

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 070 - FOLDER -006

[12/02/1997-12/03/1997]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Email to Sandra Thurman et al from Cathy Mays. Subject: Holiday Party (2 pages)	12/03/1997	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/02/1997 - 12/03/1997]

2009-1006-F

jm46

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 15:20:41.00

SUBJECT: December Message Calendar Update

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

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

TO: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/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: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/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: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/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: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

12/3 Race Town Hall (Akron)
Fundraisers (Chicago)

12/4 Pageant of Peace Lighting of Christmas Tree

12/5 USEU Summit (WH)
Tape Radio Address - OPEN Message

12/8 Congressional Meeting w/ Gingrich
(Coverdell postponed until January)
Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus Meeting confirmed

12/9 Human Rights Reception (NYC)

12/10 Economic Revitalization Event (Bronx, NY)

12/11 OPEN for Message Event (Miami) *Possibly Social Security related.

12/12 Asian Pacific Outreach Meeting

12/13 Live Radio Address - OPEN

12/15 Irish PM Visit

12/16 Medals of Science and Technology

12/17 Congressional Mtg w/ Daschle and Gephardt - Democratic Unity
Message
Minority Farmers Meeting

12/18 Children's Holiday Event

12/19 Malcolm Baldrige Quality Awards - OPEN Message
Tape Radio Address - OPEN

12/26 Tape Radio Address - OPEN (Holiday Message)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 15:32:02.00

SUBJECT: Cabinet memo 12-2-97

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

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

TO: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/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: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/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: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/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: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

AGRICULTURE

Today - the Secretary is in Argentina

AIDS

Today -Director Sandy Thurman is in NYC taping Montel Williams show on women and AIDS

ONDCP

Today - the Director is coordinating HIDTA (High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas) Conference
Tomorrow - News Conference on Threats and Strategies of High Intensity Drug Areas

EDUCATION

Today - the Secretary makes remarks at Internet Summit in CT; Roundtable discussion at middle school

EPA

Today - the Administrator speaks at Annual Superfund conference

HHS

Today - nothing public

HUD

Today - the Secretary attends roundtable discussion on increasing fair housing

INTERIOR

Today - nothing public

JUSTICE

Today - the AG attends online Internet Summit

OMB

Today - nothing public

OPM

Today - nothing public

SBA

Today - nothing public

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 16:59:18.00

SUBJECT: INS Meeting

TO: Jeffrey P. Morales (CN=Jeffrey P. Morales/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/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: Charles F. Ruff (CN=Charles F. Ruff/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

INS Restructuring Meeting

This Meeting will be held Thursday Dec 4, at 2:00 PM in room 180 of the Old Executive Office Building.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 17:27:13.00

SUBJECT: SSA report

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

SSA has shared with us their draft report on children's SSI -- the 30-day top to bottom review that Ken promised. I am looking at it closely with OMB and a guy from Sylvia's office (Nelson Reyneri, who comes to all our meetings on this). The content looks reasonable to us, but it is not written as clearly as it might be. So we are asking questions and giving them suggestions. I don't think we'll need another meeting with Ken and us on this, but I'm not sure of that yet.

Ken Apfel wants to release it at the end of the week because he plans to go to California next week, but I'm not sure that timetable is realistic.

Sylvia's person says she wants to give the President an information/summary note on this right before it's released, so I plan to write that tomorrow. I'll send it to you. Supposedly Sylvia has also made the legitimate point that it would be preferable not to release this immediately before the holidays.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 18:00:17.00

SUBJECT: Corporation for Natl Service thinking of MLK Day service for the President

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

TEXT:

I will do the weekly item you asked for on service and race. FYI, attached is what John Gomperts/the Corporation are thinking so far about a specific proposal for the President to serve on MLK Day. If we hate it, we should let them know asap, but it sounds pretty good to me. I will include this idea in the weekly as a possibility unless you would rather I didn't.

(FYI, I happened to get a copy of Harris Wofford's memo to the President on the race town hall. I understand you have a copy. He also attached the US News/Steve Waldman column that caught your eye.)

It would be a literacy-oriented project, likely connected with DC Reads and the work-study stuff that is going on with the DC area colleges. We are scheming on a project in which K-3 students would be invited with their parents and/or tutors. Along with the people who are serving, the kids would build (more like put together) and then decorate a small bookshelf. The kids would then be able to take the bookcase home with them. And they would receive 5 - 10 books to start their collection. In addition, there will be reading stations and possibly other activities.

We have great partners such as First Book and the United Way and other organizations. The project will involve AmeriCorps, seniors, service-learning and work-study -- a real streams of service kind of deal.

We are looking at locations, and looking specifically for a location that would be suitable for the President and/or other White House principals.

We think the event can be very visual and also be right on message, bringing together a variety of initiatives of the president. We very much want the President, and other principals to participate.

If you (or other folks) have an immediate negative reaction to this proposal, let me know. Our top goal is to have the President participate and we can be flexible and creative in coming up with the right project.

Race Initiative

1. I have been working with the Town Hall people (Ann Lewis and Minyon heading the effort) on questions for the President and the moderator to use in Akron.
2. Also today, Tanya and I met with folks from the PIR and Bob Shireman to discuss the agenda for the December 17th Board Meeting. The topic is K-12 education. The proposed themes of the day are equity and excellence in primary and secondary education. They envision a more chatty format, with panelists taking questions from the audience and the Board. The proposed panelists include education experts (those who have promoted various models of school reform), students, parents and teachers from urban, suburban and rural school districts. These panelists would be expected to discuss the varying experiences of public education and the challenges that still exist (racial isolation; low expectations; etc.). Though they would take questions from the audience, they talked of scripting some questions or at least getting submissions from the group, and screening for interesting and relevant ones.

They envision the second session as including a discussion of "promising practices" -- programs where schools or school districts have been successful in overcoming racial divides (in resources; expectations; racial segregation; etc.) This panel would include people who are involved in programs that bridge racial divides and education experts with different views on how best to achieve equality of opportunity for kids.

This is all still very rough, but we are hoping to seem more concrete stuff (including names of potential panelists) over the next several days.

3. I met today with John Goering (PIR) and Lisa Ross (DOL) re: the January 13th Board meeting on employment. It is in its very early formative stages.

Immigration

1. We (NSC, WHC, Maria) had a meeting with the INS and Justice this afternoon re: the implementation of the suspension of deportation provisions of the new law as applied to Guatemalans, Salvadorans and Eastern Europeans covered by the new law. The advocacy groups have asked (1) for a regulation that provides for a presumption of "extreme hardship" for all central Americans covered by the legislation; (2) an additional provision that provides for a presumption of "good moral character" for the same group; and (3) that the process be handled by asylum officers (w/in INS; an administrative process) rather than immigration judges (EOIR). The INS and DOJ are very opposed to doing a reg., but have proposed a new administrative scheme that would permit asylum officers to determine suspension of deportation claims. This would expedite the process for applicants, be cheaper (no lawyers), but would still allow immigration review (de novo) if the applicant is denied by the asylum officer. It also seems to make sense because the ABC class members (who make up the bulk of those covered by the legislation) are entitled to an asylum adjudication anyway, and the suspension process could be incorporated into that proceeding. The INS is going to give us an outline of their proposal,

which will include an explanation of how different groups covered by the legislation (i.e., those who have been through the asylum process already; those who have dates scheduled before EOIR, those not in the system, etc.) would be affected by this administrative change. We should have that by the end of the week.

2. Last Wednesday, Steve Mertens from OMB let us know that he was including a reform proposal in his passback to INS. Though INS had seen an earlier version of OMB's thinking a couple of weeks ago, we were concerned that INS not think that the OMB proposal was any kind of benchmark for our review, or that it in any way had the imprimatur of the EOP. We voiced these concerns to Mertens at that time. According to Scott Busby at NSC, Commissioner Meissner was displeased that OMB included a reform proposal in their passback, outside of the DPC process, and without further consultation with them. We spoke with Mertens today, and he informed us that Commissioner Meissner had informed the DOJ that it is inappropriate for them to comment on the OMB proposal while the DPC review is happening.

