

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 005 - FOLDER -005

[03/07/1997 - 03/10/1997]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	William R. Kincaid to Elena Kagan, Bruce N. Reed, and Paul J. Weinstein Jr. Subject: Travel plans. (1 page)	03/08/1997	P6/b(6)
002. email	Diane C. Regas to Elena Kagan and Paul J. Weinstein Jr. Subject: My schedule for departure. (1 page)	03/10/1997	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
 Automated Records Management System [Email]
 OPD ([Kagan])
 OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/07/1997 - 03/10/1997]

2009-1006-F

wr29

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Eric P. Goosby (CN=Eric P. Goosby/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-MAR-1997 19:12:50.00

SUBJECT: re: Vaccine Meeting

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I attended a meeting today with Nancy-Ann Min and Kevin Thurm looking at the possibilities in the area of vaccine development.

Participants:

Nancy-Ann Min
Kevin Thurm

Outside Participatns:

Harold Varmus, M.D. NIH Director
William Paul, M.D. , Director Office of AIDS Research
Jack Whitescarver, Phd., Deputy OAR
Tony Fauci, M.D., Director NIAID/NIH
David Baltimore, M.D., Coordinator of Vaccine Research, OAR

The discussion explored the potential for the development of an effective vaccine, cost considerations and the potential role the President may take in supporting this effort.

Key Issues Discussed:

* Possible advances in vaccine development:

1. Simian Immunodeficiency Virus Vaccines are protective in monkeys
2. New attenuated vaccine developed in Australia may afford an opportunity to develop an effective vaccine with low risk of carcinogenicity
3. incorporation of the HIV viral genes into the host DNA may be carcinogenic
twenty years down the road, this precludes our ability to move rapidly through human trials (too risky, must move very slowly to develop an efficacious vaccine with a high degree of safety)
4. DNA vaccines; discovered U of Wisconsin, when DNA is injected into study animals it can elicit a strong immune response (immunogenicity). This wasn't thought to be possible 2 years ago. This line of research may prove productive in HIV vaccine research

* The feeling among the scientists was that they cannot put an accurate timeline on the success of the vaccine efforts.,

* They emphasized the need to support the basic research component of the equation in developing potential products that would be of interest to Industry

* Harold Varmus, and Kevin Thurm felt the President could promote the area of HIV Vaccine research both domestically and internationally, as part of a long term plan of events that in aggregate brought attention and resources from both the private and public sectors.

* The possibility of an initiative on Emerging Infections (Malaria, Ebola Virus, HIV and TB) was also discussed from an international perspective

FOLLOW UP

Nancy-Ann asked that NIH come back with a plan that would focus on a long term strategy for the President to consider. They will include an analysis of what type of resources may be needed to maximize our ability to take advantage of all scientific opportunities highlighting potential areas of collaboration with the pharmaceutical companies. I was asked to facilitate a more detailed description of the potential scientific products that one might anticipate over a shorter time frame, with added efforts in this area.

Timeline: 5-7 days

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-MAR-1997 20:15:10.00

SUBJECT: Department of Defense Schools

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald A. Baer (CN=Donald A. Baer/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is what I have found out about the Defense schools in relation to North Carolina:

1. In general, the overseas and stateside schools are good, and they are doing things world-wide (though not necessarily in NC, that could be pointed to as models. Chief among these are: (1) technology--getting all schools wired by 1998; (2) translating national math standards into classroom curriculum; (3) school report cards and accountability. They are also beginning to talk about providing incentives for teachers to undergo National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification, though this effort will look weak in comparison to Gov. Hunt's proposal in NC.

2. The Defense schools, especially stateside, are basically invisible according to the Defense people. They operate below the radar screen, have tremendous difficulty getting any attention, and feel that most of America, including almost all of the education community, doesn't even know they exist.

3. There are several potential downsides to a defense schools announcement from their point of view:

The school at camp Legune (sp???) is in a terrible state of disrepair, especially with leaking roofs. There is a plan to fix it, but, in the meantime, their comment was "I wouldn't want the President to visit while it was raining without an umbrella." Not exactly a strong endorsement for the notion that these are model schools.

The Defense Department is working on a congressionally mandated study of the desirability of turning stateside defense schools over to local school systems, and getting Defense out of that business. The report is at least 6 months late, and will not be completed until June at the earliest. The head of the defense schools did not know the original impetus for this study, and no one from the hill has been bugging them for the report. The Department apparently has not yet taken a position on this, though military families and leadership believe that the defense schools are generally superior to neighboring schools and will want to keep the current situation. So will neighboring local school boards, who will not want to get more students and no additional tax base.

April is the "Month of the Military Child" and would provide an additional

High Standards for Teachers

The President's speech to the North Carolina legislature provides an ideal opportunity to outline his vision and plan for rewarding good teachers, getting incompetent or burnt-out teachers out of the classroom, and for getting talented and dedicated teachers into every classroom in America. The major announcement would be calling on state legislatures around the country to enact major pay incentives for master teachers who become certified by the National Board (such as the 12% bonus Governor Hunt has proposed to the North Carolina legislature), and explaining how the President's budget will help set this new national standard of excellence in teaching -- a standard which has already gained wide, bipartisan acceptance.

But the President can also use this announcement to stipulate that our students will not reach national standards without outstanding teachers, and to lay out -- in greater depth than he has so far -- his vision for raising teacher quality. The President can issue an appeal to honor and reward good teachers while refusing to tolerate failing teachers, challenge talented young people and other mid-career professionals to enter into teaching and give them the highest-quality preparation, and speak directly to parents and grandparents, asking them not to discourage their young family members from going into what will be the noblest and most important career of the information age. With 2 million teachers to be hired in the next ten years, the President can challenge the nation to immediately establish policies and an ethic for the teaching profession that will affect the quality of our children's education for decades.

For three reasons, the address to the North Carolina legislature will be an ideal opportunity for the President to focus on teacher quality. First, Governor Hunt has been spearheading a state and national effort to focus on raising teacher quality, providing a sensible context for the President to applaud Hunt's work in North Carolina, cite Hunt's proposal to provide a 12% bonus (serious \$) to national board-certified "master teachers" as the basis for a national challenge, and describe the President's vision in context of a hard-hitting report on teaching released last fall by a bipartisan commission co-chaired by Hunt. Last week's announcement that North Carolina had the nation's largest increase in math scores can underscore the effectiveness of focusing on good teaching.

Second, a presidential focus on high standards for teaching is a natural immediate next step after addresses on challenging standards and tests for students. The public intuitively understands that the key to raising standards is good teachers, and the President can use this address to help show how to address this challenge. Timing is also ideal, coming the day after a North Carolina meeting on teaching that can foreshadow and generate interest in the President's speech. That meeting will be televised to educators around the state, and will include Governor Hunt, teachers, university leaders, and -- by satellite, at 4pm the day before the President's address -- Secretary Riley.

Third, the national board teaching standards -- championed by Hunt -- provide the best possible concrete illustration of how the President and his budget will help make high standards for teachers real. The President's budget contains \$100 million over 5 years to help the national board complete its assessments in all major academic areas, and to provide seed money to help teachers undergo the board's intensive review. The board already has bipartisan endorsements from such leaders as Hunt and Voinavich, and unusual support from education groups who have traditionally opposed efforts to distinguish among teachers at different levels of quality.

Components of announcements/ major policy address on teaching standards:

- Call on state legislatures around the country to enact major pay incentives for master teachers who become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (such as the 12% bonus Governor Hunt has proposed to the North Carolina legislature).
- Explain how the President's \$100 million budget will help set this new national standard of excellence in teaching -- i.e., support for completion of teacher assessments in all academic areas and seed capital for master teachers to undergo an intensive board review, leading to a master teacher for every school in the nation within 10 years. Call on Congress to enact this budget.
- Invite "our nation's best teachers" -- the 50 state teachers-of-the-year and others -- to the White House South Lawn for a celebration of good teaching and announcement of the new national teacher-of-the-year during the week of April 15th (The scheduling office confirmed today that this event will take place, but it has not yet been made public). Call for a national day of recognition that day for America's best teachers.
- Announce details of a national forum on recruiting and preparing teachers to take place the day after the White House event. This forum will provide an opportunity for 50 teachers-of-the-year to discuss with higher education leaders how to do a better job at recruiting and preparing the highest quality teachers. Also announce opportunity for communities around the country to participate in the event by satellite, and to organize local discussions with their best teachers and university leaders about how to recruit and prepare outstanding teachers. (USA Today and other papers gave considerable coverage to the Secretary's announcement of this forum last month, but no details have yet been made public.)
- Challenge talented young people and mid-career professionals to go into teaching. Speak directly to parents and grandparents, asking them not to discourage young people from entering teaching.
- Announce national forum that would take place later in the year on rewarding good teachers and weeding out those teachers who are incompetent or burnt-out.
- Issue broad new challenge such as calling on states and communities to raise teacher salaries generally, or to offer tax incentives for young people who teach in high-need areas. Alternatively, challenge school districts and teacher unions to examine their contracts and find new ways to reward good teachers and weed out incompetent or burnt-out teachers quickly, fairly, and less expensively.

Q&A
The Federal Government Plan to Hire Welfare Recipients

Question: Does the President have specific hiring figures in mind?

Answer: The directive asks agency and department heads to each prepare an individualized plan for hiring welfare recipients that will include each agency's results from surveying where jobs exist and what kind of jobs are available. From these survey results, each agency will decide on its own target numbers. We can't set blanket targets because all agencies are different. Some have more hiring capacity than others and some more entry level jobs than others. We need to let each agency figure out how it can best become involved.

Question: How much will this effort cost?

Answer: We don't expect it to cost anything. One of the usual functions performed by departments is that of personnel. Most departments build in these necessary activities as part of a minimal budget. We also expect to make this a priority within our existing budget.

Question: Are we talking about jobs in Washington, D.C.?

Answer: We're talking about jobs all over the country. More than 85 percent of federal jobs are located outside the Washington metropolitan area.

Question: Will the White House directly hire welfare recipients?

Answer: Absolutely. Jodie Torkelson, who handles management and administration for the White House, is working hard to put together a program at the White House. In fact, her staff is looking at Marriot's hiring program for welfare recipients and the job placement and support organization America Works, as well as others, as possible models for a White House hiring plan.

Question: How many welfare recipients will the White House hire?

Answer: Just as the Federal agencies need to survey hiring capacity and types of jobs available, so does the White House. But I know Jodie is rearing to go on this and will have a program up and running in no time.

Question: What is the date of the Cabinet meeting?

Answer: The President will hold the cabinet meeting, as stated in the directive, approximately 30 days from the date of this directive.

Question: Aren't you favoring welfare recipients over everyone else?

Answer: We are not creating any preference or incentive such as those that exist for veterans. We are encouraging the departments to work with the existing hiring authorities they now have the option to use and we will ensure they are well informed on how to use all hiring and support avenues available to them.

Question: Why are we specifically helping welfare recipients rather than other equally needy groups?

Answer: We make no apologies about the fact that we are asking the agencies to hire single mothers with children. This group is one of the most crucial to reach. We want to help these families move from dependence on welfare to independence through self-sufficiency.

Question: Is this the final step?

Answer: No. This is a first set of steps. Agencies will begin working right away to identify available jobs, reach out to welfare recipients to notify them of those jobs, and to fully use the existing programs to help recipients take *and keep* the jobs.

Question: You and others in the Administration have mentioned several times that there were many hurdles to enacting a hiring program? What were those hurdles and how did you overcome them?

Answer: The Federal hiring process is normally complex. We sat down and looked at all of the existing rules and regulations guiding federal hiring. We were pleasantly surprised to find that we could hire welfare recipients under existing authority and offer them the supports necessary to stay in jobs, also through existing programs. All of the government agencies want to become involved in this effort. However, most have been unaware that they could do so under existing authority. It is our job to make sure every agency and department head now becomes aware of the hiring and support options that are available.

