



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

July 1, 2011

CERTIFICATE OF DESIGNATION

Pursuant to CGS Section 16a-41b as amended by Public Act 11-80, I hereby appoint Anne Foley, Undersecretary of Policy Development and Planning Division of OPM, as my designee to serve, act and vote on my behalf at all meetings of the Low Income Energy Advisory Board.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Benjamin Barnes".

Ben Barnes, Secretary

Office of Policy and Management

Utility Matching Payment Program Data

(to be completed by each utility in June and December of each year)

PHASE I MATCH United Illuminating

	# of Customers	\$ Matched
Zero Balance to "Match"	498	\$ -
Zero Balance to "Match" - Below Budget Worksheets		\$ -

Successful Completion via Match Process	475	\$ 316,436.89
Successful Completion via Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	128	\$ 111,560.61

Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process	328	\$ 240,933.76
Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	69	\$ 50,260.62

TOTAL "SUCCESS"	1,301	\$ 557,370.65
TOTAL "SUCCESS" - Below Budget Worksheets	197	\$ 161,821.23

TOTAL "FAILURE"	617	\$ -
TOTAL "FAILURE" - Below Budget Worksheets	81	\$ -

TOTAL MPP Participation	1,918	\$ 557,370.65
TOTAL MPP Participation - Below Budget Worksheets	278	\$ 161,821.23

% SUCCESS	68%
% FAILURE	32%

% SUCCESS (below budget)	71%
% FAILURE (below budget)	29%

Utility Matching Payment Program Data

(to be completed by each utility in June and December of each year)

PHASE I MATCH -

	# of Customers	\$ Matched
Zero Balance to "Match"	498	\$ -
Zero Balance to "Match" - Below Budget Worksheets		\$ -
Successful Completion via Match Process	475	\$ 316,436.89
Successful Completion via Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	128	\$ 111,560.61
Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process	328	\$ 240,933.76
Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	69	\$ 50,260.62
TOTAL "SUCCESS"	1,301	\$ 557,370.65
TOTAL "SUCCESS" - Below Budget Worksheets	197	\$ 161,821.23
TOTAL "FAILURE"	617	\$ -
TOTAL "FAILURE" - Below Budget Worksheets	81	\$ -
TOTAL MPP Participation	1,918	\$ 557,370.65
TOTAL MPP Participation - Below Budget Worksheets	278	\$ 161,821.23

% SUCCESS	68%
% FAILURE	32%

% SUCCESS (below budget)	71%
% FAILURE (below budget)	29%

UTILITY MATCHING PAYMENT PROGRAM DATA - Monthly Enrollments
(to be completed and submitted monthly)

6/30/2011

	CL&P	UI	Electric	CNG	SCG	YGS	Natural Gas
# of customers "auto enrolled"		375	375				0
# of customers "new"		926	926				0
TOTAL ENROLLED	0	1301	1301	0	0	0	0
# of customers "below budget"		278	278				0

Utility Matching Payment Program Data

(to be completed by each utility in June and December of each year)

SCG

	# of Customers	\$ Matched
Zero Balance to "Match"	5,354	\$ -
Zero Balance to "Match" - Below Budget Worksheets	544	\$ -

Successful Completion via Match Process	2,930	\$ 1,925,730.05
Successful Completion via Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	139	\$ 77,045.71

Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process		\$ -
Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets		\$ -

TOTAL "SUCCESS"	8,284	\$ 1,925,730.05
TOTAL "SUCCESS" - Below Budget Worksheets	683	\$ 77,045.71

TOTAL "FAILURE"	13,686	\$ -
TOTAL "FAILURE" - Below Budget Worksheets	227	\$ -

TOTAL MPP Participation	21,970	\$ 1,925,730.05
TOTAL MPP Participation - Below Budget Worksheets	910	\$ 77,045.71

% SUCCESS	38%
% FAILURE	62%
% SUCCESS (below budget)	75%
% FAILURE (below budget)	25%

Utility Matching Payment Program Data

(to be completed by each utility in June and December of each year)

CNG

	# of Customers	\$ Matched
Zero Balance to "Match"	3,510	\$ -
Zero Balance to "Match" - Below Budget Worksheets	291	\$ -

Successful Completion via Match Process	4,421	\$ 1,926,412.37
Successful Completion via Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets	53	\$ 51,461.67

Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process		\$ -
Successful Completion via Mini-Match Process - Below Budget Worksheets		\$ -

TOTAL "SUCCESS"	7,931	\$ 1,926,412.37
TOTAL "SUCCESS" - Below Budget Worksheets	342	\$ 51,461.67

TOTAL "FAILURE"	7,217	\$ -
TOTAL "FAILURE" - Below Budget Worksheets	106	\$ -

TOTAL MPP Participation	15,148	\$ 1,926,412.37
TOTAL MPP Participation - Below Budget Worksheets	448	\$ 51,461.67

% SUCCESS	52%
% FAILURE	48%
% SUCCESS (below budget)	76%
% FAILURE (below budget)	24%

UTILITY MATCHING PAYMENT PROGRAM DATA - Monthly Enrollments

(to be completed and submitted monthly)

	CL&P	UI	Electric	CNG	SCG	YGS	Natural Gas
# of customers "auto enrolled"			0	10,472	11,568		22,040
# of customers "new"			0	10,132	7,567		17,699
TOTAL ENROLLED	0	0	0	20,604	19,135	0	39,739
# of customers "below budget"			0	518	527		1045

Operation Fuel, Inc. Program Totals 2010-2011		
Fuel Bank Name and Region	TOTAL House Holds.	TOTAL Grants
Avon- Gifts of Love	46	16,016
Bloomfield Social & Youth Services	139	52,090
Branford Fuel Bank	9	3,032
Bridgeport - First Baptist Fuel Bank	199	72,709
Bridgeport - Salvation Army	76	27,734
Bristol Fuel Bank	27	9,109
Brookfield Emergency Fuel Fund	13	4,585
Canaan Fuel Bank	5	1,720
Cheshire Youth & Social Services Fuel Bank	12	4,047
Chester Emergency Fuel Bank	26	8,157
Clinton Fuel Bank	23	7,356
Colchester Fuel Bank	1	200
Cornwall Fuel Fund	3	1,050
Coventry Fuel Bank	16	5,574
Cromwell Human Services	7	1,999
Danbury - Community Action Committee of Danbury	88	35,492
Danielson Fuel Bank	80	25,394
Derby - TEAM, Inc.	208	72,247
Durham Fuel Bank	2	500
East Hampton Volunteer Fuel Bank	17	6,255
East Hartford Fuel Bank	109	36,901
East Windsor Emergency Fuel Bank	19	6,571
Ellington Fuel Bank	20	6,593
Enfield Neighborhood Services	105	38,061
Glastonbury Community Services	25	9,274
Granby Emergency Fuel Bank	9	2,854
Greenwich Fuel Bank	29	9,627
Groton Human Services	14	4,386
Gullford Social Services	37	12,769
Hartford - Community Renewal Team	207	65,547
Hartford - Salvation Army	192	68,407
Hartford - Three Angels	57	17,600
Hebron Senior Center	17	5,487
Hebron Social Services	10	2,994
Kent Fuel Bank	2	698
Killingworth Fuel Bank	2	1,000
Lebanon Warm Hearts	2	548
Madison Fuel Bank and Senior Services	17	5,734
Manchester Area Conference of Churches	91	29,510
Meriden - New Opportunities	57	19,106
Middlebury Fuel Bank	68	23,493
Middletown - St. Vincent Depaul	127	45,005
Monroe Senior Center	18	5,891
Montville Senior and Social Services	12	4,847
New Britain Fuel Bank	211	75,636
New Fairfield Fuel Bank	2	548
New Haven Christian Community Action	55	9,865
New Haven Community Fuel Bank	596	216,237
New London - TVCCA	110	39,341
New Milford Community Fuel Bank	67	23,915
Newington Dept. of Human Services	55	21,889
Newtown Fuel Bank	13	4,301
Norfolk Fuel Bank	1	350
North Branford Fuel Bank	24	7,960
Norwalk Energy Assistance Program	38	13,425
Norwich Catholic Charities	38	10,695
Norwich Human Services	108	35,644
Orange Emergency Fuel Assistance Program	3	900
Pawcatuck Neighborhood Center	17	7,450
Plymouth Fuel Bank	15	5,348

