

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 072 - FOLDER -005

[01/21/1998 - 01/24/1998]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. email	Cynthia Rice to Elena Kagan et al. re: Success Story (1 page)	01/24/1998	P6/b(6)
001b. email attachment	re: Success Story (2 pages)	01/24/1998	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/21/1998-01/24/1998]

2009-1006-F

bm105

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 15:07:08.00

SUBJECT: Welfare to Work Housing Voucher info for specialty press

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

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

TEXT:

We've added last paragraph to the one pager to provide to specialty press. Estela, please call me when you get this (6-5573).

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 16:20:50.00

SUBJECT: Final Welfare to Work Housing Voucher documents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Here are final versions of three documents.
Q&As on vouchers

One pager on vouchers

One pager on vouchers for specialty press, with last paragraph added.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D72]MAIL48801602R.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750437C1D0000010A020100000002050000008645000000020000C9138D9CC8E7B4B07A2419

WELFARE TO WORK HOUSING VOUCHERS

The President's FY99 budget will take further steps to promote work and welfare reform through a new plan to provide 50,000 new housing vouchers to welfare recipients who need housing assistance in order to get or keep a job.

Families could use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. These targeted vouchers will give people on welfare a new tool to make the transition to a job and succeed in the work place.

The \$283 million proposal will help address the problem that in many regions, jobs are being created far from where many welfare recipients live. Currently, about two-thirds of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, but three of four welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities. To make this daily commute possible, the President is fighting for a \$600 million welfare-to-work transportation initiative as part of the reauthorization of ISTEA. But in some cases it makes more sense for someone to move closer to work -- and this new proposal will make that move from welfare to work possible.

How It Will Work

These vouchers will provide States and communities with a new flexible tool to help families who need housing assistance in order to achieve self-sufficiency.

- The additional vouchers will be available on a *competitive basis* to local housing agencies. Local housing agencies, including Indian housing authorities, may submit an application, developed in consultation with the state, local, or tribal welfare agency and the local Welfare-to-Work formula funds grantee (typically the Private Industry Council).
- The vouchers will be used where they are *essential to a successful transition from welfare to work--that is, where housing assistance is critical for a family to get or keep a job.*
- Families who receive the vouchers must be *eligible for or currently receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or have received TANF within the past year.*

The initiative recognizes the direct link between affordable housing and self-sufficiency. Along with the Administration's proposal to increase the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, this initiative will make decent, affordable housing available to more Americans.

The most recent data (1993) show that approximately 2.7 million African American households and 1.8 million Hispanic American households were eligible for but did not receive housing assistance. These new vouchers will help address the unmet housing need for some African American and Hispanic American families who are making the transition from welfare to

work.

01/21/98

WELFARE TO WORK HOUSING VOUCHERS

The President's FY99 budget will take further steps to promote work and welfare reform through a new plan to provide 50,000 new housing vouchers to welfare recipients who need housing assistance in order to get or keep a job.

Families could use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. These targeted vouchers will give people on welfare a new tool to make the transition to a job and succeed in the work place.

The \$283 million proposal will help address the problem that in many regions, jobs are being created far from where many welfare recipients live. Currently, about two-thirds of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, but three of four welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities. To make this daily commute possible, the President is fighting for a \$600 million welfare-to-work transportation initiative as part of the reauthorization of ISTEA. But in some cases it makes more sense for someone to move closer to work -- and this new proposal will make that move from welfare to work possible.

How It Will Work

These vouchers will provide States and communities with a new flexible tool to help families who need housing assistance in order to achieve self-sufficiency.

- The additional vouchers will be available on a *competitive basis* to local housing agencies. Local housing agencies, including Indian housing authorities, may submit an application, developed in consultation with the state, local, or tribal welfare agency and the local Welfare-to-Work formula funds grantee (typically the Private Industry Council).
- The vouchers will be used where they are *essential to a successful transition from welfare to work--that is, where housing assistance is critical for a family to get or keep a job.*
- Families who receive the vouchers must be *eligible for or currently receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or have received TANF within the past year.*

The initiative recognizes the direct link between affordable housing and self-sufficiency. Along with the Administration's proposal to increase the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, this initiative will make decent, affordable housing available to more Americans.

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

01/21/98

Welfare to Work Housing Vouchers

January 21, 1998

Internal Questions & Answers

1. What are the new housing vouchers the President is proposing?

The President's budget will provide \$283 million for 50,000 new housing vouchers for welfare recipients who need housing assistance to get or keep a job. Families could use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. These targeted vouchers will give people on welfare a new tool to make the transition to a job and succeed in the work place.

This proposal will help address the problem that in many regions, jobs are being created far from where many welfare recipients live. Currently, about two-thirds of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, but three of four welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities. To make this daily commute possible, the President is fighting for a \$600 million welfare to work transportation initiative as part of the reauthorization of ISTEA. But in some cases it makes more sense for someone to move closer to work, and this new proposal will make that possible.

2. How are you going to pay for these new vouchers?

Next month the President will send to Congress the first balanced budget in 30 years. This proposal, which costs \$283 million in the first year, and an estimated \$1.3 billion over five years, will be paid for through cuts in other areas of the federal budget. We believe this is a sound investment which can be paid for in the context of a balanced budget.

3. Aren't you just replacing one form of welfare with another?

No. Families will be eligible for these vouchers only if they are working. This is not a free ride--while these vouchers will make housing more affordable, most families will still have to spend about 30% of their income for rent.

