

**TSA'S EFFORTS TO FIX ITS POOR CUSTOMER  
SERVICE REPUTATION AND BECOME A LEANER,  
SMARTER AGENCY**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
SECURITY**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JUNE 7, 2012

**Serial No. 112-97**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

79-504 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2013

---

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) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

## COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER T. KING, New York, *Chairman*

LAMAR SMITH, Texas	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas	HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
GUS M. BILIRAKIS, Florida	YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York
PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia	LAURA RICHARDSON, California
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
TIM WALBERG, Michigan	BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
CHIP CRAVAACK, Minnesota	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
JOE WALSH, Illinois	HANSEN CLARKE, Michigan
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania	WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
BEN QUAYLE, Arizona	KATHLEEN C. HOCHUL, New York
SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	JANICE HAHN, California
BILLY LONG, Missouri	RON BARBER, Arizona
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina	
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania	
BLAKE FARENTHOLD, Texas	
ROBERT L. TURNER, New York	

MICHAEL J. RUSSELL, *Staff Director/Chief Counsel*

KERRY ANN WATKINS, *Senior Policy Director*

MICHAEL S. TWINCHEK, *Chief Clerk*

I. LANIER AVANT, *Minority Staff Director*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California	SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
TIM WALBERG, Michigan	DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
CHIP CRAVAACK, Minnesota	CEDRIC L. RICHMOND, Louisiana
JOE WALSH, Illinois, <i>Vice Chair</i>	RON BARBER, Arizona
ROBERT L. TURNER, New York	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi ( <i>Ex Officio</i> )
PETER T. KING, New York ( <i>Ex Officio</i> )	

AMANDA PARIKH, *Staff Director*

NATALIE NIXON, *Deputy Chief Clerk*

VACANT, *Minority Subcommittee Director*

# CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Mike Rogers, a Representative in Congress From the State of Alabama, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Transportation Security .....	1
The Honorable Sheila Jackson Lee, a Representative in Congress From the State of Texas, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Transportation Security .....	2
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security .....	4
The Honorable Joe Walsh, a Representative in Congress From the State of Illinois: Prepared Statement .....	5
WITNESS	
Mr. John S. Pistole, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration: Oral Statement .....	6
Prepared Statement .....	8
FOR THE RECORD	
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security: Letter From Ranking Member Bennie G. Thompson and Hon. Nita M. Lowey .....	16
Letter From John S. Pistole .....	17



**TSA'S EFFORTS TO FIX ITS POOR CUSTOMER  
SERVICE REPUTATION AND BECOME A  
LEANER, SMARTER AGENCY**

---

**Thursday, June 7, 2012**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION SECURITY,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:04 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Mike Rogers [Chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Rogers, Walberg, Walsh, Turner, Jackson Lee, Davis, Richmond, and Thompson.

Mr. ROGERS. This hearing of the Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security will come to order.

This subcommittee is meeting today to examine TSA's efforts to fix its poor customer service reputation and become a leaner, smarter organization.

I want to thank everyone for being at this hearing and I want to thank particularly Mr. Pistole, the administrator, for being here. Sir, you have got a tough job and we appreciate your service.

I think we can agree that every person in this great country of ours has the right to criticize and complain about TSA. But what sets you and I apart from those that just want to criticize the TSA is that we have the obligation to fix the mess.

I know for a fact how dedicated you are to your security, to our security, and your distinguished service to our Nation. But the fact is, over the last 2 years, progress at TSA has come at a snail's pace and in some ways has gone backwards.

It is not enough that the agency is becoming more risk-based. The American people need to see immediate changes that impact them. For example, while the PreCheck program has gotten off to a successful start, we are talking about something that does not benefit most of the average travelers.

So let us start talking about what we can do to fix the broken and outdated policies that do affect most people.

On Monday, Congressman Walsh and I visited Chicago O'Hare Airport. We met with travelers afterwards to discuss their thoughts on TSA. The overwhelming majority of those that attended the meeting expressed frustration that 10 years after 9/11, the TSA is still collecting pocketknives; it is still collecting water bottles; it is still collecting pill cutters with razor blades; and, of course, the travelers are subjected to invasive searches and loss of privacy.

The fact is, these folks are right and reasonably are fed up. Mr. Pistole, in my view, the prohibited items list is the place for you to start taking immediate action to make changes.

Before 9/11, travelers were trained to cooperate with hijackers in those days. History has proven that if you cooperated, the plane would land safely and they would get their money or their prisoners out of jail.

We all know 9/11 changed that mentality. As we adapt and evolve to meet the threats of post-9/11 world, so do the terrorists who continue to evolve in their tactics.

The problem is that TSA is too far behind the curve to see what is coming next. The truth is, Mr. Pistole, I believe you are too bogged down in managing an oversized workforce to mitigate the next potential threat.

That is a chilling reality and despite our efforts here, your technology procurement process is still a mess.

In the case of the TSA's new credential authentication technology, all signs point to what I believe is another wasteful investment. This subcommittee will hold a separate hearing on that technology in 2 weeks. We need to make sure our transportation system is as secure as possible at the lowest cost possible and with the least intrusion to the American taxpayer.

With that, I now recognize the Ranking Member of the subcommittee, the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee for 5 minutes for her opening statement.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much and to the Members who are present and to the Ranking Member and the full committee Chairperson of the full committee, Mr. Pistole, good morning.

I thank the Chairman for this opportunity and I welcome Administrator Pistole and acknowledge that this month marks your 2-year anniversary at TSA. Might I also congratulate you on a great event that you just recently had with your family and wish them well.

I thank you for your leadership and I look forward to continuing to work with you and I also, Mr. Chairman, would like to thank you for holding what I hope will be an informative hearing.

Let me acknowledge as we all do in this business that I have before the Judiciary Committee the attorney general, and so I will be looking to be in this hearing for as long as I can and if Mr. Pistole would accept the fact that I may be not in two places at once but have to be in two places for the responsibilities that I have.

But it is important for us to recognize the leadership of Mr. Pistole and identify opportunities where TSA can do better. I consider this committee one of the hard-working committees, I would like to say hardest-working, and as well that there is a collegiality between myself and the Chairperson, we look forward to working together on a number of issues.

I take issue, however, with the title of today's hearing because I do believe that the 40,000-plus numbers of TSO officers are in fact the majority committed to the service of this Nation.

As I have traveled throughout the Nation's airports, both small, medium, and large, and encountered a number of TSOs and spoken to them about their commitment or how long they have been. A

large number, of course, rose to the occasion after 9/11 as this agency was being created. Many of them are former law enforcement officers. Others are former members of the United States military who just could not sit home while their Nation was in crisis.

That commitment is still present and I believe what is most important is that we instill that commitment and dedication to service to all of the new recruits.

I would ask this committee, would we consider missteps in the United States military as a cause for privatization or suggesting that there are too many persons and that we should indicate it is too cumbersome and difficult?—when we think of the vast numbers of men and women of the United States military in places far away.

For the most part, the Members of Congress recognize that it is important for them to be present where they are.

So I hope that we can view the Transportation Security Agency as our agency. I have said repeatedly we need increased professional development, we need the opportunity for promotion and I think, Mr. Pistole, you have agreed with me on that.

We certainly need to weed out those who are not adhering to the duties that they are mandated to do. When we find fractures in the system, we need to be able to own up to it, stand up to it and get rid of it. I hope that is what you are committed to doing.

But our transportation security system is not a call center or a help desk in a department store. I think we would be remiss if we did not recognize TSA's growth and maturity since being established in the aftermath of 9/11. Let us ask ourselves with the elimination of TSA as proposed by many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, such as the Appropriations Committee—work would make us more secure.

I remind everyone constantly, 9/11 was pre-TSA. I am thankful that we believe, most of us, that we can move forward and improve this organization. We cannot ignore that TSA expands beyond our checkpoint screening operations and has successfully instituted security programs such as Secure Flight, which vets passengers against a no-fly list before boarding a plane.

But there needs to be greater cooperation. No doubt there needs to be cooperation with airlines and airports. We need to be looking at the ingress and egress of airports where individuals can bypass TSA because of so many entrances and become a security threat. TSA does not walk the airports, per se. They are at the screening sites.

Risk-based screening, a shift on the passenger screening experience as TSA evolves and focuses more time on those individuals it knows the least about, that is important and the use of intelligence.

The Transportation Security Grant program, which requires TSA's expertise on mass transit vulnerabilities and funding priorities across all high-risk State and local jurisdictions—in my own community of Houston, this partnership has been vital.

These are just examples of how TSA has established itself beyond just our checkpoint screening. The National goal of ensuring a safe aviation environment can only be achieved through biparti-

sanship in the Legislative branch and cooperation between the Legislative branch and the Executive branch.

As I conclude, I want to look forward to securing from this hearing today, Mr. Administrator, clarifying some of the points discussed earlier this year by TSA officials: The vetting of workers at airports; privatization of Transportation Security Workers; weeding out the bad apples, such as incidents that occurred in the last 2 weeks; the status of TSA's repair station security role; and the role and responsibilities for surface inspectors at TSA, and whether or not we are working with the industry to secure such.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to this hearing and I am hoping that we will have the opportunity to leave this place with a roadmap—a continued roadmap—for the professional service of TSA officers and TSA that are in the front lines, along with Federal air marshals, in the front lines of securing the Nation's future.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence and I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentlelady.

The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member of the full committee, Mr. Thompson from Mississippi.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I welcome Mr. Pistole to our committee and look forward to his testimony.

Mr. Pistole, let me start by commending you for your decision over a year ago to grant collective bargaining rights to Transportation Security Officers at TSA. As proven by the performance of other Federal security officers, collective bargaining does not diminish our security. Collective bargaining can improve workforce morale and productivity and this will positively impact TSA's ability to fulfill its mission to secure our transportation systems.