Ridgefield Fuel Bank	3	999
Rockyhill Fuel Bank	9	3,037
Roxbury Fuel Bank	1	200
Salisbury Fuel Bank	3	699
Sharon - Northwest Corner Fuel Bank	8	2,701
Sherman Fuel Bank and Senior Center	4	1,171
Somers Fuel Bank	4	1,400
South Windsor Food & Fuel Bank	33	10,402
Stafford Fuel Bank	13	3,967
Stamford - Community Action Agency	100	28,159
Stonington Human Services Fuel Bank	7	1,412
Stratford Senior Svcs. Fuel Bank	8	1,954
Suffield - Emergency Aid Association Fuel Bank	33	9,938
Thompson (TEEG) Fuel Bank	77	24,496
Tolland Fuel Bank	15	4,516
Torrington Chapter of FISH, Inc. Fuel Bank	81	29,928
Trumbull Fuel Bank	28	9,373
Vernon Fuel Bank	47	16,551
Wallingford Fuel Bank	49	16,028
Washington Fuel Bank	3	823
Waterbury - New Opportunites, Inc.	544	191,459
Watertown Fuel Bank	2	400
West Hartford Dept. of Human Services	60	20,860
Weston Fuel Bank	12	4,950
Westport Dept of Human Services Fuel Bank	13	4,694
Wethersfield Emergency Fuel Bank	22	6,516
Wilton Social Services	4	1,400
Winchester Fuel Bank	9	2,832
Windham Fuel Bank	106	34,178
Windsor Fuel Bank	110	42,733
Windsor Locks Social Services	23	8,256
Woodbury Fuel Bank	9	2,655
TOTAL	5,036	\$1,740,362

Operation Fuel FY11 Utility Vendor Payments

<u>Program:</u>	<u>TANF</u>	<u>Summer</u>	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Spring</u>	<u>Utility Total</u>
CL&P	\$ 349,000	\$ 108,041	\$ 6,275	\$ 76,248	\$ 539,564
Yankee Gas	25,000	2,600	1,914	6,910	36,424
UI	94,500	22,055	6,490	24,057	147,102
CNG	29,500	5,245	1,639	3,558	39,942
SCG	23,000	4,616	470	4,195	32,281
Norwich Public Utilities	15,000	8,862	-	5,247	29,109
Wallingford Electric	3,500	2,700	-	1,800	8,000
Groton	1,000	972	-	499	2,471
Jewett City	500	300	-	400	1,200
Bozrah Light & Power	-	-	-	200	200
Total for each program	\$ 541,000	\$ 155,391	\$ 16,788	\$ 123,114	\$ 836,293

**Operation Fuel, Inc.
FY11 Energy Grants**

<u>Dates of Program</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Energy Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>
July 2010 - Sept 2010	federally funded TANF-ECF	utility	\$ 500,000	\$ 541,000 ¹
Summer Program: August 2010 - October 2010	privately raised charitable dollars	all	\$ 200,000	\$ 173,583
Winter Program: Dec 2010 - April 2011 ²	privately raised charitable dollars ²	deliverable fuels	\$ 400,000	\$ 902,664 ³
Spring Program: May 2011 - June 2011	privately raised charitable dollars	utility	\$ 400,000	\$ 123,114
Total Energy Grants			\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,740,361

¹ A local grant of \$125,000 from the HFFG leveraged a 4:1 match of federal funds, allowing Operation Fuel to serve 1,085 households with \$541,000 in energy grants.

² Sources of privately raised monies include individuals, corporations, foundations, faith communities and the Add-a-Dollar program through utilities. In December 2010 Operation Fuel received a \$625,000 grant from the NU foundation which allowed Operation Fuel to expand the winter program.

³ During December & January, \$10,000 and \$244,000 was disbursed, respectively. However, in the 1st 3 weeks of February, nearly \$650,000 in grants were committed, at which time the winter program was closed in order to save some funding to provide energy grants for households affected by the end of the moratorium.

