

Representative KATKO for his leadership on the Homeland Security Committee, and for meeting with me to discuss my priorities for bombing prevention from our service branches to the domestic front.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of New Jersey, there have been more than 25 bomb scares since 2020, threatening public schools, universities, community centers, and religious institutions.

Just last fall in my district, the Roxbury Township school system received a bomb threat that led to panic and K9 sweeps on school property during teaching hours, and nearby Hope-well Valley Central High School encountered an explosive threat that forced the school to evacuate and shut down early for the day.

In addition, 7 years ago this September, over a 2-day period, communities in Seaside Park and Elizabeth, New Jersey, as well as the Chelsea neighborhood of Manhattan were rocked by three bombings that wounded 31 people.

Subsequent analysis done by the Office for Bombing Prevention at DHS determined that each of the devices planted by the assailant was completely different from the others.

Two of the bombs were pipe bombs, two were homemade pressure cooker bombs, some used modified Christmas tree lights and cellphones, and one of the pressure cooker bombs used two different chemicals that alone are not dangerous but ignite when combined.

□ 1445

The office concluded that while each of the bombs was different, all included elements detailed in several issues of al-Qaida's Inspire magazine.

The invaluable analysis carried out by the office in the wake of the September 2016 New Jersey-area attacks was shared with first responders and homeland security stakeholders all across the country, underscoring the expertise of the Office for Bombing Prevention and the important role it plays in equipping our communities with the best information available to keep the public safe.

Today, the office provides critical support to help defend communities across America from the threats posed by explosives, but we need to empower it to do more. The Bombing Prevention Act does just that. It has been endorsed by the Anti-Defamation League and by the Jewish Federations of North America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6873, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

MALINOWSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6873, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2022

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6825) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance the funding and administration of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6825

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nonprofit Security Grant Program Improvement Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. ENHANCEMENTS TO FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION OF NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2009 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "and threats" before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "this" before "subsection"; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) determined by the Secretary to be at risk of terrorist attacks and threats.";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (E), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking "The recipient" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The recipient";

(C) in subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking "equipment and inspection and screening systems" and inserting "equipment, inspection and screening systems, and alteration or remodeling of existing buildings or physical facilities";

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) Facility security personnel costs, including costs associated with contracted security.

"(D) Expenses directly related to the administration of the grant, except that such expenses may not exceed five percent of the amount of the grant.";

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

"(2) RETENTION.—Each State through which a recipient receives a grant under this section may retain up to five percent of each grant for expenses directly related to the administration of the grant.";

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "2020 through 2024" and inserting "2022 through 2028"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Each such report shall also include information on the number of applications submitted by eligible nonprofit organizations to each State, the number of applications submitted by each State to the Administrator, and the operations of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program Office, including staffing resources and efforts with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (c)(1).";

(5) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (j);

(6) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsections:

"(f) ADMINISTRATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall establish within the Federal Emergency Management Agency a program office for the Program (in this section referred to as the 'program office'). The program office shall be headed by a senior official of the Agency. The Administrator shall administer the Program (including, where appropriate, in coordination with States), including relating to the following:

"(1) Outreach, engagement, education, and technical assistance and support to eligible nonprofit organizations described in subsection (b), with particular attention to such organizations in underserved communities, prior to, during, and after the awarding of grants, including web-based training videos for eligible nonprofit organizations that provide guidance on preparing an application and the environmental planning and historic preservation process.

"(2) Establishment of mechanisms to ensure program office processes are conducted in accordance with constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and other legal and agency policy requirements that protect civil rights and civil liberties and, to the maximum extent practicable, advance equity for members of underserved communities.

"(3) Establishment of mechanisms for the Administrator to provide feedback to eligible nonprofit organizations that do not receive grants.

"(4) Establishment of mechanisms to collect data to measure the effectiveness of grants under the Program.

"(5) Establishment and enforcement of standardized baseline operational requirements for States, including requirements for States to eliminate or prevent any administrative or operational obstacles that may impact eligible nonprofit organizations described in subsection (b) from receiving grants under the Program.

"(6) Carrying out efforts to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse, including through audits of grantees.