It is important for all of us not to forget that TSOs are the front-line defense in aviation security. Therefore, we must ensure that these workers are not only properly trained, but are afforded appropriate workplace protections. TSA has come a long way since it was established in 2001. Efforts to improve TSO's morale would lead to increased capacity and professionalism in their ranks and in security.

As you know, Administrator Pistole, I have called on you to reach an agreement on a contract and renew that call to you today. I would also like to take this opportunity to note the administrator's progress on efforts made to improve screening at checkpoint procedures, even though we have yet to pass an authorization bill for TSA in the House during the 112th Congress.

Although TSA faces many operational challenges, it also has made progress on initiatives that are aimed at supporting its mission. However, as the authorizing committee for TSA, it is our duty to produce legislation that ensures proper funding levels and set forth critical programs in Federal law.

Finally, I would like to point out that TSA has not provided Congress a plan for TWIC renewals. As you know, there are some 2.1 million people in this country with TWIC cards and those renewals for those individuals are coming up over the next year or so will be very crucial. We marked up a bill that addressed this in the full committee yesterday.

I would encourage you to move forward with a plan that extends the deadline for renewals until DHS has held up its end of the bar-

gain on deploying readers for the cards. I again say, Mr. Chairman, it was Congress' intent that when the TWIC program was approved that the readers were just a matter of course. But we are some years later and we are not there. So clearly, we have a problem, and I would not want that problem become a burden of the employees who have had to pay \$132.50 to get their TWIC card, which at this point is nothing more than a glorified flashcard.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The other Members of the committee are reminded that opening statements may be submitted for the record.

[The statement of Hon. Walsh follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE WALSH

JUNE 7, 2012

Thank you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing today. I also want to thank the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) Administrator John Pistole for testifying.

I recently held a town hall in my district, the 8th of Illinois, with Subcommittee Chairman Mike Rogers (AL-03). We heard from numerous constituents on their opinions of TSA, the majority of which were what I would categorize as "highly unfavorable." I recognize that many people who attend these types of events do not do so to praise the Government; they come to complain. However, if I did not believe there were enough people with something to complain about in my district, I would not have held this event and invited Chairman Rogers there. What I heard was not surprising: Overwhelmingly, my constituents complained of inconsistencies, bad attitudes, and other inappropriate behavior by Federal transportation screening officers (TSOs), and the list continues. According to my constituents, TSA and its officers are not protecting us nearly as much as they are harassing or inconveniencing us.

What I have surmised from this event and my own experiences flying in and out of O'Hare National Airport almost every week is that TSOs are not doing their work as well as they should, and Americans know it. What bothers me most, however, is that TSA seems to be doing nothing to improve either the work of TSOs or the administration's tarnished image.

When I was elected to Congress, I took an oath to faithfully discharge the duties of office. One of those duties is to ensure Federal agencies are spending the taxpayer dollar wisely. If TSA cannot find a way to do their job to the better satisfaction of the Americans that pay their salaries, I will be leading the charge to find ways to meet our Nation's security needs.

Again, thank you for testifying before us today, and I look forward to your response.

Thank you again Mr. Chairman for what you did in the 8th Congressional District of Illinois and for holding this hearing today.

Mr. ROGERS. Again, we are pleased today to have a distinguished witness before us, Administrator Pistole. John Pistole has been the administrator of the Transportation Security Administration at the Department of Homeland Security since 2010. As TSA administrator he oversees the management of approximately 60,000 employees, the security operations of more than 450 Federalized airports throughout the United States, the Federal Air Marshal Service, and the security for highways, railroads, ports, mass transit, and systems and pipelines. No small job.

The Chairman now is happy to recognize Administrator Pistole for his opening statement for 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN S. PISTOLE, ADMINISTRATOR,  
TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Thompson, and distinguished Members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today.

As we know, TSA's goal is to maximize transportation security and stay ahead of evolving threats, while protecting privacy and facilitating the flow of legitimate trade and commerce.

Chairman Rogers, I would respectfully disagree with your assessments for reasons that I will outline. I think we have made significant progress over the last 2 years, but let me start with the context that this hearing is taking place in.

So this is my first hearing since the disruption last month of the terrorist plot—the latest plot—against the United States, which ended up being an intelligence coup for not only U.S. Government, but foreign security intelligence services. But—and critical here—it shows the determination of terrorists to use unique designs, constructs, and concealment of non-metallic devices, either on a person as a suicide bomber, or in cargoes we have seen, to blow up a U.S.-bound airliner.

This incident highlights the challenges that the men and women of TSA face every day, to keep safe the 1.7 million or so travelers who fly within the United States and from the United States from the 450 airports while we strive to provide the most effective security in the most efficient way.

We are taking a number of steps to achieve those goals. That is why we are continuing to move away from the one-size-fits-all construct that was stood up after 9/11, using intelligence, technology, and training to accomplish this critical mission.

Now, are each of the over 600 million people that we screen each year, or over the 6 billion people that we have screened since our rollout in May 2002, completely satisfied with the manner in which we accomplish our mission? No, obviously not; but the vast majority are.

We have learned where and how we can modify procedures without compromising security. That is why we are transforming who TSA is, and how we accomplish our mission through these risk-based security initiatives, including modified, less intrusive physical screening of World War II veterans on honor flights, children 12 and under, from last fall, and now passengers 75 and older just in the last month.

TSA pre-checks the Trusted Traveler Program, which was mentioned, with nearly 1.5 million people, pre-screened passengers, thus far, including a number of Members of Congress, going quickly through modified checkpoint screening, because we know more about you, about them, based on their voluntary sharing of information with airlines or with global entry—pilots, who are of course the most trusted persons on the aircraft; and in the future flight attendants, members of the armed forces who fight for our freedoms, members of the intelligence community.

Now, we are exploring how we can expand this group of trusted travelers to include many others based on the risk-based, intel-driven premise that the vast majority of travelers are not terrorists and simply want to get from point A to point B safely.

So how are we accomplishing this transformation? In addition to seeking innovations in technology and expanding our canine program, we are focusing on our most valuable resource, our people.

Last fall I announced two important changes at our headquarters to promote excellence in the workplace to complement the new Office of Professional Responsibility, which I set up when I came over from the FBI 2 years ago.

These changes are designed to inculcate the three expectations I have of every TSA employee: Hard work, professionalism, and integrity; and, to ensure accountability when we don't meet those expectations.

So first, we created the Office of Training and Workforce Engagement to centralize leadership and technical training programs. Second, we expanded our ombudsman and travel engagement offices and efforts to focus on our proactive outreach with the traveling public.

So at TSA we employed a workforce as diverse as the traveling public we serve. Approximately 23 percent of our employees have served our Nation honorably in uniform through prior military experience. Attrition was 7.2 percent in fiscal year 2011, contrary to some of these reports that we hear out there. This is a reduction of over two-thirds over the last 5 years.

Recognizing communications as integral to TSA's success, we are providing opportunities to build these skills. We are providing a tactical communications, or TACCOM, course to every officer, supervisor, and manager by the end of this year with over 30,000 officers already trained. Some key concepts and strategies of TACCOM include active listening, including empathy, using voice to communicate clearly, and avoiding the tendency to trade negative comment for negative comment.

Training officials have received strong positive feedback from many officers who apply this training to their jobs. Complementing this training, additional training on the continuing education opportunities available to our workforce at community colleges close to where they work, including schools in Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, and other States. Since our associates program became fully operational in 2010, approximately 2,800 TSA personnel have enrolled.

In April we started specialized classes at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia, designed to incorporate both leadership and technical skills and expectations for supervisory security officers.

We have also established a disability multicultural division within TSA, which is responsible for engaging members of these communities in a proactive fashion.

Then last December, of course, we launched TSA Cares to assist travelers with disabilities and medical conditions prior to getting to the airport.

So in closing, as we strive to foster excellence in the TSA workforce and improve the overall travel experience for all Americans through risk-based security initiatives, we continue to carry out our core mission of providing the most effective security in the most efficient way.

Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before you today.

[The statement of Mr. Pistole follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN S. PISTOLE

JUNE 7, 2012

Good morning Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Jackson Lee, and distinguished Members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today about the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) on-going efforts to foster continued excellence in the TSA workforce and to make air passengers' experience at the checkpoint more efficient without compromising security.

The TSA workforce remains vigilant in carrying out TSA's mission every day. To do so, TSA employs risk-based, intelligence-driven measures to deter and prevent terrorist attacks and to reduce vulnerabilities in the Nation's transportation systems. These measures create a multi-layered system of transportation security to mitigate risk. We continue to evolve our security approach based on intelligence by examining the procedures and technologies we use, how specific security procedures are carried out, and how screening is conducted.

The TSA workforce operates on the front-line in executing the agency's transportation security responsibilities in support of the Nation's counterterrorism efforts. These responsibilities include security screening of passengers and baggage at over 450 airports in the United States that facilitate air travel for 1.8 million people per day; vetting more than 14 million passenger reservations and over 13 million transportation workers against the terrorist watch list each week; and conducting security regulation compliance inspections and enforcement activities at airports, for domestic and foreign air carriers, and for air cargo screening operations throughout the United States and at last point of departure locations internationally.

The transformation of TSA headquarters functions, which I announced last fall, included two important components to promote excellence within the TSA workforce and to address the needs of the traveling public. A new Office of Training and Workforce Engagement (TWE) was created to centralize technical, leadership, and workforce programs that were previously dispersed throughout the agency and to promote processes that engage our employees and empower them to execute TSA's mission. The Office of Special Counsel was expanded to the Office of Civil Rights and Liberties, Ombudsman and Traveler Engagement (CRL/OTE) to ensure that employees and the traveling public are treated in a respectful and lawful manner, consistent with Federal laws and regulations protecting privacy and civil liberties, affording redress, governing freedom of information, and prohibiting discrimination and reprisal while promoting diversity and inclusion.