Question: How are you going to hire welfare recipients at a time government is downsizing and budgets are tough?

Answer: In June 1996, after the Worker-Trainee program became fully operational, 7,000 placements had been made across the country during a time of tight budgets and personnel ceilings. Entry-level jobs exist. Now that the President has increased the earned-income tax credit, added significant additional funds for child care, raised the minimum wage, and doubled child support collections, work now pays more than welfare so welfare recipients will make the rational choice to work

rather than remain on welfare.

Question: Is this effort really going to do any good? How many entry level people can the Federal government actually hire?

Answer: In just this last fiscal year, the Federal government hired over 27,000 employees with annual pay up to \$16,500, a number that goes up to 87,900 when reviewing those hired at salaries up to \$24,500.

The President's Radio Address March 8, 1997

Announcement

Today, President Clinton will direct **each head of a Federal agency or department to use all available hiring authorities to hire and retain welfare recipients in jobs in the government. Specifically, the President would like to expand the use of the Worker-Trainee Program and other excepted service and competitive hiring processes, and would like agencies to prepare individualized plans for hiring welfare recipients. Further, the President will ask agencies to take explore and report on ways to help low-income employees access the Earned-Income Tax Credit (EITC), transportation subsidies, and affordable child care.**

Background

Since the President signed the historic welfare reform law, he has urged businesses, non-profit organizations, and religious groups across the nation to help make its promise of opportunity real by offering jobs to welfare recipients.

The hiring power of these groups is great: There are 826,000 U.S. businesses with more than 20 employees; 1.1 million nonprofit organizations (not including congregations); and 205,583 congregations with more than 100 members. Including the Federal government in this effort, increases the hiring power even more.

By taking this action, the President ensures that the federal government, in its role as employer, contributes to the greatest extent possible to this national effort.

Welfare Reform Accomplishments

The following statistics highlight Clinton Administration accomplishments on welfare reform. We are making great progress, but there is more to do.

- **Already**, the welfare rolls have dropped by almost 18 percent from the March 1994 peak. As of November 1996, there are 2,500,000 *fewer* people on welfare than the day the President took his first oath of office -- the biggest drop in history -- and the rolls continued to drop.
- The poverty rate is down, decreasing by 2.9 million people between 1993 and 1995 after four straight years of increases.
- Over the past four years, the Administration has toughened child support enforcement, increasing collections by 50 percent. That's an increase of about \$4 billion from \$8 billion to \$12 billion.
- The teen **birth** rate declined four years in a row by a total of eight percent between 1991-1995.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Making Work Pay For Low-Income Federal Employees Conversion

The President's directive asks appropriate agencies to take three steps that will assist all low-income federal employees, whether or not former welfare recipients. Following is an explanation of the existing government services in these three areas and the rationale for agencies to expand their use of each.

Notifying Those Eligible About The EITC

The President directs each agency head to notify all employees eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) of both their eligibility and their ability to receive EITC monies each month in their paychecks.

The EITC is available to low-income individuals with incomes up to \$25,760 who have at least one child living with them in a home in the United States. The credit is based on a percentage of the employee's earned income. An eligible employee can claim the credit on the individual income tax return at the end of the year or the employee may receive advance payments with her pay. Payment of the advance EITC is limited to 60 percent of what an eligible employee would receive if she has only one qualifying child. For 1997, the maximum amount that may be advanced is \$1,326.

While agencies are currently encouraged to notify eligible employees about the EITC and the payment options, not all agencies do so. By directing each agency to notify its eligible employees about the EITC, the Federal government will ensure that its low-income employees receive the EITC in the manner that best enables them to cover costs such as child care, transportation, and housing, without which an employee may not be able to enter or remain in the labor market.

Encouraging Agency Use of the Federal Fare Subsidy Program

The President directs the General Services Administration (GSA) to issue guidelines that address whether agencies may offer fare subsidies based on the employee's income.

The Federal Fare Subsidy Program is one of several programs Federal agencies have the option to offer employees as part of the 1993 Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act. As of 1994 (the most current data available) ten agencies offered direct fare subsidies to over 30,000 employees to encourage them to use mass transit. The maximum allowable subsidy under the law is \$60 a month, though an agency can choose any subsidy level up to that. The General Services Administration-facilitated program is currently under used.

If the GSA finds that agencies may offer fare subsidies based on an employee's income, the finding will reduce the agency's cost of engaging in this program thereby enabling more agencies to participate while helping low-income workers with the cost of transportation to and from work.

Finding Affordable Child Care

The President directs the GSA, after consultation with all federal agencies, to report on plans to assist low-income federal workers in finding affordable child care. In particular, the directive asks that attention be paid to the option to contract with local resource and referral agencies.

The Federal government currently offers agencies two specific options to offer all employees access to child care: the authority to contract with private child care service providers to run on-site child care centers, and the option to contract with local child care resource and referral agencies that will connect Federal employees to accessible and affordable child care. The Department of Defense also runs its own child care center and offers child care subsidies to its employees (an option not available to other Federal agencies) as allowed under the Military Child Care Act of 1989.

There are over 200 agency-sponsored child care centers around the country and more are being

built. However, while capacity is available in agency-sponsored child care centers the cost of care is often too high for those in lower income brackets. It is for this reason that the President is asking agencies to report on plans to expand the use of their option to contract with local child care resource and referral agencies.

Making Work Pay For Low-Income Federal Employees Ex-Dump Conversion

The President's directive asks appropriate agencies to take three steps that will assist all low-income federal employees, whether or not former welfare recipients. Following is an explanation of the existing government services in these three areas and the rationale for agencies to expand their use of each.

Notifying Those Eligible About The EITC

The President directs each agency head to notify all employees eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) of both their eligibility and their ability to receive EITC monies each month in their paychecks.

The EITC is available to low-income individuals with incomes up to \$25,760 who have at least one child living with them in a home in the United States. The credit is based on a percentage of the employee's earned income. An eligible employee can claim the credit on the individual income tax return at the end of the year or the employee may receive advance payments with her pay. Payment of the advance EITC is limited to 60 percent of what an eligible employee would receive if she has only one qualifying child. For 1997, the maximum amount that may be advanced is \$1,326.

While agencies are currently encouraged to notify eligible employees about the EITC and the payment options, not all agencies do so. By directing each agency to notify its eligible employees about the EITC, the Federal government will ensure that its low-income employees receive the EITC in the manner that best enables them to cover costs such as child care, transportation, and housing, without which an employee may not be able to enter or remain in the labor market.

Encouraging Agency Use of the Federal Fare Subsidy Program

The President directs the General Services Administration (GSA) to issue guidelines that address whether agencies may offer fare subsidies based on the employee's income.

The Federal Fare Subsidy Program is one of several programs Federal agencies have the option to offer employees as part of the 1993 Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act. As of 1994 (the most current data available) ten agencies offered direct fare subsidies to over 30,000 employees to encourage them to use mass transit. The maximum allowable subsidy under the law is \$60 a month, though an agency can choose any subsidy level up to that. The General Services Administration-facilitated program is currently under used.

If the GSA finds that agencies may offer fare subsidies based on an employee's income, the finding will reduce the agency's cost of engaging in this program thereby enabling more agencies to participate while helping low-income workers with the cost of transportation to and from work.

Finding Affordable Child Care

The President directs the GSA, after consultation with all federal agencies, to report on plans to assist low-income federal workers in finding affordable child care. In particular, the directive asks that attention be paid to the option to contract with local resource and referral agencies.

The Federal government currently offers agencies two specific options to offer all employees access to child care: the authority to contract with private child care service providers to run on-site child care centers, and the option to contract with local child care resource and referral agencies that will connect Federal employees to accessible and affordable child care. The Department of Defense also runs its own child care center and offers child care subsidies to its employees (an option not available to other Federal agencies) as allowed under the Military Child Care Act of 1989.

There are over 200 agency-sponsored child care centers around the country and more are being

• **built. However, while capacity is available in agency-sponsored child care centers the cost of care is often too high for those in lower income brackets. It is for this reason that the President is asking agencies to report on plans to expand the use of their option to contract with local child care resource and referral agencies.**

The Federal Government's Plan To Hire and Retain Welfare Recipients

The President's directive asks every agency and department in the Federal government to use all available hiring authorities to hire people off the welfare rolls into available jobs in the Government. To accomplish this, the President directs each federal agency to present to him in 30 days a plan for hiring and retaining welfare recipients in Federal government positions.

Following is an explanation of how the President would like each agency to prepare the plan to carry out this directive.

A. Each agency should survey and report on its hiring capacity under all hiring authorities. This report should include where the agency can hire welfare recipients and in what sort of jobs.

While we encourage agencies to pursue all hiring options -- excepted hiring authorities as well as the normal competitive hiring process -- the excepted hiring authorities, particularly the Worker-Trainee program, are the most viable avenues through which to hire welfare recipients.

The five existing excepted service programs are each targeted to a specific group and boast simplified hiring procedures: the Veteran's Readjustment Appointment Program; the Severely Handicapped Appointment Program; the Presidential Management Intern Program; the Student Career Experience Program; and the Worker-Trainee Program.

The Worker-Trainee program was designed to attract entry-level people into the Federal workforce. It is a quick and easy way to hire individuals into trainee-type positions where needed training in basic skills and developmental experiences are offered. Provisions of the program include the following:

- May hire individuals at grades GS-1, WG-1, WG-2, or the equivalent
- May promote to grades GS-3, WG-4, or the equivalent
- Initial appointment is a term like appointment
- After three years, may convert to career status

B. Each agency should submit a plan describing in detail how the agency would work through the Federal Executive Boards (FEBs) and the Federal Executive Associations (FEAs) around the country to reach out to welfare offices, employment offices, nonprofit organizations, and others that work with the welfare population on a regular basis to notify them of job opportunities within the Federal government. [FEBs and FEAs are regional and state boards made up of the Federal agencies with offices on the particular areas.]

C. Each agency should submit a plan describing in detail how the agency would prepare and mentor welfare recipients who are hired by the Federal government to ensure that once hired, the welfare recipient retains her job. Agencies will work with the Vice President's office and the National Performance Review to review existing best practices including models such as Marriot's in-house program to train and hire welfare recipients and the New York-based America Works job placement and support organization that offers job readiness and training *before* placing the welfare recipients in jobs.

D. Finally, each agency should submit the manner in which the agency will report on a

monthly basis its progress in implementing the above plans and consequent hiring.

Q&A
The Federal Government Plan to Hire Welfare Recipients

Question: Does the President have specific hiring figures in mind?

Answer: No. The directive asks agency and department heads to each prepare an individualized plan for hiring welfare recipients that will include a survey of where jobs exist within the agency. Until these surveys are conducted, there is not a sufficient basis for hiring at target numbers. After conducting their surveys, some agencies may set target numbers as motivating devices. Others may decide that numbers, at this early stage of the process, are essentially arbitrary. That is for each agency to determine.

Question: How much will this effort cost?

Answer: We don't expect it to cost anything. All personnel offices conduct recruitment and outreach as part of their normal activities and build in these necessary activities as part of their normal budgets. Essentially, we are expecting agencies to make this a priority within their existing budgets.

Question: Are we talking about jobs in Washington, D.C.?

Answer: We're talking about jobs all over the country. More than 85 percent of federal jobs are located outside the Washington metropolitan area.

Question: Will the White House directly hire welfare recipients?

Answer: Absolutely. Jodie Torkelson, who handles management and administration for the White House, is working hard to put together a program at the White House. In fact, her staff is looking at Marriott's hiring program for welfare recipients and the job placement and support organization America Works, as well as others, as possible models for a White House hiring plan.

Question: How many welfare recipients will the White House hire?

Answer: Just as the Federal agencies need to survey hiring capacity and types of jobs available, so does the White House. But the office of Administration of the Executive Office of the President is putting a program together and will report to the President, just as will other departments and agencies.

