

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 017 - FOLDER -008

[10/06/1997 - 10/07/1997]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jordan Tamagni to Laura Capps et al. re: Party (3 pages)	10/06/1997	Personal Misfile
002. email	Cathy Mays to Elena Kagan re: tickets (1 page)	10/07/1997	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/06/1997-10/07/1997]

2009-1006-F

bm65

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: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 12:29:17.00

SUBJECT: mtg w/ the Coalition

TO: Raymond E. Donnelly III (CN=Raymond E. Donnelly III/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (CN=Jennifer L. Klein/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: lgriffil (lgriffil @ os.dhhs.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

We are working on setting up a mtg early on Thurs... Just giving you all a heads up. I will get back to you with a specific time. Thanks.

Child Care Planning Meetings

House Democratic Leadership, 9/24/97:

1. Craig Hanna-- Gephardt
2. Andie King-- Gephardt
3. Deb Colton-- Ways and Means
4. Broderick Johnson-- Ed and Work
5. Gail Weiss-- Ed and Work
6. Sheryl Smith-- Appropriations
7. Rob Cogorno-- Gephardt

House New Democrats, 9/25/97:

1. Geri O'Sullivan-- McCarthy
2. Phil Singer-- Rothman
3. Jennifer Martella-- LaFalce
4. Abby Hochberg-- Lampson
5. Shannon Ashpole-- A. Smith
6. Stephen Stefanski-- John
7. Amy Bressler-- Pascrell
8. Stacy Stordahl-- Kind
9. Beth Beausang-- Allen
10. Anstice Brand-- Moran
11. Gina Mahony-- Roemer
12. Mark Harkins-- Price
13. Lisa Quigley-- Dooley

House Congressional Hispanic Caucus, 9/26/97:

1. Aylin Kuyumeu-- Sanchez
2. Selena Walsh-- Pastor
3. Henry Contreras-- Roybal-Allard
4. Joshua Tenorio-- Underwood
5. Marilyn Ramos-- Velazquez
6. Ricardo Martinez-Pumerejo-- Romero-Barcelo
7. Jeff Mendelsohn-- Rodriguez
8. Pedro A. Pla-Davila-- Becerra

House Women's Caucus, 9/29/97

1. Erin Prangle-- Norton
2. Ken Kero-- Tauscher
3. Pearle Jones-- Barton
4. Kraabel, Patsy-- Carson

5. Geri O'Sullivan-- McCarthy
6. Maura Dalton-- Eshoo
7. Cindy Pellegrini-- Slaughter
8. Terri McCullough-- Pelosi
9. Aimee Feinberg-- Woolsey
10. Becky Solay-- DeLauro
11. Marilyn Ramos-- Velazquez
12. Robin Swanson-- McCarthy
13. Kathryn Pearson--Morella
14. Sandy Zimmer-- Morella
15. Liz Powell-- Millender-McDonald
16. Joan Clarle-- Johnson

Senate Democratic Leadership, 9/29/97

1. Julie Eckert-- Kerrey
2. Stephanie Robinson-- Kennedy
3. Jeanne Ireland-- Dodd
4. Janine Jones-- Moseley-Braun
5. Joanna Slaney-- Moseley-Braun
6. Paul Seltman-- Budget
7. Heidi Bonne-- DPC
8. Opal Winebrenner-- Bryan
9. Lisa Linnell-- Conrad
10. Deborah Walter-- Bingaman
11. Kate O'Malley-- Boxer
12. Jim Jepsen-- Durbin
13. Bev Schroeder-- Harkin
14. Elyse Wasch-- Reed
15. Greg Williamson-- Murray
16. Rick Remish-- Rockefeller
17. David Kass-- Kerry
18. Donna Denison-- Landrieu
19. Paul Thornell-- Daschle
20. Elizabeth Goldon-- Breaux

Senate Republican Leadership, 10/3/97

1. John Cerisano-- Gramm
2. Hope Hegstrom-- Grassley
3. Dennis Smith-- Roth
4. Pamela Maimer-- DeWine
5. Angie Stewart-- Warner
6. Scott Olson-- Baucus
7. Kimberly Barnes-O'Conner-- Jeffords

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

8. Stacey Hughes-- Nickles
9. Erin Hickman-- Nickles
10. Maggie Smolen-- Murkowski
11. Gary Blank-- Murkowski
12. Stephanie Robinson-- Kennedy

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 09:27:56.00

SUBJECT: immigration review process

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: WARNATH_S (WARNATH_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNWTWY [UNKNOWN]) (CPC)

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Immigration Review Plan:

What:

Our review process should look into four things: 1) Commission's proposal; 2) INS's reform proposal; 3) Rep. Reyes' bill; and 4) ONDCP border proposal.

How:

Before we start meetings, I will pull together a document briefly summarizing the proposals and laying out some of the issues. We can distribute this memo internally to the interested WH offices. Since the review process strikes at the heart of institutional "turf", it would probably be wise to do an initial round of meetings with the affected agencies separately to discuss the proposals that would specifically impact their functions. We should have a list of questions that they should be prepared to answer at the meetings (e.g, feasibility, costs of proposals). We may need to meet with INS/DOJ twice, once to get briefed on their internal proposal and a second to get their feedback on other proposals. These meetings should begin next week.

Once we've heard from all the agencies, we will need to internally decide which option or combination of options we prefer. Then we should have an interagency meeting to discuss our preferred options and gauge the agencies' reactions.

Timetable:

Our internal goal should be to try to finish the process by the end of the calendar year. This would allow us to use the FY 99 budget as a vehicle if we choose. Since this will be fast upon us, I would like to shoot for one meeting per week, beginning October 13. As a goodwill gesture, I think INS/DOJ should be our first meeting.

Proposed internal timetable:

Oct. 13-- INS/DOJ

Oct. 20- State

Oct. 27- Labor

Nov. 3- INS/DOJ

Nov. 10- internal WH meeting

Nov. 17- interagency meeting

This timetable is probably a little ambitious, but as early as possible, we need to have a sense of what things should be linked to the budget

process (and ready by early December). The timing of the budget process may preclude certain dramatic changes-- and we should keep that in mind. While I think it is a useful concrete timeline for us, if we want to ultimately support something early next year, I think we should be able to do that as well.

External timetable: We should inform agencies that we plan on meeting with all of them this month and into next month, with an interagency meeting planned for mid-November. I think we should let them know that we are mindful of the '99 budget timetable, but that it will not dictate the final outcome either.

Let me know what you think of this plan, or if you have any other ideas as to how we should do this. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Toby Donenfeld (CN=Toby Donenfeld/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 12:36:36.00

SUBJECT: Regional Tobacco Forums

TO: Jerold R. Mande (CN=Jerold R. Mande/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/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:

Bruce, thanks again for participating in the tobacco forum in Tampa on Florida. It looks like we got good press and everyone was happy with how it turned out. Please let me know if you have any suggestions or changes for the next forum.

We're looking forward to scheduling the other two forums. Very tentatively we're looking at Seattle (Nov. 6-7) and Chicago (Dec. 17). The goal is to make these actually regional and bipartisan. I'm working w/ our Leg Affairs office to see if Lugar would come to Chicago or Hatch would come to Seattle. I also asked Fred DuVal about getting other elected officials outside of their state to attend one of these events. Any other thoughts or suggestions on making these regional and bipartisan would be appreciated.

Do any of you have any thoughts or red flags on either of these locations? Please advise. Thank you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christa Robinson (CN=Christa Robinson/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 11:28:20.00

SUBJECT: FYI -- Secret Service issue

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have no idea what's in the Treasury memo, but Jim Pasco from the FOP talked to Sylvia Mathews last week and she said she read the memo and felt that neither side would end up happy.

Also, Jim told her that the one item he didn't want to be put forth as a compromise was the "focus groups" Merletti is holding with the Secret Service. Apparently, Merletti has started holding "focus groups" with the Uniform Division which Jim suspects they will try to hold up as a concession, and Jim keeps reiterating that this is the same kind of thing the President threatened to veto the Team Act over.

Also, I just want to make sure you are aware that the Teamsters are competing for the FOPs membership -- the Teamsters have had 6 elections against existing FOP units in the last 6 months -- so the FOP is looking closely at anything we do for the labor unions. (At one point they were working on a press release from the AFL-CIO speech where the President was talking about his support for the collective bargaining process, but it was probably just a threat!)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lin Liu (CN=Lin Liu/OU=PIR/O=EOP [PIR])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 19:42:04.00

SUBJECT: Draft Policy Workplan

TO: Emil E. Parker (CN=Emil E. Parker/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Sanders D. Korenman (CN=Sanders D. Korenman/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Michele Cavataio (CN=Michele Cavataio/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Michael Wenger (CN=Michael Wenger/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michael J. Sorrell (CN=Michael J. Sorrell/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Claire Gonzales (CN=Claire Gonzales/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jacinta Ma (CN=Jacinta Ma/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Judith A. Winston (CN=Judith A. Winston/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Per our discussion this afternoon on Race Initiative next steps, Judy mentioned that the Initiative Staff will distribute a draft one-page workplan in each of the different areas to serve as starting points for discussion. Attached is a draft workplan for the policy working group with some ideas on goals, process, products, and resources. Please take a look and give me any comments so that I can incorporate your ideas before our Wed. 1PM meeting. Thanks. ===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

Draft Work Plan

Policy

Goals:

- Identify and rollout concrete policy action items
- Coordinate Initiative, WH and Departmental policy deliberation and announcement processes
- Focus like a laser beam on education and economic opportunity as priority issues

Process:

- Immediately, convene DPC working groups in education and economic opportunity areas - take stock of existing achievements (talk about them often) and brainstorm new ideas. Also focus concurrently on health and administration of justice issues.
- Cabinet agencies to come up with list of policy proposals (updated monthly) for WH and PIR discussion and coordination - identify tough questions and re-examine existing issues or beef up enforcement of current law - goal is to identify three issues by end of this month for concrete next steps
- DPC and PIR to develop comprehensive list of policy options in education and economic opportunity areas
- Identify specific actions possible for each policy option:
 - administrative
 - legislative
 - Executive Order
 - regulatory
 - budget
 - enforcement
- Identify and coordinate opportunities for regular and targeted policy events - bi-weekly or monthly - develop policy message consistent with communications strategy
- Identify special problem areas in education and economic opportunities needing further analysis and study right away - announce research efforts for longer term issues

Products:

- Policy and budget announcements - list of three ideas for this month
- Legislative proposals
- New regulations
- Executive orders - i.e. draft E.O. creating Interagency Forum on Race Statistics and Indicators
- Statistics fact book - quick fact book and larger resource book from Interagency Forum
- Reports on problems or achievements

Resources:

- Agencies - Cabinet officials as surrogates
- Contract out special topics for expert analysis
- National Academy of Sciences, think tanks and outside groups
- FY99 budget process - expanding enforcement

LL (10/6/97)

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Jordan Tamagni to Laura Capps et al. re: Party (3 pages)	10/06/1997	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/06/1997-10/07/1997]

2009-1006-F

bm65

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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]

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]

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.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 16:58:28.00

SUBJECT: Doggett and tobacco

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: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Doggett Amendment basically seeks to ban export promotion for tobacco and stop State from fighting prejudicial tobacco bans. His amendment was attached to state/commerce approps. in the House version and is not in Senate version, Some reports have the issue being taken up in Conference as early as this week. NSC says that is unlikely.