MAINTAINING A FIRST-RATE WORKFORCE

Before discussing the initiatives being introduced by the new TWE and CRL/OTE program offices, I want to stress that excellence in the workplace begins with a dedicated and professional workforce. While technology and instruction manuals support our efforts, it is our people that protect travelers. Public service requires public trust and demands adherence to the highest ethical and personal conduct standards. As public servants charged with protecting the Nation's vital transportation systems, we owe the traveling public nothing less. All aspects of our workforce regimen—hiring, promotion, retention, training, proactive compliance inspections, investigations and adjudications—are driven by adherence to the highest ethical standards.

TSA employs a diverse workforce that reflects the traveling public we serve. In addition, approximately 23 percent of our employees have served our Nation honorably in uniform through prior military service and our commitment to recruiting and hiring veterans continues, as TSA works with key stakeholders towards that end. We are also proud of the dedication our workforce has to the mission. The agency's Voluntary Attrition Rate, including full-time and part-time employees, was 7.2 percent in fiscal year 2011. This rate is a significant decrease from 18 percent in fiscal year 2004. As TSA marks its 10th anniversary, we are also pleased to report the average length of service for the Transportation Security Officer (TSO) workforce is approximately 6 years.

TRAINING INITIATIVES IMPROVE WORKFORCE CAPABILITIES

A dedicated TSA workforce assures the traveling public that they are protected by a multi-layered system of transportation security that mitigates risk. An effective workforce must be properly trained and good management is a key ingredient in

preserving a motivated and skilled workforce. TSA's new training office has implemented several new initiatives to accomplish this objective.

*Leaders at Every Level.*—TSA has implemented the Leaders at Every Level (LEL) initiative, a structured process designed to identify exceptional leaders at every level of TSA, from TSOs to Federal Security Directors at the airports as well as Headquarters managers. The goal is to identify traits of these exceptional leaders that can be modeled for all leaders and employees through example and training.

Since its inception last year, LEL has used a rigorous process to identify 284 exceptional leaders across all levels of TSA to act as a resource for Senior Leadership to inform their initiatives and decisions. Specifically, we have created a 1-year detail position within the Office of Human Capital for an LEL selectee to provide field insights and experience; two LEL selectees were tapped to serve as Subject Matter Experts in informing the new supervisor's training course; and all exceptional leaders were asked to provide leadership stories that will be shared agency-wide to model desired leadership characteristics for the next generation of agency leaders. Moving forward, we intend to provide further opportunities for Senior Leadership to tap into the LELs' unique insights and empower LELs to directly reach out and support their colleagues throughout TSA.

In addition, TSA has implemented a new four-tier performance management program for non-TSOs. This effort enables the workforce to actively engage in developing their annual performance goals in collaboration with their supervisors while promoting two-way communication between employees and their supervisors throughout the performance year. This program ultimately provides a mechanism to proactively identify opportunities to improve employee performance.

*Communications Skills Development Course.*—Communications is paramount to TSA's success, and the agency is providing its officers with training opportunities to improve their communications skills with the travelling public. A course titled "TACCOM"—an acronym for Tactical Communications—is an interactive communications skills development course that will be delivered to every officer, supervisor and manager by the end of this year.

TSA's headquarters training officials have received many unsolicited testimonials from those who have completed the TACCOM course, highlighting how the principles, tools, and techniques covered during this course have not only helped employees on the job, but also in their personal life. To date, almost 60 percent of the nearly 50,000 employees who will be required to participate in this 1-day 8-hour instructor-facilitated training course have completed it, and the feedback continues to be very positive.

*Emphasis Upon Supervision.*—In July 2012, TSA will also launch a new course titled "Essentials of Supervising Screening Operations (ESSO)" for Supervisory Transportation Security Officers (STSOs) only. The ESSO course is designed to incorporate both technical and leadership expectations and operational responsibilities for STSOs. This course will help STSOs understand their individual leadership strengths and weaknesses and identify the most effective ways to communicate with each person they come in contact with. STSOs will also have an opportunity to strengthen their customer service skills by understanding the need to model appropriate interactions with their team, the traveling public, and stakeholders.

The learning objective for the customer service module, as well as the ESSO course overall, is to demonstrate how important it is for STSOs to lead by example, and how to provide effective feedback to their team members.

#### CRL/OTE PROMOTES POLICY OF INCLUSION

As mentioned previously, TSA's new CRL/OTE office is responsible for ensuring that TSA employees and the traveling public are treated in a fair and lawful manner, consistent with Federal laws and regulations protecting privacy and civil liberties, affording redress, governing freedom of information and prohibiting discrimination and reprisal, while promoting diversity and inclusion.

As a result of the transformation, the role of the ombudsman has been heightened to now report directly to the administrator. While the ombudsman is primarily focused on providing neutral, informal, and confidential problem resolution services to employees for issues, concerns, and conflicts involving TSA policies or personnel, the ombudsman is also available to address passenger concerns.

We also established a new Disability and Multicultural Division within CRL/OTE by merging our disability and multicultural programs that were in two different offices. This new division is responsible for ensuring, in collaboration with the DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties (CRCL), that TSA security screening policies, procedures, and practices comply with all applicable laws, regulations, Executive Orders, and policies and do not discriminate against travelers on the basis of

disability, race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, or gender. It is also responsible for developing, managing, and strengthening partnerships and outreach with community leaders from disability- and multicultural-related interest groups, DHS Components, the DOD Wounded Warrior Program, and the CRCL. CRL/OTE provides advice on the impact or potential impact of new and existing screening procedures on members of the disability and multicultural communities, and collaborates with CRCL and the appropriate TSA offices to mitigate these impacts.

*“TSA Cares”*.—TSA strives to provide the highest level of security while ensuring that all passengers are treated with dignity and respect. The agency works regularly with a broad coalition of disability and medical condition advocacy groups to help understand their needs and adapt screening procedures accordingly. All travelers may ask to speak to a TSA supervisor if questions about screening procedures arise while at the security checkpoint.

Last December, TSA launched “TSA Cares,” a new helpline number designed to assist travelers with disabilities and medical conditions prior to getting to the airport. Travelers may call the TSA Cares toll-free number with questions about screening policies and procedures as well as what to expect at the security checkpoint. When a passenger with a disability or medical condition calls TSA Cares, a representative will provide assistance either with information about screening that is relevant to the passenger’s specific disability or medical condition or the passenger may be referred to disability experts at TSA. This additional level of personal communication helps ensure that even those who do not travel often are aware of our screening policies before they arrive at the airport.

Since its inception, TSA has provided information to all travelers through its TSA Contact Center (TCC) and Customer Service Managers in airports Nation-wide. TSA Cares will serve as an additional, dedicated resource for passengers with disabilities, medical conditions or other circumstances, or their loved ones who want to prepare for the screening process prior to flying.

*Expanded TCC Hours*.—In an effort to further enhance our support for travelers, we recently expanded the hours of the TCC. The TCC can provide information in response to questions, concerns, or complaints regarding security procedures; reports and claims of lost, stolen, or damaged items; and programs and policies. TCC operators are trained to address passengers’ questions about screening in order to resolve passengers’ concerns. The expanded hours are now Monday—Friday, 8 a.m.—11 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST); and weekends and Federal holidays, 9 a.m.—8 p.m. EST. In fiscal year 2011, the traveling public contacted the TCC more than 750,000 times.

#### RBS AND TSA PRECHECK CONTINUE TO EXPAND

As you know, last Fall TSA began developing a strategy for enhanced use of intelligence and other information to enhance a risk-based security (RBS) approach in all facets of transportation, including passenger screening, air cargo, and surface transportation. At its core, the concept of RBS demonstrates a progression of the work TSA has been doing throughout its first decade of service to the traveling public. Our objective is to mitigate risk in a way that effectively balances security measures with privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties concerns while both promoting the safe movement of people and commerce and guarding against a deliberate attack against our transportation systems.

RBS in the passenger screening context allows our dedicated TSOs to focus more attention on those travelers we believe are more likely to pose a risk to our transportation network while providing expedited screening to those we consider pose less risk. Through various RBS initiatives, TSA is moving away from a one-size-fits-all security model and closer to its goal of providing the most effective transportation security in the most efficient way possible.

The most widely known risk-based security enhancement we are putting in place is TSA PreCheck™. Since first implementing this idea last fall, the program has been expanded to 15 airports, making it possible for eligible passengers flying from these airports to experience expedited security screening through TSA PreCheck™. The feedback we’ve been getting is consistently positive. TSA pre-screens TSA PreCheck™ passengers each time they fly through participating airports. If the indicator embedded in their boarding pass reflects eligibility for expedited screening, the passenger is able to use the PreCheck™ lane. Currently, U.S. citizens flying domestically who are qualified frequent fliers of American Airlines, Delta Air Lines, and Alaska Airlines, or members of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP) trusted traveler programs, such as Global Entry, may be eligible for expedited screening at select checkpoints. TSA is actively working with other major air carriers such as United Airlines, US Airways, and Jet Blue to expand both the number

of participating airlines and the number of airports where expedited screening through TSA PreCheck™ is provided. By the end of 2012, TSA plans to have TSA PreCheck™ operating at many of the Nation's busiest airports.

TSA PreCheck™ travelers are able to divest fewer items, which may include leaving on their shoes, jacket, and light outerwear, and may enjoy other modifications to the standard screening process. As always, TSA will continue to incorporate random and unpredictable security measures throughout the security process. At no point are TSA PreCheck™ travelers guaranteed expedited screening.

