



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

FY2017 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations: Status and Issues

,name redacted,, Coordinator
Specialist in Social Policy

,name redacted,
Specialist in Social Policy

,name r edacted,
Specialist in Education Policy

,name redacted,
Specialist in Labor Economics

August 1, 2016

Congressional Research Service

7-....

www.crs.gov

R44478

Contents

FY2017 Congressional Action	2
Key Issues and Controversial Topics.....	4
Department of Health and Human Services	5
Department of Education	6
Department of Labor and Related Issues	7
Additional Resources	8

Tables

Table 1. FY2017 LHHS Discretionary 302(b) Suballocations Compared to FY2016	3
Table 2. Status of Full-Year LHHS Appropriations Legislation, FY2016.....	4

Contacts

Author Contact Information	9
----------------------------------	---

The House and the Senate have begun their consideration of annual appropriations for FY2017.¹ Of the 12 bills that are used to consider these appropriations, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies (LHHS) appropriations bill is one of the largest and most controversial. When taking into account both mandatory and discretionary funding,² the bill typically contains over \$800 billion in appropriations each fiscal year. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported their version of the bill on June 9, 2016 (S. 3040); the House Appropriations Committee version was ordered reported on July 14, 2016, and reported to the House on July 22, 2016 (H.R. 5926). Neither House nor Senate floor consideration of the bill has occurred as of the date of this report.

This report provides a brief summary of the general scope of the LHHS appropriations bill, congressional action with regard to the FY2017 bill, selected key issues and controversial topics that have arisen for the bill, and a list of additional resources.

The LHHS bill provides appropriations for the following federal departments and agencies:

- the Department of Labor;
- most agencies at the Department of Health and Human Services, except for the Food and Drug Administration (provided in the Agriculture appropriations bill), the Indian Health Service (provided in the Interior-Environment appropriations bill), and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (also funded through the Interior-Environment appropriations bill);
- the Department of Education; and
- more than a dozen related agencies, including the Social Security Administration, the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.³

When taking into account both mandatory and discretionary appropriations, the LHHS bill is consistently the largest of the 12 annual appropriations acts. The size of the bill reflects the fact that it includes annual appropriations for a number of mandatory spending programs, such as Medicaid and Supplemental Security Income. In fact, mandatory spending typically accounts for the majority of the LHHS bill (about 81% in FY2016).

It is particularly notable that the LHHS bill contains such a large proportion of mandatory appropriations because most mandatory spending is not provided through the annual appropriations process, but rather through budget authority provided by the program's authorizing law (e.g., the Social Security Act). However, while the levels of spending for appropriated entitlements like Medicaid are controlled by requirements in authorizing law, the laws lack the appropriations to fund those entitlements. As a consequence, those appropriations are provided through the annual appropriations process.

¹ For further information with regard to the annual appropriations process, see CRS Report R42388, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

² The congressional budget process distinguishes between discretionary spending, which is controlled through appropriations acts, and mandatory (or direct) spending, which is controlled through permanent law. The annual appropriations process is also used to provide appropriations necessary to finance certain mandatory spending programs that lack a funding source in the authorizing statute, which is referred to as "appropriated mandatory" or "appropriated entitlement" spending. For further information, see *ibid*.

³ For further information, see CRS Report R41716, *The Social Security Administration (SSA): Budget Request and Appropriations*, by (name redacted) ; and CRS Report RL33931, *The Corporation for National and Community Service: Overview of Programs and Funding*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

In general, the appropriations process has little control over the amounts provided for appropriated entitlements; rather, the authorizing statute controls the program parameters (e.g., eligibility rules, benefit levels) that entitle certain recipients to payments. If the money necessary to meet these commitments is not appropriated, entitled recipients (e.g., individuals, states, or other entities) may have legal recourse. Because the amount of appropriated mandatory spending is not determined through the appropriations process, discretionary appropriations tend to receive the most attention during the consideration of the LHHS bill, even though they account for less than a quarter of total LHHS appropriations.