4. Given the shortage of affordable housing nationwide, why give welfare recipients special preference for these new vouchers? Will this create an incentive for people to get on welfare in order to get housing?

We think it makes sense to assist families who are working hard to leave welfare and make a better life. These vouchers will only be available to those who are working and for whom the voucher is critical to that family getting or keeping a job. Families on welfare are already eligible for housing assistance, although there are long waiting lists in most communities. Besides, with the tough work requirements and time limits on welfare, we don't think people will sign up for welfare just to get a housing voucher.

While this proposal focuses on those leaving welfare for work, the President's FY99 budget proposal will also help spur private-sector development of more affordable rental housing for all low-income Americans through a 40% increase in the value of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit. In addition, the Administration has a long track record of working to make housing affordable and accessible, including increasing funding for the HOME program by 50%.

5. Is there any evidence that people need this help? How do you know it will make a difference?

This proposal will help address the problem that in many regions, jobs are being created far from where many welfare recipients live. Currently, about two-thirds of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, but three of four welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities. To make this daily commute possible, the President is fighting for a \$600 million welfare to work transportation initiative as part of the reauthorization of ISTEA. But in some cases it makes more sense for someone to move closer to work, and this new proposal will make that possible.

Because there is a major shortage of affordable housing, many welfare recipients live in crowded conditions or substandard housing -- problems which make it difficult for them to get to work on time every day. Overall, about 2 million poor families with children pay over 50 percent of their income for rent or live in substandard housing. Only one-quarter of welfare recipients receive any type of housing assistance and less than half of these receive portable housing assistance that they can use to rent housing in the private market.

6. Since demand far exceeds the number of new vouchers, isn't this just a drop in the bucket? How will you decide who gets them? Will every community get vouchers?

This proposal will increase the overall supply of portable housing vouchers for families on welfare by over 10 percent -- a meaningful investment. Currently, 1.4 million households receive portable rental assistance, of which 446,000 are families with children whose primary source of income is public assistance.

The vouchers will be awarded on a competitive basis to the local housing agencies. Local applications will be developed in partnership with the state, local or tribal agency administering Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the local entity (generally the Private Industry Council) receiving Welfare-to-Work funds allocated on a formula basis by the U.S. Department of Labor. HUD, working with HHS and DOL, will review local applications and select the most promising ones based on established criteria.

The proposal builds in considerable flexibility for local agencies to decide how to best target the vouchers among eligible current or former welfare recipients within their community, because different approaches will make sense in different places.

7. Won't this just encourage working people to move out of public housing, making housing projects even worse places to live?

The proposal provides local agencies considerable flexibility to design strategies that make sense for moving families from welfare to work in their community. While this proposal is not targeted specifically at public housing residents, some local areas may elect to use the new vouchers to help some families move out of public housing and into a privately-owned apartment if such a move is critical to getting or keeping a job. We believe it is important to both increase the number of working people in public housing and to provide opportunities for public housing residents to move to private housing. These vouchers are just one part of our broader housing strategy, which includes attracting more working people to public housing and helping more housing residents get jobs.

8. How will the new vouchers work? How is this different from existing housing programs?

These new welfare to work housing vouchers would be available to families eligible for or currently receiving welfare, or who received welfare within the past year, who need the voucher to get or keep a job, and who meet the criteria for Section 8. The vouchers would be portable and could be used to rent private housing.

Under existing programs, a family is eligible for Section 8 if its income is below 50 percent of the area median income. Currently, there are about 1.4 million units each of portable tenant-based Section 8, project-based Section 8, and public housing.

Section 8 tenant-based vouchers are used to rent housing in the private market. Tenants pay the landlord approximately 30 percent of their income for rent. The public housing authority uses federal funds to pay the landlord the difference between the "fair market rent" and the tenant's rental payment. The average fair market rent, which varies widely around the country, is \$594 a month, the average tenant contribution is \$213, and the average HUD subsidy is \$350.

Section 8 project-based housing subsidies are not portable. They consist of rental units in buildings owned and operated by private owners (for profit and nonprofit). These subsidies cover part or all of the units in a particular building. Tenants pay 30 percent of their income to the project's owner for rent. The remainder is paid by the federal government. These are not administered by the local housing authority. Owners contract directly with HUD or through an intermediary state housing finance agency.

Public housing consists of rental units owned and operated by public housing authorities. Rents are generally set at 30 percent of tenants' income and are paid to the housing authority to help meet operating and maintenance costs. Federal subsidies also cover operating costs and are distributed to housing authorities on a formula basis.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 14:51:31.00

SUBJECT: cloning

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:
This should be pretty useful. It'll discuss what is going on in Congress,
FDA authority issues, and the timing of the need to move legislation.
----- Forwarded by Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP on 01/21/98
02:45 PM -----

Rachel E. Levinson 01/21/98 02:42:04 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: cloning

We will meet today at 4:30 in room 180 to discuss cloning legislative
strategy. An options paper will be distributed in advance of the meeting.

Message Sent

To: _____
Clifford J. Gabriel/OSTP/EOP
Jeffrey M. Smith/OSTP/EOP
Lucia A. Wyman/WHO/EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
Jerold R. Mande/OSTP/EOP
William P. Marshall/WHO/EOP
Arthur Bienenstock/OSTP/EOP
Rachel E. Levinson/OSTP/EOP
GIPS_D @ a1.eop.gov @ inet

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 15:08:48.00

SUBJECT: Welfare to Work Housing Voucher info for specialty press--w/ attachment

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Andrea Kane/OPD/EOP on 01/21/98 03:09 PM -----

Andrea Kane
01/21/98 03:07:01 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, WEINSTEIN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY, Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
cc:
Subject: Welfare to Work Housing Voucher info for specialty press

We've added last paragraph to the one pager to provide to specialty press. Estela, please call me when you get this (6-5573).

