

**THE HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT'S  
BUDGET SUBMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON  
HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 17, 2013

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

Printed for the use of the  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

80-572 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2014

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware *Chairman*

CARL LEVIN, Michigan	TOM COBURN, Oklahoma
MARK L. PRYOR, Arkansas	JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	RON JOHNSON, Wisconsin
CLAIRE MCCASKILL, Missouri	ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
JON TESTER, Montana	RAND PAUL, Kentucky
MARK BEGICH, Alaska	MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin	KELLY AYOTTE, New Hampshire
HEIDI HEITKAMP, North Dakota	

RICHARD J. KESSLER, *Staff Director*

JOHN P. KILVINGTON, *Deputy Staff Director*

MARY BETH SCHULTZ, *Chief Counsel for Homeland Security*

STEPHEN R. VIÑA, *Deputy Chief Counsel for Homeland Security*

TROY H. CRIBB, *Chief Counsel for Governmental Affairs*

SUSAN B. CORBIN, *DHS Detailee*

KEITH B. ASHDOWN, *Minority Staff Director*

CHRISTOPHER J. BARKLEY, *Minority Deputy Staff Director*

DANIEL P. LIPS, *Minority Director for Homeland Security*

TRINA D. SHIFFMAN, *Chief Clerk*

LAURA W. KILBRIDE, *Hearing Clerk*

# CONTENTS

---

Opening statements:	Page
Senator Carper .....	1
Senator Coburn .....	5
Senator Johnson .....	15
Senator Ayotte .....	17
Senator Baldwin .....	19
Senator Begich .....	21
Senator Paul .....	24
Senator McCain .....	25
Senator McCaskill .....	28
Prepared statements:	
Senator Carper .....	39
Senator Coburn .....	42

## WITNESSES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2013

Hon. Janet A. Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security	
Testimony .....	6
Prepared statement .....	44
Responses to post-hearing questions for the Record .....	67



## **THE HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2012

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY  
AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:04 a.m., in room SD-342, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Thomas R. Carper, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Carper, Pryor, McCaskill, Begich, Baldwin, Heitkamp, Coburn, McCain, Johnson, Paul, and Ayotte.

### **OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN CARPER**

Chairman CARPER. Good morning. This hearing will come to order.

Our thanks to Secretary Napolitano for joining us to discuss the President's budget request for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for fiscal year (FY) 2014. Before we start, I want to take just a moment on behalf of Dr. Coburn and my colleagues to offer our condolences to the victims of the tragic Boston Marathon terrorist attacks and to their families. I am going to ask that we start this hearing with a moment of silence to remember the victims and their families in our prayers. [Moment of silence.]

Thank you.

Let me also take a moment just to thank our first responders and many brave bystanders who selflessly rushed into the chaotic scene to care for those who had been injured, in some cases killed, and the law enforcement personnel at the Federal, State, and local levels who continue to investigate this tragedy. We are carefully monitoring this situation and will continue to do so. In the end, we will get to the bottom of this incident and bring those responsible to justice. Every American has a role in these efforts, and we can do so by embracing one of the Secretary's main messages, and that is, if you see something, say something. Every time we go into an airport or a train station, we are reminded of those words. If we see something, say something. In this case, whoever is responsible will be brought to justice, not just because of the efforts of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), or State and local law enforcement (SLE), but because of the help of hundreds, thousands of people who saw something and are going to try to say something with all of us.

In the Navy we say, “All hands on deck.” This is all hands on deck, and everybody who wants to help, this is a good way for everybody to be part of the solution.

Unfortunately, such tragic acts of terror serve as a reminder of the critically important mission given to the Department of Homeland Security. Crafting a budget for an agency this complex and important is never easy and is particularly challenging in this fiscal environment.

The Administration’s \$39 billion budget request makes some very tough choices. It cuts the Department’s budget by roughly 2 percent below 2012 levels, but it is at least consistent with what Congress appropriated in 2013 for the Department, before sequestration cuts were applied. Still, the level of funding in this proposed 2014 budget is lower than what Congress appropriated in 2009.

Stepping back and thinking about all of the challenges that our country and this Department have faced since 2009—the Christmas Day bomber, the Times Square bomber, the Yemen Cargo Bomb plot, Hurricane Sandy, the ever-changing and ever-growing cyber threat, and now the Boston attack—it is easy to become concerned with this budget request. That said, we are facing extremely difficult budgetary times and sacrifices must be made.

And while I recognize some important missions may not receive all of the funding they or we would want in a perfect world, all departments and agencies in government must share in the sacrifices to some extent required to rein in our deficit. Our Secretary seems to have taken this message to heart, identifying \$1.3 billion in cost savings this year and more than \$4 billion since 2009, and continues to move to a risk-based approach in an effort to save more money, but to do so in a smart way.

I am happy to see that this budget proposes a much needed increase for cybersecurity which will help the Department fulfill its significant cyber responsibilities. Of course, additional resources alone are not going to get the job done—that is why passing comprehensive bipartisan legislation to complement the President’s Executive Order (EO) and address the cyber threat is one of our highest priorities.

I also welcomed the Administration’s continued commitment to securing our Nation’s borders by maintaining staffing for the Border Patrol at its current historic levels and adding more than 3,400 Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers to staff our ports of entry (POE). These critical resources are paid for, in part, with modest fee increases.

During my recent trips to our borders in Arizona, where Secretary Napolitano, Senator McCain, and Congressman McCaul joined me and I have been up to Michigan with Senator Levin recently. I heard from local mayors, business leaders, and frontline officers, I heard them say that they need more help at our ports of entry. And I anticipate we will hear many more of the same comments when I visit in Texas later this month, I think April 30 and May 1.

I just want to say to my colleagues, for anyone who is interested in spending a day and a half going down to the border in Texas, late afternoon April 30 and all day on May 1, that I would welcome you to join us.

I believe that if something is worth having, it is worth paying for, and it is worth it to Americans to better facilitate trade and travel at our ports of entry, and we need to pay for it. That is why I agree with the President's proposal to use some modest fee increases to pay for more Customs and Border Protection officers. These efforts will build on the tremendous progress we have made in securing the border over the past decade. I look forward to reviewing the immigration bill introduced this morning, I think at quarter of 2, by Senators McCain, Durbin, Schumer, and others of our colleagues to make sure that the bill makes smart investments in border security, focusing on deploying force multipliers that can help our frontline agents be more effective and efficient.

Last, I was encouraged to see the increase in funding for the consolidation of the Department's Headquarters at the St. Elizabeths Campus which I visited earlier this week. The \$105 million in this request, in conjunction with the money that the General Services Administration (GSA) has requested, will yield real savings to taxpayers by allowing us to stop leasing buildings all over the D.C. metro area, dozens of buildings all over the D.C. metro area, and help the Department at the same time to improve management and to increase morale.

Among the major departments in our Federal Government, the Department of Homeland Security has had and continues to have the lowest ranking morale. I think there is a reason for that, and one of the reasons is that they are scattered to the winds. They are not really a team, they are not really a unit. They need to be, as best we can, joined together at a central location, and we are going to try to do that. I know it is a tough, heavy lift, but it is one that we started, made huge investments—I think \$1 billion investment in infrastructure. If we stop now, we have huge investments in infrastructure and not much there to connect the infrastructure to. I do not think that is a very smart investment.

With that said, I am concerned that this budget's significant cuts to several key homeland priorities may be penny-wise and pound-foolish. The cuts to management, for instance, are shortsighted and will, I fear, undermine the progress the Department has made in this area. Last year for the first time, the Department of Homeland Security earned, as you know, a qualified audit opinion on all of its fiscal year 2011 financial statements. And in its latest high-risk report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) confirmed that there has been considerable progress at the Department in integrating its components and in strengthening its management. We are looking for a clean audit in 2014 and applaud the progress that has been made. We cannot lose this momentum. Better management will yield better results and stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

I am also concerned by the proposed reduction in frontline personnel at Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). As we work to reform our immigration laws, I believe that ICE will play a critical role. I think we all do. These reductions there could undermine our efforts to implement new reforms. I am sure we will revisit this during the course of the hearing. We also need to do a better job of managing our detention efforts to ensure that criminals are kept off the streets. While acknowledging that the sequestration Congress launched is partly to blame, I was disappointed

with the management failures that led ICE to release a number of felons among the more than 2,000 detainees 2 months ago because of budget constraints.

Another area of concern is the \$714 million request to fund the construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) in Kansas. We have talked a little bit about this. I am sure we will talk about it some more today. And I understand the importance of studying animal diseases—we all do—but I hope we can avoid providing full funding—I think seven-hundred-some million dollars in full funding—in 2014 alone for a multi-year construction project. If there is some way to build it in logical segments so we can do it over a 2- or 3-year period and, thus, avoid taking away resources from other agencies like ICE, the Coast Guard, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) next year, maybe even management, some of the management monies that we need for the Department.

And, finally, I am concerned by proposed cuts in the support the Department of Homeland Security provides to State and local governments and first responders through Homeland Security Grants, exercises, and training. As we saw clearly this week, State and local officials are the ones who will inevitably be on the front lines responding to terrorist attacks. My friend Dr. Coburn always reminds us that we need to be risk based and that we need to keep that in mind, particularly as we consider these grants to our State and local colleagues.

While acknowledging that our approach must be risk based, I want to ensure that the Department is able to continue to help State and local responders with the plans, training, and equipment they need to respond effectively, as they did so admirably in Boston this week.

The elephant in the room, of course, is sequestration. If implemented, it would take another 5 percent off the Department's already limited budget. These cuts, I fear, would interfere with the Department's operations and management and with its ability to fulfill its missions. We must find a better way to deal with our budget crisis. We need a comprehensive plan to rein in our Federal debt and deficit.

And, finally, as my colleagues have heard me say any number of times, I favor a "grand bargain"—the man sitting to my right here has worked very hard to help craft one a couple of years ago, but a grand bargain that does three things: First, raises revenues closer to levels that existed in the last 4 years of the Clinton Administration, when we actually had four balanced budgets in a row; second, to enact entitlement reform that saves money, avoids savaging older people and poor people, and actually saves these programs for future generations; and, finally, the third element, we need to look in every nook and cranny of the Federal Government and ask this question: How can we get a better result for less money in everything that we do?

I believe now is the time to make this grand bargain. The cost of the failure to do so is just too high for all of us.

Now let me turn to Dr. Coburn for any comments he would like to make at this time. Welcome. Thank you.



**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR COBURN**

Senator COBURN. Thank you. Madam Secretary, welcome. I appreciate your service. We have a lot to go through today.

I am one of the few Members of Congress who has supported your idea of consolidating our grant programs, and I commend you on that. You will have my help in working toward that, with the caveat that we actually do a much better job in terms of putting metrics on those grants and that they are truly risk based. So I will be there to help you do that. There are a lot of areas where we are not effective with Homeland Security Grants today.

I also would comment, if you read the Constitution and you look at the enumerated powers, a lot of what we have done is not our role. It is the State and locals' role. And what we have done is we have created some learned dependency out there that individual States and communities are going to have to free themselves of, because the budget parameters are not going to allow us to be the source for what they need.

On top of that, the point is we cannot spend enough money to give us a 100 percent guarantee of security.

The other thing we cannot do is we cannot get security to the level that we are going to compromise our liberty. So we have those two tensions that are going forward.

I have to say, I do trust you in terms of your vision of trying to do the best to balance those tensions. And I look forward to working with you so that we can move more of these dollars to risk-based prevention rather than parochial based. Most of the people in this room do not know the fights that we have at markups when parochial displaces the primacy of risk-based needs. There is nothing wrong with fighting for your State, but there is plenty wrong when you have fought for your State and resources which could have been used to prevent something and they are not available at the highest risk places.

The last point I would make with this large budget, and I would tell my colleague, sequestration is going to stay. That level of funding is not going up. We are not going to go back on the pledge to the American people to trim down the size of the Federal Government. And one of the positive things that is coming out of sequestration is innovation, judgment, and making hard decisions. My wish would be that the President would ask us for more flexibility. He has refused to do so, but I think eventually we are going to see that request.

My hope is that Congress is going to give you more flexibility so that can actually make the judgments that we are paying you to make.

With all of that comes the very thing that every family in this country is doing: They are doing more with less, instead of less with more. And the No. 1 charge to your agency is to do more with less. And that is across this government. It is going to have to happen. It is the only way we get out and create a future for the generations that follow us. So I look forward to your testimony. I am a supporter when it comes to reforming the things that you need to actually do your job, and I will be there to help you.

Thank you.

Chairman CARPER. Thanks, Dr. Coburn.

Before I introduce Secretary Napolitano, I want to thank Senator Heitkamp, Senator Ayotte, Senator Johnson, and Senator Baldwin for being here. Senator Baldwin, a couple of refugees from Madison, Wisconsin, are out in the audience there, George and Donna. Would you all raise your hands and say hello to one of your two Senators right there? They came to say hello. They are former Delawareans. We are happy to see them.

I may interrupt this hearing for a minute or two. Once we have, I think, nine people here, that gives us a quorum to consider the nomination of Sylvia Mathews Burwell to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Secretary Napolitano, I want to again thank you and FBI Director Mueller for joining us last evening for a classified briefing in The Capitol on the Boston tragedy. We want to welcome you here today. As our Secretary, you have led the Department I think since 2009, and starting her second term, we are glad you signed on for a second hitch.

Given the recent bombings in Boston, we appreciate your efforts all the more, and those of the team that you lead, and look forward to this time today to talk with you about the Department's fiscal year 2014 budget request.

We also want to offer any time if you want at the beginning for any updates you want to provide for the ongoing efforts in Boston, and you are now recognized to do that and for your statement. Thank you. Welcome.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. JANET A. NAPOLITANO,<sup>1</sup> SECRETARY,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, thank you, Chairman Carper and Ranking Member Coburn and Members of the Committee, for the opportunity to discuss the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security.

Before I begin, as the Chairman acknowledged, I would like to say a few words about the attack in Boston. Our thoughts and our prayers remain with the victims and their families and with the city of Boston.

DHS is, in fact, a big part of the Boston community. Hundreds of our men and women go to work in the city every day. And across the region they protect the traveling public. They secure critical infrastructure, they patrol ports and waterways. They help investigate crimes, enforce Federal laws, and support our State and local partners. So the attack directly affected DHS in many ways.

I have personally been speaking with the Governor, the mayor, the police commissioner, members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, and others, assuring them that we will do all we can to bring whoever is responsible for the attack to justice.

As President Obama has said, the FBI is investigating this as an act of terrorism, and the full force of the Federal Government will support the response and the investigation.

There is no current indication to suggest the attack was indicative of a broader plot, but out of an abundance of caution, we continue to keep in place enhanced security measures, both seen and

<sup>1</sup>The prepared statement of Ms. Napolitano appears in the Appendix on page 44.

unseen, in coordination with Federal, State, and local partners. We continue to urge the American public to remain vigilant and immediately report any signs of suspicious activity to local law enforcement.

We thank the people of Boston for their response. We stand in solidarity with them and with everyone who has been making sure that the response, the recovery, and the investigation continue full force.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I think I should not say anything in an unclassified setting except to reassure the Committee that DHS is putting its full force into providing the FBI with any and all assistance it requires in addition to doing a number of other things with the city of Boston.

Chairman CARPER. Thank you.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. As you know, this year marks the 10th anniversary of the creation of DHS, the largest reorganization of the U.S. Government since the formation of the Department of Defense (DOD). After 10 years of effort, DHS has transformed 22 legacy agencies into a single integrated Department, building a strengthened homeland security enterprise and a more secure America better equipped to confront the range of threats that we face.

The President's fiscal year 2014 budget for DHS allows us to build on our progress over the past 10 years by preserving core frontline operational priorities. At the same time, given the current fiscal environment, this is the third straight year that our budget request reflects a reduction from the previous year.

Specifically, the budget request is 2.2 percent, or more than \$800 million, below the fiscal year 2013 enacted budget. While our mission has not changed and we continue to face evolving threats, we have become more strategic in how we use these resources, focusing on a risk-based approach. This is coupled with an unprecedented commitment to fiscal discipline which has led to over \$4 billion in cost avoidances and reductions over the past 4 years through a process we call Efficiency Review (ER).

Before I get to the nuts and bolts of the budget, I want to pause to talk a little bit about sequestration because—

Chairman CARPER. Excuse me. Could I ask you to pause just for a little longer? We have nine Senators here.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. This is a good time to break.

Chairman CARPER. If you could just pause for a moment.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. OK. I will go ahead and suspend here.

Chairman CARPER. Senator Heitkamp is going to preside over the Senate in about 10 minutes, so we want to get this done.

[Whereupon, at 10:24 a.m., the Committee proceeded to other business and reconvened at 10:26 a.m.]

Chairman CARPER. We look forward to the rest of your testimony. Thank you.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Let me, if I might, resume with a quick discussion of sequestration, which has significant effects for the Department, more than \$3 billion in cuts across DHS over 6 months.

Now, the recent full-year appropriations bill enabled DHS to mitigate to some degree the projected sequester impacts under the continuing resolution (CR) on our operations and workforce. But

there is no doubt that the remaining cuts will affect operations in the short and long term.

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

First, to prevent terrorism and enhance security, the fiscal year 2014 budget continues to support risk-based security initiatives, including the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Pre-Check, Global Entry, and other trusted traveler programs. As a result, we expect one in four travelers to receive some form of expedited screening domestically by the end of the year. The budget supports Administration efforts to secure maritime cargo and the global supply chain by strengthening efforts to interdict threats at the earliest point possible.

We continue our strong support for State and local partners through training, fusion centers, and information sharing on a wide range of critical homeland security issues.

We also fund cutting-edge research and development (R&D) to address evolving biological, radiological, and nuclear threats, including construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility.

To secure and manage our borders, the budget continues the Administration's robust border security efforts while facilitating legitimate travel and trade. It sustains historic deployments of personnel along our borders as well as continued utilization of proven, effective surveillance technology along the highest-trafficked areas of the southwest border.

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

To secure maritime borders, the budget invests in recapitalization of Coast Guard assets, including the seventh National Security Cutter (NSC) and Fast Response Cutters (FRCs).

The budget also continues the Department's focus on smart and effective enforcement of our country's immigration laws. It supports the Administration's unprecedented effort to more effectively focus the enforcement system on public safety threats, border security, and the integrity of the immigration system through initiatives such as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals and greater use of prosecutorial discretion.

At the same time, the budget makes significant reductions to inefficient programs like 287(g) task force agreements, while supporting more cost-effective initiatives like the nationwide implementation of Secure Communities.

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

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

Let me pause here to say that we are greatly encouraged by the bipartisan bill that was introduced early this morning.

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

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

It is precisely this kind of funding that has enhanced preparedness and response capabilities in cities like Boston. Since 2002, the Boston urban area has received nearly \$370 million in Federal grant funding, which has been used to equip and train tactical and specialized response teams specifically in improvised explosive device (IED) detection, prevention, response, and recovery.

Within the last year, for example, the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region used grant funding to provide integrated training to improve their speed and efficiency in response to IED threats.

Importantly, grants also have supported increased coordination, particularly with respect to joint exercises and training.

FEMA has supported 12 exercises involving the city of Boston, including 8 over the past 3 years, on topics that include biological attack, hazardous materials, and other types of attack.

FEMA also has provided more than 5,500 Boston area responders with chemical, biological, and mass casualty response training. And Homeland Security Grants continue to support joint training and exercises among law enforcement and Fire Service that are part of the Massachusetts Joint Hazards Assessment Team.

These investments have proven their value time and again, and they greatly aided the response 2 days ago. We should continue this support.

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

Chairman Carper, Ranking Member Coburn, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman CARPER. Thank you. I appreciate very much your presence today and your presentation.

As I said earlier, at 1:45 or so this morning, eight of our colleagues—four Democrats, four Republicans—together introduced comprehensive immigration reform legislation. This Committee has a responsibility, I think unique in the Senate, to try to ask and answer the question: Are our borders more secure? And for those of you who have been down along the borders and had a chance to go not just maybe this or last year but in years past, I believe they are significantly more secure.

I like to say everything I do, I know I can do better. The same is true of all of us. The same is true of all Federal programs. Can we make the borders more secure? Yes, we can. Can we do that in a budget-constrained world? Yes, we can. And one of the things we need to do is to figure out what the force multipliers are that we can spend some money on to actually increase the effectiveness of our security.

When you were good enough to come and join me for a day down in your State, the State that you led for all those years as Governor, and Senator McCain and Congressman McCaul a day earlier, one of the things that I learned, one of my takeaways is that there are a number of investments that we can make, and I would say they are technology based. But we have four joint aircraft. On any given day, we might have two of them flying. And during the course of a week, 5 days we will have drones in the air, for instance, about 16 hours. That means there are 2 days they are not flying, 2 days of a week that they are not in operation and about 8 hours of every day that they are not in operation. If the winds are greater than 15 knots, they cannot fly. So we have to do something about that.

One of the things we can do is to better resource the drone operation. Two, they carry the Vehicle and Dismount Exploitation Radar (VADER)—V-A-D-E-R—radar system to detect people moving from very high altitudes in bad weather, at nighttime, approaching the border, crossing the border, attempting to cross the border. It is a remarkable tool for us to use.

We have one VADER system for four drones. It is a borrowed system I think from a company, not from the Department of Defense. And one of the things I would hope that we can do is find a way to—and our friends, our eight colleagues who have introduced the immigration reform bill have actually proposed ways to pay for some additional security measures on the border. I think a lot of them are user fee based, but we want to look very closely at those and work with our colleagues. I hope, to see how many of them we can do, can afford, and how we might invest that money in technologies that will enable our ground troops or ground forces to be more effective.

There is an aircraft called the C-206. I think it is a Cessna 206, a twin-engine airplane—very cost effective to operate, a lot more so than the drones—that can be very helpful in performing similar

missions. They can fly when the winds are greater than 15 knots and do so at a smaller price.

We have, I think, a recommendation in the budget with respect to dirigibles, and move some of the—I think they are called Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS). That is the acronym.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes.

Chairman CARPER. But they are lighter-than-air components that can carry a pod, a surveillance pod that can go up in the air, can be there for a day, a week, long periods of time, and transmit information back to forces on the ground to tell us about movement approaching the border or crossing the border.

There are land-based radar systems that are already deployed on parts of the border. We have other parts of the border maybe to the west, the western part of Arizona, where those kinds of investments would seem to make a lot more sense and enable us to better direct the resources we have on the ground and allocate those forces. Those are the kinds of things that we want to do more of.

I know in the President's budget there is language to move the lighter-than-air systems out of the Department of Defense, allocate those to Homeland Security. That is good. But there is more that we can do from there, and we have to pay for it as well.

Do you want to comment on any of that, anything that I just mentioned that you think is more appropriate, more necessary, more helpful than others?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think if you are talking about a force multiplier to the manpower on the border, which is at record levels and the budget sustains that record level of manpower, so now you are talking about a force multiplier, technology is really the key. And you have to use different technologies in different parts of the border because the terrain is so different, the circumstances are different. San Diego is very different than the South Rio Grande Valley. The South Rio Grande Valley is very different from the area between Nogales and Douglas.

So what we have done is taken the nine Border Patrol sectors along that Southwest Border and have constructed—and this is using the Border Patrol experts themselves. They know best what they need in some respects. So develop nine different technology plans that are particular to each area of the border. And we are moving to match our funding request to the technology adds that we need.

We have stopped building a one-size-fits-all integrated towers project along the entire border. We are going to use that in Arizona but not along the entire expanse of the border. It turned out to be very expensive and not operational in some of the physical circumstances that we have, and in exchange moved to more off-the-shelf technologies, technologies that may have been used in theater, other types of things that we can acquire.

So technology is a force multiplier, and then moving on to comprehensive immigration reform. Quite frankly, the two main drivers of illegal migration are work and the other is we have made it so difficult to immigrate legally because our visa system has become so sclerotic that becomes an incentive to try to get across to rejoin your family and the like.

If we deal with employers with E-Verify, if we deal with the visa system, then we can more carefully focus our resources at the border on the narco traffickers and the human smugglers and the like, who we would like to focus our law enforcement resources on.

Chairman CARPER. OK. Thanks very much.

Let me turn to management. I am impressed with the improvements in management of the Department that brought together all these diverse components, I do not know, 22 or so, as I recall, kind of mushed together into the Department of Homeland Security. But they are spread all over the place, and it makes it, not impossible, but difficult to operate as a team when you are just scattered to the winds. The effort was launched not in this Administration but in previous Administrations to begin to consolidate those efforts into an area in Washington, DC, a historic area that has great potential called St. Elizabeths.

Dr. Coburn and I have had a chance to visit the site and try to understand the rationale behind doing it. I think it makes sense. We spend huge amounts of money leasing buildings, frankly, throughout the government, and we would be better off just building them or letting an agency buy and own a property. But the problem is that when you do that, it scores as a 1-year, so if you are going to use a building for 50 years, you have to score the entire cost by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) at the front end. This is a way to actually save some money and at the same time consolidate.

Talk to us about why this is important for management purposes. Why is this important for morale? I talked earlier about the low morale at the Department despite the efforts of leadership. Talk to us about how this would help on the management side.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think, first of all, the St. E's campus would actually be the first Federal investment of its kind on the other side of the Anacostia River and could be a real economic development opportunity in that area, much as the Pentagon was years ago. But as you know, we are in over 50 facilities in the National Capital Region. When I want to have a meeting of component heads, I have to bring in the Administrator of TSA from over here, the Customs Commissioner from over there, the Secret Service from downtown, et cetera. Much better to have one campus that facilitates the management, information sharing, the kinds of integrated approach to homeland security that the Department was created for.

I am not normally one to come in and say, "Hey, we need a building," given the budget constraints. But it has already started. The investment—some of the fixed costs have already been incurred. The Coast Guard is moving and the budget supports their move before Thanksgiving. I think it is appropriate, timely, and in the long term more cost effective to actually have a real headquarters.

Chairman CARPER. OK. The last thing, turning to Dr. Coburn, he and I both believe that there is a great opportunity for this full Committee to work closely with GAO and to use that as a tool, use GAO's high-risk list as a tool to get better results for less money in everything we do. We were very much impressed when your Deputy Secretary was here a couple of weeks ago, Jane Holl Lute, and she is leaving, I understand, and we will miss her. She has



been a great public servant. But great improvement has been made in terms of management of this Department under three Secretaries now. We want to make sure that continues, and we will work with you toward that end. Dr. Coburn.

Senator COBURN. Thank you. Just a little business.

