

I would also like to thank Chairman BRADY for his continued support of H.R. 1551, as well as the bipartisan support we received when this bill was voted out of committee by voice vote last week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for continued bipartisan support from my colleagues here in the House in passing this legislation, not just because it makes commonsense changes to the credit but because of the extreme sense of urgency to provide certainty for our nuclear industry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1551, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

MODERNIZING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2742) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt an electronic system to help expedite the placement of children in foster care or guardianship, or for adoption, across State lines, and to provide funding to aid States in developing such a system, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2742

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 “Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) when a child in foster care cannot return safely home, the child deserves to be placed in a setting that is best for that child, regardless of whether it is in the child’s State or another State;

(2) the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) was established in 1960 to provide a uniform legal framework for the placement of children across State lines in foster and adoptive homes;

(3) frequently, children waiting to be placed with an adoptive family, relative, or foster parent in another State spend more time waiting for this to occur than children who are placed with an adoptive, family, relative, or foster parent in the same State, because of the outdated, administratively burdensome ICPC process;

(4) no child should have to wait longer to be placed in a loving home simply because the child must cross a State line;

(5) the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise (NEICE) was launched in Au-

gust 2014 in Indiana, Nevada, Florida, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia, has since expanded into Illinois, Virginia, Rhode Island, California, Alaska, Nebraska, and Georgia, and is expected to be expanded into additional States to improve the administrative process by which children are placed with families across State lines;

(6) States using this electronic interstate case-processing system have reduced administrative costs and the amount of staff time required to process these cases, and caseworkers can spend more time helping children instead of copying and mailing paperwork between States;

(7) since NEICE was launched, placement time has decreased by 30 percent for interstate foster care placements; and

(8) on average, States using this electronic interstate case-processing system have been able to reduce from 24 business days to 13 business days the time it takes to identify a family for a child and prepare the paperwork required to start the ICPC process.

SEC. 3. STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 471(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(25)) is amended—

(1) by striking “provide” and insert “provides”; and

(2) by inserting “, which in the case of a State other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, not later than October 1, 2027, shall include the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system” before the 1st semicolon.

(b) EXEMPTION OF INDIAN TRIBES.—Section 479B(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 679c(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) INAPPLICABILITY OF STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT TO HAVE IN EFFECT PROCEDURES PROVIDING FOR THE USE AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM.—The requirement in section 471(a)(25) that a State plan provide that the State shall have in effect procedures providing for the use of an electronic interstate case-processing system shall not apply to an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that elects to operate a program under this part.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to payments under part E of title IV of the Social Security Act for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required in order for a State plan developed pursuant to part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to meet the additional requirement imposed by the amendments made by subsection (a), the plan shall not be regarded as failing to meet any of the additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, if the State has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.

Section 437 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ELECTRONIC INTERSTATE CASE-PROCESSING SYSTEM TO EXPEDITE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE OR GUARDIANSHIP, OR FOR ADOPTION.—

“(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subsection is to facilitate the development of an electronic interstate case-processing system for the exchange of data and documents to expedite the placements of children in foster, guardianship, or adoptive homes across State lines.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A State that seeks funding under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary the following information:

“(A) A description of the goals and outcomes to be achieved, which goals and outcomes must result in—

“(i) reducing the time it takes for a child to be provided with a safe and appropriate permanent living arrangement across State lines;

“(ii) improving administrative processes and reducing costs in the foster care system; and

“(iii) the secure exchange of relevant case files and other necessary materials in real time, and timely communications and placement decisions regarding interstate placements of children.

“(B) A description of the activities to be funded in whole or in part with the funds, including the sequencing of the activities.

“(C) A description of the strategies for integrating programs and services for children who are placed across State lines.

“(D) Such other information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may provide funds to a State that complies with paragraph (2). In providing funds under this section, the Secretary shall prioritize States that are not yet connected with the electronic interstate case-processing system referred to in paragraph (1).

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—A State to which funding is provided under this subsection shall use the funding to support the State in connecting with, or enhancing or expediting services provided under, the electronic interstate case-processing system referred to in paragraph (1).

“(5) EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the final year in which funds are awarded under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, and make available to the general public by posting on a website, a report that contains the following information:

“(A) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) has changed the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

“(B) The number of cases subject to the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children that were processed through the electronic interstate case-processing system, and the number of interstate child placement cases that were processed outside the electronic interstate case-processing system, by each State in each year.

