



GPNP

Greater Pittsburgh
Nonprofit Partnership

Thank you to our 2018-2019 Partner Level Sponsor!

**cohen&
grigsby**[®]

Below is a summary of key public policy issues impacting the Pittsburgh region's nonprofit sector.

FEDERAL NEWS

["Pa. GOP supports plan to give majority party more power over redistricting," The Hill, 4/11/18](#)

["House task force on environmental justice urges more diversity at Interior," The Hill, 4/11/18](#)

["Mulaney backs House efforts to amend Senate Dodd-Frank rollback," The Hill, 4/11/18](#)

["House panel approves bipartisan bills aimed at improving the IRS," The Hill, 4/11/18](#)

["Trump signs order calling for work requirements in welfare programs," The Hill, 4/10/18](#)

["Speier introduces bill to end the 'pink tax'," The Hill, 4/10/18](#)

["Perry says he may not declare an electric grid emergency," The Hill, 4/9/18](#)

["Kudlow confronted over attacks on Obama deficit after rejecting CBO's projections on Trump budget," The Hill, 4/9/18](#)

["Trump officials create new exemptions to ObamaCare mandate," The Hill, 4/9/18](#)

["Top insurance official warns of coming ObamaCare premium hikes," The Hill, 4/9/18](#)

PA STATE POLICY NEWS



United Way
of Pennsylvania

Gubernatorial Candidate Survey

Conducted by:
The United Way of Pennsylvania

The goal of this survey is to inform voters about where candidates stand on the following issues in an impartial and nonpartisan manner:

- State Budget
- Financial Stability
- Education
- Community Strengthening
- Health

[Click Here to Learn More About PA Gubernatorial Candidates](#)

Message from the Neighborhood Assistance Coalition

Progress Made on Bill to Increase Cap on NAP Tax Credit

Help Needed to Push it Over the Finish Line

The Neighborhood Assistance Coalition is proud to report movement of HB 645 earlier this week. The Coalition was in Harrisburg to help ensure the bill moved cleanly through second consideration, meaning a final floor vote on the bill could occur as early this week. [HB 645, sponsored by Rep. Bernie O’Neill \(R-Bucks\) and Rep. Dom Costa \(D-Allegheny\)](#), would increase the cap on the tax credit from its current \$18 M to \$36 M. This is a need we and the NAP Coalition have been advocating for, as the NAP program has been consistently over-subscribed in the past few years – sometimes to the tune of over \$40 M. Raising the cap on this true public-private partnership program will allow more business to invest in our struggling communities and it will support other important programs, such as housing and the food banks. We encourage you to weigh in with your House Members. A template letter you can use is attached, and you can find your House Members [here](#). Additionally, feel free to utilize or point folks to the [NAP Coalition’s web site](#) for more information. Please help us get this bill over the finish line in the House!

House GOP approves new proposal for redistricting process changes

Some proponents for changes to how Pennsylvania draws its legislative and congressional districts went from a high on Tuesday to a low on Wednesday. Wednesday morning’s House State Government Committee meeting appears to be a direct response to Tuesday’s announcement of a plan to discharge a redistricting bill from the committee as soon as next Monday. Rep. Steve Samuelson, D-Northampton, informed the full House of Representatives on Tuesday of his intent to call up a discharge resolution on Monday, or any day thereafter, to pull his redistricting commission constitutional amendment, [House](#)

[Bill 722](#), out of the State Government Committee, which, at the time he made his announcement, had yet to act on the bill despite immense pressure by supporters of the bill.

That inaction came to end Wednesday morning, as the committee's Republicans voted during a meeting, that was scheduled not long after Samuelson's Tuesday announcement, to gut and replace the language of Samuelson's bill with an entirely different process to develop district maps for the state House, state Senate and U.S. Congress in Pennsylvania. Committee Democrats complained they had not seen the amendment prior to the meeting and had little time to digest it, which they offered as part of the reason for their opposition to acting on it Wednesday morning. The 15-11 committee party-line vote also stymies Samuelson's discharge attempt, now that the legislation has been acted upon by the committee, with the language of the bill having been entirely altered.