Question: What is the date of the Cabinet meeting?

Answer: The President will hold the cabinet meeting, as stated in the directive,

approximately 30 days from the date of this directive.

Question: Aren't you favoring welfare recipients over everyone else?

Answer: We are not creating any preference such as the one that exists for veterans. We are encouraging the departments to use an existing hiring authority that allows departments to cut through red tape and hire entry-level workers quickly and easily. We are also encouraging outreach efforts. This is the same commitment that the President has asked of the private sector.

Question: Why are we specifically helping welfare recipients rather than other poor people?

Answer: We make no apologies about the fact that we are asking the agencies to hire needy single mothers with children. These are the people whom it is most crucial to reach and put on the track of work. We want to help these families move from dependence on welfare to independence through self-sufficiency.

Question: Is this the final step?

Answer: No. This is a first step -- though a significant one. Agencies will begin working right away to identify available jobs, reach out to welfare recipients to notify them of those jobs, and to fully use the existing programs to help recipients take *and keep* the jobs.

Question: You and others in the Administration have mentioned several times that there were many hurdles to enacting a hiring program? What were those hurdles and how did you overcome them?

Answer: The Federal hiring process is full of complex rules and regulations. We sat down and looked at all of these rules to find the best way through them. We discovered an existing track of hiring authority -- The Worker-Trainee Program -- that would allow agencies to hire entry-level people quickly and easily, without all the usual hurdles. This program has fallen into disuse. It is now our job to make sure every agency and department head becomes aware of the hiring options available.

Question: How are you going to hire welfare recipients at a time government is downsizing and budgets are tough?

Answer: In just this last fiscal year, the Federal government hired over 27,000 employees with annual pay up to \$16,500, a number that goes up to 87,900 when reviewing those hired at salaries up to \$24,500. In June 1969, after the Worker-Trainee program became fully operational, 7,000 placements were made across the country during a time of tight budgets and personnel ceilings. So this program can

make a difference.

Question: Did you decide not to create a new hiring track because of pressure from the Veterans' groups and unions?

Answer: No. We decided not to create a new hiring track because it wasn't needed. A program already existed, which, if revitalized, would do the job. Creating a new program would only add unnecessary complication.

The Federal Government's Plan To Hire and Retain Welfare Recipients

The President's directive asks every agency and department in the Federal government to use all available hiring authorities -- and in particular, to expand use of the Worker-Trainee Program -- to hire people off the welfare rolls into available jobs in the Government. To accomplish this, the President directs each federal agency to present to him in 30 days a plan for hiring and retaining welfare recipients in Federal government positions.

The President's directive highlights and calls for expanded use of the Worker-Trainee Program. This program offers a quick and easy way of hiring entry-level people into the Federal workforce and bypassing complex Federal personnel hiring rules and procedures. Provisions of the program include the following:

- May hire individuals at grades GS-1, WG-1, WG-2, or the equivalent
- May promote to grades GS-3, WG-4, or the equivalent
- Initial appointment is a term like appointment
- After three years, may convert to career status

In recognition of the different characteristics of each agency's workforce, the President also instructed each head of the departments and agencies to prepare a detailed plan for hiring welfare recipients. This plan should include these components.

A. Each agency should survey and report on its hiring capacity. The report should include an assessment of the positions in the agency that could most easily be filled by welfare recipients.

B. Each agency should submit a plan describing in detail how the agency would recruit and hire qualified welfare recipients, including how the agency would reach out to welfare offices, state and private employment offices, nonprofit organizations, and others that regularly work with welfare recipients. This plan is to build upon the government's existing nationwide employment information systems which include the latest worldwide job openings, full job descriptions and skills requirements, access to application materials and on-line application, and information on a wide variety of Federal employment related topics and programs. The information systems use a combination of direct mail, satellite broadcasts, television, and technology services including the INTERNET. The plan should also use Federal Executive Boards (FEBs) and the Federal Executive Associations (FEAs) which are regional and state boards made up of the Federal agencies with offices in the particular areas.

C. Each agency should submit a plan describing in detail how the agency will assist welfare recipients to perform well enough to keep their jobs. For example, the agency could recommend on-the-job training and mentoring programs for some workers.

D. Finally, each agency should submit the manner in which the agency will report on a monthly basis its progress in implementing the above plans and consequent hiring.

The heads of departments and agencies will report to the President on their plans at a special cabinet meeting and will report monthly on implementation and progress. The Vice President will oversee the entire effort, assisting agencies in carrying out their commitments.

Making Work Pay For Low-Income Federal Employees

The President's directive asks appropriate agencies to take three steps that will help bring welfare recipients into the Federal workforce while assisting all other low-income federal employees.

Notifying Those Eligible About The EITC

The President directs each agency head to notify all employees eligible for the Earned-Income Tax Credit (EITC) of both their eligibility and their ability to receive EITC monies each month in their paychecks.

The EITC is available to low-income individuals with incomes up to \$25,760 who have at least one child living with them in a home in the United States. The credit is based on a percentage of the employee's earned income. An eligible employee can claim the credit on the individual income tax return at the end of the year or the employee may receive advance payments with her pay. Payment of the advance EITC is limited to 60 percent of what an eligible employee would receive if she has only one qualifying child. For 1997, the maximum amount that may be advanced is \$1,326.

While agencies are currently encouraged to notify eligible employees about the EITC and the payment options, not all agencies do so. By directing each agency to notify its eligible employees about the EITC, the Federal government will ensure that its low-income employees receive the EITC in the manner that best enables them to cover costs such as child care, transportation, and housing, without which an employee may not be able to enter or remain in the labor market.

Encouraging Agency Use of the Federal Fare Subsidy Program

The President directs the General Services Administration (GSA) to issue guidelines that address whether agencies may offer fare subsidies based on the employee's income.

The Federal Fare Subsidy Program is one of several programs Federal agencies have the option to offer employees as part of the 1993 Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act. As of 1994 (the most current data available), ten agencies offered direct fare subsidies to over 30,000 employees for public transportation. The maximum allowable subsidy under the law is \$60 a month, though an agency can choose any subsidy level up to that.

Offering fare subsidies based on an employee's income would reduce the agency's cost of engaging in this program, thereby enabling more agencies to participate while helping low-income workers with the cost of transportation to and from work. But there are difficult legal and policy questions associated with a change, and the President has directed the GSA to address these questions and return with appropriate recommendations.

Finding Affordable Child Care

The President directs the GSA, after consultation with all federal agencies, to report on plans to assist low-income federal workers in finding affordable child care.

The Federal government currently offers agencies two ways to offer all employees access to child care: the authority to contract with private child care service providers to run on-site child care centers of which there are currently over 200, and the option to contract with local child care resource and referral agencies that will connect Federal employees to accessible and affordable child care. The Department of Defense also runs its own child care centers and offers child care subsidies to its employees (an option not available to other Federal agencies) as allowed under the Military Child Care Act of 1989.

By issuing this directive, the President wants to encourage the agencies to review all of their child care options and report on ways each agency can best use and expand upon existing services to

help low-income Federal employees access affordable and convenient child care.

Automated Records Management System

licx-Dump Conversion

The President's Radio Address March 8, 1997

Announcement

Today, President Clinton will direct each head of a Federal agency or department to use all available hiring authorities to hire and retain welfare recipients in jobs in the government. The President will highlight the existing Worker-Trainee Program and call for agencies to expand the use of this program. The President will also call for agencies to prepare individualized plans for hiring welfare recipients. Finally, the President will ask agencies to explore and report on ways to help low-income employees gain access to the Earned-Income Tax Credit (EITC), transportation subsidies, and affordable child care.

Background

Since the President signed the historic welfare reform law, he has urged businesses, non-profit organizations, and religious groups across the nation to help make its promise of opportunity real by offering jobs to welfare recipients.

By taking this action, the President ensures that the federal government, as the nation's largest employer, contributes to the greatest extent possible to this national effort.

Critical Welfare Reform Accomplishments

The following statistics highlight Clinton Administration accomplishments on welfare reform. We are making great progress, but there is more to do.

- **Already**, the welfare rolls have dropped by almost 18 percent from the March 1994 peak. As of November 1996, there are 2,500,000 *fewer* people on welfare than the day the President took his first oath of office -- the biggest drop in history -- and the rolls continued to drop.
- The poverty rate is down, decreasing by 2.9 million people between 1993 and 1995 after four straight years of increases.
- Over the past four years, the Administration has toughened child support enforcement, increasing collections by 50 percent. That's an increase of about \$4 billion from \$8 billion to \$12 billion.
- The teen **birth** rate declined four years in a row by a total of eight percent between 1991-1995.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kathleen M. McKiernan (CN=Kathleen M. McKiernan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAR-1997 10:59:03.00

SUBJECT: thanks

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks for all of your help today and for the great paper. It makes all the difference. I think Pierre Thomas at the Post is working on the radio address for them and I've left him a message to see if he needs anything. I'll let you know as soon as I hear back. Thanks again! -- Kathy

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	William R. Kincaid to Elena Kagan, Bruce N. Reed, and Paul J. Weinstein Jr. Subject: Travel plans. (1 page)	03/08/1997	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/07/1997 - 03/10/1997]

2009-1006-F

wr29

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-MAR-1997 18:08:29.00

SUBJECT: Re: Biomaterials

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Yes. Some. The industry was quite frustrated with our position last year; they felt that there was a legitimate compromise that could have moved separate and apart from the product liability bill. They thought we were the one, real big hang up. However, I never pushed very hard or got too much involved because I didn't see any hope in legislation moving. I am sure there were numerous reasons why Bruce (and perhaps you?) did not want this to move.

I do think there is a chance this year for something constructive to emerge this year, which might be good a reasonable compromise and also good for the President. The industry really wants something and may be willing to give more in this round. Specifics are always the problem and, if you want, I can update my memory banks. I can tell you now, however, that I would have to do that in order to be of any real assistance to you.

cj

WELFARE REFORM AND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

As the work requirements of the new welfare law begin to go into effect, a critical question for both the labor movement and the states is whether worker protection laws -- particularly the minimum wage law (Fair Labor Standards Act) -- protect welfare recipients who take part in workfare or subsidized employment programs. The DPC and OMB have been running an interagency process (involving DOL, HHS, USDA, and others) to hammer out an answer to this question. We expect to have a detailed recommendation for the President within the next week, as well as a strategy for rolling out this controversial Administration policy. We believe there are advantages to announcing a decision regarding the Fair Labor Standards Act and privatization at the same time because the overall package will look balanced, favoring neither labor nor the states too much.

There is general agreement among the agencies, as a matter of both law and policy, that the Fair Labor Standards Act should be read to require payment of at least the minimum wage to most people in workfare and wage supplementation programs. On this reading, participants in such programs would count as "employees" under the Act, thus qualifying for minimum wage protection -- except for a few who would count as "trainees" instead. Bruce has given the AFL private assurances that the Administration will adopt this basic position.

Requiring the minimum wage for workfare recipients, however, will raise obvious difficulties for the states, in light of the new welfare law's work provisions. Even if a recipient is working only 20 hours each week, the existing welfare grant in many states will fall short of a minimum wage salary. As the work requirement in the law increases to 25 and then to 30 hours, and as the minimum wage also increases, more and more states will discover that their welfare grants are insufficient.

One way to mitigate this new burden on the states is to count benefits other than cash assistance toward the minimum wage. There is a very strong legal argument, based on provisions in the food stamp law, that states may add the value of food stamps to the basic welfare grant for purposes of complying with the minimum wage. Even if both these streams of benefits are counted, however, a number of Southern states will immediately come up short, and as the minimum wage increases and the work requirements become more severe, other states will join them over time. Allowing states to count the value of other benefits -- child care, housing, or transportation -- toward the minimum wage would remove this problem, but this proposal raises a number of legal and policy questions. DPC and OMB are currently working through these and similar issues with the affected agencies in an effort to apply the minimum wage law to working welfare recipients without imposing large new costs on states. If the Republican majority in Congress is unhappy with our decision, they could react by passing and sending to the President a measure to exempt the new welfare law from the Fair Labor Standards Act or to require certain

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

benefits to count towards the minimum wage.