"(g) GRANT GUIDELINES.—For each fiscal year, prior to awarding grants under this section, the Administrator—

"(1) shall publish guidelines, including a notice of funding opportunity or similar announcement, as the Administrator determines appropriate; and

"(2) may prohibit States from closing application processes prior to the publication of such guidelines.

"(h) ALLOCATION REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that—

“(A) 50 percent of amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (k) is provided to eligible recipients located in high-risk urban areas that receive funding under section 2003 in the current fiscal year or received such funding in any of the preceding ten fiscal years, inclusive of any amounts States may retain pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (c); and

“(B) 50 percent of amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorizations of appropriations under subsection (k) is provided to eligible recipients located in jurisdictions not receiving funding under section 2003 in the current fiscal year or have not received such funding in any of the preceding ten fiscal years, inclusive of any amounts States may retain pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (c).

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Administrator may allocate a different percentage if the Administrator does not receive a sufficient number of applications from eligible recipients to meet the allocation percentages described in either subparagraph (A) or (B) of such paragraph. If the Administrator exercises the authorization under this paragraph, the Administrator shall, not later than 30 days after such exercise, report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate regarding such exercise.

“(i) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act’), shall not apply to any changes to the application materials, Program forms, or other core Program documentation intended to enhance participation by eligible nonprofit organizations in the Program.”;

(7) in subsection (j), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$75 million for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024” and inserting “\$75,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 and \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2028”;

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), not more than five percent is authorized—

“(A) to operate the program office; and

“(B) for other costs associated with the management, administration, and evaluation of the Program.”;

(8) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) TREATMENT.—Nonprofit organizations determined by the Secretary to be at risk of extremist attacks other than terrorist attacks and threats under subsection (a) are deemed to satisfy the conditions specified in subsection (b) if protecting such organizations against such other extremist attacks would help protect such organizations against such terrorist attacks and threats.”.

(b) PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a plan for the administration of the program office for the Nonprofit Security Grant Program established under subsection (f) of section 2009 of the Homeland Security Act 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609a), as amended by subsection (a), including a staffing plan for such program office.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2008 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) by striking “sections 2003 and 2004” and inserting “sections 2003, 2004, and 2009”;

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “section 2003 or 2004” and inserting “sections 2003, 2004, or 2009”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6825, the Nonprofit Security Grant Program Improvement Act.

More than 20 years after the September 11 attacks, the terrorism threat landscape has grown significantly more complex, and houses of worship and other nonprofits have become targets for domestic and foreign terrorists.

Earlier this year, four Americans were held at gunpoint by a terrorist at a synagogue in Colleyville, Texas. During the Colleyville attack, Rabbi Charlie Cytron-Walker used security training to help bring the standoff to an end without injury to his congregants.

The training that proved so crucial that Sabbath was funded by the Department of Homeland Security’s Nonprofit Security Grant Program. The NSGP, as it has come to be known, is a competitive grant program that provides funding to nonprofit organizations, such as religious institutions, at high risk of a terrorist attack to help bolster their security.

Grant funding is primarily used to pay for active shooter training, fencing, barriers, and surveillance cameras.

In recent years, demand for the program has grown exponentially, given the heightened threat environment that we face. Over the past 3 years, to meet this demand, Congress has increased funding almost threefold to \$250 million in fiscal year 2022.

Even with significant new resources, FEMA reported that, in fiscal year 2021, there was a \$200 million gap between applications and funding. To provide FEMA with more resources to help bolster the security of more at-risk nonprofits, H.R. 6825 authorizes \$500 million in grant funding for fiscal years 2023 to 2028.

This bipartisan bill, which was introduced by the leaders of the Committee on Homeland Security, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON and Ranking Member JOHN KATKO, also includes a range

of enhancements to the program’s operations.

H.R. 6825 would establish a dedicated program office to carry out education, outreach, and engagement to provide technical assistance and support. Among other things, it includes technical changes to eliminate or prevent administrative or operational obstacles that may impact access by eligible applicants; sets baseline requirements for States that administer the program; and requires audits to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

The legislation, which was developed in close coordination with FEMA, was unanimously supported by the committee in March.

Before I conclude, I would like to address an article that appeared in the Jewish Link, a prominent news outlet for the Jewish community in New Jersey and New York, in which questions were raised about the grant guidance for the program for the current fiscal year.

