

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Rapid DNA Act of 2016”.

**SEC. 2. RAPID DNA INSTRUMENTS.**

(a) **STANDARDS.**—Section 210303(a) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) In addition to issuing standards as provided in paragraphs (1) through (4), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall issue standards and procedures for the use of Rapid DNA instruments and resulting DNA analyses.

“(B) In this Act, the term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

(b) **INDEX.**—Paragraph (2) of section 210304(b) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) prepared by—

“(A) laboratories that—

“(I) have been accredited by a nonprofit professional association of persons actively involved in forensic science that is nationally recognized within the forensic science community; and

“(ii) undergo external audits, not less than once every 2 years, that demonstrate compliance with standards established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

“(B) criminal justice agencies using Rapid DNA instruments approved by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in compliance with the standards and procedures issued by the Director under section 210303(a)(5); and”.

**SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COLLECTION OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.**

(a) **FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFENDERS.**—Section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

(b) **FROM CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFENDERS.**—Section 4 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may waive the requirements under this subsection if DNA samples are analyzed by means of Rapid DNA instruments and the results are included in CODIS.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) The term ‘Rapid DNA instruments’ means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.”.

**JUSTICE FOR ALL****REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 463, S. 2577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2577) to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in *italics*.)

S. 2577

*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 “Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

**SEC. 2. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.**

(a) **RESTITUTION DURING SUPERVISED RELEASE.**—Section 3583(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting “, that the defendant make restitution in accordance with sections 3663 and 3663A, or any other statute authorizing a sentence of restitution,” after “supervision”.

(b) **COLLECTION OF RESTITUTION FROM DEFENDANT’S ESTATE.**—Section 3613(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The liability to pay restitution shall terminate on the date that is the later of 20 years from the entry of judgment or 20 years after the release from imprisonment of the person ordered to pay restitution. In the event of the death of the person ordered to pay restitution, the individual’s estate will be held responsible for any unpaid balance of the restitution amount, and the lien provided in subsection (c) of this section shall continue until the estate receives a written release of that liability.”.

(c) **VICTIM INTERPRETERS.**—Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including an interpreter for the victim”.

(d) **GAO STUDY.**—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) *conduct a study to determine whether enhancing the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, to provide courts broader authority to award restitution for Federal offenses would be beneficial to crime victims and what other factors Congress should consider in weighing such changes; and*

(B) *submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A).*

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall focus on the benefits to crime victims that would result if the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, were expanded—

(A) *to apply to victims who have suffered harm, injury, or loss that would not have occurred but for the defendant’s related conduct;*

(B) *in the case of an offense resulting in bodily injury resulting in the victim’s death, to allow the court to use its discretion to award an appropriate sum to reflect the income lost by the victim’s surviving family members or estate as a result of the victim’s death;*

(C) *to require that the defendant pay to the victim an amount determined by the court to restore the victim to the position he or she would have been in had the defendant not committed the offense; and*

(D) *to require that the defendant compensate the victim for any injury, harm, or loss, including emotional distress, that occurred as a result of the offense.*

**SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR CRIME VICTIMS.**

(a) **CRIME VICTIMS LEGAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.**—Section 103(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2264) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”; and

(5) in paragraph (5), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”.

(b) **CRIME VICTIMS NOTIFICATION GRANTS.**—Section 1404E(c) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603e(c)) is amended by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”.

**SEC. 4. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.**

Of the amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in a fiscal year—

(1) not less than 75 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for direct testing activities described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 2(a) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)); and

(2) not less than 5 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for law enforcement agencies to conduct audits of their backlogged rape kits, including through the creation of a tracking system, under section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7)), and to prioritize testing in those cases in which the statute of limitation will soon expire.

**SEC. 5. SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS.**

Section 304 of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **PREFERENCE.**—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with a program authorized, in whole or in part, by this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to any eligible entity that certifies that the entity will use the grant funds to—

“(A) operate or expand forensic nurse examiner programs in a rural area or for an underserved population, as those terms are defined in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925);

“(B) hire full-time forensic nurse examiners to conduct activities under subsection (a); or

“(C) sustain or establish a training program for forensic nurse examiners.

“(2) **DIRECTIVE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to inform Federally Qualified Health Centers, Community Health Centers, hospitals, colleges and universities, and other appropriate health-related entities about the role of forensic nurses and existing resources available within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to train or employ forensic nurses to address the needs of communities dealing with sexual assault, domestic violence, and elder abuse. The Attorney General shall collaborate on this effort with nongovernmental organizations representing forensic nurses.”

#### **SEC. 6. PROTECTING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT.**

Section 8(e)(1)(A) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

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

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(iii) the program is not administered by the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice.”

#### **SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT HOUSING PROTECTIONS.**

Section 41411(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e-11(b)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “any remaining tenant”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “tenant” each place it appears.

#### **SEC. 8. STRENGTHENING THE PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT.**

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 15605(d)(2)), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) include the certification of the chief executive that the State receiving such grant has adopted all national prison rape standards that, as of the date on which the application was submitted, have been promulgated under this Act; or

“(ii) demonstrate to the Attorney General, in such manner as the Attorney General shall require, that the State receiving such grant is actively working to adopt and achieve full compliance with the national prison rape standards described in clause (i);” and

(2) in section 8(e) (42 U.S.C. 15607(e))—

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

“(2) **ADOPTION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For each fiscal year, any amount that a State would otherwise receive for prison purposes for that fiscal year under a grant program covered by this subsection shall be reduced by 5 percent, unless the chief executive officer of the State submits to the Attorney General proof of compliance with this Act through—

“(i) a certification that the State has adopted, and is in full compliance with, the national standards described in subsection (a); or

“(ii) an assurance that the State intends to adopt and achieve full compliance with those national standards so as to ensure that a cer-

tification under clause (i) may be submitted in future years, which includes—

“(I) a commitment that not less than 5 percent of such amount shall be used for this purpose; or

“(II) a request that the Attorney General hold 5 percent of such amount in abeyance pursuant to the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(B) **RULES FOR CERTIFICATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A chief executive officer of a State who submits a certification under this paragraph shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year; and

“(IV) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all the prisons listed under subclause (I) during the following 3 audit years.

“(ii) **AUDIT APPEAL EXCEPTION.**—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State may submit a certification that the State is in full compliance pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) even if a prison under the operational control of the executive branch of the State has an audit appeal pending.

“(C) **RULES FOR ASSURANCES.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) an explanation of any barriers the State faces to completing required audits;

“(IV) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(V) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State during the following 3 audit years; and

“(VI) an explanation of the State’s current degree of implementation of the national standards.