Furthermore, while discretionary appropriations represent a relatively small share of the entire LHHS bill, those funds are typically the largest single source of nondefense discretionary appropriations for the federal government (the Department of Defense bill is the largest single source of discretionary appropriations overall).⁴ In FY2016, for instance, the LHHS bill accounted for about 31% of all nondefense discretionary appropriations and about 14% of all discretionary appropriations.⁵

FY2017 Congressional Action

FY2017 LHHS appropriations are being considered in the context of statutory and procedural constraints on discretionary spending. The statutory constraints are provided through the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA; P.L. 112-25, as amended), which imposes separate limits on defense and nondefense discretionary spending each fiscal year.⁶ The LHHS bill is subject to the nondefense limit, which is \$518.5 million for FY2017. Amounts provided under the nondefense limit are typically distributed across all 12 of the annual appropriations acts, while only about half of the acts also receive appropriations that are subject to the defense limit.⁷ Separately, the congressional budget process also provides a means of procedural budget enforcement through the adoption of a budget resolution. The budget resolution provides an overall limit on spending allocated to the House and the Senate appropriations committees (referred to as a “302(a) allocation”). The appropriations committees subsequently divide the 302(a) allocation among

⁴ For further information about historic trends in defense and nondefense discretionary spending, see Figure 3 in CRS Report RL34424, *The Budget Control Act and Trends in Discretionary Spending*, by (name redacted).

⁵ Calculated by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on amounts appropriated in the FY2016 omnibus, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and reported in *Fiscal Year 2016 Senate Current Status of Discretionary Appropriations*, December 31, 2015, available at <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/50227>. The LHHS bill contains 31% of discretionary appropriations that are subject to the statutory limits on nondefense spending. These are discussed further in the section “FY2017 Congressional Action.” The bill contains about 14% of all discretionary appropriations, including those that are effectively exempt from the statutory limits.

⁶ For further information with regard to the BCA spending limits, see Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2017*, February 9, 2016, available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/sequestration/sequestration_preview_report_fy17_house.pdf.

⁷ In addition to implementing statutory discretionary spending limits, the BCA also requires sequestration (i.e., automatic across-the-board reductions) of nonexempt mandatory spending programs for each of FY2013-FY2025. President Obama has already released the required FY2017 sequestration order and the Office of Management and Budget has estimated that the sequestration percentages will equal 2% of nonexempt Medicare spending and 6.9% of other nonexempt nondefense mandatory spending, for a total reduction of \$18 billion in FY2017. OMB also estimated a 9.1% reduction, totaling \$728 million, in nonexempt defense mandatory spending, but this only applies to components of two LHHS accounts that fund activities associated with the Energy Employee Illness Occupational Compensation Program Act. *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2017*, February 9, 2016, https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/sequestration/jc_sequestration_report_2017_house.pdf.

each of their 12 subcommittees, effectively establishing limits on each of the annual appropriations bills (commonly referred to as “302(b) suballocations”).⁸ These subcommittee levels may be revised throughout the FY2017 appropriations process to reflect changing priorities and other budgetary actions.

The House and the Senate have not yet adopted a budget resolution for FY2017.⁹ In its absence, the Senate Budget Committee chair has filed budgetary levels in the *Congressional Record* that are enforceable in the Senate as if they had been included in a budget resolution for FY2017.¹⁰ Based on these levels, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported their initial 302(b) suballocations on April 18, 2016; these suballocations were subsequently revised on May 12, May 18, June 8, and June 26, 2016.¹¹ In the absence of a budget resolution in the House, the House Appropriations Committee has chosen to adopt “interim 302(b) suballocations” for the appropriations bills as those bills are marked up in full committee.¹² These interim suballocations are not procedurally enforceable. An interim suballocation for the LHHS subcommittee was adopted by the House Appropriations Committee on the same day that the bill was ordered reported out of committee, on July 14, 2016.¹³

Table 1 displays the Senate FY2017 LHHS suballocation along with comparable FY2016 appropriations. Under the current Senate suballocation, FY2017 discretionary LHHS appropriations would be reduced by \$270 million compared to FY2016. The House interim suballocation assumes a reduction of \$569 million. Both of these reductions are less than 1% of the FY2016 total for LHHS.

