

LIBERTY. OPPORTUNITY. SECURITY.
MARK WALKER, CHAIRMAN



1. [H.R. 2824: Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act](#)
2. [H.R. 2792: Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017](#)

H.R. 2824: Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act (Rep. Smith, R-NE)

CONTACT: [Matt Dickerson](#), 202-226-9718

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

H.R. 2824 is expected to be considered on September 26, 2017, under a [structured rule](#). Amendments made in order by the rule are described [below](#).

The rule is also provides for consideration of [H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017](#), under a closed rule on September 28, 2017.

The rule provides that, upon passage of both H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792, the Clerk shall combine the two bills in order to send one legislative vehicle to the Senate. This is an example of a [“MIRV” rule](#).

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 2824](#) would reauthorize and provide \$400 million in annual mandatory spending for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program through fiscal year 2022 and make reforms to the program, including by phasing in a requirement that states provide matching funds.

COST:

According to the [Congressional Budget Office](#) (CBO), H.R. 2824 “would reauthorize the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program through fiscal year 2022 and would directly appropriate \$400 million for each fiscal year 2018 through 2022 for the program. CBO estimates that enacting the bill would cost about \$2 billion over the 2017–2027 period.” Under current law, the MIECHV program is provided \$400 million annually in mandatory spending.

Because the rule provides that after passage of the reauthorization of the MIECHV program (H.R. 2824) and the offset for the reauthorization (H.R. 2792), the two bills will be combined, it would be logical for Members to consider the costs of the two bills on a combined basis.

CBO [estimates](#) that “enacting H.R. 2792 would decrease direct spending by about \$2.1 billion over the 2018-2027 period.”

Outlay Effects of H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792 (in millions of Dollars)												
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2017 - 2027
H.R. 2824 (Reauthorization)	0	12	140	300	396	396	384	256	96	0	0	1,980
H.R. 2792 (Offset)	0	0	0	0	-190	-260	-270	-280	-320	-350	-390	-2,060
Combined Total	0	12	140	300	206	136	114	-24	-224	-350	-390	-80

Over the FY 2017 – 2027 period, the combined effect of enacting H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792 would be to reduce outlays by \$80 million; over the FY 2018 – 2022 period covered by the MIECHV reauthorization the combined effect would be to increase outlays by \$794 million.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

Many conservatives may be pleased that the bill makes a number of conservative reforms to the MIECHV program, include by phasing in a state matching funding requirement, improving the focus on achieving self-sufficiency for beneficiaries, and allowing states to adopt pay for success models for their programs.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** Some conservatives may believe that the program funded by the bill would be more appropriately run by state or local governments, or civil society.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

The [Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting](#) (MIECHV) program provides grants to states and tribes to provide for visits by a nurse, social worker, early childhood educator, or other trained professionals to the homes of at-risk pregnant women and parents of young children. States are given some flexibility to implement home visiting programs, but federal funds are generally restricted to 18 types of activities that have been shown to have significant positive outcomes, as shown by the evidence. Because funding is tied to operating programs that are shown to be effective, MIECHV is often referred to as an [“evidence-based” program](#). Under current law, MIECHV receives \$400 million annually in mandatory funding. The program is authorized through FY 2017.

The bill would phase in a state funding matching requirement for the MIECHV program. Specifically, under each state program, federal MIECHV funding could comprise no more than 70 percent of funding in FY 2020, 60 percent in FY 2021, and 50 percent in FY 2022 and thereafter. For Indian tribes, the matching requirement would begin in FY 2022 and federal MIECHV funding could comprise no more than 70 percent of funding. In addition to state and local funds, the bill would permit contributions by non-profits and other federal sources of funds (such as TANF or the Social Services Block Grant) to be used for the match requirement. According to data compiled by CRS for the Committee on Ways and Means, many states already meet or exceed the 50 percent match requirement. In FY 2017, \$340 million in qualifying matching funds were spent by states on home visiting programs. Many conservatives may believe that introducing a matching requirement requires states to have “skin in the game” in carrying out the program, rather than simply spending “free” federal funding. Adding a state matching requirement to MIECHV would align the program with other programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, child support enforcement, and others.

The bill would require states to track and report to HHS on at least four of six potential benchmark areas for how the MIECHV program is improving the lives of beneficiaries. A similar requirement existed over the FY 2012 – 2014 period, but had lapsed. The benchmarks include:

1. improved maternal and newborn health;
2. prevention of child injuries, child abuse, neglect, or maltreatment, and reduction of emergency department visits;
3. improvements in school readiness and achievement;
4. reduction in crime or domestic violence;
5. improvements in family economic self-sufficiency; and
6. improvements in the coordination and referrals for other community resources and supports.

The bill would further require measurements for “improvements in family economic self-sufficiency” to include measures of employment and earnings. [Guidance](#) from former President Obama’s HHS required

self-sufficiency to be measured only in terms of educational attainment or having health insurance coverage. Many [conservatives believe](#) that the goal of all welfare programs should be to empower beneficiaries to be able to transition from dependence and into a productive life of self-sufficiency and earned success.

The bill would allow states to operate home visiting programs using a “pay for success” model, where contractors would only be paid if independent evaluations determine the desired outcome is achieved. The [RSC Budget](#) recommended that pay for success be incorporated into welfare programs.