“(ii) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, before receiving the applicable funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I), also provide the Attorney General with a proposed plan for the expenditure of the funds during the applicable grant period.

“(iii) **ACCOUNTING OF FUNDS.**—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, in a manner consistent with the applicable grant reporting requirements, submit to the Attorney General a detailed accounting of how the funds described in subparagraph (A) were used.

“(D) **SUNSET OF ASSURANCE OPTION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—On the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall cease to have effect.

“(ii) **ADDITIONAL SUNSET.**—On the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall cease to have effect.

“(iii) **EMERGENCY ASSURANCES.**—

“(I) **REQUEST.**—Notwithstanding clause (ii), during the 2-year period beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State who certifies that the State has audited not less than 90 percent of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State may request that the Attorney General allow the chief executive officer to submit an emergency assurance in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii) as in effect on the day before the date on which that subparagraph ceased to have effect under clause (ii) of this subparagraph.

“(II) **GRANT OF REQUEST.**—The Attorney General shall grant a request submitted under subclause (I) within 60 days upon a showing of good cause.

“(E) **DISPOSITION OF FUNDS HELD IN ABEYANCE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) subsequently submits a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General will release all funds held in abeyance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) to be used by the State in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(ii) **RELEASE OF FUNDS.**—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, but does assure the Attorney General that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall release all of the funds of the State held in abeyance to be used in adopting and achieving full compliance with the national standards, if the State agrees to comply with the applicable requirements in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (C).

“(iii) **REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.**—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 and does not assure the Attorney General that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall redistribute the funds of the State held in abeyance to other States to be used in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(F) **PUBLICATION OF AUDIT RESULTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall request from each State, and make available on an appropriate Internet website, all final audit reports completed to date for prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of each State. The Attorney General shall update such website annually with reports received from States under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C)(i).

“(G) **REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status of implementation of the national standards and the steps the Department, in conjunction with the States and other key stakeholders, is

taking to address any unresolved implementation issues.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR AUDITORS.—An individual seeking certification by the Department of Justice to serve as an auditor of prison compliance with the national standards described in subsection (a) shall, upon request, submit fingerprints in the manner determined by the Attorney General for criminal history record checks of the applicable State and Federal Bureau of Investigation repositories.”.

#### SEC. 9. ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) DNA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 305(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136b(c)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(b) FBI DNA PROGRAMS.—Section 307(a) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2275) is amended by striking “\$42,100,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(c) DNA IDENTIFICATION OF MISSING PERSONS.—Section 308(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136d(c)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 10. PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS.—Part BB of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797j) is amended—

(1) in section 2802(2) (42 U.S.C. 3797k(2)), by inserting after “bodies” the following: “and is accredited by an accrediting body that is a signatory to an internationally recognized arrangement and that offers accreditation to forensic science conformity assessment bodies using an accreditation standard that is recognized by that internationally recognized arrangement, or attests, in a manner that is legally binding and enforceable, to use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation not more than 2 years after the date on which a grant is awarded under section 2801”;

(2) in section 2803(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797l(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Seventy-five percent” and inserting “Eighty-five percent”; and

(ii) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “85 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Twenty-five percent” and inserting “Fifteen percent”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “0.6 percent” and inserting “1 percent”;

(3) in section 2804(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797m(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “impression evidence,” after “latent prints,”; and

(ii) by inserting “digital evidence, fire evidence,” after “toxicology,”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and medicolegal death investigators” after “laboratory personnel”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following:

“(4) To address emerging forensic science issues (such as statistics, contextual bias, and uncertainty of measurement) and emerging forensic science technology (such as high throughput automation, statistical software, and new types of instrumentation).

“(5) To educate and train forensic pathologists in the United States.

“(6) To work with the States and units of local government to direct funding to medicolegal death investigation systems to facilitate accreditation of medical examiner and coroner offices and certification of medicolegal death investigators.”; and

(4) in section 2806(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797o(a))—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

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

“(4) the progress of any unaccredited forensic science service provider receiving grant funds toward obtaining accreditation; and”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(24) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(24)) is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021.”.

#### SEC. 11. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE CAPITAL CASES.

Section 426 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14163e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or upon a showing of good cause, and at the discretion of the Attorney General, the State may determine a fair allocation of funds across the uses described in sections 421 and 422”.

#### SEC. 12. POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3600 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “under a sentence of” in each place it appears and inserting “sentenced to”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “death”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and the applicant did not—” and all that follows through “knowingly fail to request” and inserting “and the applicant did not knowingly fail to request”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) order the Government to—

“(i) prepare an inventory of the evidence related to the case; and

“(ii) issue a copy of the inventory to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) RESULTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The results of any DNA testing ordered under this section shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.

“(B) RESULTS EXCLUDE APPLICANT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a DNA profile is obtained through testing that excludes the applicant as the source and the DNA complies with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s requirements for the uploading of crime scene profiles to the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’), the court shall order that the law enforcement entity with direct or conveyed statutory jurisdiction that has access to the NDIS submit the DNA profile obtained from probative biological material from crime scene evidence to determine whether the DNA profile matches a profile of a known individual or a profile from an unsolved crime.

“(ii) NDIS SEARCH.—The results of a search under clause (i) shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’)” and inserting “NDIS”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “death”.

(b) PRESERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.—Section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “under a sentence of” and inserting “sentenced to”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

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

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

#### SEC. 13. KIRK BLOODSWORTH POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

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

“(2) for eligible entities that are a State or unit of local government, provide a certification by the chief legal officer of the State in which the eligible entity operates or the chief legal officer of the jurisdiction in which the funds will be used for the purposes of the grants, that the State or jurisdiction—

“(A) provides DNA testing of specified evidence under a State statute or a State or local rule or regulation to persons sentenced to imprisonment or death for a State felony offense, in a manner intended to ensure a reasonable process for resolving claims of actual innocence that ensures post-conviction DNA testing in at least those cases that would be covered by section 3600(a) of title 18, United States Code, had they been Federal cases and, if the results of the testing exclude the applicant as the source of the DNA, permits the applicant to apply for post-conviction relief, notwithstanding any provision of law that would otherwise bar the application as untimely; and

“(B) preserves biological evidence, as defined in section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, under a State statute or a State or local rule, regulation, or practice in a manner intended to ensure that reasonable measures are taken by the State or jurisdiction to preserve biological evidence secured in relation to the investigation or prosecution of, at a minimum, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter and sexual offenses.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 412(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136e(b)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 14. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title IV of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2278) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 414. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall—

“(1) establish best practices for evidence retention to focus on the preservation of forensic evidence; and

“(2) assist State, local, and tribal governments in adopting and implementing the best practices established under paragraph (1).

