

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 030 - FOLDER -011

[05/28/1998]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Robin Leeds (CN=Robin Leeds/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 17:11:51.00

SUBJECT: "Child Custody Protection Act"
Statistics on Relevant Issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Robin Leeds/WHO/EOP on 05/28/98 05:07
PM -----

Robin Leeds
05/27/98 02:43:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
cc: Audrey T. Haynes/WHO/EOP
Subject: "Child Custody Protection Act"
Statistics on Relevant Issues

1. Numbers of minors getting abortions - In 1996, the Alan Guttmacher

Institute (AGI) estimated that 1.4 million abortions took place. 22% of these abortions were performed on teenage girls, while 33% were performed on women aged 20-24. In general, 55% of the 1.4 million abortions performed were on women under the age 25 .

According to a 1994 AGI study, 110,890 young women between age 15 and 17 had abortions, and 12,150 young women under the age of 15 had abortions. In 1992 AGI estimated there were about 308,000 abortions among teens. In 1988, AGI estimated that 172,000 young women aged 17 or younger obtained an abortion.

2. Other relevant statistics -

- 28 states currently enforce parental consent or notification laws for a minor seeking an abortion: AL, AR, DE, GA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NC, ND, OH, PA, RI, SC, SD, UT, VA, WV, WI and WY.

- In 1991, AGI estimated that 61% of minors who have abortions do so with at least one parent's knowledge; 45% of parents are told by their daughter. Even in states that enforce no mandatory parental consent or notice requirements, more than 75 percent of minors under 16 involve one or both parents. An AGI study found that more than half of all young women who did not involve a parent in considering an abortion did involve an adult, including 15 percent who involved a step-parent or adult relative. Among minors who did not tell a parent of theirs, 30 percent had experienced violence in their family or feared violence or being forced to leave home. The majority of parents support their daughter's decision to have an abortion.

- These health care professional organizations have opposed parental consent laws mainly due to concerns about preserving patient/provider confidentiality and reducing access barriers to reproductive health care for young women: College of American Academy of Family Physicians, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Obstetricians, NAACOG, Organizations of Obstetric, Gynecological and Neonatal Nurses, National Medical Association, American Medical Women's Association, American Nurses Association, American Medical Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, and American Public Health Association.

- Data on the number of illegal abortions is largely non-existent. By it's very nature this data would not be reported by patients or providers.

- Data on the use of judicial bypass could be collected from state courts, but there is no central source that has compiled this data. A number of the pro-choice organizations are in the process of collecting this data in certain states, but this process will take some time.

Senator Gramm's Marriage Penalty Proposal

Proposal

The proposal would give a deduction of \$3,450 (in 1999) to married couples filing a joint return who have combined incomes below \$50,000. (This \$3,450 deduction is the difference between the sum of the standard deductions for a single filer and a head of household filer and the standard deduction for a joint filer.) The deduction would be available to all such couples, whether or not they itemized deductions (i.e., the deduction would be "above-the-line"). Since couples in this income range are in the 15 percent bracket, the deduction is worth \$518 as long as they have sufficient tax liability. The deduction also reduces income for purposes of the phaseout of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), so couples with incomes in the phaseout range of the EITC will get a larger credit.

Example. For a couple with two children and \$30,000 of wage income, taxes would decline by \$1,244. The decline is larger than \$518 because this couple would receive a larger EITC. For couples with income above approximately \$32,000 (and below \$50,000), the tax cut would normally be \$518.

Pros

- o Gives a tax cut to 20.1 million filers which is quite progressive, since only couples with income below \$50,000 would benefit.
- o Would extend the EITC to additional low-income working families, and increase the EITC for many current recipients.

Cons

- o Would cost **\$46.4 billion through 2003**, and approximately **\$10.5 billion per year** after 2003. This would crowd out much of the proposed expenditures in the tobacco bill.
- o The proposal has little to do with marriage penalties (other than the fact that it is giving a significant tax cut only to married taxpayers).
 - For example, a one-earner childless couple with \$50,000 of income already has a marriage bonus of over \$3,000; the proposal would simply increase this bonus. The marriage penalty for a childless two-earner couple, each with \$25,000 of income, is only about \$200; the proposal would more than eliminate this penalty.
 - Only about **40 percent** of the revenue loss would actually reduce marriage penalties.
- o The provision would create a "cliff," whereby couples with \$50,000 of income would get a tax cut of \$518 while a couple with \$1 more of income would get nothing. This creates large disincentives to earn income or large incentives to misreport income for taxpayers with incomes above the cliff.

**Alternative to Gramm Marriage Penalty Proposal:
A "Mini-Gramm" Proposal**

Proposal

The cost of the Gramm proposal could be substantially reduced by basing the deduction on the difference between the sum of the standard deductions for two single filers and the standard deduction for a joint filer (this would make the deduction \$1,450 in 1999). The deduction could also be phased in, 25 percent in 1999, 70 percent in 2000, and 100 percent beginning in 2001. In addition, the cliff would be removed by phasing out the deduction by \$0.10 for each \$1.00 of income above \$50,000. The \$50,000 income limit would be indexed after 1999, as in the Gramm proposal, but using a \$1,000 round down rule (rather than the \$5,000 round down rule in the Gramm proposal).

In 1999 the deduction would be $25\% \times \$1,450 = \362.50 , which would have a tax value at 15 percent of \$54. When fully phased in, the deduction (at the 1999 level of \$1,450) would have a tax value of \$218.

Example. Using the fully phased in value of the deduction at 1999 levels, for a couple with two children and \$30,000 of wage income, taxes would decline by \$523. The decline is larger than \$218 because this couple would receive a larger EITC. For couples with income above approximately \$32,000 (and below \$50,000), the tax cut would normally be \$218. Couples with incomes between \$50,000 and \$64,500 (where the phaseout of the deduction would end) would receive some tax cut.

Advantages Relative to the Gramm Proposal

- o The cost of this "Mini-Gramm" proposal would be **\$19.3 billion through 2003** and approximately **\$5.7 billion per year** after 2003, about half the cost of the full Gramm proposal.
- o This proposal would provide a tax cut to more couples (27.3 million versus 20.1 million), because of the phaseout of the deduction above \$50,000 of income.

Disadvantages Relative to the Gramm Proposal

- o Most of the revenue loss would still go to marriage bonuses.
- o This proposal is less progressive than the full Gramm proposal, although nearly all of the tax cut, over 83 percent, would still go to couples with incomes below \$50,000.

**Alternative to Gramm Marriage Penalty Proposal:
Increase Standard Deduction for Joint Filers to Double the Single Amount**

Proposal

The standard deduction for joint filers would be increased to double the amount for single filers (this increase would be \$1,450 in 1999). The increase in the standard deduction would also reduce income for purposes of the phaseout of the EITC. The increase would be phased in, 25 percent in 1999, 50 percent in 2000, 75 percent in 2001 and 100 percent beginning in 2002.

In 1999 the increase in the standard deduction for joint filers would be $25\% \times \$1,450 = \362.50 , which would have a tax value for couples in the 15 percent bracket of \$54 and \$102 for couples in the 28 percent bracket. When fully phased in, the increase in the standard deduction (at the 1999 level of \$1,450) would have a tax value of \$218 for couples in the 15 percent bracket, and \$406 for couples in the 28 percent bracket.

Example. Using the fully phased in value of the increase in the standard deduction at 1999 levels, for a couple with two children who use the standard deduction and have \$30,000 of wage income, taxes would decline by \$523. The decline is larger than \$218 because this couple would receive a larger EITC. Couples who itemize deductions with incomes below roughly \$32,000 would have modest tax reductions because of the change in the EITC phaseout.