3. Leanne and I have one more INS reform meeting to go. On Thursday, we are meeting with the second group of advocates (arranged by Maria) to talk about services (the other was on enforcement). By the end of the week, we will have a summary for you on the meetings that we have had. Our next step, we think, is a White House meeting on the reform (trying to get a sense of where people are internally) where we would also discuss how much we think we need to have done by the middle to end of December (thinking about whether we want something to be part of the President's budget proposal). We would next want to meet with INS on their own, to discuss options. DOJ has told us that the sooner we can make some broad decisions (whether the restructure within INS, within DOJ, pull some functions out, etc.) the better they would be able to tailor the Booze Allen (management consultants) review that they are about to start.

4. You had asked me to follow up on a letter that we received from the Carnegie Endowment re: employment verification pilot programs administered by the INS. Carnegie, et al was concerned about whether these pilots were being conducted with the appropriate concern for civil rights and privacy. I spoke with Bob Bach who informed me that INS has a RFP out to get bids on performing the evaluative function of the pilots. They will have chosen a winner by early Winter, with the hope of having the evaluation begin by March or April. The groups are concerned that pilots are running now without evaluation. However, according to Bob, only one pilot (of 5) is operating now, and they are moving with the evaluation process as fast as they can.

Bob has not been able to give the groups any more information on this effort, for fear of creating the appearance of impropriety in the bidding (i.e., the same groups that are asking for information on the process are bidding in response to the RFP; thus, if he gives too much information to one group on how they want the evaluations to be structured, they could be opening themselves up to a challenge on the fairness of their process)

5. As far as I know, we have not reached closure on the Haitian issue. Is there something else I should know or should be doing?

6. Leanne has been following up with Alan Erenbach re: battered women and 245(i).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 19:36:43.00

SUBJECT: Food Safety Budgets

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is what I was able to learn about the FDA and USDA food safety passbacks. USDA and HHS together asked for a \$170M increase over the FY98 food safety level -- \$61M for USDA and \$109M for HHS. USDA received about half of its request in its passback. FDA received none in its passback. The reason for this disparity is the different situations the two PADs, TJ and Josh, were in. Josh, overall, had to dig himself out of an almost \$2B hole just to reach last year's level of spending, and then food safety had to compete against some heavyweight programs including NIH, CDC, and Ryan White. TJ had the flexibility to increase USDA's budget.

As you may know, the situation changes when the food safety budget is sent to Congress. At the White House, USDA and FDA compete for funds from different allocations. In Congress, USDA and FDA are in the same allocation -- the agriculture appropriations subcommittees. OMB, however, does expect the disparity will be straightened out before the budget is sent to the Hill through the Presidential priorities process.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 21:45:40.00

SUBJECT: A few thoughts on today's child care meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Oh what fun I have been missing! That meeting made the TANF reg look easy.... A few thoughts to follow on all your real work:

Welfare vs Working Poor Families

I was a bit puzzled, as I think you were, by the dicotomy some were drawing between "welfare families" and "low-income working families." First, welfare families who need child care are working families (or they are at least preparing for work). Second, many low income women cycle on and off of welfare, using welfare as a form of unemployment insurance -- there is no bright line between the populations.

I think the key questions we should ask ourselves are: Do we want states to treat two mothers making \$12,000 a year differently because one used to be on welfare and one did not? I think we do not -- we want to encourage states to develop seamless child care systems that focus on incomes, not categories. In that case, what is the best way to encourage states to develop seamless systems? I think it is not by setting benchmarks or other rules which encourage the new funds to be used for the not-formerly-on-welfare working poor to counterbalance current practice of focusing dollars on former welfare recipients. I think it is by providing funds for states to raise their eligibility criteria to include more low-income families.

We do not need new targetting of the block grant in order to have a proposal which helps moderate income working families. Even without new targetting, we can talk about any expansion of the child care and development block grant as "child care for hard working minimum wage families" or "low income families making less than \$24,000 a year" and we can describe the tax credits as help for the "middle class families earning between \$24,000 and \$59,000."

So count me as a vote against benchmarking!

Stay at Home Parents

Regarding stay-at-home parents, I will admit I am completely unschooled in this issue. I do think we will be able to argue that we are helping stay-at-home parents through the \$500 per child tax credit. I do also think, as I think you do, that an additional proposal here would be very helpful.

I think such a proposal should focus on parents who stay home for more than 6-24 weeks. Thus, I would like to see something like the demonstration project idea, which would provide funds to community and religious groups (including the latter would be helpful) who provide support and assistance to stay-at-home parents, by offering parenting classes or hotlines, play groups, two hour "relief" or "emergency" child care, or which distribute materials to new parents (I thought Barry's idea of promoting connections to WIC was promising).

In fact maybe the quality fund should have two parts 1) to promote Smart Start-like local efforts to improve the quality of formal child care and 2) to promote local efforts to assist stay-at-home parents. This would allow local organizations to provide culturally-sensitive programs for parents of particularly ethnicities, which the Hispanic caucus encouraged us to do. In fact, in my in-box is the new issue of Univ of Wisconsin Institute on Poverty magazine which highlights an evaluation of a program called Avance that has worked with low-income Hispanic infants and their families in San Antonio since 1973 which has the explicit goal of "helping mothers become better teachers of their children." The evaluation found "positive and significant differences between participant and control mothers on three measures of teaching effectiveness." I can fax you a copy if you like (it's only one page).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-DEC-1997 22:29:37.00

SUBJECT: Raines child support idea

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

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

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

TEXT:

Wednesday I will write you a more comprehensive note about child support enforcement.... but I can't leave tonight without telling you that apparently, as part of a directors review, Frank Raines brainstormed his way to an idea of how to completely revamp the financial structure of the child support system, and OMB wants to put this on the table for the budget discussions. Before you get too jazzed, Elena, he does not want to hand over responsibility to the IRS!

Below is a quick summary... They view this as a possible saver in the budget (although why we would want to be seen as cutting funding for child support enforcement, I don't know). Process-wise, I think it's critical that we have an OMB-DPC discussion before this becomes part of the larger budget discussion. HHS doesn't know any of this yet, but OMB wants to tell them they're adding it to the list for consideration.

Current Structure

There are three basic parts to the current financial structure:

- 1) The federal government reimburses states for 66 percent of their child support expenditures, with an enhanced match for certain expenses.
- 2) The federal government gives states incentive payments based on performance. We have a proposal with bipartisan support on the Hill now which would revise the measures on which performance is based.
- 3) At the same time as the federal government pays states funds for child support, it collects from states a share of child support collections from AFDC families -- under the theory that the federal government helped (through AFDC, and now TANF) to support these families when the absent parent would not, and should therefore obtain a share of the support later collected from that absent parent. Overall, the federal government gives states about \$1 billion more a year in child support funds than it obtains in collections.

Proposed Structure

Raines' idea is to provide states with a block grant, and require them to

maintain their current spending in exchange for being able to keep all the collections from welfare families. In addition, the feds would distribute incentive funds based on performance. The block grant amount would be set so that overall, the federal government saves money compared to current spending. Keith Fontenot says that even though this would provide states with less money to collect child support, they could easily make up the difference by add a fee to the child support collected from non-custodial parents of non-welfare families.

It seems to me that this could get us into an enormous pissing match with states just when we're trying to threaten, prod, and cajole them into focusing on getting their state-wide computer systems up and running and implementing the new child support rules we enacted last year. Even if we make the new structure revenue neutral at the national level, it will not be revenue neutral at the state level, since a block grant will hurt states incurring large new expenses and help those that already invested, say, in computer systems.