I sent you a letter yesterday on drones. I think you all have received it in terms of your privacy situation and the fact that really has not been addressed, what the law would require, and I just would like your commitment that you will get back to me on that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Sure, yes. Absolutely.

Senator COBURN. I appreciate it.

Let us talk about FEMA preparedness grants for a minute. How do you know \$1 billion more is what is needed and not \$500 million or \$2 billion?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think you have to—first of all, you ask. Second, you survey. You compare. You identify gaps. And what we would like to move to, Senator, is a system where not every location has 100 percent of everything, that we have a more regional approach where certain capabilities are concerned. Not everybody needs HazMat teams or certain types of HazMat teams. Not everyone needs urban search and rescue, if they are within the same area and can easily get to a site should there be an event. So we look at all sorts of things in determining what is the appropriate level.

Senator COBURN. But how did you come up with \$1 billion?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Going through exactly what I said: Looking at what the gaps are, what it would take, the cost to fill that gap. Let us say, for example, that you need a certain number of personnel who have gone through a certain number of trainings on incident response. Well, you can kind of cost out, well, how much does that training cost per individual, and in what period of time can that cost be incurred?

So that is the sort of nuts and bolts that goes into constituting a number. It is inductive, not deductive. In other words, you do not start with \$1 billion and say, OK, how do I fill it up? It is more what do you need and what constitutes that.

Senator COBURN. You have \$5.2 billion I think right now in unspent grant money.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes.

Senator COBURN. How much of that is obligated?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I would say 80 percent plus.

Senator COBURN. So you have \$1 billion that is unobligated right now, and we are asking for an increase of \$1 billion. And when you talked to us last year, one of the things you noted was that you described the purpose of getting the grants out was fiscal stimulus, economic growth, and job creation.

Isn't the purpose of these grants really to enhance preparedness? And shouldn't we be making the choice based on where is our greatest risk, where is our greatest weakness? Shouldn't we be sending the money there regardless of what it does in terms of job creation and fiscal stimulus?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, and really one of our thoughts in putting some time limits on grant drawdown was that if these were

things needed for emergency response, for homeland security, they ought to go out quicker rather than later.

Now, some of the grants do take more time. I will give you a concrete example. We have been supporting New York City in the development of a computer system which, interlinked with cameras, allows it to have greater surveillance over certain areas of the city and the bridges. It turns out it takes longer than 2 years to develop such a program.

So what we recommend is we put some time limits on these grant drawdowns, subject to a waiver in appropriate circumstances.

Senator COBURN. OK. Last year, for the first time, you required States to complete their own threat and hazard identification and risk assessments as part of the grant process. How good are they? What are you doing to followup on the accuracy of those? And really my further question, my big criticism of a lot of FEMA grants and the grants coming out of your Department is we are not measuring a metric at the end of the grant to see if we accomplished what we said we were going to accomplish. And, really my question is more general. What are you going to institute so that the American taxpayer knows that when a grant goes out of FEMA or Homeland Security that it actually accomplished something that decreased risk or increased preparedness? Because right now, quite frankly, you do not know the answer to that. In a general way, what you can assess here is the quality of what we got out of the grant money we have. What are you doing to change that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right. We have been really changing grant guidance and oversight over the past years. I think you are right. I think initial grants, particularly with the speed the Department was stood up, and these grant programs, a lot of them were basically formula grants based on population and what have you. It is now time—we are at the maturation level—where we should say, look, these should be risk-based, we should identify the risk area, measure the benefits that we get out of the risks, do everything we can to get the money out as rapidly as possible, as well spent as possible. But the way it is now, Senator, we have grant programs from all over the place, and it does limit our ability to really make those tough judgments.

Senator COBURN. So this proposal to consolidate these, tell me about the efficiencies and also the accuracy as well as the performance that you hope to achieve by consolidating these grant programs.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think, first of all, the threat and hazard identification and risk assessment (THIRA), becomes a key document. I think they are of varying quality as they have come in. We will work with the States that we think need help to increase their capacity. But as we move through this process, I think what you will see is administrative savings. First of all, States do not have to pay grant writers and grant administrators, and we can have one more integrated and unified set of reviewers and auditors.

So I think anytime you say, look, we are going to take 18 programs and meld them into one, you are going to get efficiencies in costs. I think you will get a more unified approach to how the grant

money should be given and how they should be reviewed. And that is what we are seeking to do.

Senator COBURN. All right. Would you agree with me that the per capita damage indicator needs to be modified in terms of FEMA grants?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You mean in terms of—yes.

Senator COBURN. What qualifies.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, in terms of what—

Senator COBURN. It is a real disadvantage for the large States who have a significant event, and it is a real advantage for the small States that have the same amount of damage. One qualifies for FEMA grants, the other does not qualify at all. And so would you commit to work with us through your FEMA Director to try to get where we can build a consensus in Congress. How do we actually measure this better? Oklahoma had 22 FEMA grants last year. I am thankful that the Federal Government is helping Oklahoma out. But in a lot of those, we were not overwhelmed, and we could have taken and dealt with it. And some States that may be in much worse budget shape than we are had twice as much but got no help from the Federal Government on like-minded events.

So I would just like a commitment that you all will help us figure this out so that it is more equitable, one; and, two, when we are actually there to help a problem, that we help those that have the biggest problem, not the ones that qualify the easiest for the grants.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Senator, I will pledge that. A great example of how the per capita issue works in strange and unfathomable ways is we had flooding on the upper Red River. One side of the river was North Dakota, the other side was Minnesota. North Dakota got grant funding, Minnesota did not.

Senator COBURN. Right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. The same flood.

Senator COBURN. Yes, OK.

In the third annual GAO duplication report—I guess I am over time. We will come back for a second round. That will let my colleagues—

Chairman CARPER. Very good. Thanks very much.

Just in order of arrival, the next questioner will be Senator Johnson, followed by Senator Ayotte, Senator Baldwin, and Senator Begich, and the others to follow. Thank you.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHNSON**

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As long as we quit talking budget, you were talking about surpluses. You were talking about the revenue side of that equation. One of the reasons we had budget surpluses in the late 1990s is government spending was only a little over 18 percent. And, of course, we hit a high of 25 percent. We are a little over 22 percent now, and we are on a trajectory to hit 35 percent. So it was the level of spending, from my standpoint, that really balanced the budget, but I just want to get that one on the record.

Madam Secretary, again, thank you for appearing here and, truthfully, thank you for your service. I do not envy your task, and you have a big job here, and we are all rooting for you.

I would like to pick up a little bit on what Senator Coburn was talking about, the consolidated grant programs. Can you just speak to me about the type of pressure you feel, the parochial interests versus risk based? Do you find that is a real problem?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Senator, I do not involve myself in some of the direct grant decisions, so that pressure gets a little diminished. But the real problem is that these grants, many of which came out of the 9/11 Act, were written at an earlier stage in our understanding of homeland security and what capacity we had around the country.

Our understanding and our capacity is much different 10 years later, and it is time to reform the grant programs to match that.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. But from your standpoint, in terms of managing the budget, you do not feel that is a huge problem? Do you feel that your allocation of funds is appropriately designed toward risk-based assessment?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. No, I did not say that. I think we do not have the flexibility to incorporate risk-based analysis into enough of our grant programs. Too many of them have formulas, baselines, things of that sort, and what we really need to do is be evaluating where our needs are and how do we fill those needs.

Senator JOHNSON. In your written testimony, I saw that the total grant program is about \$2.1 billion. Is that correct or is that just for FEMA?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, FEMA is 98 percent of our grant program.

Senator JOHNSON. OK, so it is 2.1. How much do you think is misallocated based on parochial interests? Do you have a ballpark?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is a kind of "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?" question. There is no way to answer it without—

Senator JOHNSON. OK. Is it significant or—I mean—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. All I will say is we have been doing our level best within the statutory requirements that we have to be as rigorous as we can on our grant guidance and grant awards.

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

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

Senator JOHNSON. Even the 150 million sounds like a lot, but can you just kind of break that down? How many people are trained? How many practice rounds are fired?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, yes, I mean, CBP probably uses 60, 65 million there. The Secret Service—many of our services require qualifying multiple times a year. FLETC probably uses another 20, 30 million rounds. We can give you the actual inventory.

Senator JOHNSON. OK.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We know where the rounds are used.

Senator JOHNSON. I am actually just giving you the opportunity to try and dispel the rumors.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right. It is very strange to me how that rumor got started.

Senator COBURN. If I can interrupt, we have actually made an inquiry, and they have been very good. The second inquiry is in the process of being processed by Homeland Security. We are going to have all that available for all the Members so they can answer this question.

Senator JOHNSON. OK, great. That is great.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right. But to just be as firm as I can be the rumors are unsubstantiated and totally without merit.

Senator JOHNSON. OK, great. Thank you.

You mentioned the Secret Service. I have to admit, I was surprised during the May 2012 hearing in terms of the investigation there, and we have repeatedly requested to be able to see that Secret Service investigation report.

First of all, let me ask you: Are you satisfied with the progress made in the investigation in Cartagena?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I am satisfied with the progress made. I think some of your requests—my understanding is that you have been offered the opportunity to look at documents, but under the Privacy Act, we cannot provide you with those documents. If I am mistaken in that understanding, let me know.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. I believe we are going to need the support of the Committee to try and get that. But let me just say that I am not satisfied with the progress, and I certainly have more questions that have not been answered. And it is a year later, so I would really like basically your commitment to work with our office to get those answers—or those questions answered. I think it is incredibly important for the Secret Service to have full credibility moving forward.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, the Secret Service is an incredible department and does incredible things, and they have their own interest in making sure that their reputation and professionalism is not continually tainted by this.

Senator JOHNSON. OK. Well, thank you, Madam Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman CARPER. Thank you, Senator. Senator Ayotte.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR AYOTTE**

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Madam Secretary, for your service. We appreciate how difficult it is at this time and appreciate what you are doing and those that serve underneath you.

I wanted to ask about the State fusion centers, the national network of fusion centers. Can you tell me, in your view, how those fusion centers at the State level are working?

I also am new to this Committee. I understand as well that you have what is called the “Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN).” Do those interact with each other? So what would you say are the strengths and weaknesses of the fusion centers? And how is the information sharing integrated from a State level, thinking about the post-9/11 world to the Federal level and you think about an event like Boston and all the various agencies that are involved? Can you help me with that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. The concept behind the fusion centers was pretty straightforward, which is that one of our jobs is to get intelligence information distributed across the land into the hands of law enforcement officers and first responders who need it, and to get information back on all hazards, not specific to terrorism.

Senator AYOTTE. But it would include also terrorism-related events?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Oh, that is the first priority.

Senator AYOTTE. That is the priority focus, yes.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. But it can include—like, for example, we used them during the H1N1 epidemic a couple years ago.

Senator AYOTTE. OK. Because we have one in Concord, so it was just beginning when I was Attorney General, and—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Many of them are relatively new, but some have been in existence for several years now. The Boston one is a very strong one, and they have been really the center of how information from us and the Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF) that the FBI operates has been—we make sure we get it to all the locals who need it and get information back. So they have been going full bore since the bombs 2 days ago.

But that is the concept, because you cannot share—I mean, you have 3,000 plus local law enforcement departments across the country, so being able to share the kind of information we want to be able to share, that many departments, it is very difficult and probably not productive. So the idea was, let us create some fusion centers, let us expand their area of responsibility beyond simply terrorism, but also other kinds of crimes, hazards that might occur, and really use them as a hub for info and analytics sharing.

Senator AYOTTE. How are they working?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We have been assessing them all. There are 70. All but two are on the HSIN network, which is a classified network. I would say that a third are really good; a third are average, and we will be working with them; and a third are either new or need some real work.

But I will tell you, from a long-term perspective on the info-sharing side of the house, to me building up that network of fusion centers is going to continue to be key.

Senator AYOTTE. In March, as I understand it, former Inspector General Richard Skinner testified before this Committee that the Department faced ongoing challenges in effectively sharing counterterrorism information, and one of the issues is the ability to complete the implementation of the Homeland Security Information Network.

What is the status of that? And I understand, as you just described, that these fusion centers are part of that network, but also in the completion of the network so that we have information sharing, where are we with that? And what needs to be done?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think great progress has been made. As I mentioned, 68 of the 70 fusion centers are now on the HSIN network, and it is just a much more robust and viable network than it was when Mr. Skinner testified.

Senator AYOTTE. OK. Well, that is actually very good news.

Also, thinking about as we move forward on the information-sharing front, when you say a third of these fusion centers are either just getting up or are ineffective, how do you on the Department level, given that much of this is driven at the State and local level in terms of what gets inputted into the system, how do you plan to make sure that those third get up to par?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We are going to work directly with them. We have some staff that are really just focused on the fusion centers.

The other thing we are doing is putting some of our own analysts in the fusion centers to help with identifying the kinds of information that we need, the suspicious activity reports (SARs), and what really constitutes a SAR and what does not and how it gets transmitted.

So my hope is that over the next months and couple of years that we really will see a rapid maturation of the entire network.

Senator AYOTTE. OK. Thank you very much.

Let me add my support to the efforts that Dr. Coburn mentioned about consolidating grants, and I appreciate that you are doing that and to make sure that the grants really are meeting our current needs, because having seen, when I was at the State level, the initial grants that came out, it struck me as very scattered, and giving communities certain capacities, that I could not understand how it fit in a bigger picture of protecting our homeland, and there was not much coordination. So I would love to help you with that effort and appreciate that you are undertaking that.

Thank you for being here today.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Thank you.

Chairman CARPER. Thanks, Senator Ayotte.

Senator Baldwin, you are next, followed by Senator Begich.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR BALDWIN**

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, thank you very much for being here and for your service. I want to just add my words to those of the Chairman about the tragedy in Boston. Obviously, our thoughts and our hearts are with the families and particularly with the first responders, both those who were not wearing a uniform and ran to help and those wearing a uniform who ran to help, and many of those first responders lie within the Homeland Security Department and I hope you will share with your agents our respect and gratefulness for their work.

I wanted to start with just a specific on the line of questioning that you just had on fusion centers. Specifically, budget-wise, the Federal assistance to fusion centers mostly comes in the form of

DHS grants rather than direct funding. And I want to hear your thoughts on that mechanism and the level of funding. Should they be grant funded or direct funded in your opinion moving forward? What should we be looking at in terms of the policy of that funding mechanism?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You are right, Senator. Historically, they have been FEMA grants to the States, and the States can use the money however they want. When it started, those FEMA-to-State grants were pretty wide open.

We have been putting more and more, I want to say, guidance into those grants, and one of the things about risk based is it is also competitive. One of the things we look at is are the grantees really looking at our guidance and making a fair analysis as to how what they are proposing meets the guidance.

So we have specified fusion centers as one of the priorities in the guidance. We have not recommended a direct fusion center grant.

Senator BALDWIN. OK. I understand that the budget numbers for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) are classified. However, to the degree that you can in this forum, please talk about how much of a role I&A plays in working with State and local officials, in particular given the tragedies this week, to State and local officials to prepare for and protect the public at major public events.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think one of the major roles of our I&A—and I speak now as a former State Attorney General and Governor—is to translate intel that we collect through the whole alphabet of agencies around the Beltway into a form that State and locals can use. What are the indicators and behaviors we are watching for? What is the most up-to-date information that can be shared about an investigation? What should they be doing in the course of an investigation if we are not able to totally close off the possibility that there is a more widespread plot? Those sorts of very concrete things that require, I think, an active interpretation, really, from the intel world to the State and local world.

So that is where we focus a lot of our I&A efforts. We work with the FBI on this. So, for example, we have been putting out to State and locals what we call a joint intel bulletin (JIB). We put out the first one yesterday morning to law enforcement that needed to see it. That obviously included more detail than what was being made totally public, that sort of thing. And there have been updates to that over the course of the last 30 hours.

Senator BALDWIN. OK. Thank you.

I understand that there will be a \$10 million cut to the border security infrastructure and technology account affecting the security of the Northern Border. I wonder if you can just explain this cut and how it will impact Northern Border security or how you will adapt to make sure it is not impaired?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right. Well, the Northern Border represents a different set of responsibilities and opportunities than the Southwest Border, and we are fully cognizant of that. I think the \$10 million is a haircut, particularly compared to the President's proposed increase in port officers. And when I go up to the Northern Border, that is the No. 1 thing I hear, is the need to have more lanes staffed at the land ports because of the amount of commerce



that goes back and forth. So I hope that we do not see anything of any major level impact from that.

Senator BALDWIN. Well, since you mentioned port security, there was just a fairly extensive dialogue about the preparedness grants consolidation. How do you think that will impact port security?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think port security is obviously one of the things that goes into any kind of a risk analysis. I will give you an example.

Yesterday, or 2 days ago, when the bombings occurred in Boston, you have the harbor there. You have the Charles River. You have to immediately make sure that what you are looking at is two bombs and not a Mumbai-type attack. So, immediately, we were working with the Boston Police Department and the Coast Guard to increase security in the harbor in the Charles River until we could satisfy ourselves that there was nothing imminent there, although we have maintained that increased level of security.

You have to have the capacity to do that. You have to have personnel. You have to have equipment. The personnel have to be trained, supervised. They have to be exercised. Ports have internationally been used as a place where attacks occur. So when we looked competitively at risk-based, ports obviously will have to be given very serious consideration.

Senator BALDWIN. OK. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Chairman CARPER. Thanks, Senator Baldwin. Senator Begich.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR BEGICH**

Senator BEGICH. Thank you very much. Good to see you. Thank you yesterday for the briefing. Also, I will not add to that except to say thank you for the incredible work you are doing right now in Boston. I know there are a lot of good people on the ground as well as here in DC and around the country working on it, so thank you for your efforts.

I have two unique roles which work with your agency. The first is I will chair, this year, the Subcommittee on Emergency Management and Intergovernmental Affairs here in this Committee. So we will talk a lot more later on FEMA, but one of the things that I know comes up a lot is the State grants issue. And I know in the budget proposal there are some ideas on some statutory changes that may be needed. I think we are going to plan a June or July hearing and discussion, so we will save these questions for later.

Also, I will continue to chair the Oceans Subcommittee, which has, as you know, jurisdiction over the Coast Guard and fisheries, a lot of issues that touch you, probably more than you wanted, but are an important part of Alaska's interests.

If I can, I want to start for a second on FEMA, then I am going to move on, because I will save a lot of those questions for later. And that is, when there is a disaster that occurs, maybe a small or large disaster, one of the biggest issues is how you get information out to the public. As a former mayor, we always felt like we were on the front lines for that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes.

Senator BEGICH. Do you think the system you have now has improved significantly? And do you think there are other things we could be doing to help make sure that—when there is a disaster,

it is that first 24 hours of communication that seem to be probably the most critical, prior to and as it is occurring. Are there road blocks still out there that are causing that communication not to be fully developed? Or how do you feel where you are at today than maybe where we were 5 or 6 years ago? Does that make sense, the question?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think so.

First, with respect to the legislative language that should go along with the grants consolidation, we will be prepared to submit the appropriate legislative language for your consideration.

Senator BEGICH. Fantastic.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. This involves an interaction between the appropriations process and the authorizing process to get done.

Senator BEGICH. And I am on both, so—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. All right. [Laughter.]

Second, with respect to communication, are you speaking, Senator, with respect to communication between us and the people at the city level or—

Senator BEGICH. Public.

Secretary NAPOLITANO [continuing]. With the public in general?

Senator BEGICH. Public.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think it is much better. I think we have increasingly used social media, because so many people now receive their information through those many vehicles. So we tweet and we put stuff online and we do a lot of things to make information generally available.

Lessons learned, as we all know, the initial hours after a disaster there is often a lot of confusion and misinformation. So one of the things that we have been working on is seeing how quickly we can kind of identify what we know and explain what we do not know to the public.

Senator BEGICH. Right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. And then, of course, we recognize the public often has really—Where do I go? How do I find my kids?

Senator BEGICH. How do I get shelter? Where do I go?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. How do I get shelter, exactly. So setting up multiple ways people can get that information as quickly as possible.

Senator BEGICH. Very good. So it is an improving process, still more work to be done, but better than it was.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think we can always improve.

Senator BEGICH. Good. Let me ask you, in regards to the Coast Guard budget, I know in the budget I think it is about a 12- or 13-percent reduction, mostly on capital assets which is the bigger chunk. And, of course, you probably know where I am going, and that is, I am concerned when I look at the increased activity. And we got a little pause this year, this fiscal year, because of the oil and gas exploration issues. But 2014 and 2015 is going to be pretty robust up there. And obviously my concern is, as you reduce that budget—and I know we are in this tight budget situation, and I recognize that, but how do you see that impacting what is going to happen in monitoring not only what is in the 2014–15 future, but really this year with, fishing and drug interdiction and all these things that are critical? And, of course, from Alaska's per-

spective, the fishing issue is huge. And we have seen, as a matter of fact, the day we were out there in Alfigal Bay, we saw an incredible new facility that has done some great work on fishing. And so how do you see that impacting the enforcement efforts, and then obviously the oil and gas industry, making sure we have good coverage for what is going to happen there?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think what we will see is a continue of the sequester on operations of the Coast Guard, and that has been in some areas a 20-, 25-percent reduction in daily operations. But I think that will continue.

On the other hand, the continued work on the National Security Cutter fleet is designed so that we have in essence a mobile platform to be up in northern Alaska during the drilling season as opposed to building a permanent Coast Guard station that really would not be used half of the year.

Senator BEGICH. Right.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. And the NSC has the capability to—

Senator BEGICH. Well, they are like a whole town out in the water.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, they can provide air coverage; we can operate search and rescue from the NSC, et cetera. So the NSCs are large investments, but they have a much greater number of uses than the other types of vessels we have in the Coast Guard.

Senator BEGICH. Very good. Let me ask you also—my time is limited here. It seemed like last year the Administration was moving forward on icebreakers impressively. I think in the 5-year plan there was \$120 million or so for construction, but this year it has ratcheted back quite a bit.

What do you see there—and, first, I commend you for making sure the one that we asked to be renovated got renovated. And moving forward, I know there is a lot of controversy of should we do it, should we not. But I think it is going to pay off long term.

Give me your sense on what we see as the future as Russia and China are very busy, especially China, building icebreakers left and right, because they think they own the Arctic, to be very frank with you. They say that. They divide it up by population, which, if I am not mistaken, they are not an Arctic nation. We are.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Right.

Senator BEGICH. So that was my commentary there, but what is your thought on icebreakers and what we see in the future?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. The proposed budget does continue work on another second polar icebreaker, but it is a small downpayment, and that, quite frankly, is looking at what could be done this year and how it fits within the overall budget, not only of the Coast Guard but of the Department, writ large.

But I agree with you, our Nation needs a very strong Arctic position and Arctic policy, so we are very heavily engaged with the White House on the development of that plan.

Senator BEGICH. Very good. Thank you for your testimony, and I will look forward to the legislation regarding the grants. And then the last thing, I will send a question regarding whether you should look at leasing equipment also in a partnership with the private sector for some of these larger vessels that we may not

have the capital for. But you do not have to answer that. I will just send it in, and we will have a conversation on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman CARPER. Thank you, Senator Begich.

Next is Senator Paul, followed by Senator McCain and Senator McCaskill.

#### OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL

Senator PAUL. Madam Secretary, thanks for coming to the Committee today and for your testimony.

Are you in favor of having our commercial pilots armed?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think properly trained and if they have gone through our Federal Flight Deck Officer (FFDO) program, arming can be appropriate, yes.

Senator PAUL. I guess I am concerned because in your budget, the Administration's budget, we have zeroed out the funding for the training of pilots. I think that has been done a couple times, and we have had to add it back in. So we were wondering about your commitment to arming pilots. We think it is a—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I will tell you the reason why we have zeroed it out, Senator, and that is—and it goes to a lot of the changes in the budget. We are moving to risk based, and the FFDO program is not risk based. It is just happenstance whether you happen to have a pilot on board that went through the training or not.

We are offering the training to air carriers if they want their pilots covered. But we would rather stick with the Federal Air Marshals (FAMs), who are apportioned based on risk.

Senator PAUL. Well, I do not think I can overemphasize the importance of deterrence, and part of deterrence is not knowing who is armed and who is not armed, not knowing whose house has guns and who does not. That is why we do not want registries published of who owns guns and who does not. But I feel better even if 5 percent of the pilots have it because the terrorists do not know which 5 percent are. I would rather it be 100 percent are armed. But I think zeroing out the funding shows a lack of commitment to the idea of self-defense, and I think this sends a huge signal to terrorists around the world if we are not going to arm our pilots.

In fact, I think we need to go the opposite direction. I think we have one training facility in New Mexico where the pilots are trained. Is that where they are trained? Anyway, the pilots complain about the costs, the expense also, and the time away. It is a 48-hour program. We have training facilities for policemen in every State. I do not see any reason why we could not cooperate and make it a lot cheaper. I am for saving money. I do not mind saving money. But we have all kinds of sunk costs in training facilities for police officers, State troopers. It should not have to be done in one place. You have a manual. Send the manual around. Let them learn how to do it and have it done. We have concealed-carry in most of the States around the country. There is no reason why you cannot have local training.

I would also take military officers who have had extensive training already, and I would exempt them from half the program so they can save time and expense on getting it done.

But I think the idea of deterrence cannot be measured. You cannot measure how important it is to have deterrence. But I think that a lot of us would argue that having pilots armed is a great deal of deterrence, and we should not send any indication to any terrorists around the world that we are not serious about having our pilots armed. Thank you.

Chairman CARPER. Senator McCain.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MCCAIN**

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Secretary, and, again, I share with all of my colleagues our appreciation for the great work that your people are doing, especially in light of the tragedy in Boston.

Madam Secretary, I am sure you heard that Senator Schumer and I met with the President yesterday and briefed him on our immigration reform proposal, and he expressed his strong support. Do you share that view?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes. I obviously have not read all 854 pages in detail, but I think it embraces the principles the President has enunciated, and it is very comprehensive in its approach, so very appreciative of the work that you have done on this.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you very much. That then also means that you support the President's position that we should have a trigger on border security.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It depends on what the trigger is for, but as I understand the way the bill is written, that looks like a very reasonable approach to border security.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

One of the big problems we have is that you abandon the metric of operational control, and you have not given us a border security index. Let me quote from your hometown newspaper, an editorial the other day: "If President Obama really wants immigration reform, he needs to put pressure on Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano. She has not finished an important job. Her agency has failed to produce a simple standard for measuring border security, a project the Department of Homeland Security started in 2010, but apparently has not worked up much of a sweat to finish."

I will not complete the editorial.