“(C) The progress made by States in implementing the electronic interstate case-processing system.

“(D) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected various metrics related to child safety and well-being, including the time it takes for children to be placed across State lines.

“(E) How using the electronic interstate case-processing system has affected administrative costs and caseworker time spent on placing children across State lines.

“(6) DATA INTEGRATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretariat for the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children and the States, shall assess how the

electronic interstate case-processing system developed pursuant to paragraph (4) could be used to better serve and protect children that come to the attention of the child welfare system, by—

“(A) connecting the system with other data systems (such as systems operated by State law enforcement and judicial agencies, systems operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purposes of the Innocence Lost National Initiative, and other systems);

“(B) simplifying and improving reporting related to paragraphs (34) and (35) of section 471(a) regarding children or youth who have been identified as being a sex trafficking victim or children missing from foster care; and

“(C) improving the ability of States to quickly comply with background check requirements of section 471(a)(20), including checks of child abuse and neglect registries as required by section 471(a)(20)(B).”

SEC. 5. CONTINUATION OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDING TO PROMOTE SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES.

Section 437(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(a)) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 6. RESERVATION OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.

Section 437(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) IMPROVING THE INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN.—The Secretary shall reserve \$5,000,000 of the amount made available for fiscal year 2018 for providing funding under subsection (g), and the amount so reserved shall remain available through fiscal year 2022.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2742, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2742, Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act, which I introduced along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), my friend.

We know full well the importance of a stable home environment for a child's development and success later in life. Unfortunately, we don't live in an ideal world. We have seen too many instances when abuse, neglect, physical or mental illness, addiction, incarceration, or death necessitates removing a child from their home.

Right now, in my State of Indiana, there are more than 10,000 children in the foster care system than there were 18 months ago. This is due in large part to the opioid epidemic that has swept

across our country. Our child welfare system is under unprecedented strain.

Yet, in spite of this great need for foster care and adoption, if a child needs to be placed in another State, caseworkers from both States must literally print and fill out hundreds of pages of paperwork and mail them back and forth. This cumbersome process takes months, and just one missing page can set it back even further. These are precious months that an at-risk child is stuck in limbo, waiting for the certainty of a more permanent home. It is time to bring this process into the 21st century.

Luckily, there is an effort underway already to do just that. In November 2013, five States, including my home State of Indiana, and the District of Columbia, launched the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise, or NEICE. This is a cloud-based electronic system that allows for the electronic exchange of data between States. It started as a pilot project, but the results have been crystal clear: placement wait times dropped by a month and a half, States spent less time and money on copying and mailing, and caseworkers saved valuable time.

NEICE is now effective in 16 States, including Mr. DAVIS' home State of Illinois, but we can't stop at 16. As it stands today, if a child in my district in South Bend, Indiana, needed to be placed with their grandparents just 11 miles away in Niles, Michigan, the two States would have to undertake that arduous paperwork process because Michigan is not a part of NEICE yet. All States need to be a part of this system in order to realize its full benefits.

That is where the bill before us comes in. H.R. 2742 represents a very important investment in the future of at-risk youth. It requires States to join the NEICE system by October 1, 2027, and sets aside \$5 million in existing Federal funds to facilitate States in joining or expanding their services under NEICE.

That money doesn't come without strings. States must apply for the funds and submit detailed plans. The Secretary of Health and Human Services will have to submit periodic reports to Congress so that we can monitor progress as States join and ensure that this program continues to cut wait times for children and administrative costs for States.

In the 114th Congress, this legislation passed the House of Representatives, but, unfortunately, did not come up for a vote in the Senate. It is our hope that we can cross the finish line this year and help at-risk youth find their forever home more quickly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for being a great partner in introducing this legislation. I would like to thank Senators Young, Grassley, and Gillibrand for introducing companion legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I enter into the RECORD a list of 17 organizations that wrote in support of H.R. 2742.