Advantages Relative to the Gramm Proposal

- o The cost of this proposal would be **\$20.0 billion through 2003** and approximately **\$6.8 billion per year** after 2003.
- o The proposal would simplify filing, reducing the number of filers who itemize deductions by 3.1 million (from 39.2 million to 36.1 million). (These counts, and those given below, are based on fully phased in levels of the increase in the standard deduction in 1999.)
 - The Gramm proposal would make tax returns and filing somewhat more complex.
- o This proposal is more efficiently targeted at reducing marriage penalties than the Gramm proposal, with more than 50 percent of the revenue loss directly reducing marriage penalties (the corresponding figure for the Gramm proposal is 40 percent).
- o More couples (26.1 million versus 20.1 million) would receive a tax cut under this proposal than under the Gramm proposal.

Disadvantages Relative to the Gramm Proposal

- o The proposal is less progressive than the full Gramm proposal, with **62 percent** of the benefits would go to couples with incomes below \$50,000, and over **95 percent** would go to couples with incomes below \$100,000.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 11:46:23.00

SUBJECT: City Year speech next week

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, 2 small ideas we are playing with for next week's CityYear speech:

1. Announcing that we have set aside \$5 million in Corporation demo money to add 500-1,000 new AmeriCorps slots to pursue the summit/America's Promise goals.

2. Announcing that we are asking all AmeriCorps members to pledge to do some amount of extra service, either during their year or after. This is still a bit vague. It might be done in concert with Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boys/Girls Clubs, and the Y. Presumably CityYear would agree on the spot to do this, and then Harris could require it of future AmeriCorps grants.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 15:35:00.00

SUBJECT: Chief of Staff scheduling -- request

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

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

TEXT:

We are trying to push for the after-school event for June 11th. Our understanding is that it is tentavely scheduled for the President, and set for the First Lady. Because of the tightness of the schedule for June, they want to leave it as an option for the President. However, this event -- which is both the grants announcement and the release of a new report showing how after-school programs prevent crime and help kids learn -- responds to the President's wish to do an after-school event, and sets us up for the appropriations process we are entering. We are basically trying to get a commitment by the President for the 11th because Ed is concerned that we can't push the grants announcement much later.

Thanks very much--

Weekly Report -- Welfare Reform Team

5/28/98

Welfare Reform -- State Reinvestment of TANF Savings: During your meeting with Welfare-to-Work Partnership Board members last week you stressed the importance of states reinvesting their welfare savings in child care, transportation and training. We will work with HHS to analyze state expenditure data for TANF and child care. This data is not as timely as we would like. In the meantime, there is some encouraging information in the NGA Fiscal Survey of States released on May 27th. The way states are spending their welfare funds is shifting from cash to work-related supports. Comparing expenditures in 1996 with planned spending for 1998, the percent of welfare spending on cash assistance dropped 27 percent (roughly comparable with caseload declines), while spending on child care increased by 55 percent and spending on work activities increased 34 percent. Total welfare spending declined by 9 percent, but given caseload reductions, this actually represents increased spending per person.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Andrea Kane (CN=Andrea Kane/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 17:47:43.00

SUBJECT: Birth data and weekly

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

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

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

TEXT:

Bruce, I've finally confirmed that the drop in births to unmarried women is not new data. Ironically, it's not even in the census report (sloppy journalism). The 95 data showing a 4% drop was the first year it dropped so this must be the same number you remember that we talked about before. It was released in preliminary form in 10/96 and in a final vital statistics report from NCHS in 6/97.

Weekly: I don't think I can do justice to POTUS question on areas where people are leaving the rolls without jobs in time for this week's weekly. Elena, it came up again in POTUS meeting yesterday with CEOs. I'd done Q&A on Brookings report on caseload decline in cities but I've talked to them and they did not correlate with unemployment (as you suggested we should in your note to me yesterday Bruce). It'll take a little doing to do that and I think it's worth doing--for states and cities both. Instead, I am doing a quick piece on reinvesting TANF savings, which he also talked about yesterday, based on Fiscal Survey of States released yesterday. will send along by 6 (cuz I need to leave then today).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Rebecca M. Blank (CN=Rebecca M. Blank/OU=CEA/O=EOP [CEA])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 15:29:54.00

SUBJECT: Draft options memo for Principal's meeting on poverty measurement

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

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

TO: pruggles (pruggles @ osaspe.dhhs.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

CC: Mark A. Wasserman (CN=Mark A. Wasserman/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard B. Bavier (CN=Richard B. Bavier/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:
Attached is a draft options memo for the upcoming Principal's meeting on poverty measurement. Please return your comments to me as soon as possible.

Thanks.

Becky Blank

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D45]MAIL40804315U.126 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043700B0000010A02010000000205000000779B000000020000046592509DE08AA3B791A3A
4E2A59B9D38480FE1E6A344897CCC32B2851684DFBA27BAF6A22C5EEAAB605489D9EC71A0C9FDB
5C2D0BD73984607F51A7248348DFB2FA6316AF57ABA4E1DB243502F868CB327A2935ACDE7F1928
D6CC7B90B37B03BEA288E0719169BEB7E6078FF4864526CBAACA96C9785BE5F2A7BF422B9C378C
4A8356FAFC74945270DA3ADF8876CB593C4403596E59E2ABB5F1C32EBEC3502B368C2245B7A1E1
D9806C7824FCB846AC56FC6D0B0382BF89D9AD86FB953AB5B6100CDC829418DF40F256FF2E59AF
FDBEBD522E254B6B9B710D340260C2455119C4B8F70A7D09C041E035AF478FC9E2F78D24F19768

May 27, 1998

DRAFT MEMORANDUM FOR EOP PRINCIPAL'S MEETING

Jack Lew
Bruce Reed
Gene Sperling
Janet Yellen

FROM: EOP Policy Working Group on Poverty Measurement

SUBJECT: Advice to the Bureau of the Census

BACKGROUND

In 1992, the Bureau of the Census commissioned the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to establish a panel of experts to recommend improvements in the measurement of poverty. The final NAS report was issued in 1995. Census has announced that IT IS planning to release a report in late 1998 or early 1999 providing alternative poverty measures, based on the NAS recommendations. Near the end of 1997 the Department of Commerce approached OMB and indicated its willingness to receive any advice that OMB or other WH policy offices might have regarding policy-related issues that the Bureau of the Census will face in determining which alternative poverty measures to present. As a result of that request, an EOP Policy Working Group on Poverty Measurement (composed of CEA, DPC, NEC, and OMB) was established to review key policy-related questions. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy in HHS also attended these meetings because of her expertise on programs. This memorandum presents a set of options discussed by that group on topics where the NAS poverty measurement recommendations have major policy ramifications. (Note that a broader interagency Technical Working Group on Poverty Measurement is also meeting to consult with Census on statistical issues relating to alternative poverty measures.) It is important to note that we are merely being asked to give advice to the Bureau of the Census; what they actually publish is their decision.

The official measure of poverty has remained virtually unchanged for 35 years, despite substantial changes in family behavior and government policy. For instance, the NAS panel identified several weaknesses in the current poverty measure:

- The current poverty measure takes no account of changes in government policy, such as changes in tax laws (i.e., the expansion of the EITC) or changes in in-kind benefits (i.e., Food Stamps).
- The current measure does not distinguish between the needs of working and non-working families. In particular, it does not reflect the cost of child care and other work expenses for working low-income families.

- The current measure takes no account of medical care costs which vary substantially across families.

Note that the discussion to date only concerns the alternative measures that Census will publish. The Statistical Policy Office in OIRA officially issues the regulation that determines what the “official” poverty measurement methodology will be, while the Office of the ASPE in HHS officially determines the “guidelines”, which are a simplified form of poverty thresholds used by some programs in the determination of eligibility. The last item for discussion is the process to explore the possibility of adopting an improved alternative poverty definition as the new “official” definition and utilizing it in program eligibility decisions. Attachment 1 (from HHS) provides a brief review of how program eligibility is (or isn’t) tied to poverty line measurement.

