AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

MARKUP OF COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS 115–6, 115–7, AND 115–8

MARKUP

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

Held in Washington, DC, February 27, 2018

Printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration

Available on the Internet
www.govinfo.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
32–364 WASHINGTON : 2018

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

GREGG HARPER, Mississippi, *Chairman*

RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois, *Vice Chairman*
BARBARA COMSTOCK, Virginia
MARK WALKER, North Carolina
ADRIAN SMITH, Nebraska
BARRY LOUDERMILK, Georgia

ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania,
Ranking Member
ZOE LOFGREN, California
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland

MARKUP OF COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS 115–6, 115–7, AND 115–8

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2018

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 2:25 p.m., in Room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Gregg Harper [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Harper, Davis, Comstock, Loudermilk, and Brady.

Staff Present: Sean Moran, Staff Director; Kim Betz, Deputy Staff Director; Cole Felder, Deputy General Counsel; Dan Jarrell, Legislative Clerk; Amanda Anger, Professional Staff; Erin McCracken, Communications Director; Jamie Fleet, Minority Staff Director; and Eddie Flaherty, Minority Chief Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. I now call to order the Committee on House Administration for today's Committee meeting. A quorum is present, so we may proceed. The meeting record will remain open for 5 legislative days so that Members may submit any materials that they wish to be included therein.

There are three items that we have on the docket today: First, Committee Resolution 115–6, the Committee's views and estimates on the fiscal year 2019; second, we have Committee Resolution 115–7, a measure to amend the regulations collectively known as the Members' Congressional Handbook; and, third, Committee Resolution 115–8, a measure to amend the regulations collectively known as the Committee Congressional Handbook.

The first item before us is Committee Resolution 115–6, the Committee's views and estimates for fiscal year 2019. The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires Congressional Committees to submit to the Committee on the Budget their views and estimates on programs within their jurisdictions.

The views and estimates we are making up today highlight the Committee's continued work to conduct oversight and identify future potential savings at the Federal Election Commission. As the Committee has stated previously, one way to reduce the FEC's budget is to eliminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. The Committee continues that recommendation. In addition, the views and estimates highlight the ongoing concerns the Committee has with the Election Assistance Commission.

The views and estimates reflect the Committee's support for the ongoing efforts to strengthen the cybersecurity platforms within each of the legislative branch entities and agencies. Equally impor-

tant, the Committee supports the ongoing efforts in the House to ensure it has the resources and assistance in the event of a cyber attack.

Furthermore, the views and estimates recognize the importance of providing resources to address the issue of sexual harassment. As I have said previously, one case of sexual harassment is one too many. We need to ensure that the House's training program, which will begin this April, is effective in educating and preventing discrimination and harassment.

Finally, the views and estimates recognize the ongoing need to secure and protect Members, their staffs, their constituents, and, of course, the public. The events in the summer of 2017 and the corresponding increase in threats against Members demonstrate security remains paramount. The Committee supports funding for the United States Capitol Police and the House Sergeant at Arms for these efforts.

The second measure before us, Committee Resolution 115–7, clarifies certain provisions and makes additional technical corrections to the Members' Congressional Handbook, and I will mention a few. First, the Committee Resolution incorporates the prohibitions contained in H. Res. 724, which we passed earlier this month. H. Res. 724, among other things, prohibits the Members' representational allowance from being used for settlements or for an award in connection with conduct prohibited by the Congressional Accountability Act.

The Committee resolution also clarifies the use of the MRA for security, including allowing prior year funds to be obligated for security furnishings and enhancements, clarifies the role of the House Sergeant at Arms in approving noncapital security enhancements; clarifies responsibility for costs associated with security enhancements considered capital improvements; clarifies payments for security personnel are an ordinary and reimbursable expense; and, lastly, clarifies security items exceeding $500 must be added to office inventory.

