

133(b)(2)(F), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “sanctions” and inserting “sanctions and incentives”.

(b) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—Section 11233(b)(3)(A) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(3)(A), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—The Director may accept, solicit, and use on behalf of the Agency any monetary or nonmonetary gift, donation, bequest, or use of facilities, property, or services for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Agency.”.

(c) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND USE REIMBURSEMENTS FROM DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.—Section 11233(b)(4) of such Act (sec. 24-133(b)(4)) is amended by striking “During fiscal years 2006 through 2008, the Director” and inserting “The Director”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITIES OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.—Section 307(b) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1607(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the Service may accept public grants and private contributions made to assist it” and inserting “the Service may accept and use public grants, private contributions, and voluntary and uncompensated (gratuitous) services to assist it”.

(b) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS EMPLOYEES OF SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(d) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1603(d), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “employees of the District of Columbia” and inserting “employees of the Service”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the District of Columbia Courts and Justice Technical Corrections Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-274; 112 Stat. 2419).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill from the Senate that we are considering. Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin has put forward this bill. It has cleared the Senate, we are happy to bring this up, but I would urge its adoption.

It is S. 1629, with a very long title to it: The District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015. It just rolls off the tongue.

This bipartisan bill was introduced, as I said, by Senator RON JOHNSON of

Wisconsin, and it gives judicial officials in the District of Columbia the authority they need to make personnel and managerial decisions.

In 1997, Congress reorganized the District of Columbia judicial agencies, making them Federal agencies with Federal employees. This bill improves the efficiency and functions of the D.C. judicial branch by extending them authorities that are available to other Federal agencies.

S. 1629 allows the D.C. courts system to collect debts and erroneous payments made to employees through installment plans of reasonable amounts. Additionally, the courts will be able to provide uniforms to nonjudicial employees. This helps address safety concerns by giving these employees greater visibility in the courthouse and in the community.

Further, these reforms will allow the D.C. judicial offices to operate certain incentive programs, make use of the donations and contributions, and utilize unpaid volunteers. It brings sensible authorities to the District's judicial agencies that will allow these officers to increase efficiencies and conduct their work more effectively.

We had an opportunity to mark up this bill, and I appreciate the input of Ms. NORTON certainly, being from the District of Columbia. And we would urge its final passage here on the floor now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I need to thank Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman RON JOHNSON and Ranking Member TOM CARPER for sponsoring the District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act, and for all their hard work in getting it passed in the Senate.

Thanks also are due to my good friend, the chairman of the Oversight Committee, JASON CHAFFETZ, and its Ranking Member, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for bringing this bill to the floor and working so closely with us in the District of Columbia.

This bill may seem small, but its technical changes will improve the operations and effectiveness of three District of Columbia criminal justice agencies that are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and they are under that jurisdiction because of the Revitalization Act, which took over the funding of certain District of Columbia agencies because they are State agencies, to improve the financial condition of the District of Columbia, which was the only city that carried State functions.

This bill gives these agencies some modest new authorities that are already available to comparable Federal agencies. The bill would authorize CSOSA to use incentives-based programs for offenders, instead of only sanctions to get compliance.

This is in keeping with modern penology. It would allow the Public Defender Service to accept and use public grants, voluntary and uncompensated services, such as unpaid law clerks and interns of the kind, for example, that we use here every day, and private contributions made to advance the Public Defender Service's work. It would allow the courts to collect debts owed to it by its employees.

These changes are small and they are noncontroversial, but they mean a great deal to the District of Columbia because they will modernize and improve the daily operations of the District's criminal justice system.

If I may say so while the chairman is on the floor, these small changes, somehow I hope our committee will find a way to allow the courts, themselves, to do so that we do not have to bring such small changes before this body, which has such important work.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bipartisan piece of legislation. It is common sense. We should pass it.

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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1629.

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.

GRANTS OVERSIGHT AND NEW EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1115) to close out expired grants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1115

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 “Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act” or the “GONE Act”.

SEC. 2. IDENTIFYING AND CLOSING OUT EXPIRED FEDERAL GRANT AWARDS.

(a) EXPIRED FEDERAL GRANT AWARD REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct the head of each agency, in coordination with the Secretary, to submit to Congress and the Secretary a report, not later than December 31 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, that—

(A) lists each Federal grant award held by such agency;

(B) provides the total number of Federal grant awards, including the number of grants—

- (i) by time period of expiration;
- (ii) with zero dollar balances; and
- (iii) with undisbursed balances;

(C) for an agency with Federal grant awards, describes the challenges leading to delays in grant closeout; and

(D) for the 30 oldest Federal grant awards of an agency, explains why each Federal grant award has not been closed out.

(2) USE OF DATA SYSTEMS.—An agency may use existing multiagency data systems in order to submit the report required under paragraph (1).