The redistricting process now proposed by HB722 doesn't sound much different than the one that currently exists for state legislative district maps, although the state Supreme Court would no longer have the ability to make an appointment to the redistricting commission, which it currently has as part of the redistricting process for state legislative district maps (the current congressional redistricting process is entirely different). Unlike the four legislators (one from each legislative caucus) that make up the current state legislative redistricting commission, six state legislators, one from each caucus and two elected at large (one from each chamber) would make up the proposed commission. To adopt a map, five of the six members of the commission would have to approve the map. The governor, who isn't currently involved in the state legislative redistricting process but is for congressional redistricting, would be removed from the process entirely under the new version of HB722.

State Rep. Pam DeLissio, D-Montgomery, questioned how the six legislative members were more representative of, and more accountable to, the state's population than, say, the state Supreme Court's seven justices. Republicans noted members of the state Supreme Court may be elected statewide initially, but they don't have to be re-elected – instead standing for a retention vote every 10 years – like lawmakers every 2 or 4 years, which, the GOP argued, means they have little accountability to Pennsylvanians following their initial election.

Additionally, the new HB722 seeks to expand and clarify the criteria on which the legality of maps will be considered, with the stated legislative intent being “to prioritize local considerations and to restrict the use of partisan concerns.” The provisions within the amendment are not unlike what currently exists in the Pennsylvania Constitution for state legislative maps, but the changes do seek to address some of the concerns expressed by Republicans about how the current state Supreme Court determined the 2011 congressional district map to be unconstitutional.

The amendment hits upon the current constitutional requirements for state legislative maps (there are no such requirements written in the constitution for congressional maps) of “compact and contiguous territory as nearly equal in population as practicable.” It also attempts to maintain the geographic integrity of every county, city, incorporated town, borough, township or ward, unless it's “absolutely necessary” to divide them when drawing district lines. However, it also adds that districts should be drawn with consideration given to “the integrity of communities of interest.” And seemingly an attempt to avoid future decisions similar to the one recently made by the state Supreme Court, the amendment prohibits the use of “partisan balance” or “voter efficiency” when developing a map. Both were the primary tools employed by the state's high court to determine the 2011 congressional map was unconstitutional, to reject replacement maps

submitted to the court, and to draw the new map imposed by the court for the next two congressional elections.

The new HB722 states that once preliminary maps are developed by the commission, the public will have 30 days to comment on the maps in the plan. When that 30-day period ends, the commission will have another 30 days to prepare and adopt a revised plan for both state legislative and congressional maps. If the revised plan is unable to get the 5 needed commission votes, the commission will have another 20 days to prepare and adopt a final plan. If the commission still fails to produce enough for the plan, both the revised and final plans will be submitted to the full General Assembly for a vote, with the Legislature given 15 days to approve, by majority vote, one of the two plans.

Critics of the changes claim it would give the majority party all of the power in the redistricting process. Supporters argue those most accountable to the people of Pennsylvania – state legislators - would remain involved in the process, not a wholly unaccountable commission that, despite assertions by some, would not be immune to political bias. The original HB722 would have created an 11-person commission of randomly-selected individuals (from three separate pools of volunteers) intended to equally represent the two major political parties (4 from each party) as well as include 3 individuals who are not registered with either of the two major parties.

Critics of that process claim given how the commission is created, it could still be subject to political bias, and could be gamed by either party. Additionally, they note the original version of HB722 offered no clarity regarding the development of a plan – which was one of the primary issues during the 2011 congressional map situation – and if the commission fails to agree on a redistricting plan, the Supreme Court would be allowed to appoint a single individual to develop a plan, which is what took place during the 2011 map situation, much to the consternation of legislative Republicans. Under the amended version of HB722, challenges of any maps would be made to Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court, which would have the ability to refer back to the Legislature for the development of a new map within 30 days, should the court agree with a map challenge.

When asked by committee minority chairman Rep. Matt Bradford, D-Montgomery, if the new language strips the state Supreme Court of having any jurisdiction over the new maps, Republican legislators indicated appeals could still be made to the state's high court. Bradford also questioned why Commonwealth Court was chosen to hear map challenges, with Rep. Seth Grove, R-York, explaining, "Commonwealth Court is the court of first reprieve for intergovernmental conflict."

