S. 654

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. BURRIS) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care.

S. 1055

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 2129

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2129, a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in the District of Columbia to provide for the establishment of a National Women's History Museum.

S. 2821

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2821, a bill to require a review of existing trade agreements and renegotiation of existing trade agreements based on the review, to establish terms for future trade agreements, to express the sense of the Congress that the role of Congress in making trade policy should be strengthened, and for other purposes.

S. 3102

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3102, a bill to amend the miscellaneous rural development provisions of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to certain entities that will use the funds to make loans to consumers to implement energy efficiency measures involving structural improvements and investments in cost—effective, commercial off-the-shelf technologies to reduce home energy use.

S. 3111

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3111, a bill to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays.

S. 3123

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3123, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program to assist eligible schools and nonprofit entities through grants and technical assistance to implement farm to school programs that improve access to local foods in eligible schools.

S. 3148

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. BURRIS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. KAUFMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3148, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of Department of Defense health coverage as minimal essential coverage.

S. 3152

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3152, a bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. RES. 411

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 411, a resolution recognizing the importance and sustainability of the United States hardwoods industry and urging that United States hardwoods and the products derived from United States hardwoods be given full consideration in any program to promote construction of environmentally preferable commercial, public, or private buildings.

AMENDMENT NO. 3579

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3579 proposed to H.R. 4872, an Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to Title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 (S. Con. Res. 13).

AMENDMENT NO. 3582

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3582 proposed to H.R. 4872, an Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to Title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 (S. Con. Res. 13).

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3159. A bill to amend Public Law 10–377 to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to introduce legislation to incorporate two historically significant properties into the boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park. This expansion effort is consistent with Gettysburg National Military Park's 1999 General Management Plan, the goals of the National Park Service and is supported by the Gettysburg Borough Council.

The bill I have introduced will expand the boundary of the park to include the Gettysburg Railroad Station, also known as the Lincoln Train Station, located in downtown Gettysburg, PA. This train station was built in 1858 and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The station served as a hospital during the Battle of Gettysburg and was the departure point for thousands of soldiers who were wounded or killed in battle. The Lincoln Train Station is perhaps most historically significant as the site at which President Abraham Lincoln arrived on November 18, 1863, 1 day before he delivered the Gettysburg Address.

Currently, the station is operated by the National Trust for Historic Gettysburg and is open to the public throughout the year. Additionally, the station

served as the home of the Pennsylvania Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, which promoted events to commemorate the 200th anniversary year of Lincoln's birth in 2009. I am informed that the borough of Gettysburg had planned for the Lincoln Train Station to be used as an information and orientation center for visitors. Toward that goal, the borough in 2006 completed a rehabilitation of the station funded thought a State grant but has been unable to operate the visitor center due to a lack of funds. Accordingly, I understand that the Gettysburg Borough Council voted in 2008 to transfer the station to the National Park Service.

The legislation I introduced also expands the boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park to include 45 acres of land at the southern end of Gettysburg battlefield. I am informed by National Park officials that there were cavalry skirmishes in this area during the Battle of Gettysburg in July of 1863. Moreover, I am advised that this property is environmentally significant as the home to wetlands and wildlife habitat related to the Plum Run stream that traverses the park. This 45-acre property is adjacent to current park land and was generously donated in April of 2009. Therefore, no federal land acquisition funding will be necessary to obtain this property.

This legislation will help preserve properties and land that are historically and environmentally significant and critically important to telling the story of the Battle of Gettysburg. The Civil War was a defining moment for our Nation and we ought to take steps necessary to preserve historical assets for the benefit of current and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 3160. A bill to provide information, resources, recommendations, and funding to help State and local law enforcement enact crime prevention and intervention strategies supported by rigorous evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the PRECAUTION Act—the Prevention Resources for Eliminating Criminal Activity Using Tailored Interventions in Our Neighborhoods Act. It is a long name, but it stands for an important principle—that it is better to invest in precautionary measures now than it is to pay the costs of crime—both in dollars and lives—later on. I am pleased that the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, will again join me as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

The Federal Government has three important roles to play in fighting crime. First, the Federal Government should develop and disseminate knowledge to state and local officials regarding the newest and most effective law enforcement techniques and strategies. Second, the Federal Government should provide financial support for innovations that our State and local partners cannot afford to fund on their own. With that funding, it should also provide guidance, training, and technical assistance to implement those innovations. Third, the Federal Government can help to create and maintain effective partnerships among agencies at all levels of government, partnerships that are crafted to address specific law enforcement challenges.

