



Policy Resolution Group Reconciliation & Infrastructure Update

October 22, 2021

Please find below the latest addition of the Policy Resolution Group's FY2022 Budget Reconciliation & Infrastructure Update.

Included in this newsletter are sections on:

- State of Infrastructure and Reconciliation Negotiations
- Reconciliation Climate Policies: ~~CEPP, Carbon Tax~~, Clean Energy Incentives with Christine Wyman
- Liam Donovan's Bottom Line
- The Rundown with Yasmin Nelson
- Coverage of the House Energy and Commerce Committee Hearing on Offshore Wind Energy
- Document Library

State of Infrastructure and Reconciliation Negotiations

Negotiations over the Build Back Better reconciliation package made significant headway this past week, although there are still hurdles to getting a bill that will satisfy both moderate and progressive Democrats across the finish line.

There is still little certainty over what provisions will be included in the final reconciliation bill, as Democrats continue to look for ways of scaling back programs to fulfill Senate moderates Joe Manchin (D-WV) and Kyrsten Sinema's (D-AZ) demands for a top line of \$1.5 trillion in spending over 10 years. With Sen. Manchin reiterating his opposition to the Clean Electricity Performance Program (CEPP) and a carbon tax, Democrats are frantically attempting to cobble together climate provisions to meet their emissions reductions targets while remaining in compliance with the Byrd rule, likely forcing them to turn to clean energy tax credits and loan guarantees.

On the social spending front, Sen. Manchin's demands to scale back the Child Tax Credit and to reinstate work requirements have caused headaches among most of the Democratic Party that view the policies as essential to their chances in the 2022 midterm elections. Meanwhile, Sen. Sinema's continued opposition to higher corporate and individual tax rates makes it even more difficult to pay for the programs that progressives want included in the final bill. To try and reduce the bill's top line

estimate, Democrats have looked to shaving off the number of years funded for social spending programs and entirely eliminating others.

A Thursday agreement between President Biden and Sen. Sinema offers a potential light at the end of the tunnel to resolve disputes over how the bill will be paid for. According to one source, she “has agreed to provisions in each of President Biden's four proposed revenue categories — international, domestic corporate, high net worth individuals, and tax enforcement — providing sufficient revenue to fully pay for a budget reconciliation package in the range currently being discussed.” It will still take some heavy lifting to finalize the text of the sweeping bill, finish the requisite budgetary analyses, and pass it through both chambers. Democratic leadership is projecting confidence that they can pass both the infrastructure and reconciliation bills before the end of the month, with the looming Virginia gubernatorial election on the horizon.

Reconciliation Climate Policies: CEPP, ~~Carbon Tax~~, Clean Energy Incentives with Christine Wyman

For several weeks now, Senator Manchin has been clear that he has concerns with the Clean Electricity Performance Program (CEPP) – the mechanism contained within the House reconciliation bill that would pay electricity suppliers for providing increased amounts of clean electricity and penalize them for not meeting the stated clean electricity goals. Since the start of the reconciliation negotiations, the CEPP, combined with the host of clean energy tax incentives, had been described by Democratic leadership as the most important climate policies in achieving President Biden’s emissions reduction goals. And now it appears that neither reconfiguring the CEPP nor political willpower can overcome Senator Manchin’s concerns with “using taxpayer dollars to pay private companies to do things they’re already doing.”

The demise of the CEPP creates a fairly significant hole in the portfolio of climate policies that, taken together, would put the U.S. on a trajectory for meeting President Biden’s climate targets in advance of COP26. Which begs the question whether there is an alternative policy that could provide similar carbon emission reductions and appeal politically to Democrats in Congress.

For a brief moment it was reported that this alternative policy was a carbon tax. Perhaps the carbon tax was floated as an alternative worse than the CEPP in an attempt to drive support back to the CEPP. Regardless of the motivation, the idea of a carbon tax was short lived as a result of quick and decisive opposition from Senators Manchin and Tester, as well as what was seen as unusual design principles.

