

from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to protect and promote international religious freedom.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants.

S. 1925

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1925, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program and to make permanent the payment in lieu of taxes program and the land and water conservation fund.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 2612

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2612 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1944. A bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules be-

fore issuing or amending a rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce S. 1944, the RED Tape Act of 2015.

The letters R-E-D stand for Regulations Endanger Democracy. They do, and they are. This bill will help cut burdensome regulations—regulations that I think everybody agrees have been strangling our economy, regulations that many of my colleagues and I and economists around the country and around the world believe are at the heart of why we can't grow the great American economy.

Let me spend a few minutes on the economy, what the regulations are doing, and why I believe this bill is so important and why we are working hard to get bipartisan support for it.

There is a debate going on in this country and on the Senate floor: Are we in decline? Is America in decline? Are our best days behind us? Is China going to own the 21st century the way we did the last century?

Now, I am an optimist. I don't think we are in decline. We don't need to be in decline. Here is the reason why. We don't hear about it much, but when we look and compare the United States to other countries, we have so many comparative advantages. We still have so many comparative advantages.

Imagine the United States is in a global poker game with all the other major nations of the world around the table. We don't hear this much, but relative to other countries, we look at our hand and we hold aces. As a matter of fact, we hold most of the aces. Let me give a few examples.

The high-tech sector. Whether it is Silicon Valley, Massachusetts, places throughout the entire country, we still have the most vibrant, innovative high-tech sector of anyplace in the world, the ability to commercialize ideas with private equity and financing. If you have a good idea, an entrepreneurial idea in America, you can commercialize that, you can take that to market more quickly, more efficiently than any other place in the world.

Our agriculture sector for decades has been probably the most efficient agriculture sector in the world, feeding the world, literally.

Universities. Look at America's universities relative to any other place, any other country. I had the great honor—my oldest daughter of my three teenaged daughters graduated from high school last year. My wife and I took her to a number of universities she was looking at across the country. We have States—Massachusetts, California—that probably have better top research universities just in those States than other countries have in their entire country. In my State of Alaska, we have great universities. It is a huge advantage.

Energy. Once again through American innovation, we are the world's en-

ergy superpower again, the way we used to be, producing more oil, more gas, more renewables than any other country in the world. It is a huge advantage.

Fisheries. We are one of the top countries in the world in terms of the harvest of fisheries, and my State of Alaska is the superpower of American seafood. We harvest more than 50 percent of all seafood in America—a huge advantage for our country.

The military. I don't have to say much more about the military. We have the best, most professional military in the world, probably in the history of the world, unrivaled by any other nation, not even close.

Then even issues like—we talk a lot about immigration and how our system is broken and how the border needs to be secured. Absolutely. But we are still the country of the world that other people of the world want to come to. They want to come here.

I recently attended a naturalization ceremony in Juneau, AK. If you want to take pride in our country, if you want to see something great, go to a naturalization ceremony. See people who have been thinking about becoming an American for most of their lives finally achieving that goal. It will bring tears to your eyes. It brought tears to my eyes.

Then, of course, in terms of comparative advantages, there is our form of government, our Framers, our Constitution—the longest standing constitutional democracy in the world. It certainly is not perfect, but again, relative to other countries, it is a huge advantage.

So, as I mentioned, we have all the aces. In that big global game of poker, we have a great hand. As President Reagan said a couple decades ago, we are "the greatest, freest, strongest nation on earth." And I believe we still are.

But, of course, like all countries, we have challenges. Here is the biggest challenge, I believe: If we have all the aces, if we have all these comparative advantages, why can't we grow our economy anymore? Why can't we create opportunities for young college graduates?

Our gross domestic product shrunk the first quarter of this year for the third time in the last 9 years. That hasn't happened in more than 60 years. From 2011 through 2014, our gross domestic product only grew at a little bit below 2 percent.

The comparative advantage, the growth rate that made our country great from 1790 to 2014—U.S. real GDP growth in real dollars—averaged an annual rate of 3.7 percent—almost 4 percent GDP growth. That is the average for our country's history. That is real, robust American growth. That is what made us great. The Obama administration's average is 1.36 percent per year.

Just last week—and I know this is an issue that you and I have talked a lot about—it was revealed that we now

have officially the worst economic recovery in 70 years.

An article in the Wall Street Journal says that new GDP revisions show the worst recovery in 70 years and it was even weaker than we thought. This is a huge problem. We can no longer grow our economy. When that happens, we hurt the most vulnerable in society. But what is even more frustrating than that is when you come to Washington, it seems that nobody actually seems to care about this topic anymore or that we are going to dumb down our expectations.

It was pretty amazing. Some economists cheered. Our growth rate that was announced last quarter was a little bit over 2 percent GDP growth, and they cheered it. But, again, the issue doesn't even seem to be something that people here are focused on.

Let me give you an example. The first quarter of this year, the U.S. economy—the greatest economy in the world—went back into recession. We shrunk. That is a big deal. That should frighten people. Did the White House say anything? Did the Secretary of the Treasury come out and say: Oh, my gosh, we are back in a recession; here is what we are going to do to grow this economy because we know growth is the key to almost everything.

Not a word—in fact, what is starting to happen is—and it is a very, very dangerous trend in Washington—we are just going to dumb down our expectations. Yes, traditional levels of U.S. economic growth are almost 4 percent since the founding of our Nation. But guess what we are going to call it now. We are going to call 2 percent growth—which is all we can achieve, it seems—the new normal. We are not going to try to get back to 4 percent, the traditional levels. Democrats and Republicans have done that for decades, centuries. We are going to say: No, America, you need to be satisfied with the new normal—2 percent GDP growth.

Terms such as the “new normal,” “secular stagnation”—some are even talking that this is our destiny as a nation. I don't like that term—“new normal.” It is a surrender. It is a surrender of American greatness. It is a surrender of our future, and it is a surrender of our kids' future.

If we stay at these levels of growth—1.5 percent, 2 percent of GDP growth; the Obama administration growth levels—the challenges that we face are huge debt, infrastructure, funding the military, funding social programs, and even the cohesion of our great American country. All of these challenges will be much, much harder to address.

I believe one of the most important things we can do in this body, which we are not doing enough of, is to focus on this issue. Why are we not growing the American economy anymore? We have to get back to these robust levels of growth—Democratic, Republican levels. We have to get back to traditional levels of growth.

We can do better. Our history is better. This is the greatest economy in

the world, and we need to unleash it. What is the problem? How do we do this? How do we get back to these levels of growth? If we are holding all the aces, what is holding us back?

I believe a huge part of the problem of what is holding us back is actually this town, the Federal Government, and the agencies here that are stifling economic growth with redtape from the alphabet soup of agencies—the IRS, the EPA, and the BLM—that are constantly promulgating new regulations. As opposed to being partners in opportunity, our Federal Government wants to regulate everything, all aspects of our economy.

Regulations across the country, from Alaska to Maine, are hurting businesses, are hurting the economy, and are hurting our citizens, especially the most vulnerable. Again, this is not a partisan issue. Almost all of us on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to cut redtape. Even President Obama's own Small Business Administration puts the number—the annual cost of regulations that grow every year—at \$1.7 trillion per year. It is almost \$1.8 trillion per year. If that were the economy, that would be one of the largest economies in the world. That is a staggering number, and they are growing. Regulatory costs amount to an average of almost \$15,000 per household. It is around 29 percent of an average family budget of \$51,000. People are noticing, not only in this country but globally.

On Friday, the Financial Times had an article: “The land of free markets, tied down by red tape.”

Every nation needs a unifying idea. Americans love to see themselves as champions of free markets and entrepreneurial zeal.

That halo is coming off America because of regulations. What should we do? I believe we need to freeze the growth of regulations. That is what my bill, the RED Tape Act of 2015, does.

The cumulative Federal rules since 1976 is what we do here. We grow them like some irresistible force of nature. But it doesn't have to be that way. Unfortunately, my State has been ground zero for many overburdensome regulations—bridges, roads, and mines that take years simply to permit, not to build.

In rural Alaska, we are letting trash pile up because they don't make small, portable incinerators that comply with EPA regulations. Because of Federal roadless rules in southeast Alaska, we can't even build new alternative energy plants for energy-starved citizens of my State. Nationally, bridges are crumbling and can't get built because of overly burdensome regulations.

Let me provide one more example that you are aware of, Mr. President. Banks are failing. Because of regulations and a bad economy, over 1,300 small community banks have disappeared since 2010, and only two new banks in the United States have been chartered in the last 5 years. Even during the Great Depression we had on average 19 new banks a year. In the last

5 years, we have had two. As the article said, “the entrepreneurial halo is starting to slip, too, since increasing quantities of red tape are making life harder for start-ups.”

Let me be clear. Regulations are not all bad. Many of them keep us safe from harm. But the mountains and stacks of regulations over the decades undermine our future.

What my bill would do is very simple. It is using a simple one-in, one-out method. New regulations that cause financial or administrative burdens on businesses for the people of the United States would need to be offset by repealing existing regulations. You issue a new reg and you repeal an old reg. If an agency doesn't want to do this, the cost of living adjustments for the agency personnel will be withheld until the agency abides by this law. It is very simple.

What we need to do is stop this growth of regulations on the American people and on our economy. This bill will help keep the regulatory system under control. It will help cut the redtape that binds us. It will bind the regulatory system instead, and it will help bring back the shine of that entrepreneurial halo in great American spirit that we all yearn for.

Finally, it will make sure that the aces we have in our hand—the comparative advantages that we have over every other country in the world—are used to benefit our country, grow our economy, and create a brighter future for our children.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1957. A bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the State Licensing Efficiency Act with my colleagues Senators LANKFORD, COTTON, CAPITO, LEAHY, MERKLEY, and CRAPO.

This bill provides a simple, common-sense change to the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act, SAFE Act, which became law in 2008 as part of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act.

Overall, this bipartisan bill streamlines the licensing process for financial service providers, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SAFE Act required that state banking regulators use the electronic Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System, NMLS, to license or register mortgage loan originators.

As the author of the SAFE Act, I have been pleased to see the NMLS' success over the past five years in facilitating mortgage loan originator licensing.

The use of the NMLS for mortgage loan originators benefits state regulators, those seeking licenses to conduct financial services, and consumers.

First, it increases efficiency and consolidates the licensing process and relevant information in one place for state regulators. This also allows for easier coordination between regulators.

Second, it provides a uniform licensing process for mortgage loan originators seeking licenses.

Finally, it allows consumers to verify the credentials of financial service providers to ensure that they are truly licensed or registered in the state in which they are conducting business.

Today, over half of the States now use the NMLS for licensing entities other than mortgage loan originators, including for non-depository financial service providers like check cashers, debt collectors, and money transmitters.

Many States require Federal background checks as part of the licensing process for financial service providers.