At one point during the brief meeting, Bradford and committee Democrats sought to postpone consideration of HB722 and any amendments until after at least one public hearing could be held. The effort to require the committee to hold a hearing between now and next Tuesday failed on a party-line vote. The state Senate has held one public hearing regarding possible redistricting process changes, and intends to hold more, with another hearing by the Senate State Government Committee currently planned for April 24 in the state Capitol.

As all these discussed and considered changes are amendments to the Pennsylvania Constitution, they require General Assembly approval during two consecutive legislative sessions, before the changes would then be put to the full Pennsylvania electorate as a referendum vote. In order to get any such changes passed during the current 2017-18 legislative session, the measure would have to pass before July 6, to allow for the constitutionally-required period to advertise to the public the proposed changes. The next redistricting process will occur following the 2020 Census, so time is running out for those who want to change

that process for the 2022 elections.

· *Source: Capitolwire: "House GOP approves new proposal for redistricting process changes" by Chris Comisac*

House Judiciary Committee launches gun safety hearings

A half-dozen House lawmakers on Monday testified about bills to curb gun violence and protect schools as the House Judiciary Committee launched a round of hearings called in the wake of the Parkland, Fla. high school shooting. Judiciary Chairman Ron Marsico, R-Dauphin, said he is doing something unique by inviting all House lawmakers to testify before the committee on bills they have introduced and their views both pro and con on initiatives. Twenty-seven lawmakers have signed up so far, he added.

During that proceeding, lawmakers offered ideas on the floor and informal votes were taken to determine which measures had support. House lawmakers rejected several gun control proposals, including a statewide ban on assault weapon sales and to limit gun purchases to one a month, while supporting proposals to hire local police officers and toughen criminal penalties. If one proposal appeared to gain momentum at Monday's hearing, it is to keep guns out of the hands of individuals subject to Protection from Abuse orders.

The Senate unanimously passed Senate Bill 501 last month to require those individuals to surrender all guns within 24 hours. The bill also shortens from 60 days to 48 hours the time defendants convicted of misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence must surrender their guns. Rep. Marguerite Quinn, R-Bucks, is sponsoring a similar bill, [House Bill 2060](#), which she plans to align with the Senate-passed bill. Quinn called her bill a domestic violence bill with a firearms component, something Marsico said is important to move.

Rep. Todd Stephens, R-Montgomery, urged support for his proposal to create "extreme risk protective orders" where a family member can petition a court to remove guns from someone who is a danger to themselves or others. He said this would help reduce the number of suicides by gunshot. Rep. Madeleine Dean, D-Montgomery, co-chair of the PA SAFE caucus, expressed support for Stephens' proposal and urged action on PA SAFE-backed bills to ban rapid fire or multi-burst trigger activators ([House Bill 1872](#)) and require owners of lost and stolen guns to report that to law enforcement ([House Bill 832](#)).

Rep. Warren Kampf, R-Montgomery, spoke of strong support among his constituents for gun control measures. He asked for support of his [House Bill 2216](#) to ban sales of high capacity magazines and conversion devices. The hearings continue Tuesday and Wednesday of this week and Monday and Tuesday of next week.

· *Source: Capitolwire: "House Judiciary Committee launches gun safety hearings" by Robert Swift*

Background checks focus of debate at second Judiciary gun hearing

Legislation to expand background checks to include purchases of long guns drew the most debate Tuesday during the second day of hearings by the House Judiciary Committee on gun violence and school safety. Rep. James Santora, R-Delaware, urged passage of his [House Bill 1400](#) which would eliminate most exceptions to the requirement for a background check prior to purchase or transfer of a firearm. The bill would still exempt firearm transfers among family members from the background check requirement. The bill would close loopholes that have given unauthorized individuals access to firearms, said Santora.

Rep. Michael Schlossberg, D-Lehigh, said he thinks two bills discussed at Monday's hearing stand a realistic chance of passage: the Senate-passed

[Senate Bill 501](#), which requires individuals subject to Protection from Abuse orders to surrender all guns within 24 hours, and a proposal by Rep. Todd Stephens, R-Montgomery, to create “extreme risk protective orders” where a family member can petition a court to remove guns from a relative who is a danger to themselves or others. The hearing continues Wednesday and Monday and Tuesday of next week.