Finally, the third measure on our docket, Committee Resolution 115–8, mirrors the changes in the Members' Congressional Handbook as it relates to settlements and awards under the Congressional Accountability Act. The measure prohibits Committee funding from being used for settlements or awards in connection with conduct prohibited by the Congressional Accountability Act.

I would now like to recognize my colleague and the Committee's Ranking Member, Mr. Brady, for the purpose of providing an opening statement.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this business meeting today.

I support the three Committee resolutions before us. However, we do intend to file minority views on the proposed views and estimates on the President's budget, as we do have some well-known disagreements about the Election Assistance Commission and the Federal Election Commission.

And, of course, we support the ban on using the MRA or Committee funds to settle sexual harassments and discrimination cases. That is a very long overdue commonsense change, and I appreciate

your bipartisan work on that. I encourage my colleagues to support the proposal before us, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back.

Does any other Member wish to be recognized for the purposes of an opening statement?

Seeing none, I now call up and lay before the Committee Committee Resolution 115–6, the views and estimates for fiscal year 2019.

Without objection, the first reading is dispensed with, and the resolution is considered read and open for amendment.

[The resolution follows:]

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

115TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 115-

February 27, 2018

Resolution to Approve Committee Views and Estimates

Resolved, pursuant to § 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and House Rule X, clause 4(f), the Committee adopts the following views and estimates for Fiscal Year 2019:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

VIEWS AND ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

Federal Election Commission

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) is an independent, bipartisan commission which facilitates transparency in the federal election process through public disclosure of campaign finance data, and encourages compliance with the Federal Election Campaign Act by providing information and policy guidance. The FEC administers and interprets the Federal Election Campaign Act, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account Act. The FEC also enforces these Acts through audits, investigations, and civil litigation.

The current Fiscal Year 2018 appropriated amount for the FEC continues to be $79,119,000, the same as fiscal year 2017. This and any increased funding requires appropriate allocation. The Committee will continue to conduct vigorous oversight to identify and realize future potential savings.

Presidential Election Campaign Fund

One means to reduce the budget needs of the FEC is to eliminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund (PECF). The PECF provides taxpayer financing for presidential campaigns. The PECF receives its funds through a voluntary election on tax returns to have $3 of the taxpayer's taxes directed to the fund. For primary elections the PECF provides payments to candidates to match private contributions. Candidates who elect to participate are subject to state-by-state spending limits. For general elections the PECF provides a single grant payment to participating candidates, in return for which the candidate agrees not to spend funds from any other source.

The FEC incurs costs to administer the PECF and to audit recipients of PECF funds. These costs could be eliminated if the PECF were eliminated.

The fund is underutilized by candidates. After pledging to participate in the PECF, in 2008 then-Senator Obama declined public financing during the general election. In the 2012 campaign, only three candidates received PECF funds – Buddy Roemer (Americans Elect and the Reform Party), Gary Johnson (Libertarian) and Jill Stein (Green). The total they received was $1,356,108. Both major party candidates rejected PECF financing in both the primary and general elections. No major party candidate utilized PECF financing in the 2016 campaign.

If candidates did chose to accept PECF funds and the accompanying restrictions, the fund would be undercapitalized because the American public chooses to no longer contribute. Public support for the PECF has declined precipitously since its introduction. The percentage of taxpayers participating dropped from 28.7% in 1980 to approximately 5.4% in 2015, even though participating does not affect tax liability.

In the 112th Congress, the House twice voted to eliminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund by passing both H.R. 359 and H.R. 3463. In the 113th Congress, the Committee reported H.R. 95, which would eliminate the PECF and would reduce direct spending by approximately $130 million by 2023. In the 114th Congress, the Committee has reported H.R. 412, which would transfer $88,202,400 to the 10-Year Pediatric Research Initiative to fight childhood diseases and the remaining amount, roughly $170 million, to the United States Treasury to pay down the national debt. In the 115th Congress, H.R. 133 has been introduced, which would transfer $63,002,400 to the 10-Year Pediatric Research Initiative to fight childhood diseases and the remaining amount, roughly $250 million, to the United States Treasury to pay down the national debt.