(3) EXPLANATION OF MISSING INFORMATION.—If the head of an agency is unable to submit all of the information required to be included in the report under paragraph (1), the report shall include an explanation of why the information was not available, including any shortcomings with and plans to improve existing grant systems, including data systems.

(b) NOTICE FROM AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of an agency submits the report required under subsection (a), the head of such agency shall provide notice to the Secretary specifying whether the head of the agency has closed out grant awards associated with all of the Federal grant awards in the report and which Federal grant awards in the report have not been closed out.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which all of the notices required pursuant to paragraph (1) have been provided or March 31 of the calendar year following the calendar year described in subsection (a)(1), whichever is sooner, the Secretary shall compile the notices submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) and submit to Congress a report on such notices.

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the head of an agency provides notice to Congress under subsection (b)(2), the Inspector General of an agency with more than \$500,000,000 in annual grant funding shall conduct a risk assessment to determine if an audit or review of the agency's grant closeout process is warranted.

(d) REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the second report is submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(2), the Director of Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to Congress a report on recommendations, if any, for legislation to improve accountability and oversight in grants management, including the timely closeout of a Federal grant award.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLOSEOUT.—The term "closeout" means a closeout of a Federal grant award conducted in accordance with part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, including sections 200.16 and 200.343 of such title, or any successor thereto.

(3) FEDERAL GRANT AWARD.—The term "Federal grant award" means a Federal grant award (as defined in section 200.38(a)(1) of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto), including a cooperative agreement, in an agency cash payment management system held by the United States Government for which—

(A) the grant award period of performance, including any extensions, has been expired for more than 2 years; and

(B) closeout has not yet occurred in accordance with section 200.343 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I really want to, first, thank Senator FISCHER for the great work done in a bipartisan way in order to move this bill forward. That combination, working with a Member who serves on our committee, Mr. WALBERG, and the relentless work on this piece of legislation, it is often referred to as the GONE Act, Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act. It is a good piece of bipartisan, bicameral legislative effort.

I believe the bill will be effective in bringing about greater reforms for the grants closeout process, allowing agencies to save dollars and make better use of constrained resources. We cannot afford to allow grants to remain open year after year of their expiration date. The GONE Act is an important step in addressing this issue.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for championing this bill and working through this through his work on H.R. 3089, as well as working with the Senate in order to bring it to this point this day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, the Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act, or GONE Act—and I like that name, it is a very catchy name, and you will see why in a moment—it seeks to improve the grant management process by requiring Federal agencies to report on expired grants. The Government Accountability Office has found that expired grants are not always closed out properly. In fact, GAO found that nearly \$1 billion in undisbursed balances remained in expired and dormant grant accounts; therefore, the GONE Act's name.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would call this found money, not gone money. It is still there. Improving the grant closeout process will help protect taxpayer dollars and ensure that those dollars can be redirected to better uses.

This act may also incline agencies and localities to use funds they have asked for. This legislation would require agencies to report to the Secretary of Health and Human Services

and to Congress on the number of expired grants and those with undisbursed balances. For the oldest expired grants, agencies will need to explain why those grants have not been closed.

The bill would also require agencies to report a year after the initial report on progress made on grant closure. Hopefully, this increased accountability will bring improvement to grant management.

I commend Representatives WALBERG and LAWRENCE for their work on this bipartisan, commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), who is the lead person sponsoring this piece of legislation here in the House companion.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1115, the Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act, or as we call it, the GONE Act. As the lead House sponsor of this bill, I am proud of the bipartisan, bicameral effort that has gone into this legislation.

I especially want to thank the Senate champion of this bill, my colleague in the Senate, Senator DEB FISCHER, and also my Michigan colleague, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, along with the staff who have worked so hard to bring this bill to the floor today.

Last year, we marked up this legislation in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and passed it on to the House floor. After some additional fine-tuning made by our colleagues in the Senate, I am pleased to have the opportunity to see the GONE Act take the final step toward becoming law.

Even as we debate this bill today, the Federal Government is racking up service fees to administer thousands of expired empty grant accounts—costing taxpayers millions of dollars per year. I introduced the GONE Act to bring some common sense to the grant management process and require Federal agencies to finally take action to identify these accounts with a zero balance which should be closed out.

Specifically, the GONE Act will direct agencies to work with the Department of Health and Human Services to identify the total number of grant awards that remain open but have been expired for 2 years or more. HHS was chosen for this role because of the work it has done in closing out expired accounts—good work—and for its role as the agency which houses the Payment Management System.

In addition to the total number of expired grants, the bill requires each agency to explain to Congress why the 30 oldest grants that remain open have not been closed. The bill also directs inspectors general for certain larger grant-making agencies to conduct a risk assessment to determine if a further review of that agency's grant

closeout process is necessary. All of this information will give agencies and Congress valuable insight into issues that agencies face when it comes to a timely closeout of grants.