1. American Academy of Adoption Attorneys/American Academy of Assisted Reproductive Technology Attorneys
2. American Academy of Pediatrics
3. American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
4. American Public Human Services Association
5. California County Welfare Directors Association
6. Child Advocates, Indianapolis, IN
7. Child Welfare League of America
8. Children's Home Society of America
9. First Focus
10. Generations United
11. Indiana Department of Child Services
12. March of Dimes
13. National Association of Counties
14. National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners
15. Partnership for Strong Families
16. The Villages of Indiana
17. Voice for Adoption

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support H.R. 2742, the Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act.

Cross-State placement of youth in foster care is particularly salient to children living with kinship caregivers. Given that my congressional district has one of the highest percentages of grandparent caregivers in the Nation, I am pleased to join with Congresswoman WALORSKI in leading this important legislation.

This bill helps reduce the barriers and delays that continue to exist when the best new home for a child is in a different State than the unsafe home the child had to leave. Removing barriers that delay or prevent interstate child placement is a longtime bipartisan goal within Congress.

This bill addresses an important factor in those delays: the ability of State computer systems to link up to process the paperwork. The current paper-based system is antiquated and slow.

As part of an HHS pilot project, seven States, and the District of Columbia, currently participate in the National Electronic Interstate Compact Enterprise, or NEICE, an online tool that allows State office systems to talk to each other and process interstate placements more quickly. I am, indeed, proud that Illinois is one of those States.

An early evaluation found that this system reduced waiting times for affected children by about one-third. Ten of the States have already announced plans to join the exchange over the next 2 years. H.R. 2742 would accelerate the number of participating States in the short run and ensure that all States participate in the long run. The more States that join, the more it speeds up the process for everyone.

The director of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services

often emphasizes that we need to operate in “kid time” and not “adult time,” meaning that we need to recognize the urgency of restoring permanency for children in child welfare rather than allowing adult bureaucracy to impede permanency.

Modernizing the technology to increase efficiencies and quicken placements is common sense and respects the urgency of finding permanent, loving homes for children.

This is a good bill, and I thank Congresswoman WALORSKI and her staff for their excellent work. Our States are joined together, so we join with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), an outstanding legislator.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I salute all of those who are here today offering the bills—this one, and the four other related bills—that are being considered; particularly, Mr. DAVIS, who now holds the position as ranking Democrat on the Human Resources Subcommittee, a job that I have held for the last several years; and Ms. BASS, who has so ably led our Foster Care Caucus. I think it is unfortunate that they are here; unfortunate because all of this business should have been resolved last year.

All five of these modest bills would already be helping children today but for the way the so-called Family First Prevention Services Act was bungled last year. Each of these five bills were a part of it. But, unfortunately, families, and particularly families caring for foster children, have not, and are still not, among the first priorities of this Congress.

Of course, here in the House, there were many speeches. We had extensive hearings year after year concerning foster children and the horrors of child abuse. But speeches alone can't do the job.

There are also many people of goodwill who genuinely care about this foster care problem in both parties. Mrs. WALORSKI is certainly one of those individuals.

But all of us encountered a big problem last year in the Ways and Means Committee when the Family First Prevention Services Act came up. It was the same problem we faced in the last Congress when Senator WYDEN and I offered a larger version of the same piece of legislation.

The Ways and Means Committee majority leadership objects to adding a dime of additional revenue to accompany our speeches. The majority rejected my recommendation for a tax compliance measure to simply require the reporting of alimony payments. If you get alimony, it is a form of in-

come, but there is no report required. This is not an increased tax. It is a way of avoiding tax evasion. And it would have raised the revenues necessary to fund the additional Family First prevention services.

When this bill reached the Senate, the House's decision to reject that approach, or any other reasonable pay-for, was, instead, relying on what you could call basically a “rob Peter to pay Paul” approach by cutting funds in support of adoptions and shifting funds from one part of the foster care system to another part. That, unfortunately, became the excuse in the Senate to block the bill from being passed. I have to say that my home State of Texas, under Federal court order, to correct its many unconstitutional abuses in the foster care system, wrongfully led the way in blocking the Family First bill.

As to the particular bills that we have up today, this one recognizes how mobile our society is and how much we need to be able to go across the country in addressing this problem.

The earlier bill that we considered concerning children who age out of the foster system that Ms. BASS sponsored—really important—we heard time and again about the challenges that those children face when they are, essentially, dumped out on the street at age 18 or age 21, depending on which State they are in; and challenges particularly for young women who find themselves in that situation without adequate preparation or adult help.