APPLICATION DATA - August 1, 2011

ABCD	BCO	CACD	GRT	TEAM	HRA	CAA	NEON	TVCCA	CTE	NO	ACCESS	Total
13,661	4,239	5,331	33,720	5,002	5,426	15,073	2,938	10,118	3,190	26,628	9,386	134,712
7,783	1,983	2,711	19,233	2,545	3,159	9,390	1,703	5,521	1,800	15,677	5,265	76,770
799	362	445	2,306	442	225	810	209	745	172	2,154	714	9,383
<u>3,418</u>	<u>1,104</u>	<u>1,511</u>	<u>7,964</u>	<u>1,116</u>	<u>925</u>	<u>2,714</u>	<u>686</u>	<u>2,540</u>	<u>714</u>	<u>6,521</u>	<u>2,497</u>	<u>31,710</u>
12,000	3,449	4,667	29,503	4,103	4,309	12,914	2,598	8,806	2,686	24,352	8,476	117,863
562	196	247	1,355	256	203	515	156	456	159	856	369	5,330
122	32	18	530	15	74	225	21	48	93	266	20	1,464
45	21	1	95	51	23	46	-	18	1	61	27	389
<u>932</u>	<u>541</u>	<u>398</u>	<u>2,237</u>	<u>577</u>	<u>817</u>	<u>1,373</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>790</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>1,093</u>	<u>494</u>	<u>9,666</u>
1,661	790	664	4,217	899	1,117	2,159	340	1,312	504	2,276	910	16,849
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1,374	674	1,065	5,113	820	473	2,322	396	2,133	158	4,901	2,487	21,916
283	156	223	878	201	63	377	92	398	41	1,061	397	4,170
914	500	686	2,928	470	217	986	262	1,313	66	2,710	1,455	12,507
2,571	1,330	1,974	8,919	1,491	753	3,685	750	3,844	265	8,672	4,339	38,593
896	304	648	3,034	454	321	1,253	218	1,176	107	3,369	1,194	12,974
150	38	113	385	76	44	149	36	200	22	564	142	1,919
1,046	342	761	3,419	530	365	1,402	254	1,376	129	3,933	1,336	14,893

Applications Denied
Over-Income/Assets
Rent Less Than 30%
Incomplete (Non-Income)
Incomplete (Income)
Total Denied

Applications Pending
Certification

Crisis Assistance
CEAP
SAFA
CHAP

Total Crisis Assistance

Safety Net Assistance
CEAP Hslds.
SAFA Hslds.

Total Safety Net

CASELOAD COMPARISON

	<u>2010/2011</u> (Thru 08/01/11)	<u>2009/2010</u> Final	<u>% Change</u> (FFY 2011 vs. FFY 2010)	<u>2009/2010</u> Final
ABCD (Bridgeport)	13,661	13,617	0.3%	13,617
BCO (Bristol)	4,239	4,067	4.2%	4,067
CACD (Danbury)	5,331	5,082	4.9%	5,082
CRT (Hartford/Middletown)	33,720	32,574	3.5%	32,574
TEAM (Derby)	5,002	4,964	0.8%	4,964
HRAofNB (New Britain)	5,426	5,270	3.0%	5,270
CAAofNH (New Haven)	15,073	15,258	-1.2%	15,258
NEON (Norwalk)	2,938	2,856	2.9%	2,856
TVCCA (Norwich)	10,118	10,146	-0.3%	10,146
CTE (Stamford)	3,190	3,182	0.3%	3,182
NO (Waterbury/Meriden)	26,628	25,387	4.9%	25,387
ACCESS (Willimantic)	9,386	9,138	2.7%	9,138
Statewide	134,712	131,541	2.4%	131,541

ELIGIBLE CASELOAD COMPARISON

	<u>2010/2011</u> (Thru 08/01/11)	<u>2009/2010</u> Final	<u>% Change</u> (FFY 2011 vs. FFY 2010)	<u>2009/2010</u> Final
ABCD (Bridgeport)	12,000	11,639	3.1%	11,639
BCO (Bristol)	3,449	3,369	2.4%	3,369
CACD (Danbury)	4,667	4,358	7.1%	4,358
CRT (Hartford/Middletown)	29,503	27,772	6.2%	27,772
TEAM (Derby)	4,103	4,104	0.0%	4,104
HRAofNB (New Britain)	4,309	4,044	6.6%	4,044
CAAofNH (New Haven)	12,914	13,057	-1.1%	13,057
NEON (Norwalk)	2,598	2,429	7.0%	2,429
TVCCA (Norwich)	8,806	8,716	1.0%	8,716
CTE (Stamford)	2,686	2,606	3.1%	2,606
NO (Waterbury/Meriden)	24,352	23,108	5.4%	23,108
ACCESS (Willimantic)	8,476	8,183	3.6%	8,183
Statewide	117,863	113,385	3.9%	113,385



