

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 046 - FOLDER -006

[03/03/1999] [1]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman (CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 09:24:21.00

SUBJECT: Radio Address

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
Bruce and Elena --

Is it your understanding also that the radio address will be about class size?

----- Forwarded by Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP on 03/03/99
08:27 AM -----

Ruby Shamir

03/03/99 09:03:53 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP, Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP, Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP, Joshua S. Gottheimer/WHO/EOP

cc:

bcc:

Subject: Radio Address

Ann does not see the need for a meeting or special guests. As of now, the Radio Address will likely be small class size [vote on Patty Murray's bill next week?]. But Josh - whoever is writing it should feel free to talk to Ann about message.

Thanks.

Mary Morrison
03/03/99 08:55:03 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: goodmorning

Goodmorning... are you all going to have a radio address meeting today?
Have you all decided on a topic yet?
merci
mm

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE:

7:30 p.m. EST, Wednesday, March 3, 1999

**VICE PRESIDENT URGES SENATE TO ENACT CLASS SIZE INITIATIVE TO
PROVIDE (state # of teachers) NEW TEACHERS**

Gore Visits New York School To Call For New Efforts to Help Children Learn to Read

"Let's seize the moment to make a commitment to our children's education and America's future. Smaller classes in the early grades can help children learn to read well, master the basics, and get the foundation needed to succeed throughout their lives."

—Vice President Gore

An Opportunity for Bipartisan Progress in Education. With a key vote on the Clinton-Gore class size initiative expected next week, Vice President Gore called for the Senate to take action to reduce class size in the early grades to a national average of 18 by hiring 100,000 well-prepared teachers across the nation. Last year, with bipartisan support, Congress enacted an important down payment on the Clinton-Gore plan by approving a one-time \$1.2 billion appropriation to help communities hire and support 30,000 teachers across the nation. Next week, Senators Murray and Kennedy will offer a measure to help finish the job by authorizing \$11.4 billion more to support 100,000 well-prepared teachers across the nation over the next six years.

Supporting Effective Local Planning. Under the initiative enacted into law last year, school districts will begin to receive funding this July 1 in order to hire teachers to begin reducing class sizes this fall. While last year's one-year appropriation provided an important start on President Clinton's seven-year initiative, Congress has the chance to support effective local planning by giving school districts the confidence they need that funding will be available under this initiative for years to come. Communities will soon begin to make decisions about how to implement this new initiative, and they will not be able to use these funds as effectively as possible unless Congress makes a clear, long-term commitment to reduce class size.

Increased Funding for Communities Across the Nation. In this year's budget, President Clinton and Vice President Gore proposed \$1.4 billion to hire a total of 38,000 teachers nationally and an estimated (#) teachers in (state.) Enacting the Murray-Kennedy amendment would help finish the job on the Clinton-Gore plan by authorizing funding for school districts across (state) hire (#) teachers over the next seven years with funding levels rising to (# for appropriation in FY2005)

Small Classes Make a Difference. Studies show that smaller classes help teachers provide more personal attention to students and spend less time on discipline; as a result students learn more and get a stronger foundation in the basic skills. According to studies, students from smaller classes in North Carolina, Wisconsin, Indiana, Tennessee, and across the nation outperformed their peers in larger classes. Moreover, research shows that reduced class size makes the greatest difference for minority and disadvantaged students. For example, a national study of 10,000 4th graders and 10,000 8th graders found the greatest impact of smaller classes on inner-city youth.

Support from Major Education Organizations. Major education organizations support the President's class size initiative, including the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS), Federal Advocacy for California Education, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Education Association (NEA), the National Parent Teacher Association (PTA), the National School Boards Association (NSBA), NAACP, and the National Association of School Psychologists, the International Reading Association (IRA).

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 10:03:03.00

SUBJECT: Ed-Flex/Class Size Schedule

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I just spoke with Broderick -- he will call in later as a clearer schedule develops. Here's where things stand:

Next four hours will be spent on the motion to proceed (largely Wellstone). The vote should take place around 1:30. Broderick says there is a manager's package, but he isn't sure how complete it is -- and is trying to get more information on the amendments included in the package. Right now, Broderick expects them to spend the day on accountability. He thinks there is a chance that the Senate may get to class size late today, but it will likely come up tomorrow (where they will try and string out discussion over the weekend). It looks like the Senate won't finish Ed-Flex before Wednesday.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 10:21:01.00

SUBJECT: Recoupment and farmers

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

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

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

TEXT:

Bruce asked me to check in with congressional offices on how they would prefer the recoupment language on farmers to read: should the states be credited for money that explicitly goes through the trusts set up under the Phase II agreement or should states be credited for funds spent in more general categories such as "promoting economic development in regions injured by reduced sales or price of tobacco." I checked with Senator Robb's staff who is the main Dem. in the Senate now on the subject, and Rep. Etheridge's staff who took a lead role last year and ag. staff. They all preferred we didn't have any bill, but if there is a bill want us to use the general categories not the trusts. Gov. Patton's staff felt the same. Another very good argument for the general categories is the current drafting of the Phase II trust language. Although not finalized, the language requires that while some of the states have their own trusts, the tobacco companies will appoint a national board to oversee overall distribution of funds and deal with direct allocation of funds in some of the smaller states like Ohio. I'd guess we wouldn't want to put money into a system where they have so much control.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth R. Newman (CN=Elizabeth R. Newman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 11:06:10.00

SUBJECT: education guidelines: disability requirements

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

TEXT:

I know we thought this issue would not come up until next week....but it was just on CNN - can we get guidance? thanks

MEDICARE COMMISSION
March 3, 1999

SURPLUS

- Q:** Doesn't your plan to reserve part of the surplus for Medicare represent a "pass" on real Medicare reform?
- A:** Absolutely not. It is a simple recognition that improving and strengthening Medicare requires adequate financing. Every independent Medicare expert in the nation has concluded that it is impossible to significantly extend the life of the Trust Fund without an infusion of new financial support. Not doing so would result in excessive cuts to beneficiaries or health care providers. I am convinced my proposal actually. By assuring a significant infusion of much needed revenue, our proposal actually makes it easier for Democrats and Republicans to come together to develop reforms that strengthen the program.

MEDICARE COMMISSION

- Q:** Senator Breaux is circulating estimates by your own Medicare actuary which show that his premium support model saves \$372 billion over 10 years. Do you agree with the estimate and how do you respond to it?
- A:** The Medicare actuary projects that Senator Beaux's proposal will achieve certain savings, from a variety of sources. The premium support reforms save between \$75 and \$100 billion over 10 years, while other changes --such as raising the age of eligibility and instituting an income-related premium --save another \$200 billion or so. These estimates provide important information, but the broader challenge of the Commission is to review Senator Beaux's premium support model and the other aspects of his proposal to determine what overall impact they would have on the program, the beneficiaries it serves, and the hospitals, nursing homes, doctors and nurses who provide health care services. We look forward to receiving the final recommendations from the Commission.
- Q:** Do you support Senator Breaux's Medicare proposal?
- A:** First, let me remind you of my position on Medicare. I believe that we should dedicate 15 percent of the projected surpluses over the next 15 years to extending until 2020 the life of the Medicare Trust Fund. As I've indicated, however, my preference is to utilize these new resources in the context of broader improvements in the program which modernize the

program, make it more efficient, provide for prescription drug benefits, and still extend the life of the Trust Fund until 2020. With respect to Senator Breaux' proposal, I believe it serves no useful purpose to comment on each proposal that emerges as part of the Commission's deliberations. However, I will evaluate any proposal to see that it:

- Dedicates Surplus to Secure Medicare until 2020.
- Modernizes Medicare and Make It More Competitive.
- Guarantees Defined Set of Benefits w/o Excessive New Costs to Beneficiaries
- Use Savings from Reform to Help Fund a Prescription Drug Benefit.

