

## Markup Transcript

### House Homeland Security Committee Markup on Pending Legislation

Wednesday, June 8, 2016

MCCAUL:

Quorum being present, the Committee on Homeland Security will come to order.

The committee's meeting today for consideration of H.R. 5390, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency Act of 2016; H.R. 5253, the Strong Visa Integrity Secures America Act; H.R. 5385, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Correction Act of 2016; H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cybersecurity Act of 2016; H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016; H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016; H.R. 5391, Gains and Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Act.

I now recognize myself for a very brief opening statement.

The bill we will consider today are the product of bipartisan negotiation. They prove, once again, that this committee can come together on important issues such as visa integrity and restructuring office in the department to address ever-changing threats to the homeland, such as cyberattacks.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of these bills and the chair now recognizes the ranking member.

THOMPSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today the committee will be considering seven bills that share one common feature: a focus on transformation. We have before us legislation that seeks to transform the National Protection and Programs Directorate into an operational agency and rebrand it into the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency.

This measure (ph), if enacted, could help DHS charter new cause (ph) as we carry out its cyber, infrastructure, protection and emergency communications mission. The job of mapping out a new agency is a complicated one.

Mr. Chairman, I have a -- quite a lengthy opening statement but I will take your lead and submit for the record.

MCCAUL:

And we certainly appreciate that and without objection, be entered into the record. By agreement between the chair and ranking member, but committee by unanimous consent, so you use a amendment roster today.

THOMPSON:

I thank the chair for this -- Mr. Chairman...

MCCAUL:

Ranking member is recognized.

THOMPSON:

I look forward to working with you and my Republican colleagues to ensure Congress authorizes funding necessary to carry out a lot of this work and by reserving the right to object -- I will not (ph) -- would the chair please explain our agreement regarding the amendment.

MCCAUL:

I thank the gentleman for agreeing to the use of amendment roster. We have agreed that the bills be open to amendment at any point and that we shall take up amendments in the order listed on the roster.

The chair will allow members to offer amendments listed on the roster out of order to the extent practicable and in a manner not prohibited by House or committee rules.

Amendments not listed on the roster may be considered at the conclusion of the consideration of the roster. The chair would also note that there is a bipartisan agreement on many of these amendments. Members may be permitted to offer their amendments on (inaudible).

THOMPSON:

I thank the chair for the explanation and withdraw my reservation.

MCCAUL:

I thank the ranking member. I now call up H.R. 5390, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency Act of 2016. The bill was circulated in advance and printed copies are available.

The clerk shall designate the bill.

CLERK:

H.R. 5390.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the first reading is (inaudible) the bill's (inaudible) read and open to amendment at any point. I now recognize myself for an opening statement on the bill.

This bill redesignates a National Protection and Programs Directorate, or NPPD, as a Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection Agency. The measure realigns and streamlines the department's cyber- security and infrastructure protection missions to more effectively protect the American public against cyberattacks that could cripple the nation.

The bill establishes the organizational and leadership structure for the agency, including a Cybersecurity Division, Infrastructure Protection Division and Emergency Communications Division and the Federal Protective Service.

Last year Congress enacted the Cybersecurity Act of 2015, which bolstered the cyber-security mission of the department. This bill gives DHS the tools necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

Every day cyber criminals and nation states are looking for vulnerabilities to exploit in companies like Target and Sony, our critical infrastructure sectors and the federal government. And while the complexities of these assaults grows, the steps taken today are crucial towards ensuring our homeland remains ready to defend against these attacks.

Does any other member wish to be recognized on the bill?

LANGEVIN:

Mr. Chairman?

MCCAUL:

Mr. Langevin is recognized.

LANGEVIN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just briefly, I'd like to say a few brief words about the NPBD reauthorization plan.

And first, I wanted to commend you and the ranking member for the great work on this legislation. Over the past decade, the National Protection and Programs Directorates' role in defending the nation and the .gov domain from cyber attacks has grown in concert with the increasing threat to our networks.

And the committee has recognized the NPBD's increased activity in bills like the National Cyber Security Act of 2000 in '14, which authorized the (inaudible) and the Cyber Security Act of 2015, which made NPBD the federal government's primary hub for information sharing.