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D3]MAIL438075020.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043EE1F0000010A02010000000205000000772E000000020000F0A0819EEF0E65E2C89AB8
8F0A4896884B3E9FAF2F62C6F10D7002395DDE62F528022CE8F5F60EF258361BBEA6691CEFF6BE

WELFARE TO WORK HOUSING VOUCHERS

The President's FY99 budget will take further steps to promote work and welfare reform through a new plan to provide 50,000 new housing vouchers to welfare recipients who need housing assistance in order to get or keep a job.

Families could use these housing vouchers to move closer to a new job, to reduce a long commute, or to secure more stable housing to eliminate emergencies that keep them from getting to work every day on time. These targeted vouchers will give people on welfare a new tool to make the transition to a job and succeed in the work place.

The \$283 million proposal will help address the problem that in many regions, jobs are being created far from where many welfare recipients live. Currently, about two-thirds of new jobs are being created in the suburbs, but three of four welfare recipients live in rural areas or central cities. To make this daily commute possible, the President is fighting for a \$600 million welfare-to-work transportation initiative as part of the reauthorization of ISTEA. But in some cases it makes more sense for someone to move closer to work -- and this new proposal will make that move from welfare to work possible.

How It Will Work

These vouchers will provide States and communities with a new flexible tool to help families who need housing assistance in order to achieve self-sufficiency.

- The additional vouchers will be available on a *competitive basis* to local housing agencies. Local housing agencies, including Indian housing authorities, may submit an application, developed in consultation with the state, local, or tribal welfare agency and the local Welfare-to-Work formula funds grantee (typically the Private Industry Council).
- The vouchers will be used where they are *essential to a successful transition from welfare to work--that is, where housing assistance is critical for a family to get or keep a job.*
- Families who receive the vouchers must be *eligible for or currently receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or have received TANF within the past year.*

The initiative recognizes the direct link between affordable housing and self-sufficiency. Along with the Administration's proposal to increase the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, this initiative will make decent, affordable housing available to more Americans.

The most recent data (1993) show that approximately 2.7 million African American households and 1.8 million Hispanic American households were eligible for but did not receive housing assistance. These new vouchers will help address the unmet housing need for some

African American and Hispanic American families who are making the transition from welfare to work.

01/21/98

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 17:53:18.00

SUBJECT: ed and tobacco

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

please page me when you can. i'm hearing rumors about releasing ed early
and can't afford to get caught flat footed.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 18:16:04.00

SUBJECT: child care and NPR interview

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

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

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

TEXT:

I think this is actually a problem.

Transcript from NPR interview

Q So, if you don't get the tobacco settlement, you'll cut elsewhere?

THE PRESIDENT: If I don't get -- in other words, if we don't get the tobacco settlement, we'll either have to cut the size of the child care initiative or cut elsewhere, or do something else, because I will not just, on my own, get up and propose that we spend the proposed settlement, or part of it, on these programs. I think they are terribly important, but right now we've got other fish to fry. And we've got to make sure -- the most important thing is to keep this economy growing, to keep disciplined, to keep strong, to do what makes sense. And that's what has gotten us here, five hard years of that, and we don't want to forget that.

So we do have new spending in our programs, but it's new spending within a context of fiscal discipline. It's new discipline with the smallest federal government since Kennedy was President and the size of it continuing to go down.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 14:35:10.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

please call waldman x62272

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 13:08:34.00

SUBJECT: EEOC update

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:
Elena,

As you know, Tom and Mary have been meeting with OMB and the various agencies to discuss the changes that the EEOC has proposed to how it processes its federal sector cases. Sally Katzen headed up an interagency effort to review the concerns of the affected agencies. She then sent an e-mail asking for their views on specific parts of the proposed rule. OMB received 10 agency comments in response to her e-mail. OMB has been working with the EEOC to make changes to their proposed rule that address some of the concerns raised by the agencies. EEOC has agreed to all of the changes suggested by OMB except the one that addresses the standard of review for appeals to the OFO (EEOC appeals of AJ decisions) (See Mary's e-mail of 01/16 that spells these concerns out).

Tomorrow, Danny Warfel from Sally's office is going to call the agencies that commented on the rule to let them know of the changes EEOC has made to the rule since the agencies have last seen it. At that time, he will inform them that they should elevate any further concerns to the GC or Deputy Secy level and that Sally will have a meeting with any GC's or Deputy Secys that want to voice their concerns. That meeting is going to take place Monday, January 26th at 2pm. OMB has invited DPC and EEOC to attend as well. The place is TBD. I will let you know as I know more.