Low Income Energy Advisory Board

May 10, 2011

Benjamin Barnes, Secretary
Office of Policy and Management
450 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Roderick L. Bremby, Commissioner
Department of Social Services
25 Sigourney Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Secretary Barnes and Commissioner Bremby:

On behalf of the Low-Income Energy Advisory Board (LIEAB) I am forwarding our recommendations for the 2011-2012 Connecticut Energy Assistance Program (CEAP). The Board is aware of the difficulties facing the State as it grapples with the potential for reduced federal funding to support this program. However, the needs of Connecticut's residents to meet essential winter energy heating requirements must remain the priority in developing next year's program and benefit levels. The Board continues to be available to your agencies as a resource to vet options that you may be considering. In addition to these recommendations, the Board is planning to submit to the Department of Public Utility Control recommendations regarding the arrearage forgiveness/matching payment programs provided by the utilities as an additional benefit to that received under CEAP.

1. Consider use of state-appropriated funds to supplement available federal funds in next winter's program design.

The Board recognizes that federal funding levels for the LIHEAP block grant may be substantially lower than current funding levels. In recent years the State has designed a program that provides benefits that can be sustained only via the available federal funds. Given the unprecedented need for energy assistance seen in the last few years, limiting the program only to federal funds will jeopardize the ability to meet essential winter heating needs.

2. Maintain program eligibility levels.

For many years eligibility for CEAP benefits has been based on 60% of State Median Income (SMI). The Board recommends that this benefit level be maintained as the baseline for the 2011-2012 program. Eligibility for energy assistance offers additional critical benefits to utility-heated households that allow them to afford to maintain utility service year-round. These benefits will be lost to households no longer eligible for energy assistance if the income limits are reduced.

3. Plan for "level funding", but create a tiered approach to allow the program to be readily modified in a predictable way should available funding be less than current funding levels.

In designing the 2011-2012 program, including benefit levels, the Board recommends that DSS assume a funding level equal to the current year. However, in recognition that federal and/or state appropriations may not be sufficient to provide planned benefits, DSS should incorporate one or more "tiers" of reductions in benefits to allow the program to be ratcheted back yet still provide the plan benefits to as many recipients as possible. Each such tier should include a clear "trigger mechanism" so implementation can proceed with a minimum of additional administrative effort.

4. Require SNAP recipient households to meet the asset test for CEAP eligibility.

Current LIHEAP rules allow for the automatic determination of income eligibility for households receiving SNAP benefits. Adding the "asset test" requirement to this group of households would ensure compliance with other LIHEAP eligibility rules.

5. Change the administrative structure regarding the return of CEAP funds from utilities where the utility no longer has an account for the program beneficiary to which it can apply the benefits.

The current administrative system for the return of CEAP benefits to the program is burdensome to all involved – the utilities, the Community Action Agencies, and DSS. A simplified process whereby the utilities return CEAP benefits directly to DSS in a timely manner would enable these funds to be more effectively "recycled" into the current year's program.

6. Engage in a dialogue with the utilities and the DPUC to provide better coordination of CEAP with the arrearage forgiveness/matching payment programs offered to utility customers.

There are several "intersections" between CEAP and the utility arrearage forgiveness programs. Better coordination, including appropriate mechanisms to share information, would provide the consumer with enhanced benefits while reducing the cost of providing these services.