NPBD is acting in an operational capacity today, and it's clear that it has outgrown its current organizational structure as just a headquarters component.

So, this bill will adapt the statutory framework to embrace NPBD's evolving mission -- an effort that I fully support.

While I understand that the department has a few concerns about the specificity provided by the chairman's language, I think that the bill as whole maintains the broad outline of a structure that both the department and the committee agree will increase effectiveness. And I -- I have a number -- I've had a number of conversations with colleagues in allied nations about their efforts to ensure that the government reflects the ever-increasing cyber-security risks.

And again, I commend the chairman and the ranking member that they continue to focus on this very important issue.

I hope that this reorganization will also help to clarify for private entities whom to call when faced with a breach -- something that we on the committee have frequently heard that there's confusion about.

Finally, I also want to highlight the importance of combining cyber and physical security when conducting risk assessments. On the Armed Services Committee, where I also sit, and serve as the ranking member of the Emerging Threats and Capability Subcommittee that has jurisdiction over cyber there, we take it as a given that every conflict going forward today, and again, going forward will have both a cyber and a traditional kinetic component to it.

And with the growing reliance on internet-enabled technology within critical infrastructure, we must employ the same mindset when looking at vulnerabilities.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, let me again thank you and the ranking member for your work on this important bill. I look forward to supporting it, and I yield back.

MCCAUL:

I thank the gentleman. And thank you for your leadership in this very important issue. And I appreciate your comments.

Any other discussion on the bill?

There being no further discussion, the committee will move to consideration of the amendments on the -- I'm sorry, Ms. Watson Coleman, did you seek to be recognized?

WATSON COLEMAN:

No.

MCCAUL:

OK. Further roster agreement, listed first on the rosters and managers amendment, offered by the chairman.

The clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment to H.R. 5390, authored by Mr. McCaul.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the (inaudible) is dismissed. Now (ph) the chairman now recognizes himself for five minutes to explain the amendment. I hope I don't take the full five minutes.

This amendment makes strategic technical edits to the bill that have been negotiated in a bipartisan manner, and further streamline the department's activities in support of its cyber-security and infrastructure and protection missions.

A year ago, we heard through the media that the department wanted to reorganize its cyber-security and infrastructure protection missions. And over the last year, we've held numerous meetings and listening sessions with the department and outside stakeholders to strengthen the ability of the department to effectively combat these threats.

My amendment furthers the underlying bill's work, elevating the importance of cyber-security and infrastructure protection within the department. The amendment ensures that all the activities of the department that it currently undertakes to support its cyber-security mission remain in one organization.

As we face an ever escalating threats on -- in cyber-security space, it's important that the department has the organization and tools ready to combat these threats to protect the American people. And I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs in the amendment offered by the chairman. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Further roster agreement listed next is amendment number 025, offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Donovan.

Would the gentleman like to offer the amendment?

DONOVAN:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the roster, and ask for its consideration at this time.

MCCAUL:

The clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment to H.R. 5390, offered by Mr. Donovan.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading (ph) is dispensed with.

Mr. Donovan is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

DONOVAN:

I want to thank Chairman McCaul and Ranking Member Thompson for working in a bipartisan manner on this critical issue.

As chairman of the subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications, I am offering an amendment to enhance cyber information sharing with state and major urban area fusion centers.

I recently held a joint hearing with Chairman Ratcliffe and Ranking Members Payne and Richmond, where witnesses stressed the need for improved cyber information sharing.

One of the witnesses, Lieutenant Colonel Kooney (ph) from the New York State Police Department, said that his fusion center does not receive cyber-security intelligence information in a timely manner, which prevents his center from sharing this vital information with agencies, first responders and businesses in my state.

We also heard that sharing cyber-related information with the emergency management and first responder communities is ad hoc at best. I'm concerned that this lack of sharing cyber information with states and localities will create information-sharing stove pipes that could harm our ability to prevent, protect against and respond to a massive cyber attack.

Seventy-eight fusion centers across the United States analyze and disseminate counter terrorism and homeland security information to state and local law enforcement, fire fighters, public health officials and others.

Some fusion centers are proactively beginning to incorporate cyber-security into their operations, and that's a good thing. But more work needs to be done to create a complete cyber threat picture that allow states and localities to accurately prepare for cyber attacks.