We look forward to working with Senator Breaux and the rest of the Commission as they move forward with their important work.

Q: The Medicare Commission is proposing to raise the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67 --making it consistent with phase-up for Social Security. What is the Administration's position on this proposal?

A: As we have said many times, we have serious concerns about raising the Medicare eligibility age. I am unaware of any policy anyone has put forth that would ensure that such a proposal would not add more Americans to the ranks of the uninsured. Indeed, I have emphasized that we need to focus our attention on the most rapidly growing group of uninsured Americans -- Americans between the ages of 55 and 65. So, I view any such proposal with a good bit of skepticism.

NOTE: On Tuesday, Senator Breaux told some House Blue Dog Democrats that he would drop this proposal.

Q: Senator Breaux is recommending an income-related premium. Do you support this?

A: I am open to this concept. However, any such proposal would have to be considered in the context of an entire package of reforms.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Q: You recently said that a drug benefit should only be for those people who need it. Were you suggesting your openness to a more limited drug benefit?

A: Not at all. I was simply stating it is possible to design an acceptable drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries that is optional. Many Americans have a comprehensive retiree health drug benefit, though fewer each year, and

might not opt for the new Medicare benefit. I do believe, however, that any such drug benefit should be affordable and accessible to all Medicare beneficiaries, and that it was made available through the traditional fee for service plan as well as Medicare managed care options. This would ensure that all Medicare beneficiaries, particularly those who live in rural areas without private plan options, have access to an affordable drug benefit.

- Q.** Your Medicare Commission appointees have said that they would only support the recommendations of the Medicare Commission if they include a prescription drug benefit. Is this a litmus test for you?
- A.** Any proposal to provide a long-overdue prescription drug benefit should take place within the context of broader Medicare reform. However, I believe that a meaningful prescription drug benefit for all beneficiaries can and should be included in any such proposal. We have learned that successfully achieving meaningful Medicare reform can only happen in a bipartisan fashion. For this reason, we look forward to working with members on both sides of the aisle to add this important benefit this year.
- Q.** Won't a prescription drug benefit, even in the context of broader reforms, result in higher Medicare spending? How can it be afforded at a time when the program is facing a serious financing crisis?
- A.** Senator Breaux has said that not having a prescription drug benefit in 2000 is like not having coverage for doctor's visits in 1965. Prescription drugs have become an essential part of treatments and cures, and are expected to play an even greater role in health care in the next century. I believe that additional savings from making Medicare more efficient should be used to help finance a long-overdue prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries. It would be penny-wise and pound-foolish not to add this benefit.
- Q.** Is it true, as some Medicare Commission appointees suggest, that since 65 percent of Medicare beneficiaries already have some type of coverage, a new Medicare drug benefit would simply replace private dollars with government subsidies?
- A.** Absolutely not. Over 13 million Medicare beneficiaries have no coverage. Of that 65 percent frequently cited, 38 percent have inadequate or declining private coverage, 20 percent have Federally subsidized coverage through Medicare managed care or Medicaid, and 7 percent have coverage that changes in the course of the year. Thus, there is no stable, private source of financing for this critical benefit. Moreover, it would be virtually impossible to design a policy that only targets those beneficiaries without coverage, since existing coverage is so rapidly changing.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 11:24:53.00

SUBJECT: Hutchison may try to add bill to supplemental at full cmte markup tomorrow

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson (CN=Caroline R. Fredrickson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO]
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: J. Eric Gould (CN=J. Eric Gould/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:

Harkin's staff reports that they've heard the rumour that Hutchison plans to offer her recoupment bill to the supplemental bill at the Senate Approps markup tomorrow afternoon.

Harkin's staff current idea is to offer a second degree setting aside 30% of funds for tobacco prevention.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 11:31:26.00

SUBJECT: Morley Winograd and Food Safety

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

You asked me to check with Morley on the idea of moving inspections from FDA to USDA and re-naming USDA. He likes the idea, particularly if it can take care of the VP's problem with pesticides. (It might, increased inspections in fruit and veggies plants could conceivably decrease the pesticide problem there -- I'll look into it). He asked we put together a short memo and hold a meeting with you and Neal Lane to figure whether and how to break this to HHS. I said sure. I'd like to first set up a Bruce, Elena, Neal Lane meeting for Friday to discuss this and the NAS response. OK?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Karin Kullman (CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 11:35:02.00

SUBJECT: School Supplies Collection for POTUS Trip to Nicaragua

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

TO: Devorah R. Adler (CN=Devorah R. Adler/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: Andrea Kane (CN=Andrea Kane/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: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/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: Nicole R. Rabner (CN=Nicole R. Rabner/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Essence P. Washington (CN=Essence P. Washington/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: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./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: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I will collect any contributions DPC would like to make to this effort. Just drop them off in my office (OEOB 207) by 5:00pm on Friday. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you!

On March 8th, the President will address the people of Posoltega, Nicaragua in an event to be held at the local high school. Posoltega, along with much of Nicaragua, is still recovering from the devastation left behind by Hurricane Mitch in November of 1998. Posoltega suffered some of the worst damage when a massive mudslide from Las Casitas Volcano hit the town. Two nearby villages were entirely destroyed by the slides. It was reported that only 92 of the estimated 2,000 area residents were found alive, some injured, and the remainder were listed as missing.

Relief efforts have been great, but Posoltega is still lacking essential supplies. Over 600 students currently attend classes in makeshift tents. They are seriously in need of essential school supplies. To help, we would like to send some supplies with the President to be distributed to these 4 "tent schools." Dry erase boards, different sizes/shades of paper, poster board, colored pencils, crayons, markers, tape, notebooks, scissors, rulers, world globes, basic first aid kits, blank cassettes, and cassette recorders are among the supplies needed.

If you would like to donate some of these supplies please bring your donations to Room 184 OEOB by Sunday, March 7. Thank you for your generosity!

Note: These can be personal donations only. No government purchased supplies. Please do not solicit outside donations. Thank you!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 11:40:19.00

SUBJECT: Comparable Worth Plan

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is our proposed timetable for our Comparable Worth process:

1. This week we are reaching out to Treasury, OMB, Commerce (Orszag is now head of planning there), OPM, DOJ, EEOC, DOL, and SBA to inform them of our process, the idea of endorsing the Harkin bill, and ask them to have preliminary comments ready for a Monday afternoon meeting next week. Orszag in particular says Commerce is going to oppose and will have something to circulate. We are also asking them to be creative about other things in the area we might do. In addition, we want them to see if they can sign on to the data provision that is in Daschle's old bill. We will get you an inventory of other wage disclosure options before the meeting. If any of them look promising, you might ask the agencies to respond to the option as well.

2. March 8 Meeting. Tentative list of invites.

DOJ:	Richard Jerome, Deputy Associate Attorney General Kay Baldwin, Civil Rights Division
EEOC:	Ida Castro, Chairwoman
Labor:	Lee Satterfield, Chief of Staff Sally Paxton, Solicitor's Office
SBA:	Betsy Meyers, Associate Deputy Administrator for Entrepreneurial Development
Treasury:	David Wilcox Assist. Secty for Economic Policy
Commerce:	Jon Orszag, Director, Office of Policy and Strategic Planning
OPM:	Leigh Shein, Chief of Staff
NEC:	Sally Katzen
OMB:	Josh Gotbaum
CEA:	Becky Blank

3. Week of March 15. Second Meeting. Final agency comments will be due. In addition, we will have asked OMB and OPM to prepare ideas on limited comparable worth applications in the federal workplace which we can discuss at this second meeting.