#### CONCLUSION

As we strive to foster excellence in the TSA workforce and continue to seek ways of improving the overall travel experience for the traveling public through risk-based security initiatives, we must always remember that our success is defined, in large part, by the professionalism and dedication to duty of our people. Whether it is for business or for pleasure, the freedom to travel from place to place is fundamental to our way of life, and to do so securely is a goal to which everyone at TSA is fully committed. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I am pleased to address any questions you may have.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Administrator.

As we go into the questions period I want to remind the Members we will take as many rounds of questions as you want to have, but I want to adhere to the 5-minute rule. I will enforce it on myself and everybody else. I just want you to know we will nudge you to ask questions as many times as you want to ask, but we are going to stay to the 5-minute rule.

I will start with my questions first. Mr. Pistole, you know, I see in my town hall meetings, and again, I mentioned a few minutes ago, I was in Chicago O'Hare this Monday. I am just telling you, it is palpable. The American people are just really disgusted and outraged with the department that they see is bloated and inefficient.

You and I talk on a regular basis. You know I have shared with you privately that the department has got a bad image problem. My question to you is why can't it move more quickly to remedy these? You gave a laundry list of things there that are initiatives that are in place. But it is moving at a snail's pace. Why?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, thank you, Chairman, for recognizing that we are making progress, just not at the pace that the American people would like to see.

Mr. ROGERS. Not just like to see. It is unacceptable.

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, I disagree with that, Mr. Chairman, respectfully from the standpoint of, if we put something in place too quickly, as we have been so criticized over the years for, say, rolling out technology before we got it right, or new protocols before we got it right.

If it implicates security in a negative way, then that is the worst outcome, because if terrorists can exploit a vulnerability because of something that we rushed to get out, then that doesn't serve any of us.

Well, the bottom line is we have to provide the best possible security. The question is how can we do that in the most professional way, the most efficient way? That is why I appreciate working with the committee to say these risk-based security initiatives that we are taking are making a difference.

I think if you ask any of the 1.5 million people who have been through PreCheck, including, again, a number of folks here in the room, I think they would say it is a very positive experience. It is

a step in the right direction, and we are working aggressively to try to expand that population base.

Mr. ROGERS. Again, I acknowledge the list of programs that it has recently started are good. But they should have been started earlier. They need to be moved along, a much more rapid pace.

You have also had me talk with you privately about how strongly I feel that the department is bloated with personnel. I am of the opinion it could reduce its ranks by 30 percent to 40 percent, and still be able to do the job just as effectively if you had control over who the remaining 60 percent or 70 percent of the people were.

I also believe that if we had that leaner, smaller workforce, the public would have greater confidence, because the public is upset when they go in the airport and see all these people standing around doing nothing. Then the ones they do interact with seem unprofessional.

I feel like that if we had a smaller workforce, it would be easier for you to get them professionally trained, because it would be a smaller group of people. The savings, you realize, from making those reductions, would pay for the training.

You just mentioned that you would like to see a more professional and efficient workforce. We all would. My question to you is: Do you agree that we could reduce the workforce by 30 percent, and still be able to do the job if you got to pick the people?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, that is a very challenging proposition from a number of standpoints. So the fact is, after the Congress, in the enabling legislation said, "Go out and stand up this workforce in a year's time," so TSA went out and hired 50,000 people in a year's time, and had them out at the checkpoints working within that year's time—huge undertaking.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree.

Mr. PISTOLE. So the challenge now is then, how do we move forward in the second decade of TSA to address those concerns that you have raised? I would note that most people who would come to a town hall on something like that are probably not there to compliment something. Most people who want to show up for something want to offer constructive criticism or otherwise.

Mr. ROGERS. I hear it everywhere. I mean, family get-togethers, church. I mean, people—as soon as you mention "TSA," a light bulb goes off, and people start venting their anger. You know, I have talked with you about—it is not only a problem with the American people being upset. You have got an image problem in the Congress.

Half the Congress wants to just get rid of the department, because they think it is useless. You and I know it is not the case. I mean, you have done some very good things, some very effective programs.

The truth is we have to have airport screening. We have to have our port security at our sea ports, our trucking systems, our pipelines. But until we get the department to where the American people have confidence in it, you got a big problem.

Mr. PISTOLE. I agree, Chairman. I appreciate the concern. I believe that these initiatives that we have undertaken that are involving more and more people, and as we try to expand it to the less-frequent travelers, those everyday travelers, we have seen

record enrollment in global entry, that anybody can sign up for, \$100 for 5 years. They are eligible at 15 airports now to go through—

Mr. ROGERS. Those are good programs. I want to get back to my question. My time is almost up. Do you agree that you could dramatically reduce your workforce now that it is not the first year—you had a decade—that you could dramatically reduce the 46,000 personnel that you have got as screeners, and still do the job just as effectively, if not more professionally and effectively?

Mr. PISTOLE. No, I don't agree with that. That is a huge number. That would take a significant assessment on the one hand. If the question is how would that in practicality—so it is good to talk about theoretically, and say, "Yes, it could do that."

Mr. ROGERS. My time is expired. I recognize the Ranking Member for any questions she may have.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the Chairman very much.

I want to make the Chairman happy, Mr. Pistole. The thing that I have said to you over and over again—and as you well know, I speak quickly and I am going to be pointed in my questions. I just want you to say, "Yes."

You have got to tell TSA's story. I have said that over and over again. We have got to stop being shy, and add to the list of horror stories—which, they do exist as you well know—some of the great examples of actions by TSA agents, TSOs at the gate helping passengers, being sensitive to the elderly. The story has to be told.

Can I just ask a simple question? Do you see that as valuable to do, and will you be looking forward to try, and doing more of that—when I say "you"—your team?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. All right. Let me move forward. As you know, the Appropriations Committee has provided out of your dollars, \$15 million above the President's request for privatized screening operations.

You have testified that operating a dual public-private model cost taxpayers more than if the entire system is Federalized. Do you recommend that \$15 million at issue, and could it be directed to enhance other security operations?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, there are a number of answers to that, Ranking Member. As you know, the bottom line is, if there was additional money available for other security programs, whether in surface or whatever it may be, that would obviously be helpful. But the whole issue of the privatized airports, we are working through those issues now in terms of applications. The bottom line is—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Did you say that that dual system would cost the taxpayers more?

Mr. PISTOLE. It does currently, yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. All right. Thank you, Mr. Pistole. The issue of surface inspectors, the question of the program, surface inspector program, we had testimony here last week that we can do a better job. But if the surface inspector program were to be cut today by \$20 million, how would that hinder the mission of the program?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, two of the key accomplishments in areas that have provided tangible security results from the surface transportation inspectors has been the reduction in the toxic inhalation

hazard, from freight rail, including within a mile of where we are sitting right now, that over the last several years, because of TSA working with industry, have been able to reduce those toxic hazards in the freight cars. Again, just close by here. That is one area.

Another area is the base assessment that we have worked with metropolitan transit authorities to enhance their security in a more efficient way by focusing on the key vulnerabilities, addressing—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So the \$20 million would undermine the progress. Would you commit to me as well of engaging with industry to make sure the surface inspectors are trained to the industry, or to the rail system that they are looking at?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let us go to the Known Crewmember Pilot Program. We know that the Senate and other Members have joined in asking for flight attendants to be included in that. In light of the bipartisan, bicameral support for the inclusion of flight attendants in a Known Crewmember Program, will you commit today to use your executive authority to expand the program accordingly, review it, and see how that could be implemented?

Mr. PISTOLE. I think, as you know, Madam, had been reviewing that. Obviously, we started Known Crewmember with the pilots. We are working through the issues with the flight attendants. There are a number of other aspects to that. But yes, I commit to doing that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As you well know, we have had a number of cabin security issues. I have asked the Chairman for a cabin security hearing. I look forward to working with him to securing that hearing.

One incident in particular that obviously was unique, but involved an airline pilot in the mix. There were fortunately, among the other families, women. There were some ex-NYPD officers. But the restraints broke. They were so aged that they broke. My question to you is, in the substantial cut that we face in the appropriations bill dealing with FAMs, how would this substantial reduction in FAM stress the mission for in-cabin security?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, obviously, reduction in FAM coverage is a potential. I say “potential,” because we don’t know; but a potential reduction in aviation security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So \$50 million that is now reduced out of FAM’s budget, how would that impact—

Mr. PISTOLE. That reduces aviation security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So what are you doing to assist with airlines? Obviously, you know, because TSA is the first line, about their in-cabin security, i.e., equipment, et cetera?

Mr. PISTOLE. Sure. So of course, over the years we provided training obviously for pilots, the flight attendants, and the entire flight crew. Then the airlines have their—they have taken that in terms of additional training. They actually provide the restraints that you talk about. So we do not regulate the exact type of restraints that they would require to have on-board. But it is up to them to actually—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me, as my time is ending, make sure that they are doing it. My last point just to make, you are looking at

how you deal with the elderly and children. Is that not right? I think that is crucial that you deal with that issue.

Mr. PISTOLE. Right. Absolutely; we have instituted new policies for children 12 and under last fall. We have instituted new policies for 75 and older last month; and so all those individuals would go through an extruded physical screening, less-intrusive screening, because they are in a lower-risk category.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the Chairman for—I hope to return.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you. Chairman recognizes Mr. Turner of New York for any questions he may have.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good to see you again, Mr. Pistole. How are you? Some time ago we talked about training and behavioral analysis. How do you select these people? A good deal of judgment and tact is required, and an overriding common sense, which we all know is not that common.

Are any of the collective-bargaining provisions impeding how these people are selected?

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, Congressman. So let me answer the last question first. No, there has been nothing impeding that from a collective-bargaining perspective. We go through a selection process. Obviously, we look for volunteers of those who have the aptitude.