As reported in the [New York Times](#), the carbon tax under discussion would increase over time, possibly starting around \$15 to \$18 per ton, and would be imposed on the energy industry, but at different points in the value chain for each energy source, likely an attempt to shield more vulnerable segments of the industry and navigate the complicated politics of a carbon tax. For example, as discussed, the tax would apply directly to coal production, but for natural gas, it would apply to natural gas processing facilities, which are downstream of production. Gasoline would be excluded in an attempt to shield drivers at the pump, oil refiners would be taxed for production of diesel fuel and petrochemicals.

Without the CEPP or a carbon tax, the reconciliation bill still has significant incentives for emissions reductions, primarily in the form of the clean energy tax provisions that Democrats are now seeking to augment to make up for the reductions lost from the CEPP. These could include additional drivers for advanced nuclear — through a combination of tax credits and grants — or carbon capture — through adjustments to 45Q thresholds and rates, as well as allowing for direct pay. In addition, changes to the Department of Energy’s Loan Guarantee Office are being considered that would allow for the use

of government guaranteed funds to serve as the initial payment, thus expanding the universe of clean energy technology companies that could qualify for the program—a programmatic change that could drive emission reductions without increasing the cost of the reconciliation package, a theme that we may see as Democratic leaders in Congress attempt to balance the cost of the program against the desired emission reductions to bring to the table at COP26.

Liam Donovan's Bottom Line

Liam Donovan's Bottom Line: Biden Leans In. If you were looking for a sign that things were getting serious on Capitol Hill, you finally have it in the form of this week's unprecedented White House engagement. After months of laissez faire legislative strategy, the President sought to accelerate a stagnant process, lowering his sights on the topline target number, previewing his vision to pare down the package with House progressives, and pressing one of the key moderate holdouts on alternative financing mechanisms before delivering a wide-ranging primetime update on national television. While the goal of a framework agreement this week may prove out of reach, the administration and Democratic leaders are for the first time projecting a unified sense of urgency with a self-imposed October 31 deadline on the horizon, along with other key political waypoints.

The case for an imminent deal and a smooth, efficient legislative process is predicated on what Senate Leader Chuck Schumer termed "universal agreement...to come to an agreement" at the caucus policy lunch on Tuesday. And with reports indicating that Senator Kyrsten Sinema has agreed to enough non-rate revenue sources to pay for a package in Biden's desired range, the necessary members are all playing ball, at least in their own right.

But for all the renewed optimism and momentum being projected by Democrats in their public statements, many of the difficult choices and policy questions remain very much in flux. While the broad contours of the spending side seem to be acceptable to most members, structural questions persist, not least Senator Joe Manchin's stated concerns regarding short term policies obscuring the bill's true cost. And while clean energy tax incentives have been reaffirmed as a centerpiece of the bill's climate section, policymakers are scrambling to meet the administration's ambitious emissions reduction goals amid the apparent demise of the Clean Energy Payment Plan (CEPP). Perhaps most importantly, the bill's financing mechanisms remain completely up in the air. Senator Sinema's reluctance to raise rates or reform drug pricing not only casts aside half of the roughly \$3 trillion in House offsets, it rules out several of the largest, simplest, and most palatable revenue sources at their disposal. Plugging these holes with lesser known, poorly vetted, and more complex revenue mechanisms will take time and effort to craft and sell to the rest of the party. And ultimately the dance of legislation could entail a conference committee to work out any remaining differences between House- and Senate-passed products.

Should House leadership meet their stated goal of passing both the bipartisan infrastructure bill (BIF) and the Build Back Better Act (BBBA) reconciliation package next week, it would provide President Biden a significant boost heading into the COP26 UN Climate Change Conference in Glasgow, Virginia Democrats with a talking point heading into their off year election, and Congress itself with a head of steam heading into the end of the year. Yet there is reason to think that one or both of these votes will slip. First and foremost, even with a top-line agreement and a broad framework secured in short order, there is no way for the BBBA to be ready in anything resembling its final form. And without a version of the bill that mirrors what 50 Senators (and, crucially, the chamber's Parliamentarian) have agreed will pass, House leaders will have a difficult time marshaling the votes without a full court press from President Biden. Without passage of a reconciliation bill, however half-baked, progressives will require similar White House pressure to release the hard infrastructure hostage they maintained through the last iteration of this fight back in September. While Biden's newfound

engagement this week is a sign that he may be ready to engage in such hardball, he has largely opted for a finesse approach. And with a newly flush Highway Trust Fund no longer requiring a cash infusion this year, Congress could easily pass another short term patch as needed.