The PRECAUTION Act is designed to support all three of these important roles. It creates a national commission to wade through the sea of information on crime prevention and intervention strategies currently available to identify those programs that are most ready for replication around the country. Over-taxed law enforcement officials need a simple, accessible resource to turn to that recommends a few, top-tier crime prevention and intervention programs. They need a resource that will single out those existing programs that are truly ''evidence-based'' programs that are proven by scientifically reliable evidence to be effective. The commission created by the PRECAUTION Act will provide just such a report—written in plain language and focused on pragmatic implementation issues—approximately a year and a half after the bill is enacted.

In the course of holding hearings and writing this first report, the commission will also identify some types of prevention and intervention strategies that are promising but need further research and development before they are ready for further implementation. The National Institute of Justice then will administer a grant program that will fund pilot projects in these identified areas. The commission will follow closely the progress of these pilot projects, and at the end of the three-year grant program, it will publish a second report, providing a detailed discussion of each pilot project and its effectiveness. This second report will include detailed implementation information and will discuss both the successes and failures of the projects funded by the grants.

There is particular urgency for this bill as State and Federal budget shortfalls continue and State and local law enforcement are forced to do more with fewer resources. There is no doubt that money is tight, which makes it all the more important that innovative and cost-effective law enforcement strategies that benefit both public safety and the government bottom line are being used in our communities. To help accomplish this, the Federal Government must work in concert with State and local law enforcement, with the nonprofit criminal justice community, and with other branches of State and Federal Government. While we have an obligation to provide leadership and support, we do not have the right to unilaterally take control from the State and local officials on the ground. With these partnerships in place we can invest our resources in crime-fighting measures, confident that they will work. Sometimes, small and careful advances are the ones that yield the most benefit.

The PRECAUTION Act answers a call by police chiefs and mayors from more than 50 cities around the country during a national conference hosted by the Police Executive Research Forum in 2006. According to a report on the event from the Forum, these law enforcement leaders agreed that while there is a desperate need for the law enforcement community to focus on violent crime, ''other municipal agencies and social services organizations—including schools, mental health, public health, courts, corrections, and conflict management groups—need to be brought together to partner toward the common goal of reducing violent crime.'' In the hearings held by the PRECAUTION Act commission, these voices will all be heard. In the reports filed by the commission, these perspectives will be acknowledged. In the pilot projects administered by the National Institute of Justice, these partnerships will be developed and fostered.

The Senate Judiciary Committee highlighted the need for cost saving measures when it held a hearing entitled ''Encouraging Innovative and Cost-Effective Crime Reduction Strategies.'' Chief of Police Michael Schirling of Burlington, Vermont, in response to a question I asked him in conjunction with the hearing, said of the PRECAUTION Act that it would be:

> [A] useful tool for law enforcement that could, if properly implemented, result in long-term cost savings not only for law enforcement, but also for communities as a whole. The manner in which creative initiatives would be studied to validate their effectiveness and then added to a resource library of new ideas seems like a prudent approach to spreading important concepts and ideas to improve the criminal justice system in a meaningful way.

The PRECAUTION Act, though very modest in scope, is an important supplement to the essential financial support the Federal Government provides to our State and local law enforcement partners through programs such as the Byrne Justice Assistance grants and the COPS grants. When State and local law enforcement receive Federal support for policing, they have difficult decisions to make on how to spend those Federal dollars. We all know that prevention and intervention are integral components of any comprehensive law enforcement plan. The PRECAUTION Act not only highlights the importance of these components, but will also help to single out some of the best, most effective forms of prevention and intervention programs. At the same time, it will help to develop additional, cutting-edge strategies that are supported by solid scientific evidence of their effectiveness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Prevention Resources for Eliminating Criminal Activity Using Tailored Interventions in Our Neighborhoods Act of 2010'' or the ''PRECAUTION Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) establish a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to provide leadership on successful crime prevention and intervention strategies;

(2) further the integration of crime prevention and intervention strategies into traditional law enforcement practices of State and local law enforcement offices around the country;

(3) develop a plain-language, implementation-focused assessment of those current crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies that are supported by rigorous evidence;

(4) provide additional resources to the National Institute of Justice to administer grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for research and development for promising crime prevention and intervention strategies;

(5) develop recommendations for Federal priorities for crime and delinquency prevention and intervention research, development, and funding that may augment important Federal grant programs, including the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.), grant programs administered by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice, grant programs administered by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools of the Department of Education, and other similar programs; and

(6) reduce the costs that rising violent crime imposes on interstate commerce.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the National Commission on Public Safety Through Crime Prevention established under section 4(a).

(2) RIGOROUS EVIDENCE.—The term ''rigorous evidence'' means evidence generated by scientifically valid forms of outcome evaluation, particularly randomized trials (where practicable).