Then we do a screening process of them to assess whether they would be a good candidate, based on some of those criteria you mentioned, including common sense, and the ability just to engage with somebody in conversation. We then put them through a training.

For those that we have at Boston and Detroit who are engaged in what we call the “Assessor Program,” they then go through an additional training regimen, which is designed to be the most comprehensive that we have within TSA and the department, to say what are their abilities to discern what a person’s intent is by, again, just a brief conversation.

It may be as much as not what the actual answer, but how that person—their body language, their eye contact, some of those things that are known in law enforcement, of course, in terms of just being able to engage somebody so all those things are factors that we look at as we try to assess who our best people are to be those behavior detection and those assessor officers.

Mr. TURNER. How long does it take to, in your judgment, to train one of these people?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, so the assessors, which are—if you want to call them a super, you know, behavior detection officer in Boston and Detroit have been through not only—they are all behavior detection officers to start with—I believe everyone is.

Then, they go through a 40-hour training course which is tested, graded, and most people make it through, some do not if you don’t pass, if you will.

This is based on some world-wide best practices, without identifying specific countries, but world-wide best practices on what is the best way to engage a passenger in a verbal and a, you know, a non-hands-on approach.

So they go through this 40-hour training and, then, they have on-the-job training to assess, okay, you made it through the training all right, but are you actually doing this as we would like in real life? So we have it in the two airports now, in terms of the Assessor Program. We have not expanded that yet because of one the questions is: What is our return on investment? So we put people in this position, what type of detection are we getting and what is that return on investment?

Mr. TURNER. To date, have we found the speeds to process up of screening and moving that line along?

Mr. PISTOLE. It does not speed the process, but we have been able to make some modifications. For example, is it the document checker, who first checks the travel documents and the passport, can that person do some of this or does it need to be a separate officer? So we have been able to make some refinements based on that.

It takes, typically, from 20 to 30 seconds for this conversation to take place so it doesn't expedite the process, but it is another layer of security that helps us.

And is particularly noteworthy in light of the intelligence from last year where terrorists were talking about surgically-implanted devices so where they are talking about not just underwear bombs, as we have seen, but actually taking explosives and having the suicide bomber agree to have that device surgically implanted.

A behavior detection officer and assessor may be the best layer of security we have to engage that person and see whether there may be something about that person before they ever make it on a plane. So those are some of the options we look at.

Mr. TURNER. All right. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman now recognizes the Ranking Member of the full committee, Mr. Thompson, for any questions he may have.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like unanimous consent to enter into the record an exchange of letters between Mr. Pistole and myself.

Mr. ROGERS. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

LETTER FROM RANKING MEMBER BENNIE G. THOMPSON AND HON. NITA M. LOWEY

MAY 31, 2012.

The Honorable JOHN S. PISTOLE,  
Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, 601 S. 12th Street, Arlington, VA 20528.

Dear ADMINISTRATOR PISTOLE: As you know, Transportation Security Officers (TSOs), the men and women on the front lines of our Nation's aviation security efforts, fought for nearly 10 years to secure collective bargaining rights. As the main Members of Congress who advocated for collective bargaining rights for TSOs, we heralded your February 2011 decision to confer TSOs those critical workplace rights. That decision cleared the way for an election that resulted in the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) being named the exclusive representative for TSOs nearly 1 year ago.

For the past 3 months, the Transportation Security Administration has been engaged in negotiations with AFGE over a contract. This process is at a critical juncture. Unless you resolve outstanding issues and reach agreement on a final contract within the next 30 days of face-to-face negotiations, outstanding issues will be put before a unitary dispute resolution system that would further delay implementation of critical workplace rights for TSOs. Now is the time for you to show leadership and personally commit yourself to securing a timely and fair agreement and imple-

menting a third-party grievance review process for TSOs. By doing so, you will deliver on the expectations of the hard-working and committed men and women who put their trust in you when they participated in the elections nearly a year ago.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Should you want to discuss this matter with us or have any further questions on this matter, please contact me or Mr. I. Lanier Avant, Staff Director, Committee on Homeland Security, or Dana Miller, Legislative Assistant and Counsel for Congresswoman Lowey.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security.*

NITA M. LOWEY,  
*Member, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Committee on Appropriations.*

---

LETTER FROM JOHN S. PISTOLE

JUNE 6, 2012.

The Honorable BENNIE G. THOMPSON,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC 20515.*

Dear CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter of May 31, 2012, co-signed by Congresswoman Lowey. I appreciate your continuing interest in the status of collective bargaining negotiations with the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), and your support as we move forward with this effort.

On June 1, 2012, TSA and AFGE received a decision from the Panel of Neutrals regarding whether the contract ratification and referendum process should be included in collective bargaining negotiation ground rules. AFGE initiated this proceeding, arguing that negotiated ground rules should include this referendum process. The ruling held that, because my Determination of February 4, 2011, did not expressly exclude the contract ratification and referendum process from negotiation ground rules, it was appropriate to include that item as part of the ground rules. In their argument before the Panel, AFGE asserted that ground rules include any collective bargaining process from beginning to end, and are not restricted to just the period of negotiation over contract provisions. This traditional view expands the ground rules beyond what I had envisioned when issuing the Determination, and the ruling has broader impact beyond negotiations on the 11 specific topics subject to collective bargaining.

The Panel remanded the ratification and referendum proposal back to the two parties for negotiation and inclusion in ground rules. As a result of the Panel's decision, we are working to complete the ground rules negotiations consistent with the Panel's ruling. We are simultaneously negotiating on the actual contract provisions. Discussions with AFGE National leadership continue on other topics outside the scope of the Determination, including a third-party review process for certain matters.

In previous conversations, I've shared with you my belief that the long-term effectiveness of our counterterrorism and security responsibilities is inextricably linked to a motivated and engaged front-line workforce. I remain steadfast in my opinion that a union, operating within the framework of my Determination, can play a constructive role to heighten the level of employee engagement and improve mission performance. My aim remains to conclude an agreement with AFGE as soon as practical that represents the collective interests of our dedicated and hard-working TSO workforce.

I look forward to your continued interest and support of TSA and the changes we are making to become a high-performing counterterrorism organization. An identical response has been sent to the co-signee of your letter, Congresswoman Lowey. If you require any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly or Ms. Sarah Dietch, Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs[.]

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. PISTOLE,  
*Administrator.*

Mr. THOMPSON. As well as unanimous consent to enter into the record the arbitration results relative to negotiations between TSA and AFGE.

Mr. ROGERS. Without objection, so ordered.\*

Mr. THOMPSON. Relative to that collective bargaining effort and the fact TSOs have selected a bargaining representative.

Mr. PISTOLE. Can you provide the subcommittee your assurance that TSA will negotiate with AFGE in accordance with the determination and that you are committed to reaching a resolution on a contract through the regular negotiating process?

Mr. PISTOLE. Absolutely, Congressman Thompson. I am personally and we have committed to that and we are working diligently to reach that agreement.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you. Taking off from Mr. Turner's comments about behavior detection officers, you know, GAO looked at that spot program and we spend about a billion dollars of taxpayer's money putting this program together.

If we look at who we have detained, have you made an assessment of whether or not the original intent of the program is being met by the people we are detaining?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, the short answer is yes, it adds value as another layer of security at U.S. airports. The question is, again, that return on investment. Is it something that we should expand beyond—for example, the assessor program, beyond the two airports we are in as the most robust layer of security and I am still assessing the information from there?

So we have identified a number of people who exhibited behavior anomalies, if you will, suspicious behavior things and they have been people who, for example, had false documents on them, were illegal aliens, perhaps had outstanding criminal warrants for them.

So we have identified people and law enforcement has been able to step in and arrest, detain those people. One of the questions we get, well we haven't identified any terrorists, and I think that is because of the deterrent nature of the U.S. Aviation Security system, the protocols we have in place.

Every threat we have seen since 9/11, to aviation, has been from overseas whether it is Richard Reed, the shoe-bomber, whether it is a liquids plot in 2006 from London, whether it is the——

Mr. THOMPSON. So your testimony is that the billion-dollar investment, even though we have not caught a terrorist, we have caught people with visa overstays or what have you is worth the investment?

Mr. PISTOLE. I believe it is, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that the intent of the program?

Mr. PISTOLE. The intent is to deter terrorists and if it doesn't deter, then to catch them because we haven't had any actual terrorist try to get on a flight here in the United States, even though some people talk about well, what about Faisal Shahzad, the Times Square bomber. He was a fleeing felon, if you will, as opposed to a terrorist trying to do something to the flight.

Mr. THOMPSON. I expect you to defend your program. Now, GAO also has said, well, maybe we ought to have a fresh set of eyes look at it. Have you thought about having a third-party entity look at it as GAO suggested?

---

\*The document has been retained in committee files.

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes. I mean I think there is strong validation world-wide from some of the premiere security services in the world that do this type of work. But as to actually having any outside entity come in to do an independent validation, I have not taken that step, if that is what you are suggesting.

Mr. THOMPSON. GAO suggested it. Say, you know, in TSA's mind, it is a successful program, but outside of TSA, you have had no outside validation.

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, yes we have. I thought you meant a new study. So we have, for example, the S&T, Science and Technology, part of the department.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, no—

Mr. PISTOLE. You mean outside the department?

Mr. THOMPSON. Outside the department.

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, we have not paid for an independent third-party review to come in and assess the program.

Mr. THOMPSON. Last point is the TWIC card is a real issue. We have about 2.1 million people in this country with a card, over time will expire. Do you commit yourself to addressing that expiration before those times come?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, gentlemen.

The Chairman recognizes Mr. Richmond for any questions he may have.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Ranking Member, I will go straight to Congressman Thompson's last question because I think he was kind of rushed and wanted to get the commitment.