However, the SAFE Act only provided the Attorney General with the authority to share federal background check information with the NMLS for mortgage loan originators.

The FBI does not have the authority to share this information with the NMLS for any other financial service provider.

This means that while the rest of the licensing process for other financial service providers can be conducted through the NMLS, the background check cannot.

I believe background checks are a critical component of State licensing and regulation. It does not make sense to allow for the licensing process to be delayed by barring certain background checks from being coordinated through the NMLS.

The State Licensing Efficiency Act would provide the authorization needed for the Attorney General to allow the FBI to share background check information for non-depository financial service providers with state regulators through the NMLS, just as it currently does for mortgage loan originators.

Let me be clear that this bill does not change any state licensing requirements or impact any state laws. States fully retain the ability to determine when they want to use the NMLS for other financial service providers.

However, should states continue to expand their utilization of the NMLS, it makes sense to allow them to fully do so by ensuring federal background checks can be coordinated through the NMLS.

Additionally, this bill will help financial service providers seeking licenses in multiple states.

Instead of submitting federal background check requests for each State where they are seeking a license, they can submit one request via the NMLS for Federal background check information, which will be sent to the NMLS.

States conducting the licensing process will then have access to the information through the NMLS.

This should reduce the number of background check processing fees paid by financial service providers seeking licenses and reduce the processing period for the background checks so that financial service providers can get licensed more efficiently.

The State Licensing Efficiency Act makes a reasonable change to allow state regulators who use the NMLS for licensing financial service providers to fully benefit from a streamlined, transparent, and more efficient process.

Many regulatory associations support this bill including: the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the American Association of Residential Mortgage Regulators, the Money Transmitter Regulators Association, the North American Collection Agency Regulatory Association, and the National Association of Consumer Credit Administrators.

Additionally, associations representing a variety of financial service providers have voiced support, including: the Appraisal Institute, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the Money Services Round Table.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and am hopeful that this Congress will move it forward.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1960. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation that extends the time period the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, would have to seek civil monetary penalties for securities law violations.

This legislation continues to be necessary in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Gabelli v. SEC* in which the Court held that the 5 year clock to take action against wrongdoing starts when the fraud occurs, not when it is discovered. Unfortunately, *Gabelli* has made it more difficult for the SEC to protect investors by shortening the amount of time that the SEC has to investigate and pursue securities law violations.

Financial fraud has evolved considerably over the years and now often consists of multiple parties, complex financial products, and elaborate transactions that are executed in a variety of securities markets, both domestic and foreign. As a result, the evidence of wrongdoing needed to initiate an action may go undetected for years. Securities law violators may simply run out the clock, now with greater ease in the aftermath of *Gabelli*.

Couple this with the reality that while we have given the SEC even greater responsibilities, Congress, despite my ongoing efforts to urge otherwise, has not provided the agency with all the resources necessary to carry out its duties.

To give an example of the impact of this resource shortfall, SEC Chair White on May 5, 2015, before the Senate Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee testified that "even with the SEC's efficient use of limited resources to improve its risk assessment capabilities and focus its examination staff on areas posing the greatest risk to investors—efforts that helped to increase the number of investment adviser examinations approximately 20 percent from fiscal year 2013—the SEC was only able to examine 10 percent of registered investment advisers in fiscal year 2014. A rate of adviser examination coverage at that level presents a high risk to the investing public."

This legislation would address some of these challenges by giving the SEC the breathing room it needs to better protect our markets and investors. Specifically, this bill extends the time period the SEC has to seek civil monetary penalties from five years to ten years, thereby strengthening the integrity of our markets, better protecting investors, and empowering the SEC to investigate and pursue more securities law violators, particularly those most sophisticated at evading detection.

In addition, the bill would align the SEC's statute of limitations with the limitations period applicable to complex civil financial fraud actions initiated pursuant to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, FIRREA. For more than 20 years, the Department of Justice, DOJ, has benefited from FIRREA, which allows the DOJ to seek civil penalties within a 10-year time period against persons who have committed fraud against financial institutions. The SEC, which pursues similarly complex financial fraud cases, should have the same time necessary to bring wrongdoers that violate the securities laws to justice.

I thank Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, Consumer Action, the Consumer Federation of America, and Americans for Financial Reform for their support, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator SHAHEEN and me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1964. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue of great importance: helping vulnerable children stay safe and cared for by strengthening their families and connecting them to kin.

I would like to begin with a hypothetical. Imagine a single mom with

two kids and multiple part time jobs. She works long hours to provide for her family, but even then it is a struggle to pay the bills and keep food on the table. Reliable child care is extremely costly and out of reach. Because her work schedule changes week to week she is forced to leave her children unattended at times. Out of concern, a neighbor places a call to Child Protective Services, and a social worker then has to choose between two bad options—breaking up the family, or doing nothing at all to help them.

Today, most youngsters in foster care aren't there because of physical or sexual abuse. Kids predominantly wind up in foster care because their biological families, like that hypothetical single mom, are ensnared in terribly desperate circumstances that lead to neglect.

The fact is, whenever you talk with kids who have aged out of foster care about what could have helped them the most, you hear them say things like, "helping my mom . . . helping my dad . . . helping my family." What that tells me is that youngsters know they're best served when a family can be propped up, not dismantled.

Unfortunately, the child welfare system has too few tools for that to happen. Yesterday, the Finance Committee held a hearing to explore how to turn that system around—how to make a difference for kids early on so that they can grow up surrounded by family in a safe and loving home. I commend Chairman HATCH for his commitment to improving the lives of vulnerable kids and their families. The hearing was an important step forward.

Back in the mid-1990s, there was a debate over whether sending kids to orphanages was the right idea. And I saw an opportunity for our child welfare policies to break into the enormous, untapped potential of kin. So I authored the Kinship Care Act, which said that aunts and uncles or grandparents who met the right standards would have first preference when it came to caring for a niece or nephew or grandchild. It became the first federal law of its kind.

Now in 2015, I see an opportunity for Congress to take a similar approach, but go even further. I believe that building child welfare policies around proactivity and flexibility will help a lot more families stay together and thrive. States have already shown that with waivers from the rigid Federal funding system, they're able to turn smart ideas into meaningful results for kids and their families. There is a tremendous example that my home state of Oregon is currently putting in place. It's called Differential Response. Differential Response, as I see it, is all about recognizing that every kid is different, and every family faces unique challenges. So Oregon's system is approaching every case with the nuance it deserves.

Today I—along with Senators STABENOW, BENNET, CASEY, BROWN, CANT-

WELL, SCHUMER, and MENENDEZ—am introducing the Family Stability and Kinship Care Act that will make badly needed flexibility a core part of our child welfare system. The purpose of this bill is to give states and tribes the ability to make modest front-end investments in family services and kinship placement in order to reduce costly and traumatic stays in foster care. Under current law, title IV-E of the Social Security Act, the nation's largest child welfare funding stream, provides states and tribes with a Federal funding match for children only after they are placed in foster care. In contrast, State and tribal innovations implemented through title IV-E waivers suggest that permitting spending for preventive family services can reduce the prevalence and length of foster care placements while maintaining or improving safety and permanency outcomes for children. Further, State experiences with subsidized guardianship demonstrate that when children cannot remain with their parents, they do best when placed with kin.

This bill enhances Federal funding available under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act for prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their parents or other family members. It gives states and tribes the flexibility to adapt evidence-based family services to the specific needs of each family. It ensures that states and tribes are held accountable for allocating services in ways that maximize safety, permanency, and well-being for children, while minimizing the prevalence of lengthy foster care placements.

We need more than two options—foster care or nothing—when the child protection system gets involved. By helping families afford child care, maybe it is possible to prevent outright neglect. Maybe mom or dad needs counseling or medical help. Maybe they need help covering the bills or finding employment. Oftentimes, a youngster's aunt, uncle, or grandparents could step up and take them in, but they shouldn't have to take on that job without assistance. More often than not, in my judgement, it's absolutely worth exploring those avenues before breaking a family apart. In fact, it can save resources in the long run without compromising on safety.

I look forward to working with Chairman HATCH and the full Senate to advance this legislation and I am hopeful that together, we can make this critical investment in children and their families.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1965. A bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I am proud to stand here with Senators

RAND PAUL, MIKE LEE, and DICK DURBIN in introducing the Maintaining Dignity and Eliminating Unnecessary Restrictive Confinement of Youths Act of 2015, or the MERCY Act. This bipartisan bill would prohibit juvenile detention facilities from placing federally adjudicated delinquents in solitary confinement and would limit the use of such confinement for all juveniles in federal pretrial detainment. Prolonged use of solitary confinement of young people often results in severe psychological harm and it is time the federal government leads on this issue and bans the practice.

The juvenile justice system was created because it has always been understood that children are different than adults and need special protection. It was founded on the principle that youth are malleable and, therefore, the focus should be on rehabilitation rather than punishment. Adolescents are still developing psychologically and physiologically and have different needs than adults. In fact, research has shown that brains in humans do not fully develop in most individuals until the age of 25, which underscores the fragility of these young Americans. Unfortunately, our juvenile justice system has lost its way and the emphasis has shifted from one of rehabilitation to punishment. Children are finding themselves trapped in a criminal justice system that does more harm than good and nowhere is that more evident than in the practice of solitary confinement.

In 2011 alone, more than 95,000 youth were held in prisons and jails, and a significant number were held in isolation. In 2013, the Department of Justice found that 47 percent of juvenile detention centers locked youth in solitary confinement for more than four hours at a time, and some held youth for up to 23 hours a day with no human interaction. Words can hardly explain the horrors many children face while placed in isolation. Young people held in solitary suffer from resounding psychological and neurological damage, including depression, hallucinations, paranoia, anger, and anxiety. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy recently commented on the practice of solitary confinement in an opinion and said, "The penal system has a solitary confinement regime that will bring you to the edge of madness, perhaps to madness itself." The negative impact that this practice can have on youth is evidenced by the fact that studies have shown that half of all suicides by juveniles in detention facilities occurred in isolation.

Medical experts to civil and human rights advocates have made calls to end this horrible practice. The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture called for the practice to be banned across the globe. Despite the extensive data that demonstrates the harmful nature of solitary, the United States continues to use solitary confinement at alarming rates. It is time the United

States catch up to international standards and ban the use of unnecessary juvenile solitary confinement.

The MERCY Act would prohibit the use of solitary confinement of youth adjudicated delinquent in the Federal system, unless it is a temporary response to a serious risk of harm to the juvenile or others. Additionally, it would preclude the use of solitary confinement of any youth awaiting trial in federal court regardless of whether that person is being tried as an adult or juvenile. The bill ensures that before a juvenile is placed in room confinement, the staff member must use the least restrictive techniques, including de-escalation techniques or discussions with a qualified mental health professional. It mandates that juveniles be informed of why the room confinement placement occurred and that release will occur upon the youth regaining self-control or a certain period of time has elapsed. The Mercy Act limits solitary confinement on juveniles that pose a risk of harm to others to no more than 3 hours and to juveniles who pose a risk of harm to themselves to no more than half an hour. Finally, after the maximum periods of confinement expires, the bill mandates that juveniles be transferred to a facility where appropriate services can be provided.