The coming days will be pivotal for understanding size, shape, and speed of the reconciliation package. A breakthrough could yield the largest possible bill of nearly \$2 trillion with passage by Thanksgiving. Another false start over financing mechanisms could leave Democrats sweating out a significantly smaller package of \$1.5 trillion or less well into the Holidays. What's clear is that Biden is now in the ring, and his ability to close the deal and thread the needle in the weeks to come will have a profound impact on the fate of his agenda, if not his administration.

Follow Liam on Twitter: [@LPDonovan](https://twitter.com/LPDonovan)

The Rundown with Yasmin Nelson

Thursday night, President Biden conducted a Presidential Town Hall to update Americans on where he stands on many big ticket issues like COVID-19 vaccines, immigration, voting rights, the filibuster, gas prices, and supply chain issues. He also discussed what he expects to come from negotiations of his multitrillion dollar economic agenda including discussions around the Build Back Better Act. Although negotiations are ongoing within the factions of the Democratic party, the scaled back Build Back Better Act will likely still include an expansion of Medicare, climate change initiatives, universal prekindergarten, an extended childcare tax credit, housing affordability programs, and paid family leave. While the roughly \$2 trillion framework is collectively coming together, there are still many details left unresolved. We know that there will be 4 weeks of paid family leave, for example, but what we don't know is when the government backed program will begin—it could start as early as 2022 or as late as 2024.

Some advocates are disappointed that their programs are being cut. For instance, although funding for Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) will in all likelihood still be in the proposal, the funding could be reduced. There is talk that advocates are disappointed that HBCUs will have a larger share of the overall funding, causing tension amongst the groups. It's a racial equity challenge the White House will have to try to mitigate as President Biden stated last night—Black Americans overwhelmingly voted for his presidency, more than any other voting bloc.

With these challenges in mind, President Biden shared that he'd like a framework to be completed this week as discussions have been constructive. Democratic leaders were in high spirits as they began to come to agreements on a number of Democratic priorities, claiming that an agreement was imminent. Congressional Progressive Caucus leader Primila Jayapal (D-WA) even went so far as to say, "all our priorities are there in some way, shape, or form." However, as the week continued, conversations began coming up short as there are several provisions still left to be determined including the controversial issue of climate change. While things are certain to be cut, Democrats are confident they can come to an agreement this year—ultimately pushing through President Biden's economic agenda and moving on to other controversial issues.

Follow Yasmin on Twitter: [@YasminRNelson](https://twitter.com/YasminRNelson)

Coverage of the House Energy and Commerce Committee Hearing on Offshore Wind Energy

House Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy

Hearing on “Offshore Wind, Onshore Benefits: Growing the Domestic Wind Energy Industry”

October 21, 2021

On Thursday, October 21, 2021, the House Energy and Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Energy met to discuss the domestic offshore wind industry. Energy Subcommittee Chairman Bobby Rush (D-IL) opened the hearing by describing the Biden administration’s goal to deploy 30 GW of offshore wind energy by 2030, creating over 70,000 good paying jobs. He cited Vineyard Wind in Massachusetts as a great beginning, and stressed the need to make smart investments and create a diverse workforce in the process of meeting these goals. Full Committee Chairman Frank Pallone (D-NJ) cited the emerging offshore wind industry as an opportunity to revitalize the manufacturing industry in working class communities. He commended his state of New Jersey for being one of the leading states in offshore wind, and noted that it does not make sense to double down on fossil fuel infrastructure instead of investing in more renewable energy sources.