And then, unfortunately, one of your people testified to the House and said that—Mr. Borkowski told Republican Candice Miller, "I do not believe that we intend that the Border Condition Index (BCI) will be a tool for the measurement that you are suggesting."

Now, the Government Accountability Office has also issued a very scathing report about, again, a failure of establishing metrics. Do you intend to come forth in a far more transparent manner with a border security index?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Senator, let me give you some background on this and try to answer this question as concisely as I can.

There are so many ways to measure the border that the problem with the operational control definition was it did not encompass all of the ways you can look at the border. So we said let us look at what all goes into, is the border a safe and secure area.

And then it turned out, as you got into it, that is a much more difficult question to answer than it is to ask. There are a whole host of statistics, just like you have a whole host of statistics on a baseball player. And so you have to look at the picture and see what the trend lines are and the like.

Now, we have supplied those numbers ad infinitum to every committee that has requested them, and we still intend to work on an overall border conditions index. But the notion that there is some magic number out there that answers the question, I wish I could tell you there is, but we have not found it yet.

Senator MCCAIN. I know that there is. I know that there are ways of determining security anywhere in the world and in the United States of America. Now, whether it be on apprehensions—which, by the way, interestingly, are up 13 percent, which kind of contradicts the arguments that the border is much more secure when you are talking for years about how apprehensions are down as a measure of that. I cannot believe, it is beyond anyone's belief, nor anyone in the Senate that has worked on this issue, that you cannot come up with a measurement of the security of our border. If you cannot do that, then we will in legislation. We will.

So for you to assert that somehow we cannot give the American people an accurate depiction of the border—of the security on our border, where drug dealers are moving across into Arizona, as we know, where coyotes continue to put people in the most unspeakable conditions, and we do not have a measurement as to how we are doing on one of the fundamental requirements of any nation, and that is, border security, is frankly beyond me.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, if I might, Senator, if you have a magic definition, I would be happy to look at it.

Senator MCCAIN. The Government Accountability Office has a number of metrics that could be used. Why don't you consult them? Because they know, even if you do not.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, the GAO, as you know, one of their ratios is one that we have a lot of problems with, and we have explained that, at least to your staff.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, it sure is better than nothing, which is what you have come up with, Madam Secretary.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, you do not have nothing, Senator. You do not have—

Senator MCCAIN. We do not have a measurement of border security, period. And your spokesperson said that would not be coming forth anytime soon.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I am my own spokesperson, and let me, if I might, you do have a definition. You have many definitions. You have every statistic in the world, and you have your own observations. And what I have appreciated during this debate, as you have been working on reform, is your going down to the border, and you know from your own personal observation, it is different now than it was 5 years ago and, indeed, 10 years ago.

We need to sustain those efforts. We need to be able to put force multipliers down there, like technology. We need a national E-Verify-type program, which is a main driver of illegal immigration. We need the ability to clean up the visa system, which is also a main driver of illegal immigration. Those things all go together.

So we look forward to working with you on this bill as it goes through the process, but, again, if I could give you a magic number and say if we hit 42 we are in, I am not sure that would be either fair, accurate, and in any event, would not reflect all of the factors that need to be taken into consideration.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, my assertion is that we can determine whether our border is secure or not using information including what we can from new radar, the VADER radar. And, again, I tell you, if you do not give it to us, then we will decide ourselves. But we will have a measurement of border security. We owe that to the people of this country.

Who was in charge and made the decision to release 3,000 people who were detainees? Who made that decision?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I do not—3,000?

Senator MCCAIN. It was a total, I believe, of some 3,000 who were released, I have forgotten what date it was.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Oh, I think I know what you are referring to. Yes, I know what you are referring to. This was a decision made within ICE as we were under the continuing resolution with no prospect of a budget and sequestration to see what detainees could be put in alternatives to detention as a way to control costs.

Senator MCCAIN. I and now Senator Levin have made requests for information about those individuals who were released, their backgrounds, whether they had criminal activity. And so far you and your agency—well, you, because we wrote the letter to you, have not given us the information. Do we expect that information?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Let me followup on that and see where it is.

Senator MCCAIN. OK. We first wrote to you in March, and then Senator Levin and I on behalf of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (PSI) wrote to you just a couple of weeks ago. I hope we can get that information. I think the American people deserve it.

I look forward to working with you as we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, and I hope you understand that in 1986, I guess I am the only one here that voted for Simpson-Mazzoli. We gave amnesty to 3 million people on the proviso and the promise that never again would we have to worry about people coming into our country illegally because we were going to secure our border and take the necessary steps. Now we have 11 million people. We owe it to the people of this country that there not be a third wave 10, 15, or 20 years from now of a renewed number of people who have come to this country illegally.

All of us are advocates of immigration, but we believe it should be a fair system, and we believe that to have people living in the shadows—and you are as familiar as I am with the way they are now being brought to this country—we must address this issue. But the American people have to be assured that there is not going to be a third wave. You can be very helpful to us in putting into law the necessary measures, as you say, including E-Verify, that would prevent not only the demand but the supply. And I thank you, Madam Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, just one comment, Senator.

Chairman CARPER. Go ahead.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. One of the things that I noted in the draft legislation is that it has a cutoff date, so that individuals who come after the cutoff date are not eligible and would not be eligible for the pathway. This is as I understand on a cursory reading of the bill.

I think it is very important to get that information out. One of the things that happened after 1986 is there was a surge. We do not want that to happen again, and the way you prevent it is exactly as the proposal indicates.

Senator MCCAIN. I think it might be one of the factors in the 13-percent increase that we are seeing this year. Would you agree with that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We are not—

Senator MCCAIN. That and the economy?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I think the economy, and the real surge, I can tell you, is in the Southern Rio Grande Valley, and it is other-than-Mexican immigrants. It is Central Americans. We are already moving manpower and equipment down there to deal with that. I think we will be able to report some significant progress shortly.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for overspeaking my time.

Chairman CARPER. You have earned that right. Senator McCaskill.

#### **OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR MCCASKILL**

Senator MCCASKILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, want to greet you and commend the rapid response of so many first responders and law enforcement assets to Boston in a way that was clearly benefited by investments that we have made in the Federal Government and investments that we have embraced on this Committee. And so when it is executed in a professional way, you deserve kudos for that, and I want to give you kudos for that. But I am a former prosecutor, and I have a question that is just—I cannot keep it from coming out.

Based on the evidence at this point, is there any difference between Sandy Hook and Boston other than the choice of weapon?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, in terms of intent for death and destruction and injury, no. Methodology, yes. And we do not know the motivation behind Boston. We do not know whether it was domestic, international—

Senator MCCASKILL. Or if it was identical to the motivation in Sandy Hook.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We just do not know the answer to those questions. So I think that it is impossible for me to sit at the table today and say they are identical, except in effect and impact.

Senator MCCASKILL. Well, as I look at the evidence that is available, you have mass destruction and violence and slaughter of innocents, and in neither case do we know motive. And the irony is we are so quick to call Boston “terror.” Why aren’t we calling the man with the high-capacity assault weapon and the high-capacity magazine, why aren’t we calling him a “terrorist”?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I do not know the answer to that question.



Senator MCCASKILL. I think it is important that we talk about that in government because—and it may be that we learn the motive of both, and it may be the motive in Sandy Hook was political and the motive in Boston was not, or the motive in Boston was political and the motive in Sandy Hook was not. It may be they both are suffering from severe mental incapacity that caused them to want to go slaughter a bunch of innocent people.

But, as I look at it with the eye of a prosecutor and the evidence that is available right now, I find it troubling that one is characterized in a way that causes so much more fear and disruption in everyone's daily lives than the other one—not that there are not mothers all over the country that are afraid to send their first graders to school these days. There are. But I would certainly urge you, Secretary, to take a look at this and see if the government has a responsibility as to when and how we characterize an act, a criminal act, an “act of terror” when there is not evidence yet to support, I believe, that characterization until we know what the motive is. It just is troubling to me, and I think both of them—it may be they had identical motives, just one chose a military-style weapon with a high-capacity magazine, and the other one chose to make a homemade bomb.

Let me ask you about interoperability. We have now spent a huge amount of money on interoperability, and I know this is a headache. But we have spent almost half a billion dollars on interoperability, and we have another contract up for \$3.2 billion for new infrastructure, but yet we still cannot talk to each other. And obviously we have an Inspector General (IG) report that says, this has not gone well, we have wasted a lot of money.

Can you give me any hope in the front of interoperability?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, and I think the hope actually stems from the Congress' decision to set aside broadband spectrum for public safety and the creation of the FirstNet Board and the way that that has been funded. My interactions with the board, which also includes private sector representatives, suggest to me that we now have the money and, more importantly, the decisionmaking expertise to finally create a more universal answer to this problem.

There is more interoperability in the system than people allow. Sometimes the question is: Who needs to be interoperable with whom? And so if you go for everybody needs to be universally interoperable, that is a different question than if you say everybody at a certain rank needs to be interoperable with others at a certain rank and so forth.

So the definitional issues are important in terms of the universe you are trying to cover, but, nonetheless, I think, Senator—and we can get a briefing to you on this. I think in my judgment, having dealt with this issue for far too long and having dealt with it as a Governor and as a State Attorney General and being very frustrated at what was going on, this is really hope for the future.

Senator MCCASKILL. I would love to get that briefing.

The GAO report—and I know my colleague is going to maybe cover this more fully, but I do want to just emphasize the R&D policy guidance. The research and development, GAO says that there is no departmentwide policy defining R&D and as a result, you do

not really know what your total investment is in R&D, which limits your ability to oversee it.

I know that there is actually money that goes back and forth from various parts of your budget under this rubric of R&D. Are you taking some steps to address these concerns about getting a handle on maybe some duplicative R&D that is going on and contracts that are being let and maybe the right hand does not always know what the left hand is doing?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Oh, yes, I do not know the date of that report, but we have been involved in the last year in a very extensive effort led by our Science and Technology Directorate and our Acquisitions Review Board to do a portfolio review of all the R&D projects throughout the Department precisely to identify any unnecessary redundancies, make sure that we have quality control, and that we have an acquisition plan that is resultant from R&D. So the answer is that that is an area where we have made significant improvements over the last year.

Senator MCCASKILL. Maybe that Director could get with us, because the report was issued last week, so—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, they typically are not current on their research, but we will be happy to respond.

Senator MCCASKILL. It is the 2013 annual report. So let us make sure that we figure out where we are and I would love to get a brief also from that Director about where the R&D is going, because I see this all over government, that we are doing R&D at Defense, at Homeland Security, sometimes two or three within Defense and Homeland Security, at three or four different universities, and they are doing the exact same R&D. And I just want to make sure that is not occurring.

So thank you very much.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. You bet.

Chairman CARPER. Secretary Napolitano, maybe we will start off a second round. I think Senator Coburn and I have some additional questions and would appreciate your sticking with us for just a while longer.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Sure.

Chairman CARPER. Some of our colleagues may come back as well.

I want to go back to a point raised by Senator McCain. We talked about the 3,000 or so detainees that were released from a detention center. That is a matter that concerns a lot of us, not just that 3,000 people were released, but the issue where some of the people who were released were felons. In our roles as Governors, I do not know if that ever happened to you under your watch, but from time to time people were released, not often but infrequently, from prison in our State that should not have been released. And we had prisoners with the same name, several people with the same name. And once or twice the wrong Robert Smith, if you will, was released. So stuff happens like that.

I would just urge you and the folks at ICE to be extremely careful going forward to make sure, to the best we can ensure, if there are any other detainees released—my hope is that will not be happening, but if there are, that they are folks who have really no record of felonies or any kind of violent behavior.

The second thing I want to do in following up on his comments—actually, I want to steal just a page—not the whole report, but I want to just take a moment to thank Senator Coburn and his staff, along with the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, for their work in looking at fusion centers. And I think he will talk about this more at length, but I guess we have about 75 of them now. Some of them are really good. Some of them are pretty good. Some are not very good. And some are just—I will not say of no value, but of very little value. And as we work to try to target our resources in places where they could provide the best bang for our buck, the question I am going to ask you is: What are we doing to make sure that the ones that are of little value or marginal value, what are we doing in a proactive way to make sure that they step up their game?

I will use an example. Long before I came to public office, I was a naval flight officer and served as a mission commander in a Navy P-3 aircraft, which still fly in the—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We have them.

Chairman CARPER. Homeland security, that is very encouraging. But we had many patrols going across the country, around the world actually. Our job was to do maritime surveillance, the surface of the ocean and subsurface of the ocean we tracked. “The Hunt for Red October,” we did a lot of those missions and a lot of missions off the coast of Vietnam and Cambodia in that war.

But we had some squadrons in the Navy P-3 role—this is an exaggeration—that had a hard time spelling the word “submarine” much less finding them. And we had some that were terrific, and then a lot in between. And one of the things we did, the Admiral we worked for created tactical training teams to actually go out and to work literally with each squadron, maybe 12 crews, but literally to fly with, and work with those squadrons—they were marginal performers—literally worked with the crews that needed the most help.

And I do not know if a similar kind of approach—but a tactical team approach worked for us, really raised the performance of the Navy P-3 role in our maritime patrol responsibilities. Something like that might be of value. I would just lay that out on the table and again commend Senator Coburn and his staff for their work on this area.

Second, I want to turn to, if I can, cybersecurity, and I am encouraged that the Senate is actually coming together and starting to work more cohesively, more collaboratively. Immigration reform is one example. Gun legislation is before us. They are agreeing on a continuing resolution for the balance of the fiscal year and providing some discretion from your Department and others to manage through those cuts more effectively.

But I am encouraged that we are starting to see some cohesion forming around what to do, not just within the Congress, but also with our key stakeholders and your efforts.

I have a question I wanted to ask with that in mind. The budget of the President includes increases for your Department’s assistance to the private sector and to other Federal agencies. Could you just take a moment and describe how those increases for cybersecurity are designed to help our partners with critical infra-

structure and other Federal agencies that have experienced cyber attacks? Could you do that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, I think cyber obviously is probably the fastest growing area of the Department, in part because that is where we have seen the most activity grow over the last few years.

The President's budget does a couple things. It increases funding for our ability to secure the civilian side of cyber—the networks there, including continuous diagnostics and monitoring. It increases funding for the Computer Emergency Readiness Team (CERT), which is a response team that works with the private sector in response to incidents. Sometimes they work out of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC), which is the 24/7 watch center here. They actually go on-site wherever the attack is located or centered. It increases funding for the industrial control systems, a CERT in particular, because the attacks on control systems are of increasing concern. So we have that.

So it really goes through kind of all of the responsibilities we have both within the Federal Government, but also with the private sector, and provides some needed additional funding.

Chairman CARPER. All right. Thanks.

As you know, the President—in fact, you were very much involved in this. The President recently issued his Executive Order to strengthen our critical infrastructure. I especially want to applaud whoever figured out the idea of assigning to National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) the responsibility for doing the outreach to key stakeholders and asking them for their involvement and their participation in deciding what best practices should be. That was a good move, and I am hearing very positive comments in particular from the business community and the private owners of the critical infrastructure on that.

But could you describe how the budget request would be used to implement the President's Executive Order?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, the EO and the budget are integrated together. I mean, they were in some respects prepared almost at the same time. And the EO, as you know, directs us to do a number of things with the private sector, with NIST, et cetera. And so we are given the resources with which to do that and to meet the timelines that are in the EO.

Chairman CARPER. All right. And before I turn it over to Senator Coburn, I want to come back to the issue of fusion centers again. I mentioned the Navy P-3 where we used tactical training teams to go out and work with the marginally performing squadrons. In the nuclear regulatory world, I chair a Subcommittee that has jurisdiction over clean air and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). We have about 100 nuclear power plants, and we use a system where we have seen—I think we call them “red teams,” where we have literally seen teams out there to test the security. They do not go carrying weapons and finding weapons, but it is pretty realistic, and it actually raises everybody's game. It is just another example of that.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We do a lot of red teaming, Senator. That is a very good way to test whether what we are doing makes sense—

Chairman CARPER. I would just ask—

Secretary NAPOLITANO [continuing]. And find gaps.

Chairman CARPER. Good. That is good. I would just ask that we consider that with respect to the fusion centers as we try to raise their game. Thank you.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Fair enough.

Senator COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I asked the staff of PSI to give every Member of our Committee a copy of that.

Madam Secretary, when we talked about the consolidation of all these grant programs, would you kindly provide the Committee with a State-by-State and port-by-port breakdown of Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) funding from 2010 to 2012?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes.

Senator COBURN. Thank you, if you would do that.

And I am correct, other than classified information, the spending coming through these grant programs goes on [USASpending.gov](http://USASpending.gov)?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I believe that is correct, yes.

Senator COBURN. All right. Let me talk about fusion centers for a minute. I know you did not like my report very much. I heard about it in all sorts of ways. Here is the real crux:

Our Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTF) are working well. You cannot go to a place where the local law enforcement does not have a great relationship with the FBI in terms of running those organizations. So the question comes: What is the added value based on the amount of money that is spent on the fusion centers and what do they bring? And there are some real privacy rights that have been violated in fusion centers that has to be cleaned up, which we documented. We are not the majority of money that is spent on the fusion centers. In other words, we are not the No. 1 funder. That is State and local communities.

So the question is: With the limited budget, where do we get the most bang for our buck? And that is my question. What have we developed, what have we seen? And as we researched this, what we found was not very good value for the money that we are getting.

Now, your job is to be a visionary, and you are seeing at some point in the future, I understand, where you think that value is going to come. I just have real doubts about it, and so I will continue to work with you on it and everything else. But in a time of limited budgets, what my hope would be is what we take is something that is really working well, which is the JTTF organizations—and they do work well—and really enhance them where we can to maybe do everything you want to see done in a fusion center done there, rather than have two separate organizations.

So, anyhow, you and I will continue that conversation in the future, and hopefully we will get a little bit better bang for our buck out of what is going into fusion centers and more product that is actually usable coming out of them.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. If I might, Senator, I would be happy to work with you on that. I hope to at some point persuade you that really what we need are both. The JTTFs are good. We are the largest participant in the JTTFs besides the FBI.

But they are there to coordinate and investigate incidents of suspected terrorism. They have a dedicated mission. The fusion centers are there to collect information and provide analytics on all sorts of hazards. They have a much broader and more diffuse mission.

I think the fusion centers can be made better. I am not quarreling about that. But I would suggest to you that putting everything under the terrorism label is too narrow—

Senator COBURN. Except that is not what is really happening in the JTTF. There is drug stuff, there is all the other stuff. If you talk to sheriffs, if you talk to police chiefs, where do they go? They do not go to the fusion center. They go to the Joint Terrorism Task Force because that is where the information is that is timely. The problem with fusion centers is their information is always dated. It is behind the curve.

Now, maybe some of them are very good, and I do not doubt that Boston's was. But the point is, can we do that, can we create one organization rather than two and still have a benefit and save the taxpayers' money and have timely information? That is all I am saying. I am not against fusion centers, but we certainly—what the GAO report said April of this year is there is tons of duplication going on that the American taxpayer either at the State level or at the Federal level, is paying for. So why are we duplicating things, again?

And that actually takes me into the other area that I wanted to work with you on, which is the GAO's recent duplication report. I do not know. Have you read it, been briefed on it?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I have a summary of it, yes.

Senator COBURN. What steps are you taking now to address the areas identified by GAO in terms of duplication in your Department?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I have asked our management team to look at all the areas that GAO identified and to give me their assessment as to whether the GAO was correct, whether we have already corrected what the GAO perceived, because as I indicated to Senator McCaskill, by the time a GAO report is written, sometimes you do not have the most current information. That is just the way—I am not being critical, just descriptive.

Senator COBURN. Yes.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. But, yes, if we can—under these budget times, we have no interest in wasting any taxpayer dollars. So if I can find a redundancy or something can be done efficiently—that is what our Efficiency Review process is all about—we are going to do that.

Senator COBURN. The other thing that would come is where you see an area where you need our Committee's help, what I hope you will do is say, "You guys got us doing three different things in three different areas that actually lead to the same result. Here is a recommendation. Why don't you guys change this?"

So what I would like is that you really are forward with us when you look at all that the GAO has put out and say, "Congress, you have to change this for us if you expect us to be efficient and save money."

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Fair enough.

Senator COBURN. All right. Senator McCaskill talked about the Science and Technology Directorate and the duplication there. It is big, in terms of what GAO says. And I notice that you have a significant increase in funding, a 126-percent increase in funding, from 2012 for the Science and Technology Directorate. Can you talk to us a little bit about that?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Almost all of the increase in the funding is for the NBAF, which was determined by everybody who looked at the issue, including the Congress, that we needed a Level 4 ag facility, laboratory. Plum Island, where the existing one is—we are going to have to use it for a while, but in the end, it will not be our long-term facility, cannot be. There was a peer-reviewed competition for where the site should be. Kansas was the selected site. And so now we are in a partnership with the State of Kansas. We put in roughly \$700 million, they are putting in \$300-plus million of State money to build the Level 4 facility.

So the budget request enables us to begin to break ground on the main laboratory and to be on a construction schedule where we would be done by 2020.

Senator COBURN. All right. The other thing that I would note is at least three reports were due to Congress on April 10, 2013. I do not know if you are aware of that. This is the same time the President submitted his budget request, and we have not seen those reports. They cover the result of Science and Technology (S&T's) research and development for 2013, the amounts deobligated from projects from 2013, and the projected costs for the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

Are they coming? Do you have any idea? Or do you have to get back to me on it?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I will get back to you on that, Senator.

Senator COBURN. OK.

It is hard for us to look at the 2014 request when we cannot get the reports that are due to us on 2013.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I understand. I will——

Senator COBURN. That is just fair.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. That is a fair question. I will look into it. As long as we are having a frank discussion, we will get those reports to you, but perhaps we could look comprehensively at all the reporting requirements of the Department.

Senator COBURN. I agree. What is set up in legislation and mandated is not always things that will actually make you better or give us more knowledge. I understand that. You have my commitment to help you. If you see areas where you would like to see that changed, I think Senator Carper and I both would like to help you see that done.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. We will work together on it.

Senator COBURN. OK. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman CARPER. In that spirit, before I turn to Senator McCaskill, one of the things that we could probably do that would help the Secretary and future Secretaries and their leadership team is somehow figure out how to have fewer Committees and Subcommittees with jurisdiction over different pieces of what you do. How many are there in all?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It depends on how you count, but the number I use is 105.

Chairman CARPER. 105. That is a whole lot of folks to be answering to. Maybe as we do our top-to-bottom review of the Department we can actually figure out how to have a few less Committees and Subcommittees for you to report to. Senator McCaskill.

Senator MCCASKILL. I could not agree more with Senator Carper on that. It is absolutely unconscionable. I do not know how you have time to do your job because it is a fine line between oversight and making you inefficient. And I think a lot of the duplication that we have on our end, it takes a lot of nerve for me to chew on you about duplication when we are having you answer to that many Committees.

And I neglected in my first round of questioning to thank you on NBAF. There is an animal science corridor through the Midwest that is very important to a lot of preparedness that we need to have as we look to the future. And I know this was a tough call for you because of limited resources, and I know that my colleagues—and, frankly, it is in Kansas, and I am not really that fond of Kansas. [Laughter.]

But, it is good for the Midwest, and it is good—

Secretary NAPOLITANO. It is good for the country.

Senator MCCASKILL [continuing]. For our country, and so in this instance, I have been trying to fight as hard as I could for K State to get the funding for this important research facility, and I think they will be a great partner in this, and I think the entire region will be a great partner. And I realized I had gotten through and I was chewing on you and putting you on the spot, and I had not thanked you, and I wanted to stick around to do that.

Thank you very much.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. I appreciate that. It was gracious. Thank you very much.

Chairman CARPER. And that was it, huh?

Senator MCCASKILL. That was it.

Chairman CARPER. That is very nice.

I have one more question, if you could bear with us, and then I am just going to ask you for a closing thought or two you would like to share with us. We always ask our witnesses to give an opening statement, and we come at you from a bunch of different directions. You may have a thought or two you would like to close with, and so I will give you a minute to think about that while I pose a question.

It is a question that deals with fee increases, if I could. One of the elements in the proposal that Senator McCain and our seven colleagues have submitted is they are in favor of identifying force multipliers that we have talked about; ways to make us more effective on border security, and also come up with ways to help offset those costs. And there are offsets provided in the President's budget for raising some of the monies that are needed to fund some of the extra personnel and initiatives that will be used.

Just make the case for those. Not everybody is in favor of it, raising revenues even for user fees that pay for stuff that we agree needs to be done, but just make the case for us, if you would.



Secretary NAPOLITANO. Well, I think the user fees we have requested are adjustments to existing users fees. We have had a immigration user fee. We have had an air security fee. Under the understanding that those who are using those particular services, the services of the land ports or the airports, what have you, they should pay a little bit of the cost as opposed to the taxpayer generally.

The problem is the fees have not been adjusted, and there was no mechanism put in there for adjustments, automatic adjustments, and so they are woefully out of step with what they actually need to cover as a real user fee. And so what the President is requesting is that we make those adjustments.

We do not, in the case of the aviation fee, do it all at once. We do it over a period of 5 years. And we are not talking large dollars but enough so that we can make the improvements we need, maintain the security we must have, and not further burden the taxpayer generally.

Chairman CARPER. Talk to us a little bit about the trade. The amount of trade we have with Mexico and with Canada, put that in perspective with the rest of the world. And I am not going to ask you to put dollar values on that, but just in relative terms, how important is it? And why are we so concerned about making sure that trade, whether it is Mexico or Canada, can move in an effective way?

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Canada and Mexico represent two of our top three trading partners, and that translates into hundreds of billions of dollars worth of trade annually and hundreds of thousands of jobs within the United States. Facilitating that trade, having things go smoothly and efficiently across borders is not only a security issue but it is an economic imperative.

So working to keep lines shorter at the ports, figuring out ways where we can increase so-called trusted trader programs and implement the full beyond-the-border initiative with Canada—

Chairman CARPER. That is trader, spelled T-R-A-D-E-R, as opposed to another kind of traitor.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. Yes, exactly. Putting in the infrastructure for really a 21st Century border with Mexico. So these things really give meaning to the reality that these are two of our top three trading partners.

Chairman CARPER. Good. OK.

Do you want to take a minute or two just to give us a closing thought? And then I will give a short benediction, and we will call it a day.

Secretary NAPOLITANO. No. I have enjoyed being with the Committee today. I think we have had a fair airing of some of the issues. I look forward to working with the Committee on these and others that come up.