This bill that we considered addressed the primary problem of limited Federal investment in helping these vulnerable older youth prepare for independence. I don't have any objection to it or to any of the bills that are being considered today. I object only to the ideological insistence of some in the majority that any additional revenue from any source, no matter how reasonable, cannot be placed in a deficient foster care system, which too many of our States will not fix.

And today's changes do not appear to add any actual new resources to foster care, and, indeed, they are likely to be overwhelmed by one cut after another that President Trump is proposing, particularly the Medicaid cuts that are being forced through this Congress, that are very important to foster youth and to all children.

So in this Congress—so indifferent to the education and social service and health needs of children of all types across our country—perhaps only taking a little step is the best we can expect to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children in our society.

But I think all of us must be committed to work together to find a day when we are willing to take truly meaningful action before, rather than after, children—more children—are needlessly lost.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2742, the Modernizing the Interstate Placement of Children in Foster Care Act.

Children who cannot be safely returned home deserve to be placed in the best setting possible for them, regardless of the State where the setting is located; and no child should have to wait to move to that best setting because it is across the State line.

□ 1715

Separation from a parent or long-term caregiver is always traumatic for a child. Even if relatives come forward right away, it may take months to get licensed, months in which the child may bond with the foster family. When the relative lives in another State, the licensing process can often take as long as 6 months, so that might mean 6 months in foster care. Sometimes our well-intentioned efforts to protect children actually do them more harm.

H.R. 2742 provides States with resources to automate this process so that social workers no longer have to photocopy documents and submit them on paper through a succession of offices.

Last year, the National Foster Youth Institute organized a listening tour in Representative VICKY HARTZLER's district; and during a meeting with child welfare professionals, they described the challenges they face when relatives are identified in different States and they are unable to quickly place the child with family and must keep the child in foster care. The judges, social workers, and families specifically requested Members of Congress to change the law and asked the National Foster Youth Institute to please advocate for change. I look forward to communicating with Representative HARTZLER and her constituents about this legislation.

I ask my colleagues to support the legislation sponsored by Representatives WALORSKI and DAVIS, H.R. 2742.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I will say that my staff and I have been delightfully pleased to work with Representative WALORSKI and her staff in preparing this very commonsense, good legislation. I strongly support it and urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the words from someone on the ground living this every day. Sharon Pierce is the president and CEO of The Villages of Indiana, the largest not-for-profit child and family services provider in my State and a supporter of H.R. 2742: “The NEICE system is going to be invaluable in helping both the public and private sector child welfare agencies reduce considerably the length of time

a child needs to wait for a forever family.”

This isn't just a good government bill, Mr. Speaker. Sure, we are reducing costs and paperwork and we can attach all sorts of numbers and dollar figures to that, but the most important thing we are doing here is we are giving at-risk youth a more permanent home sooner. We are giving them hope sooner. We are giving them a chance to actually thrive sooner.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2742.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARTNERSHIP GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN FAMILIES AF- FECTED BY PARENTAL SUB- STANCE ABUSE ACT

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2834) to improve the well-being of, and improve permanency outcomes for, children and families affected by heroin, opioids, and other substance abuse, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2834

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 “Partnership Grants to Strengthen Families Affected by Parental Substance Abuse Act”.

SEC. 2. ENHANCEMENTS TO GRANTS TO IMPROVE WELL-BEING OF FAMILIES AFFECTED BY SUBSTANCE ABUSE.

Section 437(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 629g(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “INCREASE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND TO IMPROVE THE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AFFECTED BY” and inserting “IMPLEMENT IV—E PREVENTION SERVICES, AND IMPROVE THE WELL-BEING OF, AND IMPROVE PERMANENCY OUTCOMES FOR, CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFFECTED BY HEROIN, OPIOIDS, AND OTHER”;

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

“(2) REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘regional partnership’ means a collaborative agreement (which may be established on an interstate, State, or intrastate basis) entered into by the following:

“(A) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—

“(i) The State child welfare agency that is responsible for the administration of the State plan under this part and part E.