I represent New Orleans, Louisiana and the Port of South, Louisiana, Port of New Orleans, five or six major rail lines and TWIC issue is very important for us.

When you look at the loss of time of people going to renew the card and having to go twice and I think the major issue is the need for renewal and the need to go twice in order to get the card.

Is there a plan in place to address both of those issues, especially since we don't have the readers?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, Congressman, thank you. In recognizing the importance, especially to your district, yes, there has been a lot of very good work done.

We are very near to announcing what that plan which addresses those issues in a way that still provides adequate security in force to have validated cards, but also addresses issue that you have raised in a way that balances the individual needs with the security needs.

Mr. RICHMOND. Getting back to, I guess, the subject of this committee and I agree with the Ranking Member of the subcommittee that I think the title is unfair to you.

In your experience and any data surveys that you have seen, is your approval rating or customer satisfaction reputation that much different from any normal police department, meter maid, or anyone else who has to enforce laws that are uncomfortable or inconvenient?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, I think, in large part, we are defined by anecdotes. So of the 1.7, 1.8 million who travel every day, I am not aware of a complaint yesterday or perhaps the day before so think it is just part of the sheer numbers that we deal with.

With over 630 million people in a year, we are not going to have 100 percent customer satisfaction where every single person believes they received the best possible security screening. So I think that is just a factor of the numbers.

That being said, it is our goal to provide most effective security in the most professional way to make sure everybody gets safely from point A to point B, but it is done in a way that it recognizes the privacy and civil liberties of every traveling person.

It is something that, by definition, our job can be confrontational and so people may not agree with that. What we are working on, the training programs, the technology improvements to try to become less invasive and yet more thorough; all these things are designed with that outcome.

Not that it is a popularity contest, obviously, but it is something that we want to make sure we can assure the traveling public and, obviously, committees of oversight to say, yes, we are providing the most effective security in the most efficient way.

It doesn't happen overnight, change doesn't happen overnight, but we have instituted changes that I believe are addressing the committee's concerns and the traveling public's concerns in a way that affects the vast, vast majority, again, recognizing that there will be individuals who are not fully satisfied.

Mr. RICHMOND. Then as you move to being smarter—and one of my concerns and I probably different from many of the Members on the committee, but as you reduce the level of screening for seniors and infants, do you worry about creating an opportunity for them to be used as mules and voluntarily or involuntarily and is that a concern?

Mr. PISTOLE. That is a concern, Congressman. We have seen incidents around the world where people have been used unwittingly, as you said, particularly, well several incidents where that has happened so we have to be mindful of that and that is why when we describe TSA as being one of the multiple layers of security for the U.S. Government, the key enabled for all of this is intelligence on the front end.

So this most recent plot involving the underwear device part two, that intelligence crew I talked about, the Yemen cargo plot that was disrupted, that was all based on intelligence. So it is not like we are operating in a vacuum over here. So if somebody is going to use a child or an elderly person, we are working in close concert with the rest of the U.S. intelligence and law enforcement communities to make sure that we have information about that.

We will always keep random and unpredictable screening as part of it and everybody is still going through some physical screening, it is just a question of: Can we do it more smartly?

Mr. RICHMOND. Very quickly, I only have about 20 seconds left. Customer satisfaction, do you have any idea where you are in terms of your approval rating or customer-satisfaction rating?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, well again so—

Mr. RICHMOND. If you have a number, it would be great.

Mr. PISTOLE. So I know in terms of the calls to our TSA contact center, let us say a half million, 525,000 calls thus far this year—over half of those are just for information; 7 percent of the calls that we receive at this contact center are complaints. So most are just asking for information about screening protocols and things like that, 7 percent are complaints. I think last year, it was 6 or it was 6 percent now, 7 percent last year I have had to give to give the exact data.

Mr. RICHMOND. My time is up but I would say it is far better than the 13 percent approval rating for Congress.

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. I wouldn't bet on it.

One of the things you could do, I mean he asked a very legitimate question. I think it would be good for y'all to do—there are all kinds of survey companies that will do surveys for you on customer satisfaction. I think it would be good for y'all to hire one to go out and ask the traveling public what they think of TSA, what they would suggest.

But I want to go back to what I am suggesting and that is y'all get leaner.

You said that you thought 30 to 40 percent reduction in personnel was too much. What is a good number? Keep it in mind, you don't need 46,000, nobody in this room believes that with a straight face that you have got the right number of people.

What is the size that you can cut? Is it 25 percent?

Mr. PISTOLE. The challenge is to say what type of security is the American people—what are they expecting? So—

Mr. ROGERS. No, I am asking you, you have been in the job 2 years and you are a very smart competent fellow, I know that and I hand it to you.

You have had 2 years to run the department. if you could pick the work force, what is the number you could get by with? If it is not 46,000, is it 35,000 workers if they were professionally trained?

Mr. PISTOLE. So the current construct in order to be the most efficient agency possible, which most people don't think about some of the details, 14,000 of our officers are part-time. So just as there is a morning rush hour on the highways and the streets, there is a morning rush hour at most airports anyway.

So as opposed to having full-time people there all day, we have part-time people who come in for 4 hours in the morning, some workers split shifts, 4 hours in the afternoon—

Mr. ROGERS. Isn't that 14,000 in part-time workers over the 46,000 full-time?

Mr. PISTOLE. The requirement is that those who are hired with the cap is 46,000, so the FTE, when we get into the details, it is still below that.

That is one way we have tried to deal with that cap is to say, Congress has not approved full-time funding for all these people so we have full-time and then we have all these part-time people and part of the challenge is how do you train and retain a professional workforce? So the attrition rate that I mentioned, the 7.2 percent—is it higher for the part-time people because they are looking for other opportunities? So that is part of the challenge.

So if you are telling me you would fund us at “X” amount, the appropriations would give us “X” amount, then I would have to look at, so do I cut back the part-time, which would be less efficient because then we need full-time people who are not busy during the——

Mr. ROGERS. I want you to put out those people that are standing around not doing anything at the airport screening checkpoints.

Mr. PISTOLE. So just on that comment, sir—some of our airports don’t have break rooms where people who are close by the checkpoint and so they may have to simply go to a, you know, a coffee shop or something on their break because they may have to walk 10 to 15 minutes to get to a break room. Well, if they have a 20 break, it is difficult to do——

Mr. ROGERS. I am not talking about folks on their break, Mr. Pistole. You know I am in airports all the time and I actually am one of the people in Congress who understand the TSA and I know who is working——

Mr. PISTOLE. No you don’t.

Mr. ROGERS [continuing]. And who is not. You and I both know, you can go to any major airport and you see a lot more people than necessary at these checkpoints.

So I am going to get back to my question.

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. If it is not 25 percent, is it 20 percent that you could reduce the workforce?

Mr. PISTOLE. Sir, I am not prepared to say a percentage that I am willing to reduce because I believe the personnel we have currently, again, using that part-time construct are necessary to provide the security the American people expect today.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, it is not hurting your confidence level. You and I both know, everybody in this room knows, you can get by with less folks. I tell you with the budget problems we are having around here, you know your number is not going to be getting bigger. So if you are going to find money for the technologies that you are looking at right now, you are going to have to find it somewhere.

If you want to find the money to train these people to make them more professional, you are going to have to look for some place in your hide to come up with the money and I think you are going to have to look at right-sizing the department to get it down and then using that money to make them more professional.

You talked a few minutes ago about the professionalism necessary for this job, do you feel like that the 46,000 screeners are exhibiting the professionalism or the degree of professionalism that you expect?

Mr. PISTOLE. Most do, but there are some clearly who don’t. So if they violate our policies or procedures or if their off-duty conduct is such that they do not uphold those expectations then we take appropriate action.

Mr. ROGERS. I know that you started and I applaud you for starting a uniform training system so every screener will hopefully one day go through the exact same screening so there is more uniformity across airports.

My question is: At the rate that you are putting through that training program now, how many years will it take for the entire workforce to go through it?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well right now, we don't have appropriated funds to do that and so we are taking it out of hide because it is a priority. So it is a long-term construct—

Mr. ROGERS. By long-term, do you mean 1 year?

Mr. PISTOLE. Oh no, multiple years, out years we are talking about.

Mr. ROGERS. Decades?

Mr. PISTOLE. Not decades but multiple years.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. Tell me more about that attrition rate?

Mr. PISTOLE. Seven-point-one or 7.2 in fiscal year 2011 and—

Mr. ROGERS. Well, let me ask you this. I looked at what happened in Ft. Meyers, you know, y'all had a little problem out there, what does it take to get fired at TSA? Apparently a lot more than these folks, they only let four of them go and the other 35 or so were given suspension for not doing their job.

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, obviously, the facts of each individual, we want to make sure that we investigate properly. We afford appropriate due process. If there is immediate issue with security then we suspend them right away so they are not on the job affecting security.

These individuals that were found to be most egregious, we have proposed for dismissal, the other 37, we have proposed for suspensions based on their activity and their culpability, including the Federal security director, his deputy, and then the manager who had the oversight. So it was a situation of did they know or should have known—

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. PISTOLE [continuing]. What was going on?

Mr. ROGERS. Well I appreciate it. My time has expired.

The Chairman recognizes the Ranking Member of the full committee, Mr. Thompson, for any more questions he may have.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pistole, one of the issues that some of us have tried to move with this committee is respect to new technology. The culture of a lot of organizations is to only deal with certain vendors because they had the capacity to deliver.

But one of the things that a lot of members are exposed to is new detection technology. But we always hear that the barrier between developing the technology and what is required to get TSA's nod is so difficult to overcome.

What can you say to this committee that will allow new technologies a faster way of becoming vetted?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, thank you Ranking Member.