This Department has made tremendous advances over the past 10 years, but we know we are still improving and looking for ways to improve, and we are committed to doing that.

Chairman CARPER. Good. I mentioned this before, I do not know if ever in your presence, but I certainly mentioned it at hearings here in the past. An international study was done a year or so ago. I heard about it on NPR driving to catch the train one morning

from Delaware to D.C. And the study had been done asking people who work in countries all over the world, "What do you like about your job?" And people had, as you might imagine, a lot of different answers. Some people liked being paid. Some people liked having benefits. They liked having health care, a pension, or vacation. Some people liked the folks they worked with, and that was their favorite thing. Some people just liked the surroundings in which they worked.

But the most common answer, the most agreed-to answer among the people surveyed was this response: The thing they liked most about their work was they knew that what they were doing was important and they felt that they were making progress.

Think about that. The work that they do is important and they felt like they were making progress.

The work that you and your team at DHS is doing is incredibly important. We were reminded of that this week. And I think in many ways progress is being made, and that is a tribute to you and your predecessors and the folks that you lead.

So as I said at the beginning of the hearing, everything I do I know I can do better, and to the extent there has been some criticism here, the intent is to be constructive and to try to figure out how we can work with you to enable you and us each to do our responsibilities better.

With that having been said, the hearing record will remain open for, I am told, 15 days, until May 2, 5 p.m., for the submission of statements and questions for the record. We thank you for your time, for your service, and for being here today.

With that, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:07 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

## A P P E N D I X

---

### Opening Statement of Chairman Carper

April 17, 2013

#### “The Homeland Security Department’s Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”

My thanks to Secretary Napolitano for joining us to discuss the President’s budget request for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2014. Before we start, I first want to offer my condolences to the victims of the tragic Boston marathon terrorist attacks and their families. I ask that we now have a moment of silence to remember the victims and their families. Thank you.

I also want to thank our first responders and brave bystanders who selflessly rushed into the chaotic scene to care for those who were injured, and the law enforcement personnel at the federal, state and local level who continue to investigate this incident. I am carefully monitoring this situation and will continue to do so. In the end, we’ll get to the bottom of this incident and bring those responsible to justice. Moving forward, it is critical that all Americans recognize that we all have a shared responsibility in keeping each other safe and we should all embrace the adage, ‘if you see something, say something,’ and report anything suspicious to authorities immediately.

Unfortunately, such tragic acts of terror serve as a reminder of the critically important mission given to the Department of Homeland Security. Crafting a budget for an agency this complex and important is never easy and is particularly challenging in this fiscal environment.

The Administration’s \$39 billion dollar budget request makes some very tough choices. It cuts the Department’s budget by roughly two percent over 2012 levels but it is at least consistent with what Congress appropriated in 2013 for the Department, before sequestration cuts were applied. Still, this level is lower than what Congress appropriated in 2009.

Stepping back and thinking about all of the challenges that our country and this Department have faced since 2009 –the Christmas Day bomber, the Time Square bomber, the Yemen Cargo Bomb plot, Hurricane Sandy, the ever-changing and ever-growing cyber threat, and now the Boston attack – it’s easy to become concerned with this budget request. That said, we are facing extremely difficult budgetary times and sacrifices must be made.

While I recognize some important missions may not receive all of the funding they or we would want in a perfect world, all departments and agencies in government must share in the sacrifices required to rein in the deficit. The Secretary seems to have taken this message to heart, identifying \$1.3 billion in cost-savings this year and more than \$4 billion since 2009 and continues to move to a risk-based approach to save more money.

I’m happy to see that this budget proposes a much needed increase for cybersecurity which will help the Department fulfill its significant cyber responsibilities. Of course, additional resources alone are not going to get the job done – that is why passing comprehensive bipartisan legislation to compliment the President’s Executive Order and address the cyber threat is one of my highest priorities.

I also welcomed the Administration's continued commitment to securing our nation's borders by maintaining staffing for the Border Patrol at its current historic levels and adding more than 3,400 Customs and Border Protection officers to staff our ports of entry. These critical resources are paid for, in part, with modest fee increases.

During my recent trips to our borders in Arizona and Michigan, I heard local mayors, business leaders, and frontline officers say they need more help at our ports of entry. I believe that if something is worth having, it's worth paying for, and it's worth it to America to better facilitate trade and travel at our ports of entry. This is why I agree with the President's proposal to use modest fee increases to pay for more CBP officers. These efforts will build on the tremendous progress we have made in securing the border over the past decade. I look forward to reviewing the immigration bill soon to be introduced by the Senator John McCain and seven of our colleagues to make sure the bill makes smart investments in border security, focusing on deploying force multipliers that can help our frontline agents be more effective, and efficient.

Lastly, I was encouraged to see the increase in funding for the consolidation of the Department's Headquarters at the St. Elizabeths Campus which I visited just this week. The \$105 million in this request, in conjunction with the money that the General Services Administration has requested, will yield real savings to taxpayers by allowing us to stop leasing buildings all over the DC metro area and helping the Department improve management and increase morale.

With that said, I'm concerned that this budget's significant cuts to several key homeland priorities may be penny wise and pound foolish. The cuts to management, for instance, are shortsighted and will, I fear, undermine the progress the Department has made in this area. Last year for the first time, DHS earned a qualified audit opinion on all of its Fiscal Year 2012 financial statements. And in its latest 'High Risk' report, the Government Accountability Office confirmed that there has been considerable progress at the Department in integrating its components and in strengthening its management. We can't lose this momentum. Better management will yield better results and stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

I'm also concerned by the proposed reduction in frontline personnel at Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). As we work to reform our immigration laws, I believe that ICE will play a critical role. These reductions, then, could undermine our efforts to implement new reforms. We also need to do a better job of managing our detention efforts to ensure that criminals are kept off the streets. While acknowledging that the sequestration that Congress launched is partly to blame, I was disappointed with the management failures that led ICE to release a number of felons among the more than 2,000 detainees two months ago because of budget constraints.

Another area of concern is the \$714 million request to fund the construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas. I understand the importance of studying animal diseases, but I hope we can avoid providing full funding in 2014 alone for a multi-year construction project by building in logical segments over a two-year period and, thus, avoid taking away resources from other agencies like ICE, the Coast Guard, and FEMA next year.

Finally, I am concerned by proposed cuts in the support DHS provides to state and local governments and first responders through homeland security grants, exercises and training. As we saw clearly this week, state and local officials are the ones who will inevitably be on the front lines responding to a terrorist attack. While acknowledging that our approach must be risk-based, I want to ensure that the Department is able to continue to help state and local responders with the plans, training and equipment they need to respond effectively, as they did so admirably in Boston this week.

The elephant in the room, of course, is sequestration. If implemented, it would take another 5 percent off the Department's already limited budget. These cuts, I fear, would interfere with Departmental operations and management and with its ability to fulfill its missions. We must find a better way to deal with our budget crisis. We need a comprehensive plan to rein in our federal debt and deficit.

Finally, as my colleagues have heard me say many times, I favor a 'grand bargain' that does three key things: (1) raises revenues to levels comparable to those which enabled us to achieve four balanced budgets in the Clinton Administration; (2) enacts entitlement reform that saves money, avoids savaging older people or poor people and keeps these programs strong for the long haul; and (3) looks in every nook and cranny of the federal government and ask, 'How can we get a better result for less money?' Now is the time to make this grand bargain. The cost of the failure to do so is just too high.

**Opening Statement of Senator Tom Coburn**  
**“The Homeland Security Department’s Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”**  
**April 17, 2013**

Thank you. Madam Secretary, welcome. I appreciate your service – we have a lot to go through today.

I’m one of the few members of Congress who has supported your idea of consolidating Homeland Security grant programs, and I commend you on that. You’ll have my help on working towards that, with the caveat that we do a much better job in terms of putting metrics on those grants, and that they are truly risk-based. There are a lot of areas where we are not effective with homeland security grants today.

I would like to offer a few comments.

First, if you read the Constitution and you look at the enumerated powers, a lot of what we’ve done isn’t our role—it’s the state and locals’ role. We’ve created some learned dependency out there that individual states and communities are going to have to free themselves of, because the budget parameters are not going to allow us to be the source for what they need.

Secondly, we cannot spend enough money to give us a one hundred percent guarantee of security.

Thirdly, we cannot and should not get security to the level that we compromise our liberty. So we have those two tensions that we must deal with going forward.

I have to say, I do trust you in terms of your vision of trying to do the best to balance those tensions. And I look forward to working with you so that we can move more of these dollars to risk-based prevention programs, rather than parochial-based formulas. Most of the people in this room don’t always know about the fights that we have at mark-ups when parochial interests displace the primacy of risk-based needs. There’s nothing wrong with fighting for your state, but there’s plenty wrong when you have fought for your state and resources which could have been used to prevent something aren’t available at the highest risk places.

Finally, the last point I’d make with this large budget is that sequestration is going to stay. That level of funding is not going up. We are not going to go back on the pledge to the American people to trim down the size of the federal government. Some of the positive things that are coming out of sequestration are innovation, judgment, and making hard decisions. My wish would be that the president would ask us for more flexibility. He’s refused to do so, but I think eventually we’re going to see that request.

My hope, Madam Secretary, is that Congress is going to give the Department of Homeland Security more flexibility, so the agency can actually make the judgments that we’re paying you to make.

With all of that comes the very thing that every family in this country is doing: they're doing more with less, instead of less with more. The number one charge to your agency is to do more with less. And that's across this government. It's going to have to happen. It's the only way we create a future for the generations that follow us. So I look forward to your testimony.

Thank you.

**Statement for the Record**

**The Honorable Janet Napolitano**

**Secretary**

**United States Department of Homeland Security**

**Before the**

**United States Senate**

**Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee**

**April 17, 2013**



Chairman Carper, Ranking Member Coburn, and Members of the Committee:

Let me begin by saying thank you to this Committee for the strong support you have provided me and the Department over the past 4 years. I look forward to continuing to work with you in the coming year to protect the homeland and the American people.

I am pleased to appear before the Committee today to present President Obama's Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

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

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

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

Our borders and ports are stronger, more efficient, and better protected than ever before. At the southwest border, apprehensions have decreased to the lowest point in more than 30 years. We have significantly invested in additional personnel, technology, and infrastructure, leading to historic progress along the border. We have deepened partnerships with federal, state, local, and

---

<sup>1</sup> "Local" law enforcement includes all law enforcement at the municipal, tribal, and territorial levels.

international law enforcement to combat transnational threats and criminal organizations to help keep our border communities safe. We have strengthened entry procedures to protect against the use of fraudulent documents and the entry of individuals who may wish to do us harm. And we have made our ports of entry (POEs) more efficient to expedite lawful travel and trade. Each day, almost 1 million people arrive at our POEs by land, sea, and air. In FY 2012, DHS processed more than 350 million travelers at our POEs, including almost 100 million international air travelers and \$2.3 trillion dollars of trade, while enforcing U.S. laws that welcome travelers, protect health and safety, and facilitate the flow of goods essential to our economy.

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

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

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

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

updated and overarching national framework that acknowledges the interdependencies between cybersecurity and securing physical assets.

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

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

#### **MAXIMIZING EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS**

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

##### **Realizing Efficiencies and Streamlining Operations**

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

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

##### ***Strategic Sourcing***

Through ER and Component initiatives, DHS has used strategic sourcing initiatives to leverage the purchasing power of the entire Department for items such as language services, tactical communications services and devices, intelligence analysis services, and vehicle maintenance services. In FY 2012, we achieved \$368 million in savings, and we project \$250 million in savings

for FY 2013. We expect a comparable level of savings as we continue forward with this approach in FY 2014.

#### *Travel and Conferences*

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

#### *Real Property Management*

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

#### **Management and Integration**

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

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

Although DHS continues to maximize cost efficiencies and savings wherever possible, new investment must be made to improve our outdated financial systems and tools. The FY 2014

Budget supports financial system modernization at the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), which also provides financial management services to two other DHS Components.

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

#### **Strategic Re-Organizations**

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

#### *United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT)*

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

#### *State and Local Grants*

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

#### *Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Delegation*

Beginning in FY 2013, the General Services Administration (GSA) will work with DHS to delegate the operations of LPOE facilities to CBP. The distinctive nature of LPOEs as mission-oriented, 24/7 operational assets of CBP, as well as national trade and transportation infrastructure, differentiates this part of the portfolio from other federal buildings managed by GSA. The delegation facilitates faster delivery of service tailored to the specific needs of CBP's mission and will be more responsive to changing priorities and critical operations.

#### **DHS Commonality Efforts**

The successful integration of 22 legacy agencies into DHS was an important and ambitious undertaking that has increased the Department's ability to understand, mitigate, and protect against threats to the Nation. Further integration of the Department and of the development of a "One-DHS" culture will strengthen effectiveness, improve decision making to address shared issues, and

prioritize resources in an era of fiscal constraint. The FY 2014 Budget continues this emphasis and supports ongoing efforts aimed at furthering integration, some of which are highlighted as follows.

#### *Common Vetting*

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

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

#### *Aviation Commonality*

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

#### *Investigations*

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

#### *CBP Staffing and Mission Integration*

Given the Administration's strong and continued focus on border security, DHS has undertaken a series of initiatives to ensure that CBP's operations are integrated and that Border Patrol Agents (BPAs) and CBP Officers (CBPOs) are optimally deployed. As part of its mission integration

efforts, CBP has applied complementary BPA and CBPO deployments to enhance mission sets both at and between the POEs. Toward this goal, CBP has identified numerous mission areas where BPAs can substantially support: port operations, including canine detection operations for drugs and concealed humans; outbound operations that target currency, firearms, and fugitives; port security, counter-surveillance, and perimeter enforcement operations; inbound secondary conveyance inspections for narcotics and human smuggling. CBP has also identified mission areas where BPAs secure and transport seized contraband.

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

#### **Supporting Economic Growth and Job Creation**

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

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

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

#### **BUDGET PRIORITIES**

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

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

**Mission 1: Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security** – Protecting the United States from terrorism is the cornerstone of homeland security. DHS's counterterrorism responsibilities focus on three goals: preventing terrorist attacks; preventing the unauthorized acquisition, importation, movement, or use of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials and capabilities within the United States; and reducing the vulnerability of critical U.S. infrastructure and key resources, essential leadership, and major events to terrorist attacks and other hazards.

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

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

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



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

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

The following are highlights of the FY 2014 Budget.

**Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security**

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

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

- *Strengthening Risk-Based Aviation Security:* The FY 2014 Budget supports DHS’s effort to employ risk-based, intelligence-driven operations to prevent terrorist attacks and to reduce the vulnerability of the Nation’s aviation system to terrorism. These security measures create a multi-layered system to strengthen aviation security from the time a passenger purchases a ticket to arrival at his or her destination. The FY 2014 Budget:

- Continues expansion of trusted traveler programs, such as TSA Pre✓™ and Global Entry, which are pre-screening initiatives for travelers who volunteer information about themselves before flying in order to potentially expedite screening at domestic checkpoints and through customs. By 2014, TSA anticipates that one in four members of the traveling public will be eligible for expedited domestic screening.
- Continues enhanced behavior detection in which interview and behavioral analysis techniques are used to determine if a traveler should be referred for additional screening at the checkpoint. Analyses from pilots in FY 2013 will inform the next steps on how larger-scale implementation in FY 2014 could improve capabilities in a risk-based security environment.
- Expands Secure Flight to perform watch list matching for passengers before boarding large general aviation aircraft. An estimated 11 million additional Secure Flight Passenger Data sets are expected to be submitted by general aviation operators per year.
- Supports, as part of its multi-layered security strategy, the Federal Flight Deck Officer and Flight Crew program as a fully reimbursable program under FLETC's existing authorities.
- Prioritizes TSA's mission-critical screening functions, and proposes the transfer of all exit lane staffing to local airports pursuant to federal regulatory authorities. Airports will be responsible for integrating exit lane security into their perimeter security plans, which are assessed regularly by TSA.
- *Enhancing International Collaboration:* To most effectively carry out our core missions, DHS continues to engage countries around the world to protect both national and economic security. The FY 2014 Budget supports DHS's strategic partnerships with international allies and enhanced targeting and information-sharing efforts to interdict threats and dangerous people and cargo at the earliest point possible. The Secretary's focus on international partnerships includes elevating the Office of International Affairs to a stand-alone office and a direct report. The FY 2014 Budget:
  - Supports the Immigration Advisory Program and the continued growth of the Pre-Departure Vetting, which have experienced a 156-percent increase in the number of no board recommendations since 2010. Through these programs, CBP identifies high-risk travelers who are likely to be inadmissible into the United States and makes recommendations to commercial carriers to deny boarding.
  - Continues to modernize the IT capability for screening visa applications to support the expansion of Visa Security Program (VSP) coverage at existing overseas high-risk visa adjudication posts. The VSP represents ICE's front line in protecting the United States against terrorists and criminal organizations by preventing foreign nationals who pose as a threat to national security from entering the United States. In FY 2014, VSP will enhance visa vetting by increasing automated data exchange with the Department of State and CBP's National Targeting Center. ICE will leverage modernization to increase investigations of visa applicants who pose a potential high risk for terrorism and are attempting to travel to the United States.

- Supports the bilateral Beyond the Border Action Plan with Canada, including CBP's pre-inspection efforts in rail, land, and marine environments. Pre-inspection is a precursor to preclearance, which supports DHS's extended border strategy through the identification and prevention of terrorists, criminals, and other national security threats before they enter the United States. Pre-inspection/preclearance also helps protect U.S. agriculture from the spread of foreign pests, disease and global outbreaks.
- *Supporting Surface Transportation Security:* The surface transportation sector, due to its open access architecture, has a fundamentally different operational environment than aviation. Accordingly, DHS helps secure surface transportation infrastructure through risk-based security assessments, critical infrastructure hardening, and close partnerships with SLE partners. The FY 2014 Budget supports DHS's efforts to bolster these efforts. Specifically, the Budget:
  - Includes the NPGP, described in more detail on the following pages. This proposal focuses on building national capabilities focused on preventing and responding to threats across the country, including the surface transportation sector, through Urban Search and Rescue teams, canine explosives detection teams, and HAZMAT response as well as target hardening of critical transit infrastructure.
  - Funds surface transportation security inspectors and canine teams who work collaboratively with public and private-sector partners to strengthen security and mitigate the risk to our Nation's transportation systems.
  - Supports compliance inspections throughout the freight rail and mass transit domains, critical facility security reviews for pipeline facilities, comprehensive mass transit assessments that focus on high-risk transit agencies, and corporate security reviews conducted in multiple modes of transportation to assess security.
  - Funds 37 Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response (VIPR) teams, including 22 multi-modal Teams. VIPR teams are composed of personnel with expertise in inspection, behavior detection, security screening, and law enforcement for random, unpredictable deployments throughout the transportation sector to prevent potential terrorist and criminal acts.
  - Helps secure critical infrastructure and key resources located on or near the water through patrols, enforcing security zones and security escorts of certain vessels (e.g., vessels containing hazardous cargo) in key U.S. ports and waterways.
- *Strengthening Global Supply Chain Security:* The FY 2014 Budget continues to support the Administration's Global Supply Chain Security Strategy, which provides a national vision for global supply chain security that is secure, efficient, and resilient across air, land, and sea modes of transportation. The Budget:
  - Supports increased targeting capability through enhanced automated systems providing CBP with real-time information to focus its enforcement activities on higher-risk passengers and cargo.

- Supports the consolidation of CBP's separate cargo and passenger targeting locations, which will promote increased targeting efficiencies and reduced delays of travelers and cargo.
- Strengthens the Container Security Initiative, enabling CBP to prescreen and evaluate high-risk containers before they are shipped to the United States.
- Continues support to improve the coordination of international cargo security efforts, accelerate security efforts in response to vulnerabilities, ensure compliance with screening requirements, and strengthen aviation security operations overseas.
- Supports ongoing assessments of anti-terrorism measures in the ports of our maritime trading partners through the Coast Guard International Port Security Program.
- Supports enhanced system efficiency through continued development and deployment of the International Trade Data System. This important resource provides a single automated window for submitting trade information to the federal agencies responsible for facilitating international trade and securing America's supply chain.
- *Research, Development, and Innovation (RD&I) at S&T:* The FY 2014 Budget includes \$467 million for RD&I, a \$200 million increase from FY 2012 enacted levels. This funding includes support for unclassified cybersecurity research that supports the public and private sectors and the global Internet infrastructure. It also allows S&T to resume R&D in areas such as land and maritime border security; chemical, biological, and explosive defense research; disaster resilience; cybersecurity; and counterterrorism.
- *Support to SLLE:* The FY 2014 Budget continues support for SLLE efforts to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to pre-operational activity and other crimes that are precursors or indicators of terrorist activity through training, technical assistance, exercise support, security clearances, connectivity to federal systems, technology, and grant funding. The Budget supports efforts to share intelligence and information on a wide range of critical homeland security issues. The Budget continues to build state and local analytic capabilities through the National Network of Fusion Centers, with a focus on strengthening cross-Department and cross-government interaction with fusion centers. It also elevates the Office of State and Local Law Enforcement to a stand-alone office. The Budget:
  - Enables DHS to continue to assess capability development and performance improvements of the National Network of Fusion Centers through an annual assessment, collection of outcomes-based performance data, and targeted exercises. Resources also enable the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, in partnership with the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties and the Privacy Office, to provide privacy and civil rights and civil liberties training and technical assistance support for fusion centers and their respective liaison officer programs. Additionally, unique partnerships with FEMA, NPPD, USCG, and ICE have facilitated additional analytic training for fusion center analysts on a variety of topics.
  - Continues to support SLTT efforts to counter violent extremism, including the delivery of Building Communities of Trust initiative roundtables, which focus on developing trust

between community leaders and law enforcement officials so they cooperatively address the challenges of crime and terrorism.

- Expands, in partnership with the Departments of Justice (DOJ), Education, and Health and Human Services, ongoing efforts to prevent future mass casualty shootings, improve preparedness, and strengthen security and resilience in schools and other potential targets while working with partners at all levels of government.
- *Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Threat Detection*: Countering biological, nuclear, and radiological threats requires a coordinated, whole-of-government approach. DHS, through the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) and the Office of Health Affairs, works in partnership with agencies across federal, state, and local governments to prevent and deter attacks using radiological and nuclear (rad/nuc) weapons through nuclear detection and forensics programs and provides medical and scientific expertise to support bio-preparedness and response efforts.

The FY 2014 Budget supports the following efforts:

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

zoonotic diseases that is central to the protection of the Nation's food supply as well as our national and economic security.

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

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

#### **Securing and Managing Our Borders**

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

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

- *Law Enforcement Officers:* The Budget supports 21,370 BPAs and a record 25,252 CBPOs at POEs who work with federal, state, and local law enforcement to target illicit networks trafficking in people, drugs, illegal weapons, and money and to expedite legal travel and trade. This includes funds from proposed increases to inspection user fees.
- *Travel and Trade:* In 2012, President Obama announced new administrative initiatives through Executive Order 13597 to increase travel and tourism throughout and to the United States, and DHS plays an important role in this work. As discussed in the highlights section, DHS is continuing to develop new ways to increase the efficiency of our port operations and to make international travel and trade easier, more cost-effective and more secure.

- *Technology:* Funding is requested to support the continued deployment of proven, effective surveillance technology along the highest trafficked areas of the southwest border. Funds will be used to procure and deploy commercially available technology tailored to the operational requirements of the Border Patrol, the distinct terrain, and the population density within Arizona.
- *Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS):* DHS will take over operations of TARS beginning in FY 2014. TARS is a multi-mission capability that supports both the counterdrug and air defense missions, providing long-range detection and monitoring of low-level air, maritime, and surface narcotics traffickers.
- *Targeting and Analysis:* The Budget includes additional investments in CBP's targeting capabilities, which will enable CBP to develop and implement an enhanced strategy that more effectively and efficiently divides cargo and travelers according to the potential threat they pose.
- *POE Infrastructure:* CBP, working with its various partners including GSA, continues to modernize and maintain border infrastructure that both facilitates trade and travel, and helps secure the border. In FY 2014, CBP will work with GSA to complete the last phase of the Nogales-Mariposa inspection facility and initiate the site acquisition and design for the southbound phase of the San Ysidro modernization project. Additionally, CBP will work with GSA to initiate construction of a new bus processing terminal at the Lincoln-Juarez Bridge and renovation of the passenger and pedestrian processing facility at the Convent Street inspection facility in Laredo, Texas. Beginning in late FY 2013 and continuing in FY 2014, CBP will assume responsibility for the building operations, maintenance, and repair of the land port inspection facilities from GSA to streamline administrative processes and improve the responsiveness to CBP mission requirements. Finally, CBP proposes legislative authority in the FY 2014 Budget to accept donations from the private sector.
- *CBP Air and Marine Procurement:* Funding is requested for two KA-350CER Multi-Role Enforcement Aircraft (MEA), which provide direct support to CBP efforts to secure our Nation's borders. Unlike the older, less-capable aircraft they are replacing, MEA has the capabilities to detect, track, and intercept general aviation threats; detect and track maritime threats over a wide area; and support ground interdiction operations through a variety of sensors and advanced data and video down-link.
- *Collect Customs Revenue:* Funds are requested to support CBP's role as a revenue collector for the U.S. Treasury; customs revenue remains the second largest source of revenue for the Federal Government. CBP relies on bonds to collect duties owed when importers fail to pay and efforts to collect from the importer are not successful. This funding will support improvements to increase the efficacy of CBP's bonding process, including the delegation to a centralized office the responsibility for developing and implementing Single Transaction Bond (STB) policy, approving bond applications, reporting on activities, and monitoring results. These resources will fund the automation of STB processing and record keeping and provide effective internal controls that protect the duties and taxes (more than \$38 billion in 2012) collected by CBP. Specifically, CBP will automate and centralize into one location processing of all STBs,

resulting in enhanced program oversight, consistent processing, and reduced write-offs and delinquencies.