On behalf of Chairman THOMPSON, let me express my appreciation to Representatives PASCRELL and GOTTHEIMER, in particular, for alerting the committee to these concerns and the chairman’s commitment to engage FEMA about the questions that were raised.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 6825, the Nonprofit Security Grant Program Improvement Act of 2022.

FEMA’s Nonprofit Security Grant Program is an important resource available to nonprofit organizations, especially our houses of worship. As we all know, faith-based communities across the country face varying levels of discrimination, and it is vital that we strengthen our Nation’s emergency preparedness posture to prevent violence against all religious groups.

H.R. 6825 expands the use of Nonprofit Security Grant Program funds to include alteration or remodeling of existing buildings or physical facilities and facility security personnel costs, including costs associated with contracted security.

This bill requires more accountability on the part of FEMA to Congress by requiring the Administrator of FEMA to include information on the number of applications submitted by eligible nonprofit organizations to each State, the number of applications submitted by each State, and specific operations of the grant office in FEMA’s annual report to Congress.

Finally, this legislation also establishes an office within FEMA to provide outreach, engagement, education, and technical assistance to support eligible nonprofit organizations. This will better ensure that eligible organizations, including houses of worship, know the resources available to them.

I urge Members to support H.R. 6825, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, as an original member of the Homeland Security Committee, I had the pleasure of serving with Chairman THOMPSON. It has only been lately that we understand what he means to this country. Together, we worked to establish and grow the Nonprofit Security Grant Program into what it is now.

I associate myself with the words of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and our associates from Arkansas and Kansas. I hope people listened to what they had to say on the previous bill because knowledge is power in trying to keep the American people safe.

From Jersey City, to Colleyville, to Pittsburgh, our faith-based communities have become targets. Our churches, synagogues, and mosques are facing increased volatility, unpredictability, and threats. Now, that is either a fact or it is not a fact.

The Nonprofit Security Grant Program is a vital tool to help keep people safe from this dire threat. H.R. 6825 recognizes this growing threat by increasing the program's authorization, as you just heard. It is money that will be well spent.

We must ensure that every community can get these resources. Too many communities do not have the historic ability to even write a grant, believe it or not.

But revising the formula should not create obstacles for high-threat communities or regions, like my home State of New Jersey. I am closely monitoring the new formula FEMA has offered. It will give preference to applications with a higher Social Vulnerability Index.

It is one of the pillars of America that our neighbors are secure in their houses of worship. I will fight hard for fairness in distributing these funds.

I applaud Chairman THOMPSON for bringing this bill to the floor. Domestic terrorism threatens every community in our Nation, and we blew it 12 years ago. It is something I have warned about over a decade, and it is not abating but growing.

This funding will save lives and secure houses of worship. I urge swift passage of H.R. 6825.

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, violence shattered communities across the country this weekend, making it a very sad one for this Nation.

First, on Friday night in Milwaukee, 21 people were injured in a mass shooting as the city hosted the NBA play-

offs. Then, on Saturday, a gunman who posted a manifesto online espousing violent white supremacist viewpoints drove 2 hours to a grocery store in a predominantly Black area of Buffalo and opened fire on customers, killing 10 innocent people. Finally, yesterday, in Laguna Woods, California, an armed intruder burst into a predominantly Taiwanese Christian congregation meeting in a Presbyterian church, killing one congregant and critically wounding four others.

Today, we mourn with these communities and families who were rocked by this violence, but we also must continue asking tough questions about what is fueling such racially motivated violent extremism.

Just months ago, FBI Director Christopher Wray told Congress domestic terrorism is metastasizing through this country and was not going away any time soon. The intelligence community has recently warned that racially motivated violent extremism poses the most lethal domestic terrorism threat.

While Americans may not see eye-to-eye on what factors contribute to the current threat landscape, there seems to be general agreement that public spaces, in general, and houses of worship, in particular, need to be more secure.

That is where the Nonprofit Security Grant Program comes in. This grant program is incredibly important to at-risk nonprofits that need to bolster their security against mass shootings and terrorism threats.