My amendment addresses this concern by allowing this Department of Homeland Security to deploy a cyber-security subject matter expertise to local fusion centers. If adopted, this amendment will allow personnel from the cyber-security and infrastructure protection agency, including cyber-security analysts, to deploy to fusion centers across the nation.

It expands upon existing law, which allows personnel from only one office in the current National Protection and Programs Directorate, the Office of Infrastructure Protection to deploy to fusion centers to assist states and localities with critical infrastructure assessments.

By allowing cyber-security analyst to deploy to fusion centers, we can help ensure states have the support needed to improve and sustain their cyber-security capabilities.

I urge adoption of this common-sense amendment and I yield back.

MCCAUL:

(inaudible) yields back. Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

There will be no further discussion. The question now occurs in the amendment offered by Mr. Donovan. All those in favor, signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

Per the roster agreement, listed next is Amendment No. 082 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Payne. I understand the gentleman from New Jersey is unavailable and the ranking member will be offering his amendment.

THOMPSON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Payne has two amendments listed on the roster and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered (inaudible) at this time.

MCCAUL:

With objection (inaudible) the clerk shall report the en bloc amendment.

CLERK:

En bloc amendment to H.R. 5390 offered by Mr. Thompson.

MCCAUL:

Without objection (inaudible) is there any further discussion on the en bloc amendment?

There will be no further discussion. The question now occurs in the en bloc amendment offered by the ranking member for Mr. Payne. All those in favor, signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The en bloc amendment is agreed to.

Per the roster agreement, listed next is Amendment 053 offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. Watson Coleman. Would the gentelady like to offer the amendment?

WATSON COLEMAN:



Thank you. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the roster I'd like -- (inaudible) to be considered.

MCCAUL:

Clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment to H.R. 5390 offered by Mrs. Watson Coleman.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, (inaudible), Watson Coleman is recognized for five minutes.

WATSON COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment seeks to ensure that the (inaudible) Homeland Security Review is informed by the assessments required under this act.

The underlying legislation -- the CIPA director to conduct a national risk assessment and integrated risk assessment on cyber- security and infrastructure threats facing the nation.

I believe that risk assessments are essential to inform the activities of a federal agency. As such, I believe that the risk assessment produced (inaudible) to this act should be considered by the secretary as he seeks to reach determinations about the risk we face as a nation and as in mission areas that should be enhanced or developed to respond to such risk.

My amendment is a complement to H.R. 5385, legislation I'll introduced to require the department to utilize a risk assessment to determine the range of threats facing the homeland and the tactical strategies for addressing those -- risks.

It is imperative that the risk assessments and vision in the bill before us informed (ph) the QHSR specifically because the QHSR outlines a broad range of homeland security threats, especially in the cyber-security space.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and I yield back.

MCCAUL:

Chairwoman (ph) leads back. Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

There will be no further discussion. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by Mrs. Watson Coleman. All those in favor, signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Per the roster agreement, listed next is Amendment No. 366 offered by the gentlewoman from Texas. Ms. Jackson Lee, I understand that the ranking member will offer her amendment.

THOMPSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Jackson Lee has an amendment listed on the roster and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time.

MCCAUL:

Without object (inaudible) the clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment to H.R. 5390 offered by Mr. Thompson.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed (ph) with and is there any further discussion on the amendment?

There will be no further discussion. That question now occurs in the amendment offered by Ms. Jackson Lee. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There are no additional amendments listed on the roster. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

There will be no further amendments. The question now occurs on agreeing to the bill, H.R. 5390, as amended. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the bill is agreed to.

Question now occurs in the reporting the bill, H.R. 5390, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the motion is agreed to.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

I now call up H.R. 5253, the Strong Visa Integrity Secure America Act and discharge the subcommittee on border (ph) maritime security from further consideration. The bill was circulated in advance and printed copies are available. The clerk shall designate the bill.

CLERK:

H.R. 5253.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the first reading is dispensed with. Without objection, the bill is considered read (ph) and open to amendment at any point.

An amendment in the nature of a substitute has been offered by the gentleman from Texas Mr. Hurd. Does the gentleman wish to offer his amendment?

HURD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute listed on the roster and I ask for its consideration at this time.