- *Protect Trade and Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement:* Funding is requested to support intellectual property and commercial trade fraud investigations within ICE's National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center (IPR Center). With 21 partners and the expertise of the Federal Government's largest law enforcement agencies, the IPR Center brings together the full range of legal authorities and law enforcement tools to combat intellectual property theft, including medical regulation; patent, trademark, and copyright protection; border enforcement; organized crime investigations; and undercover operations. ICE will also increase collaboration with CBP through a joint fraud enforcement strategy to coordinate commercial fraud enforcement operations. The FY 2014 Budget also supports CBP's enforcement programs to prevent trade in counterfeit and pirated goods, and to protect consumers and national security from harm from counterfeit goods through special enforcement operations to increase IPR seizures and referrals for criminal investigation. In addition, the FY 2014 Budget supports technology and training to increase the efficiency of targeting IPR infringing merchandise.
- *USCG Recapitalization:* The FY 2014 request fully funds a seventh NSC; supports patrol boat recapitalization through the FRC acquisition; continues acquisitions of the Offshore Patrol Cutter and a new polar ice breaker; and provides for critical upgrades to command, control, and aviation sustainment. The total request for USCG Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements is \$951 million.
- *USCG Operations:* The FY 2014 request funds nearly 50,000 full-time personnel and nearly 7,000 reservists to maintain safety, security, and stewardship of our Nation's waters and maritime borders. Funds will support a full range of Coast Guard cutters, aircraft, and boats to address threats from inside the ports, within customs waters and out on the high seas.

#### **Enforcing and Administering our Immigration Laws**

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

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



*Secure Communities:* In FY 2013, the Department completed nationwide deployment of the Secure Communities program, which uses biometric information and services to identify and remove criminal and other priority aliens found in state prisons and local jails. Secure Communities is an important tool in ICE's efforts to focus its immigration enforcement resources on the highest-priority individuals who pose a threat to public safety or national security, and the Budget continues support of this program. ICE is committed to ensuring the Secure Communities program respects civil rights and civil liberties, and works closely with law enforcement agencies and stakeholders across the country to ensure the program operates in the most-effective manner possible. To this end, ICE has issued guidance regarding the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in appropriate cases, including in cases involving witnesses and victims of crime, implemented enhanced training for SLE regarding civil rights issues, and released new guidance that limits the use of detainees to the agency's enforcement priorities and restricts the use of detainees against individuals arrested for minor misdemeanor offenses such as traffic offenses and other petty crimes, among other recent improvements. The Budget also includes \$10 million for 73 ICE attorney positions that will continue prosecutorial discretion reviews of new cases to ensure that resources at the Executive Office for Immigration Review and ICE are focused on priority cases.

- *Immigration Detention:* Under this Administration, ICE has focused its immigration enforcement efforts on identifying and removing priority aliens, including criminals, repeat immigration law violators, and recent border entrants. As ICE focuses on criminal and other priority cases, the agency continues to work to reduce the time removable aliens spend in detention custody, going from 37 days in FY 2010 to fewer than 32 days in FY 2012. Consistent with its stated enforcement priorities and guidance to the field, ICE will continue to focus detention and removal resources on those individuals who have criminal convictions or fall under other priority categories. For low-risk individuals, ICE will work to enhance the effectiveness of Alternatives to Detention, which provides a lower per-day cost than detention. To ensure the most cost-effective use of federal resources, the Budget includes flexibility to transfer funding between immigration detention and the Alternatives to Detention program, commensurate with the level of risk a detainee presents.
- *287(g) Program:* The Budget reflects the cancelation of inefficient task force officer model agreements, reducing the cost of the 287(g) program by \$44 million. The 287(g) jail model agreements, as well as programs such as Secure Communities, have proven to be more efficient and effective in identifying and removing criminal and other priority aliens than the task force officer model agreements.
- *Detention Reform:* ICE will continue building on ongoing detention reform efforts in FY 2014. In FY 2013, ICE implemented its new Risk Classification Assessment nationwide to improve transparency and uniformity in detention custody and classification decisions and to promote identification of vulnerable populations. ICE will continue to work with DOJ to reduce the average length of stay in detention by working to secure orders of removal before the release of criminal aliens from DOJ custody. In addition, ICE will continue implementation of the new transfer directive, which is designed to minimize long-distance transfers of detainees within ICE's detention system, especially for those detainees with family members in the area, local attorneys, or pending immigration proceedings. ICE will also continue implementation of revised national detention standards designed to maximize access to counsel, visitation, and quality medical and mental health care in additional facilities. Finally, DHS anticipates that the

rulemaking applying the Prison Rape Elimination Act to DHS confinement facilities will be finalized in FY 2013 and implemented in FY 2013 and FY 2014.

- *Worksite Enforcement*: Requested funds will continue the Department's focus to promote compliance with worksite-related laws through criminal prosecutions of egregious employers, Form I-9 inspections, civil fines, and debarment, as well as education and compliance tools.
- *E-Verify*: The Budget provides \$114 million to support the continued expansion and enhancement of E-Verify, the Administration's electronic employment eligibility verification system. This funding will also continue support for the expansion of the E-Verify Self-Check program, a voluntary, free, fast, and secure online service that allows individuals in the United States to confirm the accuracy of government records related to their employment eligibility status before formally seeking employment. These enhancements will give individuals unprecedented control over how their social security numbers are used in E-Verify and will further strengthen DHS's ability to identify and prevent identity fraud. In FY 2014, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) also plans to phase in an enhanced enrollment process for E-Verify that reduces the enrollment burden on the employer and the Federal Government, and that will provide more-detailed user information for compliance assistance activities. Additionally, USCIS will finalize the requirements for the electronic I-9 and its supporting processes for E-Verify. These enhancements will deploy in phases in FY 2014 and subsequent years.
- *Verification Information System (VIS)*: The Budget includes \$12 million to fund the VIS Modernization initiative, a major redesign of the system that supports E-Verify that will transform the current E-Verify system, and improve usability and overall ease of operations.
- *Immigrant Integration*: The Budget includes \$10 million to continue support for USCIS immigrant integration efforts—a key element of the President's immigration principles—through funding of citizenship and integration program activities including competitive grants to local immigrant-serving organizations to strengthen citizenship preparation programs for permanent residents.
- *Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE)*: The FY 2014 Budget continues support for USCIS SAVE operations and enhancements to assist local, state, and federal agencies in determining the immigration status of benefit applicants. This effort is funded through the Immigration Examinations Fee Account.
- *USCIS Business Transformation*: The Budget continues the multiyear effort to transform USCIS from a paper-based filing system to a customer-focused electronic filing system. This effort is funded through the Immigration Examinations Fee Account. In FY 2013, USCIS will deploy additional functionality into the agency's Electronic Immigration System (ELIS) to allow processing of 1 million customer requests annually. USCIS is committed to adding functionality and benefit types until all workload is processed through ELIS.

#### **Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace**

The Budget supports initiatives to secure our Nation's information and financial systems and to defend against cyber threats to private-sector and federal systems, the Nation's critical

infrastructure, and the U.S. economy. It also supports the President's executive order on improving critical infrastructure cybersecurity and the presidential policy directive on critical infrastructure security and resilience. Taken together, the Administration's initiatives strengthen the security and resilience of critical infrastructure against evolving threats through an updated and overarching national framework that acknowledges the linkage between cybersecurity and securing physical assets.

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

- *Federal Network Security*: \$200 million is included for Federal Network Security, which manages activities designed to enable federal agencies to secure their IT networks. The Budget provides funding to further reduce risk in the federal cyber domain by enabling continuous monitoring and diagnostics of networks in support of mitigation activities designed to strengthen the operational security posture of federal civilian networks. DHS will directly support federal civilian departments and agencies in developing capabilities to improve their cybersecurity posture and to better thwart advanced, persistent cyber threats that are emerging in a dynamic threat environment.
- *NCPS*: \$406 million is included for Network Security Deployment, which manages NCPS, operationally known as EINSTEIN. NCPS is an integrated intrusion detection, analytics, information-sharing, and intrusion-prevention system that supports DHS responsibilities to defend federal civilian networks.
- *US-Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT)*: \$102 million is included for operations of US-CERT, which leads and coordinates efforts to improve the Nation's cybersecurity posture, promotes cyber information sharing, and manages cyber risks to the Nation. US-CERT encompasses the activities that provide immediate customer support and incident response, including 24-hour support in the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center. As more federal network traffic is covered by NCPS, additional US-CERT analysts are required to ensure cyber threats are detected and the federal response is effective.
- *SLTT Engagement*: In FY 2014, DHS will expand its support to the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS-ISAC) to assist in providing coverage for all 50 states and 6 U.S. territories in its managed security services program. MS-ISAC is a central entity through which SLTT governments can strengthen their security posture through network defense services and receive early warnings of cyber threats. In addition, the MS-ISAC shares cybersecurity incident information, trends, and other analysis for security planning.
- *Cybersecurity R&D*: The FY 2014 Budget includes \$70 million for S&T's R&D focused on strengthening the Nation's cybersecurity capabilities.

- *Cyber Investigations:* The FY 2014 Budget continues to support ICE and USSS efforts to provide computer forensics support and training for investigations into domestic and international criminal activities, including computer fraud, network intrusions, financial crimes, access device fraud, bank fraud, identity crimes and telecommunications fraud, benefits fraud, arms and strategic technology, money laundering, counterfeit pharmaceuticals, child pornography, and human trafficking occurring on or through the Internet. USSS ECTFs will also continue to focus on the prevention of cyber attacks against U.S. financial payment systems and critical infrastructure.

#### **Ensuring Resilience to Disasters**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- *Firefighter Assistance Grants:* The Budget provides \$670 million for Firefighter Assistance Grants. Included in the amount is \$335 million for Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grants to retain and hire firefighters and first responders, and \$335 million for Assistance for Firefighter Grants, of which \$20 million is provided for Fire Prevention and Safety Grants. The Administration re-proposes \$1 billion for SAFER grants as part of the First Responder Stabilization Fund, which was originally proposed in the *American Jobs Act*.
- *Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPGs):* Also included in the Budget is \$350 million to support emergency managers and emergency management offices in every state across the country. EMPG supports state and local governments in developing and sustaining the core capabilities identified in the NPG and achieving measurable results in key functional areas of emergency management.
- *DRF:* A total of \$6.2 billion is provided for the DRF. Of this, \$586 million is included in the Department's base budget with the remainder provided through the Budget Control Act budget cap adjustment. The DRF provides a significant portion of the total federal response to victims in presidentially declared disasters or emergencies. Because of recently passed legislation, Native American tribes can now request presidential major or emergency declarations. Two tribes, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and the Navajo Nation, have already received declarations in 2013.
- *National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP):* The NFIP is fully funded by policy fees. This program helps to reduce the risk of flood damage to existing buildings and infrastructure by providing flood-related grants to states, communities, and tribal nations. The FY 2014 Budget reflects implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. The Act improves fiscal soundness by phasing out subsidies for structures built before their flood risk was identified on a Flood Insurance Rate Map. In addition, the Act establishes a reserve fund to be used for the payment of claims and claims-handling expenses as well as principal and interest payments on any outstanding Treasury loans. The Budget includes a \$3.5 billion mandatory budget authority, of which \$100 million will be used for three interrelated mitigation grant programs to increase America's resiliency to floods.
- *Training/Exercises:* The Budget includes \$165 million for training and exercise activities to support federal, state, and local officials and first responders. In FY 2014, the Department expects to train more than 2 million first responders and, under the revised National Exercise Program, will conduct more than a dozen exercises across the country to help improve national preparedness. The Budget also supports conducting a Spill of National Significance exercise, and continues development of equipment and techniques that can be used to detect, track, and recover oil in ice-filled waters.
- *Emergency Management Oversight:* The Budget includes \$24 million in base resources for the Office of the Inspector General to continue its Emergency Management Oversight operations.

- *Incident Management:* The Budget enables the Coast Guard to achieve Full Operational Capability for the Incident Management Assist Team, providing an immediate, highly proficient, and deployable surge capacity to Incident Commanders nationwide for response to threats and other disasters.

**Maturing and Strengthening the Department and the Homeland Security Enterprise**

*St. Elizabeths Campus:* The Budget includes \$92.7 million to support construction at the St. Elizabeths Campus. Currently, the Department's facilities are scattered in more than 50 locations throughout the National Capital Region, affecting critical communication and coordination across DHS Components. USCG will move to St. Elizabeths in FY 2013. To support the incident management and command-and-control requirements of our mission, the Department will continue development of the DHS Consolidated Headquarters at St. Elizabeths Campus. The requested funding will support Phase 2 renovation of the Center Building Complex for the Secretary's Office and key headquarters functions for command, control, and management of the Department.

*Data Center Consolidation:* The FY 2014 Budget includes \$54.2 million for data center consolidation funding, which will be used to migrate FEMA, USCIS, TSA, and CBP to the enterprise data centers. A recent study performed by the Department's Office of the Chief Financial Officer analyzed 10 of the first completed migrations to enterprise data centers and determined that an average savings of 14 percent, about \$17.4 million in annual savings, had been achieved.

**CONCLUSION**

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

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

**Post-Hearing Questions for the Record  
Submitted to the Honorable Janet A. Napolitano  
From Senator Thomas R. Carper**

**“The Homeland Security Department’s Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”  
April 17, 2013**

<b>Question#:</b>	1
<b>Topic:</b>	frontline personnel
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The Department’s budget for FY 2014 proposes cutting significant numbers of frontline personnel at Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the U.S. Coast Guard, and the U.S. Secret Service. This includes more than 300 ICE criminal investigators, 850 military positions within the Coast Guard, and over 200 agents, officers and support staff within the Secret Service. What will be the impact to these agencies’ missions, and our national preparedness and law enforcement posture if these proposed personnel cuts are made?

**Response:** The Department anticipates that enactment of its FY 2014 Budget will strengthen its Components’ capabilities and mission success, particularly in the areas of the Nation’s preparedness and law enforcement posture.

Since the beginning of the Administration, DHS has made an unprecedented commitment to efficiency to better support frontline operations by building a culture of fiscal discipline and accountability, and by making the best, most efficient use of available resources. The FY 2014 Budget builds on the progress the Department has made in each of its mission areas while strengthening its existing capabilities, enhancing partnerships across all levels of government and with the private sector, streamlining operations, and increasing efficiencies.

For U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the FY 2014 Budget proposes to reduce its workforce by 131 full-time employee positions which are non-mission critical. This decrease in personnel is necessary in order to ensure sufficient funding for other priorities across the organization; the Budget does not reduce ICE agent hours or ICE’s law enforcement posture.

The net impact of the personnel decreases associated with asset decommissionings, efficiencies, and reductions, and the increases associated with the delivery of new assets

<b>Question#:</b>	1
<b>Topic:</b>	frontline personnel
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

contained in the FY 2014 President's Budget, is a reduction of 850 military positions to the U. S. Coast Guard. Approximately half of the reductions are directly tied to planned realignment of military personnel as legacy assets are replaced by new assets. Those personnel reductions have already been offset by personnel increases for new assets in prior years. The remainder of the personnel reduction is associated with efficiencies and savings initiatives identified primarily within the mission support functions of the Service.

With respect to the U.S. Secret Service, the FY 2014 Budget was formulated in recognition that some staffing levels would be reduced following conclusion of the 2012 Presidential Campaign ensure sufficient funding for other priorities across the organization. The Secret Service will achieve the personnel reductions through attrition and limited hiring. The Service has established optimal field office staffing levels that balance the investigative and protective workload while ensuring appropriate staffing levels for securing fixed posts around the White House, the Vice President's Residence, and Foreign Missions.



<b>Question#:</b>	2
<b>Topic:</b>	Management Directorate
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** If the President’s FY 2014 proposal is enacted, the Management Directorate would be cut to a level nearly 14 percent below the FY 2012 level. How can the Department sustain its progress in improving management with these proposed cuts – which under the current law would be further deepened by sequestration?

**Response:** Given the constraints of the Budget Control Act, difficult choices had to be made in developing the FY 2014 budget. Over the past four years, DHS has made significant improvements to departmental management, developing and implementing a comprehensive, strategic approach to enhance Department-wide maturation and integration. We have improved acquisition oversight, ensuring full consideration of the investment life cycle in cost estimates, establishing procedures to thoroughly vet new requirements and alternative solutions, and supporting full funding policies to minimize acquisition risk. By gaining significant efficiencies through implementing initiatives such as “Freeze the Footprint”, leveraging strategic sourcing, reviewing vehicle refresh schedules, and getting the most out of mobile workforce capabilities the Department has been able to redirect these savings towards continuing our successes in improving management. The FY 2014 Budget includes key investments to strengthen the homeland security enterprise, increase integration, address challenges raised by the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), and continue to build upon the management reforms that have been implemented under this Administration. To preserve core frontline priorities in FY 2014, we have redirected over \$1.3 billion in base resources from administrative and mission support areas, including contracts, personnel (through attrition), information technology, travel, personnel moves, overtime, directed purchasing, professional services, and vehicle management to mission-critical initiatives across the Department. The DHS Management Directorate’s contribution to this effort resulted in \$35.6 million of the total \$1.3 billion. Despite these reductions, we have made significant improvements in how our Department is managed and we remain committed to demonstrating measurable, sustained progress over the coming years.

<b>Question#:</b>	3
<b>Topic:</b>	budget proposal
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The Administration's budget proposal substantially reduces the base funding for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer. If this budget proposal was enacted would you be able to adequately provide necessary oversight of the many billions in program and project funding requested in this FY 2014 budget? If this budget proposal was enacted would you be able to sustain the Acquisition Career Intern Program to ensure a future supply of qualified acquisition specialists?

**Response:** If the current budget request of \$66.9 million is enacted, funding would be sufficient to provide adequate oversight of the Department's procurement programs. However, further reductions would negatively impact the improved acquisition oversight DHS accomplished since the Management Directorate's Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management was established, sharply diminishing the DHS Chief Acquisition Officer's ability to conduct and provide guidance for Acquisition Review Boards.

The budget request adequately funds the Acquisition Professional Career Program based on current estimates. The Office of the Chief Procurement Officer (OCPO) is working with Components to analyze staffing needs based on attrition and future requirements. Currently, 14 percent of the acquisition workforce is eligible for retirement by the end of FY 2014, and a total of 29 percent will be eligible by the end of FY 2018. These figures demonstrate a continuing need for the program. Cuts beyond the President's budget proposal will force OCPO to reduce the Acquisition Professional Career Program as well as reduce associated training programs. We will continue to work with Congress as we evaluate our ongoing acquisition needs and appreciate the support provided to enhance our acquisition programs.

<b>Question#:</b>	4
<b>Topic:</b>	cost analysis
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** What is your management team doing to improve cost analysis, and to strengthen the oversight over major acquisitions, so that we see better results and fewer cost increases in major programs? How many cost analysts are supported in the FY 2014 budget request? How many are currently employed by DHS?

**Response:** The DHS Chief Acquisition Officer (CAO) has established several initiatives to ensure programs are increasingly following DHS Acquisition policy, such as the acquisition program management Centers of Excellence (COE), Executive Steering Committees and the Decision Support Tool. Each initiative has been beneficial, but some have been more effective than others. One initiative that the CAO has determined has yet to be established is an Acquisition oversight process with early and continuous verification of system requirements, planning, and execution throughout the entire development and acquisition lifecycle. To implement this significant change to DHS current process and improve acquisition policy compliance, the CAO appointed a new Executive Director, Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management (PARM) on 30 September 2013. The new Executive Director was previously the DHS Director of Operational Test and Evaluation who implemented DHS T&E policy and oversight for the DHS major acquisition programs and has been responsible for verifying acquisition program effectiveness and suitability since 2008. The new PARM Director will continue to perform all of the prior PARM functions but will increase the emphasis on Acquisition oversight and policy compliance for all Acquisition programs. In an effort to contain and prevent cost growth in our major acquisition programs, DHS has instituted a variety of measures to ensure efficiency and mitigate risk.

Management Directive (MD) 102-01 requires Components to demonstrate appropriate planning in order to receive approval for an acquisition. To ensure program managers are executing within cost and schedule parameters and to prevent potential cost growth, every program is required to receive approval from the Acquisition Review Board (ARB) before proceeding to the next phase of the acquisition life cycle, such as moving from development to production. Part of this process includes the development of an Acquisition Program Baseline (APB). The APB documents the fundamental agreement on critical program cost, schedule, and performance objectives between the Program Manager (PM), the Component Head, and the DHS Acquisition Decision Authority (ADA). The APB's scope encompasses the entire planned execution of the program. Its cost parameters trace back to an approved Life Cycle Cost Estimate (LCCE) that documents the program's critical cost parameters in measurable, quantitative terms. The LCCE affords the Department the ability to track actual program performance against a

<b>Question#:</b>	4
<b>Topic:</b>	cost analysis
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

formal baseline. In practical terms, the APB is the “contract” between the Acquisition Decision Authority (ADA) and the Component on what will be delivered, how it will perform, when it will be delivered, and what it will cost. Should a program or project fail to meet any cost, schedule, or performance threshold in the APB the Program Manager must submit a remediation plan within 30 days explaining circumstances of the breach and proposing corrective action. Within 90 days of the breach, the program should be consistent with approved APB parameters; undergo a re-baseline of the breached parameters and have a new APB approved, or partake in a program review with the ADA to review any proposed baseline revisions and recommendations.

As a result of these oversight processes, the Under Secretary for Management (USM) is able to direct improvements to inadequate program plans before allowing them to proceed. In addition to ARB reviews at major milestones, DHS actively tracks and measures actual program performance via monthly reporting and oversight mechanisms such as the Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, Quarterly Program Accountability Report, and Exhibit 300. This oversight provides an early alert to potential problems, such as cost growth or requirements creep, and, as a result, the Department can take corrective action by engaging the Component or program.

The Department has also implemented several improvements to the quality and reliability of the cost estimating discipline across DHS. In 2011, the USM established the Cost Estimating & Analysis Center of Excellence (CE&A COE), through the Office of Program Accountability and Risk Management (PARM), to provide best practices and guidance for development of all cost estimates and cost analyses in the Department. The COE has identified and obtained best-in-class cost estimating tools and standardized operating models that have been disseminated to the Components. By providing cost estimating subject matter expertise to assist DHS Components and program managers, the number of DHS-approved LCCEs has significantly increased over the last year. This allows DHS to better articulate required funding needs and more effectively ascertain impacts to program scope should budget be changed.

DHS has also increased the number of Level III Certified Cost Estimators in FY 2013 by 50 percent over prior years. Level III, the highest level certification, represents a senior level mastery of the knowledge and skills associated with the complexities of cost estimating. DHS is institutionalizing the cost estimating discipline across the Department by embedding experienced certified cost estimators into major operational Components via the CE&A COE.

These cost estimators provide consistent application of GAO best practices and establish cost estimating standard operating procedures at the Component level. In addition to the

<b>Question#:</b>	4
<b>Topic:</b>	cost analysis
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

added focus on accountability, risk, and oversight through the establishment of PARM, the changes have significantly enhanced the maturity of the Department, particularly in this discipline. These tools and practices provide a robust foundation upon which to build a culture of cost estimation within DHS which, in turn, increases the reliability of cost estimates across the Department.

Through the work in the CE&A COE the Department has built a community of practice that is composed of both federal and contractor cost estimators. This community of practice is composed of 23 junior and senior federal cost estimators spread across the enterprise. Ten of the cost estimators are employed by PARM. The other 12 are employed by DHS Components, specifically, one at CBP, two at USCG, three at USCIS, and six at NPPD.

In 2012, we recognized the deficit of federal cost estimators within the Components and proactively hired and deployed seven cost estimators to collocate with the major Components' Acquisition Executive staff. These seven cost estimators are employed by PARM as part of the CE&A COE. The additional three cost estimators reside in PARM. The Management Directorate's FY 2014 budget includes base funding for these existing cost estimators at DHS.

**Post-Hearing Questions for the Record  
Submitted to the Honorable Janet A. Napolitano  
From Senator Carl Levin**

**“The Homeland Security Department's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”  
April 17, 2013**

<b>Question#:</b>	5
<b>Topic:</b>	lost airframes
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Carl Levin
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** Prior to 2013 there were five H-65 helicopters stationed at Air Station Traverse City. Due to the Coast Guard's Echo model transition, one H-65 was relocated from Traverse City leaving only four H-65's.

What is the Coast Guard's plan to replace the lost H-65 in Traverse City especially given the approaching summer season when Air Station Traverse City supports an airframe in Waukegan, IL?

Does the Coast Guard plan to send an additional H-65 to Traverse City this summer?

With the loss of several H-65 airframes over the last few years due to mishaps does the Coast Guard have any plan to build or retrofit new H-65 airframes?

Given that the Coast Guard is actively working to transition the H-65 from the Dolphin to the Echo model, does the Coast Guard have any money available to upgrade the current fleet of H-65 Dolphin airframes to the H-65 Echo model?

If so, what is the Coast Guard's plan to modernize its fleet to the Echo model?

**Response:** The relocated aircraft from Traverse City provides a prototype aircraft for the MH-65E upgrade. Only the physical aircraft was moved; personnel remain on station.

The FY 2014 President's Budget request has sufficient funding to continue the H-65 Echo model transition. Construction of the prototype aircraft has begun. Initial Operational Capability for the MH-65E is anticipated in FY 2017. Air Station Traverse City has sufficient resources to meet operational demands.

<b>Question#:</b>	6
<b>Topic:</b>	retrofitted airframes
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Carl Levin
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The Coast Guard has received appropriations of \$18.3M in FY12 and \$14.0M in FY13 for the retrofit of Navy H-60 airframes to Coast Guard H-60 airframes in Elizabeth City, North Carolina.

How many H-60 Navy airframes are there in Elizabeth City, NC waiting to be retrofitted?

What is the plan and timeline for retrofitting these airframes?

**Response:** There are two "sundown" airframes at the Aviation Logistics Center (ALC). The FY 2012 and FY 2013 appropriations were used to convert two Navy H-60 airframes to operational Coast Guard MH-60T aircraft. The first was completed in February, 2013, the second is scheduled to be completed in April 2014.

**Question:** With no mention in the President's FY 2014 Budget of replacing the H-65's currently stationed at Air Station Traverse City with the more capable and able H-60's, what is the Coast Guard's plan for bringing four H-60's to Air Station Traverse City?

Previous proposals have only had three H-60's moving to Traverse City. Is the movement of four H-60 airframes to Traverse City supported by the Coast Guard?

Is the movement of four H-60's to Traverse City dependent on the retrofitting of additional airframes in Elizabeth City, NC?

**Response:** The \$18.3 million in Fiscal Year 2012 was designated to replace an H-60 lost in an aircraft accident. The \$14.0 million in Fiscal Year 2013 provides an additional H-60 to fill operational and training needs.

The FY 2013 President's Budget proposed the replacement of H-65s in Traverse City with H-60s as part of a comprehensive plan to realize savings by eliminating redundancy, closing two seasonal Air Facilities and leveraging the enhanced capability of more capable H-60 helicopters. This proposal was not enacted in the FY 2013 appropriations.