Table 1. FY2017 LHHS Discretionary 302(b) Suballocations Compared to FY2016
(Budget authority in billions)

FY2016 Comparable	FY2017 House Interim 302(b)	FY2017 Senate 302(b)
\$162.127	\$161.558	\$161.857

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). FY2016 comparable is the discretionary appropriations for LHHS, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office (*Fiscal Year 2016 Senate Current Status of Discretionary Appropriations*, December 31, 2015, available at <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/50227>). The FY2017 Senate 302(b) suballocations are as reported in S.Rept. 114-286 (June 27, 2016). The FY2017 House Interim 302(b) suballocations are as posted on the House Appropriations Committee website on July 14, 2016.

⁸ For an illustration of how this process worked for the FY2016 appropriations measures, see CRS Report R44062, *Congressional Action on FY2016 Appropriations Measures*, by (name redacted) .

⁹ For a discussion of budget enforcement mechanisms that may be adopted in the absence of a budget resolution, see CRS Report R44296, *Deeming Resolutions: Budget Enforcement in the Absence of a Budget Resolution*, by (name redacted); and CRS Report R43535, *Provisions in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 as an Alternative to a Traditional Budget Resolution*, by (name redacted) .

¹⁰ The authority for these actions is provided by Section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-74). The levels were filed by the Senate Budget Committee chair on April 18, 2016. (“Allocation of Spending Authority to Senate Committee on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2017,” *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 162, no. 59 (April 18, 2016), p. S2121.) No comparable authority for the House Budget Committee chair was provided by the Bipartisan Budget Act.

¹¹ These revisions did not alter the amount of budget authority that was initially allocated to the LHHS subcommittee. (see S.Rept. 114-238, S.Rept. 114-253, S.Rept. 114-257, S.Rept. 114-273, and S.Rept. 114-286).

¹² These interim suballocations are available on the House Appropriations Committee website, at <http://appropriations.house.gov/files/?CategoryID=34785>.

¹³ See, “Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2017,” Submitted by Mr. Rogers, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 14, 2016, available at http://appropriations.house.gov/uploadedfiles/07.14.16_revised_suballocation_of_budget_allocations_for_fy_2017.pdf.

http://appropriations.house.gov/uploadedfiles/07.14.16_revised_suballocation_of_budget_allocations_for_fy_2017.pdf.

Notes: These amounts reflect current-year discretionary budget authority subject to spending limits. FY2016 comparable amounts exclude funds for program integrity activities (\$1.5 billion) for which special rules apply under the Budget Control Act. It is common for suballocations to be revised over the course of the year to reflect actual action on appropriations bills and changes in congressional priorities.

Table 2 displays congressional action on full year FY2017 LHHS appropriations that has occurred thus far. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported its version of the FY2017 LHHS appropriations bill on June 9, 2016 (S. 3040) by a vote of 29-1. (The LHHS subcommittee had reported the bill two days prior by a voice vote.) About one month later, the House Appropriations Committee’s version of the bill was approved in subcommittee on July 7, 2016, by a voice vote. It was ordered reported by the full committee on July 14, 2016, by a vote of 31-19, and reported to the House on July 22, 2016. In the last decade, initial subcommittee action on the LHHS bill has begun as early as June and as late as September.¹⁴

Table 2. Status of Full-Year LHHS Appropriations Legislation, FY2016

Subcommittee Markup		Resolution of House and Senate Differences							
House	Senate	House Report	House Initial Passage	Senate Report	Senate Initial Passage	Conf. Report	House Final Passage	Senate Final Passage	Public Law
H.R. 5926	S. 3040	H.Rept. 114-699		S.Rept. 114-274					
7/7/16	6/7/16	7/14/16		6/9/16					
voice vote	voice vote	31-19		29-1					

Source: CRS Appropriations Status Table.

Key Issues and Controversial Topics

The LHHS bill is typically considered one of the more controversial of the regular appropriations bills. This is due not only to its size, but also to the scope of its programs and related policy issues. For instance, the LHHS bill is also commonly used to establish restrictions on the use of federal funds for abortions, research on human embryos and stem cells, and activities that might be perceived as promoting gun control.¹⁵ Both the House and the Senate appropriations committees’ versions of the bill propose to retain all of these provisions.

¹⁴ In two cases during the last 10 years (FY2012 and FY2014), the House Appropriations LHHS Subcommittee did not take any action on the LHHS bill.