Subcommittee Ranking Member Fred Upton (R-MI), stated that he was troubled by the topic of the hearing, a sentiment that would be echoed by most of the committee’s Republican members. He and the other Republicans stressed that the committee should be focused on the current energy crisis, with increases in energy costs and supply chain shortages, and avoiding Europe’s problem with reliance on renewables and having to revert to gas and coal where they fall short. The Ranking Member cited obstacles including poor economics, reliability in harsh weather, permitting and labor issues, and negative environmental impacts that would prevent large scale deployment of offshore wind. Full Committee Ranking Member Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA) echoed both of those sentiments and added that the Biden administration’s anti-fossil fuel stance accelerates the energy cost crisis. She emphasized the need to focus on energy affordability and reliability and the need to address practical questions concerning the pace and scale of offshore wind development.

Heather Zichal, CEO of the American Clean Power Association, described the current status of the emerging offshore wind industry, including several ongoing projects and millions of dollars in investments. She suggested using Senator Ed Markey’s (D-MA) offshore wind legislation to spur more investment and coordinating across agencies and levels of government to ensure the administration’s goals can be met. Orsted Offshore North America CEO David Hardy highlighted how the industry creates opportunities nationwide, and stressed the need for regulatory guidance to reach the 2030 goals. He introduced a two pronged approach to solve supply chain issues, including building U.S. capabilities with existing companies and working with international partners to create domestic jobs and foreign direct investment.

James Strong, Assistant to the Director, District 8, of United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW), discussed the potential of the offshore wind industry from the union perspective. He described how supply chain manufacturing will create jobs across the country, not just in coastal states, and stressed that policy makers prioritize workforce investment.

Former Deputy Secretary of Energy Mark Menezes spoke as a private citizen at this hearing. He noted rising gas and propane prices and stressed the importance of providing reliable and affordable energy for consumers. He explained that offshore wind is more reliable than onshore, but faces difficulties

in the siting and permitting process. Mr. Menezes acknowledged the potential of offshore wind, but hoped the committee would take time to address measures to ensure affordable cost and maintain the U.S.'s position as a leader in energy.

Chairman Rush asked the first questions, focusing on including women and racial minorities in the clean energy workforce and mentioning his Blue Collar to Green Collar Jobs Act. Mr. Hardy explained that 40% of Orsted employees are women and the company is actively administering community environmental justice initiatives. Mr. Strong expressed a commitment to diversity in his company as well. Rep. Lisa Blunt Rochester (D-DE) asked for more detailed responses to the Chairman's question, and Mr. Hardy described investments Orsted had made in truck electrification initiatives and training certification programs targeted at disadvantaged communities in Newark, NJ. Mr. Strong described USW efforts to hire a more diverse workforce in response to Rep. Lori Trahan's (D-MA) questions, and described how supply chain manufacturing for offshore wind will create good paying skilled jobs for communities nationwide.

Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY), mentioning his Restoring Offshore Wind Opportunities Act, asked about Orsted projects' labor impact beyond coastal communities. Mr. Strong and Mr. Hardy cited steel, cement, and blade manufacturing as supply chain sectors that will present skilled job opportunities nationwide. Mr. Hardy listed several Orsted projects taking place and being planned in New Jersey when Chairman Pallone asked for specific steps the company has taken to partner with communities and local labor organizations. He also described Orsted's work with unions responding to Rep. Mike Doyle (D-PA), while Mr. Strong described USW's positive progress in the offshore wind field. Rep. Kathleen Rice (D-NY) asked about developers' work with academic institutions to develop training programs for offshore wind jobs. Ms. Zichal mentioned creating public-private partnerships and working with Congress and labor unions to develop programs. Mr. Hardy listed partnerships Orsted has made with community colleges and other institutions, including the New Jersey Institute of Technology, to both train workers and conduct research.