Substance: This Administration effectively banned export promotion, so this is not far from where we apparently already are. Problems: 1. while we don't promote cigs anymore, USDA seems to help tobacco (and therefore farmers). Doggett is not attached to the ag. approps. but his amendment does mention both tobacco and tobacco products. We're talking to USDA about this late today. 2. Doggett has called evidently asking for support. Should the Administration position be not to endorse specific tobacco bills yet?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 09:38:31.00

SUBJECT: Re: Secret Service/Collective Bargaining

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Elena, is Jose referring to me. To date, I don't have a copy of the memo. I will check w/ Sylvia Mathews as to its whereabouts. As soon as I get it, I will get a copy to you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 14:36:54.00

SUBJECT: Re: Preliminary conference notes Labor/HHS

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

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

No, it just means it will come up tomorrow. If we knew who the conferees were, we might suggest that they have Barry's compromise in their backpocket

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 14:23:33.00

SUBJECT: Preliminary conference notes Labor/HHS

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

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

See note in first graph re Murray amendment

----- Forwarded by Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP on 10/06/97

02:23 PM -----

Barbara Chow

10/02/97 02:56:14 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP, Robert M. Shireman/OPD/EOP, Barry

White/OMB/EOP, Charles E. Kieffer/OMB/EOP

Subject: Preliminary conference notes Labor/HHS

The Labor/HHS principals and staff have been meeting over the past several days and reached some very preliminary conclusions on a number of issues. Another meeting is planned for Monday (without Specter) and a tentative conference is scheduled for Tuesday. Staff anticipate that Senator Murray's domestic violence amendment will be discussed on Tuesday.

It does not appear likely that the conference will conclude next week but it is possible. The levels below represent first cut tentative conference outcomes and should be considered confidential and highly preliminary.

Funding

Goals 2000: Currently carried at below 1997 levels (\$491 million) but staff believe that it will ultimately be funded at a freeze. House majority staff are concerned that any level above 1997 will make create problems with Republican conservatives. We have pushed for the Senate level of \$530 million but should at some point signal our bottom line.

Pell Grants: \$317 million above the Senate, \$211 million below the House. House level was our minimum accepted level. No final decision on independent students but Democratic staff are toying with some formulation that would allow the Secretary of Education discretionary authority to raise the IPA (income protection allowance) to specified levels (this is how we address the independent students issue), if the Pell shortfall is lower than previously anticipated (or some such language) Another variation of this would provide the authorization committee a limited period of time to authorize the independent student policy but the authorization requirement would expire by 1/1/97 and default to the Secretary's discretionary authority. Will need to continue to look for offsets to pay for Pell to increase it above the current compromise. Also need to keep working with Democratic authorizers to support our no authorization position.

America Reads: \$25 million for Education in 1998, \$235 million advanced funded in 1999. Republicans believe that the \$235 million is really \$260 million because the \$25 million provided in 1998 will go into the base funding and therefore continue into 1999. I have conveyed to both Democratic staff that the \$25 million level is unacceptable. National Service numbers are not clear but the Democrats know that they are supposed to come up to \$25 million for National Service alone. The 1998 authority issues are still unresolved. We need to weigh in soon if we have a preference.

Charter Schools: \$80 million (high split). 1997 level was \$51 million, request was \$100 million.

National Education Testing: \$16 million for test is included.

Office of Civil Rights: \$58 million, 1997 level was \$55 million, request was \$62 million.

Safe and Drug Free Schools: \$556 million, same as 1997, request was \$620 million.

Adult Education State Grants: \$340 million, request was \$382 million, we asked for \$355 million during our last discussions. We should continue to press for the additional \$15 million.

Eisenhower Professional Development: \$310 million, same as 1997.

After School Learning Centers: \$30 million, 1997 level was \$1 million, request was \$50 million.

Program Administration: \$334 million, request was \$341 million.

Education Technology: \$581 million, last year's level was \$305 million, request was \$545 million.

Title I: \$136 million below 1997, no \$400 million targeted program. New problem not previously contemplated.

Welfare to work administration: \$4 million, request was \$6 million.

Youth Opportunity Areas: \$250 million in 1999, will change authorization date until July 1. Staff indicated that monies would be made available October 1, 1998 if the authorization is adopted. Authorization is currently moving in both Houses (passed House, Senate reported).

Job Training Program Act (Disadvantaged Adult Training): \$900 million, 1997 level is \$895 million. Request was \$1,064. Request was protected by the BBA. House level was \$1,043 million, Senate was \$955 million. New problem.

Adoption initiative: 0, request was \$21 million. Staff think we can get \$10 million.

Welfare research: \$21 million, request was \$44 million.

Language

National Test: Porter interested in a compromise which would involve allowing the Administration to go forward with the development of the test but banning administration until a majority (or some number) of states have signed on to the test. Another variation could include allowing administration only in those states that have signed up for the test (this is not a Porter idea and has not been floated to or by him). Specter is looking at some sort of requirement that would subject administration of the test to authorization. I do not believe that Goodling has been part of any of these discussions so we should be very cautious about these proposals.

Teamsters: Awaiting Administration letter clarifying legal requirements under the consent decree.

Needle Exchange: Looking at some sort of compromise that would retain Secretarial certification but beef up the requirements (e.g. tighten drug abuse language).

Message Sent

To: _____

John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
Jacob J. Lew/OMB/EOP
Joshua Gotbaum/OMB/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Suzanne Dale (CN=Suzanne Dale/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 11:56:09.00

SUBJECT: Mtg. Re: Proposed USCM Public Schools Summit

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

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

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

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Donald H. Gips (CN=Donald H. Gips/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

CC: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Mona G. Mohib (CN=Mona G. Mohib/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

CC: Susan A. Brophy (CN=Susan A. Brophy/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lizette V. Espinosa (CN=Lizette V. Espinosa/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
 READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

CC: Virginia N. Rustique (CN=Virginia N. Rustique/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
 READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

This meeting will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, 10/7, at 11:00am in Mickey's office (unless I get a conference room!). We're pretty shy on space, so invitees include: M. Echaveste, J. Hilley, A. Lewis, Goody M., B. Reed, G. Sperling, L. Cutler, E. Kagan, M. Cohen, and Don Gips. If we decide to move forward with a public schools conference, we will certainly open up future meetings to a broader group of participants.

Please have someone let me know if you will not be able to attend tomorrow. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP on 10/06/97 11:17 AM -----

Suzanne Dale

10/04/97 02:22:14 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
 cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
 Subject: Mtg. Re: Proposed USCM Public Schools Summit

At the suggestion of Mayor Richard Daley (D-Chicago, IL), Mayor Tom Menino (D-Boston, MA), Mayor Dannel Malloy (D-Stamford, CT), and Mayor Beverly O'Neill (D-Long Beach, CA), the leadership of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM) recently voted to formally request a "White House/Mayors Conference on Public Schools," similar to last year's White House conference on drug control. Mickey Ibarra has asked me to set up a meeting this week to discuss this request.

If a consensus is reached that a White House conference is a positive idea, the upcoming USCM/Council of Great City Schools joint meeting in Detroit (October 15 - 18) may provide the appropriate opportunity to formally announce our intention to sponsor a public schools conference.

Would you please ask someone to contact me regarding your availability for a preliminary meeting on this proposal? I'm considering Tuesday, October 7, at 11am or 4pm. Thanks.

Message Sent

To: _____

Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP
John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP
Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP
Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP
Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP

Message Copied

To: _____

Mickey Ibarra/WHO/EOP
Susan A. Brophy/WHO/EOP
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP
Fred DuVal/WHO/EOP
Emily Bromberg/WHO/EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP
Melissa Green/OPD/EOP
Mona G. Mohib/WHO/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Sky Gallegos/WHO/EOP
Lizette V. Espinosa/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 16:37:45.00

SUBJECT: Revised Murray Alternative

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

TEXT:

Here's the revised Murray amendment as we discussed this morning. The shaded areas represent changes to our earlier version (you have to launch it to see the shading).

Calculation of those subject to the work requirement.

The Murray amendment would automatically reduce the number of people subject to the work requirement one-for-one by the number of individuals granted "good cause" family violence waivers. There would be no requirement for the waived people to participate in any specific activities.

The DPC option would grant "good cause" waivers under family violence only to individuals who are participating in temporary services designed to ensure safety, promote independence and prepare for employment. This would effectively lower a state's work requirement simply by counting these individuals as working, albeit for a "temporary" period.

One way to ensure that there are no dramatic reductions to the work requirement would be to remove these individuals from the numerator and the denominator of the work requirement calculations.

Consider, for example, a state that has 100,000 welfare recipients and in FY98 is required to place 30,000 in work (i.e. 30% work rate).

Under Murray's option, if 10,000 were exempt under the family violence option, this state would only need to place 20,000 of its recipients to meet the work requirement.

Under DPC, the number would be the same so long as the waived individuals participate in temporary services that help them prepare for work (which may be less intensive than work activities).

Under our alternative, the 10,000 would be removed from the denominator, resulting in 30% of 90,000 (or 27,000) recipients who need to be placed in work. This would help guard against a "gutting" of the work requirements.

While we think this option is least likely of the three to undermine the work requirements, other groups might later seek similar relief, arguing they too should be removed from the base for purposes of calculating participation rates, and therefore exempt from work requirements. This, of course, could lead to a large exempt pool as became the case under the

Proposed Amendment

(Additions to Murray Amendment are underlined; deletions are ~~stricken~~)

SEC. . PROTECTING VICTIMS OF FAMILY VIOLENCE.

(a) Findings.--Congress finds that--

(1) the intent of Congress in amending part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in section 103(a) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193; 110 Stat 2112) was to allow States to take into account the effects of the epidemic of domestic violence in establishing their welfare programs, by giving States the flexibility to grant individual, temporary waivers for good cause to victims of domestic violence who meet the criteria set forth in section 402(a)(7)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.602(a)(7)(B));

(2) the allowance of waivers under such sections was not intended to be ~~limited by other, separate, and independent provisions of part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)~~ undermine the law's goals of work and personal responsibility;

(3) under section 402(a)(7)(A)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)(A)(iii)), requirements under the temporary assistance for needy families program under part A of title IV of such Act may, for good cause, be waived for so long as necessary; and

(4) good cause waivers granted pursuant to section 402(a)(7)(A)(iii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)(A)(iii)) are intended to be temporary and directed only at particular program requirements when needed on an individual case-by-case basis, and are intended to facilitate the ability of victims of domestic violence to move forward and meet program requirements when safe and feasible without interference by domestic violence.