MCCAUL:

The clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5253 offered by Mr. Hurd.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with and the amendment in the nature of substitute shall be considered based text for purposes of amendment. This amendment was noticed in compliance with the rules.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Hurd.

HURD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We all know the stats: 40,000 foreign fighters from 120 countries, two dozen ISIS-linked plots (inaudible) U.S. But despite improvements in the visa security screening process since 2001, terrorists and other bad actors have exploited the system to enter the U.S. legally.

One successful program established after 9/11 is the Visa Security Program. It is authorized by the Homeland Security Act of 2002, provides for visa security units, which are specially trained ICE Agents (inaudible) to visa issuing posts around the world.

While gaps like those which allowed 9/11 hijackers to obtain visas (inaudible) without a (inaudible) interview have been closed, more can be done, including the deployment of visa security units to high-risk posts based on foreign fighter flow and overall terrorism risk.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute I'm offering today would require DHS to assign (inaudible) visa security units to not fewer than 50 high-risk diplomatic and consular (ph) posts at which visas are issued.

In addition, this amendment in the nature of a substitute authorized the secretary to assign employees to conduct remote visa security vetting to support an additional 50 posts that do not have visa security units in country.

This will allow for increased vetting prior to the applicants (inaudible) interview. Early vetting gives ICE Agents critical (ph) lead time to resolve the derogatory information, coordinate with consul officers to fill in the information gaps, do interviews of those applicants.

The bill under consideration would also effectively maximize the benefit of another DHS program known as PATRIOT, which conducts remote vetting, but only in support of posts where a visa security unit is located.

This provision would expand Patriot to allow ICE Agents to vet visa applicants in a cost-effective manner at locations where the VSUs (ph) do not exist.

This ANS includes several other enhancements providing DHS with a more unifying role in granting security advisory opinions requested by the Department of State and training of console (ph) officers.

This bill makes great strides towards establishing a more reliable entry-exit system, requiring screening of electronic passports, which include embedded chips, which will minimize the threat from look-alike impostors.

In addition, the bill requires facial recognition matching of foreign nationals under the Visa Waiver program to further reduce possibilities for fraud.

This measure also closed the gap to identifying the course of the Boston Bombing investigation. One of the bombers had a paper document known as an I-20, and it was terminated as a result of his dismissal. And he therefore should not have been allowed to reenter the United States on his student visa.

However, he was able to enter through a port of entry in January of 2013. The lapse, according to some reports, this lapse occurred in part because customs and border protection officers at primary inspection points did not have access to that I-20 form.

So, this measure would require screening of the student and exchange visitor information system to be conducted in the primary screening process by CBP, eliminating the gap which allowed this co- conspirator of the Boston Bombing to reenter the country while being out of status.

While interim measurements have been made, screening against the SEVIS program in primary will close all existing gaps in the current entry system.

This legislation is supported by the Security Industry Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the U.S. Travel Association. And I ask unanimous consent that their letters of support be included in the record.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, so ordered.

(UNKNOWN)

We live in a day and an age when terrorist criminals and other actors continue to exploit our legal visa process. This cannot continue to happen; we must close remaining vulnerabilities in the current visa system.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment in the nature of a substitute and the underlying bills -- bill.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

MCCAUL:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment and the nature of a substitute?

Hearing none, further roster agreement listed next on the roster is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Donovan.

Would the gentleman like to offer his amendment?

DONOVAN:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment on the roster, and ask for its consideration at this time.

MCCAUL:

The clerk shall report the amendment.

CLERK:

Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Donovan.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

Mr. Donovan is recognized for fives minutes.

DONOVAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

No longer do terrorists plot using just couriers and caves. Terrorist organizations like ISIS are savvy social media users. They use platforms like Facebook and Twitter to communicate, plot, radicalize, inspire and recruit.

Widespread use of social media by terrorist organizations presents DHS with a challenge, but also an opportunity to mine this open source information to enhance visa vetting.

Unfortunately, our nation's security programs haven't fully caught up with the new and evolving threat. Our nation's visa security protocols do not effectively screen against public social media applications, even though those applications often provide information that slips through the cracks of the regular visa application process.

My amendment would plug this security gap by authorizing the secretary of Homeland Security to review the social media accounts of visa applicants who are citizens of, or reside in, high-risk countries.