Given the scarce resources available and our duty to the American tax payer to set priorities for federal spending, eliminating a needless and underutilized fund while paying down our national debt and directing more money to pediatric illness research is an appropriate and crucial step toward fiscal responsibility.

The Committee does not support continued operation of the PECF and strongly supports the elimination of the PECF.

Election Assistance Commission

The Election Assistance Commission (EAC) is an independent, bipartisan commission which develops guidance to meet Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requirements, adopts voluntary voting system guidelines, and serves as a national clearinghouse of information on election administration. The EAC also establishes voluntary voting system guidelines, certifies voting systems, accredits test laboratories, and audits the use of funds provided the states through election reform grants.

The FY 2017 appropriated amount for the EAC totals $9,600,000. Further reductions from the President's budget are warranted. No new funding for election reform grants has been provided to the EAC for the last eight years. Less than $5 million in grant funding currently exists.

In the 112th Congress, a majority of the House twice voted to eliminate the EAC, with 235 Members voting in favor of both H.R. 672 and H.R. 3463. A majority of the Committee's members voted in favor of eliminating the EAC on three occasions. In the 113th Congress, the Committee reported H.R. 1994, which would eliminate the EAC. The CBO estimate for H.R. 1994 stated that eliminating the EAC would save taxpayers $42 million over five years. In the 114th Congress, the Committee reported H.R. 195, which would eliminate the EAC. The CBO estimate for H.R. 195 stated that eliminating the EAC would save taxpayers $40 million over five years. In that report, the Committee stated that the EAC's "operations and budget show that its mission cannot justify maintaining a federal agency." In the 115th Congress, H.R. 634, which would eliminate the EAC, was introduced and reported out of the Committee on House Administration on February 7, 2017.

The Committee does not support continued funding for EAC activities and strongly supports its elimination.

Cybersecurity

The Committee supports appropriate funding for policies that improve the cybersecurity platform within each of the Legislative branch entities and agencies. The Committee supports the Legislative Branch Cybersecurity Working Group for its effort on sharing and implementing cybersecurity best practices. The Committee supports the Working Group's next phase – including identifying and meeting minimum standards to ensure the Legislative Branch is adequately protected and providing resources to allow all Legislative Branch agencies and entities to mature their cybersecurity programs.

The Committee also supports appropriate funding for the House of Representatives' cybersecurity platform including but not limited to the assistance and support of the Executive Branch. Included in the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act was language authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consultation with the Minority Leader to request the assistance of the Executive Branch in the event additional resources were needed to respond to a cyber breach. The Committee supports efforts to develop and approve Memoranda of Understanding between the House and the appropriate Executive Branch agencies and the resources necessary to provide adequate assistance.

Sexual Harassment

Every case of sexual harassment is one too many. At the end of the first session of the 115th Congress, the Committee passed *H.Res. 630*, a resolution directing the House of Representatives to develop and implement a mandatory training and education program focused on anti-harassment and anti-discrimination. The Committee requested the assistance of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to implement the mandatory training and education program and supports their current efforts to procure an outside vendor. The Committee anticipates the CAO will incur an annual cost of $3.75 million beginning in Fiscal Year 2018 to carry out this mandatory training program.

Separately, the House passed *H.Res. 724*, which among other things directed the CAO to establish an Office of Employee Advocacy under its supervision. The Committee believes there is a lack of parity between the representation provided to employing offices (i.e. Members and

senior staff) and lower level employees. The establishment of an Office of Employee Advocacy will assist employees in understanding their rights and responsibilities under the Congressional Accountability Act and the House Committee on Ethics. The Committee anticipates the Chief Administrative Officer will need $600,000 to establish the Office.