**Crime Meeting Agenda
December 3, 1997**

Possible 12/6 Radio Address

- * Final FY 98 Crime/Drug appropriations
- * Prisoner Drug Testing/Intervention Directive
- * G.R.E.A.T. Report

Outstanding Events/Issues

- * Possible 12/11 release in Miami of Coast Guard and Customs interdictions #s
- * Possible 12/5 Minnesota speech for AG
- * Possible 12/11 signing in Miami of Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative agreement with release of Handgun Control ad
- * Update from Justice on # of gang prosecutions at federal level/feds assisting states

Miscellaneous/ Pending Items

- * Any other pending events/releases--DOJ Reports
- * NIJ Studies-- Homicide study, others
- * Cop Killer Bullets study
- * Modified Assault Weapons

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason S. Goldberg (CN=Jason S. Goldberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 09:52:32.00

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

CC: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

Erskine would like to do a tobacco meeting tomorrow.

Could you please let me know who should be involved.

Cathy: Please work with Carole Parmelee on an appropriate time.

Thanks.

Jason

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 09:58:58.00

SUBJECT: COS SCHEDULING MEETING TODAY

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

TO: Christa Robinson (CN=Christa Robinson/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:

FYI

----- Forwarded by Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP on 12/03/97
09:58 AM -----

Jason S. Goldberg
12/03/97 09:54:16 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: COS SCHEDULING MEETING TODAY

There will be a COS Scheduling Meeting at 3:00 p.m. TODAY in Erskine's office.

Sorry for the late notice.

Message Sent

To:

Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP
Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP
Craig T. Smith/WHO/EOP
Christopher J. Lavery/WHO/EOP
KERRICK_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP
John Podesta/WHO/EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
Victoria Radd/WHO/EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
SPERLING_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
MCHUGH_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Michael D. McCurry/WHO/EOP

Stephanie S. Streett/WHO/EOP
Nancy V. Hernreich/WHO/EOP
John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP
Cheryl M. Carter/WHO/EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP
Ron Klain/OVP @ OVP
Debbie B Bengtson/OVP @ OVP
MILLISON_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Kimberly H Tilley/OVP @ OVP
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP
Raymond E. Donnelly III/WHO/EOP
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP
Jeffrey A. Forbes/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP
Laura K. Capps/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP
Dan K. Rosenthal/WHO/EOP
Patricia Solis-Doyle/WHO/EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP
Paul E. Begala/WHO/EOP
Eleanor S. Parker/WHO/EOP
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
Ansley Jones/OVP @ OVP
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP
Carolyn E. Cleveland/WHO/EOP
Jonathan H. Adashek/WHO/EOP
Virginia Apuzzo/WHO/EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP

November 5, 1997

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

MEMORANDUM FOR ERSKINE BOWLES

FROM: KAREN A. TRAMONTANO
SUBJECT: UNIFORMED DIVISION SECRET SERVICE
CC: JOHN D. PODESTA
SYLVIA MATTHEWS

I. ISSUE

The issue is whether the non-managerial employees of the Uniformed Division of the Secret Service (herein UD) should be afforded the statutory protections of 5 USC 7101 et. seq--specifically, the right to engage in collective bargaining.

II. BACKGROUND

This issue is not a new one: Jack Quinn in a December 1996 memo to the President addressed this matter and concluded that there was no national security reason to exclude the UD from participating in collective bargaining. No action had been taken on Quinn's memo until you convened a meeting of all interested parties last month to discuss this matter.

As a result of that meeting, Ed Knight, General Counsel Treasury submitted a memorandum to you outlining the Agency's position which is opposed to allowing the UD officers to engage in collective bargaining. I have discussed this issue with Counsel's office, the DPC, the Treasury Department and the Uniformed Division. A memorandum was due to you by October 23. As a result of the Amtrak negotiations which lasted two weeks, this memorandum is two weeks late. I have spoken with the FOP and taken the weight for the time delay.

The memo outlines my recommendation which is to identify the universe of UD employees who are not engaged in national security work and to modify the Executive Order to address Treasury's concerns regarding management rights and access to information.

III. ANALYSIS

Although a decision on this issue will not be made exclusively on statutory interpretation it is important to lay out the framework for analysis.

Section 7103(b)(1) of the Statute permits the President to exclude any agency or subdivision from coverage of the Statute if he determines that the organization's "primary function is intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or national security work, **and that the provisions of [the Statute] cannot be applied to that agency or subdivision in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations.**"

President Carter, in issuing Executive Order 12171, excluded the Uniformed Division of the Secret Services presumably because the organization's primary function is national security work, and the provisions of the Statute could not be applied consistent with national security requirements.

In reviewing President Carter's determination we must review two points:

1. whether the Uniformed Division of the Secret Service's primary function is "national security work"; and
2. whether the Statute can be applied to afford employees the right to collective bargaining in a manner that is consistent with national security requirements.

In answering the second question, we must resolve whether individual employees are engaged in security work under section 7112(b)(6). By making this assessment, we will also determine whether the Statute can be applied in a manner consistent with national security requirements.

IV. IS THE ORGANIZATION (UNIFORMED DIVISION) PRIMARILY ENGAGED IN NATIONAL SECURITY WORK?

The controlling legal opinion on this is Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations, 4 FLRA 744 (1980). The Authority in that opinion provided the following advice on this matter:

Neither 'security work', 'directly affects,' nor 'national security' is defined in the Statute. One ordinary definition of 'security work' is a task, duty, function, or activity related to securing, guarding, shielding, protection, or preserving something--in this case the President and Vice-President. 'Security work' would also include the design, analysis, or monitoring of security systems and procedures.

Although there is a question as to whether every UD employee is engaged in the type of national security work that would exclude them from coverage under the collective bargaining statute, I believe it is reasonable to conclude that this first test has been made and conclude that the organization's primary function is "security work." Having answered this first question affirmatively, we now must determine whether the statute can be applied in a manner that is consistent with national security.

II. CAN THE STATUTE BE APPLIED TO THE AGENCY IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND CONSIDERATIONS?

The following principles should be applied when answering this question: First, exclusion from collective bargaining deprives employees of the opportunity under the Statute to determine whether or not they wish to be represented by a labor organization. Second, exclusion also deprives them of the opportunity to engage in collective bargaining with respect to conditions of employment through labor organizations. Third, this Administration leans heavily in favor of collective bargaining.

Labor organizations and collective bargaining have been determined by Congress [and the President] to be “in the public interest.” 5 USC Section 7101(a). Accordingly, the term “national security” must be interpreted to include only those sensitive activities of the government that are directly related to the protection and preservation of the military, economic and productive strength of the United States, including the security of the Government in domestic and foreign affairs, against or from espionage, sabotage, subversion, foreign aggression and any other illegal actions which adversely affect the national defense. *Id.* @ 755-756

After listing the tasks that members of the Uniformed Division engage in the Treasury Department concluded that “the language of section 7112(b)(6) clearly applies to each member of the Uniformed Division.” See, Knight memo to EBB. Treasury did not define security work “to include only those sensitive activities of the government that are directly related to the protection and preservation of the military, economic and productive strength.” Instead, the list of activities seemed to cut broadly through what appears to be national security work without applying the statutory test to the work performed or without indicating which employees, if any, are performing the work. As a result, Treasury’s memorandum did not address fully whether the Statute could be applied consistent with national security requirements.

To fully address whether the statute can be applied in this context, Treasury should make a direct connection between the work performed by the officer/officers and the national security requirements and/or considerations.

Moreover, Treasury outlines two other concerns it has regarding the statutes application: management’s right to assign, reassign and schedule and withhold information. Under the current statute, management continues to retain the right to assign, reassign and schedule. It is unclear to me what impact Treasury believes collective bargaining would have on this unfettered management right.

However, to address Treasury’s issues we could also deem assignments, reassignments and scheduling to be non-negotiable under a modified Executive Order. Finally, Treasury’s concern that bargaining would compel the release of significant information that would jeopardize national security can be addressed in a similar manner.

VI. CONCLUSION

In addition to discussing this with a number of interested parties: Treasury, Domestic Policy Counsel, Counsel's Office and the Office of the Chief of Staff, prior to my work on this issue, other agencies were consulted to determine whether they would be concerned if the Executive Order were modified to afford the UD collective bargaining rights. No other agency, outside of Treasury, expressed any concern about this issue.