<b>Question#:</b>	7
<b>Topic:</b>	pre-disaster mitigation
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Carl Levin
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** Destructive forces from Hurricane Sandy were so massive and intense that impacts were felt as far west as the Great Lakes region. The Great Lakes witnessed winds of more than 60 miles per hour and 20-foot waves. Sand and sediment washed into harbors damaging federal thoroughfares and breakwaters. Hurricane Sandy showed the nation that we are not prepared for the impacts and costs of extreme weather. We know that every \$1 spent on disaster preparedness and resilient infrastructure building avoids \$4 in future costs. Extreme weather continues to impact every sector of this country and we cannot continue to be ill-prepared.

What is the rationale for eliminating the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, which is so critical for protecting life and property, especially in light of the damaging impacts of Hurricane Sandy?

The FY 2014 budget request indicates that the PDM program is duplicative and that there are other sources of funding. What are the other sources of pre-disaster mitigation funding for locations that are not presidentially declared disaster areas?

**Response:** FEMA proposes to eliminate funding for the PDM program in FY 2014 and will work to aggressively process grant applications funded by prior years' appropriations. FEMA will continue to make flood-related mitigation grants available to States and local and tribal governments through the existing Flood Mitigation Assistance program. States and locals can continue to utilize the Emergency Management Performance Grants and the State Homeland Security Grant Programs to address mitigation planning activities. Additionally, NFIP policyholders can use increased costs of compliance coverage post-disaster for mitigation activities. FEMA will continue to focus on mitigating costs associated with potential large-scale disaster flooding operations. The post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs allows for statewide mitigation activities targeted to a state's required hazard mitigation plan.



<b>Question#:</b>	8
<b>Topic:</b>	State Incorporation Practices
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Carl Levin
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The 50 U.S. states form nearly 2 million new corporations and LLCs each year, without knowing who owns them. The fact that our laws allow states to form corporations with hidden owners invites wrongdoers to misuse U.S. companies for terrorism, money laundering, drug trafficking, tax evasion, and other crimes. To me, it makes no sense that people have to provide more information to a state to get a drivers' license than a new corporation. It's a subject that this Committee has been examining for a number of years now, but has yet to act to correct. The Administration has now taken on the issue and urged Congress to enact legislation to require beneficial owners of companies to be identified at the time of incorporation. The Administration has included enacting legislation in its 2011 Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime and in its 2011 Open Government National Action Plan. So enacting that legislation has become a priority for the Administration.

Does DHS support enacting legislation that would require states, at the time of incorporation, to get the names of beneficial owners of the corporation being formed? If so, please explain why that legislation is important to homeland security.

The Chamber of Commerce and some Secretaries of State oppose any federal legislation, claiming it would be burdensome to implement, even though the Treasury Department and Justice Department have agreed to provide \$30 million from their forfeiture funds to help states add a question to their existing incorporation forms to request beneficial owners. When my colleagues hear about this opposition, I remind them that all of the law enforcement organizations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association and the Fraternal Order of Police, support legislation, in particular the bipartisan bill I introduced in the last Congress with Sen. Grassley, S. 1483, and which I plan to reintroduce soon. Does DHS view federal legislation in this area as imposing an undue burden on the states?

Should this Committee treat moving legislation in this area as a priority this year?

**Response:** Increasing the transparency of U.S. legal entities and their beneficial owners will address a prominent and growing national security threat, significantly assist law enforcement in preventing criminals from exploiting our financial system, and facilitate compliance by financial institutions with fundamental customer due diligence requirements consistent with global standards of financial transparency. We look forward to working with the Congress to find a meaningful solution to the misuse of legal entities.

**Post-Hearing Questions for the Record  
Submitted to the Honorable Janet A. Napolitano  
From Senator Claire McCaskill**

**“The Homeland Security Department's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”  
April 17, 2013**

<b>Question#:</b>	9
<b>Topic:</b>	communications
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** Communications were a critical component of integrating 22 agencies into DHS. To this end, DHS invested about \$430 million to develop interoperable communications that would allow elements of each former agency to speak on common channels using compatible equipment.

Although it is not highlighted in your budget request, the Department of Homeland Security is in the process of updating its radio communications and infrastructure, as evidenced by the \$3.2 billion dollar contract awarded in FY 2012.

According to a recent report from the DHS Office of Inspector General (OIG), DHS did not provide effective oversight to ensure that its components achieved the goals of interoperable radio communications. The report notes that only 1 of 479 radio users tested could access and communicate using the specified common channel and that only 20 percent of tested radios contained the correct program settings for this common channel.

Can you identify the amount to be spent out of the FY 2014 budget for interoperable communications and the safeguards you have put in place to ensure that any additional money will achieve this goal?

**Response:** Currently, DHS and component telecommunications budget categories do not separate interoperability from other projects at a high level of review. Each component agency maintains its own separate tactical communications budget managed by its Office of Information and Technology (OIT), and the DHS Information Technology Acquisitions Review (ITAR) process has been established at the enterprise level for component and Department acquisitions of more than \$2 million. The DHS Joint Wireless Program Management Office (JWPMO) was chartered in April 2012 to provide a single collaboration point for the planning, development, acquisition, and implementation of enterprise-level wireless communications systems. The JWPMO is in

<b>Question#:</b>	9
<b>Topic:</b>	communications
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

the process of establishing an investment portfolio review board, which is developing a process for more easily tracking investments in interoperability and approving those investments at an enterprise level to promote interoperability. This portfolio review board consists of the following components: Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Transportation Security Administration (TSA), U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), Federal Protective Service (FPS), U.S. Secret Service (USSS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), plus the Office of Emergency Communications (OEC). The portfolio review board is in the initial stages of prioritizing projects. Only those efforts approved by the investment portfolio review board will be executed for expenditure of funds and other resources.

**Question:** The department has spent almost half a billion on radios and communications infrastructure and has another contract for up to \$3.2 billion for new infrastructure, yet operators cannot talk to each other. How much is it going to take to reach an acceptable level of interoperability?

**Response:** Since the formation of DHS, the Department has worked to integrate multiple, existing radio communications systems from the legacy organizations that were brought together. Many of these systems required significant technological upgrades in order to provide interoperable radio communications. The DHS JWPMO has been chartered to provide a single collaboration point for the planning, development, acquisition, and implementation of enterprise-level wireless communications systems. The JWPMO is in the process of establishing an investment portfolio review board, which is developing a process for approving tactical communications projects at an enterprise level to promote interoperability. As the portfolio review board processes all requests for investments to improve interoperability, it will continually align approved efforts with current JWPMO strategic goals. These goals include:

- Increase component involvement by engaging dedicated, matrixed FEMA, USSS, ICE, TSA, USCG, FLETC, FPS and CBP resources in the Tactical Communications Network (TACNET) program, interoperability and enterprise services.
- Improve mission critical voice interoperability by implementing the structure developed by the Tactical Interoperability Framework (TIF) Committee

JWPMO will continually review investment requests and make assignments as appropriate to make progress in TIF-defined milestones for DHS interoperability gains.

<b>Question#:</b>	9
<b>Topic:</b>	communications
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question** Has the Department defined an acceptable/necessary level of department-wide interoperability?

**Response:** In 2012, the JWPMO initiated a broad-scale project to address interoperability from the mission level. The TIF charter was finalized in April 2013. The TIF provides a structure to develop better information sharing and communication along with improved situational awareness for optimizing resources. Creating a framework through which organizations acquire, plan, develop, and implement modernization of communications systems is essential to ensuring interoperability and potentially facilitates the offering of other enterprise benefits, including bulk purchase savings and development of innovative capabilities that can be shared throughout the enterprise.

**Question:** What actions has the Department taken to attain Department-wide interoperability? Do these measures address the lack of training associated with a failure to identify and access specified common channels?

**Response:** The One DHS Emergency Communications (EC) Committee—the DHS interagency body charged with establishing Departmental EC policy and guidance, including that which affects tactical communications—completed an assessment of the Department’s interoperability needs and capabilities in February 2013. The assessment took a holistic view of interoperability, beyond specific common channel use, to include interoperability governance, technical solutions, standard operating procedures, training and exercises, and agreements. The One DHS Committee and the JWPMO are working together to develop a department-wide communications interoperability plan based on the findings and recommendations from the assessment. The plan will establish priorities and guide Component efforts aimed at improving DHS interoperability.

Training is specifically addressed in an interoperable continuum adopted through the TIF effort to specify interoperability. This continuum has five elements:

1. Governance
2. Standard Operating Procedures
3. Technology
4. Training and Exercise
5. Usage

The JWPMO TIF committee first will identify a list of deliverables and artifacts that should be produced to address each element of the interoperable continuum. The TIF

<b>Question#:</b>	9
<b>Topic:</b>	communications
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

committee will leverage the OEC library as appropriate and identify specific projects and/or Integrated Product Teams (IPTs) to address specific interoperability problems. Once the TIF committee identifies desired artifacts and projects, it prioritizes and implements them as resources permit.

**Question:** Has the Department established interoperability as a measurable goal in its strategic planning? If so, has the Department developed attainable, incremental goals to achieve the overall goal? In what year will the Department meet the goal? And, does the Department believe that after executing the funds for the \$3.2 billion contract that it will achieve interoperability?

**Response:** As reviewed above, the DHS JWPMO has adopted an interoperability continuum as a performance measure for indicating an acceptable level of interoperability. This is part of the draft strategic plan that the JWPMO is now drafting to indicate its mission for attaining interoperability. The continuum has defined interval steps for achieving interoperability in each of the five areas listed in the response above. The JWPMO believes that when all these steps have been achieved in each of these five areas, interoperability among the DHS component agencies will be reached.

<b>Question#:</b>	10
<b>Topic:</b>	efficiencies
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** In the FY 2014 Budget request, DHS anticipates saving just over \$1.3 billion through efficiencies. A significant portion of these savings appear to come from advisory and assistance contracts as well as other service contracts, in fact over \$600 million will come from these contracts. The biggest portion of these particular savings will be seen at CBP, ICE and TSA.

Can you expand upon these specific savings? For example are these savings coming from the expiring of existing contracts? Give specific examples of how we are achieving these efficiencies?

For CBP, ICE and TSA what are the particular types of service contracts you have identified to achieve these efficiencies?

**Response:** The \$1.3 billion in savings and efficiencies included in the budget continues DHS's strong commitment to fiscal discipline which has led to over \$4 billion in cost avoidances and reductions since FY 2009. The following are some specific examples of what CBP, ICE, and TSA are doing to achieve savings:

- Efficiencies/OFPD Directed Purchasing Savings (\$18.5 million) – In a November 2011 Memorandum, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy directed federal agencies to reduce spending by 15 percent in FY 2011-2012 on management support service contracts, including engineering & technical services, acquisition services, information technology services, and program management support services. For FY 2014, DHS identified an additional \$31.5 million reduction for these service contracts. The \$31.5M in savings will be allocated across CBP based on FY 2010 spend data.
- Transportation Program (\$23.8 million) – CBP will realize a savings of \$23.8 million due to a reduction to transportation workload and through cost efficiencies. This savings will be acquired through reconfiguration of the assets used in meeting the lower workload requirements and cost reductions gained from the re-competition of the transportation contract.
- IT Systems and Support (\$47.9 million) - In order to meet FY 2014 CBP IT program budget targets, the CBP Office of Information and Technology (OIT) is examining the following areas: software re-evaluations, hardware maintenance strategy reviews, efficiencies realized by the installation of the CBP Cloud Computing Environment (C3E), and mission application services.

<b>Question#:</b>	10
<b>Topic:</b>	efficiencies
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Claire McCaskill
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

- Service Contract Reductions (\$17.854 million) – Through a review of procurement support service requirements and other contractual requirements, ICE has identified savings that can be realized in 2014 with minimal impact on front-line operations, such as M&A and HQIT support, material leases and contracted training and travel.
- Administrative Savings and Servicewide Reductions (\$35.25 million) – This reduction is an effort to find cost savings in administrative spending in areas such as professional service contracts, supplies and materials, and printing. ICE will also continue its efforts to reduce costs through on-going initiatives such as the Balanced Workforce Strategy.
- Agency/Enterprise Wide Reductions (\$22.422 million) - This reduction includes cost savings attributed to a Department Enterprise-Wide Efficiency initiative to reduce overall administrative expenses. It is a reduction to areas such as vehicle fleet, PCS costs, TDY and travel, professional service contracts, and overtime.
- Contract Efficiencies (\$151.933 million) – TSA achieved contract efficiencies from not renewing existing contracts and exercising contract options. Efficiencies were identified in Management Support Services from Automated Data Processing (ADP) Systems Development Services; Automated Information Systems Services; ADP Backup and Security Services; ADP Acquisition Supply Services; Program Management/Support Services; Specification Development Services; Technical Assistance; Intelligence Services; Engineering and Technical Services; Systems Engineering Services; Management Services/Contract and Procurement Support.

**Post-Hearing Questions for the Record  
Submitted to the Honorable Janet A. Napolitano  
From Senator Heidi Heitkamp**

**“The Homeland Security Department's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”  
April 17, 2013**

<b>Question#:</b>	11
<b>Topic:</b>	AIT
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Heidi Heitkamp
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** An issue of concern in North Dakota right now is airport security. Recently, TSA transferred full-body passenger scanners (AIT machines) from three North Dakota airports – Grand Forks, Bismarck and Minot. All three airports are experiencing double-digit growth thanks to my state’s strong economy. TSA made this decision because scanners at other, larger airports could not meet privacy standards as required in the FAA Modernization and Reform Act (P.L. 112-95). As I have shared with TSA Administrator John Pistole, I feel TSA erred in its overall handling of the situation by removing scanners from such high-growth facilities, and I disagree with the decision to wait until next-generation AIT machines receive certification before purchasing additional scanners.

Your FY14 budget proposal identifies cuts to screening technology because TSA expects to be at or near full operational capability for most checkpoint screening technologies after FY12 and FY13 purchases.

What role do you expect additional scanners – potentially purchased with funds appropriated in FY12 and still available – to play in reaching the full operational capacity that the budget request refers to?

Regarding the certification process for next generation AIT, what steps can DHS take to ensure this process is completed as soon as possible with minimal delays?

What other technologies, such as Explosives Trace Detection, besides AIT does TSA intend to use to meet full operational capability regarding airport passenger security?

Are these other technologies as effective as AIT scanners? If they are not, what is the rationale for relying on these technologies rather than AIT? If they are, can you provide documentation that demonstrates their effectiveness?



<b>Question#:</b>	11
<b>Topic:</b>	AIT
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Heidi Heitkamp
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Response:** Currently, it is the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) strategy not to deploy Advanced Imaging Technology (AIT) at Category III and IV airports, but instead to deploy comparable screening procedures to ensure that security effectiveness is consistent across the Nation's airports. TSA addresses vulnerabilities using a risk-based approach in order to allocate limited resources in the most effective way. TSA will employ other screening technologies and security measures, including Walk-Through Metal Detectors and Explosives Trace Detection, to maintain the most effective security at the affected airports.

TSA is committed to the use of AIT and has begun testing next-generation AIT units equipped with Automated Target Recognition from several vendors. This testing process will enable TSA to determine if these technologies meet enhanced detection standards and are feasible for use in the airport environment. These next-generation AIT units will have enhanced detection capabilities, a smaller footprint, and are intended to enable faster passenger throughput. The current schedule for the procurement of the next-generation AIT systems currently is on track with no major risks.

The AIT procurement schedule is tightly monitored for risks, and the Department of Homeland Security and TSA are collaborating on the successful execution of the testing and acquisition of these systems. Additional AIT units, currently in testing, are expected to provide a smaller footprint than existing scanners and will help enable TSA to reach full operational capability (FOC). The FOC for current and next-generation AIT systems will take into consideration, among other factors, the numerous Risk-Based Security initiatives to provide expedited screening services to eligible travelers based upon their assessed risk. TSA is evaluating the effect of these initiatives on FOC requirements and fiscal year procurement schedules.

TSA documentation on the effectiveness of screening technologies is considered Sensitive Security Information and can be provided upon request.

**Post-Hearing Questions for the Record  
Submitted to the Honorable Janet A. Napolitano  
From Senator Tom Coburn**

**“The Homeland Security Department's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2014”  
April 17, 2013**

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** Please provide to the Committee a list of all Congressionally-mandated reports that DHS is required to complete, their due dates, and statuses, as well as an estimate or description of the cost incurred by the Department associated with producing those reports. Please identify, with a written justification which, if any, of these reports the Department believes are duplicative or unnecessary.

**Response:** The chart below lists all required Congressionally-mandated reports. In addition, as required under the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010, the Administration provided a list to Congress of reports that should be eliminated, consolidated, or reduce frequency of reporting, and provided the reason for that determination.

**Current Status of Reports Due in FY 2013  
(Updated as of 06-17-2013)**

<b>Comp</b>	<b>Due</b>	<b>Title (304 reports)</b>	<b>Status</b>
CBP	10/27/2012	Cross-Border Tunnels - FY12 2nd Semi-Annual	Transmitted
CBP	11/15/2012	CBP Unobligated Balances - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
CBP	10/15/2012	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Aug 2012	Transmitted
CBP	11/15/2012	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Sep 2012	Transmitted
CBP	12/26/2012	POE Technology Demonstration Program - 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	2/15/2013	CBP Unobligated Balances - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
CBP	12/15/2012	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Oct 2013	Transmitted
CBP	1/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Nov 2013	Transmitted
CBP	2/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Dec 2013	Transmitted
CBP	3/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Jan 2013	Transmitted
CBP	10/15/2012	Integrated Scanning System FY 2013	Transmitted

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

CBP	10/13/2012	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - CBP Salaries & Expenses	Transmitted
CBP	10/30/2012	Commercial and Trade Functions in the Office of Field Operations	Transmitted
CBP	10/26/2012	FY13 Expenditure Plan - S&E Financial Plan	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 Multiyear Investment Plan - CBP Office of Information Technology	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 Multiyear Investment Plan - CBP BSFIT FYs 2013-2016	Transmitted
CBP	2/1/2013	FY13 Circumvention of Customs Duties: Imports from China	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 5-Year Strategic Plan: Textile Enforcement	Transmitted
CBP	11/27/2012	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - ACE	Transmitted
CBP	4/15/2013	FY12 Annual Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	12/27/2012	FY13 5-Year Strategic Plan: Air and Marine Operations	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 Multiyear Investment Plan: Non-Intrusive Inspection and Radiation Detection Equipment	Transmitted
CBP	12/30/2012	Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) 4th Quarter FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 5-Year Plan: Land Border Ports of Entry	Transmitted
CBP	4/10/2013	FY13 Real Property Inventory Plan	Transmitted
CBP	10/31/2012	International Trade Committee FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	6/29/2013	COBRA Customs User Fees Report for FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	1/1/2013	Border Tunnel Prevention FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	12/28/2012	CBP Semiannual Progress Report Toward Compliance with the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 - Polygraph Examination & Periodic Reinvestigations (Report 4)	Transmitted
CBP	4/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Feb 2013	Transmitted
CBP	5/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - Mar 2013	Transmitted
CBP	6/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - April 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	7/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - May 2013	Pending: Due <30 Days
CBP	8/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - June 2013	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	9/15/2013	CBP Staffing and Hiring - July 2013	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	5/15/2013	CBP Unobligated Balances - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted
CBP	8/15/2013	CBP Unobligated Balances - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	5/15/2013	Cross-Border Tunnels - FY13 1st Semi-Annual	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	3/30/2013	Dog and Cat Fur Protection Report FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	6/29/2013	Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) 1st Quarter FY 2013	Transmitted
CBP	4/29/2013	CBP Use of FY 2013 Disaster Relief Funds	Pending: Overdue to

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

			Congress
CBP	2/14/2013	Softwood Lumber Act of 2008 FY 2012	Transmitted
CBP	4/15/2013	Update 10 on Integrated Scanning System Operations FY 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	4/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - CBP Financial Plan	Transmitted
CBP	5/25/2013	CBP Officer Staffing at Air POEs	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	5/25/2013	Detention Standards and Oversight	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	4/3/2013	Classified Report - PreClearance	Transmitted
CBP	5/15/2013	ACE Quarterly Reports - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	8/15/2013	ACE Quarterly Reports - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	9/22/2013	Reimbursable Fee Agreements	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	6/24/2013	FY13 5-Year Border Patrol Staffing and Deployment Plan	Pending: Due <30 Days
CBP	6/24/2013	FY13 5-Year Strategic Air and Marine Plan Update	Pending: Due <30 Days
CBP	7/24/2013	Entry-Exit Policy and Operations Report	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	9/22/2013	Collection of Outstanding Duties	Pending: Due >30 Days
CBP	5/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - ACE	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	7/6/2013	Efforts to Counter Abuse of Prescription Drugs	Pending: Due <30 Days
CBP	1/31/2013	CBP Port of Entry (POE) Infrastructure Assessment Study	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	4/10/2013	Northern Border Port Staffing and Funding Plan	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	1/31/2013	National Land Border Security Plan	Pending: Overdue to Congress
CBP	9/6/2013	Semiannual Progress Report on Polygraph Examinations	Pending: Due >30 Days
DNDO	5/27/2013	FY13 Strategic Plan: Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Investments	Pending: Overdue to Congress
DNDO	3/31/2013	Global Nuclear Detection Architecture (GNDA) Joint Annual Interagency Review 2013	Transmitted
DNDO	3/31/2013	2013 Joint Interagency Annual Review of the National Strategic Five-Year Plan for Improving the Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Capabilities of the United States	Transmitted
DNDO	4/10/2013	Commercial First Approach	Pending: Overdue to Congress
DNDO	7/24/2013	Nuclear Material Detection Technologies	Pending: Due >30 Days
FEMA	11/15/2012	Disaster Readiness and Support Costs - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
FEMA	10/5/2012	Disaster Relief Fund - FY12 Sep	Transmitted

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

FEMA	10/4/2012	Catastrophic Resource Report - 2012	Transmitted
FEMA	11/15/2012	FEMA Disaster Contracts - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
FEMA	2/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Contracts - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
FEMA	5/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Contracts - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted
FEMA	8/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Contracts - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due > 30 Days
FEMA	4/10/2013	Disaster Relief Fund Annual Report - FY13	Transmitted
FEMA	11/5/2012	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Oct	Transmitted
FEMA	12/5/2012	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Nov	Transmitted
FEMA	1/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Dec	Transmitted
FEMA	2/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Jan	Transmitted
FEMA	3/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Feb	Transmitted
FEMA	9/30/2013	Principal Federal Official FY13	Contingent
FEMA	12/15/2012	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program (CSEPP) FY 2012	Transmitted
FEMA	11/17/2012	NCRC 2012 Report on Homeland Security Activities in the National Capital Region	Transmitted
FEMA	1/3/2013	FEMA-USACE Flood Protection Structure Accreditation Task Force Interim Report	Transmitted
FEMA	4/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Mar	Transmitted
FEMA	6/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 May	Transmitted
FEMA	5/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Apr	Transmitted
FEMA	7/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Jun	Pending: Due <30 Days
FEMA	8/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Jul	Pending: Due > 30 Days
FEMA	9/5/2013	Disaster Relief Fund - FY13 Aug	Pending: Due > 30 Days
FEMA	3/30/2013	Use of the Defense Production Act to Reduce Interruptions in Critical Infrastructure and Key Resource Operations	Transmitted
FEMA	3/30/2013	Defense Production Act Committee Report 2011 and 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	5/25/2013	FY13 Disaster Readiness and Support Annual Report	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	2/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Readiness and Support Costs FY13 1st Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	5/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Readiness and Support Costs FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	8/15/2013	FEMA Disaster Readiness and Support Costs FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due > 30 Days
FEMA	4/3/2013	Improvements to Levee Analysis and Mapping Procedures	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	5/1/2013	US Fire Administration; Educational Outreach	Transmitted

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

FEMA	5/1/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Mt Weather Capital Improvements	Pending: Overdue to Congress
FEMA	6/24/2013	FY13 Strategic Plan for Automated Systems Modernization	Pending: Due <30 Days
I&A	11/15/2012	I&A Budget Execution - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
I&A	2/15/2013	I&A Budget Execution - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
I&A	5/15/2013	I&A Budget Execution - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted by CFO
I&A	8/15/2013	I&A Budget Execution - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
I&A	6/3/2013	Annual Customer Feedback FY 2012	Transmitted on 5/24/13
I&A	5/14/2013	Intelligence Authorization Act FY 13 HSIP Report	Transmitted on 5/20/13
I&A	5/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - I&A	Pending
I&A	5/10/2013	Production Improvement Plan	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	11/15/2012	ICE Staffing and Hiring - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	11/15/2012	Detention and Removal Operations - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	11/15/2012	Domestic Investigations - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	11/15/2012	Secure Communities - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	11/15/2012	ICE Unobligated Balances - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	1/1/2013	Deportation of Parents of US-Born Children - 2012 2nd Semi-Annual	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	2/15/2013	ICE Staffing and Hiring - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	2/15/2013	Detention and Removal - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	2/15/2013	Domestic Investigations - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	2/15/2013	Secure Communities - FY13 1st Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	2/15/2013	ICE Unobligated Balances - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
ICE	4/10/2013	FY13 Textile Transshipment Enforcement	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	12/31/2012	FY 2011 Office of International Affairs VISA Security Program Deployment Overseas	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	4/10/2013	FY13 Multiyear Investment Plan - ICE Office of Information Technology	Transmitted
ICE	5/15/2013	Secure Communities - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	8/15/2013	Secure Communities - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	5/15/2013	ICE Unobligated Balances - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	8/15/2013	ICE Unobligated Balances - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	5/15/2013	ICE Staffing and Hiring - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