District Office Security Program

The Committee supports funding for the United States Capitol Police and the House Sergeant-at-Arms' to provide comprehensive security services to Members of Congress, including in their district offices. As the events of June 2017 and the corresponding increase in threats against Members of Congress demonstrate, the security of Members, their staff, their constituents, and the public at-large remains paramount. In FY 2018, the Committee on Appropriations, Legislative Branch recommended an additional $7 million to the USCP and an additional $5 million to the House SAA. The Committee continues to support any additional funding for these programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Would any Member like to make a statement?

Would any Member like to offer an amendment to the resolution?

Seeing none, without objection, the amendment will be considered as read.

Are there any other Members who wish to be recognized on the amendment?

There are none.

So the question is on the amendment offered to the views and estimates for fiscal year 2019—the question is on the motion to adopt Committee Resolution 115–6, the views and estimates for fiscal year 2019.

The question is on the motion.

All of those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All of those opposed, signify by saying nay.

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

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Does any Member wish to submit supplemental or minority views?

Mr. BRADY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the minority does.

[The information follows:]

Minority Views of Representatives Brady, Lofgren and Raskin on the Views and Estimates of the Committee on House Administration for the President's Fiscal Year 2019 Budget

Majority Views

We agree with several components of the Majority's proposal, and contest others. We support the bipartisan work to secure our information systems, improve our workplace environment and secure our district offices for Members, staff, and thousands of constituents who avail themselves of access to their Member of Congress.

Federal Election Commission

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) is charged with administering and enforcing campaign finance laws. However, in recent years, complete partisan gridlock continues to plague the FEC. As a result, there has been a marked decrease in enforcement action and audits, two key elements to maintaining the integrity of our campaign finance system.

We need a functioning FEC to enforce our existing laws, and to promulgate rules that respond to the changing media environment. During the 2016 election, Russia spread propaganda and misinformation on social media platforms without ever disclosing that they were behind the effort. The FEC must takes its duties seriously and promulgate rules that provide for similar disclosure regimes for political advertising on the internet as is required for radio and television advertisements. In addition, the FEC must enforce the existing laws and keep foreign actors out of our democracy.

To make matters worse, the Commission is in danger of losing its four-vote quorum. To take any significant action (e.g., rulemaking, opening an investigation, levying fines, offering guidance), there must be a minimum of four Commissioners. With two recent departures, the agency is down to four Commissioners. If any of them were to leave, the Commission would essentially be unable to function.

The Democrats of House Administration believe the campaign finance system needs to be reformed to promote transparency and integrity, and that the FEC needs to be fully staffed and supported so that it can fulfill its mission of enforcing and administering campaign finance laws.

Proposed termination of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund (PECF) is in dire need of modernization. The campaign finance landscape changes rapidly and dramatically and commensurate changes are needed to the PECF. In the absence of public financing, presidential candidates will have no choice but to raise significant sums from private sources, many of whom represent special interests.

The PECF was created in the wake of the Watergate scandal to restore the American public's faith in its elections and public institutions. We find ourselves in a similar situation today. We do not support wholesale repeal of the PECF. It is a system in need of reform. We also believe the choice between funding pediatric research and having a pragmatic campaign finance regime is a false choice. We should have both. The PECF needs to be reformed, not replaced.

Election Assistance Commission

The Election Assistance Commission (EAC) enjoys broad, bipartisan support from the constituencies it was designed to serve: voters and election officials. The EAC eases the considerable burden of election administration and it does this well.

The EAC is the only federal agency charged with making American elections more accessible, accurate, secure, and transparent. The EAC administers grants, develops guidance to assist states, and serves as a national clearinghouse of information on election administration. In addition, the EAC tests and certifies voting machines, provides guidance on managing election technology, and works with state and local officials to assist them in preparing for elections. In 2016, the EAC launched a video series that featured election officials, advocacy groups, and academics and offered guidance on how to leverage high- and low-tech tools in administering elections. The Commission also provides easy-to-follow cybersecurity guidance on protecting voter registration data and securing election night reporting systems.