· *Source: Capitolwire: “Background checks focus of debate at second Judiciary gun hearing” by Robert Swift*

House committee reports out Medicaid work requirement bill, other welfare-related measure

After roughly two hours of debate Tuesday afternoon, two welfare-related bills were on their way to the full House of Representatives, sent by the House Health Committee. And then some protesters sitting in the committee room began yelling at those who voted for the measures. “It’s health care not welfare, and you really don’t care,” the small group shouted once committee members finished voting on a Medicaid work requirement bill, with some adding “we’re going to vote you out of office.”

The two bills that moved due to mostly party-line 17-9 votes by the committee (one Democrat, Rep. Gerald Mullery, D-Luzerne, joined the committee’s Republican members) were ones that require the forfeiture of additional public assistance (cash assistance or food stamps) allotment once those benefits have gone unused by the eligible individual or family after a six-month period (would [House Bill 1618](#)); and direct the DHS to apply for federal waivers to require work or community engagement as a condition of eligibility for Medical Assistance (Medicaid) for non-elderly, non-pregnant adult beneficiaries who are eligible for the welfare program on a basis other than disability ([House Bill 2138](#)). Republicans on the committee argued the impetus for all of the legislation is to ensure people truly in need receive benefits.

Staff from the Department of Human Services noted more than 27,000 individuals in Pennsylvania have food stamp accounts which have gone unused for at least six months, with only two having benefit balances in excess of \$1,000. In addition to expressing concern that HB1618’s provisions could negatively impact benefit recipients, committee Democrats argued the cost of implementing the proposed change could very well outweigh the amount saved for individuals in need of public assistance benefits. “Is that enough for us to spend a dollar to save a penny,” Rep. Jason Dawkins, D-Philadelphia, said, arguing against the bill and pointing out the roughly 27,000 accounts represent about 1 percent of the more than 1.8 million Pennsylvania food stamp recipients.

After the committee’s Republicans defeated a motion to table the legislation, the committee, along party lines, voted to report the bill out of committee. The measure that drew the ire of the aforementioned protesters isn’t a new proposal, having been sent to the governor this past fall, ultimately for his veto. According to HB2138 sponsor Rep. Matthew Dowling, R-Fayette, Pennsylvania would apply to the federal government (which, under President Donald Trump, has indicated a willingness to allow Medicaid work requirements) for approval of a waiver under Section 1115 of the Social Security Act to require work or community engagement as a condition of eligibility for Medical Assistance. Committee Republican staff indicated HB2138 might differ from the proposal vetoed by Gov. Tom Wolf in October since the new bill was written to comply with federal guidance/policy announced by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on Jan. 11, 2018.

The bill seeks to focus on non-disabled adults, with the following populations

exempted from the legislation's would-be work requirement: anyone attending high school as a full-time student; anyone currently receiving temporary or permanent long-term disability benefits; anyone nineteen years of age or younger or sixty-five years of age or older; anyone who is pregnant; anyone who receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits; anyone residing in a mental health institution or correctional institution; anyone experiencing a crisis, serious medical condition or temporary condition that prevents the Medicaid enrollee from actively seeking employment, including domestic violence or substance use disorder; and anyone who is the primary caregiver to a dependent who is under six years of age or is permanently disabled.

During a March House budget hearing, DHS Secretary Teresa Miller told the committee that more than half of the nondisabled adults receiving Medicaid benefits aren't working. During Tuesday's committee meeting the following figures were presented to members: 495,000, or 51 percent, of the roughly 965,000 non-disabled adults receiving Medicaid benefits report no income. However, noting any such program would be a state-imposed program, Miller argued the cost of the program would be borne solely by the Commonwealth. She stated the work requirement for the SNAP program is paid for by the federal government, and something similar for Medicaid could cost at least \$600 - \$700 million, probably more (due to what Miller said would be a need to hire as many as 300 new employees), although the department, as of the end of March, was still working on developing a firm and final cost estimate.