It is clear, however, that Treasury has deep reservations and does not want to afford collective bargaining rights to the members of the uniformed division. As a result, although I disagree with the conclusion Treasury reached unless the Treasury is committed to making the policy work, the operations of the Uniformed Division may be disrupted not because the collective bargaining statute has been applied to the Agency but because the Agency has serious concerns about this issue. Assuming this issue is addressed, my recommendation is outlined below:

1. *Ask Treasury to determine which employees, branches, divisions etc. are not engaged in security work and can be covered by the Statute;*
2. *Based on Treasury's findings limit the universe of uniformed division employees that will be covered by the Statute; and*
3. *Modify the Executive Order to limit the scope of bargaining so that the "affects" test is applied to the exercise of management rights rather than the "directly interferes with" test;*
4. *Modify the Executive Order to ensure that access to information is restricted to that which is directly relevant to collective bargaining.*

If you concur with this recommendation, after the Executive Order is modified, Treasury should petition the FLRA for an election between the two competing unions. Collective bargaining will not occur until an election is held to determine the exclusive collective bargaining representation for the employees.

I am prepared to answer any questions you may have and to meet at an appropriate time to discuss this with you.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 10:13:28.00

SUBJECT: Mtg.

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Elena, EBB is holding a mtg. next Wed., 12/10, at 2:00 PM to discuss Sec. Ser. unionization.

Pls. let me know if you can attend. Thanks. Carole

OUTLINE FOR TOBACCO BRIEFING

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

I. Should the \$1.50 increase be only from the settlement or other factors?

- President said "up to \$1.50."
- Should be real settlement costs.
- Industry estimates show non-settlement costs could easily eat up all but .62 of the 1.50 increase. Inflation is particularly important.

II. What are the effects of different levels of price increase on consumption? How does it effect industry profitability?

- Starting at about \$1 where teen smoking has diminished by 30%, rates drop by 5-6% every 25 cents up to \$2.00. At \$3 there is a 66% decrease.
- Legislatively reduced prices lead (minus decrease ads and legal costs) to 10-17% lower profits.
- FTC analysis shows that industry would increase prices above settlement costs. A 200% pass through of settlement costs to prices leads to a present value of after tax profits increases by about 78%.
- Liability protection would lead to rising stock prices alone.
- Tobacco farmers would suffer lower value quotas as cigarette prices rise.
- Wholesalers/retailers suffer from reduced demand, possible penalties, loss of point of sale advertising.
- Local/state excise taxes will diminish depending on the size of the excise tax.

III. Does the rate that prices increase make a difference?

- This analysis didn't assume a sudden increase would have a different effect from an incremental one.
- Arguably a sudden increase could have a shock effect, alternatively people may be better at adjusting their behavior over time.
- Also sharp increases may lead to smuggling problems.

IV. Three possible approaches: (a) companies pay per pack into fund; (b) an excise tax, (c) public health user fee per pack, please discuss.

- A. Antitrust exemption so that the tobacco companies can pay per pack increases into settlement fund is not warranted.

--even without an antitrust exemption, the cigarette manufacturers will raise prices to the amount of the settlement or greater than the settlement.

--FTC report concluded that there was insufficient justification for an antitrust exemption even unrelated to price such as achieving the goal of reducing youth smoking or as an exchange with the tobacco companies for the possibility that the settlements restrictions may be ruled unconstitutional.

- B. A volume-adjusted penalty, excise tax, or per pack charge are effectively identical from a consumer point of view.

- C. The current net stream of government revenue as envisioned by the settlement is substantially smaller than the face value contained in the settlement, and will decline over time.

--If objective is to fund public health programs, the payment should rise over time in line with the needs of the programs. By analogy, other entitlement programs have experienced rates of growth far in excess of inflation rates.

V. How big a price increase is necessary to achieve the youth smoking targets?

-- Price increases due to inflation alone will not help meet youth targets.

-- About \$1.45 in fifth year to achieve 30% reduction; about \$2.40 in seventh year to achieve 50% reduction; and about \$3.00 per pack in tenth year to achieve 60% reduction (These estimates do not include any effect from non-price aspects such as access and advertising restrictions).

-- Comprehensive and strongly enforced restrictions on youth access to cigarettes could have significant effects on reducing underage use of cigarettes; might need incentives for communities to make compliance efforts; perhaps 20 to 40% reductions if strong enforcement of access restrictions.

-- Advertising restrictions are less clear on reducing youth smoking --the conclusions of several studies on advertising restrictions varies.

VI. How big a price increase to offset costs of smoking-related illnesses to the Federal government?

- A. Medicare: costs of smoking-related illnesses are unclear because lower costs of healthier population are offset by increased life expectancies associated with reduced rates of smoking.
- B. Medicaid, Veterans benefits, and FEHBP: costs unclear for the same reasons as for Medicare.
- C. TRICARE for active-duty military (formerly known as CHAMPUS): more direct cost savings because this program serves a population under the age of 65.

VII. What are implications of \$1.50 price increase for cigarette consumption, smoking rates, industry profitability, farmers, retailers, and wholesalers for different combinations of penalties and price increases?

- President called for increase of up to \$1.50 per pack.
- Penalties will lead the industry to deter youth smoking (if it is able to do so) through non-price mechanisms if penalties are larger than the profits earned from youth smoking.
- Tension between fighting smoking and having stable funding stream.
- Administrative problems with relying solely on penalties as a means of raising settlement revenues. Issues re: reliability of youth smoking rates contained in surveys.

VIII. Ways to structure look-back penalties for missing youth smoking targets.

- A mix of industry-wide and company-specific penalties would provide the best incentives; industry-wide penalties would promote efforts by all companies to reduce underage smoking; company-specific penalties would eliminate incentive for company to keep selling to youth and only pay part of penalty.
- Substantial economic justification for de minimus exception assuming there is a "hard-core" group of youths that companies have no control over, regardless of the companies' actions.
- One-time payment in year after target missed based on number of packs sold in previous year provides a known revenue vs. Per-pack taxes in year after target missed provides unknown revenue because level of sales is unknown when tax rate is instituted.

- Difficulty in assessing different taxes on different brands.
- Non-linear penalties provide the greatest incentives --i.e., penalties should increase as non-compliance rises.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 10:41:07.00

SUBJECT: 4:00 Education meeting -- Sperling

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

TO: Allison Balderston (CN=Allison Balderston/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [.OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

This meeting is not going to happen at 4 p.m. I'll keep you updated.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 11:17:10.00

SUBJECT: Tobacco Strategy Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Donald H. Gips (CN=Donald H. Gips/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
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: Charles F. Stone (CN=Charles F. Stone/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Sherman G. Boone (CN=Sherman G. Boone/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: Daniel C. Tate (CN=Daniel C. Tate/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Melissa M. Murray (CN=Melissa M. Murray/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kristen E. Panerali (CN=Kristen E. Panerali/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: weinstein_dena (weinstein_dena @ ustr.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer D. Dudley (CN=Jennifer D. Dudley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We will be having the Tobacco Strategy Meeting tomorrow, December 4, at 2:45 p.m. in Room 211, OEOB.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 11:27:42.00

SUBJECT: COS SCHEDULING MTG CANCELLED

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP on 12/03/97
11:27 AM -----

Jason S. Goldberg
12/03/97 11:21:58 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: COS SCHEDULING MTG CANCELLED

The COS Scheduling Meeting has been cancelled for today.