(3) SUBCATEGORY.—The term ''subcategory'' means 1 of the following categories:

(A) Family and community settings (including public health-based strategies).

(B) Law enforcement settings (including probation-based strategies).

(C) School settings (including antigang and general antiviolence strategies).

(4) TOP-TIER.—The term ''top-tier'' means any strategy supported by rigorous evidence of the sizable, sustained benefits to participants in the strategy or to society.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PUBLIC SAFETY THROUGH CRIME PREVENTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the National Commission on Public Safety Through Crime Prevention.

(b) MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

(A) 3 shall be appointed by the President, 1 of whom shall be the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs or a representative of such Assistant Attorney General;

(B) 2 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, unless the Speaker is of the same party as the President, in which case 1 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(C) 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives (in addition to any appointment made under subparagraph (B));

(D) 2 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, unless the majority leader is of the same party as the President, in which case 1 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate and 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(E) 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate (in addition to any appointment made under subparagraph (D)).

(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission shall be an individual who has knowledge or expertise in matters to be studied by the Commission.

(B) REQUIRED REPRESENTATIVES.—At least—

(i) 2 members of the Commission shall be respected social scientists with experience implementing or interpreting rigorous, outcome-based trials; and

(ii) 2 members of the Commission shall be law enforcement practitioners.

(3) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—The President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate shall consult prior to the appointment of the members of the Commission to achieve, to the maximum extent possible, fair and equitable representation of various points of view with respect to the matters to be studied by the Commission.

(4) TERM.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(5) TIME FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of the members shall be made not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(6) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made, and shall be made not later than 60 days after the date on which the vacancy occurred.

(7) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, the Director of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Director of the Community Capacity Development Office, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and the Director of Community Oriented Policing Services (or a representative of each such director) shall each serve in an ex officio capacity on the Commission to provide advice and information to the Commission.

(c) OPERATION.—

(1) CHAIRPERSON.—At the initial meeting of the Commission, the members of the Commission shall elect a chairperson from among its voting members, by a vote of ⅔ of the members of the Commission. The chairperson shall retain this position for the life of the Commission. If the chairperson leaves the Commission, a new chairperson shall be selected, by a vote of ⅔ of the members of the Commission.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the chairperson. The initial meeting of the Commission shall take place not later than 30 days after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed.

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, and the Commission may establish a lesser quorum for conducting hearings scheduled by the Commission.

(4) RULES.—The Commission may establish by majority vote any other rules for the conduct of Commission business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this Act or other applicable law.

(d) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall hold public hearings. The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under this section.

(2) FOCUS OF HEARINGS.—The Commission shall hold at least 3 separate public hearings, each of which shall focus on 1 of the subcategories.

(3) WITNESS EXPENSES.—Witnesses requested to appear before the Commission shall be paid the same fees as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code. The per diem and mileage allowances for witnesses shall be paid from funds appropriated to the Commission.

(e) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF EVIDENCE-BASED CRIME PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall carry out a comprehensive study of the effectiveness of crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies, organized around the 3 subcategories.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a review of research on the general effectiveness of incorporating crime prevention and intervention strategies into an overall law enforcement plan;

(B) an evaluation of how to more effectively communicate the wealth of social science research to practitioners;

(C) a review of evidence regarding the effectiveness of specific crime prevention and intervention strategies, focusing on those strategies supported by rigorous evidence;

(D) an identification of—

(i) promising areas for further research and development; and

(ii) other areas representing gaps in the body of knowledge that would benefit from additional research and development;

(E) an assessment of the best practices for implementing prevention and intervention strategies;

(F) an assessment of the best practices for gathering rigorous evidence regarding the implementation of intervention and prevention strategies; and

(G) an assessment of those top-tier strategies best suited for duplication efforts in a range of settings across the country.

(3) INITIAL REPORT ON TOP-TIER CRIME PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.—

(A) DISTRIBUTION.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall submit a public report on the study carried out under this subsection to—

(i) the President;

(ii) Congress;

(iii) the Attorney General;

(iv) the Chief Federal Public Defender of each district;

(v) the chief executive of each State;

(vi) the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts of each State;

(vii) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and

(viii) the attorney general of each State.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) the findings and conclusions of the Commission;

(ii) a summary of the top-tier strategies, including—

(I) a review of the rigorous evidence supporting the designation of each strategy as top-tier;

(II) a brief outline of the keys to successful implementation for each strategy; and

(III) a list of references and other information on where further information on each strategy can be found;

(iii) recommended protocols for implementing crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies generally;

(iv) recommended protocols for evaluating the effectiveness of crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies; and

(v) a summary of the materials relied upon by the Commission in preparation of the report.