“(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall publish the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).”

“(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2260) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 413 the following:

“Sec. 414. Establishment of best practices for evidence retention.”

#### SEC. 15. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2015”.

(b) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “To request a grant”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) A comprehensive Statewide plan detailing how grants received under this section will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

“(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and representatives of all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services, juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

“(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions;

“(D) describe the barriers at the State and local level for accessing data and implementing evidence-based approaches to preventing and reducing crime and recidivism; and

“(E) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

“(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

“(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

“(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

“(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.

“(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6). *The Attorney General may enter into agreements with 1 or more non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance and training under this paragraph.*

“(2) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the At-

torney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

“(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

“(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 to carry out this subsection.”

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement to submit a strategic plan under section 501(a)(6) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (b), shall apply to any application submitted under such section 501 for a grant for any fiscal year beginning after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 16. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this Act shall be subject to the following:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this Act 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.

(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this Act, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this Act, 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 shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act 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 a grant program described in this Act 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 subsection available for public inspection.

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a 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 and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any 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 by operation of this paragraph.

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

#### SEC. 17. NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FORENSIC LABORATORIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Attorney General shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status and needs of the forensic science community.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) examine the status of current workload, backlog, personnel, equipment, and equipment needs of public crime laboratories and medical examiner and coroner offices;

(2) include an overview of academic forensic science resources and needs, from a broad forensic science perspective, including non-traditional crime laboratory disciplines such as forensic anthropology, forensic entomology, and others as determined appropriate by the Attorney General;

(3) consider—

(A) the National Institute of Justice study, *Forensic Sciences: Review of Status and Needs*, published in 1999;

(B) the Bureau of Justice Statistics census reports on Publicly Funded Forensic Crime Laboratories, published in 2002, 2005, 2009, and 2014;

(C) the National Academy of Sciences report, *Strengthening Forensic Science: A Path Forward*, published in 2009; and

(D) the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of forensic providers recommended by the National Commission of Forensic Science and approved by the Attorney General on September 8, 2014;

(4) provide Congress with a comprehensive view of the infrastructure, equipment, and personnel needs of the broad forensic science community; and

(5) be made available to the public.

#### ISec. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the authority of the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime under section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603) includes funding ongoing projects that provide services to victims of crime on a nationwide basis or Americans abroad who are victims of crimes committed outside of the United States; and

(2) the proposed rule entitled “VOCA Victim Assistance Program” published by the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice in the Federal Register on August 27, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 52877), is consistent with section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603).]

#### SEC. 18. CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1404(c)(1)(A) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(c)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “victim services,” before “demonstration projects”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the proposed rule entitled “VOCA Victim Assistance Program” published by the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice in the Federal Register on August 27, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 52877), is consistent with section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603).

#### SEC. 19. IMPROVING THE RESTITUTION PROCESS.

Section 3612 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EVALUATION OF OFFICES OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY AND DEPARTMENT COMPONENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, as part of the regular evaluation process, evaluate each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice on the performance of the office or the component, as the case may be, in seeking and recovering restitution for victims under sections 3663 and 3663A.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—Following an evaluation under paragraph (1), each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice shall work to improve the practices of the office or component, as the case may be, with respect to seeking and recovering restitution for victims under sections 3663 and 3663A.

“(k) GAO REPORTS.—

“(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on restitution sought by the Attorney General under sections 3663 and 3663A during the 3-year period preceding the report.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include statistically valid estimates of—

“(A) the number of cases in which a defendant was convicted and the Attorney General could seek restitution under this title;

“(B) the number of cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution;

“(C) of the cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution, the number of times restitution was ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(D) the amount of restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(E) the amount of restitution collected pursuant to the restitution orders described in subparagraph (D);

“(F) the percentage of restitution orders for which the full amount of restitution has not been collected; and

“(G) any other measurement the Comptroller General determines would assist in evaluating how to improve the restitution process in Federal criminal cases.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the best practices for—

“(A) requesting restitution in cases in which restitution may be sought under sections 3663 and 3663A;

“(B) obtaining restitution orders from the district courts of the United States; and

“(C) collecting restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the implementation by the Attorney General of the best practices recommended under paragraph (3).”.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the Grassley amendment be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4727) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Attorney General to evaluate the performance of the Department of Justice in seeking and recovering restitution for victims under all Federal restitution provisions, to require recipients of DNA backlog capacity and enhancement grants to report on how the actually used their grant funds, and to prevent duplicative grants)

On page 6, line 2, strike “Of the amounts” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts”.

On page 6, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.—With respect to amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW EN-

FORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE”, the Attorney General shall require recipients of the amounts to report on the effectiveness of the activities carried out using the amounts, including any information the Attorney General needs in order to submit the report required under paragraph (2).

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 month after the last day of each even-numbered fiscal year, 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, for each recipient of amounts described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the amounts distributed to the recipient;

(B) a summary of the purposes for which the amounts were used and an evaluation of the progress of the recipient in achieving those purposes;

(C) a statistical summary of the crime scene samples and arrestee or offender samples submitted to laboratories, the average time between the submission of a sample to a laboratory and the testing of the sample, and the percentage of the amounts that were paid to private laboratories; and

(D) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant amounts in increasing capacity and reducing backlogs.

On page 37, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(10) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine whether duplicate grants 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.

On page 40, line 25, strike “sections 3663 and 3663A” and insert “each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution”.

On page 41, line 7, strike “sections 3663 and 3663A” and insert “each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution”.

On page 41, line 15, strike “sections 3663 and 3663A” and insert “each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution”.

On page 41, line 22, insert “or the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.)” after “this title”.

On page 42, lines 21 and 22, strike “sections 3663 and 3663A” and insert “each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution”.

On page 43, line 3, insert “the” before “date”.

The bill was engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2577), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2577

*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 “Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

#### SEC. 2. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.

(a) **RESTITUTION DURING SUPERVISED RELEASE.**—Section 3583(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting “, that the defendant make restitution in accordance with sections 3663 and 3663A, or any other statute authorizing a sentence of restitution,” after “supervision”.

(b) **COLLECTION OF RESTITUTION FROM DEFENDANT’S ESTATE.**—Section 3613(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The liability to pay restitution shall terminate on the date that is the later of 20 years from the entry of judgment or 20 years after the release from imprisonment of the person ordered to pay restitution. In the event of the death of the person ordered to pay restitution, the individual’s estate will be held responsible for any unpaid balance of the restitution amount, and the lien provided in subsection (c) of this section shall continue until the estate receives a written release of that liability.”.