If we truly want our criminal justice system to reflect our founding principles as a nation of liberty and justice for all, we must promote a more compassionate, common sense approach to rehabilitation that helps restore promise in our young people. It is time we ban the solitary confinement of youth and I urge the speedy passage of the bipartisan MERCY Act.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1971. A bill to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act, legislation that would expand the current Monument to include about 6,200 acres of pristine public lands across four California counties. I am proud to be joined in this effort by my friend from California, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

In 2000, President Clinton made history when he designated the California Coastal National Monument, which stretches the entire 1,100 miles of California's coastline and protects more than 20,000 small islands, rocks, exposed reefs and islands between Mexico and Oregon. It also protects the habitat for a variety of wildlife including seabirds, California sea lions and southern sea otters.

In 2012, I introduced legislation with Senator FEINSTEIN and Congressman MIKE THOMPSON to expand the Monument to include the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands in Mendocino

County. We were grateful when President Obama took action last year to add these spectacular lands as the first onshore addition to the monument.

The legislation we are introducing today would expand the California Coastal National Monument again to include five more onshore sites, creating a new network of federal coastal properties for the public to enjoy. By highlighting these sites, the measure would also boost tourism and the economy of communities up and down the coast.

Each one of these new areas is unique, with its own rugged landscape, its own majestic views of the Pacific Ocean and its own history. Each piece tells us part of the fascinating story of the development of California and our Nation.

In Humboldt County, one of my State's northern most counties, this legislation would protect Trinidad Head—13 acres of rocky shoreline which offers visitors breathtaking views of offshore sea stacks and the City of Trinidad, the oldest town on the northern California coast. The land is also home to the historic Trinidad Head lighthouse, which dates back to 1871 when it helped guide vessels carrying lumber up and down the Redwood Coast.

The Lost Coast Headlands in Humboldt County would also be included, providing visitors access to 440 acres of some of the most spectacular scenery in northern California. From alpine forests and rolling mountains to coastal bluffs south of the mouth of the Eel River, this area offers a little something for every outdoor enthusiast, whether it is hiking, bird watching or beachcombing. These lands also played an important role during the Cold War when the U.S. Navy opened a post there to monitor Soviet submarines.

The Monument would be expanded to encompass Lighthouse Ranch, about 11 miles south of Eureka, which sits on eight acres of a former U.S. Coast Guard station once used as a Christian commune. Today, it offers breathtaking, panoramic views of the Eel River Delta, Humboldt Bay and the Pacific Ocean.

Drive about 350 miles south of Humboldt County to Santa Cruz County and you will discover the Cotoni-Coast Dairies—5,780 acres of former dairy and cement plant lands. Its name is a nod to the Cotoni Indians, who lived there for thousands of years, and the Swiss dairy farmers who ran the land as a farm and ranch for much of the 20th century. The area, which would also be included in the Monument, draws in visitors with its redwoods, coastal grasslands, foothills and watersheds that flow directly into the northern Monterey Bay.

The bill would also preserve Piedras Blancas—20 acres with 425 state-owned acres cooperatively managed by the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, in Big Sur. Named for three white rocks just off the end of the point, the area is

well-known for its historic 19th century lighthouse and is also an important ecological research area. Tourists come to catch a glimpse of a beautiful landscape untouched by development and see wildlife like Elephant Seals, sea lions and sea birds.

Additionally our legislation would protect one offshore site—a group of small rocks and islands off the coast of Orange County. Back in the 1930s, the Coast Guard considered using these properties for lighthouses, but the agency now agrees they should be permanently protected as part of the National Monument. Under this bill, these amazing rocks and islands will remain a pristine part of California's natural heritage.

These are some of the most magnificent lands in the country, and we have a responsibility to protect them for current and future generations. That is why expanding the California Coastal National Monument is so critical.

The new designation would permanently protect each site from development and would ensure stronger protections for a diverse array of wildlife that call the area home, many of which are endangered. It would also help restore habitats and protect water quality by placing these properties under one management plan to allow for better coordination of available resources.

Expanding the Monument is not just good for our conservation efforts—it is also good for the economy. Each of these natural treasures showcases the breathtaking coastlines and recreational opportunities that draw visitors from California and across the world.

Listen to the numbers from these three California counties: In Humboldt County, tourism is responsible for more than \$330 million every year. In Santa Cruz County, tourism brings in more than \$700 million every year and is one of the county's top industries. Tourism in San Luis Obispo County produces more than \$1 billion annually and is also the county's largest industry, supporting 15,570 jobs in 2011.

Designating these sites as part of the National Monument will not only generate more economic activity, it will help attract increased resources to support the needs of the area, including additional conservation programs.

The expansion of this National Monument has strong support from a large coalition of local governments, elected officials, business owners, landowners, farmers, private individuals, and many conservation and outdoor industry groups. This impressive grassroots effort shows how deeply our citizens care about the future of these public lands, and I am proud to support their hard work and commitment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to expand the California Coastal National Monument and help protect these spectacular lands for generations to come.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 1974. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to amend its regulations relating to qualified mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, the mid-2000s housing bubble was fueled by cheap access to credit and unsound, deceptive, and sometimes fraudulent mortgage lending practices. Borrowers were offered risky, high-cost loans they could neither afford nor understand by originators who abandoned traditional underwriting process, accepted loan applications with little or no documentation, and directly profited from selling unsustainable loans wholesale. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act contains many necessary and important reforms to the mortgage origination industry to prevent future abuses. However, the law is complex and has, unintentionally, imposed onerous, one-size-fits-all rules on community banks and local financial institutions that originate mortgages to entrepreneurs and farmers.

For over a decade, and under supervision of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Federal Home Loan Banks, FHLBanks, have operated a set of mortgage programs that ensure small financial institutions can expand access to credit and originate affordable mortgages in their communities. The Mortgage Partnership Finance program—and the similar Mortgage Purchase Program—provides members an alternative secondary mortgage market. A FHLBank purchases a mortgage and manages the liquidity, interest rate, and prepayment risks while the originating bank member assumes some credit risk for the loans.

The FHLB mortgage programs' guidelines prior to the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act often met or exceeded the standards that we now know as Qualified Mortgage, QM, but the requirements were flexible and not unduly burdensome. QM status provides originators the legal and regulatory certainty they need to expand safe access to affordable mortgages. The FHLBanks have since harmonized their standards with QM, but some member banks struggle to comply due to the strict requirements, such as Appendix Q, for assessing a consumer's ability to repay. For example, the general QM option in some circumstances prevents community banks and credit unions that originate mortgages to the self-employed from selling those loans to the FHLBanks. This outcome is problematic because the FHLBank System is the only avenue for mortgage resale for many small financial institutions; without the ability to resell to the FHLBanks, credit availability is constrained in communities served by these institutions.

Small financial institutions that participate in the FHLBank System engage in relationship lending—their customers are their neighbors, their youth

sports coaches, their community leaders—and they should not be required to comply with burdensome regulations designed to clamp down on unsound mortgage lending practices at large institutions. The legislation I am introducing today, the Relationship Lending Preservation Act, would allow these financial institutions to continue serving farmers and entrepreneurs while ensuring the safety and soundness of the mortgage origination system. The bill simply requires the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, to establish a distinct QM option for loans eligible to be purchased by a FHLBank or loans participating in a credit risk sharing program established by a FHLBank pursuant to regulations issued by the Federal Housing Finance Agency. This legislation is supported by The Council of FHLBanks and others in the financial community.

In practice, the bill will provide QM status to loans sold to the FHLBanks that would have otherwise qualified for the general QM option except for the income and debt rules. Institutions would still be required, by FHLBank regulation, to adhere to underwriting and documentation requirements. The legislation provides parity between the FHLBanks and Fannie and Freddie, and it mirrors a request by the FHLBanks to the CFPB to modify QM to accommodate sales to the FHLBanks. Just as mortgages sold to Fannie and Freddie qualify for QM status, participants of the FHLBank mortgage programs should be eligible for QM.

It is important to note that this legislation is narrowly tailored to benefit truly community financial institutions—the new option is limited to the commonly accepted definition of community banks, those institutions with less than \$10 billion in assets—and does not increase systemic risk. Sixty-seven percent of participants in the FHLB mortgage programs are institutions with less than \$500 million in total assets—these are the smallest of the small lenders. Additionally, the FHLB mortgage programs require lenders to retain a portion of the loan's credit risk. This "skin in the game" provision ensures originators are making quality loans that will be repaid; in fact, loans participating in the FHLB mortgage programs have a 1.47 percent 90-day delinquency rate, less than 2/3 the national average of 2.29 percent.

Community-based financial institutions are central to promoting growth and economic prosperity in small and rural communities throughout North Dakota and the Nation. These institutions were not the cause of the housing and financial crises and should not be subject to regulations meant for large-scale mortgage-origination institutions. The Relationship Lending Preservation Act will ensure small financial institutions can continue to do what they do best: serve their communities by providing affordable mortgages. I urge my colleagues to support

this bill—community financial institutions, and the families they serve, are too important for our country's future.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1975. A bill to establish the Sewall-Belmont House National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the urgent need to authorize the Sewall-Belmont House & Museum as part of the National Park Service.

Sewall-Belmont is a critical piece of our Nation's history. It was the home of Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, whose perseverance brought the movement for women's suffrage over the finish line with the enactment of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution. Today it helps tell the story of one of the most important chapters in our Nation's history by highlighting the political strategies and techniques of Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, which became the blueprint for civil rights organizations throughout the 20th century.

The Sewall-Belmont House was more than a house—it was a home to great minds and leaders, thanks to the generosity of women like Alva Belmont. It was a place where women could live, rest, and work without fear of harassment while they fought boldly for the ballot.

In the 1970s, when they were threatening to tear down this building to make way for the Senate offices, Pat Schroeder and the women of the House rallied to save it. Now it is a museum where today's generation can learn about the courageous women who came before them. This house has always been the scene of making history, and has always stood for women's empowerment.

However, today Sewall-Belmont is in dire need of federal support if it is to continue to serve the public. While the National Woman's Party has been successfully operating the House and managing its historic collection, it has been forced to cut back on public tours, research requests, and educational programs due to the growing capital needs of managing an aging building.

Sewall-Belmont is a National Historic Landmark, listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and one of four designations supported by the Save America's Treasures legislation. The National Park Service recently completed a feasibility study which concluded that Sewall-Belmont's deep

historical significance and unique contribution to our Nation's history warrants its full inclusion into the National Park Service. This would not only give it the resources it needs to continue to educate the public, but would send a powerful message that women's history is an important part of our Nation's history.