This would allow DHS to zero in on individuals who present the greatest risk to our nation, should they be allowed to enter.

My amendment also defines the criteria the secretary shall use in determining high-risk countries, and it instructs the secretary to collaborate with appropriate national laboratories to develop the technology required to facilitate the review.

This technology collaboration is important to screen such platforms and minimizes what would otherwise require significant manpower and law enforcement resources. Screening visa applicants, social media accounts will enhance the visa vetting capabilities of the United States government, both in the early stages of a visa application, at the issuance phase.

It will allow for continued monitoring of non-immigrant visa holders during the time of visa application, issuance, and entry into the United States. This screening will identify derogatory information discovered during the pre-issuance vetting phase, and may lead to an ineligibility finding, which under normal circumstances, would not be known to the United States government.

DHS currently sees value in social media vetting. USCIS is currently piloting the use of social media to review applications for certain immigration benefits.

According to testimony the committee received in February, USCIS has conducted several of these pilots using social media in connection with refugee applications, and is exploring using social media for other adjudications.

My amendment will help DHS build on its work; social media screening and open source vetting will provide DHS the tools it needs to identify threats early and connect dots it otherwise would not. In essence, DHS must utilize the same tools terrorist organizations seek to use against us.

I urge support for this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

MCCAUL:

The gentleman yields back. Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Let me say, I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment. I think this San Bernardino case highlighted the lack of vetting of social media prior to the issuance of a visa, which you've identified and have -- we will correct in this legislation.

Further roster (inaudible) listed next is an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee. I understand the ranking member will offer the amendment.

THOMPSON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have three amendments on the roster, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc at this time.

MCCAUL:

If the gentleman would yield back, I'd like to go back to Mr. Donovan's amendment. We actually have to vote on that so that it's in the bill.

So, the question that occurs on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. Donovan. All of those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The ranking member is recognized.

THOMPSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I have three amendments on the roster, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc at this time.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, so ordered. The clerk shall report the en bloc amendment.

CLERK:

An en bloc amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Thompson.



MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with. And the Ranking Member, Mr. Thompson, is recognized for five minutes.

THOMPSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, these three amendments basically add additional continuity to the visa process.

They strike the greatest extent practical in pursuing any of the information on people making applications. In addition to that, we add the number of citizens of Canada who enter the U.S. without a visa, whose authorized period of stay in the U.S. states terminated before the previous fiscal year, but who remain in the United States.

In other words, we cleared the language with respect to individuals from Canada and their stays here.

I yield back.

MCCAUL:

I thank the ranking member.

Is there any further discussion on the en bloc amendment?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs in the en bloc amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Ms. Jackson Lee.

All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There are no additional amendments listed on the roster. Are there any further amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Let me just say before we vote, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this important bill forward. I think one of the most important things that we do in this committee and the department as well is prohibiting the travel of terrorists from getting into the United States and the proper screening of terrorists from entering the United States.

I think this bill will serve as a sequel to the bill we passed in December, strengthen our visa security efforts abroad and as the same time we'll be protecting the homeland.

So there being no further amendments, the question occurs on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5253 as amended. All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.

Question now occurs on a reporting H.R. 5253 as amended to the House with a favorable recommendation. All those in favor signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The motion is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is weighed (ph) on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

I now call up H.R. 5385. The Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Correction Act of 2016. The bill was circulated in advance and printed copies are available.

The clerk shall designate the bill.

CLERK:

H.R. 5385.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading is dismissed with. The bill is considered read and open to amendment (ph) at any point.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes.

WATSON COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My bill, H.R. 5385, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Correction Act, seeks to improve the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review produced by DHS every four years.

In 2007 this committee passed public law 110-53, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act. Under the act, DHS has required to produce a unified strategic framework for homeland security missions and goals.

The QHSR is supposed to outline specific threats to the homeland and offer tactical strategies for handling those threats based on insight from the entire homeland security enterprise. DHS has produced two QHSRs thus far in 2010 and 2014. The GAO has reviewed each QHSR and identified a number of areas for improvement.

My bill is a product of collaboration between the committee DHS and GAO. Among the key provisions of H.R. 5385 are refinements to the deadline requirements for a more robust stakeholder engagement and better documentation of the factors that informed (ph) the review's findings.