(c) **VICTIM INTERPRETERS.**—Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including an interpreter for the victim”.

(d) **GAO STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) conduct a study to determine whether enhancing the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, to provide courts broader authority to award restitution for Federal offenses would be beneficial to crime victims and what other factors Congress should consider in weighing such changes; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall focus on the benefits to crime victims that would result if the restitution provisions under sections 3663 and 3663A of title 18, United States Code, were expanded—

(A) to apply to victims who have suffered harm, injury, or loss that would not have occurred but for the defendant’s related conduct;

(B) in the case of an offense resulting in bodily injury resulting in the victim’s death, to allow the court to use its discretion to award an appropriate sum to reflect the income lost by the victim’s surviving family members or estate as a result of the victim’s death;

(C) to require that the defendant pay to the victim an amount determined by the court to restore the victim to the position he or she would have been in had the defendant not committed the offense; and

(D) to require that the defendant compensate the victim for any injury, harm, or loss, including emotional distress, that occurred as a result of the offense.

#### SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR CRIME VICTIMS.

(a) **CRIME VICTIMS LEGAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.**—Section 103(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2264) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”;

(5) in paragraph (5), by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”.

(b) **CRIME VICTIMS NOTIFICATION GRANTS.**—Section 1404E(c) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603e(c)) is amended by striking “2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009” and inserting “2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 4. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in a fiscal year—

(1) not less than 75 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for direct testing activities described under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 2(a) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)); and

(2) not less than 5 percent of such amounts shall be provided for grants for law enforcement agencies to conduct audits of their backlogged rape kits, including through the creation of a tracking system, under section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7)), and to prioritize testing in those cases in which the statute of limitation will soon expire.

(b) **REPORTING.**—

(1) **REPORT BY GRANT RECIPIENTS.**—With respect to amounts made available to the Attorney General for a DNA Analysis and capacity enhancement program and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE”, the Attorney General shall require recipients of the amounts to report on the effectiveness of the activities carried out using the amounts, including any information the Attorney General needs in order to submit the report required under paragraph (2).

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 month after the last day of each even-numbered fiscal year, 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, for each recipient of amounts described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the amounts distributed to the recipient;

(B) a summary of the purposes for which the amounts were used and an evaluation of the progress of the recipient in achieving those purposes;

(C) a statistical summary of the crime scene samples and arrestee or offender samples submitted to laboratories, the average time between the submission of a sample to a laboratory and the testing of the sample, and the percentage of the amounts that were paid to private laboratories; and

(D) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant amounts in increasing capacity and reducing backlogs.

#### SEC. 5. SEXUAL ASSAULT NURSE EXAMINERS.

Section 304 of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **PREFERENCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with a program authorized, in whole or in part, by this section, the Attorney General shall give preference to any eligible entity that certifies that the entity will use the grant funds to—

“(A) operate or expand forensic nurse examiner programs in a rural area or for an underserved population, as those terms are defined in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925);

“(B) hire full-time forensic nurse examiners to conduct activities under subsection (a); or

“(C) sustain or establish a training program for forensic nurse examiners.

“(2) **DIRECTIVE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to inform Federally Qualified Health Centers, Community Health Centers, hospitals, colleges and universities, and other appropriate health-related entities about the role of forensic nurses and existing resources available within the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to train or employ forensic nurses to address the needs of communities dealing with sexual assault, domestic violence, and elder abuse. The Attorney General shall collaborate on this effort with nongovernmental organizations representing forensic nurses.”.

#### SEC. 6. PROTECTING THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT.

Section 8(e)(1)(A) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607(e)(1)(A)) is amended—

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

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

“(iii) the program is not administered by the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice.”.

#### SEC. 7. CLARIFICATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT HOUSING PROTECTIONS.

Section 4141(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e–11(b)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “any remaining tenant”;

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting “or resident” after “tenant” each place it appears.

#### SEC. 8. STRENGTHENING THE PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 15605(d)(2)), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) include the certification of the chief executive that the State receiving such grant has adopted all national prison rape standards that, as of the date on which the application was submitted, have been promulgated under this Act; or

“(ii) demonstrate to the Attorney General, in such manner as the Attorney General shall require, that the State receiving such grant is actively working to adopt and achieve full compliance with the national prison rape standards described in clause (i);”;

(2) in section 8(e) (42 U.S.C. 15607(e))—

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

“(2) **ADOPTION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.**—



“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, any amount that a State would otherwise receive for prison purposes for that fiscal year under a grant program covered by this subsection shall be reduced by 5 percent, unless the chief executive officer of the State submits to the Attorney General proof of compliance with this Act through—

“(i) a certification that the State has adopted, and is in full compliance with, the national standards described in subsection (a); or

“(ii) an assurance that the State intends to adopt and achieve full compliance with those national standards so as to ensure that a certification under clause (i) may be submitted in future years, which includes—

“(I) a commitment that not less than 5 percent of such amount shall be used for this purpose; or

“(II) a request that the Attorney General hold 5 percent of such amount in abeyance pursuant to the requirements of subparagraph (E).

“(B) RULES FOR CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits a certification under this paragraph shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year; and

“(IV) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all the prisons listed under subclause (I) during the following 3 audit years.

“(ii) AUDIT APPEAL EXCEPTION.—Beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State may submit a certification that the State is in full compliance pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i) even if a prison under the operational control of the executive branch of the State has an audit appeal pending.

“(C) RULES FOR ASSURANCES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall also provide the Attorney General with—

“(I) a list of the prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State;

“(II) a list of the prisons listed under subclause (I) that were audited during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(III) an explanation of any barriers the State faces to completing required audits;

“(IV) all final audit reports for prisons listed under subclause (I) that were completed during the most recently concluded audit year;

“(V) a proposed schedule for completing an audit of all prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State during the following 3 audit years; and

“(VI) an explanation of the State's current degree of implementation of the national standards.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, before receiving the applicable funds described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I), also provide the Attorney General with a proposed plan for the expenditure of the funds during the applicable grant period.

“(iii) ACCOUNTING OF FUNDS.—A chief executive officer of a State who submits an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) shall, in a manner consistent with the applicable

grant reporting requirements, submit to the Attorney General a detailed accounting of how the funds described in subparagraph (A) were used.

“(D) SUNSET OF ASSURANCE OPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, subclause (II) of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall cease to have effect.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SUNSET.—On the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) shall cease to have effect.

“(iii) EMERGENCY ASSURANCES.—

“(I) REQUEST.—Notwithstanding clause (ii), during the 2-year period beginning 6 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, a chief executive officer of a State who certifies that the State has audited not less than 90 percent of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State may request that the Attorney General allow the chief executive officer to submit an emergency assurance in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii) as in effect on the day before the date on which that subparagraph ceased to have effect under clause (ii) of this subparagraph.

