

**Bloomberg  
Government**

**Spring 2019**

# Hill Watch

April 29, 2019







# In This Issue

## WHAT TO WATCH . . . . . 5

### AGRICULTURE

Child Nutrition Act . . . . .	8
'Lunch Shaming' . . . . .	8
Whole Milk . . . . .	8

### BUDGET

Budget Control Act Spending Caps . . . . .	9
Debt Ceiling . . . . .	10
Disaster Aid . . . . .	10
Fiscal 2020 Budget Resolution . . . . .	11
Fiscal Appropriations . . . . .	11

### CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS

For the People Act of 2019 . . . . .	12
Voting Rights Act . . . . .	12

### DEFENSE

Appropriations . . . . .	13
Defense Authorization . . . . .	13
Privatized Military Housing . . . . .	14
Sequestration . . . . .	14
Transgender Military Service . . . . .	14

### EDUCATION

Higher Education Reauthorization . . . . .	15
School Choice Tax Credits . . . . .	15

### ENVIRONMENT

Carbon Capture . . . . .	16
Carbon Reduction . . . . .	16
Carbon Tax . . . . .	16
Climate Messaging . . . . .	17
Diesel Emissions . . . . .	17
Ethylene Oxide . . . . .	17
Mine Reclamation . . . . .	18
Mining . . . . .	18
Oceans . . . . .	18
Offshore Drilling . . . . .	19
Paris Agreement . . . . .	19

Permitting . . . . .	19
PFAS . . . . .	20
Rare Earths . . . . .	20
Water Infrastructure . . . . .	20

### FINANCIAL SERVICES

Beneficial Ownership . . . . .	21
Cannabis Banking . . . . .	21

### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

China . . . . .	22
Middle East . . . . .	22
Russia . . . . .	22
Saudi Arabia . . . . .	23
Yemen . . . . .	23

### GUN BACKGROUND CHECKS

Gun-Show Loophole . . . . .	24
Background Check Time Limit . . . . .	24

### HEALTH CARE

Abortion . . . . .	25
ACA Bills . . . . .	25
Generic Drugs . . . . .	25
'Medicare for All' . . . . .	26
Medicare Price Negotiation . . . . .	26
Pandemic Response . . . . .	26
Surprise Billing . . . . .	27

### IMMIGRATION

Employment Visas . . . . .	28
Legal Status . . . . .	28

### INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Patents . . . . .	29
-------------------	----

### LABOR

Arbitration . . . . .	30
Federal Employees . . . . .	30
LGBT Rights . . . . .	30
Minimum Wage . . . . .	31

Paid Family Leave . . . . .	.31
Pay Discrimination . . . . .	.31

## PRIVACY

Consumer Protections . . . . .	.32
--------------------------------	-----

## REGULATORY POLICY

Agency Guidance . . . . .	.33
Independent Agencies . . . . .	.33
Plain-Language Regulation . . . . .	.33
Unfunded Mandates . . . . .	.34

## RETIREMENT

Retirement Savings . . . . .	.35
------------------------------	-----

## TAXATION

Electric Vehicle Tax Credit . . . . .	.36
IRS Administration . . . . .	.36
State and Local Tax Deductions . . . . .	.36
Syndicated Easements . . . . .	.37
Tax Extenders . . . . .	.37
Technical Corrections . . . . .	.37

## TECH & TELECOM

Internet of Things . . . . .	.38
Net Neutrality . . . . .	.38
Robocalls . . . . .	.38

## TRADE

Tariffs . . . . .	.39
U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement . . . . .	40

## TRANSPORTATION

Autonomous Vehicles . . . . .	.41
Infrastructure/Surface Transportation Bill . . . . .	.41

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

Blue Water Navy . . . . .	.42
VA Restructuring . . . . .	.42
Veterans Mental Health Care . . . . .	.42

### PROJECT MANAGERS:

Loren Duggan, Jodie Morris

### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:

Patrick Ambrosio, Jerome Ashton, Madelyn Callahan, Mike Ferullo, Jean Fogarty, Gregory Henderson, Paul Hendrie, Fawn Johnson, Chuck McCutcheon, Robin Meszoly, Colleen Murphy, Jonathan Nicholson, Chris Opfer, Danielle Parnass, Keith Perine, Katherine Rizzo, Heather Rothman, Adam Schank, Zachary Sherwood, Seth Stern, Rob Tricchinelli, Anna Yukhananov



# What to Watch

- **Lawmakers face crowded calendar in August recess runup**
- **Leaders share goal of avoiding new financial crises in fall**

The House and Senate face a packed summer agenda that includes work on must-do spending bills, infrastructure proposals, new trade deals, drug pricing plans, and more.

After spending the first months of the 116th Congress pushing her party's ambitious political agenda, Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said she's ready to cut deals with President Donald Trump and Republican leaders on traditional bread-and-butter issues.

"Our main must-pass legislation is the appropriations bills, and we will pass them in a bipartisan way," Pelosi said. "The president has said over and over again he wants to do an infrastructure bill. So do we. And we're going to."

Pelosi said she'll meet April 30 with Trump and other congressional leaders to begin talks on those and other items that could advance before the start of the August recess. After a record 35-day government shutdown marred the year's start, leaders don't want any replay at the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30.

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said an early deal setting defense and nondefense spending caps would be critical to advancing the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills. Better yet, a two-year deal also would prevent having to revisit the spending caps in an election year.

"I would like to see some serious bipartisan discussion going on to try to solve as many of these problems that we can," McConnell told reporters.

## **Money Bills, Debt Limit**

House Democrats scrapped plans to vote on a spending cap bill (H.R. 2021) this month because of disputes over how military and domestic discretionary spending would be handled. The House instead adopted a resolution (H. Res. 293) that permits House Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Nita Lowey (D-N.Y.) to still write measures reflecting the bill's

proposed caps of \$664 billion for defense and \$631 billion for nondefense. Additional amounts would be allowed for overseas contingency operations spending, which doesn't count toward the caps.

With no easy path to a spending-caps deal, the White House made it known to Congress that the administration would prefer to get a debt limit deal done quickly to avoid instability in the economy.

The message from the administration was to act soon to make sure there wouldn't have to be another vote on the nation's borrowing authority until after the presidential election.

McConnell previously had said that he and Pelosi agree the federal debt limit should be raised, but he said the matter can wait.

The Treasury Department is using extraordinary measures to buy time before a vote on suspending or raising the limit. The Congressional Budget Office estimated the wiggle room could last until late September or October.

Lowey said she plans to have appropriations bills ready for markup in May. The bills – which are likely to go in packages – will begin moving to the floor in June, House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said.

"Our objective is to pass appropriations bills by June 30th and not shut down the government. Those are our two major objectives," Hoyer said.

Trump and congressional Republicans want at least \$750 billion for defense, including funds that are outside the spending cap. Senate Appropriations Chairman Richard Shelby (R-Ala.) has chosen not to schedule markups while waiting for a budget deal to be struck. He said the game plan will be to again "bundle" a few bills at a time to expedite their passage.

"We've seen the president doesn't like omnibus bills," Shelby said.

The budget impasse could extend to the annual National Defense Authorization Act. The Senate Armed Services Committee has announced plans to mark up a \$750 billion bill in May while the House Armed Services Committee plans to move a \$733 billion version in June.

The timetable for both versions would put them in position for floor votes before the July 4 recess.

## Infrastructure Bill

The outcome of the budget talks also will have implications for whatever infrastructure plan Congress decides to pursue.

Pelosi said she wants to discuss with Trump a \$2 trillion infusion for infrastructure programs, which she's defining broadly to include roads, bridges, water projects and broadband.

"There's plenty of areas of common ground," Pelosi said.

McConnell said he wants to see a viable way to pay for an investment of the size envisioned by Pelosi. He said he's opposed to deficit spending to boost infrastructure.

"I think the key to it is for the president, the only person in America who can sign something into law, and the Democratic speaker of the House to reach an agreement on a credible pay-for," McConnell said. "Otherwise it's just talk."

Neither leader has endorsed a large hike in the federal gasoline tax. Meanwhile, Senate Majority Whip John Thune (R-S.D.) said ideas for tolling the Interstate Highway System or extensive public-private partnerships haven't gained momentum.

Highway and mass transit programs are authorized through Sept. 30, 2020, but transportation leaders want to get a head start on the debate. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee plans to finish writing its version this summer, while the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee may wait until fall.

## Tax and Trade

The president wants Congress to approve his trade deals, beginning with the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

## Dates to Watch

**May 20** Senate defense authorization markup begins

**May 31** National Flood Insurance Program expires

**June 4** House defense authorization subcommittee markups begin

**September** Extraordinary measures to avoid debt ceiling estimated to run out

End of fiscal 2019 and current spending caps deal

**Sept. 30** Medicaid DSH payment cut delay ends  
Community health center funding and other health programs expire

**Dec. 31** Medical device tax, health insurer fee suspensions end  
Expiration of some Tax Cuts and Jobs Act provisions

Pelosi hasn't ruled out backing the deal this summer, though House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Richard Neal (D-Mass.) said strong labor and environmental standards and related enforcement mechanisms "will make a difference" on how Democrats ultimately view the USMCA.

Neal's panel has been picking up some items from Republicans' 2018 tax agenda. On April 9, the House passed the committee's bill (H.R. 1957) overhauling some Internal Revenue Service operations. The measure was negotiated between Republican and Democratic leaders in both chambers and could soon move in the Senate.

Hoyer said he's planning to schedule floor action on the SECURE Act (H.R. 1994), a bipartisan committee-approved bill that would improve access to retirement savings accounts. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and ranking member Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) are working on similar legislation.

While action on other tax measures is possible, Neal said he wants some time to consider the renewal and extensions of expired tax breaks, known as extenders.



A Grassley-Wyden bill (S. 617) would extend about 30 expired tax credits for two years, including those for renewable energy.

## Drug Deal?

House Democrats plan to soon bring to the floor legislation (H.R. 1884) intended to shore up the Affordable Care Act and protect people with preexisting conditions, Hoyer said.

While not offering details, Hoyer said there may be a package of bills that address issues such as association health plans and state exchanges. They also may seek to expand tax credits to make ACA plans more affordable, he said.

McConnell said the Senate won't consider any ACA legislation until after the next election, however.

Pelosi said Trump may be more open to the bills the House is moving this summer to deal with prescription drug prices. Noteworthy: Grassley is among the senators who signed on to a bill (S. 844) with Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) aimed at lowering prices.

"It's high on our agenda," Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) told reporters. But "we're not going to pass just a fig leaf that does nothing. It has to be real and it has to really reduce drug prices in a significant way."

The House Rules Committee will hold a hearing April 30 on a "Medicare for All" bill (H.R. 1384) introduced by Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) that would create a universal, single-payer health program. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) has sponsored a companion Senate bill (S. 1129) backed by several other candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination. Though neither bill is likely to advance, the proposal is sure to remain a talking point going into the 2020 elections.

## Immigration

In addition, McConnell raised the possibility of a deal this year to overhaul immigration policy.

House Democrats said they plan to bring legislation (H.R. 6) to the floor this summer to help young people brought to the U.S. as children avoid deportation. McConnell didn't rule out a broader deal that also would help the Dreamers, as they're known.

"Some of that crisis can't be solved without legislation because the current asylum laws aren't working out well," McConnell said. "So I think it's long past due for us to sit down in a bipartisan basis and try to fix as much of this problem as we can," McConnell said.

Schumer and Thune also said that Congress may advance bipartisan data privacy legislation this year. The legislation would create a federal system to replace a patchwork of state laws.

Many other House-passed bills will be going nowhere in the Senate this year. For instance, the campaign finance and ethics bill (H.R. 1) has been dismissed by McConnell as a "power grab." He called a measure (H.R. 1644) to restore Obama administration net neutrality rules "dead on arrival" in the Senate.

For the short term, at least, the Senate will mainly be voting on Trump nominees. More than 130 of them, including 44 judges, are awaiting confirmation votes.

"I think the focus when we get back is to still be grinding through the backlog of nominees," Thune said.

## Paris Agreement

The House is poised to vote the week of April 29 on a bill (H.R. 9) intended to keep the U.S. in the Paris climate agreement. The president has said the U.S. will withdraw from the agreement.

It's unclear whether the House will vote on the "Green New Deal" proposal spearheaded by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) and Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.). McConnell forced a March 26 procedural on a measure (S. J. Res. 8) he introduced based on the Democrats' language that was rejected 0-57, with most Democrats voting "present" in protest.