Julie

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 09:28:20.00

SUBJECT: Tobacco Strategy Meeting

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: 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: 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: 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: Donna L. Geisbert (CN=Donna L. Geisbert/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: Kristen E. Panerali (CN=Kristen E. Panerali/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: Peter A. Weissman (CN=Peter A. Weissman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We will be having the Tobacco Strategy Meeting Thursday, January 22, at 2:45 p.m. in Room 211, OEOB.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:21-JAN-1998 10:54:06.00

SUBJECT: tobacco

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

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

TEXT:

any guidance on timing for a tobacco briefing of gov's senior staff? we
are getting close to chiles putting a call into the POTUS

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 19:34:27.00

SUBJECT: Cloning

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

TEXT:

Attached is OSTP's draft of a memo that could be sent to the President on cloning. In general it is accurate: in meetings with OSTP (Rachel Levinson), VP (Gips), counsel (Marshall), Leg affairs, and DOJ we came up with four options-- the current approach, two refinements, or a generally worded approach recommended by some outside groups. It recommends in favor of one of the refinements and recommends against preemption. However, it is sloppy and not informative enough. We are meeting again tomorrow morning to improve it. You are more familiar with the President's thinking on this issue, but here is what I think the memo should do better:

1. Explain what FDA can do. FDA has not formally announced it, but Bill Schultz thinks they have the authority to ban cloning for the time being on the basis of it not being safe. FDA thinks there is still a need for legislation that bans cloning on ethics grounds so that when it is a safe technology it remains a banned procedure.
2. Explain clearly the pros and cons of each option's effect on research. The option we chose (C) was supposed to be the most research friendly while still banning making human with cloning, that needs to be clearer.
3. I think we should list an option of not sending up a new bill. We've already said our principles and endorsed model legislation, we could offer to work with Feinstein or Kennedy to fix the problems we all see in our bill. The President could direct FDA to come up with a regulation, and leg. affairs could work with the the Senate to preserve embryo research but ban the making of humans via cloning (for instance by banning implanting in the womb using somatic cell nuclear transfer.) If you agree with this last point, I'm not sure we even need a special memo to the President but it could just be included in the Weekly.

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D2]MAIL466907129.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504354050000010A020100000002050000007F33000000020000D3FB73FE9A8A77D2782B66

DRAFT MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

SUBJECT: Cloning Legislative Options

Interest in cloning legislation was renewed by reports that a Chicago physicist plans to attempt to use this technology to create a child. Your January 10 radio address challenged Congress to enact a ban on private sector activities like the one you have imposed on the public sector. This issue is likely to appear in both the House and Senate very soon after they return. Based on bills introduced in the fall, and the difficulties inherent in trying to craft a bill of appropriate scope, there is a strong possibility that Congressional measures may deviate from the principles outlined in your draft bill.

This memorandum summarizes the following options with respect to a legislative strategy on cloning: (A.) continue to support the principles and language in your June 9, 1997 draft bill; (B.) support the principles but refine the current language; (C.) change the scope of prohibited activities to respond to criticism; or (D.) adopt a prohibition with a more general focus.

The memorandum also presents the pros and cons associated with a clause pre-empting state legislation of human cloning.

I. Substantive Prohibition

A. Support existing language without changes

Your bill has been praised by industry and professional societies for its narrow focus on the act of creating a human being through somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT), the technology used to create Dolly the sheep, and the absence of mention of embryo research. These groups also applaud your protection of noncontroversial biomedical research and the 5-year sunset provision. Current language maintains the status quo with respect to freedom to carry out embryo research in the private sector under existing (albeit limited) Federal oversight. The Federal ban on creation of human embryos for research purposes is unaffected by any of the options in this memorandum.

B. Refine current language

Continue to hold to the principles expressed in your draft bill but make the following changes to clarify the prohibition:

Current language:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to perform or use somatic cell nuclear transfer with the intent of introducing the product of that transfer into a woman's womb or in any other way creating a human being.

Suggested modification:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to introduce the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer into a woman's womb in order to create a child.

Rationale

There is greater agreement on the definition of a child than there is on a human being, thus avoiding some, but not all of the embryo research and abortion debate.

The term "or in any other way" created unnecessary confusion.

"Intent" was included as protection for a defendant, but industry and medical practitioners suggested deleting it.

C. Continue to support the principles in the existing bill but broaden its scope

We would like you to focus on pros and cons of including the phrase "in order to create a child" as it appears in Option B.

You have been sensitive to the need to be very cautious in setting a boundary around permissible biomedical research through this bill; hence its narrow focus. The phrase "in order to create a child" maintains that view with its implied intent. However, it suggests two potentially troubling scenarios of which you should be aware. First, it may be interpreted to encourage abortion because transfer of the product of cloning would be prohibited only if it was done so as to create a child, not if it was done with intent to abort. Second, someone caught in the act of attempting to create a child using this method could avoid liability simply by aborting the cloned embryo or fetus.

Therefore, we would suggest that the prohibition be modified to read as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to introduce the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer into a woman's womb.

This clear language means that during the time this law is in effect, no one in the public or private sectors may perform somatic cell nuclear transfer and implant the resulting product in a woman's uterus. Today, this is legal in the private sector, although it may be possible to exert some regulatory oversight, as discussed in the background attachment. Some fertility research would be precluded under this option, although it is difficult to determine how much because efforts are generally made to sustain a pregnancy after implantation; not to perform experiments with the intention of aborting.

The right-to-life community criticized your bill for allowing the creation of embryos for research purposes using private funds, as long as those embryos were aborted subsequently. This modification still permits the creation of embryos but removes the incentive for abortion. While the scientific and medical communities supported your earlier version, it is likely that you will retain their support even with this change in view of the larger threats to research emanating from Congress. However, it does make the sunset clause all the more crucial. We have been told that the fertility research community would not object to this approach.