Miller also told lawmakers the administration – which remains opposed to the proposal – sees the requirement as punishing people in need, potentially stripping them of the health services they would need to remain healthy in order to potentially work. Democrats voiced the same themes employed by Miller last month during budget hearings, instead arguing the state should be looking at better funding services to help individuals overcome their specific barriers to employment.

· *Source: Capitolwire: "House committee reports out Medicaid work requirement bill, other welfare-related measure" By Chris Comisac*

PA Republican Party acts, sorta, about gubernatorial candidate Mango's campaign ad

On Monday, the Pennsylvania Republican Party promised some big news would be made during a Tuesday press conference, and plenty assumed it would have something to do with GOP gubernatorial candidate Paul Mango and one of his campaign ads. It seemed like a logical conclusion, given Mango and [one particular ad](#) have come under fire not only from fellow GOP gubernatorial candidate state Sen. Scott Wagner, but also [the state Republican Party](#), which gave Wagner its endorsement in the GOP gubernatorial primary, and [other GOP faithful](#).

At Tuesday's press event, Wagner, his Lt. Gov. running mate Jeff Bartos, Pennsylvania Republican Party Chairman Val DiGiorgio and Vice Chairwoman Bernie Comfort, along with members of the GOP, called for party unity and again slammed Mango for his ads, using a new internal GOP poll to illustrate they have backfired with voters with a little more than a month to go before the primary election, which is on May 15. [A poll conducted by McLaughlin & Associates](#) that shows Wagner with a 26.6 percentage-point lead over Mango (50.2 percent to 23.6 percent).

This week, on top of refusing to suspend the criticized campaign ads, the Mango campaign stated that two independent polls showed a near dead-heat between he and Wagner, and Mango received the endorsement of former Pennsylvania Republican U.S. Sen. Rick Santorum and his advocacy organization Patriot Voices.

"First, a poll commissioned by the American Principles Project found Wagner and Mango statistically tied, with Wagner leading Mango 20 percent to 18 percent," wrote Mango spokesman Matt Benyon in a press release. "Now, a poll conducted by the highly respected Susquehanna Polling & Research and released by This Week In Pennsylvania on ABC27, showed another statistical dead heat with Wagner leading Mango by just 3 percent: 19 percent to 16 percent."

The McLaughlin & Associates poll released Tuesday by the state Republican Party also indicates a 9.4-percent showing by the third GOP gubernatorial candidate, Laura Ellsworth, who was making some stops in Harrisburg the same day (and also got portions of an op-Ed, criticizing the antics of both Wagner and Mango, [published by PennLive](#)). Ellsworth has been getting some decent press lately, even if, as some suggest, the Wagner/Mango show has been mostly helping Democratic Gov. Tom Wolf's political fortunes.

- Source: *Capitolwire*: "PA Republican Party acts, sorta, about gubernatorial candidate Mango's campaign ad" by Chris Comisac

LEGISLATION

- HB 2100: Act re gift ban for General Assembly
- HB 2155: Amends Public School Code re cert. requirement
- HB 2214: Amends Title 61 re solitary confinement
- HB 2223: Amends Titles 18 & 23 re firearms
- HB 890: Amends Landlord & Tenant Act re lease
- HB 2156: Amends Public School Code re CTE Tax Credit
- HB 2157: Amends Public School Code re CIPs
- HB 2158: Amends Public School Code re career info
- HB 2159: Amends Public School Code re articulation
- HB 2203: Amends Public School Code re resource center
- HB 2224: Amends Title 75 re vehicle property damage
- HB 2225: Amends Title 75 re school bus arm cameras
- HB 2226: Amends Title 18 re vaping products to minors
- HB 2228: Act re Keystone Scholarship Program
- HB 2229: Amends Public School Code re compulsory age
- HB 76: Act re Property Tax Independence Act
- HB 2101: Amends Title 71 re Office of Mgmt & Budget
- HB 2102: Amends Title 71 re tourism & workforce
- HB 2103: Amends Title 71 re local gov. & community
- HB 2104: Amends Title 71 re health & human services
- HB 2105: Act re state government reinvention
- HB 2172: Act re appropriation to Judicial Dept.
- HB 2173: Act re approp to Dept. of Criminal Justice
- HB 2174: Act re appropriations to Executive Offices
- HB 2175: Act re appropriations to PEMA
- HB 2176: Act re appropriations to Office of Lt. Gov.
- HB 2177: Act re approp. to the Civil Service Commission
- HB 2178: Act re approp. to the Legislative Dept.
- HB 2179: Act re appropriations to Insurance Dept.
- HB 2180: Amends Fiscal Code re approp. Provisions
- HB 2181: Act re appropriations to DCED
- HB 2182: Act re approp. to Dept. of Agriculture
- HB 2183: Act re approp. to Dept. of Auditor General