Women fought for decades against great onslaught to secure the right to vote. One hundred and sixty-seven years ago, in July 1848, the first-ever women's rights convention was held in Seneca Falls. This convention was the beginning of one of the greatest social movements of all time, kicking off the actions of the first generation of suffragists and making women's suffrage a national topic.

At this convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott stood up to meet the challenges of their time. They mobilized and they organized the American women's rights movement. They called for a convention; they called for action; they made history; they changed history. And that revolution keeps on going.

In the 20th century, Alice Paul took the lead in the women's suffrage movement. In 1916, she formed the National Woman's Party which would fight for suffrage until the 19th Amendment to the Constitution was finally enacted in 1920—long overdue.

Alice Paul was a groundbreaker and a changemaker, risking arrest and inhumane treatment so the women of America could be part of a true democracy. With their banners and sashes, Alice Paul led the Iron Jawed Angels marching on Washington to President Wilson's White House. Her Silent Sentinels stood in rain, sleet, and snow as daily reminders of America's conscience. They called for women's right to vote at a time when women didn't have a voice. Their cause captivated the nation! With each step they took, they marched toward a future where women weren't just able to vote, but were on the ballot.

Wouldn't Alice Paul be so proud to see twenty women in the United States Senate? I'm so proud to be one of them. The women of the Senate are changing history by changing the tide and changing the tone. When I arrived in the Senate in 1986, I was the first Democratic woman elected in her own right, and the sixteenth woman to serve. There are more women serving right this minute, today—fourteen Democrats and six Republicans—than had served in all of American history when I arrived.

I am so proud of all of the accomplishments made by the women of the Senate. But we didn't get here by ourselves. Not a single one of us would be here without Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party. That is why it is so important that we not only preserve the place where they fought for women's full inclusion in society, the Sewall-Belmont House, but elevate it to its rightful spot among our Nation's most important national treasures.

There are very few sites in the National Park System that celebrate women's history. I am proud that Maryland is home to one of those sites with the newly authorized Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Cambridge. But it is not enough.

Today, women have the right to vote and the right to be on the ballot. But we have so much more to accomplish to become fully equal members of society. It is critical that we remind today's generation of women and men of this long and important history so that we can keep in mind the lessons learned from these movements as we march toward full equality. As I serve my last term in the United States Senate, there is nothing more important to me than preserving the legacy of this fight.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1982. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the legislation I am introducing along with Senator BOOZMAN. This legislation authorizes the addition of a "Wall of Remembrance" to the Korean War Veterans Memorial, without the use of public funds.

The Korean War, often referred to as the "Forgotten War," began on June 25, 1950. During the three-year course of the war, some 5.7 million Americans were called to serve, and by the time the Korean Armistice Agreement was signed in July 1953, more than 36,000 Americans sacrificed their lives, 103,284 were wounded, 7,140 were captured, and 664 were missing.

To honor the Americans who served during the Korean War, on October 28, 1986, Congress passed H.R. 2005, Public Law 99-572, authorizing the construction of the Korean War Veterans Memorial located in West Potomac Park, southeast of the Lincoln Memorial and just south of the Reflecting Pool on the National Mall. For those of you who have visited this memorial, it is quite a moving experience. But unlike some other memorials, it does not list the names of those who died while serving their country.

My legislation authorizes the addition of a Wall of Remembrance to the existing Korean War Veterans Memorial. The Wall of Remembrance would list the names of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in theater in the Korean War, as well as the number of service members who were wounded in action, are listed as missing in action, or who were prisoners of war during the Korean War. The Wall would also list the number of members of the Korean Augmentation

to the U.S. Army, the Republic of Korean Armed Forces, and other nations of the United Nations Command who were killed in action, wounded in action, are listed as missing in action, or were prisoners of war.

Korean War Veterans Memorials that display the names of a nation's fallen soldiers can be found across the globe. Authorizing a Wall of Remembrance here in the United States is just one way we can help ensure that those who died while serving our country in the "Forgotten War" are no longer forgotten. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1983. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to reintroduce the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act of 2013. This legislation will implement a settlement concerning the water rights of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, who have been engaged for several decades in a struggle for recognition and protection of their federally reserved groundwater rights.

Since 1951, the Pechanga have been involved in litigation initiated by the United States concerning water rights in the Santa Margarita watershed. The Pechanga's interest has been in protecting their groundwater supplies, which are shared with municipal developments in the San Diego region. Beginning in 2006, the Pechanga worked with local water districts to negotiate a cooperative solution and put an end to their dispute.

The Pechanga Settlement Agreement is a comprehensive agreement negotiated among the Pechanga, the United States on their behalf, and several California water districts, including the Rancho California Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, and the Metropolitan Water District. The Settlement recognizes the Pechanga's tribal water right to 4994 acre-feet of water per year and outlines a series of measures to guarantee this amount. It is a watershed wide solution that protects the rights of the Pechanga while providing greater certainty and resources to the management of the basin's water supplies.

I am pleased to be joined by Senator FEINSTEIN in introducing this legislation. Our bill not only provides the Pechanga with long-overdue assurances of their water rights, but also exemplifies all the good that can be accomplished when parties put aside their differences and come to the table to negotiate collaborative solutions.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1986. A bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REID. 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. 1986

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 “Moapa Band of Paiutes Land Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Moapa River Reservation Expansion”, dated August 5, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Moapa Band of Paiutes.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE MOAPA BAND OF PAIUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 25,977 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Land”.

(c) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(d) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under this section shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

SEC. 4. TRIBAL FEE LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All right, title, and interest of the Tribe in and to the land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF THE LAND.—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 88 acres of land held in fee by the Tribe as generally depicted on the map as “Fee Into Trust Lands”.

(c) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1991. A bill to eliminate the sunset date for the Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand eligibility for such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this Friday marks 1 year since the Veterans’ Access to Care through Choice, Accountability and Transparency Act was signed into law by President Obama. This bipartisan legislation was intended to address the nationwide scan-

dal involving the death of at least 40 veterans who had been waiting for weeks, months, and even years for necessary care from the VA. Ultimately, we learned that senior VA officials purposely denied care and lied about it to obtain financial bonuses. We are still cleaning-up the aftermath of this scandal and Congress’ work continues today.

The hallmark of that law is the VA Choice Card, which for the first time allows veterans who can’t make an appointment in a reasonable time frame or who live far from a VA medical facility, to see the doctor of their choice to get the care they need. But, with all the bureaucratic hoops that the VA has required veterans to jump through to use the Choice Card since that law’s enactment and the lack of information the VA has provided veterans and relevant providers on how to get and use the Card, the VA has clearly been reluctant to expanding choice for veterans. Even after a year, I continue to get e-mails, letters and phone calls from veterans and their caregivers who are extremely frustrated with the inability to use the VA Choice Card.

As I said at the time, last year’s bill was meant as a beginning, not an end, to addressing inadequate care for our veterans. While the current law authorizes a three-year pilot program to begin implementation of the VA Choice Card, the year that has passed since its enactment has shown is that there is overwhelming demand for veterans to have the same freedom of choice for their health care that military and civilian retirees have.

I have long advocated for our veterans to have the flexibility to choose where and when they receive the care they have earned. And the Permanent VA Choice Card Act that I am introducing today moves us in that direction.

The Permanent VA Choice Card Act makes the current 3-year pilot program for the VA Choice Card permanent. This would help remove uncertainty both within the VA, among providers, and especially among our disabled veterans that this program is here to stay.

Also, the Permanent VA Choice Card Act would expand eligibility for the Choice Card. Any service-connected veteran enrolled through the VA should have access to this level of choice. It would do so by removing the requirement that a qualified veteran live more than 40 miles from a VA facility or have to wait 30 days for an appointment.

It is clear our veterans are in need of care and are not able to receive it. More than a year after the VA scandal and a year since the Choice Act was signed into law, wait-times are still too long and in some facilities are even longer than they were a year ago. The VA has made it challenging for those with the VA Choice Card to make appointments, get follow-ups, and to see specialists near their homes. By enacting the Permanent VA Choice Card

Act, we will make sure that no veteran should be denied needed care due to wait times or distance to a VA facility.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1999. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to act, without liability for certain damages, to prevent and respond to the threat of damage from pollution of the sea by crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, tourists flock every year to enjoy the inviting waters of the South Florida—sunbathing on Miami Beach, boating in Biscayne Bay National Park, snorkeling on treasured coral reefs of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary. And you might take a souvenir picture at the Southernmost Point in Key West. Standing there, you are closer to Cuba—90 miles away—than you are to Miami, which is 160 miles away.

In 1977, the U.S. negotiated a Maritime Boundary with Cuba for fisheries and other continental shelf activities, like oil exploration, roughly halfway between our nations—or 45 miles from the Southernmost Point in Key West. Since 2005, several oil companies have leased blocks in Cuban waters south of that line to drill for oil. Can you imagine the damage to our environment and our economy if oil was to coat two national parks, a national marine sanctuary, a national wildlife refuge, iconic coral reefs, world-class fisheries, and beloved beaches? It would be catastrophic. In fact, the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary was created specifically to protect against threats like an oil spill.

In 2012, four companies tried and failed to find oil. But recently, an Angolan company has ramped up plans to drill in late 2016. We are simply not prepared to protect U.S. interests from an oil spill off Cuba. The loop current that saved South Florida from the brunt of the damage from Deepwater Horizon becomes the Florida current as it runs between the Keys and Cuba and then those waters enter the Gulf Stream hugging the coast of Florida and heading north along the eastern seaboard. An oil spill in Cuban waters would almost certainly follow that same path.

For a decade, I have fought tooth and nail to protect our environment and economy from a Cuban spill. Given the news that drilling will resume next year, it is imperative that the agencies we rely on to prevent and respond to oil spills are prepared. And even though Cuba is the closest threat, an oil spill off Mexico, Bahamas, or Jamaica could enter U.S. waters. So today, I am introducing the Caribbean Oil Spill Intervention, Prevention, and Preparedness Act—a comprehensive framework to protect U.S. interests from foreign oil spills.

The bill would strengthen the authority of the Coast Guard to intervene

and make sure that we have up-to-date accurate information about the ocean currents off of Cuba's coast so that we know where an oil spill might go. It requires the relevant Federal agencies to negotiate oil pollution prevention and response with countries bordering the Gulf of Mexico and Straits of Florida especially to protect our National Marine Sanctuaries like the Florida Keys. The bill ensures we have a plan to protect coral reef ecosystems all through the Straits of Florida—because domestic fisheries rely on healthy corals. Finally, it requires any oil company that wants to drill in both U.S. waters and Cuban waters to show they have the resources and plans to adequately prepare for a worst-case oil spill in both areas.