4. Week of March 22. Final memo for sign-off. Inform Harkin and Norton. Hopefully have wage disclosure idea ready as well.

I guess we should include OPL on our invite list, yes? But I would stress that they cannot have contact with advocates during this process.

SCHEDULING PROPOSAL

TODAY'S DATE: 3/3/99

_____ACCEPT

_____REGRET

_____PENDING

TO: Stephanie Streett
Assistant to the President
Director of Presidential Scheduling

FROM: Bruce Reed
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy and
Director of the Domestic Policy Council

Thurgood Marshall Jr.
Assistant to the President and Cabinet Secretary

REQUEST: Event to Honor the 1999 National Teacher of the Year

PURPOSE: To announce the 1999 National Teacher of the Year, to honor the other state Teachers of the Year, and to highlight some of the President's education initiatives.

BACKGROUND: The National Teacher of the Year program, sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers and Scholastic, Inc., recognizes and honors the contributions of the American classroom teacher. The program designates an exemplary representatives of the country's more than 3 million elementary and secondary school classroom teachers from among the nation's State Teachers of the Year. The Teachers of the Year represent the diversity of their profession, teaching every grade level from kindergarten through grade 12 in districts ranging in size from 200 to 200,000 students. This year's finalists are from the states of Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, and Oklahoma.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: The President has participated in this event every year for the last four year.

DATE AND TIME: April 21, 22, or 23, 1999

BRIEFING TIME: 30 minutes

DURATION: 45 minutes

LOCATION: The White House

PARTICIPANTS: The President
Secretary Richard Riley
Members of Congress
National Teacher of the Year and State Teachers of the Year
Representatives from the Council of Chief State School Officers, Scholastic, Inc., and other education advocacy groups

REMARKS REQUIRED: To be provided by speechwriting.

OUTLINE OF EVENTS: -The President and Sec. Riley will meet the State Teachers of the Year.
-Sec. Riley will make brief remarks.
-The President will make brief remarks and present the 1999 National Teacher of the Year with a crystal apple.
-The National Teacher of the Year will make remarks.

MEDIA COVERAGE: Open Press.

FIRST LADY'S ATTENDANCE: Optional.

VPOTUS ATTENDANCE: Optional.

SECOND LADY'S ATTENDANCE: Optional.

RECOMMENDED BY: Bruce Reed

CONTACT: Karin Kullman
X61732

ORIGIN OF THE PROPOSAL: Council of Chief State School Officers (see attached letter)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Irene Bueno (CN=Irene Bueno/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 12:04:25.00

SUBJECT: Urban Institute Report on discrimination

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI - On March 2, 1999, the Urban Institute issued a press release on a report that calls for a National Report Card on Discrimination in America and shows that paired testing can be used to audit discrimination. They argue that this report card would promote greater understanding of the prevalence of discrimination, provide strategic guidance to civil rights enforcement agencies, develop insight on the changing pattern and impact of discrimination.

This report also provides strong support for the President's \$10 million request for additional funding to fight discrimination that would expand the use of paired testing.

HUD has been using this method for two decades but this report proposes that pair testing expand into different areas including employment, and other daily consumer transactions such as car sales, taxi services, and health club memberships etc.

I will review a copy of this report and let you know if I find anything particularly interesting.

Let me know if you have any thoughts or comments. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 12:16:14.00

SUBJECT: POTUS Draft for NAEP State by States

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

TEXT:

Today's release of state-by-state NAEP scores is more evidence that raising academic standards for all our children is beginning to pay off. Almost a quarter of the participating states have shown real improvement in reading, and some states that had scores well-below the national average have made the greatest gains in the last four years. While this news is encouraging, much remains to be done to ensure that every child in America is mastering the basics. That's why I urge the Senate to vote to continue their bipartisan support to put 100,000 new, well-prepared teachers in the classroom and also to enact my Education Accountability Act. This Act will keep education reform efforts moving forward by ensuring that states and schools districts end social promotion, turn around low-performing schools, provide parents with report cards on schools, and implement effective discipline policies. While this nation is clearly headed in the right direction, we take these steps to pick up the pace of our progress so that every child in America is prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

**Selected State Plans and Governors' Proposals:
State Tobacco Settlement**

Michigan (\$8.5 billion / 25 years; \$315 million / 1 year)

Gov. Engler wants to use a significant portion of the settlement funds for college scholarships for students who excel on state achievement tests. He is willing to use some of the money for health programs - on a one time basis but he first wants to ensure that the money is available for scholarships. Detroit News, 2/11/99

Massachusetts (\$7.9 billion / 25 years; \$293 million / 1 year)

Gov. Cellucci proposed establishing a trust fund and using the settlement money to pay for existing health care programs. His only initiative is \$500,000 to study tobacco control programs. Cellucci is under criticism by Democrats that settlement money should be used to fund the state's acclaimed tobacco control program rather than substitute current state spending on public health programs. Boston Globe, 2/11/99

New York (\$25 billion / 25 years; \$818 million / 1 year)

Gov. Pataki proposed using three-fourths of the settlement dollars to fund capital projects in an effort to reduce the state's debt. Times Union, (Albany) 2/04/99

Louisiana (\$4.4 billion / 25 years; \$163 million / 1 year)

Gov. Foster proposed to sell the state's \$4.4 billion share of the settlement to get up-front cash of \$2.3 billion to retire the state's debt and increase teachers' salaries. The Advocate, (Baton Rouge) 1/3/99

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Constance J. Bowers (CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 15:15:49.00

SUBJECT: LRM CJB 16 = EDUCATION Draft Bill on Even Start Amendments - Part of the E

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/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: Leslie S. Mustain (CN=Leslie S. Mustain/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

TO: Jeffrey L. Farrow (CN=Jeffrey L. Farrow/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Pamula L. Simms (CN=Pamula L. Simms/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel I. Werfel (CN=Daniel I. Werfel/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Broderick Johnson (CN=Broderick Johnson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wei-Min C. Wang (CN=Wei-Min C. Wang/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Barbara Chow (CN=Barbara Chow/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])

READ:UNKNOWN

LRM INTERIOR (LRM INTERIOR [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

LRM JUSTICE (LRM JUSTICE [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

LRM LABOR (LRM LABOR [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

LRM HHS (LRM HHS [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

LRM Social Security Administration (LRM Social Security Administration [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please provide comments on ED's draft "Even Start" Amendments by:

2:00 p.m., Monday, March 8, 1999

Note: This email contains only the text of the bill and sectional analysis. This material was also faxed or mailed to you, along with the text of current law marked up to show ED's proposed changes == that part is not available to send to you via email.

Note also: if the files below are in a format that you cannot access, please call to discuss.