D. Adopt a more general prohibition

Your bill is intended to prevent anyone from creating a child who is a genetically identical copy of an existing or previously existing person. Somatic cell nuclear transfer is one way of accomplishing this feat and you endorsed the recommendation of your National Bioethics Advisory Commission in limiting the scope of your bill to the use of this technology to create a child. Another option would be to construct a more general, non-technology specific ban such as the following:

It shall be unlawful to create a child who is genetically identical to an existing or previously existing child or adult.

Violation of this ban will depend on one's definition of the point at which life begins. Some people believe that an embryo is a child, hence, creating identical embryos would be in violation of the law. Under this definition, an existing reproductive technology known as blastomere or blastocyst splitting would be prohibited. This method is used to treat women with reduced fertility, particularly those who are older and wish to have more than one child but are unable or unwilling to undergo the drug treatments necessary to stimulate hyperovulation. It may also be used with donor eggs. What is done, in essence, is to fertilize one egg and after just a few cell divisions, split the early embryo. This mimics the occurrence in nature of identical twins. However, the mother has the option of implanting both embryos, or freezing one and implanting it at a later date, thus creating non-contemporaneous twins.

If one believes that life begins at birth, then it would be permissible to create a cloned embryo, implant that embryo in a woman's uterus, and abort it at any point prior to birth. This course has the same shortcomings as Option 2 in that it may be interpreted to encourage abortion.

Recommendation:

We propose that you select Option C. so as to: maintain as narrow a prohibition as possible, thus protecting a wide range of biomedical research, and preserve the status quo with respect to incentives for abortion.

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Discuss: _____

II. Federal Pre-emption of State Regulation

The industry is strongly advocating that the Administration use this bill to pre-empt state laws restricting cloning research. The industry cites the California Bill as an example of the type of provision that would prohibit appropriate biomedical research on cloning and they fear that the political climate would likely pressure states to adopt unduly restrictive measures.

There are also a number of reasons arguing against pre-emption at this time. For example, federalism concerns would normally militate against preemption unless it could be

shown that such action is necessary (e.g. when there is a need for national standards). In this case, although the industry might be inconvenienced by the existence of differing laws, there is no clear reason why uniform standards are required. Indeed, in the area of biomedical research, there is a strong argument in favor of allowing the states to experiment with a wide range of options because no single correct approach to this issue is immediately obvious. Moreover, the industry's fears that the states would act in concert to preclude important biomedical research, beyond the use of cloning to create a child, seem unwarranted. It is not likely that every state would choose to ban all research because the states that elect to forego restrictive regulation would be likely, on that account, to attract new industry. Finally, using this particular bill to preclude all state regulation of biomedical research is inconsistent with our position that this bill is designed to address only the limited issue of cloning and is not an attempt to address broader research issues.

Recommendation:

We recommend against adding a pre-emption clause.

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Discuss: _____

Attachments:

A. Discussion of Impact of FDA Regulatory Authority on Legislative Strategy

B. H.R. 922 - Bill Introduced By Rep. Vernon Ehlers to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 13:59:43.00

SUBJECT: PIR Agenda and Role for Secretary Cuomo on 2/11/98

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Doris O. Matsui (CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas Umberg (CN=Thomas Umberg/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP @ EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 01/22/98
01:56 PM -----

John M. Goering
01/21/98 06:43:38 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Jon P. Jennings/WHO/EOP
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
Subject: PIR Agenda and Role for Secretary Cuomo on 2/11/98

We attach a copy of the agenda for the President's Advisory Board meeting on race and poverty in the San Francisco Bay area. With Judy's approval, we have indicated the roles which we hope that Secretary Cuomo will contribute to at the meeting on February 11th. He is of course most welcome to join any of the activities planned for the two days.

His role includes offering a major, keynote address on the morning of February 11th and then joining the Advisory Board the same morning to listen to, and ask questions of, a panel of experts on the issues of race and poverty. Please note that Former HUD Secretary Jack Kemp will be invited to be a panelist for the discussion for which Secretary Cuomo would be in attendance .

We very much hope that you can encourage the Secretary's staff to include this meeting on his agenda . We look forward to hearing back from you soon. John Goering

Message Copied

To: _____
Judith A. Winston/PIR/EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Julie A. Fernandes/OPD/EOP
Jacinta Ma/PIR/EOP
Lin Liu/PIR/EOP

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D71]MAIL40071512V.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043DC080000010A02010000000205000000403300000002000074B65EACD3F7241E793349

DRAFT (as of March 18, 2010, 10:56AM)
Agenda
President's Advisory Board On Race
Northern California, February 10-11, 1998

Theme: *Race and Poverty in America*

The purpose of this meeting is to examine the relationship between race, poverty, and public policy in both urban and rural America. We will explore why, despite important improvements, minorities remain most impacted by poverty, examining the link between race and poverty. For example, from 1960 through 1990, the poverty rate for African-Americans has been significantly higher than for any other racial group. The poverty rate for Hispanics and Asian Pacific Americans in 1990 were, however, higher than they were in 1969. Further, we will examine the need for and effectiveness of public and private sector responses to the persistence and concentration of race-based poverty, including breaking the well-documented cycle of poverty. Recommendations made thirty years ago by the Kerner Commission in addressing race will be reviewed for their relevance. We will identify some promising practices aimed at reducing poverty in minority communities including SBA, housing and community development projects.