The Current Poverty Measure

The methodology by which current poverty thresholds are determined was developed in the early 1960s by Mollie Orshansky, a staff economist at the Social Security Administration. She developed a set of poverty thresholds that vary with the number of adults, the number of children, and the age of the family head. These thresholds represent the cost of a minimum diet multiplied by 3 to allow for non-food expenditures. The multiplier of 3 was chosen because the average family in 1955 spent one-third of its after-tax income on food. Since the late 1960s, the thresholds have simply been updated annually to adjust for price inflation.

The NAS Recommendations

In order to understand the NAS panel’s recommended revisions, one must understand the basics of determining poverty. A family is considered poor when their resources fall below a predetermined poverty line or threshold. Therefore, one must develop a methodology for estimating family resources and for defining the threshold resource level below which a family is considered poor.

1. Defining Family Resources

For purposes of the current poverty calculation, the definition of family resources is cash income. The NAS recommendations would estimate family resources as:

Family resources = Cash income + Near-money in-kind benefits - Taxes - Child care costs - Work expenses - Child support payments - Out of pocket medical care expenditures (including health insurance premiums)

The rationale for subtracting taxes, work and medical expenses from family resources is that these expenditures are typically not discretionary and reduce the income available to a family for economic survival.

There is near consensus among researchers that adjusting for near-money in-kind benefits (primarily food stamps and housing subsidies) and taxes would be an improvement in how poverty is measured. There is slightly less agreement on whether child care costs, work expenses, and child support payments should also be deducted because an unknown proportion of these expenses are likely discretionary. (The NAS proposes to cap the amount of child care and work expenses that can be subtracted to deal with this problem.) As discussed below, the adjustment for out-of-pocket medical care expenditures is more controversial.

2. Defining a Poverty Threshold

A threshold must be determined against which to compare a family's resources. The NAS panel recommends basing the threshold on a fraction of expenditures on necessities (food, shelter, and clothing) plus a little more. Specifically, the NAS panel recommends selecting the 30th to 35th percentile in the distribution of annual expenditures on food, shelter, and clothing among families of four (two adults and two children), and then multiplying this expenditure level by between 1.15 and 1.25. Thresholds for other family sizes and types would be determined by an equivalency scale calculation.

The NAS recommends adjusting these thresholds to take into account geographic variation in cost of living, based on differences in housing costs by region and by city-size. It recommends adjusting them over time by recalculating them from expenditure data on an annual basis.

OPTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Recommendations regarding which alternatives the Bureau of the Census should adopt to determine the level of the poverty threshold.

The NAS panel acknowledges that the actual level at which the poverty threshold is set (and hence the final poverty rate) is inherently arbitrary and cannot be determined on the basis of purely statistical judgements. There are two primary options:

A. The NAS alternative. As described above, the NAS panel recommends establishing a threshold based on the 30th-35th percentile in the distribution of annual expenditures for a family of four, with a small multiplier to account for additional small personal expenditures. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, column 3, this would raise the 1996 poverty rate from 13.7% to 18%, and increase poverty among all subgroups.

B. Benchmarking. The NAS also provides poverty estimates that benchmark the alternative poverty rate to equal the old poverty rate in a given year. The Census has done a number of such benchmarked calculations for 1996, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, column 2. (The report issued early next year would benchmark to 1997.) Benchmarking would assure that the aggregate poverty rate is identical for the official and the alternative measure in the benchmark year. But

the distribution of poverty among subgroups within each measure would differ (see Table 2). Similarly, both historical and future trends would differ. For instance, the alternative measure is identical in 1996 but higher in 1991. (The faster fall is largely due to the decline in the EITC.)

Pros of using the NAS measure:

- Incorporates the recommendations of the NAS panel, based on their judgement from the best available evidence.
- Maintains threshold levels that are quite similar to the current thresholds (although they have a very different interpretation.)

Cons of using the NAS Measure:

- Results in a substantially higher poverty rate (although the trends over time are similar.)
- Changes the relative poverty share of different groups.

Pros of Benchmarking:

- May provide an easier transition to the new methodology because there will not be a change in the overall level of poverty.
- Focuses the arguments on the relative distribution of who is poor rather than how many people are poor. Proposed changes in the relative well-being of different groups may be more defensible than proposed changes in the levels of poverty.

Cons of Benchmarking:

- Violates the NAS recommendation that the threshold should be based on the 30th-35th percentile in the expenditure distribution. In order to benchmark, the threshold falls to (about) the 25th percentile of expenditures on food, shelter, and clothing.

2. Recommendations regarding updating the thresholds over time

Currently the poverty threshold is updated annually using the CPI. This, however, does not allow for adjustments that reflect changes in underlying consumption patterns that might affect the revised thresholds. For instance, food prices have decreased relative to other goods over time, while housing prices have increased. There are two options:

(A) Recalculate the thresholds annually as a share of consumption on food, shelter, and clothing. (This is recommended by the NAS panel.)

(B) Update the thresholds on a year-to-year basis using a price index (preferably one based only on food, shelter and clothing). Implement a regular process (every 5-10 years) of reviewing the poverty measure and recalculating the thresholds.

NOTE: The deputies recommend Option (B).

Pros of Re-calculating the Thresholds:

- Regular recalculation will allow the poverty thresholds to more accurately reflect changes in consumption patterns and standards of living.
- Without an expectation that the thresholds will be re-calculated regularly, it may be hard to update them at all.

Pros of Updating Using the CPI:

- Using the NAS methodology, the poverty thresholds are somewhat relative (i.e., they are affected by changes in the distribution of household expenditures.) As a result, they are a moving target and do not provide an absolute standard of need. A CPI adjustment would make it easier to compare poverty from year to year against a constant standard.
- Because consumption patterns and standards of living change slowly, it may be better to take them into account periodically rather than annually.
- If updated with a CPI for necessities only (food, clothing, and shelter), this may capture most of the relevant changes and will make it easier in the short-run to understand the updating procedure.
- The data may not be good enough for an annual re-calculation of the thresholds.

3. Recommendation as to whether thresholds should be adjusted for geographic variation.

The NAS panel recommended adjusting the poverty thresholds for cost-of-living differences across regions and by city size. Census proposes to make such adjustments based on housing cost differences (which have much greater regional/city size variation than food or clothing.)

NOTE: The Deputies recommend against geographic price adjustments.

Pros of Adjusting for Geographic Variation in Cost of Living:

- Most statisticians and economists agree that such adjustments should be made if data are available.

Cons of Adjusting for Geographic Variation in Cost of Living:

- There is no one "right" way to make such adjustments and legislators could try to intervene on exactly how the "correct" regional price adjustments are done.
- The data available to make such adjustments are limited and may not be entirely reliable.
- Implementing such an adjustment in the poverty line threshold could lead to pressure to

provide regional cost adjustments in a wide variety of other government programs, from Social Security benefits to tax payments.

4. Recommendation regarding how to account for medical care expenditures.

Since the mid-1970s, analysts have been concerned that the official poverty rate overstates the extent of poverty among beneficiaries of Medicare, Medicaid, and private health insurance. At the same time, the official poverty rate may understate the extent of poverty among populations with large medical expenditures. Most analysts agree that, in principle, medical care “needs” should be incorporated into the calculations of the threshold and family resources (i.e., families with higher medical needs should have higher thresholds; those with more generous medical benefits should have higher income; and those who must spend more to achieve “good health” should have those expenses subtracted from their resources). However we cannot observe a family’s medical need. In addition, it is not clear that one can simply impute the cash value of insurance benefits and add this to income. The “extra” benefits received from insurance to cover expensive medical services do not provide income that can be used for any other purpose.

To understand the difficulties, consider including medical benefits into the income calculations. Adding medical benefits to income, without also adjusting the poverty threshold, has the perverse effect of making sicker individuals appear better off. Other proposals to adjust the poverty threshold (without also adjusting income), run into similar problems.