[click here for draft bill text:](#)

click here for section-by-section analysis text:

Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on 03/03/99 03:07 PM

Total Pages: _____

LRM ID: CJB16
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503-0001

Wednesday, March 3, 1999

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer - See Distribution below

FROM: Janet R. Forsgren (for) Assistant Director for Legislative
Reference

OMB CONTACT: Constance J. Bowers

PHONE: (202)395-3803 FAX: (202)395-6148

SUBJECT: EDUCATION Draft Bill on Even Start Amendments - Part of
the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization (Title I, Part
B of the ESEA of 1965)

DEADLINE: 2:00 p.m. Monday, March 8, 1999

In accordance with OMB Circular A-19, OMB requests the views of your
agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the
program of the President. Please advise us if this item will affect
direct spending or receipts for purposes of the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions
of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

COMMENTS: Because of the magnitude of ED's draft bill to reauthorize the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act, circulation and interagency review
will be handled in separate pieces. Attached is bill language and a
markup of current law to show ED's proposed changes.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AGENCIES:

59-INTERIOR - Jane Lyder - (202) 208-4371
61-JUSTICE - Dennis Burke - (202) 514-2141
62-LABOR - Robert A. Shapiro - (202) 219-8201
52-HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES - Sondra S. Wallace - (202) 690-7760
110-Social Security Administration - Judy Chesser - (202) 358-6030

EOP:

Barbara Chow
Sandra Yamin
Barry White
Leslie S. Mustain
Wei-Min C. Wang
Wayne Upshaw
Jonathan H. Schnur
Tanya E. Martin
Elena Kagan

William H. White Jr.
 Lynn G. Cutler
 Broderick Johnson
 Daniel J. Chenok
 Daniel I. Werfel
 Robert G. Damus
 Rosalyn J. Rettman
 Peter Rundlet
 Pamula L. Simms
 Howard Dendurent
 Janet E. Irwin
 Richard H. Kodl
 Jeffrey L. Farrow
 Jack A. Smalligan
 Larry R. Matlack
 Alison Perkins-Cohen
 Janet R. Forsgren
 James J. Jukes

LRM ID: CJB16 SUBJECT: EDUCATION Draft Bill on Even Start Amendments -
 Part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization (Title
 I, Part B of the ESEA of 1965)

RESPONSE TO
 LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL
 MEMORANDUM

If your response to this request for views is short (e.g., concur/no
 comment), we prefer that you respond by e-mail or by faxing us this
 response sheet. If the response is short and you prefer to call, please
 call the branch-wide line shown below (NOT the analyst's line) to leave a
 message with a legislative assistant.

You may also respond by:

- (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be
 connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); or
- (2) sending us a memo or letter

Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

TO: Constance J. Bowers Phone: 395-3803 Fax: 395-6148
 Office of Management and Budget
 Branch-Wide Line (to reach legislative assistant): 395-7362

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

The following is the response of our agency to your request for views on
 the above-captioned subject:

- _____ Concur
- _____ No Objection
- _____ No Comment

DRAFT
MARCH 3, 1998

1 PART B - EVEN START

2 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

3 SEC. 121. Section 1201 of the ESEA is amended—

4 (1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "high-quality" after
5 "existing";

6 (2) in paragraph (2), by striking out "and" at the end
7 thereof;

8 (3) in paragraph (3), by striking out the period and
9 inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and "and"; and

10 (4) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (4) to
11 read as follows:

12 "(4) be based on the best available research on language
13 development, reading instruction, and prevention of reading
14 difficulties."

15 PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

16 SEC. 122. Section 1202 of the ESEA is amended—

17 (1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

18 "(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—(1) IN GENERAL. For each fiscal
19 year, the Secretary shall reserve 5 percent of the amount
20 appropriated under section 1002(b) for programs, under such terms
21 and conditions as the Secretary shall establish, that are consistent
22 with the purpose of this part, and that support national demonstration
23 and model projects for isolated and especially hard-to-reach
24 populations, which shall include projects for—

25 "(A) children of migratory workers;

1 "(B) the outlying areas, for which the Secretary
2 shall reserve one-half of one percent of the funds appropriated under
3 section 1002(b);

4 "(C) Indian tribes and tribal organizations; and

5 "(D) such other populations as the Secretary may from
6 time to time determine, such as families that are homeless, that
7 have children with severe disabilities, or that include incarcerated
8 mothers of young children.

9 "(2) CRITERIA. To be selected for funding under
10 paragraph (1)(A), (C), or (D) of this subsection, an applicant must
11 effectively demonstrate that—

12 "(A) one or more partners in the proposed project
13 have provided high-quality, effective educational services to adults
14 or young children; and

15 "(B) the proposed project has substantial potential
16 to serve as a national model for other projects to help meet the
17 educational needs of low-income families.";

18 (2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

19 "(b) RESERVATION FOR FEDERAL ACTIVITIES. From amounts
20 appropriated under section 1002(b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary
21 may reserve not more than one percent to provide, directly or through
22 grants or contracts with eligible organizations, technical
23 assistance, program improvement, and replication activities.";

24 (3) in subsection (c)—

25 (A) by amending the subsection heading to read
26 "RESERVATION FOR STATEWIDE FAMILY LITERACY INITIATIVES."; and

27 (B) by striking out "From funds reserved under section

1 12260(b) (3), the Secretary shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "From
2 funds appropriated under section 1002(b) for any fiscal year, the
3 Secretary may";

4 (4) in subsection (d)–

5 (A) in paragraph (2), by striking out "that section"
6 and inserting in lieu thereof "that part"; and

7 (B) in paragraph (3)–

8 (i) by striking out "\$250,000, or"; and

9 (ii) by striking out "such year, whichever is
10 greater" and inserting in lieu thereof "such year"; and

11 (5) in subsection (e)–

12 (A) in paragraph (2), by striking out "nonprofit";
13 and

14 (B) in paragraph (3), by striking out the period at
15 the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon.

16 STATE PROGRAMS

17 SEC. 123. Section 1203 of the ESEA is amended–

18 (1) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as
19 subsections (b) and (c), respectively;

20 (2) by inserting a new subsection (a) to read as follows:

21 "(a) STATE PLAN.–(1) CONTENTS. Each State that desires to
22 receive a grant under this part shall submit a plan to the Secretary
23 containing such budgetary and other information as the Secretary
24 may require, and which shall–

25 "(A) include the State's indicators of program
26 quality, developed under section 1210 or, if the State has not
27 completed work on those indicators, describe its progress in

1developing them;

2 "(B) describe how the State is using, or will use,
3those indicators to monitor, evaluate, and improve projects it
4assists under this part, and to decide whether to continue assisting
5those projects;

6 "(C) describe how the State will help each project
7under this part ensure the full implementation of the program elements
8described in section 1205; and

9 "(D) describe how the State will conduct the
10competition for subgrants, including the application of the criteria
11described in section 1208.

12 "(2) DURATION. **[Language about the duration of the**
13**State's plan/application will be added to conform to what we propose**
14**for the duration of State plans under Part A.]";**

15 (3) in subsection (b), as redesignated by paragraph (1)–

16 (A) by striking out "section 1202(d)(1)" and
17inserting in lieu thereof "section 1202(d)"; and

18 (B) in paragraph (2), by striking out
19"subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)";

20and

21 (4) in paragraph (1) of subsection (c), as redesignated
22by paragraph (1)–

23 (A) by striking out "section 1202(d)(1)" and
24inserting in lieu thereof "section 1202(d)"; and

25 (B) by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting
26in lieu thereof "subsection (b)".

1 USES OF FUNDS

2 SEC. 124. Section 1204(a) of the ESEA is amended by striking
3out "family-centered education programs" and inserting in lieu
4thereof "family literacy services".