Throughout the hearing, Republicans and Democrats disagreed on the relevance of offshore wind as a topic for this Energy and Commerce hearing. Multiple Republican members, notably Reps. David McKinley (R-WV), Bill Johnson (R-OH), and Kelly Armstrong (R-ND), expressed disappointment that the committee was discussing offshore wind instead of the perceived threat of energy shortage coming this winter. Though some, like Rep. Debbie Lesko (R-AZ), were not opposed to offshore wind as an energy source, they expressed valuing reliability and affordability of energy over the transition to renewables in the interest of preventing high consumer costs and insufficient energy in times of need. Mr. Menezes told Rep. McKinley that we should be very concerned about the energy supply going into a severe winter, and cited the change in administration as when the rising energy prices began.

Rep. Kim Schrier (D-WA), however, countered these sentiments, pointing out that continuing to rely on fossil fuels will continue contribution to climate change by releasing more CO₂ into the atmosphere. She described some Republican claims about the impending energy shortage as "fearmongering." Further, Rep. Diana DeGette (D-CO) asked for clarification on how offshore wind would operate in cold and harsh winter conditions. Mr. Hardy explained that offshore turbines are designed to function in that kind of environment, as cold winters are when wind blows the most and when turbines produce the most power, and clarified that costs of offshore wind energy would not increase in the winter. Mr. Hardy told Rep. Kathy Castor (D-FL) that offshore wind would not be able to independently solve an energy crisis this year, but with more development could do so in the future.

Republican members were also pessimistic about meeting the Biden administration's goal of generating 30 GW of offshore wind energy by 2030. Mr. Menezes told Rep. Lesko and Rep. Bob Latta (R-OH) that the plan was not realistic, and cited nuclear as a superior clean energy source that the U.S. needs to maintain leadership on. He also confirmed for Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA) that many of the costs associated with the 2030 goal would fall on ratepayers.

In response to Rep. Michael Burgess (R-TX), Mr. Menezes encouraged Congress to pass the bipartisan infrastructure bill, specifically without an accompanying reconciliation package for timing reasons, in order to address issues that many Republican members were concerned about.

Ranking Member McMorris Rodgers asked how the U.S. could avoid energy problems that the U.K. is facing, which relies more heavily on offshore wind. Mr. Menezes cited increased demand as a result of the COVID pandemic, as well as U.K. policies favoring renewables, as examples of what to look out for. He criticized the Biden administration for cancelling the Keystone pipeline project, imposing a moratorium on oil drilling, and importing oil and natural gas from OPEC countries instead of relying on domestic fossil fuels. Rep. Peters, on the other hand, asked what the U.S. could learn from European advancements in offshore wind. Mr. Hardy explained that offshore wind prices in the U.S. are higher now because it is such a new industry here, and the cost will decrease with the help of policy. Ranking Member Upton similarly asked about what other countries are doing surrounding offshore wind regulation that the U.S. is not. Ms. Zichal encouraged looking at the industry through a long-term, holistic lens, rather than focusing on specific project aspects or goals. On affordability, Ms. Zichal assured the Ranking Member that costs would decrease, as they had in Europe, due to the nature of wind being a free and non-commoditized resource.

Several Republican members expressed technology-related objections to large-scale offshore wind projects. Rep. Latta cited vulnerability to cybersecurity attacks, Rep. Gary Palmer (R-AL) mentioned issues with recycling and disposing of turbine blades, and Reps. Armstrong, Jeff Duncan (R-SC), and David Joyce (R-OH) claimed that coastal, and especially wealthy communities, would oppose offshore wind farms for aesthetic reasons. Rep. Larry Buschon (R-IN), among others, expressed concern that materials, including rare earth minerals, needed to manufacture turbines are being sourced from other countries, especially China. Rep. Griffith expressed specific concern about dangers posed to birds by offshore turbines, and Rep. Tim Walberg (R-MI) had similar concern about safety in fisheries, specifically with the Vineyard Wind project in Massachusetts. Mr. Hardy assured the members that Orsted examined all environmental aspects when building U.S. projects.