With assistance from Jack Fitzpatrick

To contact the reporter: Nancy Ognanovich  
in Washington at [nognanov@bgov.com](mailto:nognanov@bgov.com)

To contact the editors responsible for this story:  
Katherine Rizzo at [krizzo@bgov.com](mailto:krizzo@bgov.com);  
Loren Duggan at [lduggan@bgov.com](mailto:lduggan@bgov.com)



# Agriculture

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Child Nutrition Act</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The bill would reauthorize child nutrition programs, which include federal school lunches and Special Supplemental Nutrition for Women, Infants, and Children, better known as WIC.</p> <p>The legislation hasn't been reauthorized in almost 10 years.</p> <p>One issue likely to come up during negotiations is flexibility in the national school lunch program's nutritional standards, such as added milk variety and grain standards.</p> <p>Other key issues include reauthorizing the WIC program and oversight of the summer food service program.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> A House Education and Labor subcommittee held a hearing on child nutrition March 12.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee held a hearing April 10 on child nutrition.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Agriculture Department published a final rule last year that would ease whole grain and sodium requirements, along with allowing 1 percent flavored milk in school meals. The rule took effect Feb. 11.</p> <p>Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue said earlier this year that much of what the administration wants in a reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Act "will be instructed and informed in the dietary guidelines."</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The legislation is on "a list" of things for this Congress, said House Education and Labor Chairman Bobby Scott (D-Va.).</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Agriculture Chairman Pat Roberts (R-Kan.) would like to write a bill by August recess.</p> <p>"There's a bipartisan will on this committee to get it done," he told reporters in April.</p> <p>Negotiations are still in the beginning stages with the House Education and Labor Committee.</p>
<b>Whole Milk</b>	<p><b>H.R. 832</b></p> <p>The bill would allow schools to include whole milk on their lunch menus.</p> <p>The bill is opposed by health and nutrition groups including the American Heart Association that recommend children should be served only fat-free and low-fat dairy foods in school.</p> <p>Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue has supported making school meals more flexible, such as a rule allowing 1 percent flavored milk to be offered.</p> <p>The rule took effect Feb. 11.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The bill was introduced Jan. 29 by Rep. Glenn Thompson (R-Pa.), a member of the House Agriculture Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No similar bill has been introduced in the Senate.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Thompson said he'll try to get his measure into the Child Nutrition Act.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate doesn't have a version of this bill, however it would likely be opposed by Senate Democrats who question the scientific support for the legislation.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The USDA would likely support the measure based upon the final rule it published.</p>
<b>'Lunch Shaming'</b>	<p><b>S. 1119, H.R. 2311</b></p> <p>The bill would block schools from publicly identifying a child who doesn't have funds for a meal or has an outstanding credit by requiring a wristband or hand stamp.</p> <p>The legislation also would require any communication related to outstanding credit to be directed to the child's parent or guardian.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Tom Udall (D-N.M.) introduced legislation April 10. A similar bill in the last Congress stalled in the Senate Agriculture Committee.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Deb Haaland (D-N.M.) introduced the companion House bill on April 12.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Proponents will push to include language in the Child Nutrition Act.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House fiscal 2020 budget proposed increasing eligibility verification for household applications for school lunches to "strengthen program integrity," according to the document.</p>

To contact the reporter: Teaganne Finn in Washington at [tfinn@bgov.com](mailto:tfinn@bgov.com)

To contact the editor: Paul Hendrie in Washington at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com)





# Budget & Appropriations

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Budget Control Act Spending Caps</b>	<p><b>H.R. 2021</b></p> <p>The bill would avoid steep cuts to discretionary spending in fiscal 2020 and 2021, raising spending caps under the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112-25). Defense and nondefense caps would be raised by roughly equal amounts in both years. The caps are enforced using sequestration.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House Budget Committee approved the bill 19-17 on April 3. House Budget Chairman John Yarmuth (D-Ky.) decided not to bring <b>H.R. 2021</b> up for a vote on the floor in early April, as progressives called for more domestic spending in comparison to military funds.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No companion bill.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b></p> <p>The next step is for House, Senate and White House negotiators to try to craft a bipartisan deal.</p> <p>Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said in April he had spoken with President Trump and Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) about striking a deal. A final deal won't likely provide parity between the defense and nondefense increases, Yarmuth said, but a two-year agreement would be the last one necessary before the Budget Control Act expires.</p> <p>The White House doesn't appear to want an early caps deal, preferring to wait until the Sept. 30 funding deadline approaches, Yarmuth and Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.) have said. Some Democrats were emboldened to oppose Yarmuth's plan because they knew they could wait for a deal later in the year, Congressional Progressive Caucus co-chair Mark Pocan (D-Wis.) said.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Debt Ceiling	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The limit on federal borrowing was suspended until March 1 by the Balanced Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123). When the debt ceiling was reinstated March 2, it was raised to \$21.988 trillion from the \$20.456 trillion it had been previously.</p>	<p>The Treasury Department has been taking various "extraordinary measures" - basically, accounting moves - to stay below the debt ceiling once it was reinstated. Those maneuvers, along with the annual spring influx of cash from individual and corporate tax collections, are expected to allow the Treasury to keep borrowing to fund government operations for several months.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> The Congressional Budget Office in late February projected that, unless the debt limit is changed, Treasury would probably run out of cash "near the end of this fiscal year or early in the next one," or around the end of September/beginning of October. The Democratic-controlled House didn't adopt a fiscal 2020 budget resolution, which would have spun off a separate bill to increase the borrowing limit. Senate Finance Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) has said he expects the debt limit to be part of larger budget talks later in the year.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin in a March 5 letter urged Congress to boost the limit "as soon as possible."</p>
Disaster Aid	<p><b>H.R. 268, H.R. 2157</b></p> <p>Lawmakers are negotiating a measure that would provide supplemental disaster aid funds to areas affected by natural disasters dating back to 2017. The debate is over how much money should be included for each place, particularly for Puerto Rico, and how much should be provided for long-term reconstruction.</p> <p>The House's first offer this year, passed in January, would provide \$14.2 billion, though that didn't cover the floods that hit Midwestern states after passage. A Republican amendment would provide \$13.5 billion, including less in long-term reconstruction funds for U.S. territories.</p> <p>House Democrats then introduced <b>H.R. 2157</b>, which included the original \$14.2 billion plus \$3 billion for flooded Midwestern states.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House passed <b>H.R. 268</b> on Jan. 16 by a vote of 237 - 187 in January.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The measure has stalled in the Senate as Republicans oppose fulfilling all of Democrats' requests for funding for U.S. territories. Neither a Senate substitute to <b>H.R. 268</b> or the underlying bill could obtain the 60 votes to advance. Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) and Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, introduced the \$17.2 billion package as an amendment.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said the House would vote on <b>H.R. 2157</b> the week of May 6.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Puerto Rico funding is the "linchpin" to a disaster aid deal, Senate Appropriations Chairman Richard Shelby (R-Ala.) said after meeting with Trump in April.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The president has said he's concerned about wasted money in Puerto Rico, Shelby said. Still, Trump encouraged Senate Republicans to make another proposal to Democrats, and directed White House and Senate Appropriations Committee staffers to communicate about continued negotiations.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Fiscal 2020 Budget Resolution</b>	<p><b>S. Con. Res. 12</b></p> <p>Senate Republicans' budget resolution doesn't spell out next year's spending levels, allowing flexibility if lawmakers agree to raise spending caps.</p> <p>House Democrats haven't produced a budget resolution, which would serve as a spending framework and project longer-term debt and deficit figures.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Budget Committee approved its resolution by a party-line 11-9 vote on March 27.</p> <p><b>House:</b> No companion resolution.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The measure may not get a floor vote if the House doesn't produce its own measure, Budget Chairman Mike Enzi (R-Wyo.) said.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Yarmuth hasn't ruled out doing a full budget resolution, but said the spending caps are a higher priority. The House adopted a "deeming" resolution, <b>H. Res. 293</b>, on April 9 as part of a vote on a separate measure. The measure will provide guidance to appropriators and other committees even without a full resolution.</p>
<b>Fiscal 2020 Appropriations</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>Both chambers are working to pass 12 spending bills funding the government by the end of September. Lawmakers may repeat their fiscal 2019 "minibus" strategy, packing two, three or four bills together. The largest pairing last year included the Defense and Labor-HHS-Education bills, combining the top funding priorities for Republicans and Democrats. That may happen again this year, House Appropriations Labor-HHS-Education Chairwoman Rosa DeLauro (D-Conn.) said.</p>	<p>No bills have been released in either chamber. Appropriators are still holding hearings with agency officials on the president's budget request, which arrived in March rather than February because of the government shutdown. Appropriators also have yet to agree to allocations for each of the 12 subcommittees, determining how much money can be included in each bill.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) said he hopes to pass all 12 appropriations bills through the House by the end of June, and said he might hold off on any other legislation that month if it's necessary to stick to the schedule. To do so, House appropriators will have to hold an aggressive markup schedule in May and June. Subcommittee votes are starting the week of April 29. The Senate tends to move more slowly with spending bills, though last year, two packages containing a combined five bills were signed into law before the end of fiscal 2019.</p>

To contact the reporters: Jack Fitzpatrick in Washington at [jfitzpatrick@bgov.com](mailto:jfitzpatrick@bgov.com); Jonathan Nicholson in Washington at [jnicholson@bgov.com](mailto:jnicholson@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Zack Sherwood at [zsherwood@bgov.com](mailto:zsherwood@bgov.com); Robin Meszoly at [rmezoly@bgov.com](mailto:rmezoly@bgov.com)



# Campaigns & Elections

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
For the People Act of 2019	<p><b>H.R. 1, S. 949</b></p> <p>The wide-ranging bills would ease voting rules, provide for public financing of congressional campaigns, increase transparency of campaign funding, and strengthen government ethics restrictions. Both called the For the People Act, the measures are congressional Democrats' response to alleged corruption in the Trump administration and what they view as a crisis in democracy caused by voter suppression and the influence of big campaign donors.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1</b> was passed March 8 on a 234-193 party-line vote. The bill was introduced by Rep. John Sarbanes (D-Md.) and was cosponsored by all House Democrats when it reached the House floor.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate companion bill, introduced March 28 by Sen. Tom Udall (D-N.M.), was cosponsored by the other 46 members of the Senate Democratic caucus.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Passage of <b>H.R. 1</b> two months after Democrats took over the House majority fulfilled their midterm election promises to overhaul elections and ethics laws, but lack of GOP support presaged a tough, years-long battle to try to get the measure enacted.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) says he won't schedule action on the Democratic-backed bill.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House says President Donald Trump won't sign it.</p> <p><b>2020 Election:</b> Democrats say pushing for voting rights and combating corruption will help them gain control of the Senate and White House in 2020. "This will be one of the defining issues in our election next year," Udall said.</p>
Voting Rights Act	<p><b>H.R. 4, H.R. 1799, S. 561</b></p> <p>Democrats are building a legislative record to reinstate provisions of the Voting Rights Act that were struck down by the Supreme Court in <i>Shelby County v. Holder</i>. Rep. Terri Sewell (D-Ala.) and Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) introduced companion versions (<b>H.R. 4, S. 561</b>) of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, which would require every jurisdiction in the country to receive approval from a court or the Justice Department, also known as preclearance, before implementing certain changes to voting systems.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Sewell introduced <b>H.R. 4</b> on Feb. 26 and it was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. Leahy introduced <b>S. 561</b> the same day and it was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.</p> <p>Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.) introduced the Voting Rights Amendment Act (<b>H.R. 1799</b>) along with a bipartisan group of cosponsors. It would revise the criteria used for determining the states and localities covered by preclearance requirements.</p> <p>The House Administration Committee has held several hearings on the Voting Rights Act around the country.</p>	<p>The timing for floor action on legislation hasn't been announced. Rep. Marcia Fudge (D-Ohio), who leads the House Administration Subcommittee on Elections, said April 16 that she plans to produce a report this fall.</p>

To contact the author: Ken Doyle in Washington at [kdoyle@bgov.com](mailto:kdoyle@bgov.com)