Message Sent

To:

-
- Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP
 - Phillip Caplan/WHO/EOP
 - Craig T. Smith/WHO/EOP
 - Christopher J. Lavery/WHO/EOP
 - KERRICK_D @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
 - Sylvia M. Mathews/WHO/EOP
 - John Podesta/WHO/EOP
 - Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
 - Victoria Radd/WHO/EOP
 - Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP
 - Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
 - SPERLING_G @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
 - Bruce N. Reed/OPD/EOP
 - MCHUGH_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
 - Michael D. McCurry/WHO/EOP
 - Stephanie S. Streett/WHO/EOP
 - Nancy V. Hernreich/WHO/EOP
 - John L. Hilley/WHO/EOP

Cheryl M. Carter/WHO/EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Maria Echaveste/WHO/EOP
June G. Turner/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Michelle Crisci/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
Cathy R. Mays/OPD/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP
Ron Klain/OVP @ OVP
Debbie B Bengtson/OVP @ OVP
MILLISON_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Kimberly H Tilley/OVP @ OVP
Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP
Raymond E. Donnelly III/WHO/EOP
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP
Jeffrey A. Forbes/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth S. Steele/OVP @ OVP
Laura K. Capps/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP
Dan K. Rosenthal/WHO/EOP
Patricia Solis-Doyle/WHO/EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP
Ellen M. Lovell/WHO/EOP
Paul E. Begala/WHO/EOP
Eleanor S. Parker/WHO/EOP
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
Ansley Jones/OVP @ OVP
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP
Carolyn E. Cleveland/WHO/EOP
Jonathan H. Adashek/WHO/EOP
Virginia Apuzzo/WHO/EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP
John H. Gibbons/OSTP/EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 12:00:48.00

SUBJECT: Re: Raines child support idea

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

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

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

TEXT:

How was the idea received in the meeting?

I think I'll try to sit down with OMB (Barbara Chow, Keith Fontenot and their staff) and try to get the pros and cons laid out more clearly. I don't think you need to be there, but I'd be happy to include you if you like.

Bruce N. Reed
12/03/97 09:24:31 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
cc: Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Diana Fortuna/OPD/EOP, Andrea Kane/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Subject: Re: Raines child support idea

Yes, I heard him bring that up yesterday. I don't know if it's bad policy, but it sounds like a tough sell -- giving states less \$ to collect from deadbeats. I suspect the child support advocates would hate it.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 12:35:09.00

SUBJECT: Reminder -- SOTU outreach

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As I have mentioned to some of you, we will submit to the President for his Christmas reading a book compiling memos and speech draft submissions by outsiders (authors, academics, policy experts, artists, business leaders). We are gathering up the names of people we will contact.

Please let me know if you have any suggestions for people to contact, as soon as you can.

Thanks!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 12:37:28.00

SUBJECT: Tomorrow's Meeting with Governor Thompson

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

I expect Gov. Thompson will want to talk about kids health as well as welfare because:

a) he's bringing his health secretary (Joe Lekan) as well as his welfare secretary;
b) he's been pushing hard for kids health waivers which he sees as integral to the implementation of W-2, his Wisconsin Works welfare program.

Thus, I think both Chris and I should attend the meeting.

Jeanne Lambrew is writing up a summary of the kids health situation.

You already have a general background memo Andrea wrote about the Wisconsin Works welfare program (I dropped it off last night).

I am right now putting together for you a history of Wisconsin's waiver requests relating to W-2. As you know, we turned down their Medicaid request and we still have pending their Food Stamp privatization request.

There has also been some tension between the state and locals on the implementation of the \$3 billion welfare to work grants -- I'm getting more information on that.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Email to Sandra Thurman et al from Cathy Mays. Subject: Holiday Party (2 pages)	12/03/1997	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[12/02/1997 - 12/03/1997]

2009-1006-F

jm46

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary Morrison (CN=Mary Morrison/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 15:18:21.00

SUBJECT: Short Term Scheduling Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jonathan A. Kaplan (CN=Jonathan A. Kaplan/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: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/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: ELKON_N (ELKON_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY [UNKNOWN]) (NSC)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Michele Jolin (CN=Michele Jolin/OU=CEA/O=EOP @ EOP [CEA])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Jordan Tamagni (CN=Jordan Tamagni/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Karin Kullman (CN=Karin Kullman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Amy W. Tobe (CN=Amy W. Tobe/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kristen E. Panerali (CN=Kristen E. Panerali/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: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/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: Lawrence J. Haas (CN=Lawrence J. Haas/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Peggy Cusack (CN=Peggy Cusack/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Whitney S. Staley (CN=Whitney S. Staley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno (CN=Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Kris M Balderston (CN=Kris M Balderston/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

It is unclear at this time whether or not there will be a Short Term Scheduling Meeting this week. I will let everyone know what the final decision is when we have one. Thank you very much and have a great day!

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 15:22:21.00

SUBJECT: DPC Staff Mtg. tomorrow is CANCELLED!!!!

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

TO: Allison Balderston (CN=Allison Balderston/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: Christa Robinson (CN=Christa Robinson/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: William R. Kincaid (CN=William R. Kincaid/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: Michael Cohen (CN=Michael Cohen/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: Andrea Kane (CN=Andrea Kane/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: 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: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/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: Jennifer L. Klein (CN=Jennifer L. Klein/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: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/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: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: June G. Turner (CN=June G. Turner/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 15:25:12.00

SUBJECT: Domestic Family Planning Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

There will be a meeting on the above subject with outside groups on Friday, December 12 at 3:00 pm in the Roosevelt Room. Please let me know if you can attend.

Attendees:

Sylvia Mathews
Elena Kagan
Chris Jennings
Audrey Haynes
Melanne Verveer
Ann Lewis
Martha Foley

I will forward a list of the Outside Folks as soon as I receive it.

Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 15:45:03.00

SUBJECT: Health Care Strategy

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

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

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

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

TO: Jennifer L. Klein (CN=Jennifer L. Klein/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: William H. White Jr. (CN=William H. White Jr./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: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
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: Rahm I. Emanuel (CN=Rahm I. Emanuel/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Angelique Pirozzi (CN=Angelique Pirozzi/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The Health Care Strategy meeting for tomorrow, December 4, at 4:00 p.m. is CANCELLED.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-DEC-1997 17:33:59.00

SUBJECT: Memos - tight timeline

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

December 3, 1997

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

MEMORANDUM TO: *SECRETARY RILEY*
 DIRECTOR RAINES
 BRUCE REED

FROM: *GENE SPERLING*
 BOB SHIREMAN

RE: *MENTORING INITIATIVE*

The attached draft memorandum follows up on the principals meeting of October 14, and the consultation and analysis that has gone on since that time.

A final memo will go into the President by COB tomorrow, so I need your changes and recommendations, if any, *by noon tomorrow, Thursday, December 4*. Please get your changes to Bob Shireman by fax (456-2223) or e-mail and call him (456-2803) to make sure he has received them.

CC: Mr. Bowles
 Secretary Rubin
 Dr. Yellen
 Ms. Mathews
 Mr. Podesta
 Mr. Klain
 Mr. Hilley
 Acting Deputy Secretary Smith
 Mr. Lew
 Ms. Kagan
 Ms. Winston
 Mr. Cohen
 Mr. Shireman

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

RE: COLLEGE-SCHOOL EARLY INTERVENTION INITIATIVE

In preparation for the budget decisions that will need to be made in the next few weeks, this memorandum is intended to provide you with a status report on the development of a possible college-school early intervention initiative, and an opportunity for you to provide direction to our continuing efforts. In order to move forward on the budget, there are three issues that need to be settled: (1) the basic parameters of the early intervention programs, (2) the issue of early notification (the "guarantee" of aid), and, of course, (3) funding.

With the approach described in this memo, you would be able to announce a new 21st Century Scholars program that would:

- Provide families at high-poverty middle schools (and possibly others as well) with an official notification of the \$20,000 or more that is available for their children to go to college; and,
- Through colleges and other partners, provide intensive, long-term early intervention and support services to 250,000 new children each year (at 2200 high-poverty schools) -- 1.5 million children over six years.

Background

As you remember, this initiative began with your interest in the "21st Century Scholars Act" by Rep. Chaka Fattah. This legislation, which continues to garner significant support, including some Republicans, would guarantee sixth graders at high-poverty schools a maximum Pell Grant when they got to college; send a notice to them annually from the Secretary of Education reminding them of the availability of aid; and make them automatically eligible for the counseling, academic support, and other services provided by TRIO programs (such as Upward Bound) in high school and college.

Working with OMB and Education, we analyzed the specifics of the Fattah approach and found a number of problems: higher-than-expected costs and inefficiencies; inequities and perverse incentives; and the difficult issue of a new entitlement. Most important, the research on early intervention programs indicated that in order for them to be successful, it is *critical* that mentoring, counseling and tutoring be provided to students. Simply making them eligible for TRIO is not enough. As you know, Rep. Fattah is aware of these concerns and is flexible on the design of a program.