It is my hope that this information will inform future efforts to streamline the grant's lifecycle, specifically the closeout process. In fact, S. 1115 requires OMB and HHS to submit a report to Congress on potential legislative reforms that are necessary to improve the grants lifecycle. I look forward to hearing from OMB and HHS on this topic, and I thank those agencies for the feedback they have offered on this bill.

For months, Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle have worked to develop this bill into one that will serve to advance the efficiency of the grants process. OMB, HHS, and the inspector general community have all provided helpful comments as we worked to finalize this legislation, and I am grateful for their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, spending taxpayer dollars on expired and empty grant accounts is the definition of government waste. I urge my colleagues to support this bill today and send the GONE Act to the President's desk.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a good bipartisan bill. I urge its passage. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1115.

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.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 598) to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 598

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 "Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act".

SEC. 2. INVENTORY OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1122(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

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

“(1) DEFINITION OF PROGRAM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘program’ means an organized set of activities by 1 or more

agencies directed toward a common purpose or goal.”;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2012, the Office of Management and Budget shall” and inserting “WEBSITE AND PROGRAM INVENTORY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) include on the website—

“(i) a program inventory that shall identify each program of the Federal Government for which there is more than \$1,000,000 in annual budget authority, which shall include—

“(I) any activity that is commonly referred to as a program by a Federal agency in communications with Congress, including any activity identified as a program in a budget request;

“(II) any activity that is commonly referred to as a program by a Federal agency in communications with the public, including each program for which financial awards are made on a competitive basis; and

“(III) any activity referenced in law as a program after June 30, 2019; and

“(ii) for each program identified in the program inventory, the information required under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), as applicable.”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “INFORMATION.—Information for each program described under paragraph (1)” and inserting “INFORMATION FOR LARGER PROGRAMS.—Information for each program identified in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) for which there is more than \$10,000,000 in annual budget authority”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C);

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D);

(D) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) an identification of the program activities that are aggregated, disaggregated, or consolidated as part of identifying programs;

“(B) for each program activity described in subparagraph (A), the amount of funding for the current fiscal year and previous 2 fiscal years;

“(C) an estimate of the amount of funding for the program”;

(E) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking “and” at the end; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) an identification of the statutes that authorize the program and any major regulations specific to the program;

“(F) for any program that provides grants or other financial assistance to individuals or entities, for the most recent fiscal year—

“(i) a description of the individuals served by the program and beneficiaries who received financial assistance under the program, including an estimate of the number of individuals and beneficiaries, to the extent practicable;

“(ii) for each program for which the head of an agency determines it is not practicable to provide an estimate of the number of individuals and beneficiaries served by the program—

“(I) an explanation of why data regarding the number of such individuals and beneficiaries cannot be provided; and

“(II) a discussion of the measures that could be taken to gather the data required to provide such an estimate; and

“(iii) a description of—

“(I) the Federal employees who administer the program, including the number of full-time equivalents with a pro rata estimate for

full-time equivalents associated with multiple programs; and

“(II) other individuals whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance who administer or assist in any way in administering the program, including the number of full-time equivalents, to the extent practicable;

“(G) links to any evaluation, assessment, or program performance reviews by the agency, an Inspector General, or the Government Accountability Office (including program performance reports required under section 1116) released during the preceding 5 years; and

“(H) to the extent practicable, financial and other information for each program activity required to be reported under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).”;

and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) INFORMATION FOR SMALLER PROGRAMS.—Information for each program identified in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) for which there is more than \$1,000,000 and not more than \$10,000,000 in annual budget authority shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) an identification of the program activities that are aggregated, disaggregated, or consolidated as part of identifying programs;

“(B) for each program activity described in subparagraph (A), the amount of funding for the current fiscal year and previous 2 fiscal years;

“(C) an identification of the statutes that authorize the program and any major regulations specific to the program;

“(D) for any program that provides grants or other financial assistance to individuals or entities, a description of the individuals served by the program and beneficiaries who received financial assistance under the program for the most recent fiscal year; and

“(E) links to any evaluation, assessment, or program performance reviews by the agency, an Inspector General, or the Government Accountability Office (including program performance reports required under section 1116) released during the preceding 5 years.

“(5) ARCHIVING.—After the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall archive and preserve the information included in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) relating to that fiscal year.”.

(b) EXPIRED GRANT FUNDING.—Not later than February 1 of each fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall publish on a public website the total amount of undisbursed grant funding remaining in grant accounts for which the period of availability to the grantee has expired.

SEC. 3. GUIDANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than June 30, 2018, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget—

(1) shall prescribe guidance to implement this Act, and the amendments made by this Act;

(2) shall issue guidance to agencies to identify how the program activities used for reporting under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) are associated with programs identified in the program inventory required under section 1122(a)(2)(C)(i) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a);

(3) may issue guidance to agencies to ensure that the programs identified in the program inventory required under section