(C) CONSULTATION WITH OUTSIDE AUTHORITIES.—In developing the recommended protocols for implementation and rigorous evaluation of top-tier crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies under this paragraph, the Commission shall consult with the Committee on Law and Justice at the National Academy of Science and with national associations representing the law enforcement and social science professions, including the National Sheriffs' Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Consortium of Social Science Associations, and the American Society of Criminology.

(f) RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING INNOVATIVE CRIME PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the final hearing under subsection (d) relating to a subcategory, the Commission shall provide the Director of the National Institute of Justice and the Attorney General with recommendations on qualifying considerations relating to that subcategory for selecting recipients of contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants under section 5.

(B) DEADLINE.—Not later than 13 months after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall provide all recommendations required under this subsection.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The recommendations provided under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations relating to—

(A) the types of strategies for the applicable subcategory that would best benefit from additional research and development;

(B) any geographic or demographic targets;

(C) the types of partnerships with other public or private entities that might be pertinent and prioritized; and

(D) any classes of crime and delinquency prevention and intervention strategies that should not be given priority because of a preexisting base of knowledge that would benefit less from additional research and development.

(g) FINAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF INNOVATIVE CRIME PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the close of the 3-year period for the evaluation of an innovative strategy under section 5, the Commission shall collect the results of the evaluation and shall submit a public report to the President, the Attorney General, Congress, the chief executive of each State, and the attorney general of each State describing each strategy funded under section 5 and the results of the strategy. The report under this paragraph shall be submitted not later than 5 years after the date of the selection of the chairperson of the Commission.

(2) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE REGARDING RECIPIENTS.—The collection of information and evidence by the Commission regarding each recipient of a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under section 5 shall be carried out by—

(A) ongoing communications with the grant administrator at the National Institute of Justice and other appropriate officers at other components of the Department of Justice;

(B) visits by representatives of the Commission (including at least 1 member of the Commission) to the site where the recipient of a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant is carrying out the strategy funded under section 5, at least once in the second and once in the third year of the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant;

(C) a review of the data generated by the study monitoring the effectiveness of the strategy; and

(D) other means as necessary.

(3) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a review of each strategy carried out with a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under section 5, detailing—

(A) the type of crime or delinquency prevention or intervention strategy;

(B) where the activities under the strategy were carried out, including geographic and demographic targets;

(C) any partnerships with public or private entities through the course of the period of the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant;

(D) the type and design of the effectiveness study conducted under section 5(b)(4) or section 5(c)(2)(C) for that strategy;

(E) the results of the effectiveness study conducted under section 5(b)(4) or section 5(c)(2)(C) for that strategy;

(F) lessons learned regarding implementation of that strategy or of the effectiveness study conducted under section 5(b)(4) or section 5(c)(2)(C), including recommendations regarding which types of environments might best be suited for successful replication; and

(G) recommendations regarding the need for further research and development of the strategy.

(h) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(3) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(B) COMPENSATION.—The chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—With the affirmative vote of ⅔ of the members of the Commission, any Federal Government employee, with the approval of the head of the appropriate Federal agency, may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privileges.

(i) CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH.—

(1) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE.—With a ⅔ affirmative vote of the members of the Commission, the Commission may select nongovernmental researchers and experts to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act. The National Institute of Justice shall contract with the researchers and experts selected by the Commission to provide funding in exchange for their services.

(2) OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the ability of the Commission to enter into contracts with other entities or organizations for research necessary to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section.

(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 to carry out this section.

(k) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Commission submits the last report required by this section.

(l) EXEMPTION.—The Commission shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

SEC. 5. INNOVATIVE CRIME PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may fund the implementation and evaluation of innovative crime or delinquency prevention or intervention strategies though coordinated initiatives, as described in subsection (b), through grants authorized under subsection (c), or a combination of the coordinated initiatives and grants.

(b) COORDINATED INITIATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Justice, may coordinate efforts between the National Institute of Justice and other appropriate components of the Department of Justice to implement and rigorously evaluate innovative crime or delinquency prevention or intervention strategies.

(2) SELECTION OF STRATEGIES.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate components of the Department of Justice, shall identify innovative crime or delinquency prevention or intervention strategies that would best benefit from additional funding and evaluation, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Commission under section 4(f).