We felt strongly that the Administration needed a strong early intervention initiative that goes well beyond a notification about financial aid. Research demonstrates that programs that start early and are sustained for a number of years are effective. For example, in the rigorously-evaluated Quantum Opportunities Program, 42 percent of the participants attended college, compared to 16 percent in the control group. To have a significant impact on college enrollment of disadvantaged youth, it is clear that we need a full-fledged early intervention program.

Our idea is to center this effort on colleges reaching out to high poverty schools. College involvement is critical for a number of reasons. First, this approach creates an ethic of responsibility: it reminds colleges that they are responsible for helping to build a pool of disadvantaged youth -- disproportionately minorities -- who are well-prepared for college. Second, if college is to be the goal that sixth graders see, they need to have some connection to the institution. Third, colleges are best able to tell students -- and the schools they attend -- what types of courses and skills they need to succeed. Indeed, an ancillary benefit of this approach should be higher standards.¹ And finally, a stable,

¹In fact, in response to our consultations on this issue, we already have a proposal from colleges in the California State University system for an early intervention program that would focus on math as the gateway to college.

long-term institution needs to be there to ensure the quality and staying power of a program like this one.

In October, principals discussed options (DPC, Education, PIR, COS, and OLA were represented). At that meeting, there was strong support for the concept of Federal aid to partnerships between colleges and needy schools, to provide sixth graders with mentoring and other support that would be sustained through high school graduation. There was also strong support for getting early information to families about the availability of Federal financial aid for college. But there was concern about any new entitlement to aid: first, it creates budget complications, both politically and practically; second, it creates the impression that the current programs are not secure -- contrary to the "universal access" message that we are sending in the wake of victories on HOPE and Pell.

Since the principals meeting, we have accelerated our consultations and research. I have spoken with more than 200 college presidents, both individually and in groups, and the response has been quite positive. Many of them have provided examples of their own efforts to tap into K-12 schools to recruit and offer help early. Education is reviewing all of the research literature, and with my staff has carried out an effort to identify model programs with the characteristics that we discussed at the principals meeting. Both Mike Smith and I have spoken with Eugene Lang, founder of the "I Have a Dream" program, and he agrees that we are on the right track. Even though he is best known for his promise of aid to Harlem sixth graders, he feels strongly that the early and sustained *support services* are the most important determinant of a successful program (and he agrees with the need for college involvement).

Basic Parameters of the College-School Partnerships

Some of the colleges with whom we have consulted want the program to very flexible, to incorporate a wide variety of program models. But we have pressed that while we support flexibility, there needs to be a vision -- some common elements that give the proposal an identity that will propel it to success both legislatively and, ultimately, programmatically. We recommend the following core components:

Whole Classes/Cohorts at High-Poverty Schools. Programs must start providing services to *all* of the children in a grade, class, or school. Many programs focus on students who have been pre-judged to have college "potential." But middle school is too early to rule anyone out. In addition, a whole-class approach is

more likely to involve the *school* (rather than just the students) in a way that will bring about improvements in the curriculum.

College as a Goal. The programs must hold out college as a primary goal. Special consideration would be given to partnerships that guarantee enrollment in a college for participating students who reach particular milestones, and/or for programs that guarantee additional financial aid to cover the full costs of the college.

Start Early and Stay with Kids through High School. Students should begin in the program *not later than* the seventh grade. The program must continue to provide services through high school graduation (or at least for six years). (There will be some attrition due to dropping out of school or of the program, moving out, or participating in another program.)

An Intensive Element. Programs must provide intensive assistance to students at least during some part of the program (cost estimates assume that this happens in the first year). For example, this may be a residential summer component at a college.

Community Involvement. Community organizations and businesses should be tapped to offer mentors, guarantees of additional financial aid in exchange for student performance, exposure to careers, and other support.

Note on relationship to TRIO programs. Some colleges already have Federal TRIO grants with some of the above characteristics, and/or they have other similar programs. The largest Federal investment, Upward Bound, provides counseling and intensive academic support to *selected* disadvantaged high school students who show aptitude for college. The Talent Search program provides a one-shot program of early information about college to middle school students. Those programs do not come close to addressing all of the need, so there would not normally be a problem with them duplicating some part of this new program. Applicants for the college-school partnership funds would have to describe how their existing early intervention programs would be coordinated with the new program. It is expected that some partnerships would apply for the new grants to extend and expand their programs, so that Upward Bound, for example, could essentially create a grade 4-10 feeder program, and Talent Search could add a more intensive component with follow-up during the high school years. Others might simply focus on high-poverty schools where the students are not

being served by any current program.

Early Notification/Guarantee

The early intervention effort would be joined with Rep. Chaka Fattah's concept of providing children and their families with *early, official notification* of their eligibility for college financial aid. Because of the combination of student loans, Pell Grants, and HOPE Scholarships, virtually everyone is eligible for at least \$20,000 of aid for four years of college. While a legally enforceable "guarantee" to Pell Grants six years in the future has too many problems, we can still adopt the basic concept by making a firm statement about college aid generally. (As with Federal pensions and some military benefits, the actual amounts would depend on the continuation of the programs.)

This would be part of the larger information campaign on access to higher education. While the focus would be on getting the notifications to families at the highest-poverty schools, we would not need to be that restrictive and could reach a larger number than the Fattah legislation proposes. It would not be unreasonable for us to have a goal of reaching a million students with information and an official notification (double the number that would have been reached by Fattah).

As already noted, we would encourage partnerships to supplement Federal aid with additional financial assistance and/or guaranteed admission to a particular college if the student takes the right classes and works hard.

Funding

We are discussing two possible approaches. The first would make a simple offer to colleges in a competitive program: tell us how you would use a grant of \$200,000 to \$1 million to create or expand partnerships with the characteristics outlined above. A \$300 million investment would fund 400 colleges, if the average grant size was \$750,000.

They might have partnerships with up to 2000 schools, with 226,000 students (if only one grade level was being served at all of the schools). This would leave it up to the college to determine whether and how to add new cohorts. In providing grants, we would have the flexibility to take into consideration the institution's own resources, so that Ivy League schools would be expected to take most of the costs themselves, while a Tribally Controlled Community College would not.

The other approach would be tied more specifically to the need for an intensive

start, and the cost of adding new cohorts of students each year. It would also require a growing local match.. A \$300 million Federal investment in FY 1999 would allow us to serve 250,000 seventh graders through competitive grants to partnerships with 2200 high-poverty schools, assuming a 20 percent local match and a \$1,500 per participant cost. These funds would provide mentoring to about half of the schools and students that would have been provided the guarantee under Fattah (students at schools with poverty rate of 75 percent or greater). It is five times as many as are now served by Upward Bound.

The average per-student cost would be significantly lower (\$800) in the remaining years, but additional cohorts -- new groups of seventh graders -- would continue to be added each year until there is a full complement. If we assume that the local match can be increased by 10 percent with each new cohort, until the Federal government is covering only 30 percent of the cost, then (assuming some attrition) the funding would reach a steady state at \$619 million in FY 2004. (See line [a] on the table). *Over the six years, 1.5 million kids would be served.*

Federal Cost of Early Intervention Program (in millions of dollars)

	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06
a. Full	300	415	502	565	604	619		
b. Phase-in	150	339	430	534	595	632		
c. Smaller								

If we need to reduce FY 1999 appropriations requests, the best way to do so would be to phase in the number of partnerships over two or three years, rather than assuming that all of them would be established in the first year (line b). If the out-years are a problem, then we would need to reduce the total number of schools/partnerships that we are aiming for (line c).

Add at least \$30 million. The TRIO programs have a strong, organized constituency. We are working with the association on this proposal, and so far they are supportive. But they are concerned that our interest in this new proposal may weaken our resolve as far as increases for the TRIO programs. Therefore, it is critical that an increase of at least \$30 million be included in the Budget for TRIO if we move forward with the school-college mentoring partnerships.

