H.R. 361 — Medical Preparedness Allowable Use Act (Rep. Bilirakis, R-FL)

CONTACT: NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 2, 2015 UNDER A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL

TOPLINE SUMMARY: H.R. 361 would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to allow grant funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to be used for enhancing medical preparedness, medical surge capacity, and mass prophylaxis capabilities. Examples of permissible activities include the purchase of medical kits and diagnostics to protect first responders and victims. This bill would simply codify existing authority.

COST: No Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is available. The CBO estimate for H.R. 1791 can be found here.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Federal Government?** No.
- Encroach into State or Local Authority? No.
- Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No.
- Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: FEMA's Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) and State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) provide grants to state and local governments to prevent, prepare for, protect against, and respond to acts of terrorism. This bill would clarify that SHSGP and UASI funds may be used for medical preparedness. An identical bill (H.R. 1791) was introduced in the 113th Congress and passed in the House on February 3, 2014 by the Yeas and Nays (391-2). The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 1791 can be found here.

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on January 14, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration position is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United

States, which provides Congress the power to make "all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out the constitutional powers vested in the Government of the United States.

H.R. 615 — Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act (Rep. Payne, D-NJ)

CONTACT: NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 2, 2015 UNDER A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL

TOPLINE SUMMARY: <u>H.R. 615</u> would require that the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management to develop policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department of Homeland Security. Section 3 of the bill would require the Department to submit to Congress within 120 days of the enactment of the legislation, a strategy for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications that would include:

COST: No Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is available. The CBO estimate for H.R. 4289 can be found here.

- Information on efforts and activities, including current and planned policies and directives, and training to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department;
- An assessment on the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary for Management to enforce the directives;
- The total amount of funding expended by the Department since November 1, 2012, and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications; and
- Dates upon which Department-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved.

Section 4 would mandate that the Department submit to Congress within 220 days of the enactment of the bill and biannually thereafter, a report on the implementation of these efforts.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Federal Government?** No.
- Encroach into State or Local Authority? No.
- Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No.
- Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: An identical bill (<u>H.R. 4289</u>) was introduced in the 113th Congress and passed in the House on July, 8, 2014 by the <u>Yeas and Nays</u> (393-0). The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 4289 can be found <u>here</u>.

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on January 28, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Homeland Security.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration position is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, clause 3, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

H.R. 623 — Social Media Working Group Act of 2015 (Rep. Brooks, R-IN)

CONTACT: NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

FLOOR SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 2, 2015 UNDER A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE BILL

TOPLINE SUMMARY: <u>H.R. 623</u> would authorize the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish a social media working group in order to provide guidance and best practices to the emergency preparedness and response community on the use of social media technologies before, during, and after a terrorist attack or other emergency.

COST: No Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is available. The CBO estimate for H.R. 4263 can be found here.

The Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Science and Technology would Chair the working group, while a representative from a state or local government entity would serve as co-chair of the group. The working group would be exempt from the <u>Federal Advisory Committee Act</u> (FACA) and would be authorized to hold virtual meetings to fulfill the requirement to meet twice a year.

The legislation would also mandate that the working group submit to Congress, not later than March 30th of each year, a report that: (1) focuses on the best practices and lessons learned on the use of social media during recent response efforts; and (2) provides recommendations on how to improve information sharing and the use of social media by the Department of Homeland Security. The report would include a review of current and emerging social media technologies being used to support emergency preparedness.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS: H.R. 623 would exempt the social media working group from the <u>Federal Advisory Committee Act</u>, which mandates that the public be kept informed with respect to the number, purpose, membership, activities, and cost of an advisory committee.

- **Expand the Federal Government?** No.
- Encroach into State or Local Authority? No.
- Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No.
- Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS: A September 2013 Department of Homeland Security Inspector General report on the Department's use of social media can be found here. An identical bill (h.R. 4263) was introduced in the 113th Congress and passed in the House on by the Yeas and Nays (375-19). The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 4263 can be found here.

COMMITTEE ACTION: This bill was introduced on January 30, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Homeland Security and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: No statement of administration policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.

NOTE: RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.

###