(b) Clarification of Waiver Provisions.--

(1) In general.--Section 402(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (41 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

^(C) No numerical limits.--In implementing this paragraph, a State shall not be subject to any numerical limitation in the granting of good cause waivers under subparagraph (A)(iii).

^(D) Treatment of waived individuals for purposes of certain other provisions of this part.--

(1) A state will be eligible for a reasonable good cause exception as defined in Section 409(b) if it demonstrates that its failure

to meet the requirements of 408(a)(7) is attributable to its provision of good cause domestic violence waivers.

(2) For purposes of determining compliance with the participation rate requirements set forth in section 407(a), a State may exclude recipients of good cause domestic violence waivers from the base, as defined in section 407(b)(1)(B)(ii)(I), in calculating its monthly participation rate.

~~--Any individual to whom a good cause waiver of compliance with this Act has been granted in accordance with subparagraph (A)(iii) shall not be included for purposes of determining a State's compliance with the participation rate requirements set forth in section 407, for purposes of applying the limitation described in section 408(a)(7)(C)(ii), or for purposes of determining whether to impose a penalty under paragraph (3), (5), or (9) of section 409(a).--~~

(E) Good cause domestic violence waiver defined. -- A good cause domestic violence waiver means a waiver granted in accordance with subparagraph (A)(iii) that is (i) temporary; (ii) based on an individualized evaluation of need; and (iii) includes services designed to ensure safety, promote independence, and prepare for employment.

(F) For purposes of subparagraph (E), the Secretary shall define the term "temporary," consistent with subsection (a)(2), and for the minimum period of time necessary to meet the requirements of this section.

(2) Effective date.--The amendment made by paragraph (1) takes effect as if it has been included in the enactment of section 103(a) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193; 110 Stat. 2112).

(c) Federal Parent Locator Service.--

(1) In general.--Section 453 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653), as amended by section 5534 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 627), is amended--

(A) in subsection (b)(2)--

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting `or that the health, safety, or liberty or a parent or child would be unreasonably put at risk by the disclosure of such information,' before `provided that';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting `, that the health, safety, or liberty or a parent or child would be unreasonably put at risk

by the disclosure of such information,' before `and that information'; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (i), by striking `be harmful to the parent or the child' and inserting `place the health, safety, or liberty of a parent or child unreasonably at risk'; and.

(B) in subsection (c) (2), by inserting `, or to serve as the initiating court in an action to seek and order,' before `against a noncustodial'.

(2) State plan.--Section 454(26) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 654), as amended by section 5552 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33; 111 Stat. 635), is amended--

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking `result in physical or emotional harm to the party or the child' and inserting `place the health, safety, or liberty of a parent or child unreasonably at risk';

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking `of domestic violence or child abuse against a party or the child and that the disclosure of such information could be harmful to the party or the child' and inserting `that the health, safety, or liberty of a parent or child would be unreasonably put at risk by the disclosure of such information'; and

(C) in subparagraph (E), by striking `of domestic violence' and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting `that the health, safety, or liberty of a parent or child would be unreasonably put at risk by the disclosure of such information pursuant to section 453(b) (2), the court shall determine whether disclosure to any other person or persons of information received from the Secretary could place the health, safety, or liberty of a parent or child unreasonably at risk (if the court determines that disclosure to any other person could be harmful, the court and its agents shall not make any such disclosure);'.

(3) Effective date.--The amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 day after the effective date described in section 5557(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33).

(d) Waivers. --

(1) In general, Section 415(a) (1) is amended:

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting "or (C)" before ", if any waiver" .

(B) following subparagraph (B) inserting "(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a state shall be subject to the provision of section 408(a) (7)." .

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 15:10:35.00

SUBJECT: Here are the bullet points I faxed Mary

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Our proposal allows states to grant temporary waivers from the work rules and time limits to victims of domestic violence, which is the primary goal of the Senate provision.

However, our proposal achieves this goal through a different mechanism than the Senate. Rather than exclude victims of domestic violence from the work rates and time limits altogether, our proposal ensures that states that fail to meet the work rates or time limit standards because of domestic violence waivers will not receive financial penalties.

Our proposal goes further than the Senate in encouraging states to provide services to victims of domestic violence, exempting states from penalties only if they provide services based on an individual assessment.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 18:13:31.00

SUBJECT: Senior Staff Coverage

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

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: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/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:

Please let me know. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP on 10/06/97 06:19 PM -----

Kelli R. McClure
10/06/97 06:12:17 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Michael D. Malone/WHO/EOP, Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP, Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP
Subject: Senior Staff Coverage

Due to the observance of Columbus Day on Monday, October 13, the Chief of Staff has requested a complete list of senior staff who will be working, as well as staff that will be on call and how they can be reached.

Please submit the list to me no later than 3:00 p.m. on Thursday. We will be submitting this information to the Chief of Staff on Friday morning.

Also, please provide the WHCA Signal Switchboard with numbers for the senior staff who will be out of town.

Thank you.

Message Sent

To: _____
Ronda H. Jackson/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP
Huma M. Abedin/WHO/EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP
Raymond E. Donnelly III/WHO/EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Ilia V. Velez/WHO/EOP
Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP
Carolyn E. Cleveland/WHO/EOP
Paul J. Cusack/OVP @ OVP
Debbie B Bengtson/OVP @ OVP
Ana M. Duque/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Lisa M. Jones/OMB/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Sonyia Matthews/OPD/EOP
Holly H. Holt/WHO/EOP
Rebecca A. Cameron/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 13:07:38.00

SUBJECT: Casellas Resigns

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

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

TEXT:

Did you see the clip that Gilbert Casellas, chair of the EEOC, announced he was resigning? I meant to show you when I got back, it was in Thursday's paper. It could offer an opportunity for a high-profile or agenda-minded appointment.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: William R. Kincaid (CN=William R. Kincaid/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 18:56:23.00

SUBJECT: COURT ASKS ADMINISTRATION OPINION ON NURSES FOR ...

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP on 10/06/97
06:49 PM -----

FORTUNA_D @ A1

10/06/97 04:58:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: William H. White Jr., William R. Kincaid

cc:

Subject: COURT ASKS ADMINISTRATION OPINION ON NURSES FOR ...

Date: 10/06/97 Time: 10:55

SCourt asks administration opinion on nurses for disabled students

WASHINGTON (AP) The Supreme Court today asked the Clinton administration whether it thinks public school districts must pay for nurses to accompany some disabled students throughout the school day.

The court wants to hear Justice Department lawyers' view of rulings that require a Cedar Rapids, Iowa, school district to pay for the nursing services needed by a teen-age boy identified in court papers as Garret F.

The justices are not expected to say whether they will grant full review to the Iowa case until hearing from the government lawyers, which could take months.

At issue is the scope of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The law provides that all children with disabilities receive a "free appropriate public education."

Under the law, public schools are required to provide various "special education and related services." But an exception is made for medical services.

Garret, injured in a motorcycle accident at age 4, is a quadriplegic and ventilator dependent. His mental abilities were unaffected, and he is now in the ninth grade.

During the school day, he requires a personal attendant to see to his health-care needs. Through most of his schooling, a licensed practical nurse has served as that attendant.

In 1993, Garret's mother asked the school district to pick up the costs of providing an attendant for Garret.

She said such costs are to be free "related services" provided

under the federal law. But school officials said one-on-one nursing services are medical, not educational, and do not have to be provided at taxpayer expense.

A federal trial judge and the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled for Garret and against the school district.

The appeals court relied heavily on a 1984 Supreme Court ruling that said public school officials had to pay for and provide a special procedure for a child disabled by spina bifida and unable to urinate by herself.

Such services, the high court said then, "are no less related to the effort to educate than are services that enable the child to reach, enter or exit the school."

But that 1984 opinion added: "It bears mentioning that not even the services of a nurse are required."

In the appeal acted on today, lawyers for the Cedar Rapids school officials noted that three other federal appeals courts have ruled that schools don't have to pay for continuous services provided by licensed nurses.

The case is Cedar Rapids Community School District vs. Garret F., 96-1793.

APNP-10-06-97 1058EDT

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 11:07:15.00

SUBJECT: Draft memo for your review on Harris's idea to resume Daily Point of Light

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:

Here's a draft memo on Harris's proposal to resume the Daily Points of Light awards. Let me know whether you want the memo to come from you, and whether you want to recommend an option -- I know you've said you really don't care in the past. Steve Silverman would probably be willing to send the memo if you don't want to.

This draft identifies a middle ground option between resuming and not resuming the awards, which is resuming them but not linking them to the President. It's been hard to get closure on where people are on this issue, but I think Ann Lewis opposes it, while Steve Silverman thinks we should do something here. Harris says that the former President will be very disappointed if we reject this idea.

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

SUBJECT: Harris Wofford's Proposal to Resume Points of Light Awards

Background: Harris Wofford has written to urge that you resume former President Bush's Daily Points of Light awards. He proposes to rename the awards the Presidents' Points of Light with you and President Bush as co-sponsors. Rather than having the White House take responsibility for selecting and vetting the winners on a daily basis, as was the case under President Bush, Harris proposes that the Points of Light Foundation and the Corporation for National Service take on this responsibility. The Knights of Columbus have agreed to fund the costs of this program for one year.

One factor complicating the decision is that Harris has had extensive conversations with the Points of Light Foundation and with President Bush himself on this proposal. Apparently Harris has made it clear that he favors this idea and that the decision rests with the White House. Harris indicates that President Bush will be deeply disappointed if we decide not to resume the awards.

One other timing issue is that you are scheduled to attend the dedication of President Bush's library in November. If we decide to reinstate this program, that event would be an opportunity to announce it, especially given the former President's attachment to the Points of Light program.

Arguments For:

Reinstating the awards is an easy way to keep the issue of service and volunteerism before the public on a daily basis. It would continue to repair the rift between the AmeriCorps concept of service and the more traditional volunteer sector, just as the Philadelphia summit did. AmeriCorps members would be eligible for the awards.

President Bush very much wants the Administration to do this. He will be very disappointed if we do not, and he will see it as the White House's decision because of Harris's conversations with him.

Arguments Against:

The benefits of resuming the awards are minimal. Our efforts to reach out to the volunteer sector at the Philadelphia summit were so successful that it is not clear what this would add. In addition, some would react negatively to such a decision, since the original Points of Light program was derided by many as an empty gesture.

The daily responsibility of selecting and vetting winners will be time-consuming for White House staff, and not worth the effort. Although theoretically we could assign responsibility for vetting the award winners to the Points of Light Foundation and the Corporation for National Service, from a practical standpoint we would probably still feel the need to do a legal and/or political check on award winners.

Options:

Resume the awards as Wofford proposes.

Decline to resume the awards.