Current program authorities and the question of a State role. We are currently assuming that this would be a new direct grant program from the Department of Education, probably part of our proposal for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Education is exploring a couple of current (unfunded) authorities to determine whether we could use one of them for this program. The benefit of doing so is that it makes it easier to get appropriations, because we don't have to wait for an authorization of a new program in order to get appropriations.

Some of the Committee leadership on the Hill and the student association are expected to pursue a state-based model, making use of a program authorized in 1992 called the National Early Intervention and State Scholarship Program. It is funded at \$3.2 million now and funds some useful models. Education opposes using this authority, however, because it would be more difficult to maintain a high-quality, highly targeted effort.

Next Steps

If you are comfortable with the general approach, then we will continue to draft the descriptions that will need to be included in the Budget, if funding is to be included. We will then continue to vet the idea, and will begin to develop a roll-out strategy.

Views and Recommendations

December 3, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO: SECRETARY RILEY
SECRETARY SHALALA
SECRETARY HERMAN
DIRECTOR RAINES
BRUCE REED

FROM: GENE SPERLING
BOB SHIREMAN

RE: HISPANIC EDUCATION INVESTMENTS AND ACTIONS

As you know, the President asked us to develop strategies for improving education opportunities for Hispanic Americans, particularly to reduce the dropout rate. All of you have contributed to this effort. The attached draft memorandum to the President lays out some of the actions we are prepared to take, as well as a proposal for investments in the FY 1999 Budget.

The possible investments will be compared against other requests, in the context of the budget process over the next two weeks. Please let me know *by noon tomorrow, Thursday, December 4*, if you have any suggested changes to the memo, or recommendations to add. Please focus particularly on the investments in section I. Please contact Bob Shireman at 456-2803.

CC: Mr. Bowles
Dr. Yellen
Ms. Mathews
Mr. Podesta
Ms. Murguia
Ms. Echaveste
Mr. Ibarra
Mr. Klain

Mr. Hilley
Acting Deputy Secretary Smith
Deputy Secretary Thurm
Deputy Secretary Higgins
Mr. Lew
Ms. Kagan
Ms. Winston
Mr. Cohen

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Mr. Shireman
Dr. Pompa
Ms. S. Brown

DRAFT MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

This memorandum provides you with background on our efforts to improve educational opportunities for Hispanic Americans, and a possible further investment strategy for the FY 1999 Budget. Once budget decisions are made, we will have a comprehensive package of research-based recommendations, new investments, and administrative actions ready for an announcement. The announcement would include:

- a report on the Hispanic dropout problem by researchers named by Secretary Riley two years ago (in response to a request by Sen. Bingaman). The report includes advice for schools, families, and all levels of government, but does not include any new data;
- investments in programs that address the needs of Hispanic and LEP children;
- a list of administrative and other actions -- including a Conference on Staying in School -- that Education, Labor and HHS are taking to improve Federal programs so that they better serve the Hispanic (and LEP) community; and,
- the Secretary of Education's plan describing how current programs and our agenda of research, standards and testing, teacher training, and outreach address the needs of Hispanic and LEP children.

Section I of this memo describes the consultations that have taken place and the legislative and appropriations actions that we have already taken. Section II is a reminder of some of the planned or possible FY 1999 investments that are generally important for minorities, but are not explicitly part of the Hispanic plan. *Section III lays out a possible investment strategy for Hispanics and LEP children and families for the FY 1999 Budget.* Section IV describes the other actions that agencies would announce as part of the Hispanic Action Plan. Section V presents the views of your advisors.

I. Background

In response to your request that we look into the what we can do to address the Hispanic dropout rate and to generally improve the educational opportunities of Hispanic Americans, we set out to identify possible actions in three areas:

- Then-pending Administration initiatives and reauthorization proposals that could be improved in ways that benefit Latinos (for example, funding formulas that do not adequately take into consideration growth areas).
- Appropriation items in the FY98 Budget that have a disproportionate impact on the Latino population, so that we would be sure to take that into consideration in the continuing budget process.
- Additional administrative and legislative proposals that could be aimed at increasing Hispanic educational opportunities.

As a foundation for our efforts, we were able to use a report and recommendations released last year by the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. We met with constituency groups, and held a series of meetings with Hispanic Caucus members and staff, where officials from Education, Labor, HHS, and USDA discussed their programs and some of the concerns and recommendations that have been raised. Most recently, we have been able to review the not-yet-released report of the Hispanic Dropout Project, by a group of researchers named by Secretary Riley at the suggestion of Senator Bingaman. We have also reviewed legislation proposed by Congressman Hinojosa and Senator Bingaman.

These efforts yielded results this year:

- We insisted that our **35% increase for Bilingual and Immigrant Education** be an explicit part of the Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement, a very exclusive list (only 13 items government-wide).
- The \$199 million in Bilingual Education **includes \$25 million for training teachers to help limited English proficient (LEP) kids**, a proposal that Republican appropriators fought last year. (Thank Delia for working with the appropriators this year to assure their support).
- We took another look at our **America Reads** legislation and added provisions to make doubly sure that States would have to make a particular effort to serve LEP children.

- Our proposal for **Adult Education** reauthorization -- a program that provides adult ESL -- includes a **new formula** that targets states with large numbers of LEP adults. (Unfortunately, no one in Congress is pushing the formula).
- We proposed and received an **11% increase for Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs)**.
- In a reversal from our position to eliminate the program a few years ago, we proposed and received a **small increase for HEP-CAMP** (migrant college support services and early intervention program).
- Other selected FY 1998 Appropriations that help Hispanics:
 - Job Corps* -- an effective program in which 70% of the participants are minorities -- got \$92 million increase (to \$1.246 billion). 30 Job Corps Centers teach ESL.
 - Youth Opportunity Areas*: \$250 million to the highest poverty areas to help out-of-school youth (age 16-24) become employable. (Currently six cities are funded. In NYC, 67% of those served are Hispanic; in Houston, 65%; in Los Angeles, 50%.)
 - \$1.4 billion increase in **Pell Grants** for low-income college students.
 - Obey's **Comprehensive School Reform** provides funds that will go to schools that need to be transformed -- first in line should be those with high dropout rates.

II. Generic Issues

It is important that our overall campaign for high standards and accountability remains to be seen as an important part of the answer for all children, *particularly* those who are at risk. For the announcement of the Hispanic Action Plan, Education has developed a document that describes how the key education programs work for Hispanic and LEP children.

There are also other new initiatives that have already been announced or are being considered that are oriented toward needs that have been identified in our work on Hispanic Education, including:

- **Teacher Training and Recruitment.** Your five-year, \$350 million teacher training and recruitment proposal is aimed at improving teacher preparation particularly for

harder-to-serve populations, and recruiting more minority teachers.

- **Education Opportunity Zones.** This new investment is aimed at spurring and rewarding effective reform efforts in school districts that tend to be predominantly minorities.
- **College-School Early Intervention Partnerships.** This is a proven response to the dropout problem: it takes children at high-poverty schools by the seventh grade, delivers a firm message about college opportunity, and then provides them with support through to high school graduation. We consider this a major initiative that should be announced in a broader context.

III. Decision: Added Investments

For FY 1999, we recommend that you consider increasing funding in some key programs that are important to Latinos.

<i>Investment (in millions):</i>	<i>FY 1998</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>FY 1999</i>
Bilingual Education - Teacher Training	\$25	\$25	\$50
TRIO College Preparation Programs	\$530	\$30-70	\$560
Hispanic-Serving Institutions [non-add; already approved]	\$12	[\$16]	\$28
Adult Education - Model ESL Programs	n/a	\$20	\$20
Migrant Education Program	\$305	\$30-80	\$365
Migrant Education: HEP and CAMP	\$9.7	\$5.3	\$15
TOTAL:		\$110.3-\$200.3	

This package addresses five of the six highest-priority items identified by the Hispanic Education Coalition. The only program identified by the coalition but not included above is Title I. (If the budget process yields a substantial increase in Title I, that could be included as well.) The program above that was *not* identified by the coalition is Adult Education/English-language training for adults.