On Monday of this week, I met with a group of industry personnel, CEOs, COOs from a number of companies including some small business, minority-owned businesses. One of the thing I told them is we are always looking for innovation. So the spiral development is good but we are also looking for breakthrough technology which may come from anybody. So the big-ticket items, if you will, I would agree, it is difficult for the small-business owner—the sev-

eral-person organization to try to, for example, to develop a \$100,000 piece of equipment just on the R&D and everything.

So what we do is try to—looking for opportunities—and I think if you look across the department and even across the Government, we have one of the best records, even though it is challenging, with small-business owners, minority owners to engage them in ways that may be outside the normal protocols.

So if there is anything specific, I will be glad to follow up with—

Mr. THOMPSON. Well—

Mr. PISTOLE [continuing]. It off-line and—

Mr. THOMPSON [continuing]. You know, you know, I have got about 4 minutes, I would just like to, as a follow-up to this meeting, engage you with some of the people that have contacted the committee about their difficulty and I would like for you to listen to them because what you say to us and what they say to us also, is not the same thing.

Mr. PISTOLE. Be glad to do that, sir.

Obviously, we are always looking for innovation. If we went through the number of unsolicited proposals some of them—

Mr. THOMPSON. Well the reason I say that is, some of the companies have capacity. Some of the companies have even been able to deploy their technology overseas to airports that we have relationships with but they can't get that technology through TSA's vetting.

If there is a disconnect, I want you to help us identify it and, you know, these are American companies, American jobs that we could do.

Apart from that I have one other issue I want to—the reorganization. We have been hearing about it for a little while now. Can you provide us with a preliminary report on the efficiencies you expect to gain from this reorganization?

We have been exposed to reorganizations in the past, but we have not been able to determine efficiencies. What we have been able—just to be honest with you—is you move people around, you get some people promoted, some people moved down. What is your purpose in the reorganization?

Mr. PISTOLE. The bottom line is to come up with the most efficient way of providing the security service that we provide. So, to that end last year I caused an efficiency review to be taken, particularly for the headquarters components. There is information out there, some reported by other committees, that there are 4,000 people at TSA headquarters.

We have 2,500, approximately, people at our headquarters. Now, we have other components that do National functions and vetting, for example, Annapolis Junction, our operation center out by Dulles Airport. So they may be counting those numbers—but anyway, the members at headquarters, what this review was to look at—the layers of review, for example, on documents, policy issues. So we have eliminated a number of positions at headquarters to become more efficient, leaner, smarter—to the Chairman's point.

I would have to get back with you in terms of the exact numbers and those issues, but to say it is a number of positions that have

been eliminated to reduce layers of bureaucracy and to become a smarter, leaner organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. But can you provide us with an interim report on where you are with that?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what savings are projected—

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON [continuing]. In that respect?

Mr. PISTOLE. Be glad to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. Turner, for any additional questions he may have.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I travel a good deal. I am in an airport about 12 times a month, I guess. I observe the lines. I think how fast we get in and out of there has a great deal to do with your image and customer satisfaction, and even how much air travel. I know people who prefer to drive now to the Carolinas rather than to endure what they have to do at an airport.

Just one of the things that I have noticed is the belts-on or belts-off policy. Sometimes males are required to take their belts off. It slows things down. Other times they don't. I don't know if there is a uniform policy or just to keep everyone off guard. But that is a slowing process.

Sometimes there is enough people there to help move the trays in high-peak times. I see inspectors who were looking at the electronic monitors were on-the-job training. Very often they stopped at every other bag and have to call for assistance.

I would think that these would be better suited for low-traffic periods. I don't see a process to—when things are getting out of hand there are a thousand people standing on the line for blocks, a way to quickly alleviate that?

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, Congressman.

That is one of the challenges that we have, and part of the reason—to the Chairman's question about the staffing—if we reduce the staffing by “X” percent that would likely have an impact on those wait times. Unless there is such an efficiency because of things—is it the same level of security? That is the bottom line.

So what I would like to do is provide the committee with some of the metrics we use on assessing those very things. We actually look at this issue, assess, and look for ways to improve that in terms of the staffing model for each airport based on the check-point configuration, how long the wait times are.

I get a report that shows wait times around the country, all 450 airports. Obviously it is the CAT X's that we most focus on—the largest airports—to say when there is a longer wait time than what we believe is appropriate.

I spoke yesterday with the CEO. We had five airline CEOs in yesterday for an update in classified intelligence briefing. I spoke with two of them about issues; one in particular at a major airport, where their customers are experiencing longer wait times than they are used to. So, he wanted to know how we can work on that

together in terms of their additional staffing, our additional staffing, to alleviate that issue.

So it is something we are very focused on. You raise some good points about the belts-on, belts-off. There is some random and predictable—usually the idea and the whole idea behind the Trusted Traveler PreCheck Program is let us leave the shoes on, leave the belts on, leave the light jacket on to expedite those that we have done more prescreening of.

So that is the whole construct, the whole idea behind the PreCheck program. As we get more and more people into that it will address those issues. It will help alleviate the wait times at the regular checkpoints, because we can streamline those others.

So again, it doesn't happen overnight, to the Chairman's point. I wish I could say yes, it is all going to be done tomorrow. But we are moving very deliberately and as fast as we can while maintaining the best possible security to achieve those goals that you outline.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Pistole.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Richmond, for any additional questions he may have.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will try to pick up a little bit where Mr. Turner left off. That is, besides for PreCheck, which has expedited significantly for people who have signed up, and people who travel all the time, but what should we expect or look for, for the regular traveler who has not signed up? I thought that shoes on would be something that would have been achieved by now.

What can we look for in the near future for the general traveling public to help them expedite them through the process?

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, Congressman.

We are working both internally and we have received some proposals from the private sector on that very question, how do we expand that known population using commonly available data that, if again, if people are willing to share that, how can a private company take that data, assimilate, assess it based on our criteria of risk, and then provide that information to us outside of the elite frequent fliers or even global entry program?

So we had a meeting on that yesterday. I think there is some very good opportunities. Again, and it is not an overnight fix, but I think it will give us the opportunity to greatly expand the base now, as well as, for example, the members of the military that I mentioned, as we expand beyond Reagan Airport, in Seattle, where they are now, as more and more people in the intelligence community come on.

So again, the whole idea is to build that known population as broadly as, and as quickly as we can, while maintaining the best possible security. So for the everyday common traveler, or the everyday traveler, somebody from New Orleans, Baton Rouge, says, "Okay, I travel a couple times a year." They could sign up for global entry, which would give them that expedited access at the 15 airports, now 35 by the end of the year.

But we are exploring ways that through a private-public partnership we could do that. So we don't actually get the data. I don't

want people's personal identifiable information. But if a private company does that in partnership with the individuals, and then they can provide that information to us, then we can make a risk-based judgment based on the pre-screen so we can expedite them at the checkpoint.

Mr. RICHMOND. To the Chairman's point, and I think he is far more aggressive than I am, but I would indicate support that I do think that any entity can run a little leaner and smarter to reduce costs. At some point you get to the point where you can't do more with less. I don't think we are at that point with TSA. So to the extent that we can operate leaner, more efficiently, I think that should be the goal.

My question to you would be is there anything that you have that we can help you with to make it easier for you to operate more efficiently or leaner?

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, I appreciate that, Congressman. I think simply the public recognition, and as Members of the committee do, that the broader we can expand this known population, the more quickly we can do that, the more efficiently we can operate.

So getting to the Chairman's questions, as we expand that population I do see some savings in the future. I just don't know what those are, and so the support of the committee is critically important in terms of moving forward with the whole risk-based security initiative.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The Chairman now recognizes my friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. Walsh, for any questions he may have.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Pistole. I apologize for being tardy.

Let me start out with a broad general question. If TSA does suffer from sort of a bad public relations reputation these days, and much of that is endemic to what they do, if you were to be critical though, what constructive criticism would you lay at the feet of TSA itself, and/or the folks that work with TSA in contributing to that poor public perception?

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, we talked a little bit about that. I think it is the anecdotes that drive a lot of that negative impression, and rightfully so. So is we have treated somebody unprofessionally, then shame on us, because we have not done the job that we are expected to do.

So that is clearly on us, and that is why we are doing all this new training, re-training, professionalizing of the workforce, those things that will enable us to move to the next level.

So I think the criticism is accurate. I think it is, again, driven by anecdotes, so we don't hear from the 99.9 percent of people traveling every day who had a positive experience, or at least a neutral experience, which is the vast majority. So we do hear these other ones, you know, that—and just one example. So a few weeks ago or last month there was some issue about Secretary Kissinger, you know, received a negative screening experience. Well he hadn't complained about it but it was some person who saw him and reported it. Well, so he put out a press release saying, "Look, the men and women of TSA were very professional. I go through this

because of my health condition and they treated me with respect and courtesy.” He sent me a personal letter with that same information.

So it was picked and criticized—I think it is just the environment that we are in.

Mr. WALSH. Do you measure that all? Measure—

Mr. PISTOLE. So we measure complaints. So as mentioned a little while ago, thus far this year out of the—I think it is 525,000 calls through our call center—and that is not dispositive of every complaint. Some people are so frustrated they don’t want to call, they don’t know who to call. Sometimes we get complaints from some of the privatized airports like San Francisco, they will call us to complain about what the company that does privatized air, so we have to refer them to them.

So out of those half million, it is either 6 percent or 7 percent of those who are actual complaints, advice, asking for information or clarification of things. Then last year, fiscal year 2011, was again the three-quarter million calls and it was either 6 or 7 percent. I am just not sure which number was which.

Mr. WALSH. A couple of specifics, does TSA have any plans to allow passengers in the future to carry things to protect themselves like pocketknives or anything of such?

