

Public Law 106–561
106th Congress

An Act

To improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes, and for other purposes.

Dec. 21, 2000
[S. 3045]

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 “Paul Coverdell National Forensic Sciences Improvement Act of 2000”.

Paul Coverdell
National
Forensic Sciences
Improvement Act
of 2000,
42 USC 3711
note.

SEC. 2. IMPROVING THE QUALITY, TIMELINESS, AND CREDIBILITY OF FORENSIC SCIENCE SERVICES FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE PURPOSES.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 375(b)) is amended—

42 USC 3751.

(1) in paragraph (25), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(27) improving the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.”.

(b) STATE APPLICATIONS.—Section 503(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) If any part of the amount received from a grant under this part is to be used to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes, a certification that, as of the date of enactment of this paragraph, the State, or unit of local government within the State, has an established—

“(A) forensic science laboratory or forensic science laboratory system, that—

“(i) employs 1 or more full-time scientists—

“(I) whose principal duties are the examination of physical evidence for law enforcement agencies in criminal matters; and

“(II) who provide testimony with respect to such physical evidence to the criminal justice system;

“(ii) employs generally accepted practices and procedures, as established by appropriate accrediting organizations; and

Deadline.

“(iii) is accredited by the Laboratory Accreditation Board of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors or the National Association of Medical Examiners, or will use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation by not later than 2 years after the date on which a grant is initially awarded under this paragraph; or

“(B) medical examiner’s office (as defined by the National Association of Medical Examiners) that—

“(i) employs generally accepted practices and procedures, as established by appropriate accrediting organizations; and

Deadline.

“(ii) is accredited by the Laboratory Accreditation Board of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors or the National Association of Medical Examiners, or will use a portion of the grant amount to prepare and apply for such accreditation by not later than 2 years after the date on which a grant is initially awarded under this paragraph.”.

(c) PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“PART BB—PAUL COVERDELL FORENSIC
SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**

42 USC 3797j.

“SEC. 2801. GRANT AUTHORIZATION.

“The Attorney General shall award grants to States in accordance with this part.

42 USC 3797k.

“SEC. 2802. APPLICATIONS.

“To request a grant under this part, a State shall submit to the Attorney General—

“(1) a certification that the State has developed a consolidated State plan for forensic science laboratories operated by the State or by other units of local government within the State under a program described in section 2804(a), and a specific description of the manner in which the grant will be used to carry out that plan;

“(2) a certification that any forensic science laboratory system, medical examiner’s office, or coroner’s office in the State, including any laboratory operated by a unit of local government within the State, that will receive any portion of the grant amount uses generally accepted laboratory practices and procedures, established by accrediting organizations; and

“(3) a specific description of any new facility to be constructed as part of the program described in paragraph (1), and the estimated costs of that facility, and a certification that the amount of the grant used for the costs of the facility will not exceed the limitations set forth in section 2804(c).

42 USC 3797l.

“SEC. 2803. ALLOCATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) POPULATION ALLOCATION.—Seventy-five percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year shall be allocated to each State that meets the requirements of section 2802 so that each State shall receive an amount that bears the same ratio to the 75 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for that fiscal year as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

“(2) DISCRETIONARY ALLOCATION.—Twenty-five percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year shall be allocated pursuant to the Attorney General’s discretion to States with above average rates of part 1 violent crimes based on the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by such State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available.

“(3) MINIMUM REQUIREMENT.—Each State shall receive not less than 0.6 percent of the amount made available to carry out this part in each fiscal year.

“(4) PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.—If the amounts available to carry out this part in each fiscal year are insufficient to pay in full the total payment that any State is otherwise eligible to receive under paragraph (3), then the Attorney General shall reduce payments under paragraph (1) for such payment period to the extent of such insufficiency. Reductions under the preceding sentence shall be allocated among the States (other than States whose payment is determined under paragraph (3)) in the same proportions as amounts would be allocated under paragraph (1) without regard to paragraph (3).

“(b) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, except that—

“(1) for purposes of the allocation under this section, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall be considered as 1 State; and

“(2) for purposes of paragraph (1), 67 percent of the amount allocated shall be allocated to American Samoa, and 33 percent shall be allocated to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“SEC. 2804. USE OF GRANTS.

42 USC 3797m.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under this part shall use the grant to carry out all or a substantial part of a program intended to improve the quality and timeliness of forensic science or medical examiner services in the State, including such services provided by the laboratories operated by the State and those operated by units of local government within the State.

“(b) PERMITTED CATEGORIES OF FUNDING.—Subject to subsections (c) and (d), a grant awarded under this part—

“(1) may only be used for program expenses relating to facilities, personnel, computerization, equipment, supplies, accreditation and certification, education, and training; and

“(2) may not be used for any general law enforcement or nonforensic investigatory function.

“(c) FACILITIES COSTS.—

“(1) STATES RECEIVING MINIMUM GRANT AMOUNT.—With respect to a State that receives a grant under this part in an amount that does not exceed 0.6 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for a fiscal year, not more than 80 percent of the total amount of the grant may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a).

“(2) OTHER STATES.—With respect to a State that receives a grant under this part in an amount that exceeds 0.6 percent of the total amount made available to carry out this part for a fiscal year—

“(A) not more than 80 percent of the amount of the grant up to that 0.6 percent may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a); and

“(B) not more than 40 percent of the amount of the grant in excess of that 0.6 percent may be used for the costs of any new facility constructed as part of a program described in subsection (a).

“(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 10 percent of the total amount of a grant awarded under this part may be used for administrative expenses.