The interagency group also is reviewing what other labor protections apply to welfare recipients in workfare or subsidized employment programs. The consensus view is that OSHA, unemployment insurance, and anti-discrimination laws will apply in the same way they do for other workers. We have yet to get a firm opinion from Treasury as to whether the monies paid to these welfare recipients will be subject to FICA and other taxes, as well as eligible for the EITC, but we believe they will not. Finally, these workers may well become eligible to unionize. Recent newspaper articles have suggested that some unions will undertake large-scale organizing efforts targeting welfare recipients, and we probably should expect some of these efforts to succeed.

**STATE FLEXIBILITY TO PRIVATIZE
WELFARE, FOOD STAMPS, AND MEDICAID**

The new welfare law explicitly allows states to administer and provide Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) through contracts with private entities. Now, two states (Texas and Wisconsin) are seeking federal approval to contract out certain functions of the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs as well. Organized labor is concerned that privatizing these government functions will displace state and local government workers and will undermine beneficiary rights to due process and confidentiality.

The DPC and OMB have been running an interagency process (involving the Departments of Agriculture, HHS, Labor, and OPM) to consider these requests. The group has concluded that legally:

- The TANF law explicitly allows contracting to private organizations;
- The Food Stamp law says "certification" must be completed by "merit system employees." Allowing private contracting in the Food Stamp program would require the Administration to waive or seek legislative changes to portions of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, which is administered by the Office of Personnel Management; and
- The Medicaid law forbids the State agency responsible for Medicaid from delegating authority to non-governmental entities to "exercise administration discretion in the administration or supervision of the plan." The Administration has sought a legislative change -- in its current and last year's Medicaid budget proposals -- which would allow states to delegate such authority.

Thus, we believe we can allow privatization for all three programs and it is our current policy is to allow it for TANF and Medicaid. Currently, most states have one-stop government-run eligibility centers, in which one worker determines eligibility for TANF, Food Stamps, and Medicaid. If we do not allow private contracting in Food Stamps, then states will be discouraged from contracting out TANF and Medicaid eligibility, to avoid forcing some individuals to go to one location to apply for TANF and Medicaid and another for Food Stamps.

**STATE FLEXIBILITY TO PRIVATIZE
WELFARE, FOOD STAMPS, AND MEDICAID**

The new welfare law explicitly allows states to administer and provide Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) through contracts with private entities. Now, two states (Texas and Wisconsin) are seeking federal approval to contract out certain functions of the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs as well. These states believe that a competitive contracting process will result in greater program efficiencies while protecting recipients. Organized labor is concerned that privatizing these government functions will displace state and local government workers (with a resulting loss of union membership) and will undermine beneficiary rights to due process and confidentiality.

Since June of 1995, the State of Texas has been developing a plan to streamline the application process for public assistance. Since May of 1996, federal agencies and the State of Texas have been negotiating over the conditions of a Request for Offers Texas wants to release regarding TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, and certain other federally-funded nutrition programs.

Under the Texas plan, private contractors would conduct the application and eligibility determination process, and the state would certify the determinations. Texas sought approval to release the Request for Offers by January 1997, but instead received a letter from HHS saying "We cannot provide a final decision on your request at this time." Rep. Charles Stenholm, one of the Administration's strongest welfare reform allies, complained about the delay to Frank Raines in a February 24th letter, saying the state of Texas is "willing to make accommodations to address administration concerns." According to March 7th Washington Post, the state has decided to move ahead without the Administration's approval.

A preliminary interagency analysis of the Texas proposal (involving the DPC, OMB, Agriculture, HHS, Labor, and OPM) found that:

- Current law explicitly allows TANF to be administered by private organizations;
- Current law Food Stamps and Medicaid, as well as the Administration's Medicaid budget proposal, could probably be interpreted to allow privatizing the eligibility determination process, as Texas wants. The Administration needs to decide what policy it wants to pursue.

Private contractors determining eligibility for Medicaid and Food Stamps would have to follow federal eligibility rules, since those programs remain federally guaranteed individual entitlements (unlike TANF). If the Administration does not allow private contracting for Food Stamps and Medicaid, then states will be discouraged from contracting in the TANF program because having separate eligibility systems would create administrative difficulties (requiring, for example, some individuals to go to one location to apply for TANF and another to apply for Food Stamps and Medicaid, unlike now, when nearly all states have one-stop, government-run eligibility centers). The challenge for the Administration will be to determine how to allow privatization while protecting beneficiary's rights and not undermining the federal guarantee of Medicaid and Food Stamps which the Administration fought so hard to protect.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1997 17:54:14.00

SUBJECT: Children's Defense Fund meeting March 12-15

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lyn A. Hogan (CN=Lyn A. Hogan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Lyn and I had discussed the idea of releasing a "Clinton Administration Accomplishments for Children" or "Children's Initiatives in the President's Budget" to reporters before the Children's Defense Fund meets in D.C. this week to help spawn positive media coverage. The annual conference theme is "Standing Strong Together for Children: Leave No Child Behind" and they are meeting at the Jefferson Hotel. If you like the general idea, we should get on it right away to release it either Tuesday or Wednesday.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion
AFSCME CONCERNS ABOUT MEDICAID

Background

There is almost nothing about the Medicaid policy in the President's budget that AFSCME supports. They are opposed to having any Medicaid savings, arguing that recent downward baseline adjustments mitigate the need for further deficit reduction contributions by Medicaid. They oppose how we achieve the savings, arguing that a per capita cap could hurt vulnerable populations and that cuts in disproportionate share (DSH) payments will hurt public hospitals, the patients they serve, and the employees who work in the institutions. And finally, they are extremely uncomfortable with providing more administrative flexibility to the states, publicly arguing that it will subject beneficiaries to substandard care and reductions in access, and privately worrying that states will contract out with non-union employees to administer Medicaid.

At this time, there is nothing we can do relative to AFSCME's concerns about how we achieve our savings. Our budget is now public and we certainly cannot run away from the per capita cap and the DSH savings proposals. Although they will grumble about our savings policy, AFSCME understands we cannot modify it at this stage in the process. Instead, they are focusing on two issues that they believe we can address: (1) the allocation of DSH savings and (2) our yet to be submitted state flexibility language, particularly as it relates to personnel requirements.

- (1) **DSH Allocation/Targeting.** AFSCME and the public hospitals agree that there may be limited savings in DSH, but only if it is combined with much better targeting of DSH dollars to the hospitals they say are providing care to the greatest numbers of uninsured, underinsured and high cost Medicaid patients -- the public hospitals. While most of the players (the private hospitals, public hospitals, physicians, the unions, consumer groups, and even some states) all acknowledge there could be better targeting, no one agrees on how best to do it. It is for this reason that we chose to punt on this issue, saying that we wanted to work with interested parties on how best to design an improved allocation formula. Consistent with that, we have already held meetings in the last week and a half with both the unions and the public hospitals, and we plan do to more.

Talking Points:

- **I understand your concerns about both the size of the DSH cut and the need for better targeting of these dollars. We agree that we need to find ways to better target dollars, but -- as you know -- the devil is in the details.**
- **We did not release a specific, new targeting formula because we thought it would more likely hurt, rather than help, the chances of reforming the current allocation approach. If we went ahead with almost anything, the states and many hospitals would have used up all of their energy killing it, rather than working together to find consensus on this difficult issue.**
- **We have held some constructive preliminary meetings with your policy experts on this issue, and we plan on doing more. Let's keep talking to see if**

we can come up with something we both can agree on.

- (2) **State flexibility/personnel requirement issues.** AFSCME is particularly concerned about two provisions in our Medicaid flexibility proposal: (A) the elimination of the waiver process for managed care and (B) the relaxation of certain personnel requirements for the Medicaid program.

(A) AFSCME opposes the elimination of the managed care waiver process. They like it because they feel it gives them time to weigh in on issues they are concerned about, thus giving them the opportunity to push the Department to make changes before final approval. The truth is that neither the current waiver process nor the proposed state plan amendment process that will replace it affords much opportunity for the unions to influence the actions of the Department. What remains the same, though, is the Department's authority to not grant, or subsequently repeal, the authority to implement a managed care program. Moreover, although the time-consuming waiver process would be repealed under our proposal, we are going to include new language that would assure that quality standards are being met by managed care plans.

(B) AFSCME is significantly concerned about our provisions to relax personnel requirements on state Medicaid programs. They charge that such changes will undermine quality and, at least as important to AFSCME, potentially lead to further reductions in force in Medicaid programs around the country. They believe, for example, that allowing non-government employees to do eligibility may create conflict of interest problems for companies who are also overseeing managed care plans.

Unlike the new welfare law, our current Medicaid language does not allow states to completely privatize the administration of the program. It does, however, repeal the requirement that states use Federal merit protection systems when hiring personnel. The unions are satisfied that we are not talking about a welfare law type approach, but extremely concerned that the merit protections repeal will open up the door to going down that road. The Administration is still trying to determine exactly how we want to interpret both current welfare law (e.g., food stamps) and our new Medicaid proposal, particularly on the issue of whether private personnel can determine eligibility. We have an interagency/OMB/DPC working group finalizing our position in these issues.

Talking Points:

- **I understand your concerns about the Medicaid flexibility provisions. We want to work with you on these important issues.**
- **While we cannot back-track on our position on the elimination of the waiver process, we do want to work with you to assure that appropriate quality standards are in place. When we send up the statutory language, you will see that we are improving our Medicaid quality provisions.**
- **We understand your concerns about the merit system protections. We are working hard to develop a workable, realistic approach to administering Medicaid that assure a high quality program. I know you have met with Donna Shalala on this issue and I believe we should continue our conversations so there are no surprises.**

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: T J. Glauthier (CN=T J. Glauthier/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1997 12:31:51.00

SUBJECT: Children's Health EO

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Alecia Ward (CN=Alecia Ward/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Robert S. Fairweather (CN=Robert S. Fairweather/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Carline M Jelsma (CN=Carline M Jelsma/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ronald M. Cogswell (CN=Ronald M. Cogswell/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Bradley M. Campbell (CN=Bradley M. Campbell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have reviewed a recent draft of the EO that has been under development for several weeks. I do not know the results of your meeting on Friday, but understand the process is moving along. I will not be able to attend your Tuesday meeting either, but will be sure that Carrie or someone on our staff is present.

I continue to support the overall objective of this proposed EO, but also continue to have difficulty with some of its specifics. Let me mention three:

Section 304 -- is the requirement more exhaustive than it need be? This asks agencies to identify and report "all data needs that have arisen". Can't we be more flexible and ask them to report in a more general way, such as to report "key data needs that have arisen", or some other phrase? Section 4 -- this sounds like it could be a massive database undertaking. Has anyone estimated how big it will be, how much it will cost, and who will be responsible for it? I worry, too, that it could be duplicative of other databases. This is described in very comprehensive terms, covering all federally-sponsored research in the area, as well as aiming to include private and academic research, and making it all available to the public. Section 501 -- do we want this worded the way it is? I will defer to Sally Katzen and OIRA, but this seems to be structured to imply that we are not choosing the most protective alternatives, and therefore that we need to identify more protective alternatives and explain why we did not select them. Couldn't we do this in a more positive manner, and perhaps cause less new work for the agencies, by directing that they explain how the proposed action provides appropriate protection for children and what alternatives were evaluated and why they were rejected. This formulation is more positive and would allow agencies to explain that they rejected less strict alternatives, too.