Reestablish these awards as the "Daily Points of Light" awards, administered by the Corporation and the Points of Light Foundation, with no connection to the President or the White House. It is not clear how President Bush would react to such a plan.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 18:16:12.00

SUBJECT: Intact D & E

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Any plans for the White House to make a SAP Statement prior to the hearing on Wednesday?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 6-OCT-1997 11:43:00.00

SUBJECT: Service summit 6 months later

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:

Several members of the press are planning stories on progress in the 6 months since the service summit. The Times already did one, and the Boston Globe is working on one that may not be positive; it may already have been in the press this weekend. Jonathan Alter will do one that people suspect will be critical. America's Promise is trying to respond by putting together a 6-month update that Powell will reveal in some setting later this month. They have asked all commitment makers for media-oriented nuggets they could use. (I am putting together a package for them on federal agency commitments.) America's Promise remains in a state of flux. They still have not developed their tracking system for commitments, and personnel changes continue.

Steve Silverman and I have talked about us doing a "6 month memo" that would lay out our own progress since the summit and talk about where we want to be at the 1-year point. Let me know if you think that's a good or bad idea. Ideas we could develop are outreach on health insurance, both Medicaid and the new program; and reauthorization of AmeriCorps. You may have seen that Harris just sent the President a memo -- it's a general update on the Corporation, with a plea for making reauthorization a priority by releasing it this year and pushing hard early next year.

Dear Representative Stupak:

Thank you for your letter dated September 24, 1997, expressing your profound concern about food safety and the provisions concerning food safety in the North American Free Trade Agreement. I share your concern about the safety of food for all Americans, and I will not permit any trade policy to impair the health and safety of the American people.

I have committed this Administration to ensuring that the food that Americans eat is the safest in the world. We have put in place improved safety standards for meat, poultry, and seafood products, and have begun the process of developing enhanced safety standards for fruit and vegetable juices. Together, we have put in place important legislative proposals, including the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996 and the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996.

This month, I announced an initiative to upgrade domestic food safety standards and to ensure that fruits and vegetables coming from overseas are as safe as those produced in the United States. I asked Congress to enact legislation that will require the Food and Drug Administration to halt imports of fruits, vegetables, and other food products produced in countries that do not meet U.S. food safety requirements. I also directed the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture to work cooperatively with the agricultural community to develop guidance on agricultural and manufacturing practices for fruits and vegetables within one year. Finally, I committed to providing the necessary funds in my Fiscal Year 1999 budget to enable the FDA to dramatically expand its international food inspection force.

This new initiative will help guarantee the safety of food in the United States. It provides the improved inspection capacity we need and increased regulatory power to combat imports that could be contaminated. I am committed to continuing to improve the safety of food that Americans eat, and I look forward to working with you on this vital project. Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 22:15:33.00

SUBJECT: Strategy 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:

FYI. Stuart Kasdin from OMB called (saying Josh Gotbaum asked him) saying they'd like to be on the tobacco planning. Want him at the strategy meeting?

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Cathy Mays to Elena Kagan re: tickets (1 page)	10/07/1997	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[10/06/1997-10/07/1997]

2009-1006-F
bm65

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: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 16:40:35.00

SUBJECT: Historical data on civil rights - PIR request

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
FYI:

----- Forwarded by Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP on 10/07/97
04:30 PM -----

Susan M. Carr

10/07/97 02:46:05 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
cc: Alan B. Rhinesmith/OMB/EOP
Subject: Historical data on civil rights - PIR request

Below is the historical civil rights crosscut document I prepared for the PIR.

Let me know your fax number, if you want a hard copy.

See you tomorrow.

----- Forwarded by Susan M. Carr/OMB/EOP on 10/07/97
02:44 PM -----

Susan M. Carr

09/23/97 10:03:43 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Susan M. Carr/OMB/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Historical data on civil rights - PIR request

----- Forwarded by Susan M. Carr/OMB/EOP on 09/23/97
10:03 AM -----

Susan M. Carr

09/23/97 10:03:30 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Lin Liu/PIR/EOP@EOP
cc: Alan B. Rhinesmith/OMB/EOP@EOP, Francis S. Redburn/OMB/EOP@EOP, Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP@EOP
Subject: Historical data on civil rights - PIR request

Per your request of last week, the attached table shows budget authority, outlays, and fte's for the following civil rights agencies:

- EEOC
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
- HUD Fair Housing Activities
- DOJ Civil Rights Division
- Education Office of Civil Rights
- HHS Office of Civil Rights
- DOJ OFCCP
- DOT Office of Civil Rights

As I mentioned in my previous e-mail, the deflators used to determine real change between 1993 and 1998 are 3.1% for S&E accounts and 2.3% for grant programs.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D9]MAIL456966977.216 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

00001A00021004000000000005F00000B5C002000010A0000000000000001F0008000000013003
0026001F00080000010130060024001F00080000020130010024001F0008000003013003002400
1F00080000040130030024001F00080000050130030024001F00080000060130030024001F0008
0000070130030024001F00080000080130030024001F00080000090130030024001F000800000A
0130030024001F000800000B0130160016000300060001000000010004001C000101010000000B
1E59040400B2A84F1C7AF0E6000000E6A74F1C00000500100000005F1905000000050000004600
05000600050000009F0E0907001A0000009F0E000E010302080308040805080608070808080907

Clinton Presidential Records Automated Records Management System [EMAIL]

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Hex Dump file is not in a recognizable format, has been incorrectly decoded or is damaged.

File Name: p_67966964_opd_html_1.xls

Attachment Number: [ATTACH.D9]MAIL456966977.216

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ora Theard (CN=Ora Theard/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 15:37:34.00

SUBJECT: Houston 209 Meeting

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

TO: Judith A. Winston (CN=Judith A. Winston/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Robert N. Weiner (CN=Robert N. Weiner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Alissa K. Brown (CN=Alissa K. Brown/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher J. Lavery (CN=Christopher J. Lavery/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Melissa J. Prober (CN=Melissa J. Prober/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

CC: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Sylvia Mathews and Chuck Ruff will host a meeting re the Houston affirmative action issue tomorrow morning, Wednesday, October 8, at 9:30 a.m. in the Counsel's office (2d floor, West Wing). Please respond by e-mail or call 62632 to confirm your attendance.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 18:56:40.00

SUBJECT: Murray amendment at markup at L/HHS/ED

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

TEXT:

fyi

----- Forwarded by Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP on 10/07/97
06:58 PM -----

Barry White

10/07/97 06:44:25 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP

cc: Anil Kakani/OMB/EOP, Jill M. Blickstein/OMB/EOP, Lisa M. Kountoupes/OMB/EOP, Jack A. Smalligan/OMB/EOP

Subject: Murray amendment at markup at L/HHS/ED

You asked for a report on markup.

Today's 90 minute markup session was not for decision making, but rather for positions to be stated on selected issues. According to our bill tracker who was present, Senator Murray asked that the conferees not eliminate her amendment "protecting domestic violence victims from the welfare work requirements". Rep. Lowey supported her. There was no further discussion.

I am a little startled by the notion of "protecting" people from the work requirement, but if that's the way this issue is being thought of, it is more understandable why our variation on her theme is portrayed negatively by some groups. What we wanted to do was ensure that victims get real help, through temporary services and the work requirements, to get off of welfare and into jobs and independence. Seems to me a better way of protecting them in the long run than keeping them on welfare. But what do I know.

Conferees still hope to finish work by Thursday.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Christopher F. Walker (CN=Christopher F. Walker/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 14:26:32.00

SUBJECT: Late-term potus draft for your review

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

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

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

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

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

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

CC: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura K. Capps (CN=Laura K. Capps/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please review the following Late-term Potus draft and alert me as to any concerns or necessary edits. This letter will go to approximately 140 Members. We are attempting to get this letter out by COB today. Thanks for your assistance.===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT: [ATTACH.D28]MAIL44827597P.216 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043AE040000010A02010000000205000000120F00000002000085CAA11A65A49B50D974F4
721C5368CB3244DB7D8367C20E21E82B3B183EA8C02CE96395E0C32A92AB6586EBC08EAF25C7F7
90D34B6DD371BFF7C0B9CAC1271F1DF2322A2A0E55BA5109B67B7AD4754CFCF90A2F39034CF400
FC8D3EBE0F663E3BFF1F5F54DA8570CE4A6A092021F4801413444C28901FE34C8DADEED8062C96
3E0C2C340CB3E06ADBA85460316648103EAD67BFCFF47E978F114831477544942E3DA24644C9B4
1F6E83196365C777362E5DAE00BB374F84EB8191AE16AC002331843F59A7F2DCB5E0879DA2FABB
5EC99EA7E758EB859601BA890DB5084CE56ECB7675B4DC4DE76897A0FCA869E24BEE888605D6B4
6892860980D8C971846320D0C936B08C19862591310F2AD6563B071100CDCC8565CCAED30EB8F

Dear Representative xxxx:

The House of Representatives will soon vote on accepting the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1122, legislation that will ban all late-term abortions.

As you know, I have long opposed late-term abortions, and I continue to do so except in those instances necessary to save the life of a woman or prevent serious harm to her health. Unfortunately, neither H.R. 1122, nor the Senate Amendment which will be pending before the House, contains an exception to the measure's ban on late-term abortions that will adequately protect the lives and health of the small group of women in tragic circumstances who need an abortion performed at a late stage of pregnancy. Consequently, I urge you to vote against H.R. 1122 when it comes before the House. Moreover, should the House agree to the Senate Amendment and send H.R. 1122 to me for signature, I will veto the legislation.

Let me be clear. I have asked Congress repeatedly, for almost two years, to send me legislation that includes a limited exemption for the small number of compelling cases where use of this procedure is necessary to avoid serious health consequences. When Governor of Arkansas, I signed just such a bill into law that barred third-trimester abortions, with an appropriate exception for life or health. I believe that Congress should work in a bipartisan manner to fashion legislation that recognizes that there are cases where this procedure should be allowed when the health risks facing a woman are deadly serious and real. To abandon the women

Although I continue to hope that this painful issue can be resolved, enactment of H.R. 1122 is not the answer. I urge you to vote against this measure.

Sincerely,

The Honorable xxxxx
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 15:04:23.00

SUBJECT: DOL meeting went well; locals seemed happy and states didn't complain much

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

TEXT:

I just spoke to Patricia Savage at HHS (who works for Mary Bourdette and had been fielding calls from Murray's staff) to tell her about the OMB-DPC-Murray conversation this morning. She didn't seem too alarmed.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 14:17:32.00

SUBJECT: Caucuses and testing--update

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 talked with Andy Blocker briefly a little while ago on testing issues and the appropriations bill. He's got a somewhat different cut at things than we did this morning, and suggests we need to worry about the Caucuses more than we had been planning to.

Before turning to this issue in more detail, Andy and I reiterated to each other that our overall position with regard to proposed Republican compromises remains the same -- we are not interested at all in discussing compromises that will require any additional authorization down the road.