“(II) GRANT OF REQUEST.—The Attorney General shall grant a request submitted under subclause (I) within 60 days upon a showing of good cause.

“(E) DISPOSITION OF FUNDS HELD IN ABEYANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) subsequently submits a certification under subparagraph (A)(i) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General will release all funds held in abeyance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) to be used by the State in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(ii) RELEASE OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, but does assure the Attorney General that % of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall release all of the funds of the State held in abeyance to be used in adopting and achieving full compliance with the national standards, if the State agrees to comply with the applicable requirements in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (C).

“(iii) REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If the chief executive officer of a State who has submitted an assurance under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) is unable to submit a certification during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016 and does not assure the Attorney General that % of prisons under the operational control of the executive branch of the State have been audited at least once, the Attorney General shall redistribute the funds of the State held in abeyance to other States to be used in accordance with the conditions of the grant program for which the funds were provided.

“(F) PUBLICATION OF AUDIT RESULTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall request from each State, and make available on an appropriate Internet website, all final audit reports completed to date for prisons under the operational control of the executive

branch of each State. The Attorney General shall update such website annually with reports received from States under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C)(i).

“(G) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, the Attorney General shall issue a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status of implementation of the national standards and the steps the Department, in conjunction with the States and other key stakeholders, is taking to address any unresolved implementation issues.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR AUDITORS.—An individual seeking certification by the Department of Justice to serve as an auditor of prison compliance with the national standards described in subsection (a) shall, upon request, submit fingerprints in the manner determined by the Attorney General for criminal history record checks of the applicable State and Federal Bureau of Investigation repositories.”.

#### SEC. 9. ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) DNA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 305(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136b(c)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(b) FBI DNA PROGRAMS.—Section 307(a) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-405; 118 Stat. 2275) is amended by striking “\$42,100,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

(c) DNA IDENTIFICATION OF MISSING PERSONS.—Section 308(c) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136d(c)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 10. PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.

(a) GRANTS.—Part BB of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797j) is amended—

(1) in section 2802(2) (42 U.S.C. 3797k(2)), by inserting after “bodies” the following: “and is accredited by an accrediting body that is a signatory to an internationally recognized arrangement and that offers accreditation to forensic science conformity assessment bodies using an accreditation standard that is recognized by that internationally recognized arrangement, or attests, in a manner that is legally binding and enforceable, to use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation not more than 2 years after the date on which a grant is awarded under section 2801”;

(2) in section 2803(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797l(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “Seventy-five percent” and inserting “Eighty-five percent”; and

(ii) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “85 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “Twenty-five percent” and inserting “Fifteen percent”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “0.6 percent” and inserting “1 percent”;

(3) in section 2804(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797m(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “impression evidence,” after “latent prints,”; and

(ii) by inserting “digital evidence, fire evidence,” after “toxicology,”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and medicolegal death investigators” after “laboratory personnel”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following:

“(4) To address emerging forensic science issues (such as statistics, contextual bias,

and uncertainty of measurement) and emerging forensic science technology (such as high throughput automation, statistical software, and new types of instrumentation).

“(5) To educate and train forensic pathologists in the United States.

“(6) To work with the States and units of local government to direct funding to medicolegal death investigation systems to facilitate accreditation of medical examiner and coroner offices and certification of medicolegal death investigators.”; and

(4) in section 2806(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797o(a))—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

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

“(4) the progress of any unaccredited forensic science service provider receiving grant funds toward obtaining accreditation; and”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(24) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(24)) is amended—

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

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

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021.”.

#### SEC. 11. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF REPRESENTATION IN STATE CAPITAL CASES.

Section 426 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14163e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or upon a showing of good cause, and at the discretion of the Attorney General, the State may determine a fair allocation of funds across the uses described in sections 421 and 422”.

#### SEC. 12. POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3600 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “under a sentence of” in each place it appears and inserting “sentenced to”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(i), by striking “death”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and the applicant did not—” and all that follows through “knowingly fail to request” and inserting “and the applicant did not knowingly fail to request”;

(3) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) order the Government to—

“(i) prepare an inventory of the evidence related to the case; and

“(ii) issue a copy of the inventory to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”;

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) RESULTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The results of any DNA testing ordered under this section shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.

“(B) RESULTS EXCLUDE APPLICANT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a DNA profile is obtained through testing that excludes the applicant as the source and the DNA complies with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s

requirements for the uploading of crime scene profiles to the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’), the court shall order that the law enforcement entity with direct or conveyed statutory jurisdiction that has access to the NDIS submit the DNA profile obtained from probative biological material from crime scene evidence to determine whether the DNA profile matches a profile of a known individual or a profile from an unsolved crime.

“(ii) NDIS SEARCH.—The results of a search under clause (i) shall be simultaneously disclosed to the court, the applicant, and the Government.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the National DNA Index System (referred to in this subsection as ‘NDIS’)” and inserting “NDIS”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(2)(B), by striking “death”.

(b) PRESERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.—Section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “under a sentence of” and inserting “sentenced to”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

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

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

#### SEC. 13. KIRK BLOODSWORTH POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 413 of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “fiscal years 2017 through 2021”; and

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

“(2) for eligible entities that are a State or unit of local government, provide a certification by the chief legal officer of the State in which the eligible entity operates or the chief legal officer of the jurisdiction in which the funds will be used for the purposes of the grants, that the State or jurisdiction—

“(A) provides DNA testing of specified evidence under a State statute or a State or local rule or regulation to persons sentenced to imprisonment or death for a State felony offense, in a manner intended to ensure a reasonable process for resolving claims of actual innocence that ensures post-conviction DNA testing in at least those cases that would be covered by section 3600(a) of title 18, United States Code, had they been Federal cases and, if the results of the testing exclude the applicant as the source of the DNA, permits the applicant to apply for post-conviction relief, notwithstanding any provision of law that would otherwise bar the application as untimely; and

“(B) preserves biological evidence, as defined in section 3600A of title 18, United States Code, under a State statute or a State or local rule, regulation, or practice in a manner intended to ensure that reasonable measures are taken by the State or jurisdiction to preserve biological evidence secured in relation to the investigation or prosecution of, at a minimum, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter and sexual offenses.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 412(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 14136e(b)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021”.

#### SEC. 14. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title IV of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law

108–405; 118 Stat. 2278) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 414. ESTABLISHMENT OF BEST PRACTICES FOR EVIDENCE RETENTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall—

“(1) establish best practices for evidence retention to focus on the preservation of forensic evidence; and

“(2) assist State, local, and tribal governments in adopting and implementing the best practices established under paragraph (1).