¹⁵ For an overview of common restrictions included in the LHHS bill, see the “Funding Restrictions Related to Certain Controversial Issues” section of CRS Report R44287, *Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education: FY2016 Appropriations*, coordinated by (name redacted) and (name redacted) . For historical information on provisions related to abortions, see CRS Report RL33467, *Abortion: Judicial History and Legislative Response*, by (name redacted) . For historical information on provisions related to human embryos, CRS Report RL33540, *Stem Cell Research: Science, Federal Research Funding, and Regulatory Oversight*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

Department of Health and Human Services

The congressional debate over the FY2017 LHHS bill is taking place amid broader discussions of the federal government's role in combatting heroin and prescription opioid abuse, responding to the effects of lead contamination in Flint, MI, and controlling the spread of the Zika virus.¹⁶ (This debate has occurred—and may continue to occur—through a variety of legislative avenues, including supplemental appropriations and authorizing legislation.¹⁷) For the FY2017 LHHS bill, both the House and the Senate appropriations committees propose increasing budgetary resources for heroin and prescription opioid abuse treatment and prevention programs within HHS. The House and the Senate committees also would fully fund the amount requested by the President for the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning program.¹⁸ On the topic of Zika response, however, while the House committee indicates funding that would be specifically for that purpose, the Senate committee does not. In addition, the House committee version of the LHHS bill proposes the creation of a new Infectious Diseases Rapid Response Fund within the CDC, which would be funded with an initial appropriation of \$300 million.

Recent debates surrounding the LHHS bill also have reflected concerns over how (or whether) to implement certain aspects of health care reform.¹⁹ Such debates have resulted in new provisions within the bill, such as those from FY2015 and FY2016 that prevent certain funds from being used to make risk corridor payments associated with health insurance exchanges.²⁰ For FY2017, the Senate Appropriations Committee-reported version of the bill proposes to continue both that restriction on risk corridor payments, as well as all of the other ACA-related provisions that were enacted in FY2016.²¹ Similarly, the House Appropriations Committee proposes that all of those provisions be continued (with one exception²²); the committee also proposes a number of new provisions that would curb HHS activities, or the use of HHS funds, for ACA-related purposes. Furthermore, the House committee version of the LHHS bill incorporates the Health Care Conscience Rights Act (H.R. 940), which would amend the ACA so that individuals/employers would not have to purchase or sponsor coverage of abortion or other items or services to which they have a moral or religious objection.

¹⁶ For background on all of these issues, see CRS Report R44375, *SAMHSA FY2017 Budget Request and Funding History: A Fact Sheet*, by (name redacted) CRS Report R43559, *Prescription Drug Abuse*, by (name redacted) et al. CRS Insight IN10446, *Lead in Flint, Michigan's Drinking Water: Federal Regulatory Role*, by (name redacted) and CRS Report R44549, *Supplemental Appropriations for Zika Response: The FY2016 Conference Agreement in Brief*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

¹⁷ For example, the conference report for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016, which relates to opioid addiction, has been adopted by the House and the Senate (S. 524). Both the House and the Senate have considered a conference report on a supplemental appropriations measure that would provide funding for the Zika response, but that conference report has not been adopted by both chambers (see Divisions B-D of H.R. 2577).

¹⁸ The Senate Appropriations Committee proposes \$17 million for the Childhood Lead Poisoning program, which is equal to the amount requested. The House Appropriations Committee proposes \$17.5 million for that program.

¹⁹ More information about health care reform is available on the CRS website at <http://www.crs.gov/Cli/SubIssue?cliid=3746>.

²⁰ For more information on restrictions previously placed on health care reform through the LHHS bill, as well as those proposed for FY2017, see CRS Report R44100, *Use of the Annual Appropriations Process to Block Implementation of the Affordable Care Act (FY2011-FY2017)*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

²¹ The prohibition on the use of funds for risk corridor payments is in Section 225 of S. 3040.

²² The FY2016 provision authorizing the transfer of Medicare trust funds to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account was not included in the House Appropriations Committee version of the FY2017 LHHS bill. The FY2016 bill restricted HHS from using these additional funds to support the ACA.