To contact the editors responsible: Kathy Rizzo at [krizzo@bgov.com](mailto:krizzo@bgov.com), Loren Duggan at [lduggan@bgov.com](mailto:lduggan@bgov.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Appropriations	<p><b>Not yet introduced</b></p> <p>The fiscal 2020 Defense appropriations bill would allot funding for most Pentagon programs in fiscal year 2020, which starts Oct. 1. The defense spending bill doesn't cover military construction, which is also part of the Pentagon's jurisdiction, and is instead part of a bill funding the Veterans Affairs Department.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Leaders are contemplating an unusual schedule for this year: moving defense spending before the defense authorization or policy bill, reversing the traditional order. The House Appropriations Committee is looking to write its bill by mid-June. So far, the panel has conducted a series of budget hearings. There's no official markup schedule yet.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Appropriations panel only recently started a series of hearings on the Pentagon's fiscal 2020 budget request. There is no markup scheduled yet.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The goal is to pass the defense spending bill by the Fourth of July recess. Lawmakers have yet to agree on whether the spending levels for national security should total \$733 billion, as the Budget Committee is planning, or a different number.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Appropriations Committee Chairman Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), who also heads the Defense Subcommittee, said he would prefer the Trump administration's request of \$750 billion for national security.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> It's not clear how the administration would receive the defense spending bill, as it's certainly going to be part of the larger negotiations over budget caps.</p>
Defense Authorization	<p><b>Not yet introduced</b></p> <p>The National Defense Authorization Act will set policy and authorized spending levels for national security programs in fiscal 2020. The measure is crucial for authorizing military pay increases and military construction, as well as for providing direction for major weapons programs such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter and new aircraft carriers. The bill also is aimed at improving the way the Pentagon buys weapons and services and addresses the national security programs at the Department of Energy.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Armed Services Committee will go first with a markup starting May 20.</p> <p><b>House:</b> The House Armed Services Committee leaders plan to mark up the measure June 12 with subcommittees starting work the week before.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Speedy approval of the measure is uncertain, particularly in the Senate. Negotiations over the final bill sent to the president will almost certainly involve the topline amount authorized, because the House Armed Services Committee is likely to back about \$733 billion while the Senate panel will go for the administration's full \$750 billion request. Other big policy questions include whether to fund updated Boeing Co. F-15X fighter aircraft and to retire the aircraft carrier USS <i>Harry S. Truman</i> early. Nuclear weapons spending may also make negotiations tougher.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> It's too early to tell whether the president will see any items that could trigger a veto.</p>



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Privatized Military Housing</b>	<p><b>S. 703, H.R. 1792</b></p> <p>The Ensuring Safe Housing for Our Military Act would provide new protections for military service members who face health, safety, or environmental hazards in the Pentagon's privatized housing. The military could withhold rent and incentive payments to contractors who manage properties, and troops would not be forced to pay deposits or penalties for breaking leases because of hazards in the homes.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) introduced the legislation in March and it now has 10 cosponsors, all Democrats. It was referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Rep. Mike Levin (D-Calif.) filed a House version that has five cosponsors, including two Republicans, and is now with the House Armed Services Committee.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Lawmakers could be motivated to make the changes this year or include pieces of the proposals in the defense authorization bill, after military families testified in February about horrendous housing conditions. The military pays companies to operate private residences for about 200,000 families and has been scrambling to fix hazards such as lead, mold and vermin following the Senate hearing.</p>
<b>Sequestration</b>	<p><b>H.R. 2110</b></p> <p>The Relief from Sequestration Act introduced by Armed Services Chairman Adam Smith (D-Wash.) would get rid of the sequestration, or automatic across-the-board spending cuts, that are threatening defense and domestic spending. The bill would keep budget caps in place but would eliminate the threat of automatic cuts if those caps were exceeded.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Smith's bill was referred to the House Budget Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No companion legislation has been introduced yet.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Smith's bill could become fodder for the annual defense authorization bill and defense spending measure.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> If the House backs Smith's bill and Senate doesn't pass similar legislation, it'll be part of negotiations over the bills to be sent to the president.</p>
<b>Transgender Military Service</b>	<p><b>S. 373, H.R. 1032</b></p> <p>The Defense Department would be prohibited from barring prospective military recruits or discharging current troops based on their gender identity. The legislation also deems the military's new restrictive transgender policy to be inconsistent with the goal of allowing military service by all who are qualified.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.), who is the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee and a presidential candidate, sponsored the bill. Four Democratic senators and Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine) have signed on as cosponsors.</p> <p><b>House:</b> The companion House bill was introduced by Rep. Jackie Speier (D-Calif.), chairwoman of the House Armed Services Personnel Subcommittee, and has four cosponsors including one Republican, Rep. John Katko (R-N.Y.).</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Smith strongly opposes the Defense Department's new policy that bars transgender recruits and forces troops to serve in their birth gender. He has said the committee will draft legislation this year as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. The House voted 238-185 on March 28 to adopt a resolution (<b>H. Res. 124</b>) opposing the president's policy.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> It remains unlikely the Republican-majority Senate will approve a reversal of the military personnel policy.</p>

To contact the reporters: Roxana Tiron in Washington at [rtiron@bgov.com](mailto:rtiron@bgov.com); Travis J. Tritten in Washington at [ttritten@bgov.com](mailto:ttritten@bgov.com)

To contact the editor: Paul Hendrie in Washington at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Higher Education Reauthorization	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The higher education law authorizes the distribution of approximately \$120 billion in federal student aid and how student borrowers repay \$1.5 trillion in debt. The law also sets standards for 6,000 colleges, universities, and higher education institutions. Congress last comprehensively updated the law in 2008.</p> <p>Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, said an updated bill must address four areas: ensuring colleges are affordable, accessible, responsible for their students' capacity to repay loans, and responsive to allegations of sexual assault.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Murray and HELP Chairman Lamar Alexander (R-Tenn.) are negotiating a bipartisan bill while holding additional hearings on higher education. Alexander said he wants the committee to mark up a bill around June or July.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Education and Labor Committee Chairman Bobby Scott (D-Va.) and ranking member Virginia Foxx (R-N.C.) introduced separate bills to update the law in the last Congress. This year, the committee is holding several hearings on various higher education topics, after which Scott and Foxx will attempt to work out a bipartisan bill.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Prospects for a higher education bill this year improved when Alexander announced his plans to retire at the end of 2020. A former Education secretary and college president, Alexander has set a goal to have the bill signed into law by Christmas, something his ranking member and House counterparts have said they will work toward.</p> <p>If a comprehensive bill doesn't come together, Alexander said he would try to pass other higher education legislation, such as simplifying the application form for federal aid.</p> <p>Murray and Scott have said they'd support only a comprehensive higher education bill. A further obstacle is the Education Department's work on a rule governing college responses to sexual assault allegations. Democrats opposed the draft rule as unfair to victims, while Republicans have been more supportive of protecting what they see as due process for the accused.</p>
School Choice Tax Credits	<p><b>H.R. 1434, S. 634</b></p> <p>Education Secretary Betsy DeVos rolled out her signature legislative proposal this spring: \$50 billion in tax credits for those who donate to state-approved organizations granting private school scholarships, often to low-income students. The decade-long program would provide a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for up to \$5 billion each year.</p> <p>Eighteen states already have recognized scholarship-granting organizations, and donors are eligible for both state tax credits and federal deductions. DeVos is hoping the legislation will encourage more states to set up partnerships with scholarship-granting organizations.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Bradley Byrne (R-Ala.), a candidate for Senate whose state has a tax credit scholarship program, introduced the bill Feb. 28 and it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee and the Education and Labor Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Ted Cruz (R-Texas) introduced a similar bill on Feb. 28; it was referred to the Finance Committee.</p> <p>Both appeared with DeVos at a department event touting the tax credit scholarships.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Education Department mentioned the \$50 billion tax credit in its proposed fiscal 2020 budget, but it's the Treasury Department that made the formal budget request for the tax credit.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Finance Committee hasn't announced plans for action. Sen. John Kennedy (R-La.), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee overseeing the Treasury's budget, said he was reviewing the proposal.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Democrats' opposition to school choice initiatives, including tax credit scholarships, means it likely won't advance in the House.</p> <p>While a minor school choice provision passed in the 2017 tax overhaul bill, no similar tax package is expected this year. Nor is any other major K-12 bill in the works that could provide a vehicle for the legislation.</p>

To contact the reporter: Emily Wilkins at [ewilkins@bgov.com](mailto:ewilkins@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Paul Hendrie at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com); Robin Meszoly at [rmeszoly@bgov.com](mailto:rmeszoly@bgov.com)



# Environment

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Carbon Capture</b>	<b>H.R. 1796, S. 407</b> The bill, called the Carbon Capture Modernization Act, would amend the 48A tax credit for clean coal investments. It would lower an energy efficiency requirement for new or retrofitted coal-fired power plants that have carbon capture-and-storage technology installed.	<b>House:</b> The bipartisan bill, led by Rep. David McKinley (R-W.Va.), was introduced in March and has been referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. <b>Senate:</b> Sens. John Hoeven (R-N.D.) and Tina Smith (D-Minn.) introduced <b>S. 407</b> in February, and it has been referred to the Senate Finance Committee. The legislation is similar to a bill introduced last Congress by Smith, Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W. Va.), and former Sen. Heidi Heitkamp (D-N.D.).	<b>House and Senate:</b> The bipartisan legislation has the support of a broad coalition of carbon capture supporters—including coal companies, labor unions, and environmental groups. Prospects for passage in either chamber remain unclear. This effort is separate from the bipartisan carbon capture tax credits, known as 45Q, signed into law in 2018. <b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration hasn't taken a position on the legislation.
<b>Carbon Reduction</b>	<b>H.R. 1166, S. 383</b> The legislation would build on bipartisan tax credits for carbon capture technology signed into law in 2018. The Utilizing Significant Emissions With Innovative Technologies (USE IT) Act would authorize additional funding for carbon capture research, directed at novel technologies like carbon utilization and direct air capture, at the Environmental Protection Agency. It would encourage federal and state agencies to coordinate on building carbon dioxide pipelines.	<b>House:</b> The bipartisan bill was reintroduced by Reps. Scott Peters (D-Calif.) and David McKinley (R-W.Va.) in February and has been referred to the House Energy and Commerce; Science, Space, and Technology; and Transportation and Infrastructure committees. <b>Senate:</b> Sens. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.), Shelley Moore Capito (R-W.Va.), and Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) reintroduced the bill in February. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee approved the measure by voice vote April 10.	<b>House and Senate:</b> Barrasso, chairman of the Senate environment committee, wants to quickly push the bill. Since its reintroduction, the measure has gained several additional cosponsors, including Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.). Barrasso has said he is looking to attach the USE IT Act to a larger legislative vehicle later this year. <b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration hasn't taken a position on this legislation. Trump signed a major expansion and extension of bipartisan carbon capture tax credits into law in 2018, as part of a bipartisan budget bill.
<b>Carbon Tax</b>	<b>H.R. 763, H.R. 1960, S. 940</b> The bills are competing efforts by congressional Democrats to lay down markers on carbon tax legislation. The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act ( <b>H.R. 763</b> ) would impose a carbon tax of \$15 per ton of oil, natural gas, and coal, rising at a rate of \$10 annually.	<b>House:</b> Introduced by Rep. Ted Deutch (D-Fla.) Jan. 24 with 26 cosponsors, including one Republican, Rep. Francis Rooney (Fla.). It was referred to multiple committees. <b>H.R. 1960</b> , a competing bill, was introduced March 28 by Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.) and referred to multiple committees. <b>Senate:</b> Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) introduced his carbon fee bill on March 28, and it was referred to the Senate Finance Committee. It would return 100 percent of the revenue collected to households.	<b>House:</b> The outlook for the Deutch and Beyer bills is unclear as House Democrats have yet to clearly signal whether they will back a carbon tax approach to address climate change. The Beyer bill is a companion measure to the Senate bill. <b>Senate:</b> The Republican-controlled Senate is not expected to take up carbon tax legislation, despite support for the issue from a few Republicans.