My bill puts a major emphasis on stakeholder engagement by requiring documentation regarding communications with stakeholders and information on how feedback from stakeholders influences the review.

It also seeks to enhance stakeholder engagement by specifying certain key stakeholders to be consulted. To ensure that the risk assessment undertaken to produce the Q -- QHSR is repeatable in future years.

My bill required DHS to retain all information regarding the risk assessment, including data use to generate the risk results and the sources of information to generate the risk assessment.

I appreciate the support that my partner on the Oversight Subcommittee has shown for this bill and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

MCCAUL:

The gentlewoman yields back. Is there any further discussion on the bill?

There being no further discussion on the bill, the committee with move to consideration of the amendments on the roster. For the roster (ph) agreement, listed first is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry. Would the gentleman like to offer his amendment?

PERRY:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk.

MCCAUL:

Clerk shall report the amendment.

PERRY:

Amendment to H.R. 5385 offered by Mr. Perry.

MCCAUL:

With that objection, the reading is dispensed with. Mr. Perry is recognized for five minutes.

PERRY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment requires DHS to identify wasteful, redundant and unnecessary resources that can be redirected to better support other existing capabilities and capabilities when DHS identifies the resources needed to fulfill the department's missions.

The nation is \$19 trillion in debt and DHS has to participate in maximizing all possible efficiencies. DHS has taken steps to improve how it evaluates joint requirements and reduce and eliminate redundant capabilities through the creation of the Department of Joint Requirements Counsel, the JRC.

However, DHS should integrate its -- its unity of effort into the strategic planning process. This amendment requires DHS to reduce duplication and implement waste as part of -- and eliminate waste as part of the QHSR process to make DHS a more efficient and effective organization.

I urge my colleagues to the amendment and I yield (ph).

MCCAUL:

Chairman yields back. Is there any further discussion on the amendment? Ms. Watson Coleman is recognized.

WATSON COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that I appreciate Chairman Perry's offering this amendment to H.R. 5385 that would direct the department to review the redundant wasteful or unnecessary resources identified in the course of the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review preparation. Indeed, it is necessary.

With that, I yield back. Thank you.

MCCAUL:

Gentle -- lady yields back. Is there any further discussion?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs in the amendment offered by Mr. Perry. All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

There are no more amendments listed on the roster. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

There being no further amendments, the question now occurs in agree (ph) to the bill, H.R. 5385 as amended, all those in favor signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the bill is agreed to.

The question now occurs in reporting H.R. 5385 as amended to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

All those opposed, signify by saying "no."

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, the motion is agreed to. Without objection, the motion reconsiders (inaudible) on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

I now call up H.R. 5064, the Improving Small Business Cyber Security Act of 2016 and discharge the subcommittee on cyber-security, infrastructure protection and security technologies from further consideration. The bill was circulated in advance, copies are available. The clerk shall designate the bill.

CLERK:

H.R. 5064.

MCCAUL:

Without objecting, the first (inaudible) dispense with. The bill is considered read and open to amendment at any point. Is there any discussion on the bill?

The committee with move to consideration of the amendments on the roster, per the roster agreement. Listed first is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Richmond. Would the gentleman like to offer his amendment?

RICHMOND:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have two amendments on the roster and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc at this time.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, so ordered. The clerk shall report the en bloc amendment.

CLERK:

An en bloc amendment to H.R. 5064 offered by Mr. Richmond.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

Mr. Richmond is recognized for five minutes.

RICHMOND:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My first amendment to H.R. 5064 seeks to make the bill better conform to this committee's legislative core, the Homeland Security Act of 2002. My amendment specifies that DHS may provide information on cyber-threat indicators, defensive measures, cybersecurity risks, incidents, analysis and warnings to small businesses. Such language conforms to the statutory language that this committee enacted in 2014 and currently exists in the Homeland Security Act.

It also makes the bill consistent with other legislation that comes before this committee by incorporating a small terminology change.

Mr. Chairman, my second amendment gets to what our expectations are of the SBA and DHS as they collaborate to develop a small business development center cyber-strategy as required under the act. It clarifies that SBA's network of small business development centers ought to be leveraged by DHS to disseminate timely cyber-threat and other information to small businesses.