ICE	8/15/2013	ICE Staffing and Hiring - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	5/15/2013	Domestic Investigations - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	8/15/2013	Domestic Investigations - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	5/15/2013	Detention and Removal - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
ICE	8/15/2013	Detention and Removal - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	7/1/2013	Deportation of Parents of US-Born Children - 2013 1st Semi-Annual	Pending: Due <30 Days
ICE	4/29/2013	ICE Use of FY 2013 Disaster Relief Funds	Transmitted
ICE	6/24/2013	Cooperation from Foreign Countries on Repatriation	Pending: Due <30 Days
ICE	9/30/2013	Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement Report	Pending: Due >30 Days
ICE	8/16/2013	Border Enforcement Security Task Force	Pending: Due >30 Days
NPPD	10/4/2012	National Emergency Communications Capabilities - Baseline Assessment Update, 2012	Transmitted
NPPD	10/13/2012	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Cybersecurity Activities	Transmitted
NPPD	3/30/2013	Coordination of Chemical Security Efforts - FY13 1st Semi-Annual	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	9/30/2013	Coordination of Chemical Security Efforts - FY13 2nd Semi-Annual	Pending: Due >30 Days
NPPD	4/10/2013	FPS Human Capital Report	Transmitted
NPPD	4/10/2013	FY13 Obligation Report - Continuous Monitoring and Diagnostics	Transmitted
NPPD	4/10/2013	FY13 Multi Year Investment Plan for Office of Biometric Identity Management	Transmitted
NPPD	4/10/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	5/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - OBIM	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	8/15/2013	Continuous Monitoring - FY13 1st Quarter Update	Pending: Due >30 Days
NPPD	7/1/2013	Cybersecurity Improvements	Contingent
NPPD	4/3/2013	Grant Programs	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	4/3/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Federal Network Security	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	4/3/2013	FY13 Veterans Cybersecurity Workforce	Pending: Overdue to Congress
NPPD	1/30/2013	Title X - Improving Critical Infrastructure Security Sec.210E(d)	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM	4/3/2013	FY08-13 Executive Aircraft Usage and Funding	Transmitted
OSEM	5/25/2013	Departmental Integrity Efforts	Pending: Overdue to Congress

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

OSEM-CISOMB	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman	Pending: Due <30 Days
OSEM-CRCL	12/28/2012	CRCL Third Quarter FY 2012 Report to Congress	Transmitted
OSEM-CRCL	3/28/2013	No Fear Act Annual Report for FY 2012	Transmitted
OSEM-CRCL	09/30/2013	CRCL FY 2012 Annual Report to Congress	Pending
OSEM-CRCL	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties	Pending: Due <30 Days
OSEM-CRCL	9/30/2013	CRCL FY 2013 Q1 and Q2 Report to Congress	Pending: Due >30 Days
OSEM-IGA	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Office of Intergovernmental Affairs	Pending: Due <30 Days
OSEM-PLCY	11/15/2012	Border Security Status Report (BSSR) - FY12 4th Quarter	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	12/28/2012	PLCY Visa Waiver Program (VWP) Summary Report for Taiwan	Transmitted
OSEM-PLCY	2/15/2013	Border Security Status Report - FY13 1st Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	12/3/2012	PLCY Visa Waiver Program (VWP) Summary Report for Finland	Transmitted
OSEM-PLCY	12/28/2012	VISA Waiver Program (VWP) Continuing Designation Review Report on Sweden	Transmitted
OSEM-PLCY	12/28/2012	VISA Waiver Program (VWP) Continuing Designation Review on United Kingdom	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	12/28/2012	VISA Waiver Program (VWP) Continuing Designation Review on Luxembourg and Estonia	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	5/15/2013	Border Security Status Report - FY13 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	8/15/2013	Border Security Status Report - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
OSEM-PLCY	3/31/2013	VISA Waiver Program (VWP) Continuing Designation Review Report to Congress on Andorra, Austria, Brunei, Denmark, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Spain, and South Korea	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PLCY	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - PLCY	Pending: Due <30 Days
OSEM-PRIV	10/1/2012	Privacy 2012 Annual Report to Congress	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PRIV	12/31/2012	Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Privacy Office's Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2012 Report to Congress	Transmitted
OSEM-PRIV	2/28/2013	2012 Data Mining Report	Pending: Overdue to Congress
OSEM-PRIV	3/30/2013	Q1 FY 2013 803 Report	Transmitted
OSEM-PRIV	6/28/2013	Q2 FY 2013 Section 803 Report	Pending: Due <30 Days
OSEM-PRIV	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Privacy Office	Pending: Due <30 Days
S&T	10/22/2012	FY12 3rd Quarterly Update - RDI funding	Transmitted
S&T	4/22/2013	Research Development Institute	Pending: Overdue to Congress
S&T	6/24/2013	FY13 National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility Construction Plan	Pending: Due <30 Days



<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

S&T	7/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Report - Financial Sector Cybersecurity	Pending: Due >30 Days
S&T	4/10/2013	Plum Island Animal Projected Costs	Pending: Overdue to Congress
S&T	4/10/2013	FY12 De-Obligated Research and Development Funds	Pending: Overdue to Congress
S&T	4/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Research, Development and Innovation	Pending: Overdue to Congress
TSA	10/1/2012	Risk-Based Security Screening for Members of the Armed Forces	Transmitted
TSA	12/20/2012	Air Cargo Screening - FY12 2nd Semi-Annual	Transmitted
TSA	11/15/2012	Federal Air Marshals Service - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
TSA	6/1/2013	Implementation of ATR Software	
TSA	12/28/2012	Airport Exit Lanes Pilot Programs	Transmitted
TSA	12/28/2012	Screening of Armed Forces	Transmitted
TSA	2/15/2013	Federal Air Marshals - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
TSA	12/31/2012	Transportation Security Information Sharing Environment (TSISE)	Transmitted
TSA	12/6/2012	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - Air Cargo	Transmitted
TSA	12/7/2012	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - EDS and Checkpoint	Transmitted
TSA	6/20/2013	Unclaimed Money at Airports - FY12	Transmitted
TSA	12/27/2012	2013 Advanced Integrated Passenger Screening	Transmitted
TSA	2/21/2013	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - VIPR	Transmitted
TSA	5/15/2013	Federal Air Marshals - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted
TSA	8/15/2013	Federal Air Marshals - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
TSA	4/10/2013	Installation of Optimal Baggage Screening Systems and FTE Savings	Transmitted
TSA	5/25/2013	Security Breaches Report	Transmitted
TSA	7/24/2013	Federal Law Enforcement Supplement to FAMS	Pending: Due >30 Days
TSA	9/22/2013	Air Cargo Screening Report	Pending: Due >30 Days
TSA	5/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - Air Cargo Security	Transmitted
TSA	5/25/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - EDS and Checkpoint Support	Transmitted
TSA	5/15/2013	Screening Partnership Program (SPP) - FY13 2nd Qtr.	Transmitted
TSA	8/15/2013	Screening Partnership Program (SPP) - FY13 3rd Qtr.	Pending: Due >30 Days
TSA	6/24/2013	2013 Advanced Integrated Passenger Screening Update	Transmitted
TSA	6/24/2013	Unclaimed Money at Airports - Transfer Collections to Nonprofit Organizations	Pending: Due <30 Days
TSA	5/10/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - FAMS	Transmitted
TSA	9/30/2013	Advanced Imaging Technology Study and Health Risks of AIT	Pending: Due >30 Days

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

TSA	4/10/2013	5-Year Strategic Plan of Investments	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	10/15/2012	Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Disbursements for FY 2011	Transmitted
USCG	2/1/2013	2012 Sexual Harrassment and Violence at CGA	Transmitted
USCG	11/12/2012	FY12 4th Qtr - OCO	Transmitted
USCG	4/10/2013	5-Year Capital Investment Plan: FYs 2014-2018	Transmitted
USCG	12/1/2012	Assessment of the Adequacy of the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Workforce 2012	Transmitted
USCG	1/13/2013	Sexual Assault in the U.S. Coast Guard in FY 2012	Transmitted
USCG	10/31/2012	Drug Interdiction Expenditures FY 2012	Transmitted
USCG	3/13/2013	Conveyance of Coast Guard Real Property in 2012	Transmitted
USCG	1/20/2013	Coast Guard's National Housing Assessment	Transmitted
USCG	3/23/2013	Compliance with Security Standards Pursuant to Maritime Transportation Security Plans in 2012	Transmitted
USCG	2/15/2013	Capabilities and Readiness to Fulfill National Defense Responsibilities During FY 2012	Transmitted
USCG	1/29/2013	Rescue 21 (2013)	Transmitted
USCG	3/20/2013	Environmental Compliance and Restoration	Transmitted
USCG	2/2/2013	Marine Industry Training Program FY 2012	Transmitted
USCG	4/30/2013	Use of AC&I Disaster Funds	Transmitted
USCG	5/1/2013	Living Marine Resource Enforcement Activities Annual Summary 2012	Transmitted
USCG	1/28/2013	Threat of Terrorism to U.S. Ports and Vessels in 2012	Transmitted
USCG	9/30/2013	Marine Safety Long Term Strategy, Performance Report and Annual Plan FY 2013	Transmitted
USCG	4/22/2013	Support of Military Families	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	6/24/2013	Infrastructure and Response Capabilities in the Arctic	Pending: Due <30 Days
USCG	6/24/2013	USCG FY13 Automation Modernization Report	Pending: Due <30 Days
USCG	4/22/2013	Major/MinorShore Construction, Housing, Aids to Navigatoin and Survey and Design	Transmitted
USCG	5/10/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - USCG Military Housing and Prioritized Backlog	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	3/1/2013	Distant Water Tuna Fleet CY 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	6/28/2013	Presidential Security Expenditures, First Half, Fiscal Year 2013	Transmitted
USCG	9/27/2013	Waterside Security of Especially Hazardous Cargo – Resource Deficiency Reporting for FY 2012	Pending: Due >30 Days
USCG	7/1/2013	Hazing in the Coast Guard	Pending: Due <30 Days

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

USCG	6/11/2013	Ringo Cocke Canal Passenger Vessels Regulatory Requirements	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	5/24/2013	Diversity in Coast Guard Leadership	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCG	4/10/2013	Capital Investment Plan and Unfunded Priority List	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	10/30/2012	Internal Affairs Investigations January - June 2012	Transmitted
USCIS	12/1/2012	Adjustment of Status Granted Pursuant to Section 13 for October 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	12/30/2012	TRIG Report (Secretary's Application of the Discretionary Authority Contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act)	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	12/30/2012	FY 2012 H-1B Petitions	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	12/31/2012	H2 B Petitions FY12 Part 2	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	12/30/2012	Characteristics of H-1B Specialty Workers FY 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	1/3/2013	Section 13 Report November 2012	Transmitted
USCIS	2/2/2013	Section 13 Report December 2012	Transmitted
USCIS	3/1/2013	Adjustments of Status Granted Pursuant to Section 13 for January 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	11/25/2012	Annual Report on the Impact of the Homeland Security Act on Immigration Functions Transferred to the Department of Homeland Security	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	3/1/2013	Temporary Protected Status: Calendar Year 2012 Report	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	4/30/2013	Internal Affairs Investigations July to December 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	4/2/2013	Characteristics of H-2B Nonagricultural Temporary Workers FY 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	11/1/2012	Section 13 Report for September 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	4/1/2013	Section 13 Report for February 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	10/1/2012	Section 13 Report for August 2012	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	9/30/2013	Electronic Access to Immigration Information	Contingent
USCIS	7/1/2013	Section 13 Report for March 2013	Pending: Due <30 Days
USCIS	3/1/2013	Report on Certain Applications for Naturalization Pending Longer Than One Year As of December 2012 (Military Naturalization)	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USCIS	7/1/2013	Section 13 April 2013	Pending: Due <30 Days
USM	11/6/2012	Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report 3rd FY12 Quarterly Update	Transmitted

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

USM	4/10/2013	FY13 Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report	Transmitted
USM	9/30/2013	FY13 DHS Efficiency Review	Contingent
USM	8/15/2013	CASR- CY13 1st Quarterly Update	Pending: Due >30 Days
USM	2/15/2013	CASR Quarterly Update FY13 - 1st Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM	5/15/2013	CASR Quarterly Update FY13 - 2nd Qtr	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCFO	6/24/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - DHS HQ Consolidation	Pending: Due <30 Days
USM-OCFO	2/15/2013	DHS User Fees - FY 12 Semi-Annual Update	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	10/30/2012	Official Reception and Representation Expenses - FY12 4th Qtr	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	10/15/2012	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Aug 2012	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	11/15/2012	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Sep 2012	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	2/15/2013	Federally Funded Research and Development Centers - FY12 2nd Semi-Annual	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCFO	1/5/2013	FY12 Event Fees	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	1/30/2013	Official Reception and Representation Expenses - FY13 1st Qtr	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	12/15/2012	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Oct 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	1/16/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Nov 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	2/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Dec 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	3/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Jan 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	8/15/2013	Federally Funded Research and Development Centers - FY13 1st Semi-Annual	Pending: Due >30 Days
USM-OCFO	10/28/2012	FY13 CR Expenditure Plan - DHS-Wide Operations	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	4/26/2013	FY13 Expenditure Plan - DHS-Wide Appropriations After Sequestration	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	6/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - April 2013	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCFO	4/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Feb 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	5/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Mar 2013	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	7/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - May 2013	Pending: Due <30 Days
USM-OCFO	8/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Jun 2013	Pending: Due >30 Days
USM-OCFO	9/15/2013	DHS Budget Execution and Staffing - Jul 2013	Pending: Due >30 Days
USM-OCFO	8/15/2013	Official Reception and Representation Expenses - FY13 3rd Qtr	Pending: Due >30 Days
USM-OCFO	5/15/2013	Official Reception and Representation Expenses - FY13 2nd Qtr	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	3/31/2013	Internal Control of FY13 Disaster Funds	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	4/10/2013	FY14-18 FYHSP	Transmitted
USM-OCFO	6/24/2013	Campaign to Cut Waste	Pending: Due <30 Days

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

USM-OCFO	4/10/2013	Federally Funded Research and Development Centers - FYs 13 & 14 Projections	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCFO	6/24/2013	DHS User Fees - Revised Plan	Pending: Due <30 Days
USM-OCHCO	4/3/2013	Insourcing and Balanced Workforce Strategy Fiscal 2009-2012	Transmitted
USM-OCIO	4/10/2013	FY13 Multiyear Investment Plan - OCIO IT Acquisition Projects	Transmitted
USM-OCIO	4/3/2013	HSPD-12 Trusted Internet Connection	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCPO	4/10/2013	Buy American Requirements	Pending: Overdue to Congress
USM-OCSSO	1/31/2013	SSI 2012 Report	Transmitted
USSS	4/29/2013	USSS Use of FY 2013 Disaster Relief Funds	Transmitted
USSS	4/10/2013	USSS IITT Multi-Year Investment and Management Plan	Transmitted
USSS	6/15/2013	Update to 2012 Campaign Financial Plan	Pending: Overdue to Congress

The Department does not currently have an estimate on the resources required and the costs incurred to produce the 304 reports currently required in FY 2013. DHS does not currently track the number of man-hours or production costs associated with the development of each report. Reports are significantly varied in terms of content and material.

#### DHS OUTDATED & DUPLICATIVE CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED REPORTS

Title	Reporting Frequency	Proposed Action	Rationale	Brief Description of Rationale
CBP - FY12 Annual Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Distribution Report	Annual	Consolidate	duplicative	There are three reporting requirements in the Senate Report 112-74 that all deal with very similar topics: ADCVD yearly distributions, Collection on the Outstanding \$1 billion in Antidumping/Countervailing Duties, and Collections During the Preceding Fiscal year. These topics are also closely related to an annual authorizations report on ADCVD collections during the preceding fiscal year (required by NAFTA Implementation Act). Request these reports be combined into one report with the annual authorization report on duty collections (NAFTA Implementation Act, H.R. 3450,

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

				Sec 691, 19 USC 16771). CBP also requests changing the due date to Congress to the end of April, because it takes two months to collate and organize the data after the yearly distributions (usually in early December) and two months for review.
CBP - Outstanding Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Collection Reports	Annual	Consolidate	duplicative	There are three reporting requirements in the Senate Report 112-74 that all deal with very similar topics: ADCVD yearly distributions, Collection on the Outstanding \$1 billion in Antidumping/Countervailing Duties, and Collections During the Preceding Fiscal year. These topics are also closely related to an annual authorizations report on ADCVD collections during the preceding fiscal year (required by NAFTA Implementation Act). Request these reports be combined into one report with the annual authorization report on duty collections (NAFTA Implementation Act, H.R. 3450, Sec 691, 19 USC 16771). CBP also requests changing the due date to Congress to end of April, because it takes two months to collate and organize the data after the yearly distributions (usually in early December) and two months for review.
CBP- FY12 Staffing and Hiring Monthly Report	Monthly	Consolidate	duplicative	Information is duplicative with on-board statistics included in the CFO Monthly Execution Report. Suggest this report requirement be eliminated.
ICE - FY12 Annual Worksite Enforcement	Annual	Streamline	duplicative	Recommend this information be provided in conjunction with the quarterly worksite enforcement briefing and eliminate this report.
ICE - Quarterly Domestic Investigations	Quarterly	Reduce Frequency	cost/benefit	Recommend changing this report requirement to a quarterly briefing requirement as the information can be provided in a more timely fashion.
ICE - Quarterly	Quarterly	Reduce	cost/benefit	Recommend changing this report

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

Secure Communities		Frequency		requirement to a quarterly briefing requirement as the information can be provided in a more timely fashion with a summary annual report provided within 45 days after the end of the fiscal year.
ICE - Quarterly Unobligated Balances	Quarterly	Streamline	duplicative	Recommend this report requirement be eliminated as the same information is provided via the Department's Monthly Execution Report.
ICE - Trade Compliance Expenditure Plan	Annual	Streamline	duplicative	Recommend consolidating all three Trade Compliance and Enforcement Reports into one annual report.
ICE - Staffing and Hiring Monthly Report	Monthly	Streamline	cost/benefit	Recommend changing this monthly report to a quarterly report as the benefit of providing monthly information does not outweigh the time and resources needed to produce it
TSA - Quarterly Recovered or Deobligated Funds for Explosive Detection Systems	Quarterly	Reduce Frequency	duplicative	Recommend change in submission schedule to semi-annual vice quarterly. DHS believes that there is minimal value in reporting this data on a more frequent basis, considering the cost and redundancy in effort associated with generating the report.
TSA - Quarterly Federal Air Marshals Report	Quarterly	Reduce Frequency	duplicative	Recommend change in submission schedule to semi-annual vice quarterly. DHS believes that there is minimal value in reporting this data on a more frequent basis, considering the cost and redundancy in effort associated with generating the report.
TSA - Registered Traveler Program, Protection of Personal Information	Annual	Consolidate	other	The Registered Traveler Program is no longer an active program.
OSEM-PLCY Quarterly Border Security Status Report	Quarterly	Streamline	duplicative	This report contains information on illegal border entries, apprehensions, and other statistics that is often provided as background in other reporting requirements such as the BSFIT expenditure plan which provides a comprehensive overview of CBP's efforts at the borders –

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

				current status, future endeavors, issues/problems and resolutions – all of which encompasses this reporting requirement. Recommend this report requirement be eliminated.
USCG - 2011 Sexual Harassment and Violence at CGA	Annual	Consolidate	cost/benefit	Recommend combining this report with the Authorizations report titled "Sexual Assaults in the CG." Both are annual requirements.
USM-OCPO Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report Quarterly Update	Quarterly	Reduce Frequency	cost/benefit	Recommend changing this requirement from quarterly to one annual report.
USCG - Annual assessment of adequacy of marine safety workforce	Annual	Repeal	Redundant	The Coast Guard notes that the content of this report is incorporated in the annual submission of the "Marine Safety Long Term Strategy, Performance Report."
USCG – Annual report on marine industry training program	Annual	Repeal	Redundant	The Coast Guard notes that the content of this report is incorporated in the annual submission of the "Marine Safety Long Term Strategy, Performance Report."
USCG – Biennial report on major acquisitions	Biennial	Repeal	Redundant	The Coast Guard notes that the content of this report is incorporated in the Department of Homeland Security's Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report.
USCG – Annual report on minor construction and improvement	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual capital investment plan	Annual	Repeal	Redundant	The Coast Guard notes that the capital investment plan element of this report is provided as part of the President's annual budget submission.
USCG – Annual report on conveyance of real property	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual list of projects	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.



<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

USCG – Annual marine safety strategy and plans	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual resource deficiency reporting; waterside security of especially hazardous cargo	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual report on terrorist threats	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Presidential Protection Assistance Act of 1976; semi-annual report of expenditures	Biannual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual report on use of Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	The National Pollution Fund Center continues to anticipate the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund will be able to cover projected non-catastrophic liabilities, including claims, without further increases to vessel liability limits. Annual report updates do not provide any significant new information or recommendations. Accordingly, the Coast Guard believes that this reporting requirement has outlived its legislative purpose and informative value.
USCG – Biennial report on oil pollution research and development program	Biennial	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996;	Annual	Repeal	Redundant	Most, if not all the information, contained in this report is found in other Executive branch publications. And, from year to year, the content of

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

annual report on drug interdiction				this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual report on the modernization of national distress and response system	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	As the Rescue 21 project nears completion, this reporting requirement has outlived its legislative purpose and informative value. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual report on Coast Guard capabilities and readiness to fulfill national defense responsibilities	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004; annual report on compliance with security standards established pursuant to maritime transportation security plans	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	The steady decline in enforcement actions and deficiencies awarded to non-compliant vessels suggests that this reporting requirement has outlived its legislative purpose and informative value. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual report on distant water tuna fleet	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG – Annual updates on limits on liability	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	The National Pollution Fund Center continues to anticipate the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund will be able to cover projected non-catastrophic liabilities, including claims, without further increases to vessel liability limits. Annual report updates do not provide any significant new information or recommendations. Accordingly, the Coast Guard believes that this reporting

<b>Question#:</b>	12
<b>Topic:</b>	reports
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

				requirement has outlived its legislative purpose and informative value.
USCG – Annual summary on fisheries enforcement plans and reporting; Biennial updates on foreign fishing incursions	Annual/Biennial	Repeal	Cost/benefit	From year to year, the content of this report differs little. In lieu of a report, the Coast Guard recommends that it brief congressional staff.
USCG –	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	
USCG –	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	
USCG –	Annual	Repeal	Cost/benefit	
USCG – Non-recurring recommendations on tug escorts for laden oil tankers; Non-recurring risk assessment of transporting Canadian oil sands	One-time	Repeal	Cost/benefit	The production of these reports is dependent on the cooperation of Canadian authorities, which rightly has their own priorities and obligations. Additionally, the cost of the latter is prohibitive (in excess of \$1M). The Service believes most of the information Congress seeks could be presented in a brief without further delay or cost.

<b>Question#:</b>	13
<b>Topic:</b>	grants
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** At the April 17, 2013 hearing, you indicated that the Department performed a survey and capability gap analysis to determine the amount of FY2014 funding requested for FEMA's preparedness grants. Please provide the committee with the results of that survey and gap analysis, as well as a description of how the survey and analysis were performed.

You indicated that the department anticipates administrative cost savings as a result of consolidating existing preparedness grants. What is the dollar amount of administrative cost savings that you estimate can be achieved through consolidation, and what is that estimate based on?

**Response:** FEMA has established measurable goals and objectives through the National Preparedness Goal and National Preparedness System that enable us to systematically measure improvements in first responder capabilities and state-wide preparedness. FEMA's strategy is to base assessments on the principles of the National Preparedness System: the Nation needs to understand the risks it faces, use those risks to determine the capabilities it needs, assess its current capability levels against those requirements, and track its progress in closing capability gaps. Developing and maintaining an understanding of the variety of risks faced by communities and the Nation, and how this information can be used to build and sustain preparedness, are essential components the System.

In 2012, FEMA released the methodology for determining risks in Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 201: Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) Guide (CPG-201). The THIRA process is an all-hazards assessment tool developed by FEMA for use by jurisdictions of all sizes. Diverging from past efforts to establish measures and metrics for a capability that would be applied uniformly, this approach allows a jurisdiction to establish its own capability targets based on the risks it faces. It expands on existing local, state, territorial, and tribal hazard identification and risk assessments and other risk methodologies by broadening the factors considered in the process, incorporating the whole community from the beginning to the end of the process, and by accounting for important community-specific factors. This knowledge allows a jurisdiction to establish informed and defensible capability targets based on plausible impacts of the threats and hazards of concern to their jurisdiction. Each of the 10 FEMA Regions and all 56 states and territories completed THIRAs in 2012.

<b>Question#:</b>	13
<b>Topic:</b>	grants
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

The States assessed their current capabilities against their THIRA targets in the State Preparedness Report, also submitted to FEMA in December 2012. For each identified capability shortfall, states and territories indicated the degree to which they expected to fill the shortfall themselves or their expected reliance on federal capability. Responses regarding the responsibility for filling existing shortfalls help identify mismatches in perception about appropriate roles between different levels of government. State, territorial and federal officials may not always agree on the perceived roles, but in an era of constrained budgets, these results may be used to start productive conversations about expectations, constraints, and innovative partnership models to fill critical shortfalls.

Taken together, the THIRA results and the SPR identify capability needs. These products allow the Nation to look holistically across all capabilities and whole community partners to gauge areas of strength and areas for improvement. FEMA reports the results of the capability assessments annually in the National Preparedness Report submitted to the White House March 30 and released publicly on May 30, 2013.

The proposal to consolidate the existing suite of preparedness grants into one National Preparedness Grant Program is driven by the need to improve coordination among various grantees and to allow for the type of strategic, risk-informed decision-making about grant investments that is not possible under the current structure. An ancillary, but by no means less important, benefit of the consolidation is the expectation that both the Department and its grantees will realize administrative cost savings as a result of consolidating existing preparedness grants.

There is an administrative burden for both grantees and FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) as they manage the existing portfolio of grants; each has independent, statutory and administrative reporting requirements. By consolidating programs, this administrative burden will improve. FEMA's GPD is currently working to determine how the proposed NPG, if enacted, would impact its organizational structure and future workforce requirements. It is anticipated that any administrative cost savings would take several fiscal years, as the existing portfolio of grants will continue to require oversight until closed out procedures can be conducted. Efforts will be made to determine estimated cost benefits for grantees even though each state and local unit of government manages its grants differently.

<b>Question#:</b>	14
<b>Topic:</b>	information sharing
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** In April 2013, GAO issued a report identifying potential duplication and overlap in the mission of the federally-supported field-based information sharing initiatives, including Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs), Field Intelligence Groups, Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS), state major urban area fusion centers, and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Investigative Support Centers. Specifically, GAO found “91 instances of overlap in some analytical activities—such as producing intelligence reports—and 32 instances of overlap in investigative support activities.” Given the potential duplication and overlap that exists in domestic intelligence collection and information sharing, I would like to hear your ideas for how DHS could maximize its contribution to the nation’s intelligence and information sharing mission. Specifically, please describe the reforms you would suggest Congress make to better define roles and responsibilities should be for the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the intelligence operations of DHS’s component agencies.

**Response:** DHS is charged with supporting and establishing information sharing relationships with state and local fusion centers, which—unlike any of the others in the report—are owned and operated by state and local governments under their legal authorities. The other entities examined in the report—JTTFs, Field Intelligence Groups (FIGs), RISS and HIDTAs—are sponsored, funded and overseen by federal agencies.