These common-sense provisions should have broad support. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2002. A bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. 2002

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MENTAL HEALTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES

Sec. 101. Law enforcement grants for crisis intervention teams, mental health purposes, and fixing the background check system.

Sec. 102. Assisted outpatient treatment programs.

Sec. 103. Federal drug and mental health courts.

Sec. 104. Mental health in the judicial system.

Sec. 105. Forensic assertive community treatment initiatives.

Sec. 106. Assistance for individuals transitioning out of systems.

Sec. 107. Co-occurring substance abuse and mental health challenges in drug courts.

Sec. 108. Mental health training for Federal uniformed services.

Sec. 109. Advancing mental health as part of offender reentry.

Sec. 110. School mental health crisis intervention teams.

Sec. 111. Active-shooter training for law enforcement.

Sec. 112. Co-occurring substance abuse and mental health challenges in residential substance abuse treatment programs.

Sec. 113. Mental health and drug treatment alternatives to incarceration programs.

Sec. 114. National criminal justice and mental health training and technical assistance.

Sec. 115. Improving Department of Justice data collection on mental illness involved in crime.

Sec. 116. Reports on the number of mentally ill offenders in prison.

TITLE II—COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Findings.

Sec. 203. Sequential intercept model.

Sec. 204. Veterans treatment courts.

Sec. 205. Prison and jails.

Sec. 206. Allowable uses.

Sec. 207. Law enforcement training.

Sec. 208. Federal law enforcement training.

Sec. 209. GAO report.

Sec. 210. Evidence based practices.

Sec. 211. Transparency, program accountability, and enhancement of local authority.

Sec. 212. Grant accountability.

TITLE III—NICS REAUTHORIZATION AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 301. Reauthorization of NICS.

Sec. 302. Definitions relating to mental health.

Sec. 303. Incentives for State compliance with NICS mental health record requirements.

Sec. 304. Protecting the second amendment rights of veterans.

Sec. 305. Applicability of amendments.

Sec. 306. Clarification that Federal court information is to be made available to the national instant criminal background check system.

TITLE IV—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OFFSET

Sec. 401. Reauthorization of appropriations.

Sec. 402. Offset.

TITLE I—MENTAL HEALTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES

SEC. 101. LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS, MENTAL HEALTH PURPOSES, AND FIXING THE BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

(a) EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) Mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams.

“(I) Achieving compliance with the mental health records requirements of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180; 121 Stat. 2259).”.

(b) COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (21);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) to provide specialized training to law enforcement officers to—

“(A) recognize individuals who have a mental illness; and

“(B) properly interact with individuals who have a mental illness, including strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises;

“(18) to establish collaborative programs that enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to address the mental health, behavioral, and substance abuse problems of individuals encountered by law enforcement officers in the line of duty;

“(19) to provide specialized training to corrections officers to recognize individuals who have a mental illness;

“(20) to enhance the ability of corrections officers to address the mental health of individuals under the care and custody of jails and prisons, including specialized training and strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises; and”; and

(4) in paragraph (21), as redesignated, by striking “through (16)” and inserting “through (20)”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GRANTS.—Section 34(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a(a)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and to provide specialized training to paramedics, emergency medical services workers, and other first responders to recognize individuals who have mental illness and how to properly intervene with individuals with mental illness, including strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises”.

SEC. 102. ASSISTED OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 2201 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ii) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “The Attorney General”;;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, or court-ordered assisted outpatient treatment when the court has determined such treatment to be necessary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COURT-ORDERED ASSISTED OUTPATIENT TREATMENT.—The term ‘court-ordered assisted outpatient treatment’ means a program through which a court may order a treatment plan for an eligible patient that—

“(A) requires such patient to obtain outpatient mental health treatment while the patient is living in a community; and

“(B) is designed to improve access and adherence by such patient to intensive behavioral health services in order to—

“(i) avert relapse, repeated hospitalizations, arrest, incarceration, suicide, property destruction, and violent behavior; and

“(ii) provide such patient with the opportunity to live in a less restrictive alternative to incarceration or involuntary hospitalization.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE PATIENT.**—The term ‘eligible patient’ means an adult, mentally ill person who, as determined by a court—

“(A) has a history of violence, incarceration, or medically unnecessary hospitalizations;

“(B) without supervision and treatment, may be a danger to self or others in the community;

“(C) is substantially unlikely to voluntarily participate in treatment;

“(D) may be unable, for reasons other than indigence, to provide for any of his or her basic needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, health, or safety;

“(E) has a history of mental illness or condition that is likely to substantially deteriorate if the patient is not provided with timely treatment; or

“(F) due to mental illness, lacks capacity to fully understand or lacks judgment to make informed decisions regarding his or her need for treatment, care, or supervision.”.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH COURTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “eligible offender” means a person who—

(A)(i) previously or currently has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness, mental retardation, or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders; or

(ii) manifests obvious signs of mental illness, mental retardation, or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders during arrest or confinement or before any court; and

(B) is determined by a judge to be eligible.

(2) the term “mental illness” means a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder—

(A) of sufficient duration to meet diagnostic criteria within the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association; and

(B) that has resulted in functional impairment that substantially interferes with or limits 1 or more major life activities.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a pilot program to determine the effectiveness of diverting eligible offenders from Federal prosecution, Federal probation, or a Bureau of Prisons facility, and placing such eligible offenders in drug or mental health courts.

(c) **PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS.**—The pilot program established under subsection (b) shall involve—

(1) continuing judicial supervision, including periodic review, of program participants who have a substance abuse problem or mental illness; and

(2) the integrated administration of services and sanctions, which shall include—

(A) mandatory periodic testing, as appropriate, for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances during any period of supervised release or probation for each program participant;

(B) substance abuse treatment for each program participant who requires such services;

(C) diversion, probation, or other supervised release with the possibility of prosecution, confinement, or incarceration based on noncompliance with program requirements or failure to show satisfactory progress;

(D) programmatic offender management, including case management, and aftercare services, such as relapse prevention, health care, education, vocational training, job placement, housing placement, and child care or other family support services for each program participant who requires such services;

(E) outpatient or inpatient mental health treatment, as ordered by the court, that carries with it the possibility of dismissal of charges or reduced sentencing upon successful completion of such treatment;

(F) centralized case management, including—

(i) the consolidation of all cases, including violations of probations, of the program participant; and

(ii) coordination of all mental health treatment plans and social services, including life skills and vocational training, housing and job placement, education, health care, and relapse prevention for each program participant who requires such services; and

(G) continuing supervision of treatment plan compliance by the program participant for a term not to exceed the maximum allowable sentence or probation period for the charged or relevant offense and, to the extent practicable, continuity of psychiatric care at the end of the supervised period.

(d) **IMPLEMENTATION; DURATION.**—The pilot program established under subsection (b) shall be conducted—

(1) in not less than 1 United States judicial district, designated by the Attorney General in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as appropriate for the pilot program; and

(2) during fiscal year 2017 through fiscal year 2020.

(e) **CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.**—Before making a designation under subsection (d)(1), the Attorney General shall—

(1) obtain the approval, in writing, of the United States Attorney for the United States judicial district being designated;

(2) obtain the approval, in writing, of the chief judge for the United States judicial district being designated; and

(3) determine that the United States judicial district being designated has adequate behavioral health systems for treatment, including substance abuse and mental health treatment.

(f) **ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the United States Probation Offices shall provide such assistance and carry out such functions as the Attorney General may request in monitoring, supervising, providing services to, and evaluating eligible offenders placed in a drug or mental health court under this section.

(g) **REPORTS.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall monitor the drug and mental health courts under this section, and shall submit a report to Congress on the outcomes of the program at the end of the period described in subsection (d)(2).

SEC. 104. MENTAL HEALTH IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

Part V of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 3796i et seq.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“SEC. 2209. MENTAL HEALTH RESPONSES IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

“(a) **PRETRIAL SCREENING AND SUPERVISION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may award grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, non-profit agencies, or any combination thereof,

to develop, implement, or expand pretrial services programs to improve the identification and outcomes of individuals with mental illness.

“(2) **ALLOWABLE USES.**—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) universal behavioral health needs and risk screening of defendants, including verification of interview information, mental health evaluation, and criminal history screening;

“(B) assessment of risk of pretrial misconduct through objective, statistically validated means, and presentation to the court of recommendations based on such assessment, including services that will reduce the risk of pre-trial misconduct;

“(C) follow-up review of defendants unable to meet the conditions of release;

“(D) evaluation of process and results of pre-trial service programs;

“(E) supervision of defendants who are on pretrial release, including reminders to defendants of scheduled court dates;

“(F) reporting on process and results of pretrial services programs to relevant public and private mental health stakeholders; and

“(G) data collection and analysis necessary to make available information required for assessment of risk.

“(b) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS AND INTERVENTION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may award grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, non-profit agencies, or any combination thereof, to develop, implement, or expand a behavioral health screening and assessment program framework for State or local criminal justice systems.

“(2) **ALLOWABLE USES.**—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) promotion of the use of validated assessment tools to gauge the criminogenic risk, substance abuse needs, and mental health needs of individuals;

“(B) initiatives to match the risk factors and needs of individuals to programs and practices associated with research-based, positive outcomes;

“(C) implementing methods for identifying and treating individuals who are most likely to benefit from coordinated supervision and treatment strategies, and identifying individuals who can do well with fewer interventions; and

“(D) collaborative decision making among system leaders, including the relevant criminal justice agencies, mental health systems, judicial systems, and substance abuse systems, for determining how treatment and intensive supervision services should be allocated in order to maximize benefits, and developing and utilizing capacity accordingly.

“(c) RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or non-profit agency that receives a grant under this section shall, in accordance with subsection (b)(2), use grant funds for the expenses of a treatment program, including—

“(A) salaries, personnel costs, equipment costs, and other costs directly related to the operation of the program, including costs relating to enforcement;

“(B) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to program participants, including aftercare supervision, vocational training, education, and job placement; and

“(C) payments to public and nonprofit private entities that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to

provide alcohol and drug addiction treatment to offenders participating in the program.

“(d) SUPPLEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for programs described in this section.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant made under this section may not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the program described in an application under subsection (e).

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—To request a grant under this section, a State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

“(f) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the distribution of grants under this section is equitable and includes—

“(1) each State; and

“(2) a unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency—

“(A) in each State; and

“(B) in rural, suburban, Tribal, and urban jurisdictions.

“(g) REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.—For each fiscal year, each grantee under this section during that fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the effectiveness of activities carried out using such grant. Each report shall include an evaluation in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require. The Attorney General shall specify the dates on which such reports shall be submitted.

“(h) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Grants awarded under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under subparagraph (C) that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 1 year after the date on which final audit report is issued.

“(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of grantees under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) FINAL AUDIT REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit a final report on each audit conducted under subparagraph (B).

“(D) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—Grantees under this section about which there is an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 1-year period described in subparagraph (A).