In 2020, I was proud to author legislation that was enacted into law to authorize this program. Today, I am here in support of H.R. 6825, legislation I introduced in the wake of a terrorist attack on a synagogue in Colleyville, Texas, to expand the availability of crucial funding to more at-risk nonprofits and improve the program's operations.

My legislation, Mr. Speaker, does so by increasing the authorization for funding to \$500 million annually through fiscal year 2028 and by establishing a dedicated program office.

This past February, the National Terrorism Advisory System Bulletin stated: "Threats directed at historically Black colleges and universities and other colleges and universities, Jewish facilities, and churches cause concern and may inspire extremist threat actors to mobilize to violence."

□ 1500

With each passing day, the list of potential targets for mass violence seems to expand, and FEMA has already told us that even with funding for the program increasing roughly three-fold in just a few short years, the demand for funding is still outpacing available funding. The additional resources provided under my bill will help FEMA do more to help more at-risk nonprofits.

Importantly, H.R. 6825 requires FEMA to provide outreach, engagement, and technical support to non-

profits, with particular attention to eligible at-risk nonprofits in underserved communities.

As was mentioned before, in recent days, questions have arisen about how FEMA plans to bring new at-risk nonprofits into the program, a goal that many of us support.

I strongly believe that with the enhanced funding that Congress provides in this year's appropriations, FEMA can expand the program's reach while preserving funding to existing grantees that continue to be at risk.

To that end, together with my colleague, Mr. PASCRELL, I am engaging FEMA about its approach, and I look forward to resolving it.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to my colleagues' support in passing this critical legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, back home in New Jersey, I make a point of checking in on faith communities as often as I can. We gather together, we talk about the issues of the day, we talk about how their members can help the community at large. And in every one of these conversations, I am sad to say, the issue of security comes up. We talk about this grant program and how it can help them protect themselves.

It saddens me because I know that bulletproof glass is not the solution to hatred. Security guards and security cameras are not the solution to the violence that is plaguing our society. Security at the point of the religious institution is not the solution, it is the last resort. And yet, it is something that we have to do. Until we defeat the hatred, until we deal with how it spreads through our society, we have to harden our institutions so people can worship and gather peacefully in safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of a bill that addresses this need, H.R. 6825, the Nonprofit Security Grant Program Improvement Act. It is a timely measure that is responsive to the current threat picture.

Instances of anti-Semitic crime, for example, hit an all-time high in 2021 in America. My home State of New Jersey and the neighboring State of New York, accounted for nearly 30 percent of the reported total.

The bill is endorsed by The Jewish Federations of North America, the Anti-Defamation League, the Sikh Coalition, the Secure Community Network, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, and The National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc.

Just today, ahead of consideration of the bill, The Jewish Federations of North America reached out to say: "The Nonprofit Security Grant Program is critically important to the safety and security of faith communities and others who are at risk. The Jewish Federations would like to thank Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KATKO for advancing an

authorization bill that will strengthen the Nonprofit Security Grant Program and increase much-needed funding for at-risk institutions.”

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, while it is not enough, I do strongly believe that enactment of H.R. 6825 will position this program to be effective in the future. It will enable us to provide these essential grants to every faith institution that needs them.

None of us want to communicate to folks in our district that we were able to help this synagogue, this mosque, this church, but the one across the street, the one in a different neighborhood, we are sorry, we can't help you because we ran out of money. That is absolutely unacceptable, and we are going to solve this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6825, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6825, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

DHS ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6871) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6871

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS Acquisition Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY OF MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and acquisition management” after “Procurement”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by inserting “(including firearms and other sensitive assets)” after “equipment”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), the first subsection (e) (relating to the system for award management consultation), and the second subsection (e) (relating to the definition of interoperable communications) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) ACQUISITION AND RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1702(a) of title 41, United States Code, the Under Secretary for Management is the Chief Acquisition Officer of the Department. As Chief Acquisition Officer, the Under Secretary shall have the authorities and perform the functions specified in section 1702(b) of such title, and perform all other functions and responsibilities delegated by the Secretary or described in this subsection.