In the end, the NAS panel recommended subtracting all medical out-of-pocket (MOOP) expenses (including health insurance premiums) from income, without trying to value health insurance as a part of income or medical need as a part of the thresholds. Hence, family resources are measured net of MOOP. Those individuals with good insurance will have few out-of-pocket expenses; those without insurance who face health problems will have lower measured incomes as they pay more for medical care. (The NAS panel also recommends a “medical care risk” index be developed, separate from an index of economic need, to measure how well an individual is protected against medical problems.)

This adjustment accounts for the larger poverty rates using the NAS methodology. For example, in 1996 the poverty rate was 13.7% using the current methodology; it would have been 18% using the NAS methodology, but only 13.2% using the NAS methodology minus the medical expenses adjustment. This adjustment has its largest impact on poverty rates for the elderly and would have the effect of substantially narrowing the poverty gap between children and the elderly. This adjustment is one of the most controversial of the NAS recommendations.

There is general agreement that ignoring medical care and medical expenses entirely is not a good idea, particularly given the rapid increase in medical costs in the past 30 years and the extent of uninsurance among the low-income population. Ignoring this issue -- particularly given this Administration’s concern with it -- is not a credible option. There are two other

alternatives

(A) Follow the NAS recommendations and subtract MOOP from family resources. This makes families without health insurance who face medical expenses less well-off than other families. (Note, there is still an open discussion as to whether MOOP should be subtracted from family resources or added to the thresholds. Either way, it will make little difference in aggregate. This is clearly a technical decision best left to the Census.)

(B) Try to impute the value of health insurance to income, so those with insurance have higher resources. Health insurance should then also be imputed into the thresholds.

NOTE: The Deputies recommend option A

Pros of Adjusting for MOOP:

- While not perfect, under the NAS recommended adjustment families with higher medical expenditures will be “poorer.” The NAS recommended adjustment would also be sensitive to changes in health care financing that would increase disposable income and thereby reduce poverty.
- If we do not adjust for medical care (in some way) now, it may be much harder to do so in a few years when we will have better data (because the change will be so dramatic it will be viewed as another big methodology change).

Cons of Adjusting for MOOP:

- The data that are currently available are out-of-date, (but we should have updated information available in a more timely fashion within another year.)
- The NAS recommended approach relies on the controversial assumption that all medical care expenditures are nondiscretionary. (This concern could be mitigated to some extent by imposing a cap on the amount of medical expenses.)

Pros of Imputing the Value of Health Insurance into Resources and Thresholds:

- Provides a more complete accounting of all medical resources available to a family.

Cons of Imputing the Value of Health Insurance into Resources and Thresholds:

- There is no accepted “correct” way to do this. The data here are probably more unreliable than the data needed to impute the value of MOOP to families.
- Many analysts agree with the NAS panel that the value of health insurance is quite different than (say) the value of food stamps, which are far more fungible. Mixing in health insurance coverage with economic need causes serious interpretational and conceptual problems to a measure of economic need.
- To date, Census has been following the NAS recommendations. If we asked them to

switch to this approach, it might require substantial additional work and seriously delay their report.

5. Recommendations regarding which alternatives Census should publish and/or how they should be presented.

The current plan is to publish a small number (maybe 3) alternatives. For instance, the Census could publish a 1997-benchmarked poverty rate and a NAS-alternative poverty rate, providing two alternatives. Or it could publish a 1997-benchmarked poverty rate including all of the NAS recommendations, and then publish the same thing without MOOP, or without geographical price variation. (There will be extensive appendices in this report that will report a wide variety of different poverty calculations, to demonstrate the statistical properties of the poverty measurement recommended by NAS.)

- Will it be confusing to publish multiple (even a small number) of alternatives, as opposed to only one alternative? How will this affect how the report is received? How should these be presented?
- What problems will it create to have multiple alternatives if at some future point we want to redefine the official poverty rate to one of these improved alternative measures?

6. Process from here

Among the options to be considered as we move forward from here:

- Hold a joint DPC-NEC Principal's meeting to brief the broad group of interagency principals about this process and it's potential implications.
- An interagency working group should start discussing the implications of alternative poverty measures on program eligibility.
- Is there some preparation we should be sure happens on the Hill or among advocacy groups to prepare people for the upcoming poverty report?

Table 1. Poverty Rates and Thresholds under Alternative Measures, 1991-96, CPS

	Official measure	Benchmarked to 1996	NAS Experimental	
Poverty Rates				
1991	14.2	14.5	18.9	
1992	14.8	15.3	19.6	
1993	15.1	15.7	20.2	
1994	14.6	14.7	19.0	
1995	13.8	13.8		18.2
1996	13.7	13.7	18.0	
Thresholds for 2 adults and 2 children (in dollars)				
1991	13,812	11,891	13,891	
1992	14,228	12,249	14,309	
1993	14,654	12,616	14,738	
1994	15,029	12,938	15,115	
1995	15,455	13,305	15,543	
1996	15,911	13,698	16,002	

Table 2. Poverty Rates under Alternative Measures, 1996, CPS

	Official measure	BenchmarkedNAS to 1996	Experimental
All persons	13.7	13.7	18.0
Children	20.5	18.1	23.8
Nonelderly adults	11.4	11.5	15.0
Elderly	10.8	15.6	20.4
White	11.2	11.8	15.6
Black	28.4	25.2	32.0
Hispanic origin	29.4	28.5	37.7
One or more workers	9.5	10.0	13.6
Persons in family of type:			
Married couple	6.9	7.8	11.1
Female householder	35.8	32.3	40.4
Geographic regions:			
Northeast	12.7	14.3	18.8
Midwest	10.7	10.3	13.8
South	15.1	14.2	18.3
West	15.4	16.1	21.0
Metro/CC	19.6	19.2	24.7
Not CC	9.4	10.6	14.1
Nonmetro	15.9	13.5	17.5

Attachment 1 (from HHS)

Use of the Federal Poverty Guidelines in Determining Program Eligibility and Benefits

The Federal poverty guidelines are a simplified version of the official poverty line thresholds which are used for program purposes. They are issued by HHS annually, and are based on the previous year's thresholds.

As Gordon Fisher, the analyst at HHS who oversees the production of the guidelines, notes in a recent paper:

A number of people believe that the poverty guidelines affect many big entitlement programs. That belief is an exaggeration of the actual situation. Most of the Federal programs using the guidelines are medium-sized or small, with only a few big programs. Moreover, most...are discretionary programs...Only a few programs using the guidelines are mandatory: Medicaid, the Food Stamp Program, and child nutrition programs (mainly the National School Lunch Program.)¹

As Fisher notes, spending under discretionary programs, which are appropriated each year, would not be affected by any change in the guidelines, even if that change affected eligibility for the program. If eligibility for these programs expands, the appropriated funds are able to serve a smaller proportion of the eligible population, but total spending does not change. (Most of these programs already serve only a small fraction of those estimated to be eligible.) Only the three big mandatory programs Fisher mentions above would have spending changes associated with a change in the guidelines.

Even within these three programs, the impact of changes in the poverty guidelines is less than might be expected. In Medicaid, for example, most recipients qualify for coverage because of their participation in other means-tested programs such as TANF and SSI--programs that do not use the poverty line in their eligibility criteria. The major group whose coverage does depend on the guidelines is children in families below 133% of the poverty line who are not current or recent TANF recipients. In all, people whose eligibility for Medicaid is somehow related to the poverty line are estimated to account for about 20 percent of Medicaid recipients. Since most are in families with incomes well below the specified level, only a small fraction would actually be affected by a poverty line change.

Impacts in the Food Stamp Program and the National School Lunch Program would probably be even smaller. The poverty guidelines are used in the Food Stamp Program to set gross income eligibility--only families with gross incomes below 130% of the poverty line are eligible for food

¹G. Fisher, "Disseminating the Administrative Version and Explaining the Administrative and Statistical Versions of the Federal Poverty Measure." Clinical Sociology Review, vol. 15 (1997), p. 165.

stamps. Actual food stamp benefits are calculated based on net income, however--income after deductions for work expenses and other items. Net income is compared to a specific benefit allotment, determined nationally for each family size, and that benefit is reduced by 30 cents for every dollar of net income the family receives. In practice, the benefit allotment would reach zero for almost all families long before an income of 130 percent of poverty was reached. Thus, the gross income eligibility cut-off for food stamps is more theoretical than real--families at or near 130% of the poverty line will almost always be eligible only for zero benefits.