With regard to the Hispanic and Black Caucuses, here's his view:

1. Obey has told Hilley that he feels uncomfortable carrying our water on the tests while the caucuses continue to oppose them. Andy and Hilley think that we need to take some steps to satisfy the caucuses in order to shore up our own side in conference. At best we will get half of each caucus to switch positions, but that should be enough for Obey.

In short, we need the caucuses not for their votes on the floor, but for their impact on Obey in conference.

2. There are three keys to accomplishing this--(1) Spanish testing; (2) addressing civil rights concerns; and, (3) school construction. No surprises here.

On Spanish testing--Andy's view would suggest we be more prepared to commit now to pay for the tests than we discussed this morning. However, we still have the problem of setting off the other side, so I'm not yet inclined to move from where we were after we talked this morning.

On school construction-- Rengel will introduce his school infrastructure proposal on Thursday at Ways and Means, as a substitute for a Coverdell-like proposal. I just came from a meeting where Treasury, ED, OMB, NEC and me on behalf of DPC tentatively agreed that we should support Rangel, through a Riley/Rubin letter. We'll see the letter before it goes anyplace. Andy Blocker thinks this is a good move, and I've asked him to figure out how to play this to our maximum advantage on testing.

Mike Smith and I haven't yet connected on the other civil rights issues, though I don't think there is much there we need to rethink from our discussion this morning.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa N. Benton (CN=Melissa N. Benton/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 18:31:01.00

SUBJECT: Justice letter to Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conferees on Teams

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

The Department of Justice is requesting clearance of a letter identical to a previously cleared DOJ letter to Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conferees objecting to the prohibition on the use of federal funds to supervise the Teamsters election rerun. DOJ would like to send the same letter to the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conferees to protest an identical provision in that bill.

Please advise no later than noon tomorrow (Wednesday) if there are any objections to clearing this letter.

If you have any questions or would like a copy of the Commerce-Justice-State letter, please call me at 5-7887.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa N. Benton (CN=Melissa N. Benton/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 12:14:48.00

SUBJECT: Paragraph on financial reporting and disclosure

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barry White (CN=Barry White/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

NEC wants to make sure everyone is comfortable with the paragraph in the Labor letter on the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act discussing the bill's financial reporting and disclosure provisions. The concern is that the Administration may be vulnerable to criticism for applying a different standard on disclosure and reporting to unions than it does in the context of campaign finance reform.

The paragraph in question reads as follows:

"The bill would also impose burdensome new financial reporting and disclosure requirements on unions, by amending the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. In 1993, the Department of Labor rescinded comparable regulations, because they would have imposed unwarranted costs on labor unions (particularly labor organizations), without providing corresponding benefits to union members. Under current law, workers who object to paying full dues under a union-security clause are already entitled to union financial information, under procedures that do not burden labor unions unnecessarily. "

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa N. Benton (CN=Melissa N. Benton/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 15:21:05.00

SUBJECT: Revised Labor letter on H.R. 1625, the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

I am in the process of circulating via fax a further-revised version of the Labor letter on the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act. Please review and advise me of any changes or problems by 4:30 p.m. today. We plan to clear the letter by COB today, to allow the Department of Labor to send it to the Committee prior to tomorrow morning's markup.

If you did not receive the revised draft, please call me at 5-7887 and I'll resend it.

Thanks!

DRAFT -- 10/7/97 -- 3:50

WELFARE CASELOADS HAVE DECLINED MORE THAN 3 ½ MILLION
UNDER PRESIDENT CLINTON
October 7, 1997

President Clinton announced today that welfare caseloads have declined another quarter of a million, bringing the total reduction to more than 3 ½ million and more than 25 percent since he became President. Since he signed welfare reform into law last August, welfare rolls have declined by 1.7 million or 14 percent to just under 10.5 million. For the first time since 1969, less than 4 percent of the U.S. population is on welfare. A total of 49 out of 50 states have lowered their welfare rolls -- 13 states by 40 percent or more.

Later today, Vice President Gore will announce that the federal government has made tremendous progress in fulfilling its commitment to hire 10,000 welfare recipients by the year 2000, doing its fair share to lower the welfare rolls.

The new caseload numbers underscore the success of the welfare reform law as it begins its second year. This 3 ½ million caseload decline is the largest in history. Today, welfare caseloads, which fell by a record 1.9 million in the President's first three-and-a-half years in office, are on course to have dropped by 2 million more in the one year after signing the law. The numbers released today, from June 1997, reflect 10 months of the first year of welfare reform.

President Clinton has made welfare reform a top priority of his Administration. During his first four years in office, the President granted federal waivers to 43 States to require work, time-limit assistance, make work pay, improve child support enforcement, and encourage parental responsibility. In August 1996, President Clinton signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), a comprehensive bipartisan welfare reform bill that establishes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Since signing the bill into law, the President has focused on efforts to create jobs to move people from welfare to work, which include fighting for and winning an additional \$3 billion for welfare to work in the Balanced Budget Act, mobilizing the business community to hire welfare recipients, working with civic, religious and non-profit groups to mentor families leaving welfare for work, and hiring our fair share of welfare recipients in the federal government.

October 7, 1997

Questions and Answers on Welfare

Caseload Numbers

Question: Why does the Administration say that welfare reform has already been a success?

Answer: One year after signing the welfare law, caseloads have declined by over 3.6 million, or 26 percent since the President took office. 10.5 million people were on the rolls in June 1997, down from 14.1 million in January 1993, a drop of 3.6 million or 26 percent. This is the largest caseload decline in history: in no other comparable time period have as many people come off the rolls. The 10.5 million people on the rolls represent less than 4 percent of the population -- the smallest percentage of the population on welfare since 1970.

Year	Welfare Caseload (millions)	Population (millions)	Percent
1969	6.706	202.677	3.3%
1970	8.466	205.052	4.1%
1971-1992	between 8-13	between 207-255	between 4.1-5.3%
1993	14.142	258.137	5.5%
1994	14.225	260.660	5.5%
1995	13.652	263.034	5.2%
1996	12.648	265.284	4.7%
June 1997*	10.494	266.789	3.9%

* Data released today.

The bipartisan welfare plan that the President signed last year is dramatically changing the nation's welfare system into one that requires work in exchange for time-limited assistance. The law contains strong work requirements, a performance bonus to reward states for moving welfare recipients into jobs, state maintenance of effort requirements, comprehensive child support enforcement, and supports for families moving from welfare to work -- including increased

funding for child care and guaranteed medical coverage. State strategies are making a real difference in the success of welfare reform, specifically in job placement, child care and transportation.

Even before the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act became law, many states were well on their way to changing their welfare programs to jobs programs. By granting Federal waivers, the Clinton Administration allowed 43 states -- more than all previous Administrations combined -- to require work, time-limit assistance, make work pay, improve child support enforcement, and encourage parental responsibility. The vast majority of states have chosen to continue or build on their welfare demonstration projects approved by the Clinton Administration.

Question: **The President often uses the decline in welfare caseloads as a measure of the success of welfare reform. Isn't the decline due mainly to the good economy?**

Answer: Welfare caseloads are the best measure we have right now of the success of welfare reform. According to a May report by the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) over 40 percent of the reduction in the welfare rolls can be attributed to the strong economic growth during the Clinton Administration, nearly one-third can be attributed to waivers granted to states to test innovative strategies to move people from welfare to work, and the rest is attributed to other factors -- such as the Clinton Administration's decisions to increase the Earned Income Tax Credit, strengthen child support enforcement, and increase funding for child care.

Question: **Which are the 13 states that have cut their rolls by over 40% in the last 4 years?**

Answer: The 13 states are: Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. (See attached state-by-state table.)

Question: **Only one of the 50 states has had an increase in its welfare caseloads -- Hawaii, which has experienced a 36% increase. Why?**

Answer: This is a complex question to answer because of conditions unique to Hawaii, including the local economy and different population and demographic trends. Hawaii is a state where economic recovery from a recession lags behind the nation as a whole. It is also unique in that it is geographically remote from the rest of the country, making its economy more contained. Eligibility changes in Hawaii since 1995 have brought additional families into the system, but state officials report that they have simultaneously increased their emphasis on work for those

who are on the welfare rolls. Finally, Hawaii reports that they had an influx of welfare recipients from other U.S. Pacific territories -- Guam and the Mariana Islands -- in 1994.

General Welfare Questions

Question: The President said that the balanced budget he signed into law fixed what he promised to fix when he signed the welfare reform law last August. What did he mean?

Answer: When the President signed welfare reform into law last August, he said he thought the cuts in programs for legal immigrants and nutritional assistance -- cuts which "have nothing to do with the fundamental purposes of welfare reform" -- were "too deep" and he pledged to fix them. The new budget does that, by restoring \$11.5 billion in health and disability benefits for legal immigrants who were in the U.S. as of last August and are receiving benefits or become disabled in the future. The new budget restores \$1.5 billion in food stamps cuts, providing 235,000 work slots for able-bodied childless recipients who must work under the new law. The budget also ensures that 30,000 children losing SSI because of the stricter new eligibility rules will keep their Medicaid coverage.

\$3 Billion Welfare to Work Fund

Question: What is the \$3 billion Welfare to Work Fund?

Answer: The balanced budget signed into law this summer includes the President's proposal for a \$3 billion Welfare to Work Jobs Challenge fund. First proposed by the President shortly after he signed the welfare law, this fund will help states and local communities move long-term welfare recipients into lasting, unsubsidized jobs. These funds can be used for job creation, job placement, and job retention efforts, including wage subsidies to private employers and other critical post-employment support services. The Department of Labor will provide oversight, but most of the dollars will be placed, through the Private Industry Councils, in the hands of the localities who are on the front lines of the welfare reform effort. In addition, 25 percent of the funds will be awarded by the Department of Labor on a competitive basis to support innovative welfare to work projects.

In addition, the new budget also includes a welfare-to-work tax credit for employers. This tax credit will give employers an added incentive to hire long-term welfare recipients by providing a credit equal to 35% of the first \$10,000 in wages in the first year of employment, and 50% of the first \$10,000 in wages in the second year, paid to new hires who have received welfare for an extended period. The credit is for two years per worker to encourage not only hiring, but also retention.

Fair Labor Standards Act and Worker Protections

Question: Why is the Administration undermining welfare reform by insisting that participants in workfare programs get the protections of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and other employment laws?

Answer: We believe that worker protection laws, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act, should apply to workfare participants in the same way they apply to other workers. If a workfare participant counts as an "employee" under these laws, then she should get protection. No one doing real work should be paid a subminimum wage.

And we believe that paying working welfare recipients the minimum wage and giving them other worker protections will promote, not undermine, the goals of welfare reform, because it will give them the ability to support their families and break the cycle of dependency.

We will work with states to ensure that they can comply with this policy, without undue financial burden, while still meeting the welfare law's work requirements. Of course, if states place welfare recipients in private jobs, then the minimum wage already applies. And we are working to minimize costs associated with the application of employment laws to workfare participants in other ways.

Welfare to Work Partnership

Question: What is the Welfare to Work Partnership?