The EAC is in the unique position of being a federal agency with relationships with state and local election officials, and with an expertise in election administration. The Commission has been vital to helping states work with DHS to understand and take advantage of the "critical infrastructure" designation. Since the designation was made in January 2017, the EAC has worked diligently to build trust between state election officials and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) by facilitating, mediating, and participating in meetings between election officials and DHS. The EAC also produced educational materials to help states understand

and utilize the critical infrastructure designation and worked with DHS to help the agency understand election administration.

Instead of attempting to terminate the agency, the President should nominate and the Senate should confirm a fourth commissioner, and Congress should work to provide the EAC with more resources so it can provide more robust assistance to states on election security and other important election administration issues.

Election Security

It is now well known that Russia targeted the voting systems of 21 states in 2016, and although there is no evidence of the attacks altering the vote count, Russian hackers were able to breach at least one state's voter registration databases. If these attacks had been successful, hackers would have been able to alter or delete voter registration records, causing a great deal of chaos on Election Day and undermining public confidence in election results.

In addition, our voting machines can easily be hacked. In July, at DefCon, one of the world's largest, longest-running, and best-known hacker conferences, 25 pieces of election equipment were successfully breached by participants with little prior knowledge and limited tools. In over 40 states, elections are carried out using voting machines that were purchased more than a decade ago. These machines are now either obsolete or at the end of their useful life. Some of these machines rely on operating systems like Windows XP or Windows 2000 which pose a particularly significant security risk as those operating systems either do not receive regular security patches, or have stopped receiving support altogether. These issues are exacerbated by the fact that nearly twenty percent of Americans cast their ballot on voting machines that do not have any kind of paper backup. In other words, if these paperless machines were hacked, it would be nearly impossible to tell.

The unprecedented attack by Russia exposed these serious national security vulnerabilities to our election infrastructure. Congress must take immediate action to secure our voting systems, because we know that Russian hackers are likely to continue to try and penetrate election systems in 2018 and beyond. Days before the 2017 elections, Bob Kolasky, the acting Deputy Undersecretary of the National Protection and Programs Directorate at the Department of Homeland Security said, "We saw in 2016 that Russia had an intent to be involved in our elections and some capability to be active or to attempt to be active in scanning election systems. We have not seen any evidence that intent or capability has changed." Just a few weeks

ago, when appearing before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the Trump administration's most senior intelligence officials warned that Russia will be back in 2018.

State and local election officials are acutely aware of the threats they are facing, but they lack the necessary funds to safeguard their voting infrastructure. In most states, legislatures are not increasing their election security budgets, and in some cases, Governors are actively undermining election security efforts. Moreover, state and local officials have expressed a desire for Congress to step in. The majority of state election officials surveyed by *Politico* in late 2017 indicated that they needed additional funding from the federal government to replace obsolete election systems and technology and to bolster election security. Indeed, the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) issued a statement in December 2017 calling on Congress to provide the $396 million to help states secure their election systems. The group wrote:

> As election officials around the country work to update and maintain aging election systems, [NASS] calls on Congress to assist them in this effort by providing states with the remaining funding under [the Help America Vote Act]...[This] will not solve all of the challenges election officials face, but it will help states enhance the efficiency and security of elections, including through the purchase of new voting systems, the implementation of additional cybersecurity tools, and the hiring of additional IT professionals.

This issue is simply too important to sit back and watch state governments and the federal government pass responsibility back and forth. With the 2018 midterm elections rapidly approaching, it is imperative that the House of Representatives act to secure our elections and protect the integrity of the ballot box by appropriating, at the very least, the $396 million requested by state election officials.

Strengthening Employee Protections

H. Res 724 requires each employing authority covered by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA) to adopt an anti-discrimination, anti-harassment policy. In addition, the resolution creates the Office of Employee Advocacy (OEA) to provide legal assistance to covered employees of the House of Representative in the event of an action arising pursuant to the CAA.

