



Committee on
HOMELAND SECURITY
Chairman Michael McCaul

Opening Statement

April 29, 2014

Media Contact: Charlotte Sellmyer
(202) 226-8417

**Statement of Subcommittee Chairman Susan W. Brooks (R-IN)
Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications
Committee on Homeland Security**

**“Stakeholder Assessments of the Administration’s National Preparedness Grant Program
Proposal”**

Remarks as Prepared

For the third year in a row, the President’s budget request has proposed the consolidation of a number of homeland security grant programs, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program, Urban Area Security Initiative, Port Security Grant Program, and Transit Security Grant Program, into a new National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP). In the past, Congress has denied this request due to a lack of detail and the failure to send a legislative proposal.

This year, FEMA shared its legislative proposal and it was a topic of a great deal of discussion at this Subcommittee’s budget hearing at which Administrator Fugate testified. Despite this lengthy discussion, questions remain. As a result, Ranking Member Payne and I sent a letter to Administrator Fugate with a number of detailed questions about the proposal. As requested, we received a response to our inquiry this past Friday and the information will be helpful to our review of the proposal. I ask unanimous consent to insert our letter and FEMA’s response into the record.

Today, we are pleased to receive testimony from a number of stakeholders who would be impacted by the NPGP proposal. Your perspectives will be invaluable to this Subcommittee as we continue to evaluate the potential impacts of this proposal.

To that end, I am interested in hearing your opinions of the proposal this morning, both for and against. If you support the proposal, why? If you oppose it, why? What alternative reforms, if any, would you suggest? Are there any reforms that could be made to the current grants structure that would make it more efficient and better able to meet your needs?

I am also interested in your perspective on how the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and Capability Estimation processes are working. Have the addition of these requirements helped you to better address your security needs?

We know that these grants have made a difference. One need only look to the response to the Boston Marathon bombings just over one year ago to see the contribution. It is for this reason that, as we stated in our letter to Administrator Fugate, any efforts to reform the current system must be thorough, well-informed, and premised on the goal of ensuring that our nation is best able to prevent, prepare for, mitigate, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks.

Before I yield to the Ranking Member, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major County Sheriffs' Association and the National Sheriffs' Association into the record. The letter discusses their perspective on the NPGP proposal, and in particular why it is important to retain the 25 percent law enforcement set-aside. I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the record a letter from the National Fusion Center Association regarding the importance of the set-aside for intelligence and information sharing.

With that, I look forward hearing from our distinguished panel of witnesses and continuing our discussion of the grant programs this morning.

###