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Climate Messaging	<p><b>S. J. Res. 8, S. J. Res. 9, S. Res. 59, H. Res. 109, H. Res. 288</b></p> <p>The two nonbinding resolutions from Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) and Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.), would set out a blueprint for phasing out fossil fuel emissions over the next decade while creating jobs, promoting human rights, and providing universal health coverage. Senate Democrats introduced a nonbinding joint resolution that would have the Senate recognize that climate change is real; that human activity during the last century is “the dominant cause of the climate crisis,” and that the U.S. and Congress should take immediate action to address the climate challenge. Senate Republicans introduced a measure to force Democrats to a floor vote on whether they support the Green New Deal; its text was based on the Markey and Ocasio-Cortez measures. House Republicans also countered with a “Green Real Deal.”</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Senate Democrats’ effort has no House companion. Ocasio-Cortez introduced <b>H. Res. 109</b> on Feb. 7 and it has more than 90 cosponsors, all Democrats.</p> <p>Rep. Matt Gaetz (R-Fla.) introduced <b>H. Res. 288</b> on April 3 with one cosponsor, Rep. Francis Rooney (R-Fla.). It was referred to multiple committees.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Tom Carper (D-Del.) introduced <b>S. J. Res. 9</b> on Feb. 28; it is cosponsored by 44 Democrats, both independents, and one Republican, Maine Sen. Susan Collins. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) held a procedural vote March 26 on Republican measure <b>S. J. Res. 8</b>, where it was defeated 0-57. Most Democrats voted “present” to protest what they viewed as an attempt to malign the Green New Deal and the Democratic presidential candidates who support it.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Democratic leadership prefers to move other climate change bills, like an effort that would keep the U.S. in the Paris climate agreement. Gaetz wants a discharge petition needing 218 signatures to force a vote on the House floor. He needs more than 20 Democrats to reach that number, even if all Republicans sign on, an uphill battle.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> McConnell isn’t expected to bring Carper’s nonbinding Senate resolution to a floor vote, although Democratic senators say they will look for opportunities to offer it on the floor to put Republicans on record on climate change.</p>
Diesel Emissions	<p><b>H.R. 1768, S. 747</b></p> <p>The Diesel Emissions Reduction Act would reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, which provides states and local municipalities with grants and rebates to replace old diesel engines with cleaner parts.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1768</b>, introduced March 14 by Rep. Doris Matsui (D-Calif.), was referred to the Energy and Commerce Committee. The bill has three cosponsors: Reps. Billy Long (R-Mo.), Alan Lowenthal (D-Calif.), and Rob Wittman (R-Va.).</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Tom Carper (D-Del.) introduced <b>S. 747</b> in March. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee approved the bill April 10.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Matsui is working with the committee to schedule a hearing.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sens. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.) and Carper are working to get a floor vote on <b>S. 747</b>.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House is seeking to reduce program funding to \$10 million for fiscal 2020. Congress increased funding to \$75 million for 2019.</p>
Ethylene Oxide	<p><b>H.R. 1152, S. 458</b></p> <p>The legislation would require the Environmental Protection Agency to revise the toxic air emissions standards for ethylene oxide based on the results of the National Center for Environmental Assessment.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1152</b>, introduced in March by Rep. Bradley Schneider (D-Ill.), was referred to the Energy and Commerce Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) introduced <b>S. 458</b> on Feb. 12. The bill has been referred to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Schneider is trying to get a hearing or a markup scheduled.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No plans yet.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The EPA is reviewing ethylene oxide standards for sterilization facilities that were last updated in 2006. The agency could propose revised standards for this sector as early as mid-2019.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Mine Reclamation	<b>H.R. 2156</b> The Revitalizing the Economy of Coal Communities by Leveraging Local Activities and Investing More Act would speed the delivery of \$1 billion in funding to coal states for abandoned mine cleanup. It purports to boost local economies and clean up blighted landscapes.	<b>House:</b> Reps. Matt Cartwright (D-Pa.) and Hal Rogers (R-Ky.) introduced the bill April 9.  <b>Senate:</b> No companion version has been introduced.	<b>House:</b> The bill's supporters have laid the groundwork in previous Congresses.  <b>Senate:</b> Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) introduced a version of the bill in the last Congress, indicating at least a decent chance of passage.  <b>Administration:</b> The White House hasn't weighed in on the legislation, but it doesn't seem at cross-purposes with Trump's agenda.
Mining	<b>H.R. 2050</b> The Appalachian Communities Health Emergency Act would stop new or expanded mountaintop removal coal mining until the Department of Health and Human Services studies its impact on human health.	<b>House:</b> Rep. John Yarmuth (D-Ky.) introduced the bill April 3. A House Natural Resources subcommittee held a hearing on it April 9. It was also referred to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.  <b>Senate:</b> No companion version has been introduced.	<b>House:</b> Democrats see the bill as a way to push back against Trump's coal agenda and could use their majority to muscle it through.  <b>Senate:</b> Given Republicans' support for coal, any companion version would be unlikely to move out of committee.  <b>Administration:</b> The White House is extremely unlikely to endorse any bill that holds back more coal mining.
Oceans	<b>H.R. 1716, S. 778</b> The Coastal Communities Ocean Acidification Act would require the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to assess the vulnerability of coastal communities to the potential for ocean acidification, one of the side effects of climate change as the oceans absorb more carbon dioxide. Ocean acidification can hurt aquatic ecosystems and harm coastal fishing industries. NOAA would have to conduct these ocean acidification assessments every seven years.	<b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1716</b> , introduced by Rep. Chellie Pingree (D-Maine), was approved by a House Science, Space and Technology subcommittee on a voice vote April 9.  <b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 778</b> , introduced by Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), hasn't come up for a hearing yet in the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee.	<b>House:</b> The bill has bipartisan support from Reps. Don Young (R-Alaska) and Peter King (R-N.Y.), and it also has strong momentum after winning unanimous approval in subcommittee.  <b>Senate:</b> The legislation also has bipartisan support in the Senate, with backing from three Democrats in addition to Murkowski and Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine).



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Offshore Drilling	<p><b>H.R. 1149, H.R. 1606, S. 828</b></p> <p>The Atlantic Coastal Economies Protection Act would ban seismic air gun testing off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.</p> <p>The Atlantic Seismic Airgun Protection Act would ban seismic air gun testing in the the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Jeff Van Drew (D-N.J.) introduced <b>H.R. 1149</b> on Feb. 11 alongside Rep. Donna Shalala (D-Fla.). It now has 34 cosponsors, eight of whom are Republicans. Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.) introduced the other bill March 7 with Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.) Since then, 10 other cosponsors, all Democrats, have signed on. The bill now sits with a House Natural Resources subcommittee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Beyer bill has been referred to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Sen. Cory Booker (D-N.J.) introduced it March 14. No companion version of the other bill has been introduced.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The bill could get a floor vote as part of a package of anti-offshore drilling measures.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The measures' hopes are slim in the Senate, considering the Republican leadership's staunch support for more oil and gas exploration.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Because the Trump White House wants to expand offshore drilling, it almost certainly won't support the bills.</p>
Paris Agreement	<p><b>H.R. 9</b></p> <p>The legislation aims to keep the U.S. committed to the Paris climate agreement. The bill would require the administration to submit, within 120 days, a plan outlining how it will meet the U.S. goal under the global climate pact to cut greenhouse gas emissions 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. Known as the Climate Action Now Act, it also would prohibit the administration from using federal funds to withdraw from the Paris deal.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Kathy Castor (D-Fla.), chairwoman of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, introduced the bill in March, offering a unifying climate policy for House Democrats amid divisions over the Green New Deal. The measure was approved by the House Energy and Commerce Committee April 4 and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 9. No Republicans voted for the legislation.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> There is no Senate companion.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> House Democrats have teed up the bill for quick passage in early May. It is unlikely to be taken up by the Republican-led Senate.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration hasn't taken a position on the legislation. But President Trump announced in June 2017 he would pull the U.S. from the climate deal, though that withdrawal doesn't take effect until November 2020.</p>
Permitting	<p><b>H.R. 1650</b></p> <p>The Ending Duplicative Permitting Act would forbid the Bureau of Land Management from requiring drilling permits on state or private land unless the federal government owns at least a 50 percent ownership stake in the subsurface minerals.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Liz Cheney (R-Wyo.) introduced the bill March 8. It has four original cosponsors, all Republicans, and has been referred to a House Natural Resources subcommittee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No companion version has been introduced. The same was true of the previous Congress, even though the Republican-controlled House passed the bill.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Alan Lowenthal (D-Calif.), who chairs the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, isn't expected to let the bill come up for a vote.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Publicly, Senate Republicans have shown little interest in the measure, even though it is consistent with their general approach to resource extraction.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Should the bill reach President Trump's desk, he would likely sign it.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
PFAS	<b>H.R. 535, S. 638</b> <p>This legislation, also known as the PFAS Action Act, would require the EPA to declare per- and polyfluoroalkyl compounds as hazardous substances under Superfund law. If the legislation is signed into law, the agency would have one year to finalize that designation.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 535</b>, introduced Jan. 14 by Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-Mich.), was referred to the House Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure committees.</p> <p><b>Senate: S. 638</b>, introduced Feb. 28 by Sen. Tom Carper (D-Del.), was referred to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Hearings for the House and Senate bills have not yet been scheduled.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The EPA plans to list per- and polyfluoroalkyl compounds as hazardous substances under Superfund law by the end of 2019, an agency official said April 9.</p>
Rare Earths	<b>S. 1052</b> <p>The bill would authorize \$23 million every year through 2027 for the Department of Energy to research new technologies to pull rare earth elements from coal and coal byproducts. The Rare Earth Element Advanced Coal Technologies Act would both offer an economic boost and would clean up coal ash and acid mine drainage left behind by old mine sites.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> No companion version has been introduced.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W. Va.) introduced the measure April 4. Sens. Shelley Moore Capito (R-W.Va.) and Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) were original cosponsors.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The bill could draw bipartisan support. The measure has been introduced in previous Congresses, but has never moved forward.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration hasn't weighed in but has offered strong support for new coal technologies.</p>
Water Infrastructure	<b>H.R. 1417, S. 611</b> <p>This legislation would establish a new trust fund that would provide nearly \$35 billion annually for water infrastructure grants. The Water Affordability, Transparency, Equity, and Reliability Act also would make changes to the way existing water infrastructure loan programs are administered and would require the head of the EPA to issue a report on environmental justice issues related to drinking water access.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 1417</b>, introduced Feb. 28 by Rep. Brenda Lawrence (D-Mich.), hasn't come up for a hearing yet in the House.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has not held a hearing on <b>S. 611</b> yet. It was introduced by Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.).</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The legislation has strong support from the Democratic majority in the House, including backing from several committee and subcommittee chairs. No Republicans have signed on to it yet, however.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Support for this bill in the Senate is tepid thus far, with only Democratic backers.</p>

To contact the reporters: Sylvia Carignan in Washington at [scarignan@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:scarignan@bloombergenvironment.com); Stephen Lee in Washington at [stephenlee@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:stephenlee@bloombergenvironment.com); Amena H. Saiyid in Washington at [asaiyid@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:asaiyid@bloombergenvironment.com); David Schultz in Washington at [dschultz@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:dschultz@bloombergenvironment.com); Dean Scott in Washington at [dsconfig@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:dsconfig@bloombergenvironment.com); Abby Smith in Washington at [asmith@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:asmith@bloombergenvironment.com); Tiffany Stecker in Washington at [tstecker@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:tstecker@bloombergenvironment.com)

To contact the editors: Gregory Henderson at [ghenderson@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:ghenderson@bloombergenvironment.com); Jean Fogarty at [jfogarty@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:jfogarty@bloombergenvironment.com); Chuck McCutcheon at [cmccutcheon@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:cmccutcheon@bloombergenvironment.com); Rob Tricchinelli at [rtricchinelli@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:rtricchinelli@bloombergenvironment.com); Anna Yukhananov at [ayukhananov@bloombergenvironment.com](mailto:ayukhananov@bloombergenvironment.com)



# Financial Services

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Beneficial Ownership</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>Draft legislation in the House would require disclosure of individuals with substantial control over newly formed corporations and limited liability companies. Known as the Corporate Transparency Act of 2019, the bill would ensure an applicant to form a company reported details of its beneficial owner to the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. The bill would also require applicants to provide FinCEN with the beneficial owner's name, address and one of several identification numbers. The bill would allow FinCEN to provide ownership data to law enforcement agencies upon request. It would also set civil penalties of as much as \$10,000 for violations, and set criminal penalties at no more than three years imprisonment.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Pending introduction by Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D-N.Y.), who offered a similar bill in the last Congress.</p> <p>The bill will likely be referred to the House Financial Services Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> There is no current companion bill. Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) introduced the companion legislation to Maloney's previous beneficial ownership bill, which Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) cosponsored.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Maloney is expected to introduce the bill this spring after ironing out details with Republicans on the Financial Services Committee. The House will likely pass the bill with some bipartisan support. Some Republicans oppose a requirement that FinCEN control the ownership data.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Various iterations of the ownership proposal were introduced in the Senate in the 115th Congress. The bill faces an uphill battle, but is likely to draw some initial Republican support.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin has said the House proposal "is headed in the right direction." Treasury wants any beneficial ownership data collection regime to contain strong privacy protections.</p>
<b>Cannabis Banking</b>	<p><b>H.R. 1595, S. 1200</b></p> <p>The SAFE Banking Act companion bills would shield banks, credit unions and other financial services companies from enforcement action by federal regulators if they choose to do business with the cannabis industry. The legislation would make it easier for the cannabis industry to obtain and keep bank accounts, and shift the industry's cash-reliant economy into mainstream banking accounts.</p> <p>The American Bankers Association and other financial services support the bill.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 1595</b> was introduced March 7 by Rep. Ed Perlmutter (D-Colo.), Denny Heck (D-Wa.), Steve Stivers (R-Ohio) and Warren Davidson (R-Ohio). It had 165 bipartisan cosponsors as of April 12. The House Financial Services Committee approved the bill March 28 on a bipartisan vote of 45-15.</p> <p><b>Senate: S. 1200</b> was introduced by Sens. Jeff Merkley (D-Ore.) and Cory Gardner (R-Colo.) on April 11 with 20 bipartisan cosponsors.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The bill's main sponsors expect the bill to reach the House floor by summer. The legislation will likely have sufficient votes in the Democratic-controlled House.</p> <p>The legislation has noteworthy supporters.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The outlook in the Republican controlled Senate is less certain. Gardner is one of three GOP senators backing the bill at this time. He faces reelection in 2020 in a state increasingly moving to the political left. He may seek to gain support among GOP colleagues but faces an uphill battle to get legislation through the chamber.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin has called for the cannabis industry to be able to use mainstream banking services.</p>

