 10:47 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