The National School Lunch Program has two cut-offs related to the poverty guidelines: Families with incomes below 130% of poverty are eligible for free lunches, and those below 185% are eligible for reduced-price lunches. Unlike the Food Stamp and Medicaid Programs, however, the school lunch program does not collect and verify detailed information on recipients' family incomes. Instead, families are asked at the beginning of each school year (or when their child enters a new school) to fill out a form certifying that their incomes are below the specified level. Because this process is relatively informal, it seems unlikely that small changes in the level of the income cut-off would have big impacts on the number of children applying for and receiving free and reduced-price school lunches. In any case, total spending on the school lunch program--a significant proportion of which is not means-tested--is much smaller than spending on Medicaid and food stamps. In 1996 Federal spending on the school lunch program was \$5.4 billion, compared to \$25.4 billion for food stamps and almost \$92 billion for the Federal share of Medicaid.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 16:32:57.00

SUBJECT: COPS Event Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Mayor White from Cleveland will speak at tomorrow's event. The program is as follows:

Vice President

Mayor Michael White

Attorney General Reno

Superintendent Terry Hillard, Chicago Police Dept.

POTUS

We have 15 uniformed Cops for the stage, and 2 Clinton Cop success stories for the front row. We need reserved cards for Joe Brann, Director of the COPS Office, and Ray Fisher, Associate AG.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 09:05:05.00

SUBJECT: Education 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

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

TEXT:

I think this would be helpful. Do either of you have a problem?
----- Forwarded by Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP on 05/28/98
09:03 AM -----

Mindy E. Myers
05/27/98 10:08:47 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP
cc:
Subject: Education Strategy Meeting

Janet feels strongly that Broderick should be included in these meetings.
Is that okay with you? Please call and let me know (62230). Janet is
happy to talk to you about it as well.

Thanks!
----- Forwarded by Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP on 05/27/98
10:03 PM -----

Cathy R. Mays 05/27/98 06:20:51 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Peter A. Weissman/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP, Jessica L.
Gibson/WHO/EOP, Sandra Yamin/OMB/EOP
Subject: Education Strategy Meeting

The weekly Education Strategy Meeting will be tomorrow, May 28, at 5:15
p.m. in Bruce Reed's office.

Message Sent

To: _____
Gene B. Sperling/OPD/EOP
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP

Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP
Janet Murguia/WHO/EOP
Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP
Vicky_Stroud @ ed.gov @ inet

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 22:12:23.00

SUBJECT: Sorry...wrong version...incomplete sentence

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

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

CC: Christa Robinson (CN=Christa Robinson/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:
Here we go again...jc3

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT: [ATTACH.D7]MAIL42884415B.126 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043B0040000010A020100000002050000009B2C0000000200000B687F20459A2A733DFFBE8
427F4C66D207597EEEEFAE1ADB4154207A55E02604D7492BBD72145E3ABC96643A423368680742
620BDF2CC7D4EC86795893A3E2214A4C24513372E4C4D015F1003FD181AADB5A18DBBC16A5DA22
78E7591F09E5DC392E80FEAF921EB1631E5D6F706235288899E99517A5FEDBE38BAF455A7BE6E9
3D3D744DD1F11724692159CFE17C5B1A13FC3EE57930988B140E548153B736CF6458534A2E4737
11E5ADACAB311149F80CD6F35173E42831D1F17DBC59D1B92C0536F4F381D60EE66AC218BC2733
CA5C0E2358A37BC8D7DA631AE53F5FB245F12A3C1C496DC4C847DC61A0890FDE638785328CD724
62E50BBE1D281561AAA728E9368027BD5CE73DE0FE44197443948FC2176D2D5C9BC0D2CC748234
5CAF6A40E1C469CC37A07BBA11D15BD499A6A870EAA6B21B436243085B1D782CDDE5EB6E2F2410
8C6E2F3615E4EB009EA67C2DDB5E73419D3D29B898E0E8AA055EECDA5ECFF94AED875CF06F28F1
867CF6A6EA9E23D7E3EFC788B0017D396620BF0DE1805509A38315E08A1F9DFFF069A97732220
199625ADCFE7DF8C801983DE4F78462A966C8F5356DF93D1D1467A28ABE805F3D6823A8ACB8CF3
881825EABFA89EA5E776D81135BAE156782CA7F58BE7E0E8D908F1A25D4628066714A26C13F40A
300506FB6F02000A0000000000000000000000000823010000000B0100008C02000000550100000
4E0000009703000009250100000006000000E50300000B300200000028000000EB030000081601
000000320000001304000008770100000040000000450400000834010000001400000085040000
0802010000000F0000009904000008050100000008000000A80400000984C006F00630061006C
0020005000720069006E00740065007200
00
C800C8002C012C012C012C01C800C8003000
00
00
00
00
0B010000103600540069006D006500730020004E0065007700200052006F006D0061006E002000
52006500670075006C0061007200
00
4F00470053005C00570050005C005300540041004E0044004100520044002E0057005000540000
000A0000008C06010045008D06010002008E06010044008F060100020090060100020091060100
4500920601000200930601004400940601004500950601000200F7AA6422000000003800380070

**Questions and Answers on COPS Event
May 29, 1998**

New COPS Initiative

Q. What is the new COPS initiative you are announcing today? How will it work?

A. The President launched a new initiative, called the Distressed Neighborhoods Pilot Project, to provide funding for high-crime, high-need communities to hire new officers through the Justice Department COPS Program. Under the initiative, \$106 million in grants will be provided to 18 pilot cities to fund 738 new or redeployed officers. The communities will be required to deploy these officers in the targeted areas with high crime or poverty identified by the cities.

The grants provided through the initiative will fund 100% of the entry-level salary and benefits for new law enforcement officers for three years -- waiving the usual local match. In addition, the COPS Office will provide a package of assistance including specialized training to help cities better address crime in their targeted neighborhoods.

Q. How much are the cities receiving? How many officers will each city fund?

A. The cities and totals for grants and officers are as follows:

Baltimore, MD	100 officers	\$10.8 million
Bessemer, AL	12 officers	\$1.2 million
Birmingham, AL	25 officers	\$2.8 million
Buffalo, NY	20 officers	\$2.8 million
Camden, NJ	5 officers	\$891,000
Chicago, IL	150 officers	\$23 million
Cleveland, OH	100 officers	\$15 million
El Paso, TX	12 officers	\$1.4 million
Flint, MI	12 officers	\$877,122
Fort Pierce, FL	3 officers	\$318,000
Fresno, CA	75 officers	\$13.7 million
Greenville, MS	6 officers	\$493,920
Hartford, CN	12 officers	\$1.5 million
McAllen, TX	20 officers	\$2.2 million
Miami, FL	168 officers	\$24.2 million
Monroe, LA	5 officers	\$393,435
Muskegon, MI	5 officers	\$609,230
San Bernardino, CA	8 officers	\$1.6 million

Q. How were these cities selected?

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

A. The Justice Department COPS Office reviewed crime data, previous participation in COPS and other Federal programs, and financial hardship. The primary criteria used were crime index indicators, unemployment data, and poverty data. The jurisdictions in the pilot have some of the highest crime and poverty rates in the nation as compared to other cities of similar size.

Q. Why weren't other cities such as Gary, Indiana, and Nashville -- both of which have had increases in crime-- selected?