“(E) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(F) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity receives a grant under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is prohibited from receiving grants under

subparagraph (D), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant that was improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) NONPROFIT AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant program under this section, the term ‘nonprofit agency’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this section to a nonprofit agency that holds money in an offshore account for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 511(a)).

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit agency that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—Not more than \$20,000 of the amounts made available to the Department of Justice to carry out this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded a grant under this section to host, or make any expenditures relating to, a conference unless the Deputy Attorney General provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference or make such expenditure.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all final audit reports issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(D) have been issued; and

“(iii) any reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(F) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grantees excluded under paragraph (1)(D) from the previous year.

“(i) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare the possible grant with any other grants awarded to the applicant under this Act to determine whether the grants are for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards multiple grants to the same applicant for the same purpose, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”

SEC. 105. FORENSIC ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT INITIATIVES.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (k), as added by section 205, the following:

“(1) FORENSIC ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT (FACT) INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, nonprofit agencies, or any combination thereof, to develop, implement, or expand Assertive Community Treatment initiatives to develop forensic assertive community treatment (referred to in this subsection as ‘FACT’) programs that provide high intensity services in the community for individuals with mental illness with involvement in the criminal justice system to prevent future incarcerations.

“(2) ALLOWABLE USES.—Grant funds awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) multidisciplinary team initiatives for individuals with mental illnesses with criminal justice involvement that addresses criminal justice involvement as part of treatment protocols;

“(B) FACT initiatives that involve mental health professionals, criminal justice agencies, chemical dependency specialists, nurses, psychiatrists, vocational specialists, forensic peer specialists, forensic specialists, and dedicated administrative support staff who work together to provide recovery oriented, 24/7 wraparound services;

“(C) services such as integrated evidence-based practices for the treatment of co-occurring mental health and substance-related disorders, assertive outreach and engagement, community-based service provision at participants’ residence or in the community, psychiatric rehabilitation, recovery oriented services, services to address criminogenic risk factors, and community tenure;

“(D) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program, including behavioral health services and aftercare supervision; and

“(E) training for all FACT teams to promote high-fidelity practice principles and technical assistance to support effective and continuing integration with criminal justice agency partners.

“(3) SUPPLEMENT AND NOT SUPPLANT.—Grants made under this subsection shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for programs described in this subsection.

“(4) APPLICATIONS.—To request a grant under this subsection, a State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency shall submit an application to

the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.”.

SEC. 106. ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS TRANSITIONING OUT OF SYSTEMS.

Section 2976(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) provide mental health treatment and transitional services for those with mental illnesses or with co-occurring disorders, including housing placement or assistance; and”.

SEC. 107. CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES IN DRUG COURTS.

Part EE of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797u et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2951(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3797u(a)(1)), by inserting “, including co-occurring substance abuse and mental health problems,” after “problems”; and

(2) in section 2959(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797u-8(a)), by inserting “, including training for drug court personnel and officials on identifying and addressing co-occurring substance abuse and mental health problems” after “part”.

SEC. 108. MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING FOR FEDERAL UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Commerce shall provide the following to each of the uniformed services (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code) under their direction:

(1) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Programs that offer specialized and comprehensive training in procedures to identify and respond appropriately to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals with mental illnesses are involved.

(2) IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY.—Computerized information systems or technological improvements to provide timely information to Federal law enforcement personnel, other branches of the uniformed services, and criminal justice system personnel to improve the Federal response to mentally ill individuals.

(3) COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS.—The establishment and expansion of cooperative efforts to promote public safety through the use of effective intervention with respect to mentally ill individuals encountered by members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 109. ADVANCING MENTAL HEALTH AS PART OF OFFENDER REENTRY.

(a) REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 2976(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(f)), as amended by section 106, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting “mental health services,” before “drug treatment”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) target offenders with histories of homelessness, substance abuse, or mental illness, including a prerelease assessment of the housing status of the offender and behavioral health needs of the offender with clear coordination with mental health, substance abuse, and homelessness services systems to achieve stable and permanent housing outcomes with appropriate support service.”.

(b) MENTORING GRANTS.—Section 211(b)(2) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17531(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including mental health care” after “community”.

SEC. 110. SCHOOL MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS.

Section 2701 of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a(b)) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the development and operation of crisis intervention teams that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises.”.

SEC. 111. ACTIVE-SHOOTER TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Attorney General, as part of the Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement and Ensuring Officer Resilience and Survivability Initiative (VALOR) of the Department of Justice, may provide safety training and technical assistance to local law enforcement agencies, including active-shooter response training.

SEC. 112. CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES IN RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 1901(a) of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) developing and implementing specialized residential substance abuse treatment programs that identify and provide appropriate treatment to inmates with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders or challenges.”.

SEC. 113. MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by striking part CC and inserting the following:

“PART CC—MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS

“SEC. 2901. MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State, unit of local government, Indian tribe, or nonprofit organization; and

“(2) the term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who—

“(A) comes into contact with the criminal justice system or is charged with an offense;

“(B) has a history of or a current—

“(i) substance use disorder;

“(ii) mental illness; or

“(iii) co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders; and

“(C) has been approved for participation in a program funded under this section by, the relevant law enforcement agency, prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation official, corrections official, judge, representative of a mental health agency, or representative of a substance abuse agency.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to develop, implement, or expand a treatment alternative to incarceration program for eligible participants, including—

“(1) pre-booking treatment alternative to incarceration programs, including—

“(A) law enforcement training on substance use disorders, mental illness, and co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders;

“(B) receiving centers as alternatives to incarceration of eligible participants;

“(C) specialized response units for calls related to substance use disorders, mental illness, or co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders; and

“(D) other arrest and pre-booking treatment alternatives to incarceration models; or

“(2) post-booking treatment alternative to incarceration programs, including—

“(A) specialized clinical case management;

“(B) pre-trial services related to substance use disorders, mental illness, and co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders;

“(C) prosecutor and defender based programs;

“(D) specialized probation;

“(E) treatment and rehabilitation programs; and

“(F) problem-solving courts, including mental health courts, drug courts, co-occurring mental health and substance abuse courts, DWI courts, and veterans treatment courts.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General—

“(A) that meets the criteria under paragraph (2); and

“(B) at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) CRITERIA.—An eligible entity, in submitting an application under paragraph (1), shall—

“(A) provide extensive evidence of collaboration with State and local government agencies overseeing health, community corrections, courts, prosecution, substance abuse, mental health, victims services, and employment services, and with local law enforcement agencies; and

“(B) demonstrate consultation with the Single State Authority for Substance Abuse;

“(C) demonstrate that evidence-based treatment practices will be utilized; and

“(D) demonstrate that evidenced-based screening and assessment tools will be used to place participants in the treatment alternative to incarceration program.

“(d) REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible entity awarded a grant for a treatment alternative to incarceration program under this section shall—

“(1) determine the terms and conditions of participation in the program by eligible participants, taking into consideration the collateral consequences of an arrest, prosecution or criminal conviction;

“(2) ensure that each substance abuse and mental health treatment component is licensed and qualified by the relevant jurisdiction;

“(3) for programs described in subsection (b)(2), organize an enforcement unit comprised of appropriately trained law enforcement professionals under the supervision of the State, Tribal, or local criminal justice agency involved, the duties of which shall include—

“(A) the verification of addresses and other contacts of each eligible participant who participates or desires to participate in the program; and

“(B) if necessary, the location, apprehension, arrest, and return to court of an eligible participant in the program who has absconded from the facility of a treatment provider or has otherwise significantly violated the terms and conditions of the program, consistent with Federal and State confidentiality requirements;

“(4) notify the relevant criminal justice entity if any eligible participant in the program absconds from the facility of the treatment provider or otherwise violates the

terms and conditions of the program, consistent with Federal and State confidentiality requirements;

“(5) submit periodic reports on the progress of treatment or other measured outcomes from participation in the program of each eligible offender participating in the program to the relevant State, Tribal, or local criminal justice agency, including mental health courts, drug courts, co-occurring mental health and substance abuse courts, DWI courts, and veterans treatment courts;

“(6) describe the evidence-based methodology and outcome measurements that will be used to evaluate the program, and specifically explain how such measurements will provide valid measures of the impact of the program; and

“(7) describe how the program could be broadly replicated if demonstrated to be effective.

“(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An eligible entity shall use a grant received under this section for expenses of a treatment alternative to incarceration program, including—

“(1) salaries, personnel costs, equipment costs, and other costs directly related to the operation of the program, including the enforcement unit;

“(2) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the relevant State or Tribal jurisdiction and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program, including aftercare supervision, vocational training, education, and job placement; and

“(3) payments to public and nonprofit private entities that are approved by the State or Tribal jurisdiction and licensed, if necessary, to provide alcohol and drug addiction treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program.

“(f) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—An eligible entity shall use Federal funds received under this section only to supplement the funds that would, in the absence of those Federal funds, be made available from other Federal and non-Federal sources for the activities described in this section, and not to supplant those funds. The Federal share of a grant made under this section may not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the program described in an application under subsection (d).

“(g) **GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the geographical distribution of grants under this section is equitable and includes a grant to an eligible entity in—

“(1) each State;

“(2) rural, suburban, and urban areas; and

“(3) Tribal jurisdictions.

“(h) **REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.**—Each fiscal year, each recipient of a grant under this section during that fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the outcomes of activities carried out using that grant in such form, containing such information, and on such dates as the Attorney General shall specify.

“(i) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year

thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

“(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate

and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

“(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

“(5) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(B) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”

SEC. 114. NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Part HH of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2992. NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible organizations to provide for the establishment of a National Criminal Justice and Mental Health Training and Technical Assistance Center.

“(b) **ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATION.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘eligible organization’ means a national nonprofit organization that provides technical assistance and training to, and has special expertise and broad, national-level experience in, mental health, crisis intervention, criminal justice systems, law enforcement, translating evidence into practice, training, and research, and education and support of people with mental illness and the families of such individuals.