Answer: The Partnership is a national, independent, nonpartisan effort of the business community launched in May 1997 to help move people on public assistance to jobs in the private sector. The Partnership concentrates on energizing the business community to hire and retain welfare recipients without displacing existing workers. The Partnership provides information, technical assistance and support for businesses of all sizes and sectors, from all industries and from all areas of the country.

The Welfare to Work Partnership now includes well over 1,000 businesses. In order to join the Welfare to Work Partnership, companies must either have hired or must pledge to hire individuals from public assistance without displacing current employees.

The Partnership recently launched a toll-free hotline and web page to help companies all across the nation hire people off welfare. Companies can sign up with the Partnership and/or get more information by calling the Partnership's toll-free hotline (1-888-USA-JOB1) or visiting its web site

(www.welfaretowork.org). Also, the Partnership recently launched a “city to city challenge” in St. Louis. Because jobs are created and filled at the community level, the Welfare to Work Partnership is pledging to visit 12 high poverty cities over the next 6 months to strengthen each city's welfare to work infrastructure. In every city, the Partnership will recruit businesses to hire and retain welfare recipients and give them the technical assistance to do so. They will help city service providers improve the way they operate so they can provide businesses with work-ready welfare recipients. Finally, the Partnership will work with elected and appointed state and local officials to celebrate the city's efforts and ensure long-term changes. Possible cities include: Indianapolis, Baltimore, Columbus or Cleveland, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, Seattle, New York City, Detroit, San Antonio, Philadelphia, Denver, and Atlanta.

White House Hiring

Question: In April, the White House pledged to hire six welfare recipients. Have any been hired?

Answer: Yes. The Executive Office of the President has already hired six welfare recipients. [Note that the original commitment that the “White House” would hire six people actually reflected the full Executive Office of the President, including OMB and the Office of Administration. To date, the White House has hired 3 people, OMB has hired 2, and the Office of Administration has hired 1.]

Work Participation Rates

Question: *Why are so many states not meeting the work rates? Does that mean welfare reform is a failure?*

Answer: It's important to keep in perspective that 93 percent of the welfare caseload is made up of single parent families and nearly all states expect to meet the work rates for those families. The law requires 25 percent of the total welfare caseload to work and 75 percent of the two parent families to work. We think these work rules are tough but fair and states with serious welfare reform efforts should be able to meet them. After all, in these families one parent can work while the other takes care of the children.

Question: *How many states do you expect to fail the work rates?*

Answer: We are not sure. States have until mid-November to report data. Informally, most states have told us they will meet the overall 25 percent work rate, but many have reported concerns about meeting the 75 percent two parent rate. As you may know, the Associated Press surveyed states and found 19 states expect to fail the

two parent work rates and seven states do not know. However, because of the staggered start dates for state TANF plans, only two-thirds of states have to report data and are subject to financial penalties this fiscal year, and none of these states will be reporting more than three months of data (from July 1- September 30th).

Question: Will the Administration penalize states that fail the work rates?

Answer: We will impose penalties on states that do not meet work rates. We believe it is critical that states place a priority on putting welfare families to work. The law does provide states with the opportunity to receive a credit toward the work rates for those who leave the welfare rolls and allows them to propose a corrective compliance plan in lieu of a penalty. We will evaluate these requests on a case by case basis.

Question: Is the Administration going to weaken the two parent work rate through regulations, as The New York Times has reported?

Answer: The welfare law explicitly says that states shall receive a "pro rata reduction of the participation rate due to caseload reductions" and provides a formula for reducing the work rates from, for example, 75 to 50 percent, if the state has had a 25 percent caseload reduction. Thus it is the law, not the regulation, which provides the caseload credit.

Child Support Computer Systems

Question: Haven't a lot of states failed to meet the October 1st deadline for having state-wide child support computer systems in place? What is the Administration planning to do about this?

Answer: States have had nine years to develop these computer systems, and we don't intend to extend the deadline any further. We do, however, believe that the current law -- which requires us to withhold all federal child support funds -- will undermine efforts to collect child support for need families. Thus, while we proceed with the penalty process, we intend to accept the invitation from members of Congress such as Chairman Shaw to try to work together to devise an additional penalty structure. [Note: 17 states and the District of Columbia will not meet the deadline.]

Child Support Enforcement -- National New Hire Directory

Question: What is the National Directory of New Hires?

Answer: The National Directory of New Hires is part of the welfare law's new tools to

collect child support from deadbeat parents. The best way to collect child support is to take it right out of parents' paychecks, a process called "wage withholding." Before now, it was easy for the 30 percent of parents who live in a different state from their children to avoid wage withholding because the state where their children live didn't know where they worked. The National Directory of New Hires, which will go on-line October 1st, will change all that. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that the new hire directory will increase child support collections by \$6.4 billion over the next ten years.

Question: Do you have any concerns about privacy issues raised by such a database?

Answer: I believe it is critically important we do everything we can to ensure that parents pay the child support they owe. Federal law requires the Department of Health and Human Services to establish safeguards to protect privacy and ensure the data are used only by authorized persons for authorized uses. These issues were reviewed in great detail as the child support legislation was considered in the last Congress, and there was strong bipartisan support for the establishment of the new hire directory and other new child support enforcement measures.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 21:35:13.00

SUBJECT: tobacco farmers, next steps?

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: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

By my count, there are currently five types of tobacco farmer approaches floating around: tobacco companies promise to buy for 25 years; a legislative buy-out of quotas; a legislative guarantee not to alter the existing program; a legislative subsidy to encourage the growing of alternative crops; and a commission inside USDA. We seemed to favor the first. Lugar has suggested the second. Some farmer representatives have recommended the third. Anti-smoking groups and some farmers the fourth. Others the fifth.

Absent our involvement, there is some reason to believe that the farmer state representatives may coalesce around a proposal that has a legislative guarantee with a legislative buy-out option. This might be fine (although costly) but it would be inconsistent with the companies promising to buy for 25 years. I'll ask OMB to cost the Lugar option out (\$8 a pound).

In any case, the high level of interest in this topic suggests some position will start to form soon if they sense a vacuum. I suggest we have our meeting with legislators soon to make sure we stay a part of it and don't get caught on the wrong side of a proposal we don't agree with but which has already gotten substantial backing.

The choices regarding the meeting I see are:

* Who hosts? (POTUS, VPOTUS, Bruce/Donna)

*Who comes? (Legislators, or legislators plus farmer leaders, or possibly adding some Governors to the mix)

*What's said? I think if we do the meeting relatively soon, we can still be soliciting input and discussing process (staying in touch), and hearing about options.

Any thoughts on these questions?

Regards, Tom

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 22:17:53.00

SUBJECT: Religious service and student loans

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: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Elena: You asked if this is still in dispute. It is. Our bill hasn't gone to the Hill yet.

Bruce: Any reaction? Do you think I should push Education on this?

----- Forwarded by Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP on 10/07/97
10:32 AM -----

Diana Fortuna

09/23/97 01:24:43 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP

cc: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP, William R. Kincaid/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP

Subject: Higher ed reauthorization and our service summit proposal

There is a sticky issue on implementing one of our service summit proposals. This is the proposal that interest should not accumulate on any student loans when students take time off to serve. Our plan has always been to include this in our higher ed reauthorization bill, which is being readied for transmittal to the Hill in the next few weeks.

The issue is that the Department's draft would not permit this subsidy if the service is with an organization engaged in religious activities, with certain exceptions. Education is taking the position that doing otherwise raises constitutional questions. This means that a group like the Rev. Tony Campolo's would not qualify. As you recall, Campolo's program was the inspiration for this idea, and the President talked about Campolo when he announced this (see below).

Elena, do you want to review the language to make sure they aren't going overboard? They are reexamining it after I pointed out a few areas where it seems excessively strict. For example, it would rule out teaching English in a program that offered any religious instruction, even if the student was not doing religious instruction. However, I should note that Campolo's people do proselytization for part of their day, so they're not right on the edge of this line.

When we resolve this, we can tell him in the weekly report. Let me know

if you want this in the weekly while we're figuring it out.

[FYI, here's what the President said at the summit. Actually, he deviated from the prepared text in a way that made it sound like this new proposal applied ONLY to religious service.]

"For here in Philadelphia, a minister who is a friend of mine, Reverend Tony Campolo, is helping to organize a movement among churches to get churches to sponsor 10,000 full-time youth volunteers to take a year off from college, or defer a year from college, under the sponsorship of their churches. The churches will do what we do in AmeriCorps, helping to provide for the living expenses of the young people. But I think we ought to say to them, at the very least, it shouldn't cost you any money to serve. And so if you've got a college loan, and you take a year off to serve under the sponsorship of a religious organization, I am going to propose legislation to say, 'During that year, no interest should accrue on that college loan.' It should not cost you any money to serve your country."

Child Care Planning Meetings

House Democratic Leadership, 9/24/97:

1. Craig Hanna-- Gephardt
2. Andie King-- Gephardt
3. Deb Colton-- Ways and Means
4. Broderick Johnson-- Ed and Work
5. Gail Weiss-- Ed and Work
6. Sheryl Smith-- Appropriations
7. Rob Cogorno-- Gephardt

House Republican Leadership, 10/6/97

1. Ren Haskins-- Bill Archer
2. Cassie Bavin-- Bill Archer
3. Richard Stombres-- Bill Goodling
4. Denzel McGuire-- Bill Goodling
5. Bob Knisely-- Robert Livingston

House New Democrats, 9/25/97:

1. Geri O'Sullivan-- McCarthy
2. Phil Singer-- Rothman
3. Jennifer Martella-- LaFalce
4. Abby Hochberg-- Lampson
5. Shannon Ashpole-- A. Smith
6. Stephen Stefanski-- John
7. Amy Bressler-- Pascrell
8. Stacy Stordahl-- Kind
9. Beth Beausang-- Allen
10. Anstice Brand-- Moran
11. Gina Mahony-- Roemer
12. Mark Harkins-- Price
13. Lisa Quigley-- Dooley

House Congressional Hispanic Caucus, 9/26/97:

1. Aylin Kuyumeu-- Sanchez
2. Selena Walsh-- Pastor
3. Henry Contreras-- Roybal-Allard
4. Joshua Tenorio-- Underwood
5. Marilyn Ramos-- Velazquez
6. Ricardo Martinez-Pumerejo-- Romero-Barcelo
7. Jeff Mendelsohn-- Rodriguez

8. Pedro A. Pla-Davila-- Becerra
House Women's Caucus, 9/29/97:

1. Erin Prangle-- Norton
2. Ken Kero-- Tauscher
3. Pearle Jones-- Barton
4. Kraabel, Patsy-- Carson
5. Geri O'Sullivan-- McCarthy
6. Maura Dalton-- Eshoo
7. Cindy Pellegrini-- Slaughter
8. Terri McCullough-- Pelosi
9. Aimee Feinberg-- Woolsey
10. Becky Solay-- DeLauro
11. Marilyn Ramos-- Velazquez
12. Robin Swanson-- McCarthy
13. Kathryn Pearson--Morella
14. Sandy Zimmer-- Morella
15. Liz Powell-- Millender-McDonald
16. Joan Clarle-- Johnson