The bill would require states to conduct a needs assessment by FY 2020 and to target resources to high risk communities. The bill would also require the establishment of data standards to allow for the exchange of information between states.

AMENDMENTS:

1. [Smith \(R-NE\)](#): Would require states to take into account the staffing, community resource, and other requirements in order to carry out at least one model of home visiting for families that reside in communities in need of such services. According to the Committee on Ways and Means, the amendment “Ensures that high-needs communities are not overlooked when states are deciding where to operate home visiting programs.”
2. [Pascrell \(D-NJ\)](#): Would strike the provision in the underlying bill that requires measurements of success home visiting programs in states for “improvements in family economic self-sufficiency” to include measures of employment and earnings.

[Guidance](#) from former President Obama’s HHS required self-sufficiency to be measured only in terms of educational attainment or having health insurance coverage.

Many conservatives may be concerned that this amendment would gut the efforts of the bill meant to further focus the MIECHV program on achieving self-sufficiency for beneficiaries.

3. [DelBene \(D-WA\)](#): Would strike the provision in the underlying bill that phases in a very limited matching requirement for Indian Tribes.

The bill would phase in a state funding matching requirement for the MIECHV program. Specifically, under each state program, federal MIECHV funding could comprise no more than 70 percent of funding in FY 2020, 60 percent in FY 2021, and 50 percent in FY 2022 and thereafter. For Indian tribes, the matching requirement would begin in FY 2022 and federal MIECHV funding could comprise no more than 70 percent of funding.

Many conservatives may believe that introducing a matching requirement requires states and tribes to have “skin in the game” in carrying out the program, rather than simply spending “free” federal funding. Adding a matching requirement to MIECHV would align the program with other programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, child support enforcement, and others.

4. [Murphy \(D-FL\)](#): Would require HHS to take use the most accurate federal data on population and poverty, to the extent that HHS makes grant decisions based upon those factors. According to the Committee on Ways and Means, “Puerto Rico and other territories are not fully accounted for because HHS uses poverty data that does not include territories. This amendment would more accurately identify families in poverty, and the need across states and territories.”

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 2824 was introduced on June 8, 2017, and referred to the House Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce Committees. The Ways and Means Committee marked up and reported the bill on [September 13, 2017](#), by a 22 – 15 vote.

The Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee held a hearing on the MIECHV program on [March 15, 2017](#).

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

No Statement of Administration Policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

“Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.””

H.R. 2792: Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017 (Rep. Noem, R-SD)

CONTACT: [Matt Dickerson](#), 202-226-9718

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

H.R. 2792 is expected to be considered under a [closed rule](#) on September 28, 2017.

The rule is also provides for consideration of H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act, under a [structured rule](#) on September 26, 2017.

The rule is provides that, upon passage of both H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792, the Clerk shall combine the two bills in order to send one legislative vehicle to the Senate. This is an example of a [“MIRV” rule](#).

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 2792](#) would prohibit payment of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits to individuals who are subject to felony arrest warrants or parole violations, beginning in 2021.

COST:

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) [estimates](#) that “enacting H.R. 2792 would decrease direct spending by about \$2.1 billion over the 2018-2027 period.”

Because the rule provides that after passage of the reauthorization of the MIECHV program (H.R. 2824) and the offset for the reauthorization (H.R. 2792), the two bills will be combined, it would be logical for Members to consider the costs of the two bills on a combined basis.

CBO [estimates](#) that H.R. 2824 “would reauthorize the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program through fiscal year 2022 and would directly appropriate \$400 million for each fiscal year 2018 through 2022 for the program. CBO estimates that enacting the bill would cost about \$2 billion over the 2017–2027 period.” Under current law, the MIECHV program is provided \$400 million annually in mandatory spending.

Outlay Effects of H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792 (in millions of Dollars)												
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2017 - 2027
H.R. 2824 (Reauthorization)	0	12	140	300	396	396	384	256	96	0	0	1,980
H.R. 2792 (Offset)	0	0	0	0	-190	-260	-270	-280	-320	-350	-390	- 2,060
Combined Total	0	12	140	300	206	136	114	-24	-224	-350	-390	-80

Over the FY 2017 – 2027 period, the combined effect of enacting H.R. 2824 and H.R. 2792 would be to reduce outlays by \$80 million; over the FY 2018 – 2022 period covered by the MIECHV reauthorization the combined effect would be to increase outlays by \$794 million.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

Many conservatives will be pleased that the bill would withhold welfare payments for individuals who have a warrant for their arrest for the commission of a felony or for violating parole.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 2792 would prohibit the payment of a monthly Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit to any individual who is subject to an arrest warrant for a crime that is a felony or who has a warrant for a violation of a condition of his or her parole. The changes would be effective on January 1, 2021.

As a result of a series of court cases, the Social Security Administration is currently limited in its ability to withhold benefit payments.

OUTSIDE GROUP SUPPORT:

- Social Security Inspector General
- National Sheriffs Association
- Fraternal Order of Police.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 2792 was introduced on June 6, 2017, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee marked up and reported the bill on [September 13, 2017](#), by a 23 – 14 vote.

The text of H.R. 2792 was also originally included as a part of H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

No Statement of Administration Policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

“Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.” No specific enumerating clause was cited.

NOTE: *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###