“(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the National Institute of Justice shall publish the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).

“(c) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or obligate compliance with the best practices established under subsection (a)(1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2260) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 413 the following:

“Sec. 414. Establishment of best practices for evidence retention.”.

#### SEC. 15. EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Effective Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2015”.

(b) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3752) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “To request a grant”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) A comprehensive Statewide plan detailing how grants received under this section will be used to improve the administration of the criminal justice system, which shall—

“(A) be designed in consultation with local governments, and representatives of all segments of the criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, law enforcement personnel, corrections personnel, and providers of indigent defense services, victim services, juvenile justice delinquency prevention programs, community corrections, and reentry services;

“(B) include a description of how the State will allocate funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(C) describe the process used by the State for gathering evidence-based data and developing and using evidence-based and evidence-gathering approaches in support of funding decisions;

“(D) describe the barriers at the State and local level for accessing data and implementing evidence-based approaches to preventing and reducing crime and recidivism; and

“(E) be updated every 5 years, with annual progress reports that—

“(i) address changing circumstances in the State, if any;

“(ii) describe how the State plans to adjust funding within and among each of the uses described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of section 501(a)(1);

“(iii) provide an ongoing assessment of need;

“(iv) discuss the accomplishment of goals identified in any plan previously prepared under this paragraph; and

“(v) reflect how the plan influenced funding decisions in the previous year.



“(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments requesting support to develop and implement the strategic plan required under subsection (a)(6). The Attorney General may enter into agreements with 1 or more non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance and training under this paragraph.

“(2) PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall begin to provide technical assistance to States and local governments, including any agent thereof with responsibility for administration of justice, requesting support to meet the obligations established by the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall include—

“(A) public dissemination of practices, structures, or models for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment; and

“(B) assistance with adopting and implementing a system for the administration of justice consistent with the requirements of the Sixth Amendment.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 to carry out this subsection.”

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement to submit a strategic plan under section 501(a)(6) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (b), shall apply to any application submitted under such section 501 for a grant for any fiscal year beginning after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 16. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under this Act shall be subject to the following:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this Act 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.

(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this Act, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

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

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

(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department

of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this Act, 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 shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act 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 a grant program described in this Act 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 subsection available for public inspection.

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a 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 and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any 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 by operation of this paragraph.

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under

this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

(10) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this Act, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine whether duplicate grants 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. 17. NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FORENSIC LABORATORIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Attorney General shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on the status and needs of the forensic science community.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) examine the status of current workload, backlog, personnel, equipment, and equipment needs of public crime laboratories and medical examiner and coroner offices;

(2) include an overview of academic forensic science resources and needs, from a broad forensic science perspective, including non-traditional crime laboratory disciplines such as forensic anthropology, forensic entomology, and others as determined appropriate by the Attorney General;

(3) consider—

(A) the National Institute of Justice study, *Forensic Sciences: Review of Status and Needs*, published in 1999;

(B) the Bureau of Justice Statistics census reports on Publicly Funded Forensic Crime Laboratories, published in 2002, 2005, 2009, and 2014;

(C) the National Academy of Sciences report, *Strengthening Forensic Science: A Path Forward*, published in 2009; and

(D) the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of forensic providers recommended by the National Commission of Forensic Science and approved by the Attorney General on September 8, 2014;

(4) provide Congress with a comprehensive view of the infrastructure, equipment, and personnel needs of the broad forensic science community; and

(5) be made available to the public.

#### SEC. 18. CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1404(c)(1)(A) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(c)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “victim services,” before “demonstration projects”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the proposed rule entitled “VOCA Victim Assistance Program” published by the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice in the Federal Register on August 27, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 52877), is consistent with section 1404 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603).

#### SEC. 19. IMPROVING THE RESTITUTION PROCESS.

Section 3612 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EVALUATION OF OFFICES OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY AND DEPARTMENT COMPONENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall, as part of the regular evaluation process, evaluate each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice on the performance of the office or the component, as the case may be, in seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—Following an evaluation under paragraph (1), each office of the United States attorney and each component of the Department of Justice shall work to improve the practices of the office or component, as the case may be, with respect to seeking and recovering restitution for victims under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution.

“(k) GAO REPORTS.—

“(1) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on restitution sought by the Attorney General under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution during the 3-year period preceding the report.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include statistically valid estimates of—

“(A) the number of cases in which a defendant was convicted and the Attorney General could seek restitution under this title or the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.);

“(B) the number of cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution;

“(C) of the cases in which the Attorney General sought restitution, the number of times restitution was ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(D) the amount of restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States;

“(E) the amount of restitution collected pursuant to the restitution orders described in subparagraph (D);

“(F) the percentage of restitution orders for which the full amount of restitution has not been collected; and

“(G) any other measurement the Comptroller General determines would assist in evaluating how to improve the restitution process in Federal criminal cases.

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations on the best practices for—

“(A) requesting restitution in cases in which restitution may be sought under each provision of this title and the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) that authorizes restitution;

“(B) obtaining restitution orders from the district courts of the United States; and

“(C) collecting restitution ordered by the district courts of the United States.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the report required under paragraph (1) is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the implementation by the Attorney General of the best practices recommended under paragraph (3).”

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, by way of explanation, that final piece of legislation represents the passage of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act. This is legislation the Judiciary Committee has considered, as the Presiding Officer knows, which Senator PAT LEAHY, the ranking member, and I have been working on for some time.

It would improve victims' rights by increasing access to restitution and reauthorize programs that support crime victims in court, and it would increase resources for forensic labs to reduce the rape kit backlog. That last measure is something that has been a concern of mine for a number of years. Congress has appropriated a significant amount of money, under the Debbie Smith Act, to test forensic evidence in rape kits to identify the offenders in sexual assault cases. Unfortunately, over time, more and more of that money had been used for administrative and not testing purposes. If reports are to be believed, as many as 400,000 untested rape kits either sat in evidence lockers or in labs untested, thus denying those victims, whom those kits represent, resolution of their issues of closing the circle on their grief. We need to also make sure we have done everything we can in keeping our commitment to pursue the offender who has committed those sexual assaults.

Since my days as attorney general of Texas, protecting the rights of crime victims has been close to my heart, but I know we always worry about whether there is enough money to be able to adequately fund law enforcement. We have also previously—particularly on the issue of trafficking—made sure we created a crime victims fund that takes the money from the fines and penalties paid by the procurers, or the people who are charged with purchasing sexual services from trafficking victims, puts that money into the fund that will then be used to help the victims heal. In particular, we need to get rid of this rape kit backlog.