A. The pilot cities were chosen based on a careful analysis of several factors -- not just crime rates alone. A combination of factors, such as economic distress, crime, unemployment and poverty were all considered. Many of the targeted neighborhoods under the initiative face some of the most dire circumstances facing any community in America. We recognize that the pilot cities are not the only ones facing challenges with respect to these criteria, which is why we will look into expanding the initiative in the future. In addition, the COPS Office is already working with cities such as Gary and Nashville to provide a wide range of community policing assistance and support.

COPS General

Q. How many of the 75,000 officers whom you've funded are actually on the street?

A. While the most recent survey of this information by the COPS office will not be completed until next month, we do know that more than half of the new officers (40,000) have already been hired by local police departments and are on the street.

The remaining police officers are somewhere in the process of being recruited, screened, tested or trained -- a process that can take as long as 18 months. The funds to pay these officers are available to local police departments just as soon as they are ready to hire their new recruits.

Equally important, the COPS office expects local law enforcement agencies to use their normal rigorous recruiting and hiring procedures in filling all COPS-funded positions. Nothing could be more important than hiring qualified and fully screened police to entrust with the public's safety.

(NB: Consistent with the 1994 Crime Act, the Administration has provided funding for about 17,000 new officers every year since FY 1995. That means that by the end of this year, we should have funded a total of 65,000 more police -- with just under 40,000 on the street. With more than four months left in the fiscal year, we have already surpassed these expectations -- 75,000 funded and over 40,000 on the street.)

Q. Some have argued that this program is only a short-term fix, and that after three years, these officers will either be fired or absorbed through a department's natural attrition process. Does the Justice Department have any idea whether these

communities will actually keep these officers when the 3-year grant period expires?

- A. We are confident that the vast majority of our grantees are planning to retain their officers. This was part of the commitment they made in order to receive the federal COPS grant. And the reports that the Justice Department has received from the grantees as well as some of the research and media stories from across the country confirm it.

For example, a recent Akron Beacon Journal survey found that 44 out of 45 Northern Ohio agencies are planning to retain their officers. The Daily Southtown in Illinois reported that all 33 communities in its coverage area that had received grants were making plans to retain these officers. In Mississippi, the Biloxi Sun Herald reported that Gulf Coast communities planned to retain their officers.

We understand that there may be some unforeseen circumstances, fiscal emergencies or natural disasters that may prevent a department from retaining their COPS-funded officers. The COPS Office will work with communities on a case-by-case basis if they encounter such difficulties.

We are also starting to provide assistance for smaller communities with populations below 50,000 that are facing unexpected financial hardships. The COPS Small Community Grant Program will provide one-time grants for a fourth year of COPS funding for some of our smaller grantees to help them make the transition to 100% local funding when the grant expires.

COMMUNITY POLICING AND CRIME RATES

Q. Isn't crime really falling because of aging baby boomers, or the decline in crack use? Isn't it just a matter of time before crime goes back up?

- A. There is no doubt that community policing and these additional officers have had an impact on crime. Police chiefs and sheriffs across the country have consistently credited community policing with the gains we have experienced over the last six years in our fight against crime. And an increasing number of researchers are also concluding that increased police staffing levels and community policing can cause significant reductions in crime.

Demographics do not need to be our destiny. The federal government can help by working with police, prosecutors, and community leaders to give them the tools they need to make a difference. By working together and taking a balanced approach -- of more police, fewer guns on our streets, tougher punishment for violent offenders, and better opportunities for our kids -- our efforts are showing results.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Fred DuVal (CN=Fred DuVal/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 17:53:02.00

SUBJECT:

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I've been touching base with Attorneys General other than Moore/Greggiore and wanted you to know that most don't care that we've worked the tobacco spending issues with the Govs - and most are grateful the package is more state friendly than the June 20 agreement.

Please remember that while Mike has a profile and singular importance (and willingness to stay totally engaged), he doesn't speak for even a majority of his colleagues on most of these issues. We have to and should deal with him as the prinipal AG negotiator - but he overplays his hand.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 11:43:42.00

SUBJECT: Privacy Meeting Update

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

TEXT:

Here is an update on what happened in the privacy meeting:

Sally asked that everyone come up with a draft package of privacy initiatives in two weeks. The topics that the package will address are: (1) the privacy entity in the EOP; (2) identity theft; (3) profiling; and (4) industry self-regulation (what Ira Magaziner is working on). The package will hopefully also include some legislation we could endorse.

The following are some upcoming dates:

June 4 - the industry is thinking of having a pre-announcement of how it will regulate itself

June 4 - FTC is releasing a report on privacy

June 23 - Commerce Department "summit"

July 1 -Commerce Department report to the President - Sally pushed Ira on the industry self-regulation part -- if the industry doesn't come up with a strong enough proposal, we need to have a Plan "B" to announce on July 1.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Julie A. Fernandes (CN=Julie A. Fernandes/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 16:40:15.00

SUBJECT: Commencement Speeched

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:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[MESSAGE.D60]MAIL46467315K.126

The following is a HEX dump of the file:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Joseph C. Fanaroff (CN=Joseph C. Fanaroff/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 12:47:16.00