Section 603 -- Now that I see the substance of the prior EO, 12606, I do not think we should revoke it as part of this action. I had supported that before on the understanding that this one really did replace the old one, but it is clear from the details that EO12606 is broader and covers a number of subjects related to families that are not dealt with in this new draft EO at all.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1997 14:15:00.00

SUBJECT: AFSCME FROM HELL

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Could you please forward my final two pager to moi for my records? Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1997 20:45:47.00

SUBJECT: Gov. Whitman's complaint re: cost of minimum wage not valid if food stamps

TO: Lyn A. Hogan (CN=Lyn A. Hogan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kenneth S. Apfel (CN=Kenneth S. Apfel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I was reading Gov. Whitman's letter more carefully today, and noticed that all the calculations are based on counting ONLY cash assistance towards the minimum wage. She says paying the minimum wage for 30 hours a week will cost NJ \$333 per participant more per month. The HHS data I got from Elena's files say that if food stamps are counted in paying the minimum wage:

NJ could SAVE \$67/month for a family of 3
NJ would SAVE \$197/month for a family of 4
NJ would lose \$152/month for a family of 2

Depending on the distribution of the population, New Jersey may not have to spend more after all. Of course, the state could only make up the loss for two person families if it cut cash benefits for larger families, so those families (even with the subsequent rise in food stamps) would be worse off.

In any case, we should get ASPE to run numbers based on the actual family sizes in each state, shouldn't we? Then we can have a total savings or loss number for each state which we can release if we so chose. What do you think?

P.S. Ken -- Bruce asked if someone would check our '94 and '96 bills requirements re: Fair Labor Standards Act so we can be prepared to answer the question "Have we changed our policy?" Could someone on your staff do that or should I call HHS?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-MAR-1997 18:50:58.00

SUBJECT: brain conference

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Any way we can touch base tomorrow morning? In particular, we need to discuss the POTUS and HRC event on Wednesday before we have a larger meeting with POTUS scheduling, etc. Will the E.O. on children be ready to be announced then?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 17:20:56.00

SUBJECT: Scheduling Requests

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Christa and I talked today, and discussed some ideas on how she can be best utilized. One thing we discussed, which makes great sense to me, is for her to draft all DPC scheduling requests under your name. I believe this is important, since she is attending the short-term scheduling meetings where she must defend our proposals.

If you agree, I will let the staff know and ask Christa to begin with this task.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 16:45:53.00

SUBJECT: welfare/states

TO: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary E. Glynn (CN=Mary E. Glynn/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michelle Crisci (CN=Michelle Crisci/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michael D. McCurry (CN=Michael D. McCurry/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Perhaps I'm missing something we're doing, but a Rich Wolf piece in today's USA Today makes it clear that some states are going to take at least some of this year's welfare windfall and spend it on something other than welfare-related costs, whether it's education, job-training, child care, whatever. Doesn't it make sense for us to be urging them to spend all of this money to help in the transition from welfare to work?

Automated Records Management System
JHex-Dump Conversion

Prior to the Summit itself, we should do at least one event designed to highlight our own approach and involvement with national service and voluntarism. The first ideas probably has the most merit, but several possibilities follow:

- National Service Scholars Program -- The President could announce the launch of this \$1,000 scholarship for high school juniors or seniors who do an outstanding job in community service. The Federal government puts up \$500, and local or community sources match that amount. Civic groups like the Lions, Elks, and Kiwanis are being encouraged to fund the local match, and could attend the event. We would push to have the first scholarship winners attend as well. By focusing on young people who do service, rather than purely volunteer efforts, this would reinforce the President's concept of service. The President first announced the scholarship program at an event last year at Penn State. Under the President's 1998 budget, the program could expand to every high school next year.
- Commit half of all work-study slots to service by the year 2000 -- Such an announcement could be made at a college with a good program of service-based work-study -- for example, where college students teach young children to read.
- Highlight Young People Serving Young People -- The President could attend an award ceremony for a program in Philadelphia that uses high school students to tutor second-graders. National Youth Service Day on April 15 could be highlighted.
- Feature AmeriCorps alumni -- The President could demonstrate how the AmeriCorps program produces future service leaders by meeting with a group of AmeriCorps alumni at a literacy or early childhood event. AmeriCorps alumni are trying to set a standard for themselves of 10 hours per month of volunteer time.
- Faith-based Service -- The President could challenge religious institutions and faith-based organizations to create full-time service opportunities, and agree to give them National Service scholarships if they do.
- Commitment by Federal Government -- The President could announce some or all of the Federal agencies' commitments to the Summit. We are working with Federal agencies to identify what types of commitments they can make to the Summit's five goals. Possibilities include making a Federal commitment around giving young people the opportunity to serve; or showing how service could further all our existing Administration priorities, such as literacy, welfare to work, crime, etc.
- Earth Day -- This year's Earth Day commemoration should tie into the service theme. We are working with CEQ on this.
- President's Service Awards -- Summit organizers are pushing to have these annual awards presented by the President or First Lady at the Summit itself, but we could push to hold them prior to the Summit. They are considered the highest honor in the volunteer

*Automated Records Management System
Ilex-Dump Conversion*

world, and are normally awarded around National Volunteer Week (mid-April).

- Give Federal Employees More Flexibility to Volunteer -- We could try to expand on an executive order by former President Bush to make it easier for Federal employees to volunteer (although one area of exposure is that it is not clear how closely we have been following that executive order).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diane C. Regas (CN=Diane C. Regas/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 23:54:09.00

SUBJECT: Kids EO

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Attached are the options that Elgie and I came up with. I recommend the following process (on which we would seek NEC and CEQ agreement):

1. White House discussion of options. The purpose of these discussions would be to agree to which are worth putting on the table. One important goal of this process would be to identify which (if any) options would address OIRA's concerns. Tues/Weds.
2. Jointly-called (DPC,NEC,CEQ) Deputies meeting to attempt to resolve remaining issues. Friday
3. Draft memo to President. Monday
4. Jointly-called Principals meeting to seek resolution or narrow views and arguments that will be in a memo.Tues/Weds.
5. Send memo to President.

----- Forwarded by Diane C. Regas/OPD/EOP on 03/10/97
11:47 PM -----

Elwood J. Holstein
03/10/97 01:20:55 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: McGavock D. Reed/OMB/EOP, Bradley M. Campbell/CEQ/EOP
Subject: Kids EO

We have agreed to defer announcement of the EO beyond Wednesday in hopes of expeditiously resolving outstanding agency disagreements. The interagency meeting to continue wordsmithing will still take place this afternoon at 4pm in room 248, as scheduled, but we anticipate the need for additional meetings in the near future to address remaining differences, especially those regarding Section 5. In the meantime, attached are some options we can begin to think about within the White House as alternative approaches to that section.

Message Sent

To:

Sally Katzen/OMB/EOP
Donald R. Arbuckle/OMB/EOP
Michael A. Fitzpatrick/OMB/EOP
Kathleen M. Wallman/WHO/EOP

Section 5 Alternatives

1. Re-write 5(b) as follows: “An assessment of potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the covered regulatory action that have been identified by the agency or the public. This assessment shall include the relative effectiveness of the alternatives in reducing or mitigating risks to children; and”

Explanation: This option provides agencies with flexibility to explain the spectrum of choices they considered instead of highlighting only those options that are more protective of children. This spectrum will provide more context to any public debate about the appropriateness of the agency’s choice. At the same time, this option preserves the goal of openness on the record about how agency rulemakings protect children.

2. Delete 5(c).

Explanation: This would reduce, but probably not eliminate, the obligation agencies would have to explain why their proposed regulatory approach is preferable to an alternative more protective of children.

3. Delete 5(c) and, in 5(b), delete the opportunity for members of the public to identify reasonably feasible alternatives.

Explanation: In addition to reducing the burden of explaining why a potentially more protective alternative was not adopted, this option would enhance agency discretion by eliminating the requirement that they assess alternatives proposed by members of the public.

4. Delete section 5 entirely.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jill M. Pizzuto (CN=Jill M. Pizzuto/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 15:38:40.00

SUBJECT: Texas Privatization meeting??

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Cathy R. Mays (CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Elena:

are you / the DPC organizing a meeting re: this issue?? Just wondering when it may be. Ken brought this up at our staff meeting today and asked that I follow up w/ you.

thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 11:54:53.00

SUBJECT: Stuff

TO: Dena B. Weinstein (CN=Dena B. Weinstein/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Should we hold the assault report for later?

----- Forwarded by Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP on 03/10/97
 11:55 AM -----

Paul J. Weinstein Jr.
 03/10/97 11:23:31 AM
 Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
 cc: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP
 Subject: Stuff

POTUS Schedule

3/10 Mubarak Meeting, Press Conference
 3/11 Speech to Conference on Free TV and Political Reform
 Economic Portion of DC Announcement
 Dorgan Fundraiser
 DNC Dinner
 3/12 ABC RADIO Town Hall with Kids to focus on the issue of drugs.
 Early Childhood Development EO
 Meeting with Republican Leadership and Committee Chairs
 3/13 Speech in Ralieggh before State Legislature on Education.
 3/14 Some type of event in Jupiter Island -- maybe focus on school
 construction.
 Radio Address (Topic not yet determined)
 3/15 Golf with Greg Norman. Then back to DC for Gridiron Dinner.
 3/16 Down
 3/17 St. Patrick's Day. Meeting with IRISH PM and Russian Foreign
 Minister.
 Reception
 3/18 Speaker's St. Patrick's Day lunch.
 3/18 to 3/21 Helsinki and Copenhagen. Yeltsin Summit.

Agency Announcements

USDA Ag summit with Gov. Hunt in NC. EQUIP environmental
 program, proposed allocations nationwide to be announced
 Thursday, speak to Public Voice and Women's Health 2000
 conference to speak on nutrition.

JUSTICE Assault weapons report coming out at end of the week. 6% decrease in crimes committed this year. Civil Rights staff may visit burned down church.

INTERIOR Bison Slaughter press conference. Friday, NY Times Ed Board meeting on Endangered Species Act.

HUD Wed hearing on Indian Housing programs. There was expose in Seattle Times earlier this year. Safeway event on monday morning. Not clear if Secretary will go. Cabinet Affairs wants him to. Cuomo in NYC to kick off savings bond drive.

VETERANS Sec will do 9:00 am school event at Eastern High School. It is their adopted school. Also announcing telecom grant to school.

GSA Security since Oklahoma Bombing. USA TODAY wants info on counter measures being taken since the bombing.

Message Sent

To:

Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP
Lyn A. Hogan/OPD/EOP
Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP
Dennis K. Burke/OPD/EOP
Christa Robinson/WHO/EOP
Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP
Stephen C. Warnath/OPD/EOP
Elizabeth Drye/OPD/EOP
Diane C. Regas/OPD/EOP
Sarah A. Bianchi/OMB/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 11:36:14.00

SUBJECT: your phone

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I called the phone people to put a priority on this job-- they said it would be done today. I authorized this to be done on overtime for Friday pm but apparently, they never carried out the request.

The phone people will be installing a new line into 218 which will allow you to forward your calls back and forth to the WW and the OEOB. Laura will be able to pick up 65584 for you in the WW; you may want to keep your new line in 218 as a personal/private line. If you like, we can remove the number from the screen so only your name shows up (keeping the line private). Let me know if you are interested in doing this.

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Kathleen M. McKiernan (CN=Kathleen M. McKiernan/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 16:05:03.00

SUBJECT: child labor issues

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

AP is beginning work on a major series on child labor abuse, both internationally and in the US. They are talking to the Labor Department, but were wondering if there was anyone at the White House that follows that issue. Is there anyone you can think of? Would they be in DPC?