“(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Any organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall establish and operate a National Criminal Justice and Mental Health Training and Technical Assistance Center to—

“(1) provide law enforcement officer training regarding mental health and working with individuals with mental illnesses, with an emphasis on de-escalation of encounters between law enforcement officers and those with mental disorders or in crisis, which shall include support the development of in-person and technical information exchanges between systems and the individuals working in those systems in support of the concepts identified in the training;

“(2) provide education, training, and technical assistance for States, Indian tribes, territories, units of local government, service providers, nonprofit organizations, probation or parole officers, prosecutors, defense attorneys, emergency response providers, and corrections institutions to advance practice and knowledge relating to mental health crisis and approaches to mental health and criminal justice across systems;

“(3) provide training and best practices around relating to diversion initiatives, jail and prison strategies, reentry of individuals with mental illnesses in into the community, and dispatch protocols and triage capabilities, including the establishment of learning sites;

“(4) develop suicide prevention and crisis intervention training and technical assistance for criminal justice agencies;

“(5) develop a receiving center system and pilot strategy that provides a single point of entry into the mental health and substance abuse system for assessments and appropriate placement of individuals experiencing a crisis;

“(6) collect data and best practices in mental health and criminal health and criminal justice initiatives and policies from grantees under this part, other recipients of grants under this section, Federal, State, and local agencies involved in the provision of mental health services, and non-governmental organizations involved in the provision of mental health services;

“(7) develop and disseminate evaluation tools, mechanisms, and measures to better assess and document performance measures and outcomes;

“(8) disseminate information to States, units of local government, criminal justice agencies, law enforcement agencies, and other relevant entities about best practices, policy standards, and research findings; and

“(9) provide education and support to individuals with mental illness involved with, or at risk of involvement with, the criminal justice system, including the families of such individuals.

“(d) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Grants awarded under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under subparagraph (C) that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 1 year after the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of grantees under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) FINAL AUDIT REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit a final report on each audit conducted under subparagraph (B).

“(D) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—Grantees under this section about which there is an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 1-year period described in subparagraph (A).

“(E) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal

years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(F) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity receives a grant under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is prohibited from receiving grants under subparagraph (D), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant that was improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) NONPROFIT AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant program under this section, the term ‘nonprofit agency’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this section to a nonprofit agency that holds money in an offshore account for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 511(a)).

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit agency that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all final audit reports issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed

by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(D) have been issued; and

“(iii) any reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(F) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grantees excluded under paragraph (1)(D) from the previous year.

“(5) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(B) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”

SEC. 115. IMPROVING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION ON MENTAL ILLNESS INVOLVED IN CRIME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Attorney General promulgates regulations under subsection (b), any data prepared by, or submitted to, the Attorney General or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to the incidences of homicides, law enforcement officers killed, seriously injured, and assaulted, or individuals killed or seriously injured by law enforcement officers shall include data with respect to the involvement of mental illness in such incidences, if any.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate or revise regulations as necessary to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 116. REPORTS ON THE NUMBER OF MENTALLY ILL OFFENDERS IN PRISON.

(a) REPORT ON THE COST OF TREATING THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report detailing the cost of imprisonment for individuals who have serious mental illness by the Federal Government or a State or unit of local government, which shall include—

(1) the number and type of crimes committed by individuals with serious mental illness each year; and

(2) detail strategies or ideas for preventing crimes by those individuals with serious mental illness from occurring.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders shall define “serious mental illness” based on the “Health Care Reform for Americans with Severe Mental Illnesses: Report” of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, American Journal of Psychiatry 1993; 150:1447–1465.

TITLE II—COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) An estimated 2,000,000 individuals with serious mental illnesses are booked into jails

each year, resulting in prevalence rates of serious mental illness in jails that are 3 to 6 times higher than in the general population. An even greater number of individuals who are detained in jails each year have mental health problems that do not rise to the level of a serious mental illness but may still require a resource-intensive response.

(2) Adults with mental illnesses cycle through jails more often than individuals without mental illnesses, and tend to stay longer (including before trial, during trial, and after sentencing).

(3) According to estimates, almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of jail detainees with serious mental illnesses have co-occurring substance use disorders, and individuals with mental illnesses are also much more likely to have serious physical health needs.

(4) Among individuals under probation supervision, individuals with mental disorders are nearly twice as likely as other individuals to have their community sentence revoked, furthering their involvement in the criminal justice system. Reasons for revocation may be directly or indirectly related to an individual's mental disorder.

SEC. 203. SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MODEL.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (o).

(b) SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MODEL.—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT GRANTS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State, unit of local government, Indian tribe, or tribal organization.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General may make grants under this subsection to an eligible entity for sequential intercept mapping and implementation in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MAPPING; IMPLEMENTATION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use funds for—

“(A) sequential intercept mapping, which—

“(i) shall consist of—

“(I) convening mental health and criminal justice stakeholders to—

“(aa) develop a shared understanding of the flow of justice-involved individuals with mental illnesses through the criminal justice system; and

“(bb) identify opportunities for improved collaborative responses to the risks and needs of individuals described in item (aa); and

“(II) developing strategies to address gaps in services and bring innovative and effective programs to scale along multiple intercepts, including—

“(aa) emergency and crisis services;

“(bb) specialized police-based responses;

“(cc) court hearings and disposition alternatives;

“(dd) reentry from jails and prisons; and

“(ee) community supervision, treatment and support services; and

“(ii) may serve as a starting point for the development of strategic plans to achieve positive public health and safety outcomes; and

“(B) implementation, which shall—

“(i) be derived from the strategic plans described in subparagraph (A)(ii); and

“(ii) consist of—

“(I) hiring and training personnel;

“(II) identifying the eligible entity's target population;

“(III) providing services and supports to reduce unnecessary penetration into the criminal justice system;

“(IV) reducing recidivism;

“(V) evaluating the impact of the eligible entity's approach; and

“(VI) planning for the sustainability of effective interventions.”.

SEC. 204. VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (i), as added by section 203, the following:

“(j) ASSISTING VETERANS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) PEER TO PEER SERVICES OR PROGRAMS.—The term ‘peer to peer services or programs’ means services or programs that connect qualified veterans with other veterans for the purpose of providing support and mentorship to assist qualified veterans in obtaining treatment, recovery, stabilization, or rehabilitation.

“(B) QUALIFIED VETERAN.—The term ‘qualified veteran’ means a preliminarily qualified offender who—

“(i) served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves; and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

“(C) VETERANS TREATMENT COURT PROGRAM.—The term ‘veterans treatment court program’ means a court program involving collaboration among criminal justice, veterans, and mental health and substance abuse agencies that provides qualified veterans with—

“(i) intensive judicial supervision and case management, which may include random and frequent drug testing where appropriate;

“(ii) a full continuum of treatment services, including mental health services, substance abuse services, medical services, and services to address trauma;

“(iii) alternatives to incarceration; and

“(iv) other appropriate services, including housing, transportation, mentoring, employment, job training, education, and assistance in applying for and obtaining available benefits.

“(2) VETERANS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may award grants under this subsection to applicants to establish or expand—

“(i) veterans treatment court programs;

“(ii) peer to peer services or programs for qualified veterans;

“(iii) practices that identify and provide treatment, rehabilitation, legal, transitional, and other appropriate services to qualified veterans who have been incarcerated; and

“(iv) training programs to teach criminal justice, law enforcement, corrections, mental health, and substance abuse personnel how to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving qualified veterans.

“(B) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Attorney General shall give priority to applications that—

“(i) demonstrate collaboration between and joint investments by criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, and veterans service agencies;

“(ii) promote effective strategies to identify and reduce the risk of harm to qualified veterans and public safety; and

“(iii) propose interventions with empirical support to improve outcomes for qualified veterans.”.

SEC. 205. PRISON AND JAILS.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (j), as added by section 204, the following:

“(k) CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—

“(A) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY.—The term ‘correctional facility’ means a jail, prison, or other detention facility used to house people who have been arrested, detained, held, or convicted by a criminal justice agency or a court.

“(B) ELIGIBLE INMATE.—The term ‘eligible inmate’ means an individual who—

“(i) is being held, detained, or incarcerated in a correctional facility; and

“(ii) manifests obvious signs of a mental illness or has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness.

“(2) CORRECTIONAL FACILITY GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to applicants to enhance the capabilities of a correctional facility—

“(A) to identify and screen for eligible inmates;

“(B) to plan and provide—

“(i) initial and periodic assessments of the clinical, medical, and social needs of inmates; and

“(ii) appropriate treatment and services that address the mental health and substance abuse needs of inmates;

“(C) to develop, implement, and enhance—

“(i) post-release transition plans for eligible inmates that, in a comprehensive manner, coordinate health, housing, medical, employment, and other appropriate services and public benefits;

“(ii) the availability of mental health care services and substance abuse treatment services; and

“(iii) alternatives to solitary confinement and segregated housing and mental health screening and treatment for inmates placed in solitary confinement or segregated housing; and

“(D) to train each employee of the correctional facility to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving inmates with mental health or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.”.

SEC. 206. ALLOWABLE USES.

Section 2991(b)(5)(I) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(b)(5)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) TEAMS ADDRESSING FREQUENT USERS OF CRISIS SERVICES.—Multidisciplinary teams that—

“(I) coordinate, implement, and administer community-based crisis responses and long-term plans for frequent users of crisis services;

“(II) provide training on how to respond appropriately to the unique issues involving frequent users of crisis services for public service personnel, including criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, emergency room, healthcare, law enforcement, corrections, and housing personnel;

“(III) develop or support alternatives to hospital and jail admissions for frequent users of crisis services that provide treatment, stabilization, and other appropriate supports in the least restrictive, yet appropriate, environment; and

“(IV) develop protocols and systems among law enforcement, mental health, substance abuse, housing, corrections, and emergency medical service operations to provide coordinated assistance to frequent users of crisis services.”.

SEC. 207. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.

Section 2991(h) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) ACADEMY TRAINING.—To provide support for academy curricula, law enforcement officer orientation programs, continuing

education training, and other programs that teach law enforcement personnel how to identify and respond to incidents involving persons with mental health disorders or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) **PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.**—The Attorney General, in awarding grants under this subsection, shall give priority to programs that law enforcement personnel and members of the mental health and substance abuse professions develop and administer cooperatively.”.

SEC. 208. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide direction and guidance for the following:

(1) **TRAINING PROGRAMS.**—Programs that offer specialized and comprehensive training, in procedures to identify and appropriately respond to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals who have a mental illness are involved, to first responders and tactical units of—

(A) Federal law enforcement agencies; and

(B) other Federal criminal justice agencies such as the Bureau of Prisons, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and other agencies that the Attorney General determines appropriate.

(2) **IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY.**—The establishment of, or improvement of existing, computerized information systems to provide timely information to employees of Federal law enforcement agencies, and Federal criminal justice agencies to improve the response of such employees to situations involving individuals who have a mental illness.

SEC. 209. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the practices that Federal first responders, tactical units, and corrections officers are trained to use in responding to individuals with mental illness;

(2) procedures to identify and appropriately respond to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals who have a mental illness are involved, to Federal first responders and tactical units;

(3) the application of evidence-based practices in criminal justice settings to better address individuals with mental illnesses; and

(4) recommendations on how the Department of Justice can expand and improve information sharing and dissemination of best practices.

SEC. 210. EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICES.

Section 2991(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

“(4) propose interventions that have been shown by empirical evidence to reduce recidivism;

“(5) when appropriate, use validated assessment tools to target preliminarily qualified offenders with a moderate or high risk of recidivism and a need for treatment and services; or”.