(3) PROGRAM OFFICE ROLE.—The head of any appropriate component of the Department of Justice, as determined by the Attorney General, may provide incentives under a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant entered into or made by the component, including a competitive preference priority and providing additional funds, for a public or private entity to—

(A) implement a strategy identified under paragraph (2); or

(B) participate in the evaluation under paragraph (4) of the strategies identified under paragraph (2).

(4) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice may enter into or make contracts, cooperative agreements, or

grants to conduct a rigorous study of the effectiveness of each strategy relating to which an incentive is provided under paragraph (3).

(B) AMOUNT AND DURATION.—A contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under subparagraph (A) shall be for not more than $700,000, and shall be for a period of not more than 3 years.

(C) METHODOLOGY OF STUDY.—Each study conducted under subparagraph (A) shall use a study design that is likely to produce rigorous evidence of the effectiveness of the strategy and, where feasible, measure outcomes using available administrative data, such as police arrest records, so as to minimize the costs of the study.

(c) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice may make grants to public and private entities to fund the implementation and evaluation of innovative crime or delinquency prevention or intervention strategies. The purpose of grants under this subsection shall be to provide funds for all expenses related to the implementation of such a strategy and to conduct a rigorous study on the effectiveness of that strategy.

(2) GRANT DISTRIBUTION.—

(A) PERIOD.—A grant under this subsection shall be made for a period of not more than 3 years.

(B) AMOUNT.—The amount of each grant under this subsection—

(i) shall be sufficient to ensure that rigorous evaluations may be performed; and

(ii) shall not exceed $2,000,000.

(C) EVALUATION SET-ASIDE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A grantee shall use not less than $300,000 and not more than $700,000 of the funds from a grant under this subsection for a rigorous study of the effectiveness of the strategy during the 3-year period of the grant for that strategy.

(ii) METHODOLOGY OF STUDY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Each study conducted under clause (i) shall use an evaluator and a study design approved by the employee of the National Institute of Justice hired or assigned under subsection (e) and, where feasible, measure outcomes using available administrative data, such as police arrest records, so as to minimize the costs of the study.

(II) CRITERIA.—The employee of the National Institute of Justice hired or assigned under subsection (e) shall approve—

(aa) an evaluator that has successfully carried out multiple studies producing rigorous evidence of effectiveness; and

(bb) a proposed study design that is likely to produce rigorous evidence of the effectiveness of the strategy.

(III) APPROVAL.—Before a grant is awarded under this subsection, the evaluator and study design of a grantee shall be approved by the employee of the National Institute of Justice hired or assigned under subsection (e).

(D) DATE OF AWARD.—Not later than 6 months after the date of receiving recommendations relating to a subcategory from the Commission under section 4(f), the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall award all grants under this subsection relating to that subcategory.

(E) TYPE OF GRANTS.—One-third of the grants made under this subsection shall be made in each subcategory. In distributing grants, the recommendations of the Commission under section 4(f) shall be considered.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $18,000,000 to carry out subsections (b) and (c).

(e) DEDICATED STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice shall hire or assign a full-time employee to oversee the contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants under this section.

(2) STUDY OVERSIGHT.—The employee of the National Institute of Justice hired or assigned under paragraph (1) shall be responsible for ensuring that recipients of a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under this section adhere to the study design approved before the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant was entered into or awarded.

(3) LIAISON.—The employee of the National Institute of Justice hired or assigned under paragraph (1) may be used as a liaison between the Commission and the recipients of a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under this section. The employee shall be responsible for ensuring timely cooperation with Commission requests.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $150,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to carry out this subsection.

(f) APPLICATIONS.—A public or private entity desiring a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Director of the National Institute of Justice or other appropriate component of the Department of Justice may reasonably require.

(g) COOPERATION WITH THE COMMISSION.—A person entering into a contract or cooperative agreement or receiving a grant under this section shall cooperate with the Commission in providing the Commission with full information on the progress of the strategy being carried out with a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under this section, including—

(1) hosting visits by the members of the Commission to the site where the activities under the strategy are being carried out;

(2) providing pertinent information on the logistics of establishing the strategy for which the contract, cooperative agreement, or grant under this section was received, including details on partnerships, selection of participants, and any efforts to publicize the strategy; and

(3) responding to any specific inquiries that may be made by the Commission.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) For the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of the PRECAUTION Act, and each fiscal year thereafter through the end of the fifth full fiscal year after such date of enactment, there is appropriated to the Attorney General from the Fund $4,750,000 to carry out the PRECAUTION Act.''.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 3161. A bill to establish penalties for servicers that fail to timely evaluate the applications of homeowners under home loan modification programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Mortgage Modification Reform Act, which is designed to protect homeowners and communities from big banks who fail to modify mortgages in a timely fashion.