To contact the reporters: Lydia Beyoud at [lbeyoud@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:lbeyoud@bloomberglaw.com); Jacob Rund at [jrund@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:jrund@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editors: Mike Ferullo at [mferullo@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:mferullo@bloomberglaw.com); Seth Stern at [sstern@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:sstern@bloomberglaw.com)



# Foreign Affairs

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
China	<b>S. 1092</b>  Legislation would impose financial and visa sanctions on Chinese individuals determined to be responsible for or complicit in the theft or use of stolen U.S. intellectual property that could be a significant threat to national security.	<b>Senate: S. 1092</b> , "Secure IP Act," was introduced by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas). The measure was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.  <b>House:</b> No companion measure has been introduced.	<b>Administration:</b> The U.S. will resume trade talks with China on April 30, which would also cover intellectual property protections and technology transfer.
Middle East	<b>S. 1, H.R. 336, H.R. 31</b>  <b>S. 1</b> and <b>H.R. 336</b> would authorize at least \$3.3 billion annually through fiscal 2028 for security assistance to Israel. The measure would allow U.S. state and local governments to enforce measures against entities that engage in a boycott, divestment, or sanctions (BDS) activity targeting Israel.  All three bills would expand financial and visa sanctions targeting the Syrian government and its central bank. Humanitarian aid activities would be exempt from sanctions.	<b>Senate:</b> The Senate passed the "Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act," 77-23 on Feb. 5. It was introduced by Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.).  <b>House: H.R. 336</b> , the companion measure, was introduced by House Foreign Affairs Committee ranking member Michael McCaul (R-Texas). The bill has 29 Republican cosponsors.  The House passed the Syria provisions in a stand-alone bill ( <b>H.R. 31</b> ) by voice vote on Jan. 22.	<b>House:</b> It's uncertain whether the Democratic-controlled House will consider either version of the legislation.  <b>Senate:</b> The Senate hasn't taken up the House-passed Syria measure.
Russia	<b>S. 1060, S. 482</b>  <b>S. 1060</b> would impose sanctions if the director of national intelligence determines Russia or another foreign government interfered in a federal election. Sanctions would be imposed on Russia's banking, energy, and defense sectors, including sovereign debt, if a positive determination is made.  <b>S. 482</b> would also impose sanctions on Russian assets, reaffirm support for NATO, establish criminal penalties for certain cybercrimes, and require reports from the State Department on the proliferation of chemical weapons.	<b>Senate: S. 1060</b> , "Defending Elections from Threats by Establishing Redlines Act," was introduced by Sens. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). The measure was referred to the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee.  A similar bill ( <b>S. 482</b> ) was introduced by Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.). The "Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act" was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.	<b>Senate:</b> The Senate blocked House-passed legislation ( <b>H. J. Res. 30</b> ) in January 2019 that would have maintained sanctions on Russian companies associated with oligarch Oleg Deripaska.

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	<b>H.R. 1471, S. 612</b> Legislation would require congressional approval for any nuclear agreement between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia. It would also bar any such agreements until Saudi Arabia has been transparent about journalist Jamal Khashoggi's death and has made substantial progress on human rights.	<b>House: H.R. 1471</b> , the "Saudi Nuclear Nonproliferation Act," was introduced by Rep. Brad Sherman (D-Calif.) and cosponsored by nine Democrats and one Republican. The measure was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.  <b>Senate: S. 612</b> , the companion measure, was introduced by Sens. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). The bill was referred to Senate Foreign Relations Committee.	<b>Senate:</b> Sens. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) and Rubio requested the Government Accountability Office to investigate the Trump administration's talks with Saudi Arabia over a deal that would allow U.S. companies to build nuclear reactors there.  <b>House:</b> It's unclear whether the House will consider either measure.
<b>Yemen</b>	<b>S. J. Res. 7</b> The measure would use congressional authority under the War Powers Resolution to direct the president to end U.S. involvement from hostilities in Yemen.	<b>Senate:</b> The Senate passed the measure by a 54-46 vote on March 13.  <b>House:</b> The House cleared the measure by a vote of 247-145 on April 4:  <b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump vetoed the measure on April 16	<b>House and Senate:</b> The Senate would go first on a vote overriding the president's veto, but it's unlikely to receive the necessary two-thirds support. The House wouldn't hold a vote in that case.  U.S. involvement in Yemen's civil war may continue to be debated as part of the fiscal 2020 defense authorization bill.

To contact the author: Naoreen Chowdhury at [nchowdhury@bgov.com](mailto:nchowdhury@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Adam Schank at [aschank@bgov.com](mailto:aschank@bgov.com); Loren Duggan at [lduggan@bgov.com](mailto:lduggan@bgov.com)





# Gun Background Checks

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Gun-Show Loophole</b>	<p><b>H.R. 8, S. 42</b></p> <p>Legislation to close the federal “gun-show loophole” has been introduced in both chambers.</p> <p>Currently, private gun transactions without a licensed dealer don’t require background checks.</p> <p>The bill would require any firearm transfer between unrelated, unlicensed individuals – such as participants at a gun show – to be conducted through a licensed dealer, who would be required to perform a background check on the recipient.</p> <p>There would be exceptions related to law enforcement agencies, loans or gifts within a family or at shooting ranges or hunting while the gun owner is present.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 8</b>, the “Bipartisan Background Checks Act,” was introduced by Rep. Mike Thompson (D-Calif.) and cosponsored by 227 Democrats and five Republicans and was passed by the House Feb. 27 240-190, mostly along party lines, with eight Republicans voting for the bill and two Democrats voting against it.</p> <p><b>Senate: H.R. 8 and S. 42</b> haven’t been considered in the Senate. The House-passed bill has been placed on the Senate calendar, while the Senate bill, introduced by Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) and cosponsored by 40 Democrats and independent Bernie Sanders (Vt.), has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) said his panel won’t take up either bill, which most Republicans oppose.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House issued a veto threat Feb. 25, saying <b>H.R. 8</b> is “incompatible with the Second Amendment’s guarantee of an individual right to keep arms.”</p>
<b>Background Check Time Limit</b>	<p><b>H.R. 1112</b></p> <p>The Enhanced Background Checks Act would prevent gun sales from proceeding if a background check isn’t completed within three days, as allowed under the “Charleston Loophole.”</p> <p>A June 2015 mass shooting at a historically black church in Charleston, S.C., was perpetrated with a gun legally sold before a background check was completed.</p> <p>Under the bill, a gun buyer could petition the Justice Department to allow the sale to be completed after 10 days without a background check result, and the sale could proceed 10 days after that.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 1112</b>, introduced by Rep. Jim Clyburn (D-S.C.) and cosponsored by 14 Democrats and Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), was passed by the House on Feb. 28, with only three Democrats voting against the measure and seven Republicans supporting it.</p> <p><b>Senate: H.R. 1112</b>, which doesn’t have a Senate companion, has been placed on the Senate calendar.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) said his panel won’t take up the bill, which most Republicans oppose.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House issued a veto threat Feb. 25. “Allowing the Federal Government to restrict firearms purchases through bureaucratic delay would undermine the Second Amendment’s guarantee that law-abiding citizens have an individual right to keep and bear arms,” the White House wrote.</p>

To contact the author: Adam M. Taylor in Washington at [ataylor@bgov.com](mailto:ataylor@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Adam Schank at [aschank@bgov.com](mailto:aschank@bgov.com); Loren Duggan at [lduggan@bgov.com](mailto:lduggan@bgov.com)



# Health Care

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Abortion</b>	<p><b>H.R. 20, H.R. 784, H.R. 962, S. 109, S. 160, S. 311</b></p> <p>These bills include various approaches to restricting abortion.</p> <p><b>H.R. 784</b> and <b>S. 160</b> would ban abortion at 20 weeks, with some exceptions, while <b>H.R. 962</b> and <b>S. 311</b> would require doctors to provide medical care to infants born alive after an attempted abortion. <b>H.R. 20</b> and <b>S. 109</b> would make permanent the Hyde amendment, an annual ban on using federal funds for abortion.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House bills are sponsored mostly by Republicans but include a few Democrats. They haven't advanced in committee.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 109</b> and <b>S. 311</b> fell short of the 60 votes needed to advance during floor consideration earlier this year. The Judiciary Committee held a hearing on <b>S. 160</b> on April 9.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Republicans are trying to force a vote on <b>H.R. 962</b>, while Democrats have had their sights set on reversing the Hyde amendment and other administration policies.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Democrats have generally blocked the Senate bills from advancing, though there is some crossover in both parties on abortion issues.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration supported the Senate bills that came to the floor, and the president called for banning "late-term" abortion in his state of the union address.</p>
<b>ACA Bills</b>	<p><b>H.R. 986, H.R. 987, H.R. 1010, H.R. 1385, H.R. 1386, H.R. 1425</b></p> <p>These six bills make up the core of Democrats' goals for shoring up the Affordable Care Act's insurance markets. Together they would reverse a number of Trump administration rules and policies that have expanded non-ACA-compliant insurance plans and rescinded funds for marketplace enrollment activities.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The Energy and Commerce Committee approved the bills April 3, mostly along party lines, and approved <b>H.R. 986</b> by voice vote. The Education and Labor Committee also approved <b>H.R. 1010</b>, dealing with short-term insurance, by a 26-19 vote on April 9.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Most of the House bills don't have Senate versions.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House is likely to pass these bills mostly by party-line votes largely as a campaign messaging tool for Democrats.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> GOP leaders have shown no interest in taking up such bills.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House has historically opposed such legislation.</p>
<b>Generic Drugs</b>	<p><b>H.R. 965, S. 340</b></p> <p>The CREATES Act would permit some companies to bring civil action against a drugmaker for refusing to make enough samples of a product available for testing so a generic version of it can be developed. The bill is meant to combat abuses of a federal safety program that keep low-cost generic drugs off the market.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The Energy and Commerce Committee reported <b>H.R. 965</b> by a unanimous 50-0 vote after Democrats and Republicans agreed on minor changes to it. The Judiciary Committee is also slated to take up the measure.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 340</b> has been placed on the Senate calendar without committee referral.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House is slated to vote on the CREATES Act in May. The bill is widely seen as low-hanging fruit for a Congress eager to take on the issue of drug pricing this year.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The principal sponsors in the Senate, Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), have both said CREATES is likely to be part of a package of health bills slated to come to the Senate floor this summer.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House hasn't yet signaled whether it supports the CREATES Act.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
'Medicare for All'	<p><b>H.R. 1384, S. 1129</b></p> <p>The bills would create similar single-payer health systems that ban most private insurance and provide expansive benefits with little or no out-of-pocket costs. Some offsets have been floated – like increased taxes on the wealthy – but aren't included in the legislation. Other iterations of "Medicare for All" include creating government health plans as a public option (<b>H.R. 2000, S. 981, H.R. 2085, S. 1033, S. 3</b>); expanding Medicaid (<b>H.R. 1277, S. 489</b>); or creating a Medicare buy-in program at age 50 (<b>H.R. 1346, S. 470</b>).</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.) introduced <b>H.R. 1384</b> on Feb. 27 with 106 original cosponsors.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) introduced <b>S. 1129</b> on April 10 with 14 cosponsors, including several presidential candidates.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House Rules Committee will hold a hearing on <b>H.R. 1384</b> April 30. A second will be held by the House Budget Committee later this year. Other committees with jurisdiction, such as Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, haven't announced plans to take up the bill.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) has dismissed the idea but some Senate Republicans have suggested they may hold a vote on the "Medicare for All" bill just to put political pressure on some Democrats.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration has been vocally opposed to single-payer health care systems and has repeatedly denounced the idea.</p>
Medicare Price Negotiation	<p><b>H.R. 275, H.R. 1046</b></p> <p>Generally, these bills would require the Health and Human Services secretary to negotiate with drugmakers and use the government's buying power to get lower prices for prescription drugs.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Peter Welch (D-Vt.) introduced <b>H.R. 275</b> on Jan. 8, while Lloyd Doggett (D-Texas) introduced <b>H.R. 1046</b> on Feb. 7. No hearings have been scheduled, but Doggett, chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, said recently he expects the committee to take up his bill sometime this year.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Republican leaders have opposed such legislation.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said that a negotiation bill will be part of Democrats' health policy agenda this year.</p> <p>However, there's some debate among Democrats about how to shape the policy.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Republicans have generally been opposed to giving the federal government more power to negotiate with drugmakers.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump has spoken favorably about negotiation, but his HHS Secretary, Alex Azar, has said he has reservations.</p>
Pandemic Response	<p><b>H.R. 269</b></p> <p>The bill would renew programs to prepare, prevent, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health threats through fiscal 2023. It would also modify the regulatory framework for nonprescription drugs, and establish user fees for drugmakers.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House passed the bill Jan. 8 by a vote of 401-17.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The House bill has been placed on the Senate calendar without committee referral.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> A disagreement between Sens. Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.) and Richard Burr (R-N.C.) over a proposal to ban most electronic cigarette flavors has stalled Senate action.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The administration hasn't issued a statement, but it has commented on revamping the nation's biodefense strategy.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Surprise Billing	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>Surprise billing refers to instances where patients face high medical bills despite having insurance coverage sufficient to cover the health services they receive.</p> <p>Most proposals in this area look to end balance billing, when a hospital or doctor and an insurer can't agree on the cost of a service and charge the patient for any costs beyond what insurers are willing to pay.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House Education and Labor Committee has discussed the issue but not specific legislation.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> A bipartisan group of senators led by Sens. Bill Cassidy (R-La.) and Maggie Hassan (D-N.H.) are meeting to design a package of bills to address surprise billing.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> House Democrats have said they'd take on the issue but haven't rallied around a specific bill.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Senate group is working with the leaders of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee to shape their proposal and get it into a collection of health bills slated to come to the Senate floor sometime this summer.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House convened a panel earlier this year to discuss the issue, signaling it wants to work on surprise billing.</p>