I have been working with one of my personal heroes, Debbie Smith. She has worked very hard to make sure we don't forget these victims, just as she courageously talks about her own terrible experience. It is very important that we get more of these rape kits inventoried so we know exactly what the scope of the problem is and we get more of them tested.

Some cities like Houston, TX, have waited around for the Federal Government. Thanks to former Mayor Parker, Houston has cleared its rape kit backlog by testing all of them. It is incredible what sort of evidence they have been able to produce by creating hits on the DNA testing matchup and being able to solve previously unsolved crimes. Of course, DNA being as powerful as it is can also make sure that people who are falsely accused of a crime are exonerated.

I appreciate the work of the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY,

who joined me in introducing the bill, and I appreciate his commitment to seeing it through. As always, I thank Senator GRASSLEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, for his leadership in helping shepherd this bipartisan bill through the committee. This is now ready to go to President Obama and be signed into law.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of America's greatest strengths is our judicial system: a system based on the ideal of equal justice for all. The Senate has a critical role to play in protecting this judicial system. Perhaps most importantly, it is our responsibility to confirm qualified judges to vacancies throughout the country so that our courts function at full strength and Americans receive swift and reliable justice. Another core responsibility is ensuring fairness. In criminal cases, fairness requires that the rights of victims and the accused are respected. It requires that evidence is processed quickly and accurately. And if there is a mistake and an innocent person is wrongly convicted, fairness requires that we have the tools available to correct them.

The bill the Senate passes today, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act, will make our courts more fair. It provides tools to strengthen indigent defense and expand the rights of crime victims. It will improve the use of forensic evidence, including rape kits, to provide justice as swiftly as possible. It will help protect the innocent by increasing access to postconviction DNA testing. Passage of this bipartisan bill is long overdue, but it is an important step that we celebrate today.

The Justice for All Reauthorization Act builds on the work I began in 2000, when I introduced the Innocence Protection Act. That bill sought to ensure that defendants in the most serious cases receive competent representation and, when appropriate, access to postconviction DNA testing.

I started my career as a prosecutor in Vermont. I know that we must hold those who commit crimes accountable, but we must also ensure that our system treats the accused fairly and does not wrongly convict those who are not guilty. In some cases, DNA testing can prove the innocence of individuals where the system got it grievously wrong. “Innocent until proven guilty” is a hallmark of our criminal justice system, but when a person who has been found guilty is actually innocent, we must provide access to tools like DNA testing that can set the record straight.

The Innocence Protection Act and the funding it provides for postconviction DNA testing has played a critical role in helping the innocent clear their names and receive the exonerations they deserve. These cases happen more often than people might think. In the first 6 months of 2016, at

least four people have been exonerated by DNA testing after spending a combined 100 years in prison for crimes they had not committed.

Can you imagine how terrifying it must be to be convicted of a crime you did not commit? You are separated from all that you know and all those you love—perhaps for decades or life. You are housed in a cold, bare prison cell, isolated and scared. And perhaps worst of all, no one believes you when you say you did not do it. The four men exonerated by DNA in just the last few months no doubt experienced that and worse, so did my friend Kirk Bloodsworth.

Kirk was a young man just out of the Marines when, in 1984, he was sentenced to death for the rape and murder of a 9 year-old girl, a heinous crime he did not commit. He maintained his innocence and finally received a second trial, only to be convicted again, though this time he received two consecutive life sentences. Again, he fought to clear his name, pushing to have the evidence against him tested for DNA, then a novel new scientific method. The DNA found at the crime scene was not his, and he was released from prison in 1993. He became the first death row inmate in the United States to be exonerated through the use of DNA evidence.

Kirk inspired me to create the Kirk Bloodsworth Post Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program as part of the Innocence Protection Act in 2000. He continues to be a remarkable champion for justice, and I am proud the grant program we both care so deeply about is reauthorized as part of the bipartisan legislation before us today.

We must continue funding this critical postconviction DNA testing since we know our system is imperfect. It is an outrage when an innocent person is wrongly punished, and this injustice is compounded when the true perpetrator remains on the streets, able to commit more crimes. We are all less safe when the system gets it wrong.

Of course we must do more to ensure that our justice system gets it right from the beginning, and that means improving the quality of indigent defense. This legislation requires the Department of Justice to provide technical assistance to States to improve their indigent defense systems, and it ensures that public defenders will have a seat at the table when States determine how to use their Byrne JAG criminal justice funding. Although these are small changes, I hope they lay the ground work for greater improvements ahead, including adoption of my Gideon's Promise Act. That legislation would allow the Department of Justice to ensure that States are satisfying their obligations to provide competent counsel under the 6th and 14th Amendments. It has been a part of this bill in previous years, but unfortunately does not yet have the support it needs for passage. We must do more to protect this fundamental right, and I

will continue to work to see the Gideon's Promise Act passed into law.

In addition to the Innocence Protection Act, the Justice for All Reauthorization Act also increases resources for public forensic laboratories by reauthorizing the Coverdell program. It addresses the needs of sexual assault survivors by ensuring that rape kit backlogs are reduced and forensic exam programs are expanded. It strengthens some key provisions of the Prison Rape Elimination Act. And it expands rights for victims of all crime.

While we still have a long way to go, we have made progress over the years to respond to the needs of sexual assault survivors, and I am glad this legislation continues to build on that strong record. Last Congress, we reauthorized the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Program, named for my brave friend Debbie Smith who waited for years after being attacked before her rape kit was tested and the perpetrator was caught. I included language in the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to increase services and funding for survivors of sexual assault and further reduce the rape kit backlog.

I thank Senator CORNYN for working with me to pass this important legislation today. The programs authorized through the Justice for All Act are a smart use of taxpayer dollars that ensure the integrity of our justice system. Senators who talk about the need to go after criminals and promote public safety should support our legislation, which I hope we can enact into law this year.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I commend Senator CORNYN and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, for their work on the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016, which today passed the Senate. I also want to thank the sponsors for agreeing to accept, as part of this reauthorization measure, some transparency language that I developed. This language also passed the Senate today by unanimous consent in the form of a floor amendment to the Justice for All Reauthorization Act.

The purpose of the original Justice for All Act, on which many of us worked during congressional consideration of the measure in 2004, is to protect crime victims' rights, authorize resources to reduce backlogs of unanalyzed DNA evidence from crime scenes and convicted offenders, and expand the DNA testing capacity of the Nation's crime laboratories. The statute also authorizes resources for testing DNA evidence to protect the innocent from wrongful convictions. By working together in a bipartisan fashion, our colleagues have produced legislation that will extend these programs for several more years.