Ms. Zichal noted that floating offshore wind would be best suited to west coast projects, explaining to Rep. Jerry McNerney (D-CA) that there was still research to be done, as floating technology is newer and less developed than fixed-bottom offshore wind. She assured Rep. Doris Matsui (D-CA) that improvement would come with more investment in floating technology. Mr. Hardy clarified that wind power is viable in the Gulf of Mexico despite lower wind speeds. Rep. Annie Kuster (D-NH) expressed concern about connecting offshore wind farms to existing onshore grid infrastructure, to which Ms. Zichal assured that while more research is needed, FERC decisions are moving in the direction of solving this issue.

Several members of both parties asked what Congress and the federal government could do to advance the offshore wind industry. Ms. Zichal recommended funding and supporting DOE studies and updating FERC and BOEM memorandums on collaboration. She again emphasized taking a holistic approach to the industry and focusing on creating demand and opportunity for investment, and assured that the bipartisan infrastructure bill and Build Back Better Act were substantial "core components" to start from. Mr. Menezes stressed that the U.S. cannot continue to rely on rare earth

minerals and other materials sourced from other countries, and encouraged producing these materials or substitutes domestically.

Document Library

Background Material

For the Congressional Research Service report on “The Senate’s ‘Byrd Rule’” click [HERE](#).

Provisional Text

For a preliminary budget reconciliation framework signed by Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) and Sen. Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) on July 28 click [HERE](#).

For the House Committee on the Budget’s full text of the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).

- For Part 1 of the House Committee on the Budget’s report on the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).
- For Part 2 of the House Committee on the Budget’s report on the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).
- For Part 3 of the House Committee on the Budget’s report on the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).

For the summary of the Senate budget resolution click [HERE](#).

- For the text of the Senate budget resolution click [HERE](#).
- For the committee print to accompany the FY22 budget resolution click [HERE](#).
- For Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer’s (D-NY) dear colleague letter regarding the climate impacts of the budget resolution click [HERE](#).

For the summary of the House budget resolution click [HERE](#).

- For the text of House Resolution advancing the bipartisan infrastructure agreement, the Senate budget resolution, and H.R. 4 the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 click [HERE](#).

For a summary of Sen. Ron Wyden’s (D-OR) proposals for tighter tax rules on partnerships and an excise tax on stock buybacks click [HERE](#).

- For the text of Sen. Wyden’s proposals click [HERE](#).

Markups

Agriculture: For the text of the House Agriculture Committee print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For a summary of the proposals click [HERE](#).

Education and Labor: For the text of the House Committee on Education & Labor print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairman Bobby Scott (D-VA) click [HERE](#).

Energy and Commerce: For a fact sheet of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce markup of the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).

- For a memorandum on the markup click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle A on Air Pollution click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle B on Hazardous Materials click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle C on Drinking Water click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle D on Energy click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle E on Drug Pricing click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle F on Affordable Care Coverage click [HERE](#).
- For Subtitle G on Medicaid click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle H on CHIP click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle I on Medicare click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle J on Public Health click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle K on Next Generation 9-1-1 click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle L on Wireless Connectivity click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle M on Distance Learning click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle N on the Manufacturing Supply Chain click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle O on FTC Privacy Enforcement click [HERE](#).
- For subtitle P on the Department of Commerce Inspector General click [HERE](#).
- For a full committee action summary click [HERE](#).

Financial Services: For the text of the House Committee on Financial Services click [HERE](#).

- For an amendment in the nature of substitute offered by Chairwoman Maxine Waters (D-CA) click [HERE](#).
- For the committee Memorandum click [HERE](#).
- For the text of H.R. 5195, the “Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2021” click [HERE](#).
- For the text of H.R. 5196, the “Expediting Assistance to Renters and Landlords Act of 2021” click [HERE](#).

Homeland Security: For the committee print of the reconciliation of the House Homeland Security Committee print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For the amendments adopted click [HERE](#).

Judiciary: For the text of the House Committee on the Judiciary print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairman Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) click [HERE](#).

Natural Resources: For the text of the House Natural Resources Committee print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

Science, Space, and Technology: For the committee print of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairwoman Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) click [HERE](#).