Mr. PISTOLE. To the Chairman’s point earlier, we have looked at the prohibited item list and I think there are some opportunities for us—there is strong concern from some that if we allow knives on airports or airplanes for example, that—we know how the box cutters were used on 9/11 to, you know, to kill flight attendants and perhaps a passenger as a way of intimidating people to get into the cockpit.

So there is some strong views on both sides. But yes, we have looked at that. We have made some minor modifications along the way. I don’t know what all has been announced but there have been some minor modifications.

What we are looking for is to have our folks focus on what can cause catastrophic failure to the aircraft and that is—the greatest threat now is the nonmetallic improvised explosive device. So that is what I want our folks focusing on. The fact that they find all these other things, okay, that is good but that is not going to bring down an aircraft, so that is where we are evolving to.

In the future here, we will have some updates in that regard.

Mr. WALSH. Great, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank you.

You know, following up on that, you are right. We need to be focused on the real risk threat which is explosives and not on a pair of scissors, grooming scissors or fingernail clippers and stuff. So I do hope that you will visit that with a broad perspective.

I want to go back to one of the other questions that was asked about Henry Kissinger.

You know, he is one of the most recognized people on the planet. Donald Rumsfeld, we had an issue a couple of years ago where he was going through and was patted down.

I think the thing that aggravates the public about that is, if we are truly moving to a threat- or risk-based perspective of how we

do this job, why are we patting down Donald Rumsfeld? I mean a supervisor ought to at least have the discretion to say, I don't think we have got to worry about him.

So, do you see my point? I think that is why it winds up on TV because it is just an illustration that there is not the degree of professionalism that we want. You know, I am concerned about the fact that apparently supervisors don't have more discretion.

I would like to see the department get much more aggressive about finding the money out of hide, my preference is by downsizing, to put more supervisors through uniform training so they have got a lot more professionalism and more discretion frankly.

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes, thank you Chairman.

I agree completely with you on that. We need to empower our front-line people, particularly supervisors, and that is why we started with our first classes at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for supervisors knowing that they are critical to drive the change that—that we are trying to make at TSA to empower them.

Currently the Federal security directors do have that discretion, but they are obviously not at each checkpoint 24 hours a day. So what we are trying to do is push that discretion down with the right people to make sure that there is good judgment, there is good common sense being used in those situations.

So I agree with you on that.

Mr. ROGERS. Tell me what kind of time line you see being realistic.

Mr. PISTOLE. For the?

Mr. ROGERS. Training of the supervisors.

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, again, we are doing this all out of hide, so I would have to say I can't do anything or I can't do this, so I am going to do that. So right now, we have trained 50 supervisors and we have classes, I think we have eight or nine more classes scheduled for the rest of this year, so that would cover several hundred more—

Mr. ROGERS. Out of how many?

Mr. PISTOLE. I want to say 3,000-some. I don't know the exact number. So again, without specific funding—so talking about funding—

Mr. ROGERS. Right.

Mr. PISTOLE [continuing]. If there was funding for this and Congress and the American people said we need to train TSA supervisors and others more, then I obviously, I could expedite it very quickly.

Mr. ROGERS. Right.

I do want to go back to the issue a little while ago about termination. Sheila Jackson Lee, in her opening statement, talked about the fact when we do run across people that aren't doing their job, we need to run them off. I completely agree with her on that not just because it gets bad apples out of the system who need to find something else to do, but it sends a message to the other workers that we take this stuff serious and we expect them to do their jobs or go somewhere else to go to work.

So I do hope that y'all will be more aggressive in that area. I know when the GAO reports where we found they audited the screening system and they found failures. More often than not, the failures were attributed to human error; some because they weren't trained well enough, some just because they were sorry.

Those folks need to be fired, because very seldom have I found any instance where when they had that failure, they were fired. Instead they were removed from that position and then given more training and then sent back. You just need to fire some of those folks and it would get everybody else's attention I think.

Mr. PISTOLE. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the accountability. I think if you look at what we have done, particularly in the last year since we stood up the Office of Professional Responsibility with security officers, for example in Honolulu or in Charlotte or most recently in Ft. Myers that when we find people not doing the job, we will give them due process but we will hold them accountable and we will fire them and that is—

Mr. ROGERS. Well I hope so because the American public, you know, is paying for that and they are standing in the lines and they are seeing this and I really think it would help that image problem—

Mr. PISTOLE. I agree.

Mr. ROGERS [continuing]. That the department has got.

Mr. PISTOLE. I agree.

Mr. ROGERS. If you put a bump in their step.

Were you going to ask something? I thought you asked for my attention.

Mr. RICHMOND. No.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I am sorry, I am sorry.

The, Mr. Thompson talked to you a few minutes ago about this access to you by business leaders. You know, one of the concerns I have had is procurement problems in the department and not just in your department, the entire Department of DHS.

Tell me, why was the business roundtable used to decide who got to come and talk to you?

Mr. PISTOLE. The—

Mr. ROGERS. This was at the recent TSA Systems Integration Facility.

Mr. PISTOLE. Oh yes, the meeting on Monday.

So the—

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Thompson was talking about it—

Mr. PISTOLE. Right, right, right.

Mr. ROGERS [continuing]. A little while ago.

Mr. PISTOLE. So there were members of this roundtable who were organized because they have either existing contracts or they are looking for what the way forward is. But it wasn't limited to that, it was also open to I believe it was 25 or 50, I don't recall, other businesses who were allowed to participate so they didn't have to be—you didn't have to be a member of the roundtable to participate in that, if that is your question.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, well I think what was frustrating to me about it was it was open only to a limited universe. You know, one of the things that we have been trying to urge the department to do is broaden the number of private-sector people you bring in for dia-

logue so they have a better feel for what your challenges are maybe then some ideas about how to meet those——

Mr. PISTOLE. Right.

Mr. ROGERS [continuing]. Challenges.

As I have talked with your personnel who deal with procurement, they have indicated they are going to try to broaden that net and this was just inconsistent with that and I didn't know if you were aware of——

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, yes. So to that point, again, there were the core group but it was not limited to that group. Again, I have to get the numbers but I think there another 50 percent of that group that it was open to anybody who wished to come with space limitation. So I think they had to indicate an interest and then I don't know if everybody who was interested in coming, whether there were space limitations.

But it was a full house and I spoke to the group and I took questions from anybody who had a question. So if there was a small business or there was somebody who wants to do business, it was completely open to anybody who wanted to ask a question.

Mr. ROGERS. Great.

Mr. Richmond, do you have any more questions?

Mr. RICHMOND. I was just going to join you in the question about the bad actors and inefficient people, incompetent people that they need to fire them which is the same message and the same thing we talked about when we found the private security company in Detroit who had the agent who found the bag outside and brought it into lost and found and our question at the same time was, No. 1: Why do we still have that private contractor?; and No. 2, the private contractor still has the employee.

I think one thing that helps is when people know that you won't tolerate incompetence, laziness, or whatever the matter. It improves your image. But more importantly, it makes our citizens safer which is the goal. So I would join in that and even being in support of TSA and traveling a lot—and, you know, even as someone who probably wouldn't fit the mold of getting the light security check, I am neither young nor older and, you know, so I don't have a problem with TSA.

I think that there is some areas you can improve. I don't think you need to be the greeter at Wal-Mart. But at the same time, I don't think you need to be the overbearing security guard who does not use common sense in how they deal with people.

Mr. Chairman, I would just suggest that, you know, as distinguished and notable as Donald Rumsfeld and Henry Kissinger are, I would still bet that the odds of Brittany Spears are more easily recognized than them, so——

Mr. ROGERS. Let us hope so.

Mr. RICHMOND. But, so we just have to make sure that common sense does play into the decision making.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly my point; there are certain people that are just so well-known that you have got to use your common sense because if you start patting them down, people are going to say, they are patting down Beyonce. She is not going to blow the plane up.

Say what?

Mr. RICHMOND. [Off mike.]

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, off the record, yes, yes, I know where you are going.

I want to offer a couple more examples of where I think you can get money out of hide.

Now we had a hearing in here a couple of weeks ago on—the ground security—surface inspectors, just over 400 of them—and we had five different industry folks in here who were saying we have no idea what they are all doing. You know? There used to be 80-something of them and they all felt like they could still get by with that 80, we don't know why there is 400. That is an area I think that I would like to see you visit. That has been a very rapid ramp-up of personnel.

Another is in the airports where we do have private contractors, we are very heavy on TSA personnel supervising those private contractors.

For example, in San Francisco, we have 88 Federal employees under the FSD supervising the contractor there but they only have 44 managers that they are supervising. It is pretty hard to understand why you have got to have two people supervising one person.

So I mean those are things that I think are just examples of how there is some potential to go in there and do some thinning which would help pay for this professional training that you and I both agree.

I do hope that you will take from this hearing the overriding theme that I have had and that is I want to see y'all get leaner and smarter on a much more rapid pace.

Mr. PISTOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may just comment on the San Francisco example, so that, I think 88 number—that I believe is less than 20 who are actually overseeing the private company. So that 88, if that is the right number, is actually the entire office that deals with all other issues not just—for example, to have forward-deployed counsel from the Office of General Counsel, has a surface inspectors—things that are not related to that airport security.

So that—

Mr. ROGERS. That makes sense. Even if it is 20—

Mr. PISTOLE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS [continuing]. For 40 people, I mean they literally could get by with two or three people who are supervising those 40 managers.

Mr. PISTOLE. Well, I don't agree with that. I mean obviously if it has got to be a different contractor, we would just turn them loose and say, "Okay. You have free reign." But yeah, there is a medium in there. I agree and I agree we can be more efficient.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Davis, do you have any questions?

Mr. DAVIS. No I don't.

Mr. ROGERS. All right, well welcome.

Thank you again, Mr. Pistole for being here.

This hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:27 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]