5 PROGRAM ELEMENTS

6 SEC. 125. Section 1205 of the ESEA is amended to read as
7follows:

8 "PROGRAM ELEMENTS

9 "SEC. 1205. Each program assisted under this part shall--
10 "(1) identify and recruit families most in need of services
11provided under this part, as indicated by the eligible parent or
12parents' low income and low level of adult literacy or English
13language proficiency, and other need-related factors;

14 "(2) screen and prepare parents (including teenage
15parents) and children to enable them to participate fully in the
16activities and services provided under this part, including testing,
17referral to necessary counseling, and other developmental, support,
18and related services;

19 "(3) be designed to accommodate participating families'
20work schedules and other responsibilities, including scheduling and
21locating services to allow joint participation by parents and
22children, and providing support services necessary for participation
23in the activities assisted under this part if those services are
24unavailable from other sources, such as--

25 "(A) child care for the period that the parents are
26involved in the programs assisted under this part;

1 "(B) transportation to enable parents and their
2 children to participate in those programs; and

3 "(C) career counseling and job-placement services;

4 "(4) provide high-quality, intensive family literacy
5 services (as defined in section 1202(e)(3)), using instructional
6 approaches that the best available research on reading indicates
7 will be most effective in building adult literacy and children's
8 language development and reading ability;

9 "(5) employ an instructional staff, the majority of whom
10 have obtained, or are actively working toward, certification or other
11 credentials in a field directly related to early childhood education,
12 adult education, or parenting education;

13 "(6) provide special training for staff, including
14 child-care staff, to develop the skills, and obtain certification
15 in, instructional areas needed to carry out the purpose of this part;

16 "(7) provide and monitor integrated instructional services
17 to participating parents and children through center-based and
18 home-based programs;

19 "(8) serve those families most in need of the activities
20 and services provided under this part, including individuals with
21 special needs, such as individuals with disabilities, individuals
22 with limited English proficiency, and homeless individuals;

23 "(9) use methods that ensure that participating families
24 successfully complete the program, including--

25 "(A) operating a year-round program, including
26 continuing to provide some instructional services for participants
27 during the summer months;

1 (2) in paragraph (1)–

2 (A) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

3 "(A) a description of the program goals, including
4 outcomes for children and families that are consistent with the
5 program indicators established or adopted by the State under
6 section 1210, and of the strategies the applicant will use to reach
7 those goals;"

8 (B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "each of" after
9 "incorporate";

10 (C) in subparagraph (D) by inserting "and" at the
11 end thereof;

12 (D) by striking out subparagraphs (E) and (F) and
13 inserting in lieu thereof the following:

14 "(E) provisions for rigorous and objective
15 evaluation of progress toward the goals described in
16 subparagraph (A), and the continuing use of evaluation data for
17 program improvement."; and

18 (3) in paragraph (2), by striking out "paragraph (1) (A)"
19 and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1)".

20 (b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT. Section 1207 of the ESEA is further
21 amended by striking out subsection (d).

22 AWARD OF SUBGRANTS

23 SEC. 128. (a) SELECTION PROCESS. Section 1208(a) of the ESEA
24 is amended–

25 (1) in paragraph (1)–

26 (A) in subparagraph (B), by striking out
27 "limited-English" and inserting in lieu thereof "limited English";

1 (B) by striking out subparagraph (C);
2 (C) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (H)
3 as subparagraphs (C) through (G) respectively;
4 (D) in subparagraph (E), as redesignated by
5 subparagraph (C), by striking out "Federal" and inserting in lieu
6 thereof "non-Federal"; and
7 (E) in subparagraph (G), as redesignated by
8 subparagraph (C), by striking out "local educational agencies" and
9 inserting in lieu thereof "family literacy projects"; and
10 (2) in paragraph (3), by striking out "one or more of the
11 following individuals:" and inserting in lieu thereof "an individual
12 with expertise in family literacy programs, and may include other
13 individuals, such as one or more of the following:".

14 (b) EXEMPLARY PROJECTS. Section 1208 of the ESEA is amended
15 by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c) to read as follows:
16 "(c) EXEMPLARY PROJECTS.—(1) Notwithstanding
17 subsection (b) (5) (A), each State may use funds under this part in
18 any fiscal year to continue providing assistance, for up to four
19 additional years, for not more than two projects that have been highly
20 successful in achieving the goals described in their plans under
21 section 1207(c) (1) (A) and that have substantial potential to serve
22 as models for other projects throughout the Nation and as mentor
23 sites for other family-literacy programs in the State.

24 "(2) The Federal share of any subgrant under paragraph (1)
25 shall not exceed 50 percent for any fiscal year."

1 EVALUATION

2 SEC. 129. Section 1209 of the ESEA is amended to read as
3 follows:

4 "EVALUATION

5 "SEC. 1209. The Secretary shall provide for an independent
6 evaluation of programs assisted under this part, to-

7 "(1) determine their performance and effectiveness; and

8 "(2) identify effective programs that can be duplicated
9 and used in providing technical assistance to Federal, State, and
10 local programs."

11 INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

12 SEC. 130. Section 1210 of the ESEA is amended-

13 (1) by striking out "Each" and inserting in lieu thereof
14 "By September 30, 2000, each"; and

15 (2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (3) to
16 read as follows:

17 "(3) With respect to a program's implementation of
18 high-quality, intensive family literacy services, specific levels
19 of intensity of those services and duration of individuals'
20 participation that are necessary to result in the outcomes described
21 under paragraphs (1) and (2), which the State shall periodically
22 review and revise as needed to achieve those outcomes."

23 REPEAL AND REDESIGNATION

24 SEC. 131. (a) REPEAL. Section 1211 of the ESEA is repealed.

25 (b) REDESIGNATION. Section 1212 of the ESEA is redesignated
26 as section 1211.

* * * * *

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

WPCS

2[ZB19<jC\ PQPPart B of Title I of the bill would amend Part B of Title I of t
 he Paul RiddlePaul Riddle#XP\ PQXP#footerfooter
 (# X` hp x (#2 <X0page numberpage numberheaderheader
 (# X` hp x (#Default ParaDefault Paragraph FontC\ PQP\ `*Times New
)XP\ PQXP\ `*Times New Roman (TT)XXP\ PQXP\ `*Times New
 [X]#XP\ PQXP#footer (# IBfooterX` hp x (##'0*,.8135@8:<H?Apage number"page num
 ber"
 X` hp x (#` hp x ([DRAFT
 MARCH 3, 1999[

Part B of Title I of the bill would amend Part B of Title I of the ESEA, which a
 uthorizes the Even Start
 program.

Section 121, statement of purpose [ESEA, 1201]. Section 121 of the bill would a
 mend the
 Even Start statement of purpose in section 1201 of the ESEA by requiri
 ng that the existing community
 resources on which Even Start programs are built
 be of high quality, and by adding a requirement that
 Even Start programs be ba
 sed on the best available research on language development, reading
 instruction
 , and prevention of reading difficulties. These amendments would reflect amend
 ments made
 to other provisions of the Even Start statute in 1998 and enactment
 of the Reading Excellence Act (Title
 II, Part C of the ESEA) in that same year.

Section 122, program authorized [ESEA, 1202]. Section 122 (1) of the bill would
 amend
 section 1202(a) of the ESEA, which directs the Secretary to reserve 5 pe
 rcent of each year's Even
 Start appropriation for certain populations and areas
 . As revised, section 1201(a) (1) would emphasize
 that programs funded under th
 e 5percent reservation are meant to serve as national models; retain the
 curren
 t requirement to support projects for the children of migratory workers, Indian
 tribes and tribal
 organizations, and the outlying areas; specify that the amou
 nt reserved each year for the outlying areas
 is onehalf of one percent of the
 available funds; and permit the Secretary to fund projects that serve
 additiona
 l populations (such as homeless families, families that include children with s
 evere disabilities,
 and families that include incarcerated mothers of young chi
 ldren). The latter provision would replace
 the current requirement to award a
 grant for a program in a woman's prison when appropriations reach
 a certain lev
 el.