In the past year I have heard from hundreds of families in New Hampshire who have fallen behind on their mortgages. Often, they tell me that they can no longer afford their payments because of circumstances beyond their control. A family member has been laid off or had her hours reduced. Medical bills have started piling up. Higher interest payments kicked in at just the wrong time. And since value of the average home has declined over 15 percent in New Hampshire, they now owe more on their home than it's worth.

But these families want to make it work, so they reach out to their bank or ''mortgage servicer'' to figure out a way to make payments they can afford. Often, when a homeowner comes to a servicer, they can work together to bring the homeowner's payments down to an affordable level. When a servicer modifies a mortgage, everybody wins: the homeowner can stay in their home; the servicer avoids the costly foreclosure process; and communities are spared from the devastating effects that foreclosures have on home values and communities.

That is why these families in New Hampshire and others across the country breathed a sigh of relief when they heard that a new program, called the Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP, would provide powerful incentives to servicers to work with borrowers to keep them in their homes.

We were told that HAMP would help 3–4 million homeowners stay in their homes by reducing the amount a family owes each month to 31 percent of its monthly income. The big, national servicer banks who signed up for the program would avoid the foreclosure process and receive incentive payments. Most importantly, communities would have benefitted by stemming the tide of foreclosures, which have so drastically lowered home values and the equity of millions of homeowners.

But a year into the program, it is clear that many of these big banks are unwilling or uninterested in helping people in our communities. The banks routinely lose documents and ask the borrower to send them in again, delaying the process for months at a time. They don't respond to calls and voice messages that are only returned weeks or months later—if they are returned at all. And as homeowners wait for a decision, the banks charge them late fees, which puts them even further behind. When homeowners finally receive modification offers, they often come at the last minute—just days before the borrower's home is set to be auctioned.

As a result of these abuses, instead of helping the millions of homeowners that they promised would be able to stay in their homes, servicers have offered trial modifications to less than 30 percent of eligible homeowners. The banks participating in HAMP have only provided permanent relief to only 116,000 homeowners.

We know that the servicers are capable of success in this program because some servicers have been better than others. According to the latest Servicer Performance Report from the Treasury, some servicers have helped as little as 2 percent of their eligible

borrowers, while others have helped over 50 percent. And it's not surprising that some of the servicers with the worst numbers are the same big banks that were happy to be bailed out by TARP not too long ago.

It is time to tell these big banks that enough's enough. We need protections for homeowners, and we need to penalize the servicers who have failed to offer the help they promised.

That is why I am introducing legislation today, the Mortgage Modification Reform Act, to stop the big banks from abusing homeowners and to start penalizing those who do not live up to their promise to provide homeowners with the relief they need.

The Mortgage Modification Reform Act would charge banks ''late fees'' for every month that they fail to evaluate a homeowner for this program. After 3 months, if a homeowner has not received an answer on whether their mortgage will be modified, the banks' payments will be reduced 10 percent for each month that it fails to evaluate the homeowner. By reducing payments to the banks over time, the bank will be encouraged to evaluate these borrowers earlier and more frequently. This also protects the taxpayer by only rewarding those banks that respond quickly and punishing those that fail to act. Banks will have to perform to get paid, and if they don't, their compensation will stay with to the taxpayer.

This legislation would also require banks to stop the foreclosure process until it determines whether a borrower qualifies. This would also give much-needed peace of mind to homeowners who aren't sure which will come first: the modification they need, or the sale of their home.

In addition, the legislation would prevent banks from imposing fees while they wait for a decision. There is no reason that a bank should charge a homeowner for being delinquent while waiting for evaluation in the program. There is no reason for a homeowner to pay fees for an unnecessary foreclosure process. This legislation would put an end to these abusive practices.

Finally, the Mortgage Modification Reform Act provides a protection for borrowers that has been missing from day one of this program: a way for homeowners to request a review of the bank's decision. Right now, the banks make all the decisions whether a homeowner qualifies for the program or not. There is no way for the homeowner to appeal that decision. But we know that those decisions aren't always right. Many homeowners were originally told that they didn't qualify, but ask their Senator or get legal assistance to ask the servicer to take another look. Often, they did qualify for the program, but the servicer did not evaluate the borrower properly.

But not every homeowner should have to involve their Senator or a lawyer to get their bank to respond. They should be able to make their case on their own to an independent arbiter. This legislation requires the Treasury Department to create a separate, independent review process to allow homeowners who feel they have been wrongly denied the chance to stay in their home. In addition, to ensure transparency, this legislation would require the servicer to submit documentation to the Treasury for each denial that it makes.