To contact the authors: Alexander Ruoff in Washington at [aruoff@bgov.com](mailto:aruoff@bgov.com); Jeannie Baumann in Washington at [jbaumann@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:jbaumann@bloomberglaw.com); Danielle Parnass in Washington at [dparnass@bgov.com](mailto:dparnass@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Paul Hendrie at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com); Fawn Johnson at [fjohnson@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:fjohnson@bloomberglaw.com); Robin Meszoly at [rmeszoly@bgov.com](mailto:rmeszoly@bgov.com); Adam Schank at [aschank@bgov.com](mailto:aschank@bgov.com)



# Immigration

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Employment Visas</b>	<p><b>H.R. 641, H.R. 1044, S. 175, S. 386, S. 1103</b></p> <p>The Agricultural Worker Program Act (<b>H.R. 641, S. 175</b>) would create a “blue card” program for undocumented agricultural workers, granting legal status and a pathway to permanent resident status.</p> <p>The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act (<b>H.R. 1044, S. 386</b>) would eliminate per-country caps on employment-based green cards.</p> <p>The Reforming American Immigration for a Strong Economy (RAISE) Act (<b>S. 1103</b>) would create a skills-based point system for immigration and eliminate diversity and extended family visas, reducing immigration overall.</p>	<p><b>House: H.R. 641</b> was introduced Jan. 17 by Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) and referred to the Judiciary Committee. It has 73 cosponsors, all Democrats. Introduced Feb. 7 by Lofgren and Rep. Ken Buck (R-Colo.), <b>H.R. 1044</b> has 259 cosponsors and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate: S. 175</b>, with 13 cosponsors, was introduced Jan. 17 by Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.). It’s been referred to the Judiciary Committee. Introduced Feb. 7 by Sens. Mike Lee (R-Utah) and Kamala Harris (D-Calif.), <b>S. 386</b> has 27 cosponsors and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. <b>S. 1103</b>, which has two cosponsors, was introduced April 10 by Rep. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) and referred to the Judiciary Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> A March 4 Judiciary hearing resulted in general bipartisan support for immigration changes in agriculture. <b>H.R. 1044</b> could come under new House rules that require a floor vote if a bill hits 290 cosponsors and there’s no committee action.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> A blue card program was part of a broad immigration bill the Senate passed in 2013, so could be part of another deal. Sen. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) could block <b>S. 386</b> or its House version, as he’s done in the past.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump is a wild card on most immigration issues. He hasn’t spoken directly on agricultural workers, but has made general statements in support of skilled immigration. Trump did support the 2017 RAISE Act.</p>
<b>Legal Status</b>	<p><b>H.R. 6, S. 874, S. 879</b></p> <p>The American Dream and Promise Act (<b>H.R. 6</b>) would grant legal status to young, undocumented immigrants who came to the U.S. as children. It also would grant permanent legal status to nationals of certain countries who have lived and worked in the U.S. under the temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure programs. The Dream Act (<b>S. 874</b>) and Safe Environment from Countries Under Repression and in Emergency (SECURE) Act (<b>S. 879</b>) would grant legal status to the same groups via two separate bills.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Introduced by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-Calif.) March 12, <b>H.R. 6</b> has 227 cosponsors, all Democrats, and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.</p> <p><b>Senate: S. 874</b> was introduced by Sens. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) March 26, and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. It has five cosponsors. <b>S. 879</b> was introduced March 26 by Sens. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.) and has 14 cosponsors, all Democrats. It has been referred to the Judiciary Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Republicans at a March 6 Judiciary Committee hearing were agreeable to legal status as long as it’s paired with border security and enforcement provisions.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The Dream Act has bipartisan support, and been passed by the Senate in the past in other legislative packages. The SECURE Act’s fate is less clear.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Trump has been open to legalizing “dreamers” if other immigration and border security demands are met. The administration also has said Congress, not the agencies, should afford legal status to TPS and DED recipients.</p>

To contact the reporter: Laura D. Francis in Washington at [lfrancis@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:lfrancis@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Chris Opfer in New York at [copfer@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:copfer@bloomberglaw.com)





# Intellectual Property

## Legislative Purpose

## Bill Status

## Outlook

### Patents

#### Not yet introduced.

A bipartisan, bicameral group is drafting a bill redefining what inventions qualify for patent protection under Section 101 of federal patent law.

The bill would make it easier for companies, including those in the pharmaceutical, technology, and life sciences industries, to more easily win patents and enforce them in court. The effort comes as companies and innovators complain that U.S. case law lacks clarity on what inventions are patent eligible.

**Senate:** Sens. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.) and Chris Coons (D-Del.) April 17 released a framework outlining the prospective legislation. The pair has convened four private roundtables with industry representatives and legal associations to discuss patent eligibility issues the bill would address. Under the framework, an exclusive list of subjects that don't qualify for patent protection on their own, such as mathematical formulas or mental activities, would be created.

**House:** Reps. Hank Johnson (D-Ga.), Doug Collins (R-Ga.) and Steve Stivers (R-Ohio) are participating in the Senate effort.

**Senate:** Tillis plans to introduce a bill over the summer but has not specified a time frame.

**House:** No time frame specified.

**Administration:** The Trump administration hasn't weighed in on the legislation.

To contact the reporter: Malathi Nayak in Washington at [mnayak@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:mnayak@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Keith Perine at [kperine@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:kperine@bloomberglaw.com)



# Labor & Employment

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Arbitration	<b>H.R. 2148, S. 1082</b> The BE HEARD in the Workplace Act would eliminate mandatory arbitration and nondisclosure agreements for harassment complaints, eliminate money damages caps for harassment victims, and give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission greater power to pursue harassment complaints.	<b>House:</b> Rep. Katherine Clark (D-Mass.) introduced <b>H.R. 2148</b> on April 9. The bill was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee as well as Judiciary, House Administration, Oversight and Reform, and Veterans' Affairs. <b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 1082</b> was introduced by Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) on April 9. It was referred to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.	<b>House:</b> The bill has 21 cosponsors in the House, all Democrats. <b>Senate:</b> Murray is the ranking member of the HELP Committee, but the bill isn't likely to move in the Republican-controlled Senate. <b>Administration:</b> The administration hasn't taken a public stance on the legislation.
Federal Employees	<b>H.R. 1076, S. 387</b> The Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act would bar federal agencies and contractors from asking job applicants about their criminal histories until the conditional offer stage. The measure would apply to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, including the U.S. Postal Service. It also would apply to private-sector contractors for positions within the scope of federal contracts.	<b>House:</b> The House Oversight and Reform Committee approved <b>H.R. 1076</b> , introduced by Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.), by voice vote on March 26. The measure has 10 cosponsors, including only one Republican, Doug Collins of Georgia. <b>Senate:</b> The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee approved <b>S. 387</b> , introduced by Sen. Cory Booker (D-N.J.), by voice vote on Feb. 13. The bill has seven cosponsors, including three Republicans and four Democrats.	<b>House:</b> The bill's chances in the House are good, given that Democrats control the chamber. <b>Senate:</b> The measure isn't likely to make it to the Senate floor. Critics say the bill would further complicate the federal hiring process. <b>Administration:</b> The president isn't likely to sign the bill in its current form.
LGBT Rights	<b>H.R. 5, S. 788</b> The Equality Act would amend several laws, including Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, to ban sexual orientation and gender identity bias on the job and in public accommodations.	<b>House:</b> The Judiciary and the Education and Labor Committees have held hearings on the bill, introduced Rep. David Cicilline (D-R.I.). The bill's 240 cosponsors include three Republicans <b>Senate:</b> The bill, introduced by Sen. Jeff Merkley (D-Ore.) was referred to Senate Judiciary Committee. The measure was cosponsored by 43 Democrats, two independents and Republican Susan Collins of Maine.	<b>House:</b> The House could pass the bill largely along party lines. The bill is a key piece of House leadership's economic platform. <b>Senate:</b> The legislation likely will stay stalled in the GOP-held Senate. Some Republicans have raised concerns about encroaching on religious rights. <b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration has not weighed in on the legislation.

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Minimum Wage</b>	<p><b>H.R. 582, S. 150</b></p> <p>The Raise the Wage Act is a Democratic-led bill that would increase the nation's decade-old \$7.25 hourly minimum wage to \$15 by 2024 and erase separate minimum pay rates for tipped and other workers.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The Education and Labor Committee approved the bill, sponsored by Rep. Bobby Scott (D-Va.), in a party-line, 28-20 vote March 6.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The bill, introduced by Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), is cosponsored by 31 Democrats and was referred to the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The bill doesn't yet appear to have the support for House passage. Some moderate Democrats have raised concerns about impacts on small businesses and low-income regions.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The GOP-led Senate is not likely to consider legislation as it is currently written. Republicans have voiced concern about potential job losses as a result of the \$15 hourly mandate.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> White House economic adviser Larry Kudlow has voiced opposition to a federal minimum wage.</p>
<b>Paid Family Leave</b>	<p><b>H.R. 1185, S. 463, not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The FAMILY Act would create a national insurance fund for all workers. Both employers and employees would contribute to the fund, which would be used to provide workers with up to 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave.</p> <p>Sens. Bill Cassidy (R-La.) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) are working on separate paid family leave legislation aimed at securing bipartisan support.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1185</b>, introduced by Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-Conn.), was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee and has 182 Democratic cosponsors.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 463</b>, introduced by Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.), was referred to the Senate Finance Committee, and is cosponsored by 32 Democrats and two independents.</p> <p>The Cassidy-Sinema bill hasn't been introduced and the details are still unclear.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The bill could get a markup in the Ways and Means Committee. The committee's chairman Rep. Richard Neal (D-Mass.) is among the cosponsors.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Senate GOP leadership isn't likely to consider new labor and employment mandates on employers.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Trump has called on Congress to pass paid leave legislation. Some Republicans have previously proposed allowing workers to use Social Security to pay for family leave.</p>
<b>Pay Discrimination</b>	<p><b>H.R. 7, S. 270</b></p> <p>The Paycheck Fairness Act is a Democratic-led bill that would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to require companies to show that pay disparities among workers doing the same job are based on "bona fide job-related factors" that are "consistent with business necessity."</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The chamber passed the bill March 27 by a 235-187 vote, which included seven Republicans crossing the aisle to join Democrats in support of the bill.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The legislation, introduced by Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), is cosponsored by 44 Democrats and two independents who caucus with the party. The bill was referred to the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The bill, which does not have any Republican cosponsors, is not likely to move in the GOP-controlled chamber.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The president isn't likely to sign the measure, given Republican concerns about making it harder for businesses to defend pay decisions.</p>

Note: The description of the Paid Family Leave bills in the legislative purpose column on this page has been corrected regarding the employers affected and length of leave.