A new section 1202(a)(2) would require applicants under the 5percent reservation, other than the outlying areas, to demonstrate that one or more partners in the proposed project has provided highquality, effective educational services to adults or young children; and that the proposed project has substantial potential to serve as a national model for other projects to help meet the educational needs of lowincome families. These criteria will help ensure both that these projects succeed at the local level and that they have an impact beyond their local communities.

Section 122(2) of the bill would amend section 1202(b) of the ESEA, which authorizes the Secretary to reserve up to 3percent of each year's appropriation for evaluation and technical assistance. Because other provisions of the bill would provide a new authority to fund evaluations across the entire range of ESEA programs, the specific reference to evaluations would be deleted here, and the maximum setaside for technical assistance (the remaining activity under this provision) would be one percent. In addition, section 1202(b) would permit the Secretary to provide technical assistance directly, as well as through grants and contracts. Section 122(3) of the bill would amend section 1202(c) of the ESEA, which directs the Secretary to spend \$10 million each year on competitive grants for interagency coordination of statewide family literacy initiatives, to make these awards permissive rather than mandatory, and to remove the specific dollar amount that must be devoted to these awards each year. The Secretary should have the flexibility to determine the ongoing need for these awards, as well as the amount devoted to them, and whether program funds should be devoted instead to services to children and families. [Conforming amendment would be made to the Reading Excellence Act, Title IIC, which contains part of the mandate to make these awards.]

Section 122(4) and (5) would make technical and conforming amendments to section 1202(d) and (e).

Section 122(5)(A) would amend the definition of "eligible organization" in section 1202(e)(2) to permit forprofit, as well as nonprofit, organizations to qualify as providers of technical assistance under section 1202(b). The current limitation unnecessarily limits the pool of providers, excluding some who are highly qualified.

Section 123, State programs [ESEA, 1203]. Section 123(1) of the bill would redesignate

subsections (a) and (b) of section 1203 of the ESEA as subsections (b) and (c) and insert a new subsection (a) relating to State plans. New subsection (a) would require a State that wants an Even Start grant to submit a State plan to the Secretary, including certain key information specified in the bill, including the State's indicators of program quality, which the 1998 amendments require each State to develop. [(Add discussion of plan duration after language is agreed to for Title I, Part A)]□

Section 123(3) and (4) of the bill would make technical and conforming amendments to section 1203.

Section 124, uses of funds [ESEA, 1204]. Section 124 of the bill would amend section 1204(a) of the ESEA, relating to the permissible uses of Even Start funds, by replacing a reference to "familycentered education programs" with "family literacy services". "Family literacy services" is the term used elsewhere in the statute and defined in section 1202(e)(3).

Section 125, program elements [ESEA, 1205]. Section 125 of the bill would restate, in its entirety, section 1205 of the ESEA, which lists the required elements of each Even Start program. This restatement would provide helpful clarification and greater readability for some of these elements; reorder the elements in a more logical sequence; add some new elements; and move certain requirements that now apply to local applications and State award of subgrants (under sections 1207(c)(1) and 1208(a)(1)) to the list of program elements, where they more logically belong.

In particular, career counseling and jobplacement services would be added to the examples of services that can be offered as a way to accommodate participants' work schedules and other responsibilities under paragraph (3). Paragraph (4) would be revised to require that instructional programs integrate all the elements of family literacy services and use instructional approaches that, according to the best available research, will be most effective. Paragraph(5) would contain a new requirement that a majority of a program's instructional staff have obtained, or be actively working toward, certification or other credentials in a field directly related to early childhood education, adult education, or parenting education. Paragraph (6) (currently (5)) would add a new requirement that staff training be aimed at helping staff obtain certification in relevant instructional areas, as well as the necessary skills. Paragraph (8) (currently (9)) would add (to language incorporated from current 1207(c)(1)(E)(ii)) a spec

ific reference to individuals with disabilities as included among those who may be most in need of services. Paragraph(9) would clarify and consolidate, into a single element, the various statutory provisions that promote the retention of families in Even Start programs, including the requirement of current paragraph (7) to operate on a yearround basis, the requirement of current section 1208(a)(1)(C) to provide services for at least a 3year age range, and the language in current section 1207(c)(1)(E)(iii) about encouraging participating families to remain in the program for a sufficient period of time to meet their program goals.

This updated statement of program elements reflects experience and research over the past several years. It will promote better program planning and higher quality programs, with better results for participating families.

Section 126, eligible participants [ESEA, 1206]. Section 126 of the bill would amend section1206(a)(1)(B) of the ESEA to restore the eligibility of teenage parents who are attending school, but who are above the State's age for compulsory school attendance. As amended in 1994, the current statute terminates a parent's eligibility when he or she is no longer within the State's age range for compulsory school attendance, excluding many teen parents and their children who could benefit from Even Start services.

Section 127, applications [ESEA, 1207]. Section 127(a) of the bill would amend section 1207(c) of the ESEA, relating to local Even Start plans, by emphasizing the importance of continuous program improvement; requiring a local program's goals to include outcome goals for participating children and families that are consistent with the State's program indicators; emphasize that the program must address each of the program elements in the revised section 1205; and require each program to have a plan for rigorous and objective evaluation. Current subparagraphs (E) and (F) of section 1207(c)(1) would be deleted because the substance of those provisions would be addressed in the revised statement of program elements in section 1205.

Section 127(b) of the bill would delete subsection (d) of section 1207, which purports to allow an eligible entity to submit its local Even Start plan as part of an SEA's consolidated application under TitleXIV of the ESEA. This provision has had no practical effect.

Section 128, award of subgrants [ESEA, 1208]. Section 128(a)(1) of the bill would amend section 1208(a)(1) of the ESEA, relating to a State's criteria for selecting local programs for Even Start subgrants, by deleting subparagraph (C), which refers to a three-year age range for providing services, because that provision would be converted to a program element under section 1205. Section 128(a)(

1) would also make technical and clarifying amendments to section 1208(a)(1).

Section 128(a)(2) would amend section 1208(a)(3) to require a State's review panel to include

an individual with expertise in family literacy programs, to enhance the quality of the panel's review and selections. Inclusion of one or more of the types of individuals described in section 1208(a)(3)(A) ; (E) would be made optional, rather than mandatory.

Section 128(b) of the bill would add a new authority, as section 1208(c), for each State to

continue Even Start funding, for up to four years beyond the statutory 8-year limit, for not more than two projects in the State that have been highly successful and that show substantial potential to serve as models for other projects throughout the Nation and as mentor sites for other family literacy projects in the State. This would allow States and localities to learn valuable lessons from well-tested, proven programs.

Section 129, evaluation [ESEA, 1209]. Section 129 of the bill would delete paragraph (3)

from the national evaluation provisions in section 1209 of the ESEA.

That paragraph describes certain technical assistance activities that are more appropriately addressed under section 1202(b).

Section 130, program indicators [ESEA, 1210]. Section 130 of the bill would amend section

1210 of the ESEA to set a deadline of September 30, 2000 for States to develop the indicators of

program quality required by the 1998 amendments. Those

amendments did not include any deadline

for the development of those indicators.

In addition, the bill would add, to the current indicators that States

are to develop, indicators relating to the levels of intensity of services and the duration of

participating children and adults needed to reach the outcomes

the State specifies for the currently

required indicators.