The Board is asking for your support for these recommendations. If you should have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (860) 418-6441.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Raymond L. Wilson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Raymond L. Wilson
Chairman LIEAB

Cc: Claudette Beaulieu, DSS
Pam Giannini, DSS
Tom O'Brien, DSS
Anne Foley, OPM
Caty Patton, OPM

As Congress sharpens its knife, advocates urge funding of heat aid



Published on *The Connecticut Mirror* (<http://ctmirror.org>)

[Home](#) > As Congress sharpens its knife, advocates urge funding of heat aid

As Congress sharpens its knife, advocates urge funding of heat aid

Arielle Levin Becker
and Deirdre Shesgreen
August 2, 2011

Connecticut lawmakers and social service advocates on Tuesday urged Congress to preserve funding for an energy assistance program that helps more than 113,000 low-income state households heat their homes in the winter.

Such appeals could become commonplace in the coming weeks, as the fallout of a deal to cut \$550 billion in federal domestic discretionary spending over the next decade becomes clear. Senate Majority Leader Martin M. Looney, D-New Haven, said the request for LIHEAP is likely to be the "opening gambit" in a series of pleas to restore federal funds.

Tuesday's request, made at a press conference at the state Capitol, centered on the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP, and the source of anxiety among Connecticut officials predates the debt ceiling debate that led to this week's deficit-cutting plans. Earlier this year, President Obama has recommended slashing LIHEAP's funding from \$5.1 billion to \$2.5 billion.

Under that proposal, Connecticut could get \$41 million in LIHEAP funds during the federal fiscal year that begins in October--\$57 million less than this year, according to Operation Fuel, which provides emergency energy assistance to people who are not eligible for government programs. Congress has discretion to deviate from the president's recommendations, and members of Connecticut's delegation have criticized the LIHEAP cut.

Home heating oil costs are projected to rise by 7.2 percent this winter, to \$4.04 a gallon, said Patricia J. Wrice, Operation Fuel's executive director. In 2010, 113,385 Connecticut households received funding from the program, getting an average of \$863.

"This would be a very painful, very painful cut," Looney said.

Rep. Vickie O. Nardello, D-Prospect, who co-chairs the Energy & Technology Committee, warned that seniors and low-income residents who spend a disproportionate amount of their money on heating costs would have to shift spending from food and transportation to cover a shortfall in energy assistance.

"Connecticut cannot afford to have a 50 percent reduction in LIHEAP," she said.

LIHEAP helps heat and cool people's homes, and it also helps the state economy, because the funding goes directly to businesses, said James Gatling, President and CEO of the Waterbury agency New Opportunities and chairman of the Connecticut Association for Community Action. He said a cut to LIHEAP would be unjust, inhumane and unconscionable.

"LIHEAP saves lives and helps Connecticut's struggling economy," Gatling said.

Community action agencies like New Opportunities screen some 130,000 people for LIHEAP eligibility, finding more than 110,000 who qualify, Gatling said.

Edith Pollock Karsky, executive director of the community action association, said she is "80 percent" confident that the LIHEAP funding will be restored. She praised the state's delegation for their support, and said she thinks that once Obama hears the concerns from states he needs for re-election, he won't allow the "devastating cut" to take place.

LIHEAP funding is included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill. Both the House and Senate spending committees have yet to unveil their 2012 Labor-HHS proposals.

The just-passed debt agreement has injected some fresh uncertainty into the fight over funding for a bevy of domestic spending programs, including LIHEAP. That's because the agreement includes higher spending caps than the House Republican budget, so Labor-HHS could actually be in line for fewer spending cuts than GOP leaders initially indicated.

Rep. Rosa DeLauro, D-3rd District, said she and others are waiting for new figures to see how much money they will have to work with when they draft their Labor, HHS bill in September. She said Tuesday that LIHEAP "is clearly a priority for me."

"If I can in any way, I'm going to prevent the cutbacks," she said when asked about Obama's proposed cut to LIHEAP.

Still, she noted that domestic programs will be vulnerable. "On LIHEAP and all of the programs which critically affect people's lives, I will be very, very concerned," DeLauro said. She noted that when the House GOP parceled out the spending cuts, the Labor-HHS bill took the biggest hit.

House Speaker John Boehner's debt limit bill is "going to relieve a little bit of pressure, a miniscule amount of pressure," on the Labor-HHS bill, Rep. Steven C. LaTourette of Ohio, a senior GOP appropriator, recently told Congressional Quarterly.

Health Human Services Washington