House Congressional Black Caucus, 10/6/97:

1. Donna Crews-- Waters
2. Abdullah Payton-- Scott
3. Monique Clendinen-- Christian-Green
4. Jennifer Simon-- Dellums
5. Elizabeth Douglas-- Lewis
6. Maya Rockeymoore-- Watt
7. Joseph Lee-- Waters

Senate Democratic Leadership, 9/29/97:

1. Julie Eckert-- Kerrey
2. Stephanie Robinson-- Kennedy
3. Jeanne Ireland-- Dodd
4. Janine Jones-- Moseley-Braun
5. Joanna Slaney-- Moseley-Braun
6. Paul Seltman-- Budget
7. Heidi Bonne-- DPC
8. Opal Winebrenner-- Bryan
9. Lisa Linnell-- Conrad
10. Deborah Walter-- Bingaman
11. Kate O'Malley-- Boxer
12. Jim Jepsen-- Durbin
13. Bev Schroeder-- Harkin
14. Elyse Wasch-- Reed

Automated Records Management System

Hex-Dump Conversion

15. Greg Williamson-- Murray
 16. Rick Remish-- Rockefeller
 17. David Kass-- Kerry
 18. Donna Denison-- Landrieu
 19. Paul Thornell-- Daschle
 20. Elizabeth Goldon-- Breaux
- Senate Republican Leadership, 10/3/97

1. John Cerisano-- Gramm
2. Hope Hegstrom-- Grassley
3. Dennis Smith-- Roth
4. Pamela Maimer-- DeWine
5. Angie Stewart-- Warner
6. Scott Olson-- Baucus
7. Kimberly Barnes-O'Conner-- Jeffords
8. Stacey Hughes-- Nickles
9. Erin Hickman-- Nickles
10. Maggie Smolen-- Murkowski
11. Gary Blank-- Murkowski
12. Stephanie Robinson-- Kennedy

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 14:42:37.00

SUBJECT: DOJ mtg

TO: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Anybody know anything about this? Anybody have ideas about how to contribute to making this meeting productive? Anybody interested in attending? jc3

----- Forwarded by Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP on 10/07/97
02:41 PM -----

Michele Cavataio

10/07/97 01:38:51 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: DOJ mtg

Hi,

Thanks for coming to our meeting and talking about the policy piece. I also wanted to talk about this meeting with DOJ on Thursday. It's at 10:30am at DOJ. What I know so far is that Eileen Mayer, Lisa Winston and Isabel Pinzler are supposed to attend. What are your thoughts on possible items we could talk about? Are you available/interested in coming?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 08:21:36.00

SUBJECT: Furniture

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI-

----- Forwarded by Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP on 10/07/97 08:27 AM -----

Ashley L. Raines
10/07/97 08:04:59 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Furniture

The company that will be reupholstering the furniture in your offices will be coming by around 12 noon to pick up all of the furniture. Just to remind you of the items that will be picked up and brought back within about two weeks:

Couch in 224R
Couch in 222

Please let me know if there is a problem removing any of the above items today. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 10:27:25.00

SUBJECT: FYI: Departure Statement scheduled for 8:45 am in the Oval

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

TEXT:

Dear Representative Stupak:

Thank you for your letter dated September 24, 1997, expressing concern about the effects of increased trade on food safety. I share your concern about the safety of food for all Americans, and I will not permit any trade policy to impair the health and safety of the American people.

I have committed this Administration to ensuring that the food that Americans eat is the safest in the world. We have put in place improved safety standards for meat, poultry, and seafood products, and have begun the process of developing enhanced safety standards for fruit and vegetable juices. Together, we have enacted legislation in this area, including the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996 and the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996.

This month, I announced an initiative to upgrade domestic food safety standards and to ensure that fruits and vegetables coming from overseas are as safe as those produced in the United States. I asked Congress to enact legislation that will require the Food and Drug Administration to halt imports of fruits, vegetables, and other food products from any foreign country with food safety systems and standards that are not on par with those of the United States. I also directed the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture to work cooperatively with the agricultural community to develop guidance on agricultural and manufacturing practices for fruits and vegetables within one year. Finally, I committed to providing the necessary funds in my Fiscal Year 1999 budget to enable the FDA to dramatically expand its international food inspection force so that it can make effective use of this new legislative authority. I am attaching a fact sheet on my new proposal, as well as the directive I sent to Secretaries Glickman and Shalala.

This new initiative will help guarantee the safety of food in the United States. It provides the improved inspection capacity we need and increased regulatory power to combat imports that could be contaminated. I am committed to continuing to improve the safety of food that Americans eat, and I look forward to working with you on this vital project. Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Andrew J. Mayock (CN=Andrew J. Mayock/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 09:13:55.00

SUBJECT: Latest Draft Working Group List

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael J. Sorrell (CN=Michael J. Sorrell/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Jacinta Ma (CN=Jacinta Ma/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael Wenger (CN=Michael Wenger/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Lin Liu (CN=Lin Liu/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Jon P. Jennings (CN=Jon P. Jennings/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan M. Liss (CN=Susan M. Liss/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Cheryl D. Mills (CN=Cheryl D. Mills/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Judith A. Winston (CN=Judith A. Winston/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: edley (edley @ law.harvard.edu @ INET @ LNWTWY [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Thomas D. Janenda (CN=Thomas D. Janenda/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Claire Gonzales (CN=Claire Gonzales/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Michele Cavataio (CN=Michele Cavataio/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Trooper Sanders (CN=Trooper Sanders/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

CC: Laura K. Capps (CN=Laura K. Capps/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

Goals Working Groups

- 1. Policy - Kagan / Liu / Sperling**
Group members - Cerda, Chirwa, Edley, Freedman, Kordeman, Parker, Rundlet

- 2. Recruiting Leaders / Outreach - Echaveste / Ibarra / Wenger**
Group members - Johnson, Cutler, Mayock, Murguia, Thornton

- 3. Promising Practices - Liss / Liu**
Group members - Cavataio, Counsel intern, Cutler, Janenda, Moran, Rundlet, Sorrel, Walker

- 4. Tough Messages - Edley / Winston**
Group members - Begala, Blumenthal, Edley, Edmonds, Kagan, Mathews, Rundlet, Waldman

- 5. Dialogue in Communities - Gonzales / Lewis**
Group members - Barnes, Begala, Blumenthal, Hubbard, Ma, Reyneri, Wenger

- 6. Living Report - Edley / Winston**
Group members - Begala, Blumenthal, Kagan, Liu, Mathews, Rundlet, Waldman

- 7. Youth - Moore / Sorrel**
Group members - Jennings, Lewis, Moran, Mayock, Walker, Velez

Process Working Groups

- 1. Advisory Board - Moore / Winston**
Group members - Echaveste, Edley, Gonzales, Wenger

- 2. Cabinet Affairs - Cavataio / Marshall**
Group members - Beaubaire, Jennings, Hubbard, Mayock

Interagency Working Group - Marshall / Winston

3. Communications / Press - Gonzales / Lewis

Group members - Barnes, Beaubaire, Johnson, Mendoza, Reyneri

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IDEAS

Unbanked

1. Make Electronic Funds Transfer Regulation into a major announcement on the unbanked. The proposed regulation was issued in September. In January the 90-day comment period is over. By March the proposal will be finalized. Under the new regulation, up to 10 million may be brought into the banking system.
2. Public education campaign on financial literacy and services. Treasury received \$2 million in 1997 for the campaign. The Department is planning to start the campaign in late fall or early winter. The campaign's goal is to improve people's (particularly the unbanked) understanding of financial products and services. Treasury will circulate pamphlets through banks and credit unions, labor unions, through federal agencies such as Veterans and Social Security, the American Bankers Association, consumer groups, etc. Treasury will also do Public Service Announcements.

Empowerment Zones

The Domestic Policy Council (DPC) recommends a "fast track" announcement of the Second Round Empowerment Zone (EZ) designees. We believe that the financial benefits available to the Second Round EZs do not warrant a long, extended application process. With only tax incentives and small sums of targeted, categorical grant funding available, we believe it would be a mistake to ask applicants to put together an extensive, comprehensive strategic plan. Instead, the DPC recommends a streamlined application process which would allow the designations to be awarded no later than the end of March. We propose that applicants respond to two questions: 1) how they will encourage the private and non-profit sectors to utilize the various tax incentives to promote economic opportunity, job creation, and sustainable development (brownfields); 2) how do they plan to utilize the categorical grants (in accordance with the program regulations) and how will the applicants work with community groups and the private sector to leverage these dollars?

Because of the lack of a large pool of flexible funds, we understand certain individuals are proposing that we not refer to the designees as EZs. We want to make clear our opposition to such a position. While the second round incentives are not as generous as the first round (and we need to make that clear up front in the application), in no way should we place the President or the Vice President in a position where they are not able to claim their victory in fulfilling their promise of a second round. The second round EZs are just that, EZs. To not claim victory makes no political sense.

PROPOSED TIMELINE:

December 20 – Applications are sent out to prospective applicants.

February 20 – Applications are due to HUD and USDA.

March 15 – HUD and USDA advise the CEB and Vice President of their proposed designees.

March 30 – The designees are announced.

ADVANTAGES

- * Insures earliest possible use of tax incentives which are already available to designated communities.

- * Allows communities to put into effect their plans at a much earlier date. Thus, we will have positive results to hopefully talk about prior to the 2000 general election.
- * Allows the Administration to move through the difficult process of choosing twenty winners out of very large pool of applicants at a much quicker pace.
- * Eliminates unnecessary paperwork.
- * Reduces unnecessary waiting period for making awards.
- * Insures the announcing of the designees before the 1998 election while not violating the "gentleman's agreement" between the Congress and the Administration on the timing of the announcement.

DISADVANTAGES

- * May negatively impact on rural applicants, who require more time to complete applications.
- * EZ interest groups have asked for longer application periods, not shorter ones.
- * Extensive outreach to community groups will be limited. However, since there are not the same kind of flexible funds available, there is no longer reason for extensive discussions with those groups. However, we recommend leaving the option open of working an additional plans with the designees and community groups should the Congress provide HUD and USDA with flexible funds in later years.

Two New Rounds Of CDFI Awards

The House-Senate Appropriations Conference Report includes \$80 million, a 62.5 % increase from last year. This will allow Treasury to make two more rounds of awards over the next fiscal year. In addition, Treasury is going to launch this year a Secondary Market Initiative, to encourage the securitization of community development loans, thus making them cheaper and more available. Treasury has the funds to do this in FY98 (\$4 million). Finally, the CDFI legislation is up for reauthorization in 1998. This is going to be a major fight for the Administration and should be designated as one of the President's chief urban economic development goals for the next year.