Section 131, repeal and redesignation [ESEA, 1211 and 1212]. Section 131(a) of the bill

would repeal section 1211 of the ESEA, relating to research. The essential elements of this section

would be incorporated into the revised section

on evaluations (1209). Section 131(b) of the bill

would redesignate section 12
12 of the ESEA as section 1211.

* * * * *

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 15:37:44.00

SUBJECT: One change to Ed Flex SAP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Broderick Johnson/Scott Fleming asked that we make the following change to the SAP for S. 280, ed-flex bill. Barbara Chow is okay with this change. If all of you approve, I can release the SAP immediately. The bill is on the Senate floor now. Thank you.

S. 280 - Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999
(Sen. Frist (R) TN and 41 cosponsors)

The Administration has long supported the concept of expanding ed-flex demonstration authority to permit all States to waive certain statutory and regulatory requirements of Federal education programs in a manner that will promote high standards and accountability for results, coupled with increased flexibility for States and local school districts to achieve those results. The Administration will support S. 280 as long as the bill's accountability provisions are strengthened to ensure that State waivers of Federal requirements enhance children's educational achievement supports amendments designed to: 1) ensure that State waivers of Federal requirements result in improved student achievement; and 2) enhance parental involvement.

In order to ensure consistency between ed-flex authority and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which will be undergoing reauthorization this year, the Administration urges Congress to sunset this legislation upon enactment of the ESEA.

The Administration strongly supports an amendment that is expected to be

offered to S. 280 that would implement the President's proposal for a long-term extension of the one-year authority to help school districts reduce class size in the early grades, which the Congress approved last year on a bipartisan basis. In order to hire qualified teachers, arrange for additional classrooms, and take other steps that are necessary to reduce class size, school districts need to know, as soon as possible, that the Congress intends to support this initiative for more than one year.

* * * * *

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 15:43:39.00

SUBJECT: Class Size Mtg w/ ED Organizations

TO: Susan_Frost (Susan_Frost @ ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/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: Mike_Cohen (Mike_Cohen @ ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

CC: Daniel_bernal (Daniel_bernal @ ed.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

The class size meeting is at 9:30 am in room 476, OEOB.

Attendees:

Council of Great City Schools - Mike Casserly, Jeff Simmering
Chief State School Officers - Gordon Ambach
NEA - Mary Elizabeth Teasley, Joel Packer
AFT - Jane Meromey
PTA - Mary Beth Oakes, Carolyn Henrich
La Raza - Roberto Rodriguez

Waiting for Confirmation from:

Amer Assoc of School Administrators - Bruce Hunter
National School Boards - Mike Resnick
Suzanne Bergeron - Urban League

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-1999 15:48:29.00

SUBJECT: More news on Hutchison amendment

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

CC: J. Eric Gould (CN=J. Eric Gould/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP on 03/03/99
03:49 PM -----

J. Eric Gould 03/03/99 03:30:51 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
cc:
Subject: Hutchison amendment

Spoke to Ann Ford and they are working the issue pretty hard. They are having state public health people call Approps. members.

Hutchison is still planning on offering the amend. with no offsets / she thinks that CBO's estimate is wrong. Some Reps. are unhappy with this approach and believe it will undermine their efforts in the long run.

Bryant had told folks that Graham was objecting to Hutchison bringing up the bill in this context.

Roth was weighing in on Stevens to get him to oppose the Amendment.

Harkin is taking the lead for the Dems. Lautenberg will assist Harkin.

Govs. are making calls to Committee members to support the amendment.

HEALTH

A. PATIENTS BILL OF RIGHTS

I. Legislative status. There is early momentum in both houses for a strong bill.. The House is clearly the most encouraging, and seems to be the best place to design a compromise for the short-term. Congressman Dingell has reintroduced his bill from last year and believes he can attract as many as 210 cosponsors. Congressman Ganske has also introduced a modified version of the Dingell bill which slightly alters the enforcement provision by dropping the punitive damages section. By any definition, however, it remains a very strong bill. It remains unclear whether the best strategy is to advocate for a normal committee markup or to encourage these two members to file a discharge petition to bypass this process. For the short term, Mr. Dingell will opt for the traditional Commerce Committee markup approach, reserving the right to utilize a discharge petition if that process gets bogged down. The goal is to have passed legislation that will be both strong and bipartisan by the August recess.

II. Presidential Actions. The President could do a bipartisan event to highlight the fact there are Republicans and Democrats that have proposed strong and comprehensive legislation for a Patients Bill of Rights, rather than the piecemeal approach. We will continue to work with advocacy groups, such as the breast cancer community and physician associations, to gather their support for a comprehensive bill. In addition, the Vice President could join the Democrats when they unveil the Dingell Kennedy bill.

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. It is unclear how Speaker Hastert is going to work to ensure that the bill does not move too quickly and undermine the weak Republican caucus position from last year. We believe that he will want to have a bipartisan bill at some point, but we also believe that he wants to avoid a significant enforcement provision being included in any final bill.

B. LONG TERM CARE

I. Legislative status. On 1/19/99, Senator Daschle introduced the Health Protection and Assistance for Older Americans Act. This bill includes a number of provisions of our long term care initiative, including the \$1000 tax credit, the National Family Caregivers Program, and the OPM program, as well as all three of our Medicare buy-in provisions. Although we are working to expand the list of co-sponsors, this may be difficult, since Daschle included the Medicare buy-in as component of this legislation. We should also review options for Democratic sponsorship in the house; perhaps Congressman Cardin or Levin; Congressman Stark has already indicated interest. There is a hearing scheduled on the FEHBP long term care insurance proposal scheduled for March 18th. The Republicans are planning to invite representatives of the insurance industry, who are expected to oppose this part of our long term care initiative.

II. Presidential Actions. **The President has asked the Vice President to host a series of forums around the country to highlight this issue, which he will continue to do. There may be some opportunities to highlight this proposal as it moves through the legislative process.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. There is a fair amount of bipartisan support for this legislation. We are working with to determine which Republicans serving on House committees of jurisdiction are likely sponsors and develop an outreach strategy to sign them up.

C. DISABILITY

I. Legislative status. **One issue that is gaining a great deal of bipartisan support, particularly in the Senate, is the Jeffords-Kennedy-Roth-Moynihan Work Incentives Improvement Act. The Senate has already held hearings on this legislation and is planning a March 4 markup. Senator Roth has asked that members refrain from amending the legislation in order to ensure its swift progress through the committees of jurisdiction.** Although there has been no companion bill introduced in the House, Congresswoman Johnson and Congressman Lazio are likely sponsors. Interest among Democrats is high. Since Congressman Waxman has had a long involvement in this issue, he is a likely sponsor as well. We are still looking for sponsors for the tax credit and the assistive technology pieces of the initiative.

II. Presidential Actions. **The President and Vice President could issue statements, hold an event with supportive members of Congress, or host another Task Force meeting to continue to highlight this proposal as it moves through the legislative process. This policy can also be highlighted at the White House Conference on Mental Health.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **This is one issue that has a great deal of bipartisan support. We should continue to highlight the bipartisan interest in this legislation to assure that we get a bill passed this year.**

D. ASSURING ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Improving Access to Health Care Services for Working Americans. This initiative invests \$1 billion over 5 years in comprehensive health care delivery systems that traditionally provide services to the uninsured. The proposal responds to the growing challenges the nation's health care infrastructure faces with the increasing number of uninsured and limits on public sector provider payments.

I. Legislative status. HHS is currently working with the Appropriations Committees to secure funding for this initiative.