Making this program work isn't just important for these homeowners, it's also critical to our economic recovery. With million homeowners across the nation behind on their mortgages and at risk of foreclosure, we need this program achieve its potential of stopping millions of homes from flooding the housing market and further depressing home values.

I urge my colleagues to join me to prevent banks from continuing to abuse this program, and to get it on track to provide help to the millions of homeowners who need it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3161

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Mortgage Modification Reform Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''covered trial loan modification'' means a trial loan modification—

(A) offered by a servicer to a homeowner under a home loan modification program; and

(B) for which the servicer has received from the homeowner the information required for a trial loan modification;

(2) the term ''home loan modification program'' means a home loan modification program put into effect by the Secretary under title I of division A of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.), including the Home Affordable Modification Program;

(3) the term ''homeowner'' means an individual who applies for a home loan modification under a home loan modification program;

(4) the term ''permanent loan modification'' means any agreement reached between a homeowner and a servicer on a long-term basis, as determined by the Secretary, under a home loan modification program;

(5) the term ''qualified counselor'' means a qualified counselor described in section 255(f) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(f));

(6) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury;

(7) the term ''servicer'' has the same meaning as in section 129 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1639a) (relating to the duties of servicers of residential mortgages), as added by section 201(b) of the Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–22; 123 Stat. 1638);

(8) the term ''servicer incentive payment'' means a payment that is made by the Secretary to a servicer—

(A) in exchange, or as an incentive, for making a loan modification under a home loan modification program; and

(B) at the time the servicer makes an offer of a trial or permanent modification to a homeowner; and

(9) the term ''trial loan modification'' means any agreement reached between a homeowner and a servicer on a temporary basis, as determined by the Secretary, under a home loan modification program.

SEC. 3. FORECLOSURE.

A servicer may not initiate or continue a foreclosure proceeding with respect to the mortgage of a homeowner if—

(1) the homeowner submitted an application for a loan modification under a home loan modification program—

(A) before receiving a notice of foreclosure from the servicer; or

(B) not later than 30 days after the homeowner received a notice of foreclosure from the servicer; and

(2) the servicer has not made a determination, as described in section 5(a) that the homeowner does not qualify for a loan modification under a home loan modification program.

SEC. 4. PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF IMPROPER DENIALS.

(a) PROCESS FOR REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a process by which a homeowner may request the Secretary to review a denial by a servicer of an application by the homeowner for a trial loan modification or permanent loan modification.

(2) QUALIFIED COUNSELORS.—The process established under paragraph (1) shall include the use of qualified counselors to report wrongful denials of trial loan modifications and permanent loan modifications.

(3) SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary shall require a servicer to submit supporting documentation with respect to any denial by the servicer of an application by a homeowner for a trial loan modification or permanent loan modification that is reviewed by the Secretary under the process established under paragraph (1).

(b) PENALTIES.—If the Secretary determines after a review under the process established under subsection (a) that a servicer has wrongly denied the application of a homeowner for a trial loan modification or a permanent loan modification, the Secretary shall impose a penalty on the servicer.

SEC. 5. PENALTIES FOR SERVICERS THAT DO NOT TIMELY EVALUATE HOMEOWNERS.

(a) TIME FOR EVALUATION OF HOMEOWNERS.—Not later than 3 months after the date on which a homeowner submits an application for a loan modification to a servicer that participates in a home loan modification program, the servicer shall—

(1) evaluate the application of the homeowner; and

(2) notify the homeowner that—

(A) the homeowner is qualified for a trial loan modification or a permanent loan modification under the home loan modification program; or

(B) the servicer has denied the application.

(b) PRIORITY FOR EVALUATING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) PRIORITY.—A servicer that participates in a home loan modification program shall evaluate the applications of homeowners for loan modifications in the order in which the servicer receives the applications.

(2) PROHIBITION.—A servicer that participates in a home loan modification program may not select the order in which the applications of homeowners are evaluated for loan modifications—

(A) on the basis of—

(i) the income of the homeowner that made the application; or

(ii) the value of the loan for which a modification is requested; or

(B) for any reason other than the time at which the servicer receives the applications.

(c) LATE FEES FOR SERVICERS.—

(1) REDUCED SERVICER INCENTIVE PAYMENTS FOR LOANS INDIVIDUAL HOMEOWNERS.—The Secretary shall reduce the amount of any servicer incentive payment with respect to the loan modification of an individual homeowner by 10 percent for each full month that—

(A) follows the date that is 3 months after the date on which the homeowner submits an application for a loan modification to the servicer; and

(B) precedes the date on which the servicer notifies the homeowner under subsection (a)(2).