“(2) FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to the authorities and functions specified in section 1702(b) of title 41, United States Code, the functions and responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Management related to acquisition (as such term is defined in section 131 of such title) include the following:

“(A) Advising the Secretary regarding acquisition management activities, considering risks of failure to achieve cost, schedule, or performance parameters, to ensure that the Department achieves its mission through the adoption of widely accepted program management best practices (as such term is defined in section 714) and standards and, where appropriate, acquisition innovation best practices.

“(B) Leading the Department's acquisition oversight body, the Acquisition Review Board.

“(C) Synchronizing interagency coordination relating to acquisition programs and acquisition management efforts of the Department.

“(D) Exercising the acquisition decision authority (as such term is defined in section 714) to approve, pause, modify (including the rescission of approvals of program milestones), or cancel major acquisition programs (as such term is defined in section 714), unless the Under Secretary delegates such authority to a Component Acquisition Executive (as such term is defined in section 714) pursuant to paragraph (3).

“(E) Providing additional scrutiny and oversight for an acquisition that is not a major acquisition if—

“(i) the acquisition is for a program that is important to the strategic and performance plans of the Department;

“(ii) the acquisition is for a program with significant program or policy implications; and

“(iii) the Secretary determines that such scrutiny and oversight for the acquisition is proper and necessary.

“(F) Establishing policies for managing acquisitions across the Department that promote best practices (as such term is defined in section 714).

“(G) Establishing policies for acquisition that implement an approach that considers risks of failure to achieve cost, schedule, or performance parameters that all components of the Department shall comply with, including outlining relevant authorities for program managers to effectively manage acquisition programs (as such term is defined in section 714).

“(H) Ensuring that each major acquisition program has a Department-approved acquisition program baseline (as such term is defined in section 714), pursuant to the Department's acquisition management policy that is traceable to the life-cycle cost estimate of the program, integrated master schedule, and operational requirements.

“(I) Assisting the heads of components and Component Acquisition Executives in efforts to comply with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives.

“(J) Ensuring that grants and financial assistance are provided only to individuals and organizations that are not suspended or debarred.

“(K) Distributing guidance throughout the Department to ensure that contractors involved in acquisitions, particularly contractors that access the Department's information systems and technologies, adhere to relevant Department policies related to physical and information security as identified by the Under Secretary.

“(L) Overseeing the Component Acquisition Executive organizational structure to ensure Component Acquisition Executives have sufficient capabilities and comply with Department acquisition policies.

“(M) Developing and managing a professional acquisition workforce to ensure the goods and services acquired by the Department meet the needs of the mission and are at the best value for the expenditure of public resources.

“(3) DELEGATION OF CERTAIN ACQUISITION DECISION AUTHORITY.—The Under Secretary for Management may delegate acquisition decision authority, in writing, to the relevant Component Acquisition Executive for a major capital asset, service, or hybrid acquisition program that has a life-cycle cost estimate of at least \$300,000,000 but not more than \$1,000,000,000, based on fiscal year 2022 constant dollars, if—

“(A) the component concerned possesses working policies, processes, and procedures that are consistent with Department acquisition policy;

“(B) the Component Acquisition Executive concerned has adequate, experienced, and dedicated professional employees with program management training; and

“(C) each major acquisition program has a Department-approved acquisition program baseline, and it is meeting agreed-upon cost, schedule, and performance thresholds.”.

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF TEST AND EVALUATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 323. OFFICE OF TEST AND EVALUATION.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established in the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department an Office of Test and Evaluation (in this section referred to as the ‘Office’). The Office shall—

“(1) serve as the principal advisory office for test and evaluation support across the Department; and

“(2) serve as the test and evaluation liaison with—

“(A) Federal agencies and foreign, State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments;

“(B) the private sector;

“(C) institutions of higher education; and

“(D) other relevant entities.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be led by a Director. The Director shall oversee the duties specified in subsection (a) and carry out the following responsibilities:

“(1) Serve as a member of the Department's Acquisition Review Board.

“(2) Establish and update, as necessary, test and evaluation policies, procedures, and guidance for the Department.

“(3) Ensure, in coordination with the Chief Acquisition Officer, the Joint Requirements Council, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, and relevant component heads, that acquisition programs (as such term is defined in section 714)—

“(A) complete reviews of operational requirements to ensure such requirements—

“(i) are informed by threats, including physical and cybersecurity threats;