SEC. 211. TRANSPARENCY, PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY, AND ENHANCEMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2991(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “MENTAL ILLNESS” and inserting “MENTAL ILLNESS; MENTAL HEALTH DISORDER”; and

(B) by striking “term ‘mental illness’ means” and inserting “terms ‘mental illness’ and ‘mental health disorder’ mean”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

“(9) **PRELIMINARILY QUALIFIED OFFENDER.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘preliminarily qualified offender’ means an adult or juvenile accused of an offense who—

“(i) (I) previously or currently has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders;

“(II) manifests obvious signs of mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders during arrest or confinement or before any court; or

“(III) in the case of a veterans treatment court provided under subsection (i), has been diagnosed with, or manifests obvious signs of, mental illness or a substance abuse disorder or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorder;

“(ii) has been unanimously approved for participation in a program funded under this section by, when appropriate—

“(I) the relevant—

“(aa) prosecuting attorney;

“(bb) defense attorney;

“(cc) probation or corrections official; and

“(dd) judge; and

“(II) a representative from the relevant mental health agency described in subsection (b)(5)(B)(i);

“(iii) has been determined, by each person described in clause (ii) who is involved in approving the adult or juvenile for participation in a program funded under this section, to not pose a risk of violence to any person in the program, or the public, if selected to participate in the program; and

“(iv) has not been charged with or convicted of—

“(I) any sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)) or any offense relating to the sexual exploitation of children; or

“(II) murder or assault with intent to commit murder.

“(B) **DETERMINATION.**—In determining whether to designate a defendant as a preliminarily qualified offender, the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge, and mental health or substance abuse agency representative shall take into account—

“(i) whether the participation of the defendant in the program would pose a substantial risk of violence to the community;

“(ii) the criminal history of the defendant and the nature and severity of the offense for which the defendant is charged;

“(iii) the views of any relevant victims to the offense;

“(iv) the extent to which the defendant would benefit from participation in the program;

“(v) the extent to which the community would realize cost savings because of the defendant’s participation in the program; and

“(vi) whether the defendant satisfies the eligibility criteria for program participation unanimously established by the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge and men-

tal health or substance abuse agency representative.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 2927(2) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797s-6(2)) is amended by striking “has the meaning given that term in section 2991(a).” and inserting “means an offense that—

“(A) does not have as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another; or

“(B) is not a felony that by its nature involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.”.

SEC. 212. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (k), as added by section 205, the following:

“(m) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

“(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

“(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

“(n) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”.

TITLE III—NICS REAUTHORIZATION AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION OF NICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(e) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2013” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH.

(a) TITLE 18 DEFINITIONS.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 921(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(36)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘has been adjudicated mentally incompetent or has been committed to a psychiatric hospital’, with respect to a person—

“(i) means the person is the subject of an order or finding by a judicial officer, court, board, commission, or other adjudicative body—

“(I) that was issued after—

“(aa) a hearing—

“(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

“(BB) at which the person had an opportunity to participate with counsel; or

“(bb) the person knowingly and intelligently waived the opportunity for a hearing—

“(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

“(BB) at which the person would have had an opportunity to participate with counsel; and

“(II) that found that the person, as a result of marked subnormal intelligence, mental impairment, mental illness, incompetency, condition, or disease—

“(aa) was a danger to himself or herself or to others;

“(bb) was guilty but mentally ill in a criminal case, in a jurisdiction that provides for such a verdict;

“(cc) was not guilty in a criminal case by reason of insanity or mental disease or defect;

“(dd) was incompetent to stand trial in a criminal case;

“(ee) was not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility under section 850a of title 10 (article 50a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

“(ff) required involuntary inpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital for any reason, including substance abuse; or

“(gg) required involuntary outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital based on a finding that the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others; and

“(ii) does not include—

“(I) an admission to a psychiatric hospital for observation; or

“(II) a voluntary admission to a psychiatric hospital.

“(B) In this paragraph, the term ‘order or finding’ does not include—

“(i) an order or finding that has expired or has been set aside or expunged;

“(ii) an order or finding that is no longer applicable because a judicial officer, court, board, commission, or other adjudicative body has found that the person who is the subject of the order or finding—

“(I) does not present a danger to himself or herself or to others;

“(II) has been restored to sanity or cured of mental disease or defect;

“(III) has been restored to competency; or

“(IV) no longer requires involuntary inpatient or outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital; or

“(iii) an order or finding with respect to which the person who is subject to the order or finding has been granted relief from disabilities under section 925(c), under a pro-

gram described in section 101(c)(2)(A) or 105 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), or under any other State-authorized relief from disabilities program of the State in which the original commitment or adjudication occurred.

“(37) The term ‘psychiatric hospital’ includes a mental health facility, a mental hospital, a sanitarium, a psychiatric facility, and any other facility that provides diagnoses or treatment by licensed professionals of mental retardation or mental illness, including a psychiatric ward in a general hospital.”; and

(2) in section 922—

(A) in subsection (d)(4)—

(i) by striking “as a mental defective” and inserting “mentally incompetent”; and

(ii) by striking “any mental institution” and inserting “a psychiatric hospital”; and

(B) in subsection (g)(4)—

(i) by striking “as a mental defective or who has” and inserting “mentally incompetent or has”; and

(ii) by striking “mental institution” and inserting “psychiatric hospital”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “as a mental defective” each place that term appears and inserting “mentally incompetent”; and

(2) by striking “mental institution” each place that term appears and inserting “psychiatric hospital”;

(3) in section 101(c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”; and

(4) in section 102(c)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS A MENTAL DEFECTIVE OR COMMITTED TO A MENTAL INSTITUTION” and inserting “MENTALLY INCOMPETENT OR COMMITTED TO A PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL”; and

(B) by striking “mental institutions” and inserting “psychiatric hospitals”.

SEC. 303. INCENTIVES FOR STATE COMPLIANCE WITH NICS MENTAL HEALTH RECORD REQUIREMENTS.

Section 104(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking “of paragraph (2)” and inserting “of paragraph (1)”; and

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

“(1) INCENTIVES FOR PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS AND FIXING THE BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF COMPLIANT STATE.—In this paragraph, the term ‘compliant State’ means a State that has—

“(i) provided not less than 90 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; or

“(ii) in effect a statute that—

“(I) requires the State to provide the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; and

“(II) implements a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

“(B) INCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE.—During the period beginning on the date that is 18 months after the enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015 and ending on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of such Act, the Attorney General—

“(i) shall use funds appropriated to carry out section 103 of this Act, the excess unobligated balances of the Department of Justice and funds withheld under clause (ii), or any combination thereof, to increase the amounts available under section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) for each compliant State in an amount that is not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount that was allocated to such State under such section 505 in the previous fiscal year; and

“(ii) may withhold an amount not to exceed the amount described in clause (i) that would otherwise be allocated to a State under any section of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) if the State—

“(I) is not a compliant State; and

“(II) does not submit an assurance to the Attorney General that—

“(aa) an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) will be used solely for the purpose of enabling the State to become a compliant State; or

“(bb) the State will hold in abeyance an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) until such State has become a compliant State.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall issue regulations implementing this paragraph.”.

SEC. 304. PROTECTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

“(a) PROTECTING RIGHTS OF VETERANS WITH EXISTING RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Secretary shall provide written notice in accordance with subsection (b) of the opportunity for administrative review under subsection (c) to all persons who, on the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, are considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 as a result of having been found by the Department to be mentally incompetent.

“(b) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice under this section to a person described in subsection (a) that notifies the person of—

“(1) the determination made by the Secretary;

“(2) a description of the implications of being considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18; and

“(3) the right of the person to request a review under subsection (c)(1).

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) REQUEST.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a person described in subsection (a) receives notice in accordance with subsection (b), such person may request a review by the board designed or established under paragraph (2) or by a court of competent jurisdiction to assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to

others. In such assessment, the board may consider the person's honorable discharge or decorations.

“(2) BOARD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Secretary shall designate or establish a board that shall, upon request of a person under paragraph (1), assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person may file a petition with a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for judicial review of an assessment of the person under subsection (c) by the board designated or established under subsection (c)(2).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.”.

SEC. 305. APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.

With respect to any record of a person prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, before the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall remove such a record from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—

(1) upon being made aware that the person is no longer considered as adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital according to the criteria under paragraph (36)(A)(i)(II) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code (as added by this title), and is therefore no longer prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm;

(2) upon being made aware that any order or finding that the record is based on is an order or finding described in paragraph (36)(B) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code (as added by this title); or

(3) upon being made aware that the person has been found competent to possess a firearm after an administrative or judicial review under subsection (c) or (d) of section 5511 of title 38, United States Code (as added by this title).

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION THAT FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION IS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

Section 103(e)(1) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the terms ‘department or agency of the United States’ and ‘Federal department or agency’ include a Federal court; and

“(ii) for purposes of any request, submission, or notification, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall perform the functions of the head of the department or agency.”.

TITLE IV—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OFFSET

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ADULT AND JUVENILE COLLABORATION PROGRAMS.—Subsection (o) of section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa), as redesignated by section 203, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking “2009 through 2014” and inserting “2016 through 2020”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 20 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section may be used for purposes

described in subsection (j) (relating to veterans).”.

(b) MENTAL HEALTH COURTS AND QUALIFIED DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (20), by striking “2001 through 2004” and inserting “2016 through 2020”; and

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking “2009 and 2010” and inserting “2016 through 2020”.

SEC. 402. OFFSET.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “covered amounts” means the unobligated balances of discretionary appropriations accounts, except for the discretionary appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) RESCISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the first day of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, there are rescinded from covered amounts, on a pro rata basis, the amount described in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT OF RESCISSION.—The amount described in this subparagraph is the sum of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (20) and (26) of section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the first day of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury a report specifying the account and amount of each rescission under this subsection.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 242—CELEBRATING 25 YEARS OF SUCCESS FROM THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON WOMEN'S HEALTH AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 242

Whereas, on September 10, 1990, the Office of Research on Women's Health (in this resolution referred to as “ORWH”) was established at the National Institutes of Health (in this resolution referred to as “NIH”) to—

(1) ensure that women were included in NIH-funded clinical research;

(2) set research priorities to address gaps in scientific knowledge; and

(3) promote biomedical research careers for women;

Whereas ORWH was established in law by the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-43; 107 Stat. 122) and implemented the law requiring researchers to include women in NIH-funded tests of new drugs and other clinical trials;

Whereas, today, more than ½ of the participants in NIH-funded clinical trials are women, enabling the development of clinical approaches to prevention, diagnosis, or treatment appropriate for women;

Whereas, in 2015, ORWH, with enthusiastic support from NIH leadership, announced that, beginning in January 2016, NIH-funded scientists must account for the possible role of sex as a biological variable in vertebrate animal and human studies;