Today, there are nearly 1,000 such centers across the nation, providing no-cost business consulting and low-cost training to small businesses. In New Orleans, the Louisiana Small Business Development Center is an epicenter for entrepreneurial activity. It just makes sense to tap into it.

I encourage my colleagues for vote for my en bloc amendment, and I yield back.

MCCAUL:

The gentleman yields back.

Is there any further discussion of the en bloc amendment? There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the en bloc amendment offered by Mr. Richmond.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There are no additional amendments listed on the roster. Are there any further amendment to the bill?

There being no further amendments, the question now occurs on agreeing to H.R. 5064 as amendment.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The bill is agreed to.

The question now occurs on reporting H.R. 5064 as amended to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the motion is agreed to.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

I now call up H.R. 5388, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2016; H.R. 5389, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2016; and H.R. 5391, the Gains in Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Act, and as unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

Without objection, so ordered.

The bill were circulated in advance. Current copies are available. The clerk shall designate the bill.

CLERK:

H.R. 5388, H.R. 5389, H.R. 5391.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the reading is dispensed with.

The bills are considered read and open to amendments at any point.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Richmond, is recognized for five minutes.

RICHMOND:

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5391, the Gains in Global Nuclear Detection Architecture Act, is a bill to improve the documentation of the planning and prioritizing process for nuclear detection research and development project initiated by the Department of Homeland Security Domestic Nuclear Detections Office, the Transformational and Applied Research Directorate (inaudible).

Preventing terrorists from smuggling nuclear or radiological material to carry out an attack in the United States and is and has long been a top national priority. The Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, or DNDO, has at its core mission to improve our nation's capabilities to deter, detect, respond to, and attribute responsibility for domestic nuclear terrorist attacks that might occur.

As part of this mission, DNDO conducts transformational and applied research and development for the improvement of radiation and nuclear detection devices and forensics. My concern here is that under federal standards for internal control, federal agencies are required to promptly document transactions and significant events when they plan to execute research and development activities.

This is required to maintain their relevance and value to management in the department in controlling operations and making decisions. The Government Accountability Office recently issued a review that concluded that better documentation would help the effectiveness of DNDO's Transformational and Applied Research Directorate. GAO found that DNDO needed to do a better



job of demonstrating more openly how projects are selected for funding within the research and development portfolios can align with the research challenges and identified gaps, especially in the global nuclear direction architecture, or GNDA.

Without documentation to explain how research and development projects align with research challenges, it is hard to determine whether DNDO research investments are positioned to address identified gaps in the global nuclear detection architecture. It is my understanding that DNDO has -- has agreed with the GAO findings and undertaken steps to correct this need and create a path forward.

Enactment of H.R. 5391 will make sure that DNDO takes a systematic approach for evaluating, prioritizing and selecting research topics. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back.

MCCAUL:

The gentleman yields back.

Does any other member wish to be recognized on these bills offered en bloc?

There are no amendments listed on the roster. Are there any amendments to these bills?

There being no amendments, the question now occurs on agreeing to the bills offered.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the bills are agreed to.

The question now occurs on reporting the bills to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the motion is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

This concludes the consideration of bills noticed by the committee for today.

I would like -- before I recognize the gentleman from New York, I would just like to say for the benefit of the committee members that this committee has now passed 80 bills out of committee, which is a record. Only -- the only other committee to pass more legislation out of committee is

the Energy and Commerce Committee. We've had 70 bills pass the House and 16 of these bills have been signed into law by the president.

So, I just want to thank all members on the committee on both sides of the aisle and the staff for what's been a very productive, I think, Congress, at least for this committee.

So with that, I now recognize Mr. Katko.

KATKO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Pursuant to rule 22, clause 1, of the rules of the House, I move that the committee authorize the chairman to offer such motions as may be necessary in the House to go to conference with the Senate on the bills ordered reported by this committee today, or on similar Senate bills.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

THOMPSON:

Mr. Chairman?

MCCAUL:

The ranking member is recognized.

THOMPSON:

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House rule 11, clause 2(L), I ask that members have two calendar days to file with the clerk of the committee supplemental, additional or minority views on each of the bills ordered reported by the committee today.

MCCAUL:

Without objection, so ordered.

There being no further business to transact, the committee stands adjourned.