Reforms to the procedure and policies aimed at preventing discrimination and harassment at the House of Representatives and throughout the legislative branch were long overdue. Those seeking justice for CAA violations found the system overwhelming, intimidating, and ineffective. As such, the House set out to overhaul the process and implement reforms that work for victims, not against. We support funding the OEA to ensure the office is fully resourced, as well as the necessary funding for anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training that is in person and interactive for the House of Representatives and all other employees of the legislative branch.

National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped

The National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS) was established by an Act of Congress in 1931 and offers free services to U.S. residents and citizens living abroad who are seeing impaired or who have physical disabilities that prevent them from reading regular print. There are a wide variety of materials available through NLS including books, magazines and music materials. All resources, including the playback equipment needed to read the materials, are available for free for eligible residents. NLS has a verbal agreement with a network of 100 national libraries that distribute NLS materials, allowing easier access for customers. There are 450,000 patrons of NLS and 60% of this population is over the age of 60.

NLS constantly looks for ways to increase access to their resources, which can be difficult due to the specific challenges they face. One issue has been the distribution of hard copy braille titles. These titles can be bulky, an average braille book is between two to eight volumes per title, and distributing and transporting these titles can be cumbersome for the Library and the user. Finding innovative ways to get resources to their patrons in an easier format has always been a priority for NLS. In November 2015, Ranking Member Brady introduced H.R. 4093 *Library of Congress Administrative Reform Act of 2015*. The first section of the bill authorized NLS to provide playback equipment in multiple formats. While Congress never passed H.R. 4093, in 2016 the Senate introduced, and Congress passed, S.320 authorizing NLS to provide the playback equipment. As a result, in 2017, NLS partnered with Perkins Library in Massachusetts for a pilot program that would provide e-readers to registered borrowers. Historically, the high price of braille e-readers made large scale use of them impractical, but when a more affordable e-reader, the Orbit Reader 20, came to the market, Perkins Library started distributing them to their patrons. NLS has partnered with Perkins in hopes of learning about the effectiveness of distributing e-readers to their customers and

growing the e-reader program. The e-reader pilot was originally meant to test 200 e-readers nationwide, but currently only 40 e-readers are part of the pilot.

Resources like the e-readers are vital to the patrons of NLS and the Committee is concerned that NLS does not have enough funding to run these programs. While NLS works to enhance the resources available for their customers, there was no increase in the NLS budget for programmatic changes in the 2019 budget request. The current request is $51.192 million, $1 million less than the 2018 budget request, and is only to support mandatory pay related and price level increases. The Committee wants to ensure that NLS has the funding they need to serve their patrons and develop their resources and with no increase in their programmatic budget, it does not seem that this will be possible.

Robert A. Brady	Zoe Lofgren	Jamie Raskin
Ranking Democratic Member	Member	Member

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI, the Member is entitled to 2 additional calendar days to file such views in writing and signed by that Member and file with the clerk of the Committee.

I now call up and lay before the Committee Committee Resolution 115–7, a measure to clarify and make technical corrections to the Members' Congressional Handbook.

Without objection, the first reading is dispensed with, and the Committee resolution is considered read and open for the Committee.

[The resolution follows:]

Committee Resolution 115-7

Resolved, the Committee on House Administration adopts the following regulations amending and superseding prior regulations known collectively as the Members' Congressional Handbook:

- After "1. The MRA may only be used for official and representational expenses." insert:

  "2. The MRA may not be used to pay a settlement or award in connection with conduct prohibited under the *Congressional Accountability Act of 1995*."

- After "19. Requests to obligate prior year funds after January 2 of the succeeding year will be considered by the Committee when a Member provides documentation demonstrating a bona fide intent to obligate the prior year's funds during the applicable year." strike the remainder of the paragraph and insert:

  "Applicable to equipment and software in both D.C. and district offices, and to furnishings and security enhancements in the district office only. Please see the *Security* section for more information on district office security enhancements."