Small Business: For the text of the House Committee on Small Business print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairwoman Nydia Velázquez (D-NY) click [HERE](#).

Transportation and Infrastructure: For the text of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee print containing legislative proposals click [HERE](#).

- For the amendment in nature of a substitute click [HERE](#).

Ways and Means: For a summary of the House Ways and Means Committee markup of the Build Back Better Act click [HERE](#).

- For a memorandum on the markup click [HERE](#).
- For a section-by-section summary of subtitles A-E click [HERE](#).
 - For Subtitle A on Universal Paid Family and Medical Leave click [HERE](#).
 - For Subtitle B on Retirement click [HERE](#).
 - For Subtitle C on Child Care Access and Equity click [HERE](#).
 - For Subtitle D on Trade Adjustment Assistance click [HERE](#).
 - For Subtitle E, Part 1 on Health Careers click [HERE](#). For Part 2 on Elder Justice click [HERE](#). For Part 3 on Skilled Nursing Facilities click [HERE](#). For Part 4 on Medicare Dental, Hearing, and Vision Coverage click [HERE](#).
- For a section-by-section summary of Subtitle F-J click [HERE](#).
 - For legislative recommendations relating to infrastructure financing, green energy, social safety net, and prescription drugs click [HERE](#).
 - For the estimated budgetary effects of the revenue provisions from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For the estimated distributional effects of the revenue provisions from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For a description of the Chairman's Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For a summary of Subtitle F on Infrastructure from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For a summary of Subtitle G on Green Energy from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For a summary of Subtitle H on the Social Safety Net from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
 - For a summary of Subtitle J on Drug Pricing from the Joint Committee on Taxation click [HERE](#).
- For a section-by-section summary of Subtitle I click [HERE](#).
 - For legislative recommendations relating to Funding Our Priorities click [HERE](#).
- For the Joint Committee on Taxation's estimated budgetary effects of legislative recommendations relating to infrastructure financing and community development, green energy, social safety net, responsibly funding our priorities, and drug pricing click [HERE](#).
- For the final vote results click [HERE](#).

Letters

For a letter for Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer on the environmental benefits of the infrastructure bill and reconciliation bill see [HERE](#).

For Senator Joe Manchin's Opinion piece calling for a strategic pause on spending click [HERE](#).

For a letter from Rep. Stephanie Murphy (D-FL) and Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-TX) rejecting deficit spending except on climate policy click [HERE](#).

For a letter from Democrats calling for increased support for biofuels click [HERE](#).

For a letter from House Democrats supporting the Polluter Pays Climate Fund Act click [HERE](#).

For a letter from House Democrats supporting an array of international tax provisions see [HERE](#).

For a letter from Democratic governors supporting the budget reconciliation bill click [HERE](#).

For an endorsement of the environmental provisions from a coalition of environmental groups see [HERE](#).

For a letter from the United Mine Workers of America opposing the initial proposal for a Clean Electricity Standard click [HERE](#).

For a letter from America's Power opposing the Clean Electricity Performance Program click [HERE](#).

For a letter from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association opposing the Clean Electricity Performance Program click [HERE](#).

For a letter from the American Public Power Association opposing the Clean Electricity Performance Program click [HERE](#).

For a letter from America Electric Power opposing the Clean Electricity Performance Program click [HERE](#).

bracewell.com

policyresolutiongroup.com



Bracewell LLP makes this information available for educational purposes. This information does not offer specific legal advice or create an attorney-client relationship with the firm. Do not use this information as a substitute for specific legal advice. Attorney advertising.

Bracewell is a leading law and government relations firm primarily serving the energy, infrastructure, finance and technology sectors throughout the world.

Our industry focus results in comprehensive state-of-the-art knowledge of the commercial, legal and governmental challenges faced by our clients and enables us to provide innovative solutions to facilitate transactions and resolve disputes.

If you are an EU citizen and would like to be forgotten, please click [here](#).

Texas

New York

Washington, DC

Connecticut

Seattle

Dubai

London