Department of Education²³

Congressional debate on FY2017 funding for the Department of Education (ED) has focused primarily (but not exclusively) on implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; P.L. 114-95)—which in 2015 reauthorized provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the first time since enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001—and on undergraduate student aid.²⁴ FY2017 is the first year of funding for many ESSA-authorized programs and activities, including the reauthorized Title I-A program and the new Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program (commonly known as the “Title IV block grant”).²⁵ With respect to student aid, the FY2017 appropriations conversation has centered on proposals to revive and pay for the so-called “year round” Pell Grant, which was eliminated in FY2011, and on whether to tap the Pell Grant program’s estimated discretionary funding surplus.²⁶

The two largest sources of discretionary funding for elementary and secondary education in the LHHS bill are the Title I-A program and the special education programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, P.L. 108-446).²⁷ Both the House and the Senate committee-reported bills would provide around a half billion more in funding for Title I-A in FY2017 (compared to FY2016)—the second year in a row that the program would receive a year-over-year increase of this magnitude.²⁸ With respect to the Special Education account, the House bill recommends more funding (overall) than the Senate bill in FY2017. However, the House bill would provide funding at or below FY2016 levels for most programs while increasing funding for IDEA, Part B, Grants to States; the Senate bill would provide funding at or slightly above FY2016 levels for all programs.

²³ For more information about key terms and concepts related to ED funding, see CRS Report R44477, *Department of Education Funding: Key Concepts and FAQ*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

²⁴ In addition to funding provisions, both House and the Senate committee-reported bills also include education-related policy provisions, though these were not the central focus of debate during markup in either committee (with the exception of year-round Pell Grants). Some of the policy provisions are long-standing—such as the decades-old provision prohibiting funds from being used to provide transportation for the purpose of racial desegregation (e.g., bussing; see P.L. 114-113, Division H, Sec. 301)—while others are new. New policy provisions in FY2017 include those in the Senate committee-reported bill that would authorize and pay for year-round Pell (S. 3040, Sec. 310), and a provision in the House committee-reported bill that would limit ED’s ability to enforce the May 13, 2016, Office of Civil Rights Dear Colleague Letter on transgender students (H.R. 5926, Sec. 311). Other provisions in the House bill address ED’s rules on gainful employment, teacher preparation, and the federal definition of a credit hour (Sec. 310).

²⁵ For more information, see CRS Report R44461, *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) ; and see CRS Report R44297, *Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Highlights of the Every Student Succeeds Act*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

²⁶ For more information, see CRS Report R42446, *Federal Pell Grant Program of the Higher Education Act: How the Program Works and Recent Legislative Changes*, by (name redacted) .

²⁷ For more information, see CRS Report R41833, *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B: Key Statutory and Regulatory Provisions*, by (name redacted) .

²⁸ In FY2016, the Title I-A program received a \$500 million increase over the prior year, while the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program was funded at \$450 million (an 11% decrease). For FY2017, House and Senate appropriators recommend a second, commensurate year-over-year increase in Title I-A—\$450 million and \$500 million, respectively—and recommend no funding for SIG. The Senate committee report notes that its FY2017 recommendation consolidates SIG funding into Title I-A. (See S.Rept. 114-274, p. 166.) The ESSA did not reauthorize the SIG program and the Administration did not seek funding for the program in FY2017. Within Title I-A in FY2017, the Senate committee bill would increase funding for Targeted Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants, while the House committee bill would increase funding for Basic Grants.

As enacted, ESSA authorizes \$1.65 billion for the new Title IV block grant program in FY2017. The House committee-reported bill recommends a funding level (\$1 billion) that is closer to the ESSA-authorized amount, while the Senate committee-reported bill recommends an amount that is closer to the combined FY2016 appropriations total for programs that were eliminated and consolidated into the Title IV block grant (\$300 million).²⁹ It is unclear if the proposed funding for the Title IV block grant program, which is substantially lower than authorized, would provide sufficient resources to local educational agencies (LEAs) to carry out the program.³⁰ (This has been the focus of some debate.)