Housing Portability

- 1) Expand the Regional Opportunity Counselling Program (ROC). Include an additional \$20 million in FY99 budget to increase number of ROC sites. These agencies help Section 8 families identify housing opportunities outside of adjacent high poverty, segregated areas.
- 2) Encourage the use of exception rents as a tool for opening up suburban housing markets.
- 3) Eliminate obstacles to portability of Section 8 vouchers.
- 4) Reduce mortgage denial rates for minorities by working with mortgage and real estate industry.
- 5) Expand number of Homeownership Zones from six to 20 sites. HUD will provide \$10 million in FY97 and has requested an additional \$50 million in FY98 and FY99. This program enable cities to undertake large, single family developments in inner city neighborhoods. These developments can retain and attract

stable, middle-income families into the inner cities.

6) Implement Homeownership Empowerment Vouchers. These would allow Section 8 certificate holders to apply their certificates to mortgage payments.

Fair Lending/Fair Housing Initiative

Purpose: To ensure equitable access to credit markets. This initiative could include 1) an examination of the impact of credit scoring loan systems and risk based pricing on lower-income and minority individuals; 2) a presidential initiative urging the banking regulators to obtain more data on reasons for home mortgage denials; 3) a presidential request to Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs) to retain loan denial data for further analysis of lending patterns; 4) increased funding for DOJ/HUD testing of how applicants are treated; 5) Public education around the 30 year anniversary of the Fair Housing Act.

OMB Budget Process

The DPC and the NEC are holding a series of meetings with OMB to review and set priorities for HUD's Transportation's, and Treasury's FY99 urban/economic development budget. The first meeting was last week. A meeting with key people at the three agencies will be held this week. Additional meetings with OMB will follow.

Proposed Race Initiatives: Crime Hex-Dump Conversion**Community Policing**

One of the cornerstones of the 1994 Crime Bill -- and the President's signature anti-crime program -- is the COPS initiative. The two main goals of the COPS initiative are to reduce and prevent crime by (1) dramatically increasing police presence (100,000 more police on the street), and (2) expanding the community policing philosophy to law enforcement agencies throughout the country. While the Administration has already done much to highlight the hiring of more "cops on the beat," the Race Initiative provides us with an opportunity to emphasize community policing.

Community policing is best defined by its two main components -- community engagement and problem solving. While many police departments engage in community relations, they do not necessarily work with members of the community -- particularly minority communities -- to better understand and address their specific crime problems. Community policing is also more than a series of programs (block watches). It is a philosophy that requires law enforcement agencies to transform how they deliver police service, manage police resources, interact with the community and work with other components of the criminal justice system. We believe that targeting resources from the President's COPS initiative to high-crime minority neighborhoods will have the dual impact of prevent and reducing crime while also promoting improve police interaction with minorities residents.

We would propose the following four-part initiative:

1. *Launch a targeted initiative to improve policing in historically under protected neighborhoods.* Funds from the COPS program have been used to target gang/youth violence, drugs and other specific crime concerns. We could work with the COPS office and Justice to develop criteria that target high-crime, minority neighborhoods that often receive less police service (i.e., public housing communities) than other neighborhoods. Funds could be used to help hire new officers for to patrol these areas and, to a lesser degree, support community organizations to work hand-in-hand with police.
2. *Promote diversity training throughout the country.* As part of the COPS initiative, Justice has funded 35 Regional Community Policing Institutes throughout the country to provide training in specialty areas such as, problem-solving, community partnerships, community policing in rural and suburban areas, and police

integrity and ethics. Diversity training could be an added area of emphasis.

3. *Establish Citizen Academies.* To help community residents understand police procedures, such as the use of deadly force and arrest policies, some departments sponsor Citizen Academies -- or police academy training sessions for citizens. While no COPS funds currently have been used for this purpose, these academies are specifically authorized in the Crime Bill.
4. *Promote minority recruitment and hiring.* The authorizing statute for the COPS initiative generally requires applicants to make best efforts to promote the hiring of minorities. Justice has not generally enforced this provision, and we could ask them to try and make this requirement more meaningful. However, this would not without controversy. Tougher minority hiring requirements were defeated during the crime bill's consideration, and would be opposed by Members and applicants alike. Alternatively, we could seek to fund a little noticed grant program in the crime bill that aims to promote minority recruitment in law enforcement.

All of these initiatives are authorized in the 1994 crime bill and could be funded within the \$1.4 billion COPS appropriation for FY 1998. We would need about 4 to 6 weeks to work with Justice on developing program criteria. And we would need to make sure that the amount of non-hiring funds proposed for this initiative would not compromise the President's commitment to hire 100,000 more police by FY 2000.

Law Enforcement in Indian Country

Contrary to nationwide trends, violent crime is rising on American Indian reservations. The homicide rate for Indians has increased by 80% in Indian Country since 1992, and is the highest of any ethnic group. Moreover, law enforcement resources in Indian Country are inadequate and have been dwindling -- there are only half as many officers per capita in Indian Country as in the rest of the United States.

To address this problem, on August 25th, the President directed the Attorney General and Secretary of the Interior to make recommendations to him by December 31st on how to improve law enforcement in Indian Country. To link these recommendations with the Race Initiative -- as well as to be considered as part of the FY 1999 budget process -- we have asked Justice and Interior to submit their recommendations to DPC and OMB by October 31st. Expected outcomes from this policy review include the transfer of law

enforcement authority from Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Justice Department, as well as increased law enforcement resources specifically designated for Indian Country.

At-Risk Youth Prevention

Few crime initiatives are as important to the Black and Hispanic Caucuses than preventative efforts targeted at minority youth. That is why these members fought to include billions of dollar for prevention in the 1994 crime bill and to try and defeat the House Republicans juvenile crime bill. Unfortunately, despite our efforts and the efforts of the caucus, few of the crime bill's prevention programs have received any funding -- and few Republicans support including prevention programs in the pending juvenile crime legislation.

Despite the limited support in Congress for prevention, a \$75 million initiative for at-risk youth -- proposed by the President as part of his juvenile crime strategy -- stands a good chance of being funded. To date, Senate appropriators have included this initiative in their versions of the Commerce-Justice-State (CJS) appropriations. If passed, this initiative would give us the rare opportunity (and flexibility) to target truly at-risk and minority youth. We would, however, have to persuade Justice to abandon its current plan to distribute these funds to states on a formula basis.

If this initiative drops out of the final CJS appropriations bill, we will have to look for other, more limited or longer term opportunities to discuss prevention initiative as part of the Race Initiative. The Department of Education's 21st Century Learning Centers would probably be the next best thing to consider.

MEMORANDUM FOR ELENA KAGAN

From: Mike Cohen
Bill Kincaid

Subject: Strategy for Maintaining and Expanding Diversity in Higher Education

Over the past 24 hours we have consulted with Department of Education and NEC staff, and have reached out to the higher education community, to determine what additional steps (beyond the proposed mentoring and partnerships initiative) the Administration should take to maintain and expand diversity in the nation's postsecondary institutions. In the course of these consultations we have identified additional persons with whom further discussions would be valuable, and who could help us further shape and refine this strategy. For now, here is our thinking:

I. Make the case for diversity.

- Particularly in the context of higher education, the President should speak even more frequently and with greater focus than he does now on the importance of diversity. We should consider devoting a town hall to this topic. Pushing this message will greatly help higher education institutions sustain their individual efforts.
- Ask the Department of Education to assemble data to more convincingly make the case for the educational value of diversity. The higher ed community remains firmly committed to the importance of diversity, but they could use help bolstering gut instincts with research.
- ACE is organizing an effort to get the entire higher education community to sign on to a joint statement on the importance of diversity. A Presidential announcement of such a statement could make a strong event.

II. Identify and highlight effective outreach and recruitment efforts.

- Clearly there are some good examples of outreach and recruitment efforts that are working in specific circumstances. We should identify and highlight these examples in speeches and other forums.
- The Department of Education should be tasked with working with the higher education community to determine what publications, guidebooks, or meetings (beyond already-scheduled higher education group meetings) could be helpful in this regard.

- The President could invite college presidents, deans and others to the White House to discuss successful initiatives.

III. Keep the focus off admissions policies per se.

- Many postsecondary institutions (other than those in the 5th Circuit, or in California, which face different constraints) are quietly reviewing their affirmative action policies to ensure that they pass muster under Bakke. Our sense is that they can best accomplish this without high profile attention at the Federal level.

WELFARE CASELOADS DECLINED 39 MONTHS [check] IN A ROW
October 7, 1997

Today, President Clinton announced that welfare caseloads had declined 39 months [check] in a row, to just under 10.5 million. The welfare rolls have fallen by 1.7 million since the President signed welfare reform into law and by 26 percent or 3.6 million since he became President. For the first time since 1969, less than 4 percent of the U.S. population is on welfare. 49 out of 50 states have lowered their welfare rolls; 13 states by 40 percent or more.

Later today, Vice President Gore will announce that the federal government has made tremendous progress in fulfilling its commitment to hire 10,000 welfare recipients by the year 2000.

These new caseload numbers underscore the success of the welfare reform law as it begins its second year. Prior to the Clinton Administration, the welfare caseload had dropped by more than a quarter million only twice in six decades. Today welfare caseloads, which fell by a record 1.9 million in the President's first three-and-a-half years in office, are on course to have dropped ed by 2 million more in the year since he signed the law. The numbers released today, from June 1997, reflect 10 months of the first year of welfare reform.

President Clinton has made welfare reform a top priority of his Administration. During his first four years in office, the President granted federal waivers to 43 States to require work, time-limit assistance, make work pay, improve child support enforcement, and encourage parental responsibility. In August 1996, President Clinton signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), a comprehensive bipartisan welfare reform bill that establishes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Since signing the bill into law, the President has focused on efforts to create jobs to move people from welfare to work, which include fighting for and winning an additional \$3 billion for welfare to work in the Balanced Budget Act, mobilizing the business community to hire welfare recipients, working with civic, religious and non-profit groups to mentor families leaving welfare for work, and hiring our fair share of welfare recipients in the federal government.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jerold R. Mande (CN=Jerold R. Mande/OU=OSTP/O=EOP [OSTP])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-OCT-1997 18:19:24.00

SUBJECT: Timing of 4th Circuit Decision

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: Donald H. Gips (CN=Donald H. Gips/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Toby Donenfeld (CN=Toby Donenfeld/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I checked with George at DoJ and Zeller at FDA on the timing of the 4th Circuit decision. Both agreed we won't be able to do more than guess when a decision might come. Mitch said FDA lawyers have found that the 4th Circuit usually takes 6 to 9 months to issue a decision. Oral arguments were on August 11. George said the October date was merely a point in time where we should be prepared for a decision, based on the 4th Circuit granting expedited review, but has no view on when a decision most likely will be issued. Coincidentally, DoJ and HHS are meeting tomorrow to discuss the court's pending decision. I will try to attend.