(2) REDUCED PAYMENTS FOR ALL LOANS.—If the Secretary determines that, on the date that is 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, less than 75 percent of all homeowners who applied to a servicer for loan modifications under a home loan modification program have been evaluated within 3 months of the date of the application, the Secretary shall reduce by 25 percent the amount of any servicer incentive payment the servicer would otherwise be eligible to receive under the home loan modification program.

(d) DELINQUENCY FEES CHARGED TO HOMEOWNERS.—No servicer may impose a fee on a homeowner due to delinquency during the period beginning on the date on which the homeowner submits an application to the servicer for a loan modification and ending on the date on which the homeowner receives notice under subsection (a)(2).

(e) COLLECTION AND REPORT OF DATA.—

(1) COLLECTION OF DATA.—Each servicer shall report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may determine, data relating to the processing by the servicer of applications for loan modifications.

(2) REPORT OF DATA.—The Secretary shall publish a monthly report containing the data collected under paragraph (1).

SEC. 6. REDUCED PAYMENTS FOR FAILURE TO EVALUATE HOMEOWNERS FOR PERMANENT MODIFICATIONS.

If the Secretary determines that, on the date that is 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, less than 70 percent of all covered trial loan modifications offered by a servicer have been evaluated for conversion to permanent loan modifications before the date that is 3 months after the date on which the servicer and the homeowner entered into an agreement for a trial loan modification, the Secretary shall reduce by 25 percent the amount of any servicer incentive payment the servicer would otherwise be eligible to receive under the home loan modification program. Such reduction shall be in addition to any other reduction in payment that may have been imposed on the servicer for any other violation of this Act.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO PAYMENTS TO HOMEOWNERS.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to require a reduction of a payment by the Secretary made on behalf or for the benefit of a homeowner in connection with a loan modification.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, of Ohio, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. BYRD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KOHL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3162. A bill to clarify the health care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that constitutes minimum essential coverage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, concerns have been raised to me about a technical error in the health care reform bill that was recently passed, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, H.R. 3590. In drafting the PPACA, a provision was included which designates health care provided under VA's authority as meeting the minimum required health care coverage that an individual is required to maintain.

However, due to the way this exemption was worded, this definition may exclude children with spina bifida, who are seriously disabled and to whom VA provides reimbursement for comprehensive health care. The underlying bill gave authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to designate other care, which could include the VA spina bifida program, as meeting the definition of minimum essential coverage. This bill would simply clarify what was originally intended.

Chapter 18 of title 38 contains the Spina Bifida Health Care Program, which is a health benefit program administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs for Vietnam War and certain Korean War Veterans' birth children who have been diagnosed with spina bifida, except spina bifida occulta. The program provides reimbursement for medical services and supplies.

The legislation I introduce today corrects this small error. Additionally, this legislation would clarify that recipients of CHAMPVA would also be considered as meeting the requirement for minimum essential coverage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS THAT CONSTITUTES MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (v) of section 5000A(f)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, is amended to read as follows:

''(v) chapter 17 or 18 of title 38, United States Code, or otherwise under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, of an individual entitled to coverage under such chapter or laws for essential health benefits (as defined by the Secretary for purposes of section 1302(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act) insofar as such benefits are available under such chapter or laws; or''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in section 1501(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and shall be executed immediately after the amendments made by such section 1501(b).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 468—HONORING THE BLACKSTONE VALLEY TOURISM COUNCIL ON THE CELEBRATION OF ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. RES. 468

Whereas on April 8, 2010, the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council will celebrate the 25th anniversary of its founding;

Whereas since 1985, the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council has been at the forefront of sustainable destination development, community building, resiliency, education, and scholarly research;

Whereas the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council is a non-profit corporation registered as a 501(c)(3) educational organization and is authorized under Section 42-63.1-5 of the Rhode Island General Laws as the State-designated regional tourism development agency for the Blackstone Valley of Rhode Island;

Whereas the development region of the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council follows the length and width of the Blackstone River Watershed, from the many tributaries in southern Massachusetts, to the end of the river at the headwaters of the Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island;

Whereas the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council represents the Rhode Island cities of Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket, and towns of Cumberland, Lincoln, North Smithfield, Smithfield, Glocester, and Burrillville;

Whereas the Blackstone Valley is the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution that began in 1790 in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, when Samuel Slater began textile manufacturing in a wooden mill on the banks of the Blackstone River;

Whereas since its beginning, the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council has worked to develop, promote, and expand the economic and community development base for the cities and towns in the Blackstone Valley to create a viable visitor and cultural destination that preserves the historic heritage of the region;

Whereas the Blackstone Valley Tourism Council works as an interpreter and educator