A notable difference between the House and the Senate committee-reported bills is in their respective approaches to the Pell Grant program. The Senate committee bill would allow students to receive Pell Grants year-round, while the House committee bill would not.³¹ Further, although there are differences in the way the House and the Senate appropriations committees would treat mandatory and discretionary Pell Grant program resources, as a practical matter both bills would provide similar levels of total budget authority for the program in FY2017 and each would provide a maximum award of \$5,935. The significance of the difference in approaches is in the effect on the Pell Grant program surplus and the provision (or not) of year-round Pell Grants.³² The surplus would be smaller, to pay for year-round Pell Grants, under the Senate committee-reported bill.

Department of Labor and Related Issues

The LHHS bill also remains a vehicle for active debates over the appropriate scope of federal policies related to labor standards and labor relations. In recent years, for example, the bill has included provisions prohibiting the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) from issuing new regulations related to union election rules and how prevailing wages are determined in the H-2B program. Both the House and the Senate appropriations committees propose to continue these provisions. In addition, prior to consideration of the FY2017 LHHS appropriations, there was some congressional interest in including new provisions in the bill related to recent NLRB decisions on joint employer standards and union election rules, as well as recent regulations from the Department of Labor, such as the fiduciary rule and the white collar overtime exemption.³³

²⁹ See S.Rept. 114-274, p. 173.

³⁰ As authorized, the Title IV block grant provides grants to states by statutory formula. States, in turn, use those funds to provide sub-grants to LEAs—also by formula. At lower levels of total program funding, LEAs may receive commensurately smaller sub-grants and may be unable to carry out the purposes of the program. In the FY2017 President's request, the Administration sought \$500 million for the Title IV block grant program and proposed appropriations language that would allow states to award sub-grants on a competitive basis, rather than on a formula basis. The House and Senate committee bills do not include language to allow states to award sub-grants on a competitive basis.

³¹ Pell Grants typically limit full-time students to the equivalent of two semesters of Pell Grant awards. Students who wish to attend an additional semester (or summer term classes) are ineligible for additional Pell Grant aid. The Senate committee-reported bill proposes a year-round Pell Grant provision that would allow eligible students to receive up to 150% of the maximum Pell Grant award in a single award year if enrolled for additional payment periods (e.g., an additional semester). For more information about the program, see CRS Report R42446, *Federal Pell Grant Program of the Higher Education Act: How the Program Works and Recent Legislative Changes*, by (name redacted).

³² The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the program will have a \$7.8 billion surplus by the end of FY2016. See Congressional Budget Office, *Federal Pell Grant Program: Cumulative Shortfall/Surplus and Available Funding*, March 2016 Baseline, at <https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/51304-2016-03-PellGrant.pdf>.

³³ See Dear Colleague Letter to Chairman Cole and Ranking Member DeLauro, March 23, 2016. See also Ben Weyl and Matthew Nussbaum, "Politico Pro Q&A with Rep. Tom Cole," *PoliticoPro*, March 24, 2016; and Gayle Cinguegrani, "Overtime Proposed Rule would Make Workers Earning Below \$50,440 Eligible," *Bloomberg BNA*, June (continued...)

Both the House and the Senate appropriations committees propose to continue provisions from the FY2016 act related to labor standards and labor relations. Some of these major labor-related provisions include the following:³⁴

- an allowance for employers to use “staggered crossings” for non-immigrants working in the seafood industry under the H-2B visa program;
- a requirement for the Secretary of Labor to accept private wage surveys in the determination of prevailing wages in the H-2B program; and
- a prohibition on the NLRB from issuing new regulations on electronic voting for union elections.

Notably, the House committee version of the LHHS bill also includes additional labor provisions that the Senate committee version does not, including prohibitions on implementing regulations on the fiduciary rule, the white collar exemption overtime rule, and the joint employer standards.³⁵

Additional Resources

The following resources provide additional information on the status of congressional action on FY2017 appropriations, as well as the LHHS bill as a whole:

- CRS Appropriations Status Table: FY2017, available at <http://www.crs.gov/AppropriationsStatusTable/Index>.
- CRS Report R44287, *Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education: FY2016 Appropriations*, coordinated by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .
- Additional CRS reports addressing key funding questions for the programs and agencies funded by the LHHS appropriations bill are available on the CRS website at <http://www.crs.gov/CLI/SubIssue?cliid=2347>.

(...continued)

30, 2015.