The intelligence products disseminated by fusion centers are directed to customers, such as local municipalities, emergency management agencies and other first responders, who are not traditionally served by local FIGs, which focus support on FBI Field Offices. FBI JTTFs primarily support the exchange of investigative information for the purpose of enabling task force officers detailed to JTTFs to support federal counterterrorism investigations.

DHS, through the Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A), is working closely with federal partners, including the FBI and the Office of National Drug Control Policy, through the Fusion Center Subcommittee of the Information Sharing and Access Interagency Policy Committee, to foster improved coordination and collaboration with fusion centers through engagement on fusion center governance bodies and advisory boards. DHS is also working closely with fusion centers to define performance measures that reflect the degree to which fusion centers coordinate with each other and with other field-based information sharing entities to avoid inefficiencies and minimize duplication of effort. As noted in the GAO report, we expect to complete the development of these measures by the end of September 2013.

<b>Question#:</b>	14
<b>Topic:</b>	information sharing
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

DHS also continues to more effectively align its internal intelligence and information sharing efforts through programmatic alignment and strategic planning. As the Chief Intelligence Officer for the Department (CINT), the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis leads the Homeland Security Intelligence Council (HSIC), composed of Key Intelligence Officials from all intelligence components of the Department. The CINT, in consultation with the HSIC, provides strategic oversight across the DHS intelligence enterprise and, through the HSIC, establishes working groups on key issues including collections management, counterintelligence, analytic coordination and intelligence systems across the intelligence components of the Department. This coordination prevents duplication and unnecessary overlap – understanding that, as noted by GAO, “overlap in these activities can lead to benefits such as validating information for customers.”

DHS looks forward to working with Congress on these efforts and will keep Congress apprised of our progress in improving coordination and collaboration among fusion centers, other field-based federal entities and the Department.

<b>Question#:</b>	15
<b>Topic:</b>	fusion centers
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The October 12th, 2012 report by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations titled “Federal Support For and Involvement in State and Local Fusion Centers,” highlighted DHS’ inability to provide accurate tally of how much it had granted to states and cities to support fusion center efforts.

How has DHS improved its ability to effectively track preparedness grant funding being spent on fusions centers?

**Response:** Per the requirements of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) conducts on-site financial and programmatic monitoring in each State, territory and eligible urban area every two years. During the monitoring, FEMA staff review progress made towards completing grant investments, as outlined in the grantee’s funding application. This includes a review of the fusion center investments.

In addition to the on-site monitoring noted above, FEMA also conducts quarterly financial reviews of grantee drawdown activities as well as biannual reviews of project-specific activities (including fusion center-related investments.)

**Question:** What is the current number of fusion centers in operation?

**Response:** There are currently 78 designated fusion centers.

**Question:** How has DHS reformed its oversight of intelligence reporting generated by information at the state and local level?

**Response:** As DHS pointed at the time, and Chairman Lieberman, Ranking Member Collins, Chairman King and major law enforcement organizations have since confirmed, the committee report on federal support for fusion centers is out of date, inaccurate and misleading. Of particular concern is that the committee refused to review relevant data, including important intelligence information pertinent to their findings, in preparing their report. Not only does the report rely on limited data from two to three years ago in its analysis, much of what it identifies as problematic had been identified and rectified by DHS prior to their investigation. The report also fundamentally misunderstands the role of the federal government in supporting fusion centers and overlooks the significant benefits of this relationship to both state and local law enforcement and the federal government. Among other benefits, fusion centers play a key role by receiving classified



<b>Question#:</b>	15
<b>Topic:</b>	fusion centers
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

and unclassified information from the federal government and assessing its local implications, helping law enforcement on the frontlines better protect their communities from all threats, whether it is terrorism or other criminal activities. The Department of Homeland Security supports fusion centers, working in coordination with other federal partners, through training, technical assistance, technology and grant funding, as well as the deployment of DHS intelligence officers who work side-by-side with fusion center personnel to assess threats and share information. Homeland security begins with hometown security, and fusion centers play a vital role in keeping communities safe all across America.

**Question:** How has DHS improved its ability to assess performance by state and local fusion centers in contributing to stated federal missions?

**Response:** Beginning in 2012, the scope of the DHS' annual fusion center assessment process was broadened from a focus on capability development to include an evaluation of the National Network of Fusion Centers' (National Network) performance in contributing to national information sharing and homeland security outcomes. National Network partners finalized the initial set of five performance measures in April 2012. These five performance measures reflect the benefits of a National Network, as well as the shared responsibilities of individual fusion centers and federal, state and local partners in supporting and sustaining the National Network over time. These measures also reflect the implementation and institutionalization of Critical Operational Capabilities and Enabling Capabilities and the fusion process in general. An expanded set of performance measures, which are currently being implemented, will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the broader value and impact of the National Network.

**Question:** Has the Department implemented any reforms in response to the PSI report's recommendations? If so, what are they and what have they accomplished?

**Response:** The Department closely examined the recommendations contained in the report, what it has already done to address these issues, and what additional steps can be taken to further improve support for fusion centers. Highlights include:

- **Recommendation: DHS should reform its intelligence reporting efforts at state and local fusion centers to eliminate duplication.**

Fusion centers today share information via a variety of mechanisms, including through the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative, which was not fully deployed during the period covered by the Report.

<b>Question#:</b>	15
<b>Topic:</b>	fusion centers
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

• **Recommendation: DHS should improve its training of intelligence reporters.**

In 2012, I&A piloted a revised and expanded Reports Officer Course as part of a larger Reports Officer certification program. The course has undergone both further development and delivery in 2013. Post-training Reports Officer certification includes a period of supervised on-the-job training and an independent assessment of reporting for compliance with standards.

• **Recommendation: DHS should strictly align fusion center grant funding to meet federal needs.**

The way the Department awards federal dollars to state and local first responders is largely dictated by current statutory requirements. Per these requirements, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) does not award funding directly to fusion centers; rather, funds are awarded to states through their State Administrative Agencies (SAAs), which use funding to support fusion centers, among other eligible security related expenses. FEMA provides flexibility to SAAs to reprogram grant funding to meet the goals and objectives of their homeland security strategies, subject to applicable federal laws and regulations. Starting in FY 2011, DHS instituted processes to tie the allocation of grant funds requested for fusion centers to capability gaps identified in the annual Fusion Center Assessment. I&A has also partnered with FEMA to strengthen the grant guidance and its associated reporting requirements concerning fusion centers.

• **Recommendation: DHS should track how much money it gives to each fusion center.**

The Department has made significant strides in recent years to track grantee spending, consistent with applicable law. Per the requirements of the 9/11 Act, FEMA formally conducts on-site financial and programmatic monitoring in each state, territory, and eligible urban area every two years. During the monitoring, FEMA staff review progress made towards completing grant investments, as outlined in the grantee's funding application. This includes a review of the fusion center investments. In addition to the on-site monitoring noted above, FEMA also conducts quarterly financial reviews of grantee drawdown activities as well as biannual reviews of project-specific activities including fusion center-related investments.

• **Recommendation: DHS should align its practices and guidelines to protect civil liberties, so they adhere to the Constitution, federal law, and its statutory mission.**

<b>Question#:</b>	15
<b>Topic:</b>	fusion centers
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

DHS is proud of the standards we apply to ensure that privacy and civil liberties are paramount considerations as we work to protect the homeland. To facilitate protections we build into programs at their inception, both the DHS Privacy Office and the DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties provide critical policy advice and rigorous oversight to ensure that individual rights are not diminished as a result of Department efforts, activities and programs aimed at securing the homeland. Furthermore, because law and policy is continually changing, we are careful to review and refine our practices and guidelines, as necessary.

**Question:** In the wake of the PSI report, was there any internal examination of DHS functions which pertain to federal fusion center support – grant-making, intelligence gathering, information sharing, oversight, or assessment? If so, what were they and what did they find?

**Response:** DHS conducts regular, ongoing oversight of its support to fusion centers. DHS welcomes regular reviews of, and recommendations for, enhancing its support to state and locally owned and operated fusion centers.

<b>Question#:</b>	16
<b>Topic:</b>	OBP
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The Office for Bombing Prevention (OBP) has responsibilities to implement the National Policy for Countering Improvised Explosive Devices and enhance the Nation's ability to prevent, protect against, respond to, and mitigate the terrorist use of explosives against critical infrastructure, the private sector, and Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial entities.

What is the mission of the OBP?

**Response:** The Office for Bombing Prevention's (OBP) mission is to protect life and critical infrastructure by building capabilities within the general public and across the private and public sectors to prevent, protect against, respond to, and mitigate bombing incidents. OBP accomplishes its mission through a portfolio of complementary counter-improvised explosive device (IED) capability development programs available at no cost to its diverse customers. OBP is a key organization in the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) counter-IED effort, leading and coordinating activities throughout the Department to enhance counter-IED capabilities and reduce the risk of explosive attack against critical infrastructure, the private sector, and Federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial entities through bombing prevention and awareness programs. OBP focuses on four areas to improve counter-IED preparedness: coordination of national and intergovernmental bombing prevention efforts, counter-IED training and awareness, information sharing and decision support, and counter-IED capability analysis and planning support.

OBP has deployed several programs and capabilities to fulfill this mission:

- **Counter-IED Capabilities Analysis and Planning Support** assists state and local governments to more effectively build and manage their counter-IED capabilities, including:
  - **Multi-Jurisdiction IED Security Planning (MJIEDSP)** Workshops assist high-risk areas by producing IED security planning guidance outlining specific bombing prevention actions to reduce vulnerabilities and mitigate the risk of IED attacks within a multi-jurisdiction area. Responding effectively to explosive threats and actual incidents requires close coordination amongst a variety of public safety and law enforcement organizations and disciplines. This planning process assists state and local governments in high-risk urban areas to collectively identify roles, capability gaps, and how to optimize limited prevention, protection, and response resources. MJIEDSP results in

<b>Question#:</b>	16
<b>Topic:</b>	OBP
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

detailed security planning guidance to enhance multi-agency, multi-jurisdiction capabilities.

- **National Capabilities Analysis Database (NCAD)**, a capability assessment program for bomb squads, explosive detection canine teams, SWAT teams, and public safety dive teams. NCAD's standardized methodology measures readiness, equipment, training, and assets required for effective IED threat response. The resulting integrated information provides a snapshot of national IED preparedness that supports informed decision-making in the areas of policy, resource allocation, and capability enhancements. NCAD uses a consistent, repeatable analytical methodology, field surveys, and web-accessible database to identify gaps and steer improvement. NCAD gives state and local, homeland security professionals a qualitative and quantitative basis for understanding their counter-IED capabilities in comparison to preparedness goals and standards, remedying gaps, and optimizing their value through improved investment strategies and asset allocation.
- **Information Sharing and Decision Support** pushes valuable counter-IED information to first responders and supports Federal decision makers during significant IED incidents that require a whole-of-government response, including:
  - **The Technical Resource for Incident Prevention (TRIPwire)**, the DHS 24/7 online, collaborative, information-sharing network designed for bomb squad, law enforcement, and other emergency services personnel to learn about current terrorist IED tactics, techniques, and procedures, to include design and emplacement considerations. TRIPwire access requires verification and is limited to the bombing prevention community. Developed and maintained by OBP, the system combines expert analyses and reports with relevant documents, images, and videos gathered directly from terrorist sources to help law enforcement anticipate, identify, and prevent IED incidents
  - **TRIPwire Community Gateway (TWCG)** is a TRIPwire web portal designed specifically for the Nation's private sector critical infrastructure owners and operators and private security personnel. TWCG provides expert threat analyses, reports, and relevant planning documents to help key private sector partners anticipate, identify, and prevent IED incidents. Developed and maintained by OBP, TWCG shares IED-related information tailored to each of the 16 critical infrastructure sectors, as well as certain educational institutions, in accordance with the National Infrastructure Protection Plan. Sector partners benefit from increased communication, improved awareness of emergent threats, and access to resources and guidance on IED preventive and protective measures.

<b>Question#:</b>	16
<b>Topic:</b>	OBP
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

- **The National Explosives Task Force (NETF)** is an interagency body that evaluates technical information and intelligence on IED threats in order to inform real-time, complementary response actions for IED threats and incidents; law enforcement investigations; intelligence sharing; and protective measures, including screening decisions. OBP provides subject matter experts to the NETF to provide focused analysis in recurring intelligence and information coordination, as well as engage in surge-capacity support. OBP contributes expertise and facilitates coordination with DHS capabilities, and establishes surge-capacity support during significant incidents.
- **Bombing Prevention Training and Awareness** builds knowledge of counter-IED principles and techniques among law enforcement, first responders, and private sector partners that increase capability to detect, prevent, protect against, and respond to IED threats. This includes:
  - **Bombing Prevention and Risk Mitigation Training**, which includes a diverse curriculum, such as Surveillance Detection; Protective Measures; IED Awareness/Bomb Threat Management; IED Search Procedures; and IED Counterterrorism. This training is the most requested training offered by the DHS National Protection and Programs Directorate's Office of Infrastructure Protection (IP) and demand outpaces available resources. OBP has trained approximately 25,000 law enforcement, first responders, and private sector partners since 2009.
  - The **Bomb-Making Materials Awareness Program (BMAP)** is an OBP-designed, joint OBP-Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) outreach program that is a collaborative effort designed to increase public and private sector awareness of homemade explosives (HME) by promoting private sector point-of-sale awareness and suspicious activity reporting to prevent misuse of explosive precursor chemicals and components commonly used in IEDs. The program develops prevention opportunities by building a network of vigilant and informed private sector partners who serve as the Nation's counter-IED "eyes-and-ears."
- **Coordination of National and Intergovernmental Bombing Prevention Efforts**
  - OBP functions as the program management office for counter-IED policy activities within DHS. In that role, OBP works to align DHS and national counter-IED efforts through coordination of ongoing programs with national policy and strategy goals.
  - OBP executes that role by representing DHS as the Deputy Administrator of the Joint Program Office for Countering IEDs (JPO C-IED), the interagency policy and program coordination body led by the FBI, and chairs the DHS

<b>Question#:</b>	16
<b>Topic:</b>	OBP
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

IED Working Group through which DHS coordinates across multiple components with substantive counter-IED programs.

The National Policy for Countering IEDs, articulated through Presidential Policy Directive 17 (PPD-17), calls for a whole-of-government approach in the national effort to counter IEDs. Thus, responsibility for countering IEDs falls to more than just a single department. The Departments of Justice, (DOJ), Defense (DOD), State (DOS), DHS, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) all have substantive roles assigned through the National Policy and the interagency Implementation Plan developed in support thereof. OBP has significant roles across all eight “priority capability” areas defined in PPD-17, *Countering Improvised Explosive Devices*. OBP has been designated as the interagency lead for 11 of 49 tasks identified in the PPD-17 Implementation Plan and as interagency support for 18 of 49, giving OBP a substantive role in over 59 percent of the tasks identified in support of the National Policy. In addition, OBP has responsibility for the programmatic coordination of counter-IED efforts within DHS, including the implementation of PPD-17.

**Question:** Did the Office of Bombing Prevention play a role if any, in the response and aftermath of the Boston Marathon Bombing?

**Response:** Yes, OBP played an important role in response to the bombing in concert with other Federal counter-IED mission partners. Information sharing between DHS and other Federal partners is critical during bombings and is informed by technical expertise on the threat so that subsequent actions can be executed in an effective and complementary manner. To that end, OBP deployed staff to the NETF within 30 minutes of the bombings in order to provide Federal partners with information on DHS activities, IED protective measures, and counter-IED assets in the Boston region. The OBP liaison facilitated sharing of device intelligence to inform operational activities and develop appropriate guidance to other jurisdictions and the private sector.

Together, this technical insight was used to coordinate numerous intelligence and information products to state and local, as well as private sector, partners throughout the week following the incident:

- o OBP developed and shared multiple information bulletins on the Boston incidents for dissemination through TRIPwire, and contributed to numerous joint interagency products coordinated between FBI, DHS, and other Federal partners.
  - During the week of April 15, 2013, TRIPwire logged over 1,110,878 site hits (four times the average number of hits), providing an

<b>Question#:</b>	16
<b>Topic:</b>	OBP
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

indication of how heavily the community relies upon TRIP*wire* as a vital source of counter-IED information, particularly during times of elevated threat.

- OBP shared both bomb threat management and protective measures guidance documents based on the devices used in Boston that were used in subsequent DHS and FBI intelligence and information products.
- OBP developed and shared a consolidated list of U.S. Government Counter-IED Resources to assist State and local and private sector partners following the incidents.

OBP provided information on state and local counter-IED assets, such as bomb squads and canine teams, in the Boston area from its NCAD to inform the FBI's incident command and tactical decisions. OBP also provided incident information and protective measures to interagency and private sector partners; including the Faith Based Advisory Council, Government Coordinating Council, Sector Coordinating Council, and Commercial Facilities Sector via conference calls and information-sharing gateways.

Prior to the incident, OBP assisted the Boston area in enhancing specific counter-IED capabilities. OBP's efforts in Boston are representative of its assistance to many other large urban areas throughout the country. For example, OBP conducted a MJIEDSP Workshop for Boston and surrounding jurisdictions in 2009 that focused on simultaneous attacks using multiple IEDs against mass transit, large public venues, and other critical infrastructure within the downtown Boston area. More than 40 state and local stakeholders from 19 organizations participated. The Workshop resulted in counter-IED planning guidance extremely relevant to the Boston and Watertown incidents including multiple IED response; evacuation/shelter in place procedures; medical surge and emergency triage; emergency public information and warning; Memorandum of Agreement/ Mutual Aid Agreements (including DOD); device-specific response strategies (for secondary IEDs targeting first responders; leave-behind IEDs; and radio-controlled IEDs); managing mass public reporting of suspicious items; and IED incidents at large public gatherings, including sporting events; all of which applied to the Boston incident.

OBP conducted nine Counter-IED Training and Awareness sessions in the Boston area since 2008, with 398 participants from local law enforcement, first responders, emergency management, and private sector security. Courses included Surveillance Detection; Protective Measures; Bomb-Making Materials Awareness; IED Counterterrorism; and Adversarial Targeting.



<b>Question#:</b>	17
<b>Topic:</b>	DHS Component
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** For each DHS component, how much of the FY2014 budget request will be spent under contracts?

**Response:** Based on analysis of past years' spending, the Department anticipates that no more than approximately \$14.5 billion will be spent under contracts in FY 2014. Contract spending may be less than this amount, due to fiscal constraints within the current budget environment. The FY 2014 budget includes break-outs of amounts requested for advisory and assistance service contracts (Budget Object Class 25.1) and other service contracts from non-Federal sources (Budget Object Class 25.2). These are shown by Component in the table below.

Component	Service Contracts (Object Classes 25.1 and 25.2) \$ in thousands
<b>CBP</b>	\$ 1,270,214
<b>DMO</b>	\$ 152,198
<b>DNDO</b>	\$ 47,387
<b>FEMA</b>	\$ 2,652,863
<b>FLETC</b>	\$ 16,370
<b>ICE</b>	\$ 467,685
<b>NPPD</b>	\$ 1,515,750
<b>OHA</b>	\$ 44,619
<b>OIG</b>	\$ 5,628
<b>S&amp;T</b>	\$ 68,156
<b>TSA</b>	\$ 1,031,716
<b>USCG</b>	\$ 1,154,878
<b>USCIS</b>	\$ 805,910
<b>USSS</b>	\$ 162,984
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$9,396,358</b>

Additional contract spending will occur in the following object classes, but these object classes do not include breakouts for contract and non-contract spending:

- Supplies (Object Class 26.0)
- Operation and maintenance of facilities (Object Class 25.4)
- Operation and maintenance of equipment (Object Class 25.7)
- Equipment (Object Class 31.0)
- Construction (Object Class 32.0)

<b>Question#:</b>	18
<b>Topic:</b>	USCG budget
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** The Coast Guard's 2014 budget request proposes reductions of approximately \$628 million—including a \$43 million reduction in training along with the decommissioning of 2 High Endurance Cutters; 8 HU-25/2 HC-130 Aircraft and 2 Air Facilities. Understanding that resources are scarce, please describe how these reductions will affect the Coast Guard's ability to execute its mission. How will the Coast Guard prioritize and meet its training and operational readiness requirements given this significant reduction?

**Response:** The FY 2014 Budget sustains the most critical frontline operations, including maintaining search and rescue coverage, protecting critical infrastructure and key resources, supporting safe navigation, safeguarding natural resources, protecting the environment, detecting and interdicting drugs and individuals attempting to enter the United States illegally, and supporting the Nation's foreign policy objectives. In order to address the Coast Guard's highest priority short and long-term risks, the FY 2014 Budget decommissions aging assets that are decreasing in performance while growing more expensive to maintain, and reduces lower-risk operations such as those at the AIRFACs, the International Port Security (IPS) and Port State Control (PSC) Programs.

The Fiscal Year 2014 budget proposes the decommissioning of legacy Coast Guard assets, including two High Endurance Cutters (HEC), eight HU-25 and two C-130H aircraft. The HEC and C-130H fleet have become increasingly difficult to maintain and sustain operationally, with an average age of 44 and 28 years, respectively. The loss of these assets will be mitigated by the delivery in 2014 of the fourth National Security Cutter, HC-144A and HC-130J Maritime Patrol Aircraft.

<b>Question#:</b>	19
<b>Topic:</b>	BioWatch
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** In total, how many alerts or BioWatch Action Results (BARs) has BioWatch generation two issued since it has been installed? Of those, how many have been substantiated as threats to public safety?

**Response:** Since 2003, more than 7 million tests have been performed by qualified local and state public health laboratory officials. Out of these more than 7 million tests, BioWatch has reported 149 BARs which were subsequently determined to represent naturally-occurring biological pathogens from likely-environmental sources. BioWatch is intended to detect biological agents that are known to cause human illnesses, and most of them occur naturally in the environment. To date, low concentrations of naturally occurring pathogens have not been shown to be a risk to public health.

The BioWatch program uses laboratory tests which specifically look for the presence of a biological agent's DNA. A BAR is declared based on a protocol that uses a series of tests that look for multiple segments of DNA specific to the biological agent—all of which must be positive—before the Laboratory Director declares the BAR. If a BioWatch laboratory detects the DNA of a biological agent, federal, state and local officials, from public health, law enforcement and emergency response, have the ability to assess the incident and determine if the detection is a result of bioterrorism and/or if there is a threat to the public health.

To date, no jurisdiction has determined that a BAR was a threat to public health. A list of all BARs is provided in the attached spreadsheet. This spreadsheet includes the date, jurisdiction, agent, site, and a description of the screening performed and results. These instances represent less than 1/100<sup>th</sup> of 1 percent (or less than 0.002 percent) of all tests performed by the BioWatch system.

<b>Question#:</b>	20
<b>Topic:</b>	funding for S&T
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

**Question:** GAO identified duplication in funding research studies by DHS components including the Science and Technology Directorate. You are asking for \$1.5 billion in funding for Science and Technology, a 126 percent increase from FY 2012. How can you ensure that this money won't duplicate other research efforts within DHS components? Do you have a way to track all of your existing research projects across the Department?

**Response:** In the past decade, S&T has undergone many changes and continues to evolve. The extraordinary breadth and diversity of DHS's missions requires S&T to address a wide range of programs including DHS Components' near-term needs for new operational capabilities and improved operational effectiveness, efficiency, and safety. S&T also has responsibilities related to understanding and creating solutions to biological and chemical threats, and to conducting the R&D required to meet homeland cybersecurity needs. It is important to note that more than 80 percent of the increase in the FY 2014 President's Budget is for the National Bio and Agro Defense Facility (NBAF) construction. The remainder of the FY 2014 budget is roughly equivalent to FY 2011 and FY 2013 enacted levels.

S&T has procedures in place to avoid duplication of research efforts within DHS and other agencies as well as procedures to track its existing research projects. For example, all S&T research and development projects must include an environment scan of technology work being done by industry, universities, overseas work, and Government laboratories. This helps to ensure that S&T does not repeat work and it helps S&T adapt/adopt existing work for DHS needs.

S&T has also developed the Science & Technology's Resource Allocation Strategy (STRAS) to work with senior DHS Component and first responder officials to validate and prioritize mission capability gaps and develop technology solution requirements to help shape S&T R&D investments. In addition, S&T is working with DHS Components, other Federal agencies, and owners of critical infrastructure to develop R&D Strategies identifying the top challenges faced by the Homeland Security Enterprise. For example, Chem/Bio and Cybersecurity, two mission areas that do not directly map to a single DHS Component, will have an R&D Strategy that is co-drafted and co-signed by the Director of the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency (HSARPA) and the appropriate subject matter lead. These R&D Strategies are shared with all of S&T's R&D partners through mechanisms such as webinars and industry days.

<b>Question#:</b>	20
<b>Topic:</b>	funding for S&T
<b>Hearing:</b>	DHS Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Tom A. Coburn
<b>Committee:</b>	HOMELAND SECURITY (SENATE)

The R&D Strategies will guide future R&D investment by identifying areas where the S&T R&D portfolio can map to identify priorities and close remaining operational gaps as funding becomes available. S&T will work closely with its partners in industry, academia, other Federal agencies and the National Labs to fill these gaps moving forward.

In addition to working closely with DHS Components to develop the R&D Strategies, the S&T First Responders Group's (FRG) Solution Development Process helps determine the first responders' priority needs and, in partnership with the first responder community, develops solutions to meet those needs. This process requires FRG to coordinate with the first responder community through interagency and external groups nationwide to identify and prioritize requirements. S&T then reaches out to commercial sector partners to transition and integrate technologies, standards, and knowledge products into regular use.

Finally, DHS has instituted an R&D related portfolio review process modeled on S&T's successful review process established in FY 2010. DHS's United States Coast Guard (USCG) was the first to implement this review process, which is helping shape and direct key technological research within USCG to bring those efforts toward fruition, and ensure that there isn't duplication between the agencies with DHS. This type of review will be of great value to the coordination of efforts in research and development efforts across the Department. The intent is to expeditiously continue the review process with other DHS Components with the help and assistance of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology to improve the coordinated approach to research and development and related activities within DHS. In addition to direct research and development, the review will include operational analysis (documenting and resolving Component capability gaps including any modeling and simulation funding to better understand where gaps reside in a Component's mission space, the improvement of concepts of operation, etc.); technology improvement (any incremental upgrade to currently deployed technology); spiral development (resources devoted toward iterative processes such as software development involving the continual refinement of technology); and product development (any funding for new technology or knowledge products).