Thanks in advance -- Kathy

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield (CN=Alice E. Shuffield/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 21:51:00.00

SUBJECT: OMB Legislative Report -- March 10, 1997

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa Green (CN=Melissa Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Pizzuto (CN=Jill M. Pizzuto/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrew M. Schoenbach (CN=Andrew M. Schoenbach/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward A. Brigham (CN=Edward A. Brigham/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Francis S. Redburn (CN=Francis S. Redburn/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David E. Tornquist (CN=David E. Tornquist/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard J. Turman (CN=Richard J. Turman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_P (SMITH_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Keith J. Fontenot (CN=Keith J. Fontenot/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jack D. Fellows (CN=Jack D. Fellows/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rodney G. Bent (CN=Rodney G. Bent/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David H. Morrison (CN=David H. Morrison/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven D. Aitken (CN=Steven D. Aitken/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Roger L. McClung (CN=Roger L. McClung/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Toni S. Hustead (CN=Toni S. Hustead/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HOGAN_L (HOGAN_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary Jo Siclari (CN=Mary Jo Siclari/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WILLIAMS_MA (WILLIAMS_MA @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: VELLENGA_T (VELLENGA_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WARREN_W (WARREN_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (CEQ)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas C. Jensen (CN=Thomas C. Jensen/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WARREN_M (WARREN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ABERNATHY_P (ABERNATHY_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kate P. Donovan (CN=Kate P. Donovan/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SPERLING_G (SPERLING_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ben A. Freeland (CN=Ben A. Freeland/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ananias Blocker III (CN=Ananias Blocker III/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark A. Weatherly (CN=Mark A. Weatherly/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: April K. Mellody (CN=April K. Mellody/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHAEFER_V (SCHAEFER_V @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James B. Kazel (CN=James B. Kazel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Fairweather (CN=Robert S. Fairweather/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert J. Nassif (CN=Robert J. Nassif/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lucia A. Wyman (CN=Lucia A. Wyman/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nicholas B. Kirkhorn (CN=Nicholas B. Kirkhorn/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ANGELL_J (ANGELL_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Himler (CN=Janet Himler/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen L. Hancox (CN=Karen L. Hancox/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: REED_B (REED_B @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth M. Toohy (CN=Elizabeth M. Toohy/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy L. Brandel (CN=Nancy L. Brandel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WALKER_A (WALKER_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MORAN_K (MORAN_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WHITE_B (WHITE_B @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip R. Dame (CN=Philip R. Dame/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stacey L. Rubin (CN=Stacey L. Rubin/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINSTEIN_D (WEINSTEIN_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: E. Holly Fitter (CN=E. Holly Fitter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert J. Pellicci (CN=Robert J. Pellicci/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: COOK_MY (COOK_MY @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: BROWN_JA (BROWN_JA @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ingrid M. Schroeder (CN=Ingrid M. Schroeder/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GIBBONS_M (GIBBONS_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PANERALI_K (PANERALI_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PETERSON_RK (PETERSON_RK @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James J. Jukes (CN=James J. Jukes/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James T. Heimbach (CN=James T. Heimbach/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lara L. Roholt (CN=Lara L. Roholt/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott Quehl (CN=Scott Quehl/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bernard H. Martin (CN=Bernard H. Martin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles Konigsberg (CN=Charles Konigsberg/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce D. Long (CN=Bruce D. Long/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ellen J. Balis (CN=Ellen J. Balis/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah L. Shaw (CN=Deborah L. Shaw/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (CN=Richard P. Emery Jr./OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert B. Rideout (CN=Robert B. Rideout/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARTZ_K (SCHWARTZ_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen Peroff (CN=Kathleen Peroff/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet L. Graves (CN=Janet L. Graves/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jill M. Blickstein (CN=Jill M. Blickstein/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joseph J. Minarik (CN=Joseph J. Minarik/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (CN=Kenneth S. Apfel/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ADAMS_G (ADAMS_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert G. Damus (CN=Robert G. Damus/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles E. Kieffer (CN=Charles E. Kieffer/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jacob J. Lew (CN=Jacob J. Lew/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles R. Marr (CN=Charles R. Marr/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter R. Orszag (CN=Peter R. Orszag/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael W. Williams (CN=Michael W. Williams/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patricia E. Romani (CN=Patricia E. Romani/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice E. Shuffield (CN=Alice E. Shuffield/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward M. Rea (CN=Edward M. Rea/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Harry G. Meyers (CN=Harry G. Meyers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David J. Haun (CN=David J. Haun/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Louisa Koch (CN=Louisa Koch/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert M. Shireman (CN=Robert M. Shireman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Larry R. Matlack (CN=Larry R. Matlack/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gary L. Bennethum (CN=Gary L. Bennethum/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (CN=Bruce K. Sasser/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert S. Dotson (CN=Robert S. Dotson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eugene M. Ebner (CN=Eugene M. Ebner/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Russell W. Horwitz (CN=Russell W. Horwitz/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher R. Ulrich (CN=Christopher R. Ulrich/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Julie E. Mason (CN=Julie E. Mason/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Justine F. Rodriguez (CN=Justine F. Rodriguez/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GOLDBERG_JS (GOLDBERG_JS @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DENTON_M (DENTON_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (CEQ)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: ABRAMSON_K (ABRAMSON_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: OLIVER_A (OLIVER_A @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Angus S. King (CN=Angus S. King/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: LEVIN_P (LEVIN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter G. Jacoby (CN=Peter G. Jacoby/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Richard A. Mertens (CN=Richard A. Mertens/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SCHWARTZ_N (SCHWARTZ_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary E. Glynn (CN=Mary E. Glynn/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: MCKIERNAN_K (MCKIERNAN_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Gribben (CN=John A. Gribben/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet E. Irwin (CN=Janet E. Irwin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melinda D. Haskins (CN=Melinda D. Haskins/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alphonse J. Maldon (CN=Alphonse J. Maldon/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: DONNELLY_RE (DONNELLY_RE @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anita Chellaraj (CN=Anita Chellaraj/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dainel C. Tate (CN=Dainel C. Tate/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shelley N. Fidler (CN=Shelley N. Fidler/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SILVERMAN_S (SILVERMAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: GREEN_M (GREEN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WALKER_C (WALKER_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Chow (CN=Barbara Chow/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Phebe N. Vickers (CN=Phebe N. Vickers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: PALMIERI_J (PALMIERI_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: WEINSTEIN_P (WEINSTEIN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Annette E. Rooney (CN=Annette E. Rooney/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alison C. Perkins (CN=Alison C. Perkins/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna M. Briatico (CN=Anna M. Briatico/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Constance J. Bowers (CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey A. Weinberg (CN=Jeffrey A. Weinberg/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JONES_RE (JONES_RE @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [OMB]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HOLSTEIN_E (HOLSTEIN_E @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OPD)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Kelman (CN=Steven J. Kelman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet R. Forsgren (CN=Janet R. Forsgren/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: James C. Murr (CN=James C. Murr/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann M. Cattalini (CN=Ann M. Cattalini/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisa Millsap (CN=Elisa Millsap/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel M. Tangherlini (CN=Daniel M. Tangherlini/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Fitzpatrick (CN=Michael A. Fitzpatrick/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce W. McConnell (CN=Bruce W. McConnell/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Kountoupes (CN=Lisa M. Kountoupes/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alicia K. Kolaian (CN=Alicia K. Kolaian/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanne D. Lind (CN=Susanne D. Lind/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert E. Barker (CN=Robert E. Barker/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Philip A. DuSault (CN=Philip A. DuSault/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry T. Clendenin (CN=Barry T. Clendenin/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ronald M. Cogswell (CN=Ronald M. Cogswell/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alan B. Rhinesmith (CN=Alan B. Rhinesmith/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah F. Kramer (CN=Deborah F. Kramer/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: SMITH_CM (SMITH_CM @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William A. Halter (CN=William A. Halter/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (OMB)

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy A. Min (CN=Nancy A. Min/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: T J. Glauthier (CN=T J. Glauthier/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry B. Anderson (CN=Barry B. Anderson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rebecca R. Culberson (CN=Rebecca R. Culberson/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John A. Koskinen (CN=John A. Koskinen/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
 READ:UNKNOWN

TO: RAINES_F (RAINES_F @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (OMB)
 READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

TO: DIRECTOR FRANK RAINES
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR JACK LEW
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR JOHN KOSKINEN

FROM: OMB LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

DATE: MARCH 10, 1997

SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE REPORT

The House Rules Committee on Tuesday at 1:30 pm is expected to take up an unnumbered Resolution, calling on the President to submit another budget. The Resolution calls for a budget that 1) does not rely on any contingencies, 2) balances by 2002 using CBO scoring, 3) does not sunset the tax cuts, 4) achieves a significant portion of the savings, in the first three years, and 5) extends the Medicare trust fund for a substantial period.

UPCOMING HEARINGS:

Tuesday, March 11th

House Appropriations, Treasury/Postal Subcommittee -- Director Raines will testify on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government portion of the President's FY98 Budget. (2:00 pm, Rayburn 2360)

Senate Budget Committee -- Hearing on the House Coalition Budget.

Witnesses include Representatives Minge (D-MN) and Stenholm (D-TX).

(10:00 am Dirksen 608)

House Budget Committee -- Secretary Rubin with Deputy Director Jack Lew will testify on the Administration's Budget. (1:00 pm, Cannon 210)

Senate Finance Committee -- State Governors Michael Leavitt (R-Utah) and Bob Miller (D-NV) will testify on the Administration's FY98 budget request for Medicaid.

Wednesday, March 12th

Joint House/Senate Budget Committee -- Hearing with the National Governors on Medicaid. Witnesses included Governors Brandstad (R-IO), Voinovich (R-OH), Ridge (R-PA), Miller (R-NV), and Patten (D-KY) (9:30am, Dirksen 106)

House Budget Committee -- Michael Boskin will testify on possible revisions to how the Consumer Price Index is figured (10 am, Cannon 210)

Thursday, March 13th

House Education and Workforce Committee -- Hearing on the President's Education Proposals. (10:00 am, Rayburn 2175)

CONGRESS TODAY (3/10):

SENATE

The Senate considered S.J.Res. 39 regarding Governmental Affairs Committee Funding for Campaign Finance Investigations. Senator Glenn introduced an amendment, which clarifies the scope of the Resolution (please call our office at 5-4790 if you need a copy of the amendment).

HOUSE

Pro Forma session; No Votes

CONGRESS TOMORROW (3/11)

SENATE

The Senate will convene at 10:00 am to continue consideration of S.J. Res 39, regarding Committee Funding for the Governmental Affairs Investigation and Senator Glenn's amendment to clarify the scope of the investigation. The Senate hopes to reach an agreement in the morning to hold a vote on the Glenn amendment around 2:00 pm, shortly after party caucuses from 12:30 - 2:00. The Senate hopes to complete action on S.J.Res. 39 mid-week.

HOUSE

Convene for morning hour at 12:30 pm, legislative business at 2:00 pm; No votes before 5:00 pm.

Consider the following bills (11) under suspension of the rules:

S.J.Res. 5 - To Waive Trade Act Provisions for Appointment of Barshefsky. (40 minutes debate)

H.R. 649 - Department of Energy Standardization Act of 1997

[No SAP -- support informally]

H.R. 651 - Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 652 - Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.J.Res. 32 - Granting Consent to Certain Amendments Enacted by the Hawaii Legislature to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 63 - Designating Trinity Lake

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 709 - National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997

[No SAP -- support informally]

H.Con.Res. 16 - Concerning the Urgent Need to Improve the Living Standards of those South Asians Living in the Ganges and Brahma putra River Basin

H.Res. 68 - Sense of the House Concerning the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the U.S. and Japan

H.R. 750 -- Hong Kong Reversion Act, supporting the autonomous governing of Hong Kong

[SAP under discussion]

H.R. 914 - Making Certain Technical Corrections in the Higher Education Act of 1965, Relating to Graduation Data Disclosures

[No SAP -- no objection]

HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE (3/11):

The Rules Committee will meet at 1:30 on Tuesday to consider the following:

H.R. 852 - Paperwork Reduction Amendments

[SAP pending: No objection. Administration supports the goal of the bill, though legislation is not necessary to accomplish the goal.]