³⁴ In the Senate Appropriations Committee-reported bill (S. 3040), these provisions are in Sections 109 (H-2B “staggered crossings”), 110 (H-2B prevailing wage), and 406 (electronic voting). In the House Appropriations Committee version (H.R. 5926), these provisions are in Sections 112 (H-2B “staggered crossings”), 113 (H-2B prevailing wage), and 407 (electronic voting).

³⁵ In the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill (H.R. 5926), the fiduciary rule provision is in Section 110, the white collar exemption overtime rule provisions is in Section 111, and the joint employer standard provision is in Section 410.

Author Contact Information

(name redacted), Coordinator
Specialist in Social Policy
f[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

(name redacted)
Specialist in Education Policy
f[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

(name redacted)
Specialist in Social Policy
f[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

(name redacted)
Specialist in Labor Economics
f[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

Key Policy Staff

Area of Expertise	Name	Phone	Email
LHHS Coordinators	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
Department of Labor			
Coordinator, DOL	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
Job training and employment services	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Mine Safety and Health Administration	Scott Szymendera	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Occupational Safety and Health Admin.	Scott Szymendera	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Office of Workers' Compensation	Scott Szymendera	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Older Americans Act, employment programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Pension and welfare benefits	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Trade adjustment assistance	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Unemployment compensation	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Veterans employment	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Wage and hour standards	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act (WIOA)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Health and Human Services			
Coordinator, HHS	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
Coordinator, HHS	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
Abortion procedures	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
AIDS, Ryan White programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Bioterrorism, HHS funding	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov

Area of Expertise	Name	Phone	Email
Cancer research	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crsloc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Chafee Foster Care Independence and Education/Training Voucher Programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Child abuse and neglect, child welfare	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Child care and development	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP; funded in authorizing laws, not LHHS)	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.logov
Community Services Block Grant	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Developmental Disabilities Act	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Elder abuse and neglect, elder justice	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Family Planning, Title X	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Federal health centers	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Food and Drug Administration (FDA; funded through Agriculture appropriations, not LHHS)	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Foster care and adoption	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Global health; international AIDS, TB, and malaria	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Head Start	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Health professions/health workforce programs	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Immunization	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Indian Health Service (IHS; funded through Interior-Environment appropriations, not LHHS)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Medicaid	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Mentoring programs for vulnerable youth	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Needle exchange, AIDS	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
NIH, health research policy	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Older Americans Act	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov

Area of Expertise	Name	Phone	Email
	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Pandemic/seasonal influenza	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Prevention and Public Health Fund (directly appropriated by Affordable Care Act, not LHHS)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Randolph-Sheppard Act	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Refugee Resettlement Assistance	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Runaway and Homeless Youth Act	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Social Services Block Grant	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Stem cell research, cloning	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF; funded in authorizing laws, not LHHS)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Department of Education			
Coordinator, ED	(name redacted)	7-....	-redacted-@crs.loc.gov
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and accountability	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Adult education and literacy	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
After-school programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Assessment in education	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Career and technical education	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Charter schools/school choice	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
College costs and prices	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Education block grants	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Elementary and secondary education	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
English language acquisition	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Higher education	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Impact Aid	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Indian education	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
International Education Programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Legal issues related to education in general	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Pell Grants	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Reading programs	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Rehabilitation Act	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov

Area of Expertise	Name	Phone	Email
School and Campus Safety	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Special education, IDEA	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Special education, IDEA, legal issues	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Student financial assistance/need analysis	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Student loans	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Teacher recruitment, preparation, & training	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/ @crs.loc.gov
Vocational rehabilitation	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Related Agencies			
Committee for Purchase from People Who are Blind or Severely Disabled (U.S. Ability One Commission)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Corporation for National & Community Service (VISTA, Senior Corps, AmeriCorps)	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	(name redacted) (name redacted)	7-.... 7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov /redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Institute of Museum and Library Services	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
National Labor Relations Board	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
National Labor Relations Board, legal issues	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
National Mediation Board	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Railroad Retirement Board	Scott Szymendera	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Social Security Administration (SSA), administrative expenses	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov
Supplemental Security Income (SSI)	(name redacted)	7-....	/redacted/@crs.loc.gov

EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.