SUBJECT: DAILY TALKING POINTS -- WE MUST PASS A BIPARTISAN PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

TO: Kathy Weatherly at gore-dc (Kathy Weatherly at gore-dc @ ccm ail [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy McKay at gore-dc (Amy McKay at gore-dc @ CCMAIL [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rhonda Melton at gore-dc (Rhonda Melton at gore-dc @ CCMAIL [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bill Mason at gore-dc (Bill Mason at gore-dc @ ccm ail [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth Katze at gore-dc (Elizabeth Katze at gore-dc @ ccm ail [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andy Dryden at gore-dc (Andy Dryden at gore-dc @ ccm ail [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andy Dryden at gore-dc (Andy Dryden at gore-dc @ CCMAIL [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Clark Ogilvie at gore-dc (Clark Ogilvie at gore-dc @ CCMAIL [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Ligon at gore-dc (David Ligon at gore-dc @ ccm ail [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nancy Hoit at NPR (Nancy Hoit at NPR @ CCMAIL [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Morley A. Winograd (CN=Morley A. Winograd/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Weiss (CN=Jonathan Weiss/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beth A. Viola (CN=Beth A. Viola/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cindy Trutanic (CN=Cindy Trutanic/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David R Thomas (CN=David R Thomas/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dan J. Taylor (CN=Dan J. Taylor/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Karen E. Skelton (CN=Karen E. Skelton/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin D. Scott (CN=Kevin D. Scott/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas M. Rosshirt (CN=Thomas M. Rosshirt/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irwin P. Raij (CN=Irwin P. Raij/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William H. Pickle (CN=William H. Pickle/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy C. New (CN=Wendy C. New/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Satish Narayanan (CN=Satish Narayanan/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Heather M. Marabeti (CN=Heather M. Marabeti/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Mallory (CN=Lisa M. Mallory/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher S. Lehane (CN=Christopher S. Lehane/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jim Kohlenberger (CN=Jim Kohlenberger/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Aram H. Kailian (CN=Aram H. Kailian/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ansley Jones (CN=Ansley Jones/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joanne M. Hilty (CN=Joanne M. Hilty/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gordon Heddell (CN=Gordon Heddell/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly M. Harold (CN=Kimberly M. Harold/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Haas (CN=Lawrence J. Haas/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sue R. Greenberg (CN=Sue R. Greenberg/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lucia F. Gilliland (CN=Lucia F. Gilliland/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vanessa M. Flindt (CN=Vanessa M. Flindt/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Philip G Dufour (CN=Philip G Dufour/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jennifer N. Devlin (CN=Jennifer N. Devlin/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael A. Deavers (CN=Michael A. Deavers/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maurice Daniel (CN=Maurice Daniel/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Audrey Choi (CN=Audrey Choi/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kay Casstevens (CN=Kay Casstevens/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Charles W. Burson (CN=Charles W. Burson/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lee Ann Brackett (CN=Lee Ann Brackett/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Matthew L. Bennett (CN=Matthew L. Bennett/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bobbie J. Bauman (CN=Bobbie J. Bauman/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Doug Babcock (CN=Doug Babcock/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Steven W. Adamske (CN=Steven W. Adamske/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: William C. Haymes (CN=William C. Haymes/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leland L. Scott Jr. (CN=Leland L. Scott Jr./OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Maria E. Soto (CN=Maria E. Soto/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Katherine D. Sheckells (CN=Katherine D. Sheckells/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott R. Palmer (CN=Scott R. Palmer/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Audrey M. Hutchinson (CN=Audrey M. Hutchinson/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda C. Gray (CN=Linda C. Gray/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John M. Goering (CN=John M. Goering/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Randy D. Ayers (CN=Randy D. Ayers/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Allyson K. Woods (CN=Allyson K. Woods/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: JoAnn Ward (CN=JoAnn Ward/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Franklin F. Urteaga (CN=Franklin F. Urteaga/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheri A. Thornton (CN=Sheri A. Thornton/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeffrey M. Smith (CN=Jeffrey M. Smith/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nora H. Sabelli (CN=Nora H. Sabelli/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donald Pryor (CN=Donald Pryor/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Joan Porter (CN=Joan Porter/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Martin C. Offutt (CN=Martin C. Offutt/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Duncan T. Moore (CN=Duncan T. Moore/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Oliver G. McGee (CN=Oliver G. McGee/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa A. Malone (CN=Lisa A. Malone/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Martha A. Livingston (CN=Martha A. Livingston/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Neal Lane (CN=Neal Lane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kelly Kirkpatrick (CN=Kelly Kirkpatrick/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Henry C. Kelly (CN=Henry C. Kelly/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian G. Kahin (CN=Brian G. Kahin/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda D. Johnson (CN=Linda D. Johnson/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jefferson Hofgard (CN=Jefferson Hofgard/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Beverly K. Hartline (CN=Beverly K. Hartline/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Holly L. Gwin (CN=Holly L. Gwin/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anthony J. Gibson (CN=Anthony J. Gibson/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sybil Francis (CN=Sybil Francis/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Miriam A. Forman (CN=Miriam A. Forman/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara A. Ferguson (CN=Barbara A. Ferguson/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura L. Efros (CN=Laura L. Efros/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandy L. Cole (CN=Sandy L. Cole/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cynthia M. Chase (CN=Cynthia M. Chase/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Arthur Bienenstock (CN=Arthur Bienenstock/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deanna M. Behring (CN=Deanna M. Behring/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Samuel F. Baldwin (CN=Samuel F. Baldwin/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susanne Bachtel (CN=Susanne Bachtel/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lorena E. Ahumada (CN=Lorena E. Ahumada/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Irene Yeh (CN=Irene Yeh/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah Rosen (CN=Sarah Rosen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael A. O'Mary (CN=Michael A. O'Mary/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/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: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Sandra L. Bublick Max (CN=Sandra L. Bublick Max/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Valon J. Wadsworth (CN=Valon J. Wadsworth/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Wendy E. Gray (CN=Wendy E. Gray/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Antony J. Blinken (CN=Antony J. Blinken/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wesley P. Warren (CN=Wesley P. Warren/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Nancy Marlow (CN=Nancy Marlow/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa Guide (CN=Lisa Guide/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Keith E. Laughlin (CN=Keith E. Laughlin/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judy Jablow (CN=Judy Jablow/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ellen Athas (CN=Ellen Athas/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Edward R. Clark (CN=Edward R. Clark/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David B Sandalow (CN=David B Sandalow/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Alberta A. Winkler (CN=Alberta A. Winkler/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Moe Vela (CN=Moe Vela/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul A. Tuchmann (CN=Paul A. Tuchmann/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kimberly H Tilley (CN=Kimberly H Tilley/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Rachael E. Sullivan (CN=Rachael E. Sullivan/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan Spalter (CN=Jonathan Spalter/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Callie Shell (CN=Callie Shell/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Clark E. Ray (CN=Clark E. Ray/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Nathan B. Naylor (CN=Nathan B. Naylor/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Aimee M. Malnati (CN=Aimee M. Malnati/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve L. Kwast (CN=Steve L. Kwast/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vivian Jones (CN=Vivian Jones/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Scott R. Hynes (CN=Scott R. Hynes/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Hegarty (CN=Paul Hegarty/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wendy Hartman (CN=Wendy Hartman/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce Harding (CN=Bruce Harding/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary C. Gumbleton (CN=Mary C. Gumbleton/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ricardo M. Gonzales (CN=Ricardo M. Gonzales/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jalair Y. Flynn (CN=Jalair Y. Flynn/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael B. Feldman (CN=Michael B. Feldman/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lydia R. Ewing (CN=Lydia R. Ewing/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gisela J. Diaz (CN=Gisela J. Diaz/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Todd H. Dennett (CN=Todd H. Dennett/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Marc R D'Anjou (CN=Marc R D'Anjou/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul J. Cusack (CN=Paul J. Cusack/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Andrei H. Cherny (CN=Andrei H. Cherny/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alejandro G. Cabrera (CN=Alejandro G. Cabrera/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michael J. Burton (CN=Michael J. Burton/O=OVP @ OVP [OVP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Brown (CN=Lisa M. Brown/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matthew J. Bianco (CN=Matthew J. Bianco/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa A. Berg (CN=Lisa A. Berg/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David W. Beier (CN=David W. Beier/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gayle Bauer (CN=Gayle Bauer/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Eli G. Attie (CN=Eli G. Attie/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bill F Althoff (CN=Bill F Althoff/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas B. Samburg (CN=Thomas B. Samburg/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kelly Skoloda (CN=Kelly Skoloda/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark H. Bartholomew (CN=Mark H. Bartholomew/OU=OA/O=EOP @ EOP [OA])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert Wexler (CN=Robert Wexler/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Michelle R. Waldron (CN=Michelle R. Waldron/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lydia Sermons (CN=Lydia Sermons/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Evelina Mosby (CN=Evelina Mosby/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Diana Kappner (CN=Diana Kappner/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Danielle B. Glosser (CN=Danielle B. Glosser/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cedra D. Eaton (CN=Cedra D. Eaton/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David K. Chai (CN=David K. Chai/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Alexander L. Boyle (CN=Alexander L. Boyle/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Elizabeth R. Asher (CN=Elizabeth R. Asher/OU=PIR/O=EOP @ EOP [PIR])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William G. Wells (CN=William G. Wells/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Victor J. Villhard (CN=Victor J. Villhard/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sandra J. Toomey (CN=Sandra J. Toomey/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David Y. Stevens (CN=David Y. Stevens/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Frances Sharples (CN=Frances Sharples/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steven M. Rinaldi (CN=Steven M. Rinaldi/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Trent L. Prezler (CN=Trent L. Prezler/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lori A. Perine (CN=Lori A. Perine/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Tracy S. Olmstead (CN=Tracy S. Olmstead/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Stephen G. Moran (CN=Stephen G. Moran/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Deborah J. McGovern (CN=Deborah J. McGovern/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce W. MacDonald (CN=Bruce W. MacDonald/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rachel E. Levinson (CN=Rachel E. Levinson/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cecilia D. Lafoe (CN=Cecilia D. Lafoe/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gerald P. Kiernan (CN=Gerald P. Kiernan/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Nirmala Kannankutty (CN=Nirmala Kannankutty/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kerri A. Jones (CN=Kerri A. Jones/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Alice C. Hogan (CN=Alice C. Hogan/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark D. Hodge (CN=Mark D. Hodge/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gerald J. Hane (CN=Gerald J. Hane/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel L. Goroff (CN=Daniel L. Goroff/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Clifford J. Gabriel (CN=Clifford J. Gabriel/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Betty J. Fountain (CN=Betty J. Fountain/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ruth A. Fisher (CN=Ruth A. Fisher/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gerald L. Epstein (CN=Gerald L. Epstein/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: George G. Cravaritis (CN=George G. Cravaritis/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Donna I. Coleman (CN=Donna I. Coleman/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Rosina M. Bierbaum (CN=Rosina M. Bierbaum/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Susan L. Bassow (CN=Susan L. Bassow/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Peter W. Backlund (CN=Peter W. Backlund/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Judith D. Auerbach (CN=Judith D. Auerbach/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [OSTP])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: John W. Ahlen (CN=John W. Ahlen/OU=OSTP/O=EOP @ EOP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Jonathan T. Weber (CN=Jonathan T. Weber/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Penelope R. O'Brien (CN=Penelope R. O'Brien/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Robert D. Kyle (CN=Robert D. Kyle/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Sarah T. Holewinski (CN=Sarah T. Holewinski/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: John C. Gilmore (CN=John C. Gilmore/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: Carolyn A. Filak (CN=Carolyn A. Filak/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: William M. Chiong (CN=William M. Chiong/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: Erik R. Cafarella (CN=Erik R. Cafarella/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sherman G. Boone (CN=Sherman G. Boone/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Brian A. Barreto (CN=Brian A. Barreto/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: William J. Antholis (CN=William J. Antholis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Natalie S. Wozniak (CN=Natalie S. Wozniak/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer C. Poole (CN=Jennifer C. Poole/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: David T. Johnson (CN=David T. Johnson/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dale W. Akers (CN=Dale W. Akers/OU=NSC/O=EOP @ EOP [NSC])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michael V. Terrell (CN=Michael V. Terrell/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Linda Lance (CN=Linda Lance/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kathleen A. McGinty (CN=Kathleen A. McGinty/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elliot J. Diringier (CN=Elliot J. Diringier/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elisabeth A. Blaug (CN=Elisabeth A. Blaug/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dinah Bear (CN=Dinah Bear/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn D. Mosley (CN=Carolyn D. Mosley/OU=CEQ/O=EOP @ EOP [CEQ])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D82]MAIL43376215K.126 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750436B0E0000010A02010000000205000000A52900000002000023F3426B1C8B63BA18B4BF
255365DDEEA6C04BEE3F83ACB0FAB480C2FF3861310E5D0D57D24113CC76B37FFBCC31C6582F9A
FBC79681BFCDD68B9500261AC6B20DA9E62ACA67D351FDB191623923388659C06E180630534F3C
97620561A945A8728A4FAD2CA5CCC5086F5CCA6022BD576BCCF79DC85BF6D2071AB6A2C7A9E4BB
F71EE2CC4BE833A24C9576390FE675DDF48DC1A2CAC0CEF629DDB479213BFC2E4F36C1D2165566