1. Bilingual Education - Teacher Training. This program provides current teachers with the skills they need to address the English language deficiencies of their students. (Despite the

name, it does not require a bilingual program). By doubling the FY 1998 investment and sustaining that level over five years, we could *train 20,000 teachers*. The need in this area is huge -- California alone has a reported shortfall of 20,000.

2. TRIO College Preparation Programs. A recent evaluation of the Upward Bound program (support for promising disadvantaged kids to go to college) showed dramatically positive results for Hispanics. This is an opportunity to showcase this success. We will also be making changes to the TRIO statute to encourage more funding to areas that are under-served, such as the Hispanic community. Even though we may be proposing an *earlier* mentoring program, it is important that we propose an increase in TRIO so that the very strong TRIO constituency does not see the new program as a threat. \$30 million is the same increase that the programs received in FY 1998; \$60 million would receive a more enthusiastic response.

3. Hispanic-Serving Institutions. These funds go to strengthen colleges where at least 25 percent of the student body is Hispanic and a large portion are needy. This substantial increase is already slated, as a result of Higher Education Act reauthorization and other discussions.

4. Adult Education - Model ESL Programs. The largest single source of English-as-a-Second-Language funding comes from the Adult Education program (which also promotes adult literacy and GED attainment). There are a plethora of approaches, and huge demand for these programs. But there is little information about what types of programs are most effective for different populations. This five-year \$100 million investment would go toward improving the ESL programs that we now fund through identification and dissemination of proven and promising practices. It could also be used to provide more training for adult ESL instructors, and/or to expand the use of the televised ESL series "Crossroads Cafe," if the evaluations of that program are as positive as expected.

5. Migrant Education Program. Because of their mobility, migrant children -- more than 80 percent of whom are Hispanic -- often do not "belong" to any one school system or even one State. That is why the Federal role in this area is critical. Funded at \$305 million in FY 1998, MEP is a State formula program that supports an extremely wide range of interventions specifically tailored to the needs of the local population it serves. Services range from the identification and recruitment of kids into schools, to all kinds of school-based interventions, to after school programs and summer sessions.

The 1994 reauthorization (of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) focused MEP on the most mobile families, and resulted in more services are now being provided in the summer and between school sessions. Despite a narrowing of eligibility rules, the number of participating children has been increasing since the reauthorization, in part because of

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

partnerships between MEP and several major agribusiness partners. These partnerships have led to improved service and coordination by local providers (education, health, public safety, library).

Increased funding would help to address the growing population of children who are being referred to the program, and to continue to provide a richer array of supplemental educational services. *A \$60 million investment is included in the proposal to address Child Labor issues.*

IV. Administrative Actions and Program Improvements

Based on our review of the Advisory Commission recommendations, other reports, and our meetings with the constituency groups and the Caucus, the agencies have signed off on a number of changes to, or enhancements in, current programs to better serve the Hispanic population. They are described below:

Dropout Prevention:

- *Comprehensive School Reform.* As part of this new \$150 million program aimed toward transforming failing schools, the Education Department will identify model approaches that show promise in reducing high dropout rates, and that address the needs of limited-English proficient children. The Department's guidelines to States will encourage funds to go to schools that need to address a dropout problem.
- *White House Conference on Staying in School.* The President and the Administration will participate in a conference to share solutions -- lessons from successful efforts to reduce dropout rates and to provide youth with alternatives to traditional high schools.
- *Clearinghouse on Successful Models for Dropout Prevention.* The Education Department, through its various research centers (and other clearinghouses), has a great deal of resources relating to dropout prevention. This would provide school and community leaders with "one-stop shopping" for ideas and information on best practices for keeping kids in school.

General:

- *Public Service Announcements in Spanish.* Univision has agreed to produce a series of public service announcements on education, such as encouraging parents to read to their children at an early age, and telling families about college financial aid.
- *Toll-Free Number and More Information in Spanish.* The Education Department is developing criteria to systematically determine what publications should be translated so that Spanish-speaking parents have better access to the information. In addition, the Department will establish a toll-free number that is answered in Spanish (or change the current number to prompt non-English speaking callers earlier), to ensure that there are no barriers to parents who want to find out how to better help their children succeed in school.

- **Model High Schools:** Working with the National Council of La Raza and ASPIRA, the Education Department's New American High Schools Initiative will focus attention on schools that better prepare all students for college and careers. Four of the ten schools initially selected have a Hispanic population of 20 percent or more. In addition, the Department has awarded a two-year contract to improve student preparation at six urban high schools and to serve as models for other high schools. Three of the six have substantial Hispanic student participation.

Early Childhood and Parental Involvement

- **Early Head Start:** [Checking whether new funding in FY 1998 can be geared toward the needs of Hispanic community]
- **Head Start:** The Bipartisan Balanced Budget includes continued expansion of the program, toward the goal of serving one million children by 2002. The Department of Health and Human Services will implement an outreach plan to ensure that programs are reaching the Hispanic community. As a part of that effort, the Department will identify and disseminate a "best practices" guide for serving limited-English proficient (LEP) children.
- **Title I/parent training:** Parents who do not speak English well need extra care and support to gain their active participation in the schooling of their children. The Department of Education is compiling a set of "best practices" for implementing family literacy and parent involvement programs. This will include guidelines for working with LEP parents.

Improving teaching and learning

- **America Reads:** The Education Department and Scholastic, Inc., have developed and are distributing, posters featuring the message "Reading is Power/Leer es Poder." The back of the poster provides reproducible reading activities for classroom use. Spanish language tutoring kits have been developed and will be distributed to Hispanic communities. LULAC has been an active partner in America Reads effort.
- **Bilingual/Teacher Training:** The Bipartisan Balanced Budget Agreement secures a 27 percent increase for the bilingual education program. As part of that increase, the Education Department will dedicate \$25 million to increase the number of teachers who are qualified to teach LEP children, and to improve teacher preparation programs so that

all teachers can meet the needs of LEP students.

- *Technology.* To ensure that all schools take advantage of the funding available through the \$2 billion Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the discounts of up to 90 percent (for the poorest schools) that will be available through the FCC's Universal Service Fund, the Education Department will conduct a series of technical assistance workshops, including some that are targeted to communities with large populations of Hispanic students. [Mention VP's leadership of outreach effort?]

Migrants

- **Technology.** The Education Department has awarded six grants, at \$15 million over five years, for projects that apply the use of technology to improve teaching and learning for migrant children.
- **Coordinated eligibility.** The Education Department is exploring the possibility of waiving eligibility requirements for Migrant Even Start and other education programs so that children of participants in the Job Training Partnership Act's migrant program (section 402), who have already been judged needy, will be automatically eligible.

Second chance and job training

- **Youth Opportunity Areas.** \$250 million has been appropriated for FY 1999, targeted to the highest poverty areas in the country to help out-of-school youth (age 16-24) become employable. (Currently six cities are funded. In NYC, 67 of those served are Hispanic; in Houston, 65 ; in Los Angeles, 50 .)
- **Bilingual Contextual Learning.** The Labor Department is currently evaluating the results of an innovative approach for training individuals for the burgeoning home health care field. The Department will broadly disseminate the "lessons learned" from this experience.
- **ESL in Job Training.** The Labor Department will include guidance for providing services to limited-English-proficient populations in JTPA or successor programs.

College opportunity

- **TRIO programs.** The Education Department's reauthorization proposal will include measures designed to make the programs more available in areas that are now under-served by TRIO, including those with substantial Hispanic populations.
- **Information about college financial aid.** The largest Spanish language newspaper in the country, La Opinion, is publishing and distributing a Spanish-language version of the Education Department's guide, "Getting Ready for College Early." The Department is seeking out other opportunities to better reach Latino families.
- **Hispanic-Serving Institutions.** The Education Department's reauthorization of the Higher Education Act will include the creation of a new part under Title III for Hispanic-Serving

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Institutions.

Other efforts: The Education Department will release a plan that includes a number of other items, and improvements in data collection and research relating to Hispanic and LEP students.

V. Views and Recommendations