- HB 2184: Act re appropriations to Treasury Dept.
- HB 2185: Act re approp. to Dept. of Labor & Industry
- HB 2186: Act re approp. to State Ethics Commission
- HB 2187: Act re approp. to Dept. of Aging
- HB 2188: Act re approp. to Dept. of Banking & Sec.
- HB 2189: Act re appropriation to DMVA
- HB 2190: Act re approp. to Office of Attorney General
- HB 2191: Act re approp. to Thaddeus Stevens College
- HB 2192: Act re approp. to Milk Marketing Board
- HB 2193: Act re appropriation to PennDOT
- HB 2194: Act re appropriations to PA State Police
- HB 2195: Act re appropriations to PHC4
- HB 2196: Act re appropriations to the Governor
- HB 2197: Act re appropriations to Dept. of State
- HB 2198: Act re appropriations to DCNR
- HB 2199: Act re appropriations to Dept. of Revenue
- HB 2230: Act re approp to State System of Higher Ed
- HB 2231: Act re PA Infrastructure Investment Authority
- HB 2132: Act re approp to PHEAA
- HB 2233: Act re approps to Environmental Hearing Board
- HB 2234: Act re approps to PDE
- HB 2235: Act re making approps to DEP
- HB 2236: Act re approps to DGS
- HB 2237: Act re approps to DDAP
- HB 2238: Act re approps to DOH
- HB 2239: Act re approps to DHS
- HB 2240: Act re approps to PHMC
- HB 2241: Amends Title 53 re soda tax
- HB 2242: Supplement re agricultural colleges
- HB 2243: Supplement re University of Pittsburgh
- HB 2244: Supplement re Temple University
- HB 2245: Supplement re Lincoln University
- HB 2246: Act re UPenn appropriations
- HB 2247: Amends Title 20 re background checks
- HB 2248: Amends Tuition Accounts Program Act re grants
- HB 2249: Amends Title 18 re gun show sales
- HB 2250: Amends Title 18 re firearm sale & transfer
- HB 2251: Amends Title 18 re firearm purchase
- HB 2252: Amends Title 18 re firearm purchase
- HB 2504: Amends ABC-MAP Act re naloxone addition
- HB 2255: Amends Title 64 re BIOS program update
- HB 2258: Amends Title 42 re PGC forfeitures
- SB 1103: Amends Public School Code re school safety
- SB 1075: Amends Title 62 re locally sourced food
- SB 1076: Amends Farmers' Market Dev. Act re funding
- SB 1077: Amends Tax Reform Code re rural jobs
- SB 1095: Amends Public School Code re grad requirements
- SB 1098: Amends Title 75 re school bus arm cameras
- SB 1101: Amends Title 75 re theft vehicle title
- SB 1104: Amends Public School Code re CTE teacher
- SB 299: Amends PA Election Code re nom. Petitions
- SB 1102: Amends Reg. Review Act re reduction
- SB 1117: Act re PSP, PGCB, & AG appropriations
- SB 1118: Act re PUC appropriations

- SB 1119: Act re Workers' Compensation appropriations
- SB 1120: Act re Bureau of Professional & Occupational
- SB 1121: Act re Consumer Advocate appropriation
- SB 1122: Act re Small Business Advocate appropriation
- SB 1124: Act re SERS appropriation
- SB 1125: Act re PSERS appropriation
- SB 1126: Amends Title 42 re training
- SB 1100: Act re PA Fresh Food Financing Initiative
- SB 1128: Amends Title 75 re school vehicles

Prepared By:



STAY CONNECTED