To contact the reporters: Jaclyn Diaz in Washington at [jdiaz@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:jdiaz@bloomberglaw.com); Louis C. LaBrecque in Washington at [llabrecque@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:llabrecque@bloomberglaw.com); Tyrone Richardson in Washington at [trichardson@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:trichardson@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Chris Opfer at [copfer@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:copfer@bloomberglaw.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Consumer Protections	<p><b>S. 189, S. 748, S. 1214</b></p> <p>Businesses and privacy advocates alike are pushing for a new, broad federal privacy law to boost consumer protections after high-profile data breaches affecting millions of Americans and concerns over how businesses handle personal data.</p> <p>Companies such as Facebook Inc. want Congress to pre-empt state laws like the California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018. Privacy advocates want greater enforcement authority for the Federal Trade Commission.</p> <p>Members in both chambers have introduced various privacy bills, but a central, broadly drafted bill has yet to emerge.</p>	<p><b>Senate: S. 189</b> was introduced by Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) in January and referred to the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee.</p> <p><b>S. 748</b> was introduced by Sens. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) and Josh Hawley (R-Mo.) on March 12 and referred to the Commerce committee.</p> <p><b>S. 1214</b> was introduced by Markey April 12 and referred to the Commerce committee.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Commerce Chairman Roger Wicker (R-Miss) and Sens. Jerry Moran (R-Kan.), John Thune (R-S.D.), Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.), and Brian Schatz (D-Hawaii) are working on a bill that may pre-empt state laws in exchange for giving the FTC more power.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Democratic leaders may wait for Senate action before moving on the issue.</p>

To contact the reporter: Daniel R. Stoller in Washington at [dstoller@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:dstoller@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Keith Perine at [kperine@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:kperine@bloomberglaw.com)



# Regulatory Policy

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Agency Guidance	<b>S. 380</b> The bill would require agencies to post on one central website all guidance documents, directives, memorandums, and notices to the private sector that interpret regulations.	<b>Senate:</b> Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.), chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, introduced the bill. The committee approved an amended version by voice vote on Feb. 13. <b>House:</b> No companion legislation has been introduced.	<b>House:</b> The House approved a similar bill by voice vote in the 115th Congress, when it was under Republican control. <b>Senate:</b> Johnson was attempting to get unanimous consent to pass the bill in the final days of the 115th Congress. Public interest advocates oppose the bill. <b>Administration:</b> The White House has not expressed its views on this bill.
Independent Agencies	<b>S. 869</b> The bill would require independent federal agencies to submit significant proposed and final rules, along with supporting analysis, for review by the White House Office of Management and Budget.	<b>Senate:</b> This is the fifth time Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) has introduced a version of this bill over the past decade. It has been referred to the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. <b>House:</b> No companion bill has been introduced.	<b>House:</b> The bill traditionally has not advanced in the House, and past heads of independent agencies have opposed previous versions. <b>Senate:</b> The bill could be the subject of a committee hearing this year, but chances of passage are slim. <b>Administration:</b> Since the Clinton administration, nearly all past administrators of the White House regulatory affairs office have endorsed oversight of independent agency rulemaking.
Plain-Language Regulation	<b>H.R. 1087, S. 395</b> The bill would require agencies in notices and rulemaking to include a link to a 100-word, plain-language summary of the rule.	<b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1087</b> , introduced by Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer (R-Mo.), has been referred to the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law. <b>Senate:</b> Sen. James Lankford (R-Okla.) introduced <b>S. 395</b> , and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee approved the bill by voice vote Feb. 13.	<b>House:</b> Democrats, now in the majority, remain skeptical of the GOP-sponsored legislation. "These bills are handouts to corporate special interests. They are dead on arrival," said Rep. David Cicilline (D-R.I.), chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law. <b>Senate:</b> The bill awaits a vote by the full Senate. <b>Administration:</b> The White House has not expressed its views on this bill.

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Unfunded Mandates	<p><b>H.R. 300, S. 870</b></p> <p>The bill would require cost analyses of regulations under more circumstances, allow for more input from affected stakeholders, and codify Congressional Budget Office methods of accounting to determine the costs of regulations.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> This is the fifth time Rep. Virginia Foxx (R-N.C.) has introduced a version of this bill over the past decade. It has been referred to the committees on Oversight and Reform, Budget, Rules, and Judiciary.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) introduced <b>S. 870</b> on March 26. It was referred to the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House has passed versions of the bill in previous Congresses with primarily Republican support. Democrats, who now control the House, remain opposed to bills they say would stymie the rulemaking process.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> The bill could be the subject of a committee hearing this year but faces an uphill climb for passage.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The White House has not expressed its views on this bill.</p>

To contact the reporter: Cheryl Bolen in Washington at [cbolen@bgov.com](mailto:cbolen@bgov.com)

To contact the editor: Paul Hendrie at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com)





# Retirement

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Retirement Savings	<p><b>H.R. 1994; S. 972</b></p> <p>The House and Senate bills are similar. The House's Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement (SECURE) Act of 2019 and the Senate's Retirement Enhancement and Savings Act (RESA) of 2019 would give retirement savers more time to build up their nest eggs and more financial tools to do so. There's also built-in fees to keep the tax bundles revenue-neutral.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House Ways and Means Committee approved <b>H.R. 1994</b> by voice vote on April 2. It's sponsored by House tax writers Richard Neal (D-Mass.), Kevin Brady (R-Texas), Ron Kind (D-Wis.) and Mike Kelly (R-Pa.).</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Finance Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and ranking member Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) introduced <b>S. 972</b> on April 1. The Finance Committee unanimously approved an earlier version of the bill in late 2016.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> House Democratic leaders have not yet scheduled a floor vote for the SECURE Act. Neal told reporters he and Brady are working on a second retirement tax bill that he'd like to move before the August recess.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Senate Republicans have, in previous years, wrestled with how/when to bring RESA up on the Senate floor. Grassley hasn't indicated whether he'll bring his bill to the floor, amend the SECURE Act, or work out some other compromise.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> While the administration has not weighed in on these bills specifically, they reflect some of the retirement goals (broader access; regulatory relief) President Donald Trump outlined in an August 2018 executive order.</p>

To contact the reporter: Warren Rojas in Washington at [wrojas@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:wrojas@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Fawn Johnson at [fjohnson@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:fjohnson@bloomberglaw.com)



# Taxation

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Electric Vehicle Tax Credit</b>	<p><b>S. 1094, H.R. 2256</b></p> <p>Lawmakers want to expand a tax credit for plug-in electric vehicles. The \$7,500 tax credit ends after a manufacturer sells 200,000 vehicles.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) has introduced legislation that would create a \$7,000 tax credit for an additional 400,000 electric vehicles after manufacturers hit the vehicle cap. The bill was cosponsored by Sens. Lamar Alexander (R-Tenn.) and Susan Collins (R-Maine).</p> <p><b>House:</b> Rep. Dan Kildee (D-Mich.) introduced a similar bill in the House.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> The electric vehicle legislation could be attached to a larger tax extenders bill later in the year.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> No position</p>
<b>IRS Administration</b>	<p><b>H.R. 1957, S. 928</b></p> <p>The legislation would rework operations and procedures at the Internal Revenue Service, including the agency's appeals process and procedures for asset seizures. The measure would also exclude some low-income taxpayers from the agency's private debt collection program, which allows the agency to hire private companies to collect unpaid tax debts.</p> <p>The bill would codify the Free File program, in which the IRS enters into agreements with private companies to provide free tax preparation software to low-income taxpayers.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House passed the bill April 9 by voice vote. The legislation was introduced by Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee Chairman John Lewis (D-Ga.) and ranking member Mike Kelly (R-Pa.), and Ways and Means Chairman Richard Neal (D-Mass.) and ranking member Kevin Brady (R-Texas).</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Finance Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) introduced companion legislation March 28.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The House passed similar legislation last Congress, but the Senate never acted on it. But Brady indicated the bill could make it through this year.</p> <p>"I'm very optimistic about its future because both parties have done some good, thoughtful work together," Brady said April 9.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Grassley said he is open to "hotlining" the IRS bill, which would allow it to quickly pass the Senate via unanimous consent.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> David Kautter, the Treasury Department's assistant secretary for tax policy, said in early April that while the department hasn't staked out a formal position on the bill, much of it seems reasonable.</p>
<b>State and Local Tax Deductions</b>	<p><b>S. 437, H.R. 1142, H.R. 1757</b></p> <p>Democrats in high-tax states such as New York, New Jersey and California want to undo the \$10,000 cap on state and local tax (SALT) deductions under the 2017 Republican tax law.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Reps. Lauren Underwood (D-Ill.) and Sean Casten (D-Ill.) introduced <b>H.R. 1757</b>, which would increase the cap to \$15,000 for individual filers and \$30,000 for a married couple. That threshold would also be adjusted to keep pace with inflation.</p> <p>Rep. Bill Pascrell (D-N.J.) introduced <b>H.R. 1142</b>, which would undo the cap and restore the deduction.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) has introduced <b>S. 437</b>, which is similar to the Pascrell bill.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Some Democrats are waiting for an opportunity to push legislation to tweak or repeal the SALT cap. But Republican tax law writers have shown no interest in revisiting the cap.</p> <p>"The Senate Finance Committee won't be revisiting the SALT deduction reforms made in Tax Cuts and Jobs Act under Chairman Grassley's leadership," a spokesman for the Senate Finance chairman said.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump said Feb. 6 that he is open to looking at the SALT cap.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Syndicated Easements</b>	<b>S. 170, H.R. 1992</b> Lawmakers want to put an end to syndicated conservation deals, a form of tax-advantaged land deals that has received close attention from the IRS in recent years. The IRS flagged the transactions as suspicious in a late-2016 notice.	<b>Senate:</b> Sens. Steve Daines (R-Mont.) and Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) introduced their bill, which would prevent partnerships from using the tax break when the charitable deduction claimed is more than two-and-a-half times the original amount invested.  <b>House:</b> Reps. Mike Thompson (D-Calif.) and Mike Kelly (R-Pa.) have introduced a companion bill in the House.	<b>Senate:</b> Grassley and Wyden have started an investigation into these tax-advantaged land deals.  <b>Administration:</b> No position.
<b>Tax Extenders</b>	<b>S. 617</b> Lawmakers are still trying to determine what to do with the dozens of temporary tax breaks, known as extenders, that come up for renewal every couple of years. They affect industries such as biofuel companies and short-line railroads. The Senate's bill would retroactively extend expired tax credits and offer certain tax benefits to individuals and businesses affected by major disasters in 2018.	<b>Senate:</b> Sen. Charles Grassley, who introduced <b>S. 617</b> Feb. 28, is a strong supporter of extenders and wants Congress to retroactively extend the dozens of provisions that have expired.  <b>House:</b> Many lawmakers in the House think it is time to come up with a long-term solution for extenders—making some permanent and axing others. A Ways and Means subcommittee held a hearing on the tax breaks on March 12.	<b>House and Senate:</b> It is unclear when lawmakers will act on extenders. The House is still figuring out how to proceed.  Grassley has been looking for the right legislative vehicle to attach the tax extenders. He indicated before leaving for the two-week April recess that it is unlikely extenders would be attached to the IRS administration package.  <b>Administration:</b> No position.
<b>Technical Corrections</b>	<b>Not yet introduced.</b> A technical corrections bill would tweak the 2017 tax law to fix provisions where congressional intent doesn't align with the legislative text. For example, Congress wants to correct the language in the law that prevents restaurants and retailers from immediately writing off the costs of interior improvements.	<b>House:</b> Neal says he would like to hold more hearings on the tax law before making fixes and changes.  <b>Senate:</b> Republicans in the Senate support a technical corrections bill but they would need Democrats' support to pass it.	<b>House and Senate:</b> Fixing the "retail glitch" has bipartisan support in both chambers.  <b>Administration:</b> Leaders in the Treasury Department, including Secretary Steven Mnuchin, have said passing technical corrections is a top priority.

To contact the reporters: Allyson Versprille in Washington at [aversprille@bloombergtax.com](mailto:aversprille@bloombergtax.com); Kaustuv Basu in Washington at [kbasu@bloombergtax.com](mailto:kbasu@bloombergtax.com)

To contact the editors: Patrick Ambrosio at [pambrosio@bloombergtax.com](mailto:pambrosio@bloombergtax.com); Colleen Murphy at [cmurphy@bloombergtax.com](mailto:cmurphy@bloombergtax.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Internet of Things	<b>H.R. 1668, S. 734</b> The legislation would mandate that connected devices bought by the federal government meet minimum security requirements. The bills would require the National Institute of Standards and Technology to develop recommendations for managing connected device cybersecurity risks.	<b>House:</b> Rep. Robin Kelly (D-Ill.) introduced <b>H.R. 1668</b> in March. It has been referred to the Oversight and Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology committees. <b>Senate:</b> Sen. Mark Warner (D-Va.) introduced <b>S. 734</b> in March. It has been referred to the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.	<b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 1668</b> has the support of tech companies, including Symantec, Mozilla, and Cloudflare. Industry groups such as BSA. The Software Alliance also back the measure. <b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 734</b> has the support of tech companies and industry groups. <b>Administration:</b> The administration hasn't publicly endorsed or opposed <b>H.R. 1668</b> or <b>S. 734</b> .
Net Neutrality	<b>H.R. 1644, S. 682</b> The legislation would restore Obama-era net neutrality rules that banned internet service providers from blocking, slowing, or charging more for faster data speeds, and prevent the FCC from eliminating the rules. The measures would reclassify broadband as a Title II common-carrier service under the Communications Act.	<b>House:</b> The House passed <b>H.R. 1644</b> on April 10 by a 232-190 vote. It was introduced March 8 by Rep. Mike Doyle (D-Pa.) <b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 682</b> was introduced March 6 by Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.) It was referred to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee.	<b>Senate:</b> Senate GOP leaders have no plans to take up either the House-passed bill or Markey's measure. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said the House bill was "dead on arrival." Senate Commerce Committee Chairman Roger Wicker (R-Miss.) and Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) are drafting a compromise net neutrality bill, but the rest of the Senate Democratic Caucus backs Markey's bill. <b>Administration:</b> The Trump administration April 8 issued a veto threat against <b>H.R. 1644</b> .
Robocalls	<b>H.R. 1602, S. 151</b> The legislation would enable the Federal Communications Commission to impose civil penalties of as much as \$10,000 per call to those who intentionally violate telemarketing restrictions. <b>H.R. 946</b> The legislation would expand the definition of "autodialer" under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act to include devices that make calls to stored telephone numbers.	<b>House:</b> Rep. David Kustoff (R-Tenn.) introduced <b>H.R. 1602</b> in March. Energy and Commerce Chairman Frank Pallone (D-N.J.) introduced <b>H.R. 946</b> in February. Both bill were referred to Energy and Commerce. <b>Senate:</b> Sen. John Thune (R-S.D.) introduced <b>S. 151</b> in January. The Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee approved the bill by voice vote April 3.	<b>House:</b> Neither House bill has advanced. <b>Senate:</b> <b>S. 151</b> has the support of telecom trade groups including CTIA and USTelecom, consumer groups such as the National Consumer Law Center, and attorneys general in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three U.S. territories. Thune said April 11 no senators have expressed opposition. <b>Administration:</b> The administration hasn't publicly endorsed or opposed <b>H.R. 1602, S. 151</b> , or <b>H.R. 946</b> .