The purpose of my amendment to this reauthorization measure is to increase the transparency and promote accountability of many DNA-related programs and activities that are ad-

ministered by the Justice Department's Office of Justice Programs. We have all seen the recent articles in USA Today, ProPublica, and elsewhere that suggest we may need to take additional steps to effectively accomplish the goals of these programs. In particular, these articles have raised questions about the DNA capacity enhancement and backlog reduction program, which is administered by OJP's National Institute of Justice.

We don't fully understand, for example, why significant backlogs of DNA evidence from crimes of murder and sexual violence persist, despite the appropriation of more than \$1 billion by Congress for the DNA programs that are authorized under the Justice for All Act. The U.S. Government Accountability Office, in a 2013 report entitled "DOJ Could Improve Decision-Making Documentation and Better Assess Results of DNA Backlog Reduction Program Funds," suggested that NIJ could better document the rationale for its yearly funding priorities and take additional steps to verify the reliability of grantee performance data. The Justice Department's inspector general also suggested, in a March 2016 audit report of the DNA program, that NIJ's process for identifying grantees with the potential for generating program income needs improvement.

My transparency language, which is modeled on accountability language that already applies to grant recipients under the STOP grant program, is designed to elicit more information about how the funds appropriated for Justice for All Act programs are being used in practice. First, it would require the Attorney General to annually report to Congress, for each recipient of DNA grants, the amounts distributed to each grant recipient, the purposes for which these funds were used, and each recipient's progress in achieving those purposes. Second, under this amendment, the Attorney General must summarize the types of DNA samples submitted to crime labs, the average time it took to test these DNA samples, and the proportion of each grant that went to private crime labs. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it would require the Attorney General to evaluate the effectiveness of grant amounts in increasing crime labs' capacity and reducing backlogs of DNA evidence.

The amendment I sponsored also includes some language that is designed to ensure we avoid duplication in grant programs, as well as a provision that is intended to enhance crime victims' access to restitution. I thank Senator LANKFORD, who cosponsored the amendment, for suggesting the inclusion of the antiduplication language, which is modeled on language that I led the Judiciary Committee in approving as part of several other measures before our committee. Senator FEINSTEIN, who also cosponsored this amendment, also deserves credit for suggesting the addition of restitution language.

In closing, I want to again extend my appreciation to Senators CORNYN and LEAHY for their hard work on this measure, which our Judiciary Committee reported last month and congratulate them on Senate passage of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying S. 524.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

*Resolved*, That the House insist upon its amendments to the bill (S. 524) entitled "An Act to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

#### COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators GRASSLEY, ALEXANDER, HATCH, SESSIONS, LEAHY, MURRAY, and WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is now pending.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendments, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators Grassley, Alexander, Hatch, Sessions, Leahy, Murray, and Wyden with respect to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, and to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni

Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, there will now be up to 2 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to start by commending the majority leader who just came to the floor and offered a motion to go to conference on CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation because it will allow the U.S. Congress to be a better partner in fighting against this heroin and prescription drug epidemic that is seizing our communities.

This is a big step today because it says we are going to send a few Senators over to work with the House to come up with a consensus bill between CARA, which passed in this body on March 10, by the way, by a 94-to-1 vote. That never happens around here, and it happened because after 2½ weeks of debate on the floor, everybody realized this is an issue that had to be addressed and that the legislation we came up with was the sensible and responsible way to do it.

It was legislation we developed over a 3-year period. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I were the leads on it. We had five conferences here in Washington, bringing experts in from around the country. We took the best ideas, regardless of where they came from, and came up with a way to deal with the prevention and education aspect of this, to prevent people from getting into the funnel of addiction in the first place, but then, for those who are addicted, to treat addiction like the disease that it is, to get them into the treatment and recovery services that they need, as well as to help our law enforcement; specifically, to help our law enforcement with regard to Narcan, which is naloxone, which helps to stop the overdose deaths. We also help to get prescription drugs off of people's shelves and to avoid this issue of people getting into the issue of opioid addiction, sometimes inadvertently, through prescription drug overprescribing.

This is a bill that actually addresses the problem in a responsible way. It is comprehensive.

The House then passed its own legislation. They passed 18 separate bills, smaller bills, not as comprehensive but which included some good ideas that were not in the Senate bill; one, for instance, raising the cap on doctors who are treating people with Suboxone. Some of those ideas should be incorporated as well, but the point is, we have to move and move quickly.

If we think about this, since the Senate passed its legislation, which was on March 10, we have unfortunately seen roughly 129 people a day lose their lives to overdoses. So many thousands of Americans have lost their lives even

since March 10. This legislation takes the right step to address that problem and not to address just those who have overdosed and died but those who are casualties of this epidemic, who have therefore lost their job, lost their family, lost their ability to be able to function.

As I talk to recovering addicts around my State of Ohio, I hear the same thing again and again: The drugs become everything, and this does cause families to be torn apart. It does cause crime. When I talk to prosecutors in my State, they tell me that most of the crime—in one county, recently a county prosecutor told me that 80 percent of the crime is due to this heroin and prescription drug epidemic. So this is one we must address for so many reasons, and we must address it right away.

I am pleased we are finally appointing conferees. I hope the other side will not consider blocking this because we need to move on with this to get this legislation to the President's desk. We have been talking with the House about their legislation that was passed subsequent to our legislation and talking about how to make some of these compromises to be able to come up with a consensus bill. I think we are very close. Again, I think there are some ideas in the House bill we should incorporate, and I think there are some ideas in the Senate bill that must be included in the House bill that are not included now. I think one is with regard to recovery services.

We know that the best evidence-based treatment and recovery can make a difference in turning people's lives around, and therefore we do support recovery services. For those in the field, they will tell us it is not just about the medication-assisted treatment, it is that longer term recovery that creates the success we are all looking for.

Then, on the prevention side, we have focused more specifically on a national awareness campaign to get people again focused on this issue of the link between prescription drugs and the dangers there that are narcotic prescription drugs and the opioid addiction issue. I can't tell you how sad it is to talk to parents back home who have lost a child because that child started on prescription drugs. In two cases, I can tell you about parents who have come to talk to me—one testified at a hearing that we had back in Cleveland, OH—two cases where the teenager went in to get a wisdom tooth extracted and was given painkillers—prescription drugs—and from that became addicted and from that went to heroin and from that, sadly, had an overdose and died.

So I think this awareness is incredibly important because most people don't realize that four out of five heroin addicts in Ohio started on prescription drugs. That awareness alone will save so many lives and create the opportunity for us to keep people out of that funnel of addiction in the first