Key Questions:

- To what extent are poverty and race related? Is there a link between race and concentrated poverty?
- What are the main causes of continuing and concentrated poverty among whites and minorities? Does discrimination continue to effect opportunities for minorities to move out of poor, segregated neighborhoods? What are the connections between racial isolation and poverty and how can we alter the negative aspects of these connections?
- What governmental and non-governmental programs and policies are most effective in addressing minority group poverty and racial segregation? Should such policies and programs differ in order to address the distinctive position and needs of different racial/ethnic groups? How should they do this?

Day 1 (San Francisco/Oakland/East Palo Alto):

The day will be devoted to having Board members visit Promising Practices sites in the San Francisco, Oakland, and East Palo Alto communities. The day will end with a community forum held in San Jose.

HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo and SBA Administrator Aida Alvarez will be invited to attend.

San Francisco:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices. Secretary Andrew Cuomo will be invited to attend.

Oakland:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices.

East Palo Alto:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices.

San Jose:

Community Forum: 6:00-7:30 pm

The day will conclude with a community forum in which Board members listen and learn about issues related to race in the San Jose area.

Possible Moderators: Local San Jose Moderator; Emerald Yeh, KRON; Wendy Tokuda, anchor; Thuy Vu, KPIX; Michael Krasny, KQED (NPR); Dennis Richmond, KPPU.

Day 2 (in San Jose):

9:00 am - 9:10 am

Welcome and review of agenda by Chairman Franklin.

9:10 am - 9:15 am

Welcoming remarks from local official.

9:15 - 9:25 am

Keynote/Opening Address by HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo

9:25 am - 9:40 am: **Overview of the Poverty Status of Minorities:**

Current statistics regarding race/poverty for the US and the San Jose metropolitan area (CMSA). The presenter will describe who is poor in America, trends in poverty and race, and how racial groups differ from each other. Dr. Laura Tyson, University of California at Berkeley or local area Asian American expert.

9:40 am - 11:45 am: **Poverty and Race: The Facts and Causes**

HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo will be invited to participate in the morning panel with the Advisory Board. This round table discussion will bring together national experts to discuss if there is a link between race and poverty, as well as the status and causes of continuous and concentrated poverty in urban and rural communities. Economic inequality and race will be assessed as will the role of housing discrimination and how it limits opportunities to move out of 'ghetto' neighborhoods. The key controversies have been the extent to which the causes are racial or non-racial and the extent to which the poor themselves bear responsibility for the continued impoverishment.

Possible panelists include:

Professor William Julius Wilson, Harvard;
Professor Douglas Massey, University of Pennsylvania;
Professor Frances Fox Piven, Columbia;
Dr. Isabelle Sawhill, Brookings;
Ms. Antonia Hernandez, MALDEF;
Professor Manuel Pastor, Chair of the Department of Latin American and Latino Studies, University of California at Santa Cruz;
Professor Jerry Lopez, UCLA Law School;
Professor Matthew Snipp, Stanford University;
Former HUD-Secretary Jack Kemp, Empower America;

Professor Shelby Steele;
other local Hispanic, Asian American (Robert Jibou; Min Zhou; Ailee Moon;
Wei-Yin Hu; Eric Fong).

This session would conclude with 45 minutes of q&a.
Moderator: TBD

11:45 - 1:30 pm
Lunch

1:30 pm - 3:30 pm: Poverty and Race: Policy Issues and Local Solutions

This panel discussion will focus on the main national, State and local options for addressing the causes of poverty and possible programs and policies to address race-based poverty. The panel will consist largely of local state and area program experts. The discussion will likely include a focus on welfare-to-work as well as housing deconcentration efforts from HUD. Local initiatives will be assessed as well. The panel could include representatives of the California Rural Legal Services (Jose Padilla), the Asian Law caucus; Asian-American experts (Robert Jibou; Eric Fong) and American Indian practitioners; Robert Woodson, Neighborhood Development. This session would conclude with 45 minutes of q&a from the audience.

Moderator: TBD

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 16:03:29.00

SUBJECT: Meeting next week re: H1B visas

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Next Tuesday, January 27th, at 3pm we are meeting in Room 211 to discuss H1B (specialty skills) visas. The meeting will include representatives from Commerce, INS and Labor. Please let me know if this does not work for you. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 16:20:05.00

SUBJECT: Maria and service/race

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI, Maria Echaveste has been pushing for an 800 number for the state of the union where the President could refer people who want to volunteer, in connection with the race initiative. The Corporation for National Service told her it couldn't do this, particularly on such short notice, but suggested creating a Corp. web site that would point potential volunteers to existing web sites of the United Way, the big youth service group, United Way, America's Promise, etc. So we'll see. (Previously, Maria tried to get religious orgs to agree to offer service opportunities, but didn't get much response.)

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Steven M. Mertens (CN=Steven M. Mertens/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 14:53:16.00

SUBJECT: Follow-up Meeting with INS on Booze-Allen Statement of Work

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

A meeting has been scheduled for Friday, January 23 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 246 to continue the dialog with INS and the Department of Justice on the Booze-Allen restructuring contract and the contract statement of work. Commissioner Meissner and Bob Bach will attend from INS and Steve Colgate, Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Bob Deigleman and John Morton will likely attend from the Department.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 13:06:24.00

SUBJECT: Draft Statement on national test

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

TEXT:

Rahm: do you want the WH or ED to put out a statement?