To contact the reporters: Alexis Kramer in Washington at [akramer@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:akramer@bloomberglaw.com); Jon Reid in Washington at [jreid@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:jreid@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editor: Keith Perine at [kperine@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:kperine@bloomberglaw.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Tariffs	<p><b>S. 287, S. 365, H.R. 764, H.R. 940</b></p> <p>Sen. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) introduced a bill, <b>S. 287</b>, in January to limit the president's power to impose tariffs on national security grounds under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act. The Trump administration has used Section 232 to impose tariffs on steel and aluminum imports from Canada, Mexico, and other nations, drawing the ire of business groups and members of Congress. Critics say the tariffs are potentially harmful to the economy and trade.</p> <p>A competing Section 232 measure, <b>S. 365</b>, was introduced in January by Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio). The Toomey bill would require congressional approval for any Section 232 tariff actions, while the Portman bill would allow lawmakers to pass a resolution of disapproval to cancel tariffs after the fact.</p> <p><b>H.R. 940</b>, a House version of Toomey's bill, was introduced in January by Rep. Mike Gallagher (R-Wis.).</p> <p>Meanwhile, Rep. Sean Duffy (R-Wis.) in January introduced <b>H.R. 764</b>, a bill that would give the president even more authority to impose tariffs.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The Toomey and Portman bills are pending before the Senate Finance Committee.</p> <p>Committee Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) has announced plans to introduce a compromise version, working with a bipartisan group of panel members, including Toomey and Portman.</p> <p>Grassley's bill is in the final stages, according to sources.</p> <p><b>House:</b> Gallagher's bill, introduced in January is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Gallagher is actively working to add more cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, an aide said. It currently has 20 cosponsors, including several Ways and Means members.</p> <p>Duffy's bill is also pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. It has mostly Republican cosponsors who don't sit on the panel.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Majority Whip John Thune (R-S.D.) has said the effort to rein in Trump's tariffs has drawn a "high level of interest," particularly among Republicans. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) hasn't yet indicated his plans for the legislation, which would likely set up a showdown with Trump.</p> <p><b>House:</b> House Ways and Means Chairman Richard Neal (D-Mass.) hasn't announced plans to take up any Section 232 legislation. Rep. Kevin Brady (R-Texas), the panel's ranking member, has said he's closely watching Grassley's effort.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Trump supports the Duffy bill and during his State of the Union address he called on Congress to pass it.</p> <p>But efforts in the Senate to rein in the president's tariff power don't bode well for Duffy's bill, which would take the opposite direction.</p> <p>"Congress must reassert its constitutional responsibility on trade, not cede even more to the executive branch," Toomey said in a statement reacting to the speech.</p>

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The White House is preparing to submit legislation to replace the North American Free Trade Agreement with the U.S.-Mexico Canada Agreement.</p> <p>The bill would change rules on auto trade with Mexico and Canada. The administration is working with House Democrats to address labor and other concerns before submitting the bill.</p> <p>The USMCA would also add new provisions for the modern internet economy that include data storage prohibitions and measures to protect cross-border data flows.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Under the fast-track procedures governing the agreement, no amendments to the legislation are permitted once it's formally introduced. Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) says the administration must strengthen labor and environmental provisions and address problems with pharmaceutical protections before she will bring the pact up for a vote. She also wants Mexico to enact and implement its promised labor legislation with clearly defined enforcement language and timelines before moving forward.</p> <p>As speaker, Pelosi could remove the deal from expedited congressional consideration—a tactic she used previously to stall the U.S.-Colombia trade pact.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Finance Committee Chairman Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) says the administration must remove metal tariffs on Canada and Mexico before Congress can consider the deal.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump said he would submit the measure as soon as legally allowed by the fast track procedures. That could happen 30 days after he sends Congress a draft statement of administrative action outlining all the administrative changes that will be needed.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> The administration must bring on board a large bloc of Democrats to get approval and is targeting the New Democratic Coalition, which tends to be more favorable to trade deals than progressives. Concerns about labor enforcement, environmental measures and data exclusivity for biologic drugs also threaten Democrats' support for the pact. Republicans are expected to supply the bulk of the votes. Trade lawyer Dan Ujcz of Dickinson Wright said the USMCA is about 80 votes short—mostly on the Democratic side.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Most Senate Republicans back the deal, while Democrats are publicly lukewarm with some joining House colleagues in demanding changes. Sens. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) and Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio) have floated a labor enforcement proposal.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Trump wants a vote by the summer. But trade analysts doubt Congress will act so quickly, with some seeing votes slipping to the 2020 lame-duck session. Trump could try to force Congress's hand by giving notice that he will pull out of NAFTA.</p>

To contact the reporters: Alexei Alexis in Washington at [aalexis@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:aalexis@bloomberglaw.com); Rossella Brevetti in Washington at [rbrevetti@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:rbrevetti@bloomberglaw.com)

To contact the editors: Seth Stern at [sstern@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:sstern@bloomberglaw.com); Jerome Ashton at [jashton@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:jashton@bloomberglaw.com); Madelyn Callahan at [macallah@bloomberglaw.com](mailto:macallah@bloomberglaw.com)





# Transportation

	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
<b>Autonomous Vehicles</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>Expected House and Senate bills would create the first national framework regulating emerging self-driving vehicle technology. The legislation would preempt state and local authority to regulate the design, construction, and performance of self-driving vehicles and delegate it to the federal government.</p> <p>The bills would establish a process for the Transportation Department to exempt manufacturers from safety standards for autonomous vehicles.</p>	<p>No bills have been introduced yet this Congress. In the 115th Congress, the House passed a bill in September 2017 introduced by Rep. Robert Latta (R-Ohio). In the Senate, a bill sponsored by Sen. John Thune (R-S.D.) and cosponsored by Sen. Gary Peters (D-Mich.), was approved by the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in November 2017.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Thune and Peters are waiting to introduce a new version of their bill until they hear from the House, following a bipartisan, bicameral meeting of top staff of both parties from the committees of jurisdiction.</p> <p>If the four party leaders on the committees agree to work toward a compromise, the most likely legislative path would be the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration title of a surface transportation bill.</p> <p>Thune said he and Peters would likely reintroduce the committee-approved version of their 2017 bill.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao told lawmakers in April she's worried about the "state-by-state patchwork" of regulations for self-driving cars, which her department's voluntary guidance was meant to address.</p>
<b>Infrastructure Package/ Surface Transportation Bill</b>	<p><b>Not yet introduced.</b></p> <p>The forthcoming surface transportation bill would authorize funding for highway and mass transit programs; the current authorization expires Sept. 30, 2020. The Highway Trust Fund is expected to become insolvent in fiscal 2021 if lawmakers don't pass either a short- or long-term authorization bill with additional funding. The fund primarily relies on receipts from the federal motor fuels tax and other excise taxes, but has needed several infusions from the general fund in recent years because the gas tax of 18.4 cents per gallon and diesel tax of 24.4 cents per gallon haven't been raised since 1993.</p> <p>Leaders are also discussing an infrastructure package that could move separately.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Peter DeFazio (D-Ore.) and ranking member Rep. Sam Graves (R-Mo.) asked members to identify policy priorities in late April and plan a series of hearings on a new six-year bill in coming months.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sens. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.) and Tom Carper (D-Del.), the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee leaders, have gathered requests for policy priorities from committee members and were taking input from other senators in early April. They want the committee to approve a bill by the end of July, Carper said.</p>	<p><b>House and Senate:</b> Barrasso and Carper have said they're moving their bill on a fast track because they recognize that paying for the programs they authorize will be a challenge.</p> <p>DeFazio is deferring to party leaders on any separate infrastructure package that could move this year, as he works on a six-year authorization bill that he does not expect to be done by July.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The president called for a \$200 billion infrastructure push in his State of the Union address, but his budget proposed cuts to the Transportation Department. Chao told lawmakers in early April that all funding options "are on the table."</p>

To contact the reporter: Shaun Courtney in Washington at [scourtney@bgov.com](mailto:scourtney@bgov.com)

To contact the editor: Paul Hendrie at [phendrie@bgov.com](mailto:phendrie@bgov.com)



	Legislative Purpose	Bill Status	Outlook
Blue Water Navy	<p><b>H.R. 299, H.R. 203</b></p> <p>The Blue Water Navy Vietnam Veterans Act would expand a presumption of benefits from illnesses linked to Agent Orange exposure for former service members who served in waters off the coast of southeast Asia.</p> <p>The bill responds to Vietnam-era veterans' complaints that their benefits have been unfairly denied by the Department of Veterans Affairs while other service members who served on land receive disability compensation.</p> <p>It would also increase some VA home loan fees.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> <b>H.R. 299</b>, introduced by House Veterans' Affairs Chairman Mark Takano (D-Calif.), and <b>H.R. 203</b>, introduced by ranking member Phil Roe (R-Tenn.), are identical bills viewed as having broad bipartisan support. The House overwhelmingly passed similar legislation last year.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> No companion bill.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Both Takano and Roe have said they would like to pass Blue Water Navy legislation this year even if a recent court ruling stands. That court decision allows veterans who served off the coast of Vietnam to receive a presumption of benefits from illnesses linked to Agent Orange, but does not cover those who served in Korea or Thailand.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The VA opposed similar legislation last year, but recommended to the Justice Department to let the court ruling stand.</p>
VA Restructuring	<p><b>H.R. 2045, S. 1003</b></p> <p>The legislation would establish an Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration at the VA.</p> <p>The bill would shift transition, education and employment programs to the new administration from the Veterans Benefit Administration, which is currently responsible for all VA benefits outside health care and cemetery services.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Rep. Brad Wenstrup (R-Ohio) introduced <b>H.R. 2045</b> on April 3 and it's slated for a markup in May, according to lawmakers.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) introduced <b>S. 1003</b> on April 3 and it was referred to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee.</p>	<p><b>House:</b> Takano and Roe say they intend to support the bill. Takano cosponsored a similar bill in the 115th Congress.</p> <p><b>Senate:</b> Rubio says the bill has strong bipartisan support, but is worried about timing. "My concern is more about where it fits in the traffic jam that is the U.S. Senate," Rubio said.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> The VA opposes the bill.</p>
Veterans Mental Health Care	<p><b>S. 785</b></p> <p>The legislation would require the VA to develop a plan to address mental health counselor and therapist staffing shortages and give the VA direct hiring authority.</p> <p>It also would increase the number of locations at which veterans can access VA telehealth services, and offer grants to organizations that provide transition assistance and mental health services.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Sen. Jon Tester (D-Mont.), the top Democrat on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, introduced the bill on March 13. It's cosponsored by Sen. Jerry Moran (R-Kan.), a senior member of the panel.</p> <p><b>House:</b> No companion bill.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> The bill could get a hearing and markup due to growing frustration about the rate of veterans' suicide, which has hovered at 20 deaths per day for years despite suicide prevention being the VA's top clinical priority.</p> <p><b>Administration:</b> President Donald Trump signed an executive order in March creating a task force charged with developing a road map to prevent veteran suicide.</p>

To contact the reporter: Megan Howard in Washington at [mhoward@bgov.com](mailto:mhoward@bgov.com)

To contact the editors: Zachary Sherwood at [zsherwood@bgov.com](mailto:zsherwood@bgov.com); Loren Duggan at [lduggan@bgov.com](mailto:lduggan@bgov.com)



# Bloomberg Government

## About Us:

Bloomberg Government is a research platform that provides you with focused news and analysis, rich data, expert insights, and more – everything you need to generate opportunity and influence the influencers.

## See it in action.

[about.bgov.com](https://about.bgov.com)