H.J.Res. 58 - Disapproving the Certification of the President Regarding Foreign Assistance for Mexico During Fiscal Year 1997

[SAP/letter under discussion]

H.Res. ___ - Calling on the President to submit another Budget.

CONGRESS -- REMAINDER OF THE WEEK:

SENATE

Wednesday, March 12th, and the remainder of the week:

Complete consideration of S.J. Res 39 regarding Committee Funding for Investigation on Campaign Fundraising.

The Senate this week also hopes to consider the nominations of Pena as Energy Secretary, Lake as CIA Director, and Peterson as Vietnam Ambassador. The Senate may also consider S.J.Res. 19, regarding Mexico decertification.

Week of March 16th

Possible consideration of the TEAM Act.

Consider nominations still pending.

HOUSE:

Wednesday, March 12th, and Thursday, March 13th

On Wednesday, the House meets at 11 am for legislative business; On

Thursday, the House meets at 10 am for legislative business:

H.R. 852 - Paperwork Reduction Amendments (Subject to a Rule)

[Rules SAP pending: No objection. Administration supports the goal of the bill, though legislation is not necessary to accomplish the goal.]

H.Res. ___ - Requesting the President submit another budget.

H.J.Res. 58 - Disapproving the Certification of the President Regarding Foreign Assistance for Mexico During Fiscal Year 1997 (Subject to a Rule)

[SAP/letter under discussion]

H.R. 412 - Approving an Irrigation District Agreement (Subject to a Rule)

[No SAP]

Friday, March 14th

No Votes

The House and Senate will be out of session from March 22 through April 6 for Easter Recess

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 19:08:43.00

SUBJECT: FLSA end game

TO: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lyn A. Hogan (CN=Lyn A. Hogan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Do you think it would make sense to lay out in the memo to the President possible end game options regarding FLSA -- i.e., if the governors take the issue to Congress, what is our position? Veto all exemptions? Veto no exemptions? Somewhere in-between? Or do you think it's too early for this.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 08:28:50.00

SUBJECT: partial birth

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have a phone message this morning from Kathy Bryant re partial birth abortion. Do you want to return it? I haven't been in the meetings lately, so I'm probably not best person to talk to her. Her number is 863-2511. tds

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 12:06:41.00

SUBJECT: Draft executive order on disability issues

TO: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is OMB staff's standard reaction to the CAP idea. This is why it has never gone anywhere. They think Federal agencies should be doing this anyway, and shouldn't need a central pool of money for something they have been required by law to do for years. This is true, but doesn't get at the reality of the fact that a central pool would make it easier and more likely that folks with disabilities would be hired and/or retained.

----- Forwarded by Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP on 03/10/97
12:07 PM -----

Lisa B. Fairhall
03/07/97 05:17:09 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Kenneth S. Apfel/OMB/EOP, Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP
cc: Barry White/OMB/EOP, Robert M. Shireman/OMB/EOP, Keith J. Fontenot/OMB/EOP
Subject: Draft executive order on disability issues

I wanted to flag an issue we see with Diana's brief write-up of the executive order, dealing with expanding the DoD CAP program to other Federal agencies.

This is not the first time we have seen this issue -- last summer, Jack Lew asked staff to find out if there are any particular issues he should raise with Carol Rasco in regard to a July 17 memo from Carol to Jack. Rasco was at that time endorsing expansion of the Department of Defense's (DOD) CAP program, which provides a central fund within DOD to provide accommodations for employees with disabilities, to a Federal government-wide fund that would cover accommodations for all Federal employees with disabilities. While we understood that the DOD central fund has been quite successful at helping DOD agencies to choose appropriate adaptive technology and other accommodations, we did not support the initiative for the reasons explained below and sent you a brief note outlining those concerns. Although I have not seen the draft E.O., I assume that these concerns would apply to the current proposal as well.

All Federal agencies have been required to provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act since 1973, but many do not. Some technologies that

enable individuals with disabilities to work are very expensive, and may have a chilling effect on Federal employers, decisions to hire or provide accommodations for employees with disabilities.

We believe that the DOD central fund may serve as a useful model for other Federal agencies (agencies could use their S&E funds to establish similar programs). However, we have reservations about a Federal government-wide central fund:

- o Sections 501, 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act for 1990 (ADA) establish civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Employers governed by these laws must make "reasonable accommodations" for "otherwise qualified disabled individuals." No specific funding is provided to the Federal, State or local governments, or private sector businesses to enforce requirements of these laws. The proposed central fund for Federal agencies could establish a precedent for such incentive programs, sending the signal that compliance is only required to the extent that extra compensation is provided;

- o The Federal government should be a model employer. Establishment of special government-wide incentives for Federal agencies to hire and provide accommodations for individuals with disabilities when discrimination on the basis of disability is illegal, could not only set a precedent for providing special incentives for civil rights legislation, but could also send the wrong signal to both the Agencies and the private sector that providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities is too difficult even for Federal Agencies to enforce;

- o CAP has estimated that the average cost of an accommodation for employees with disabilities in their program was \$993 in FY 1995. This low figure argues that agencies could easily provide reasonable accommodations for their employees without establishing a central fund;

- o There has been an ongoing working group exploring ways to improve accommodations for Federal employees. We believe that this group would provide the appropriate forum to explore the DOD model further; and share effective approaches with other Agencies.

(Originally, Rasco was proposing that Tony Coelho, chair of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD) make an announcement on the plan for a central fund during the sixth anniversary celebration of the ADA on July 26. No announcement was made on the ADA anniversary.)

We continue to believe that it is probably premature to unveil a government-wide, centrally funded CAP program.

Let me know if you would like to discuss this further.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Diane C. Regas to Elena Kagan and Paul J. Weinstein Jr. Subject: My schedule for departure. (1 page)	03/10/1997	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[03/07/1997 - 03/10/1997]

2009-1006-F
wr29

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 21:35:00.00

SUBJECT: Re: Adoption idea

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Nicole has been checking into this. I forwarded your reminder to her last week.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 10:49:09.00

SUBJECT: Potential pre-Service Summit event

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As Bruce mentioned this morning, there is a good idea floating around for a Presidential event prior to the Service Summit. As you know, we have wanted to have at least one event prior to the Summit itself to keep the focus on this issue/event.

I am forwarding you the glossy one-pager that Bruce referred to this morning, but here are the basics:

We are establishing something called the "National Service Scholars Program." This would be a \$1,000 scholarship for high school juniors or seniors who have performed outstanding service. The Federal government puts up \$500, and some local source/community puts up the matching \$500. The Corporation has gotten the Lions/Elks/Kiwanis/Moose groups interested in putting up the match, and they would presumably attend such an event. There was also some talk of the President doing a letter to every HS principal.

This is a nice event for us because it is more focused on young people doing service, rather than pure volunteer stuff, and therefore nicely ties in with the Administration's concept of service.

The President already "launched" this idea at some event at Penn State last year, so I believe the news here is that we are inviting high schools to submit names if they have the match.

I need to check exactly what the budget picture is. For 1997, there is a set budget amount of \$3 million. The hope is to go nation-wide within a year or two, but I don't know if there are budget constraints to that goal.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 13:21:26.00

SUBJECT: American College of OBGYN's - Partial Birth

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pauline M. Abernathy (CN=Pauline M. Abernathy/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John P. Hart (CN=John P. Hart/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John L. Hilley (CN=John L. Hilley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracey E. Thornton (CN=Tracey E. Thornton/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter G. Jacoby (CN=Peter G. Jacoby/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd Stern (CN=Todd Stern/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [EOP]) (WHO)
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth A. Myers (CN=Elizabeth A. Myers/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

ACOG's position statement on this issue has not changed. According to ACOG, "The intervention of legislative bodies into medical decision making is inappropriate, ill advised, and dangerous." This is after the Catholic Bishops letter/statement today.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)

CREATOR: Alice E. Shuffield@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-MAR-1997 21:56:00.00

SUBJECT: OMB Legislative Report -- March 10, 1997

TO: RAINES_F (RAINES_F@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ADAMS_G (ADAMS_G@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HAAS_L (HAAS_L@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:11-MAR-1997 08:09:08.76

TO: SMITH_CM (SMITH_CM@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHWARTZ_K (SCHWARTZ_K@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: FOLEY_M (FOLEY_M@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:11-MAR-1997 08:47:46.47

TO: PETERSON_RK (PETERSON_RK@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: PANERALI_K (PANERALI_K@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HOLSTEIN_E (HOLSTEIN_E@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GIBBONS_M (GIBBONS_M@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: JONES_RE (JONES_RE@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: BROWN_JA (BROWN_JA@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: COOK_MY (COOK_MY@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WEINSTEIN_D (WEINSTEIN_D@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WEINSTEIN_P (WEINSTEIN_P@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: PALMIERI_J (PALMIERI_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:17-MAR-1997 12:10:53.40

TO: WHITE_B (WHITE_B@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: MORAN_K (MORAN_K@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: WALKER_C (WALKER_C@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WALKER_A (WALKER_A@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GREEN_M (GREEN_M@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SILVERMAN_S (SILVERMAN_S@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: REED_B (REED_B@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ANGELL_J (ANGELL_J@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: DONNELLY_RE (DONNELLY_RE@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHAEFER_V (SCHAEFER_V@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:11-MAR-1997 08:35:18.52

TO: MCKIERNAN_K (MCKIERNAN_K@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SCHWARTZ_N (SCHWARTZ_N@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:12-MAR-1997 12:02:33.44

TO: SPERLING_G (SPERLING_G@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: LEVIN_P (LEVIN_P@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ABERNATHY_P (ABERNATHY_P@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: OLIVER_A (OLIVER_A@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: WARREN_M (WARREN_M@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: ABRAMSON_K (ABRAMSON_K@A1@CD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: DENTON_M (DENTON_M@A1@CD) (CEQ)
READ:11-MAR-1997 09:13:54.86

TO: WARREN_W (WARREN_W@A1@CD) (CEQ)
READ:NOT READ

TO: GOLDBERG_JS (GOLDBERG_JS@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: VELLENGA_T (VELLENGA_T@A1@CD) (WHO)

READ:NOT READ

TO: WILLIAMS_MA (WILLIAMS_MA@A1@CD) (WHO)
READ:NOT READ

TO: HOGAN_L (HOGAN_L@A1@CD) (OPD)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SMITH_BD (SMITH_BD@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: SMITH_P (SMITH_P@A1@CD) (OMB)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jacob J. Lew (Jacob J. Lew@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John A. Koskinen (John A. Koskinen@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles E. Kieffer (Charles E. Kieffer@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rebecca R. Culberson (Rebecca R. Culberson@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert G. Damus (Robert G. Damus@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry B. Anderson (Barry B. Anderson@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: T J. Glauthier (T J. Glauthier@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kenneth S. Apfel (Kenneth S. Apfel@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nancy A. Min (Nancy A. Min@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sally Katzen (Sally Katzen@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Joseph J. Minarik (Joseph J. Minarik@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: William A. Halter (William A. Halter@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jill M. Blickstein (Jill M. Blickstein@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (Sarah A. Bianchi@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborah F. Kramer (Deborah F. Kramer@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet L. Graves (Janet L. Graves@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Alan B. Rhinesmith (Alan B. Rhinesmith@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Kathleen Peroff (Kathleen Peroff@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ronald M. Cogswell (Ronald M. Cogswell@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Barry T. Clendenin (Barry T. Clendenin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert B. Rideout (Robert B. Rideout@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Philip A. DuSault (Philip A. DuSault@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard P. Emery Jr. (Richard P. Emery Jr.@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert E. Barker (Robert E. Barker@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Deborah L. Shaw (Deborah L. Shaw@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Susanne D. Lind (Susanne D. Lind@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Ellen J. Balis (Ellen J. Balis@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alicia K. Kolaian (Alicia K. Kolaian@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce D. Long (Bruce D. Long@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lisa M. Kountoupes (Lisa M. Kountoupes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles Konigsberg (Charles Konigsberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce W. McConnell (Bruce W. McConnell@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bernard H. Martin (Bernard H. Martin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael A. Fitzpatrick (Michael A. Fitzpatrick@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Scott Quehl (Scott Quehl@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Daniel M. Tangherlini (Daniel M. Tangherlini@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Lara L. Roholt
READ:NOT READ