- After "Ordinary and necessary expenses associated with security measures necessitated by official duties are reimbursable." insert:

  "For questions concerning security equipment and services in the district, please call the District Security Service Center maintained by the House Sergeant at Arms at 202-225-3380."

- After "*Non-Capital Improvements*" strike the following paragraph and insert:

  "The House Sergeant at Arms (HSAA) will provide certain security enhancements for district offices. For any additional expenditures, the MRA is available if the item or expenditure has received approval from the HSAA."

- After "*Capital Improvements*" strike the following paragraph and insert:

  "The costs of security enhancements considered capital improvements (e.g., constructing a new doorway, installing bulletproof glass) are not reimbursable and must be borne by the landlord. However, these costs can later be incorporated into the monthly rent of the district office lease. For questions on capital improvements or modifying district office leases, please contact the CAO Office of the Administrative Counsel at x56969."

- After "*Security Personnel Support*" strike the following paragraph and insert:

"Payment for security personnel is an ordinary and necessary reimbursable expense when such personnel is hired:

1. To provide security at official, Member-hosted district events (e.g., town halls);
2. To accompany Members during the performance of their official duties; or
3. To be stationed inside or outside the district office during business hours.

Members may contract with firms or individuals to provide personal security as referenced above. Please see the Contractors section for additional information. Members should consult the District Security Service Center before hiring a security provider and should coordinate any security needs through the HSAA's Law Enforcement Coordinator Program."

- After "*Security Items*" strike the following paragraph and insert:

  "If an item exceeds $500, it must be added to the office inventory. The purchase of a bulletproof vest for the Member is a reimbursable expense."

- After "10. District office security" insert:

  "enhancements, including equipment, installation, labor, monitoring, and maintenance costs. Please see the *Security* section for more information."

The CHAIRMAN. Would any Member like to make a statement?

Would any Member like to offer an amendment to the resolution?

If there are no amendments, I move the Committee to adopt Committee Resolution 115–7.

The question is on the motion.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying nay.

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

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Does any Member wish to submit supplemental or minority views?

I now call up and lay before the Committee Committee Resolution 115–8, a measure making technical corrections to the Committee Congressional Handbook.

Without objection, the first reading is dispensed with, and the resolution is considered read and open for amendment.

[The resolution follows:]

Committee Resolution 115-6

Resolved, the Committee on House Administration adopts the following regulations amending and superseding prior regulations known collectively as the Committee' Congressional Handbook:

- After "1. Committee funds may only be used to support the conduct of official business of the Committee. Committee funds may not be used to defray any personal, campaign-related political party or campaign-related expenses, or expenses related to a Member's personal congressional office." insert:

  "2. Committee funds may not be used to pay a settlement or award in connection with conduct prohibited under the *Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.*"

- Strike "Each Committee must submit to the Committee on House Administration, by the 18th of each month, an original and one copy of a report signed by the Committee Chair on the activities of the Committee during the preceding month. The monthly report must include the following:" and replace with:

  "Each Committee must submit to the Committee on House Administration, the later of, the 18th of each month, or five business days after the closing of the monthly financial statement for that respective month, a report signed by the Committee Chair on the activities of the Committee during the preceding month. The monthly report must include the following:"

The CHAIRMAN. Would any Member like to make a statement?

Would any Member like to offer an amendment?

If there are no amendments, I move the Committee adopt Committee Resolution 115–8.

The question is on the motion.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying nay.

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

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Does any Member wish to submit supplemental or minority views?

Seeing none, for all of the matters considered today, I would ask unanimous consent that the staff be authorized to make technical and conforming changes, if necessary.

Without objection, so ordered.

That concludes today's markup.

Without objection, the markup is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:34 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

○