“(ii) The State agency responsible for administering the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant provided under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

“(B) MANDATORY PARTNERS FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROPOSING TO SERVE CHILDREN IN

OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS.—If the partnership proposes to serve children in out-of-home placements, the Juvenile Court or Administrative Office of the Court that is most appropriate to oversee the administration of court programs in the region to address the population of families who come to the attention of the court due to child abuse or neglect.

“(C) OPTIONAL PARTNERS.—At the option of the partnership, any of the following:

“(i) An Indian tribe or tribal consortium.

“(ii) Nonprofit child welfare service providers.

“(iii) For-profit child welfare service providers.

“(iv) Community health service providers, including substance abuse treatment providers.

“(v) Community mental health providers.

“(vi) Local law enforcement agencies.

“(vii) School personnel.

“(viii) Tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortia of the agencies).

“(ix) Any other providers, agencies, personnel, officials, or entities that are related to the provision of child and family services under a State plan approved under this subpart.

“(D) EXCEPTION FOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS WHERE THE LEAD APPLICANT IS AN INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL CONSORTIA.—If an Indian tribe or tribal consortium enters into a regional partnership for purposes of this subsection, the Indian tribe or tribal consortium—

“(i) may (but is not required to) include the State child welfare agency as a partner in the collaborative agreement;

“(ii) may not enter into a collaborative agreement only with tribal child welfare agencies (or a consortium of the agencies); and

“(iii) if the condition described in paragraph (2)(B) applies, may include tribal court organizations in lieu of other judicial partners.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$500,000 and not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “\$250,000 and not more than \$1,000,000”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “; PLANNING” after “APPROVAL”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “clauses (ii) and (iii)”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) SUFFICIENT PLANNING.—A grant awarded under this subsection shall be disbursed in two phases: a planning phase (not to exceed 2 years) and an implementation phase. The total disbursement to a grantee for the planning phase may not exceed \$250,000, and may not exceed the total anticipated funding for the implementation phase.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT FOR A FISCAL YEAR.—No payment shall be made under subparagraph (A) or (C) for a fiscal year until the Secretary determines that the eligible partnership has made sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the grant and that the members of the eligible partnership are coordinating to a reasonable degree with the other members of the eligible partnership.”;

(4) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, parents, and families” after “children”;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “safety and permanence for such children; and” and inserting “safe, permanent caregiving relationships for the children”;

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “or” and inserting “increase reunification rates for chil-

dren who have been placed in out-of-home care, or decrease”;

(iv) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (v) and inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) improve the substance abuse treatment outcomes for parents including retention in treatment and successful completion of treatment;

“(iv) facilitate the implementation, delivery, and effectiveness of prevention services and programs under section 471(e); and”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “where appropriate,”; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) and inserting the following:

“(E) A description of a plan for sustaining the services provided by or activities funded under the grant after the conclusion of the grant period, including through the use of prevention services and programs under section 471(e) and other funds provided to the State for child welfare and substance abuse prevention and treatment services.

“(F) Additional information needed by the Secretary to determine that the proposed activities and implementation will be consistent with research or evaluations showing which practices and approaches are most effective.”;

(5) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking “abuse treatment” and inserting “use disorder treatment including medication assisted treatment and in-home substance abuse disorder treatment and recovery”;

(6) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) demonstrate a track record of successful collaboration among child welfare, substance abuse disorder treatment and mental health agencies; and”;

(7) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “establish indicators that will be” and inserting “review indicators that are”;

(ii) by striking “in using funds made available under such grants to achieve the purpose of this subsection” and inserting “and establish a set of core indicators related to child safety, parental recovery, parenting capacity, and family well-being. In developing the core indicators, to the extent possible, indicators shall be made consistent with the outcome measures described in section 471(e)(6)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “base the performance measures on lessons learned from prior rounds of regional partnership grants under this subsection, and” before “consult”;

(ii) by striking clauses (iii) and (iv) and inserting the following:

“(iii) Other stakeholders or constituencies as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(8) in paragraph (9)(A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than September 30 of each fiscal year in which a recipient of a grant under this subsection is paid funds under the grant, and every 6 months thereafter, the grant recipient shall submit to the Secretary a report on the services provided and activities carried out during the reporting period, progress made in achieving the goals of the program, the number of children, adults, and families receiving services, and such additional information as the Secretary determines is necessary. The report due not later than September 30 of the last such fiscal year shall include, at a minimum, data on each of the performance