(Lara L. Roholt@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Elisa Millsap
READ:NOT READ

(Elisa Millsap@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ann M. Cattalini
READ:NOT READ

(Ann M. Cattalini@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: James T. Heimbach
READ:NOT READ

(James T. Heimbach@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: James C. Murr
READ:NOT READ

(James C. Murr@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: James J. Jukes
READ:NOT READ

(James J. Jukes@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Janet R. Forsgren
READ:NOT READ

(Janet R. Forsgren@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Steven J. Kelman
READ:NOT READ

(Steven J. Kelman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ingrid M. Schroeder
READ:NOT READ

(Ingrid M. Schroeder@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Jeffrey A. Weinberg
READ:NOT READ

(Jeffrey A. Weinberg@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Constance J. Bowers
READ:NOT READ

(Constance J. Bowers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Anna M. Briatico
READ:NOT READ

(Anna M. Briatico@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Robert J. Pellicci
READ:NOT READ

(Robert J. Pellicci@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Alison C. Perkins
READ:NOT READ

(Alison C. Perkins@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: E. Holly Fitter
READ:NOT READ

(E. Holly Fitter@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Annette E. Rooney
READ:NOT READ

(Annette E. Rooney@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Stacey L. Rubin
READ:NOT READ

(Stacey L. Rubin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Philip R. Dame
READ:NOT READ

(Philip R. Dame@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Phebe N. Vickers
READ:NOT READ

(Phebe N. Vickers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barbara Chow

(Barbara Chow@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Todd Stern (Todd Stern@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nancy L. Brandel (Nancy L. Brandel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Elizabeth M. Toohey (Elizabeth M. Toohey@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (Douglas B. Sosnik@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Karen L. Hancox (Karen L. Hancox@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Shelley N. Fidler (Shelley N. Fidler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet Himler (Janet Himler@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Dainel C. Tate (Dainel C. Tate@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Anita Chellaraj (Anita Chellaraj@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Nicholas B. Kirkhorn (Nicholas B. Kirkhorn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Lucia A. Wyman (Lucia A. Wyman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Alphonse J. Maldon (Alphonse J. Maldon@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert J. Nassif (Robert J. Nassif@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Melinda D. Haskins (Melinda D. Haskins@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert S. Fairweather (Robert S. Fairweather@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Janet E. Irwin (Janet E. Irwin@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: James B. Kazel (James B. Kazel@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: John A. Gribben (John A. Gribben@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: April K. Mellody (April K. Mellody@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Mary E. Glynn (Mary E. Glynn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Mark A. Weatherly
READ:NOT READ

(Mark A. Weatherly@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ananias Blocker III
READ:NOT READ

(Ananias Blocker III@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Richard A. Mertens
READ:NOT READ

(Richard A. Mertens@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Ben A. Freeland
READ:NOT READ

(Ben A. Freeland@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Peter G. Jacoby
READ:NOT READ

(Peter G. Jacoby@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Kate P. Donovan
READ:NOT READ

(Kate P. Donovan@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Angus S. King
READ:NOT READ

(Angus S. King@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Thomas C. Jensen
READ:NOT READ

(Thomas C. Jensen@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Justine F. Rodriguez
READ:NOT READ

(Justine F. Rodriguez@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Julie E. Mason
READ:NOT READ

(Julie E. Mason@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Mary Jo Siclari
READ:NOT READ

(Mary Jo Siclari@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Barry J. Toiv
READ:NOT READ

(Barry J. Toiv@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Alice E. Shuffield
READ:NOT READ

(Alice E. Shuffield@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Toni S. Hustead
READ:NOT READ

(Toni S. Hustead@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Christopher R. Ulrich
READ:NOT READ

(Christopher R. Ulrich@OVP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Roger L. McClung
READ:NOT READ

(Roger L. McClung@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Russell W. Horwitz
READ:NOT READ

(Russell W. Horwitz@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Elena Kagan
READ:NOT READ

(Elena Kagan@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Eugene M. Ebner
READ:NOT READ

(Eugene M. Ebner@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

TO: Steven D. Aitken

(Steven D. Aitken@EOP@LN GTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert S. Dotson (Robert S. Dotson@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David H. Morrison (David H. Morrison@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Rodney G. Bent (Rodney G. Bent@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Bruce K. Sasser (Bruce K. Sasser@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jack D. Fellows (Jack D. Fellows@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Gary L. Bennethum (Gary L. Bennethum@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Keith J. Fontenot (Keith J. Fontenot@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Larry R. Matlack (Larry R. Matlack@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Robert M. Shireman (Robert M. Shireman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Richard J. Turman (Richard J. Turman@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Louisa Koch (Louisa Koch@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David E. Tornquist (David E. Tornquist@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: David J. Haun (David J. Haun@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Francis S. Redburn (Francis S. Redburn@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Harry G. Meyers (Harry G. Meyers@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edward A. Brigham (Edward A. Brigham@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Edward M. Rea (Edward M. Rea@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Andrew M. Schoenbach (Andrew M. Schoenbach@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Jill M. Pizzuto (Jill M. Pizzuto@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)
READ:NOT READ

TO: Patricia E. Romani (Patricia E. Romani@EOP@LNGTWY@EOPMRX)

READ:NOT READ

TO: Melissa Green (Melissa Green@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TO: Michael W. Williams (Michael W. Williams@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TO: Anne H. Lewis (Anne H. Lewis@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TO: Peter R. Orszag (Peter R. Orszag@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TO: Jake Siewert (Jake Siewert@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TO: Charles R. Marr (Charles R. Marr@EOP@LNGETWY@EOPMRX)
 READ:NOT READ

TEXT:

Message Creation Date was at 10-MAR-1997 21:49:00

TO: DIRECTOR FRANK RAINES
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR JACK LEW
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR JOHN KOSKINEN

FROM: OMB LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

DATE: MARCH 10, 1997

SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE REPORT

The House Rules Committee on Tuesday at 1:30 pm is expected to take up an unnumbered Resolution, calling on the President to submit another budget. The Resolution calls for a budget that 1) does not rely on any contingencies, 2) balances by 2002 using CBO scoring, 3) does not sunset the tax cuts, 4) achieves a significant portion of the savings in the first three years, and 5) extends the Medicare trust fund for a substantial period.

UPCOMING HEARINGS:

Tuesday, March 11th

House Appropriations, Treasury/Postal Subcommittee -- Director Raines will testify on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government portion of the President's FY98 Budget. (2:00 pm, Rayburn 2360).

Senate Budget Committee -- Hearing on the House Coalition Budget. Witnesses include Representatives Minge (D-MN) and Stenholm (D-TX). (10:00 am Dirksen 608)

House Budget Committee -- Secretary Rubin with Deputy Director Jack Lew will testify on the Administration's Budget. (1:00 pm, Cannon 210)

Senate Finance Committee -- State Governors Michael Leavitt (R-Utah) and Bob Miller (D-NV) will testify on the Administration's FY98 budget request for Medicaid.

Wednesday, March 12th

Joint House/Senate Budget Committee -- Hearing with the National Governors on Medicaid. Witnesses included Governors Brandstad (R-IO), Voinovich (R-OH), Ridge (R-PA), Miller (R-NV), and Patten (D-KY) (9:30am, Dirksen 106)

House Budget Committee -- Michael Boskin will testify on possible revisions to how the Consumer Price Index is figured (10 am, Cannon 210)

Thursday, March 13th

House Education and Workforce Committee -- Hearing on the President's Education Proposals. (10:00 am, Rayburn 2175)

CONGRESS TODAY (3/10):

SENATE

The Senate considered S.J.Res. 39 regarding Governmental Affairs Committee Funding for Campaign Finance Investigations. Senator Glenn introduced an amendment, which clarifies the scope of the Resolution (please call our office at 5-4790 if you need a copy of the amendment).

HOUSE

Pro Forma session; No Votes

CONGRESS TOMORROW (3/11)

SENATE

The Senate will convene at 10:00 am to continue consideration of S.J. Res 39, regarding Committee Funding for the Governmental Affairs Investigation and Senator Glenn's amendment to clarify the scope of the investigation. The Senate hopes to reach an agreement in the morning to hold a vote on the Glenn amendment around 2:00 pm, shortly after party caucuses from 12:30 - 2:00. The Senate hopes to complete action on S.J.Res. 39 mid-week.

HOUSE

Convene for morning hour at 12:30 pm, legislative business at 2:00 pm; No votes before 5:00 pm.

Consider the following bills (11) under suspension of the rules:

S.J.Res. 5 - To Waive Trade Act Provisions for Appointment of Barshefsky. (40 minutes debate)

H.R. 649 - Department of Energy Standardization Act of 1997

[No SAP -- support informally]

H.R. 651 - Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 652 - Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.J.Res. 32 - Granting Consent to Certain Amendments Enacted by the Hawaii Legislature to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 63 - Designating Trinity Lake

[No SAP -- no objection]

H.R. 709 - National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997

[No SAP -- support informally]

H.Con.Res. 16 - Concerning the Urgent Need to Improve the Living Standards of those South Asians Living in the Ganges and Brahma putra River Basin

H.Res. 68 - Sense of the House Concerning the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the U.S. and Japan

H.R. 750 -- Hong Kong Reversion Act, supporting the autonomous governing of Hong Kong

[SAP under discussion]

H.R. 914 - Making Certain Technical Corrections in the Higher Education Act of 1965, Relating to Graduation Data Disclosures

[No SAP -- no objection]

HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE (3/11):

The Rules Committee will meet at 1:30 on Tuesday to consider the following:

H.R. 852 - Paperwork Reduction Amendments

[SAP pending: No objection. Administration supports the goal of the bill, though legislation is not necessary to accomplish the goal.]

H.J.Res. 58 - Disapproving the Certification of the President Regarding Foreign Assistance for Mexico During Fiscal Year 1997

[SAP/letter under discussion]

H.Res. ___ - Calling on the President to submit another Budget.

CONGRESS -- REMAINDER OF THE WEEK:

SENATE

Wednesday, March 12th, and the remainder of the week:

Complete consideration of S.J. Res 39 regarding Committee Funding for Investigation on Campaign Fundraising.

The Senate this week also hopes to consider the nominations of Pena as Energy Secretary, Lake as CIA Director, and Peterson as Vietnam Ambassador. The Senate may also consider S.J.Res. 19, regarding Mexico decertification.

Week of March 16th

Possible consideration of the TEAM Act.

Consider nominations still pending.

HOUSE:

Wednesday, March 12th, and Thursday, March 13th

On Wednesday, the House meets at 11 am for legislative business; On Thursday, the House meets at 10 am for legislative business:

H.R. 852 - Paperwork Reduction Amendments (Subject to a Rule)

[Rules SAP pending: No objection. Administration supports the goal of the bill, though legislation is not necessary to accomplish the goal.]

H.Res. ___ - Requesting the President submit another budget.

H.J.Res. 58 - Disapproving the Certification of the President Regarding Foreign Assistance for Mexico During Fiscal Year 1997 (Subject to a Rule)

[SAP/letter under discussion]

H.R. 412 - Approving an Irrigation District Agreement (Subject to a Rule)

[No SAP]

Friday, March 14th

No Votes

The House and Senate will be out of session from March 22 through April 6 for Easter Recess