**PRESIDENT CLINTON:
“WE MUST PASS A BIPARTISAN PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS”**

May 28, 1998

“This bill says, how can you let some person with the mentality of an accountant, who will only see the number of what it costs to have somebody do her surgery, who will only see the number at the bottom line of what the chemotherapy costs, make a decision. We’re not that kind of people; we’re not that kind of society.”

President Bill Clinton

May 28, 1998

Today, President Clinton is joined by Vice President Gore, Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala, and Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, in calling on Congress to pass a Patients’ Bill of Rights, legislation which offers certain protections to all Americans when they become ill. The President will also release a report showing the impact of health care issues on women, and why a Patients’ Bill of Rights is necessary to protect all Americans.

PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS. The nation’s health care system is undergoing significant change. Many Americans worry that these changes may reduce their health care options and lower the standards of care. The President has already signed an executive order requiring that all federal agencies substantially comply with the Patients’ Bill of Rights. Now, these protections must be extended to all Americans. A Patients’ Bill of Rights would give Americans much needed protections, including:

- Access to health care specialists to ensure patients receive the appropriate care they need;
- Access to emergency services when and where the need arises;
- Access to easily understood information to help patients make informed decisions;
- Grievance and appeals processes for consumers to resolve their differences with their health plans and health care providers.

A PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS HELPS ENSURE WOMEN GET ACCESS TO THE SERVICES THEY NEED. Women are particularly affected by health care issues. A new study shows that:

- Over 60 percent of physician visits are made by women, and women make three quarters of the health care decisions in American households. Without adequate patient protections, women will be unable to effectively navigate through the nation’s rapidly changing health care system.
- Women in managed care plans are increasingly dissatisfied with the quality of care. Nearly 70 percent of privately insured women ages 18 to 65 are in managed care plans. Almost two-fifths of these women worry that they will not be able to get speciality care when they need it. And 27 percent of these women worry that they will be denied a medical procedure they need.
- Without a patients’ bill of rights, women may not receive important preventive services. The consumer protection that gives women direct access to an obstetrician/gynecologist is not only necessary to make sure that pregnant women get the care they need, but is also important to ensure that women get important preventive services. Studies show that gynecologists are almost two times as likely as internists to perform timely, needed women’s preventive services.
- Patients’ Bill of Rights legislation must be passed. The only way to assure that all women, and all Americans, have the patient protections they need is to pass and enact a Federally-enforceable Patients’ Bill of Rights.

STATE LAWS CANNOT PROTECT ALL CITIZENS. The President congratulates the 44 states who have passed at least one element of the Patients’ Bill of Rights. However, over 122 million Americans are enrolled in health care plans which are not fully governed by state law, and therefore do not enjoy the full protection that these laws are intended to give.

CHALLENGING CONGRESS TO PASS A FEDERALLY-ENFORCEABLE PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS THIS YEAR. The President renews his call to Congress to pass a Patients’ Bill of Rights this year. Without this legislation, the millions of Americans in private health plans will never be assured these basic protections.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Nelson Reyneri (CN=Nelson Reyneri/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAY-1998 11:48:03.00

SUBJECT: Action Items from today's Child Custody Protection Act

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Tania I. Lopez (CN=Tania I. Lopez/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Miriam H. Vogel (CN=Miriam H. Vogel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

CC: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/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:

From today's meeting (please contact me if I missed anything)

1. Secure more intelligence (Leg Affairs)
 - A. Senate member count
 - B. Republican member who would speak out on our side, e.g. Snowe?
2. Check with DOJ regarding technicalities (Bill Marshall)
3. Identify our real life example (Robin Leeds)
 - B. Sylvia Mathews to contact her sister for ideas
4. What do we need for outreach? (Janelle Erickson, Robin Leeds, Ann Lewis)
 - A. Among constituency groups
 - B. Among members
5. Reconvene same time next week (Nelson Reyneri, June Turner)
 - A. June 4 @ 10AM, Roosevelt Room

Status of Provision Involving Tobacco Farmers

The Senate has not yet voted on provisions that deal with tobacco farmers but may do so this week. The legislation the Commerce Committee voted out included Senator Ford's provision which you supported during your trip to Kentucky last month. However, Majority Leader Lott also added Senator Lugar's competing provision to the McCain measure when the legislation reached the floor. The Lugar provision would buy-out all farmers from the quota program within 3 years at a cost of \$18 billion, eliminating the government program and creating a free market in tobacco in its place. As you recall, Senator Ford's measure preserves the program and gives farmers the option of being bought out, at a total cost of \$28.5 billion spread over 25 years.

USDA calculates that the Lugar free market approach would lead to dramatic increases in the amount of tobacco grown in the U.S., and a reduction in the cost of tobacco for companies. The Washington Post carried the USDA figures, including the calculation that the companies will save \$800 million a year or \$20 billion over the next 25 years if Lugar becomes law. In addition, OMB estimates that the Lugar provision's funding needs would necessitate a 69% cut in the research and other public health programs such as cessation, education and prevention called for in the McCain legislation. Armed with these numbers, public health groups like the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids have lobbied the Senate for the Ford measure. Procedurally, the next move is for both Ford and Lugar to try and strike the other's measure from the bill. Along with USDA, we will continue to work with Senators Ford, Robb and Hollings for their farmers provision and simultaneously seek to fashion a compromise that might garner significant Republican support.