II. Presidential Actions. We should include this initiative on the tobacco recoupment menu.

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. This proposal bears some similarity to a number of Republican proposals floated during health care reform. Republicans are generally supportive of this policy, although States could be opposed since the money is not being directed by them.

Health Options for Older Americans. This new initiative expands the health options available for older Americans by: enabling Americans aged 62 to 65 to buy into Medicare, by paying a full premium; providing vulnerable displaced workers ages 55 and older access to Medicare by offering those who have involuntarily lost their jobs and their health care coverage a similar Medicare buy-in option; providing Americans ages 55 and older whose companies reneged on their commitment to provide retiree health benefits a new health option, by extending "COBRA" continuation coverage until age 65. The President's proposal is fully funded and does not burden the Medicare Program.

I. Legislative status. On 1/19/99, Senator Daschle introduced the Health Protection and Assistance for Older Americans Act, which includes our Medicare buy-in proposals. This legislation is considered to be part of the top 10 Democratic priorities. This policy has been raised in the context of the Medicare Commission, and has the support of most of the Democrats.

II. Presidential Actions. We should use the President, Vice President, and First Lady to amplify our message on this issue, given recent trends that show there is an even greater problem in this age group since last year.

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. Most Republicans oppose this proposal, since it is viewed as a Medicare expansion.

Encouraging Small Businesses to Offer Health Insurance. This new initiative encourages small businesses to offer health insurance to their employees through: a new tax credit for small businesses who decide to offer coverage by joining coalitions; encouraging private foundations to support coalitions by allowing their contributions towards these organizations to be tax exempt; offering technical assistance to small business coalitions from the Office of Personnel Management.

I. Legislative status. **Although we currently have no sponsors, there is bipartisan interest in this proposal as well as business interest.**

II. Presidential Actions. We should amplify this in speeches on the broader coverage agenda, but the proposal is not large enough to be highlighted on its own. **We should also continue to reach out to the business community in order to obtain their support.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. This policy is generally supported by the Republicans, because it is a tax credit. It is important to note that the Republican version of the Patients Bill of Rights that the House introduced last year included a

significantly flawed version of this proposal.

Improving Access to Health Insurance through Medicaid and CHIP. The budget increases access to health insurance by restoring Medicaid and CHIP eligibility for legal immigrants affected by welfare reform; extending Medicaid eligibility to foster children up to age 21; improving transitional Medicaid for people moving from welfare to work; and providing states with \$1.2 billion over 5 years for children's health outreach activities. The budget also provides \$144 million over five years for increased CHIP funding for Puerto Rico and the territories.

I. Legislative status. This policy will be linked to unpopular Medicaid savings, but could get passed, since the policies are generally attractive to States.

II. Presidential Actions. We should use the President, Vice President, and First Lady to amplify our message in this area. In addition, we are issuing guidance to States to encourage them to conduct outreach to families leaving the TANF program who are still eligible for Medicaid.

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. Republicans are generally supportive of this policy, but for the wrong reasons. They think that it could open up CHIP for purposes of providing coverage to adults. Congressional Democrats generally do not like this policy for the same reasons. We intend to work with Congressional Democrats to find a more acceptable policy that costs the same amount.

E. PUBLIC HEALTH

Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Grants and CBC proposal. The budget provides \$1.5 billion for Ryan White, a 7 percent increase over 1999 funding levels. The budget also proposes an additional \$50 million to address HIV and AIDS issues in minority communities.

I. Legislative status. **We are working with the appropriators and the Congressional Black Caucus to assure that there is sufficient funding through the budget process for AIDS treatment. It is likely that this will receive increases through the process. We will work closely with the advocacy community to assure that both of these initiatives get sufficient attention.**

II. Presidential Actions. **The President, Vice President or First Lady could highlight this initiative at events and remarks on health care, on its own and in conjunction with the race and health initiative.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **Republicans tend to be supportive of Ryan White. It is unclear, however, whether they will support the CBC efforts.**

Mental Health Block Grants. The budget provides \$359 million, a 24 percent increase over 1999 and the largest increase ever.

I. Legislative status. We are working with members of the Appropriations Committee to ensure funding for these programs.

II. Presidential Actions. **These programs will be highlighted at the White House Mental Health Conference this June with the President, First Lady, Vice President and Mrs. Gore. The Surgeon General's report on Mental Health is also scheduled to be released this fall which will provide another opportunity to advocate Congress increase this program.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **Last year, the Congress put in more dollars in this area than we proposed. If we can work with the Republicans throughout the year on mental health, they may well support our proposed increase.**

Race and Health Initiative. The budget includes \$145 million for health education, prevention, and treatment services for minority populations.

I. Legislative status. **We are working with the appropriators as well as advocacy groups to assure that the Congress funds a strong initiative in this area.**

II. Presidential Actions. **Given the recent news about continuing disparities, we should contemplate ways for the President or Vice President to highlight the need for this initiative through reports, grants, or other administrative actions we could take to narrow these disparities.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **The Republicans were not particularly responsive to this initiative last year and wanted all of the increases to go into Community Health Centers. We will need to work closely with the groups to assure funding for this initiative.**

F. BIOTECHNOLOGY

Genetic Discrimination. This policy prevents health insurers and employers from discriminating on the basis of genetic information.

I. Legislative Status. **This legislation prevents employers and health insurers from discriminating on the basis of genetic information. There is some bipartisan interest on this issue as well, mostly on the health insurance side. Senator Daschle, together with Senator Kennedy, is introducing his bill next week.**

II. Presidential Actions. The President could issue an executive order prohibiting discrimination against employees based on predictive genetic information or information about a request for the receipt of genetic services. We will continue to work with the

advocates, including members of the breast cancer community, to secure their support for this action.

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **The Republicans have proposed legislation addressing genetic discrimination for health insurance in their Patients' Bill of Rights legislation. It is possible that we can continue to work with them in this process.**

Privacy of Medical Records. This proposal provides comprehensive privacy protections to protect the confidentiality of medical records.

I. Presidential Actions. **We could hold a bipartisan event with either the President or the Vice President to highlight the need for Congress to pass strong privacy legislation and the fact that HIPAA has already provided us with the authority to establish privacy protections for electronic medical records. Assuming Congress does not pass legislation by this fall, the President could also issue an executive action on electronic claims in late fall to implement the actions these HIPAA afforded us. We will also continue to work with the advocacy groups, including the mental health and AIDS communities to garner their support and to publicly validate that strong privacy legislation is necessary to protect individuals' civil rights. It is important to note that we have yet to reach final agreement on our position on the application of these privacy protections with regard to law enforcement. This issue is extremely controversial and will probably attract attention as this issue heats up.**

II. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **There are some Republican efforts to pass privacy legislation, but to date most have been wholly unacceptable. In fact, last year, the Republicans included privacy protections in their patients' bill of rights that undermined current state protections without putting anything in their place. There may be more desire to work in a bipartisan manner this year as the date, but we should certainly highlight any major efforts to undermine current protections.**

Medicare Cancer Clinical Trials. The budget provides \$750 million over four years for a demonstration to give more Americans access to cutting-edge cancer treatments.

I. Legislative status. **Senators Rockefeller and Mack are planning to introduce their bill quite soon. We should contemplate how to move this in the context of any broader Medicare reforms.**

II. Presidential Actions. **The President, the Vice President, or the First Lady could highlight this effort in the context of broader cancer events, such as breast cancer awareness month.**

III. Relationship to Republican agenda and priorities. **This proposal has bipartisan**

support. However, it is unclear if it will move in this Congress.