42 USC 3797n.

“SEC. 2805. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General may promulgate such guidelines, regulations, and procedures as may be necessary to carry out this part, including guidelines, regulations, and procedures relating to the submission and review of applications for grants under section 2802.

“(b) EXPENDITURE RECORDS.—

“(1) RECORDS.—Each State, or unit of local government within the State, that receives a grant under this part shall maintain such records as the Attorney General may require to facilitate an effective audit relating to the receipt of the grant, or the use of the grant amount.

“(2) ACCESS.—The Attorney General and the Comptroller General of the United States, or a designee thereof, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any book, document, or record of a State, or unit of local government within the State, that receives a grant under this part, if, in the determination of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, or designee thereof, the book, document, or record is related to the receipt of the grant, or the use of the grant amount.

42 USC 3797o.

“SEC. 2806. REPORTS.

“(a) REPORTS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—For each fiscal year for which a grant is awarded under this part, each State that receives such a grant shall submit to the Attorney General a report, at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may reasonably require, which report shall include—

“(1) a summary and assessment of the program carried out with the grant;

“(2) the average number of days between submission of a sample to a forensic science laboratory or forensic science laboratory system in that State operated by the State or by

a unit of local government and the delivery of test results to the requesting office or agency; and

“(3) such other information as the Attorney General may require.

“(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year for which 1 or more grants are awarded under this part, the Attorney General shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, a report, which shall include—

Deadline.

“(1) the aggregate amount of grants awarded under this part for that fiscal year; and

“(2) a summary of the information provided under subsection (a).”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

42 USC 3793.

“(24) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part BB, to remain available until expended—

“(A) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

“(B) \$85,400,000 for fiscal year 2002;

“(C) \$134,733,000 for fiscal year 2003;

“(D) \$128,067,000 for fiscal year 2004;

“(E) \$56,733,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

“(F) \$42,067,000 for fiscal year 2006.”.

(B) BACKLOG ELIMINATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the elimination of DNA convicted offender database sample backlogs and for other related purposes, as provided in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001.

(3) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by striking the table of contents.

(4) REPEAL OF 20 PERCENT FLOOR FOR CITA CRIME LAB GRANTS.—Section 102(e)(2) of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601(e)(2)) is amended—

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

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION REGARDING CERTAIN CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 983(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “(and provide customary documentary evidence of such interest if available) and state that the claim is not frivolous”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the amendment made by section 2(a) of Public Law 106–185.

18 USC 983 note.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE OBLIGATION OF GRANTEE STATES TO ENSURE ACCESS TO POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING AND COMPETENT COUNSEL IN CAPITAL CASES.

42 USC 14135 note.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) over the past decade, deoxyribonucleic acid testing (referred to in this section as “DNA testing”) has emerged

as the most reliable forensic technique for identifying criminals when biological material is left at a crime scene;

(2) because of its scientific precision, DNA testing can, in some cases, conclusively establish the guilt or innocence of a criminal defendant;

(3) in other cases, DNA testing may not conclusively establish guilt or innocence, but may have significant probative value to a finder of fact;

(4) DNA testing was not widely available in cases tried prior to 1994;

(5) new forensic DNA testing procedures have made it possible to get results from minute samples that could not previously be tested, and to obtain more informative and accurate results than earlier forms of forensic DNA testing could produce, resulting in some cases of convicted inmates being exonerated by new DNA tests after earlier tests had failed to produce definitive results;

(6) DNA testing can and has resulted in the post-conviction exoneration of more than 75 innocent men and women, including some under sentence of death;

(7) in more than a dozen cases, post-conviction DNA testing that has exonerated an innocent person has also enhanced public safety by providing evidence that led to the apprehension of the actual perpetrator;

(8) experience has shown that it is not unduly burdensome to make DNA testing available to inmates in appropriate cases;

(9) under current Federal and State law, it is difficult to obtain post-conviction DNA testing because of time limits on introducing newly discovered evidence;

(10) the National Commission on the Future of DNA Evidence, a Federal panel established by the Department of Justice and comprised of law enforcement, judicial, and scientific experts, has urged that post-conviction DNA testing be permitted in the relatively small number of cases in which it is appropriate, notwithstanding procedural rules that could be invoked to preclude such testing, and notwithstanding the inability of an inmate to pay for the testing;

(11) only a few States have adopted post-conviction DNA testing procedures;

(12) States have received millions of dollars in DNA-related grants, and more funding is needed to improve State forensic facilities and to reduce the nationwide backlog of DNA samples from convicted offenders and crime scenes that need to be tested or retested using upgraded methods;

(13) States that accept such financial assistance should not deny the promise of truth and justice for both sides of our adversarial system that DNA testing offers;

(14) post-conviction DNA testing and other post-conviction investigative techniques have shown that innocent people have been sentenced to death in this country;

(15) a constitutional error in capital cases is incompetent defense lawyers who fail to present important evidence that the defendant may have been innocent or does not deserve to be sentenced to death; and

(16) providing quality representation to defendants facing loss of liberty or life is essential to fundamental due process and the speedy final resolution of judicial proceedings.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress should condition forensic science-related grants to a State or State forensic facility on the State's agreement to ensure post-conviction DNA testing in appropriate cases; and

(2) Congress should work with the States to improve the quality of legal representation in capital cases through the establishment of standards that will assure the timely appointment of competent counsel with adequate resources to represent defendants in capital cases at each stage of the proceedings.

Approved December 21, 2000.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—S. 3045:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 146 (2000):

Oct. 26, considered and passed Senate.

Dec. 7, considered and passed House.