Statement on National Assessment Governing Board Decision to Modify
Contract for Developing National Tests

The Administration fought last year successfully to make sure that the independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) was given responsibility for overseeing the development of voluntary national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math. Today NAGB completed an important part of its work--to review and determine the modifications it deems necessary to the test development contract. We are pleased that NAGB is carrying out this responsibility in a serious and thoughtful manner.

Today we took another important step forward -- another step toward putting high standards in the classroom and keeping politics out. We do not agree with NAGB that it is necessary to delay the initial administration of the tests for one year. However, we are pleased that we are on track to having the first ever national tests in the basic skills, and to giving parents and communities tools to improve their local schools.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Stacie Spector (CN=Stacie Spector/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 14:04:01.00

SUBJECT: SOTU Amplification Material

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Marsha E. Berry (CN=Marsha E. Berry/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: Paul A. Tuchmann (CN=Paul A. Tuchmann/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Sidney Blumenthal (CN=Sidney Blumenthal/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: Terri J. Tingen (CN=Terri J. Tingen/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: Beverly J. Barnes (CN=Beverly J. Barnes/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: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:

FYI -Information on State of the Union Amplification activities:

1 - Paper: Communications will be responsible for pulling together the "paper" for people who will need to be talking on the State of the Union speech (Senior staff, elected officials, Cabinet members, constituent leaders, Friends of the Administration, etc). What this means is that a packet with the following items will be sent to your office by Tuesday early afternoon (unless we are told it can go earlier):

Talking points (overall)

State by State accomplishments (to offices who work

w/states)

Constituent Accomplishments

5 Year Accomplishment cards (yellow-you should have them

now)

3-5 Issue papers on specific issues that may be in the SOTU

The packets will be sent to 1-2 people in your office who will then be responsible for making the appropriate amount of copies for what your individual staff needs will be. Please make sure to communicate and coordinate within your own department to make sure that each of your colleagues will receive the materials they need.

We completely understand the need to receive this material early and will do everything we can to get this stuff to you in a reasonable amount of time while not jeopardizing information getting out before the President's speech.

Immediately following the State of the Union speech the actual text of what the President delivers will be posted on the WH web site for immediate access of the text.

2 - Message Call: We will also be setting up a 3-5 minute conference call immediately following the speech where Ann Lewis will run through message points for people who will be speaking publically and need some message guidance and focus. This will be a 1 way call, which means that Ann will talk, but the callers will not be able to ask questions. The capacity for this call is 100 people. So, please be cautious about who you recommend be on the call so all departments with surrogates will have access to this information. Kevin Moran is the contact for getting on this call.

3 - Briefings: We will also be helping schedule the Senior Staff for participation in briefings and conference calls to get everyone on message for the SOTU. Ann Walker will be helping with that piece and we will call you within the next few hours to work on slating each of the needed briefers.

Please share this memo with other staff that may need to know how things will work. If you have a specific need or problem that has not been addressed please feel free to call and we will try to help you, or direct you to someone who can. Thanks for your patience and cooperation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Richard Socarides (CN=Richard Socarides/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-JAN-1998 17:36:32.00

SUBJECT: San Jose --Revised Draft Agenda -- please disregard earlier drafts

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Doris O. Matsui (CN=Doris O. Matsui/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas Umberg (CN=Thomas Umberg/OU=ONDCP/O=EOP @ EOP [ONDCP])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP on 01/22/98
05:30 PM -----

Jacinta Ma
01/22/98 05:27:50 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
cc: John M. Goering/PIR/EOP, Lin Liu/PIR/EOP
Subject: Revised Draft Agenda

Attached is a revised agenda that better reflects our desire to have one panel that focuses on national issues and the other that focuses on local issues with people who have experience working with people in poverty. It would be great if you could send this one out and ask people to ignore the earlier one.

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D35]MAIL442346121.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043DC080000010A02010000000205000000D331000000020000A99FCF9E36C24B53B42D65

DRAFT (as of March 18, 2010, 10:58AM)
Agenda
President's Advisory Board On Race
Northern California, February 10-11, 1998

Theme: *Race and Poverty in America*

The purpose of this meeting is to examine the relationship between race, poverty, and public policy in both urban and rural America. We will explore why, despite important improvements, minorities remain most impacted by poverty, examining the link between race and poverty. The poverty rate for Hispanics and Asian Pacific Americans in 1990 was, for example, higher than it was in 1969. Typically the highest rates of poverty are experienced by American Indians. At the same time, from 1960 through 1990, the poverty rate for African-Americans has been significantly higher than for almost any other racial group.

Further, we will examine the need for and effectiveness of public and private sector responses to the persistence and concentration of race-based poverty, including breaking the well-documented cycle of poverty. Recommendations made thirty years ago by the Kerner Commission in addressing race will be reviewed for their relevance. We will identify some promising practices aimed at reducing poverty in minority communities including SBA, housing and community development projects.

Key Questions:

- To what extent are poverty and race related? Is there a link between race and concentrated poverty?
- What are the main causes of continuing and concentrated poverty among whites and minorities? Does discrimination continue to effect opportunities for minorities to move out of poor, segregated neighborhoods? What are the connections between racial isolation and poverty and how can we alter the negative aspects of these connections?
- What governmental and non-governmental programs and policies are most effective in addressing minority group poverty and racial segregation? Should such policies and programs differ in order to address the distinctive position and needs of different racial/ethnic groups? How should they do this?

Day 1 (San Francisco/Oakland/East Palo Alto):

The day will be devoted to having Board members visit Promising Practices sites in the San Francisco, Oakland, and East Palo Alto communities. The day will end with a community forum held in San Jose.

HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo and SBA Administrator Aida Alvarez will be invited to attend.

San Francisco:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices. Secretary Andrew Cuomo will be invited to attend.

Oakland:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices.

East Palo Alto:

10:30 am - 12:30 pm: Board members visit local Promising Practices.

San Jose:

Community Forum: 6:00-7:30 pm

The day will conclude with a community forum in which Board members listen and learn about issues related to race in the San Jose area.

Possible Moderators: Local San Jose Moderator; Emerald Yeh, KRON; Wendy Tokuda, anchor; Thuy Vu, KPIX; Michael Krasny, KQED (NPR); Dennis Richmond, KPPU.

Day 2 (in San Jose):

9:00 am - 9:10 am

Welcome and review of agenda by Chairman Franklin.

9:10 am - 9:15 am

Welcoming remarks from local official.

9:15 - 9:25 am

Keynote/Opening Address by HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo

9:25 am - 9:40 am: **Overview of the Poverty Status of Minorities**

Current statistics regarding race/poverty for the US and the San Jose metropolitan area (CMSA). The presenter will describe who is poor in America, trends in poverty and race, and how racial groups differ from each other.

Possible presenters: Dr. Laura Tyson, University of California at Berkeley or local area expert.

9:40 am - 11:45 am: **Poverty and Race: Facts, Causes, and National Issues**

HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo will be invited to participate in the morning panel with the Advisory Board. This round table discussion will bring together national experts to discuss if there is a link between race and poverty, as well as the status and causes of continuous and concentrated poverty in urban and rural communities. Economic inequality and race will be assessed as will the role of housing discrimination and how it limits opportunities to move out of "ghetto" neighborhoods. The key controversies have been the extent to which the causes are racial or non-racial and the extent to which the poor themselves bear responsibility for the continued impoverishment. The focus will be on national policies, programs, and legislative issues.

Possible who are suggested for possible inclusion include:

Professor William Julius Wilson, Harvard;
Professor Douglas Massey, University of Pennsylvania;
Professor Frances Fox Piven, Columbia;
Professor Manual Pastor, Chair of the Department of Latin American and Latino Studies, University of California at Santa Cruz;
Professor Matthew Snipp, Stanford University;

Former HUD-Secretary Jack Kemp, Empower America;
Professor Shelby Steele;
other local Hispanic, Asian American (Robert Jibou; Min Zhou; Ailee Moon;
Wei-Yin Hu; Eric Fong).

This session would conclude with 45 minutes of q&a.

Moderator: TBD

11:45 - 1:30 pm

Lunch

1:30 pm - 3:30 pm: **Poverty and Race: Local Policy Issues and Solutions**

This panel discussion will focus on the main State and local options for addressing the causes of poverty and possible programs and policies to address race-based poverty. The panel will consist largely of local state and area program experts. The discussion will likely include a focus on welfare-to-work as well as community and housing deconcentration and “integration” efforts from HUD, including Enterprise Zones/Community Development banks as they are being implemented at the local level. The panel could include:

Denise Fairchild, Community Development Technologies Center in LA;
Jose Padilla, California Rural Legal Services;
Representative from The Asian Law Caucus;
Robert Woodson, Neighborhood Development;
Asian American experts (Robert Jibou; Brian Cheu);
Latino and American Indian practitioners.

This session would conclude with 45 minutes of q&a from the audience.

Moderator: TBD

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 11:46:27.00

SUBJECT: Draft Two-Pager on Zones

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: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./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: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:
Bruce and Elena--

Here is the latest draft of the two-pager on the Education Opportunity Zones. We are circulating this for comment to key people at Education and internally, and may have some limited changes still to make before we need your final review. We are also working on a) revised set of urban and rural examples of the kinds of activities supported by the initiative and b) internal Q&A. Note that this version still presumes that the Zones will be leaked prior to the class-size initiative.

Thanks.

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D67]MAIL42533422X.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043BC040000010A02010000000205000000A4240000000200004FDBA2AAA937203AD3F8A9
B147487ADCBBF8771826F7F7DBEA6E39B1510227A0825731D967B36161D1F4B10049433D948587

**EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ZONES:
STRENGTHENING URBAN AND RURAL SCHOOLS**
REVISED DRAFT -- January 23, 1998

I challenge every school district to adopt high standards, to abolish social promotion, to move aggressively to help all students make the grade through tutoring, and summer schools, and to hold schools accountable for results, giving them the tools and the leadership and the parental involvement to do the job.

-- President Bill Clinton, October 28, 1997

HELPING STUDENTS IN HIGH POVERTY COMMUNITIES REACH HIGH STANDARDS. President Clinton's Education Opportunity Zones initiative will help strengthen public schools and help students master the basic and advanced academic skills where the need is the greatest: in high poverty urban and rural communities where concentrated poverty, low expectations, too many poorly prepared teachers, and overwhelmed school systems create significant barriers to high achievement. The Education Department will select approximately fifty high poverty urban and rural communities with: (1) a demonstrated commitment to use high standards and tests of student achievement as tools to identify and provide help to students, teachers and schools who need it; (2) programs to end social promotion and turn around failing schools; and (3) evidence of improved student achievement. Added investments in these communities will accelerate their progress and provide models of successful, standards-based reform for the nation. The President's initiative would invest \$200 million in FY99, and \$1.5 billion over 5 years, in raising achievement and sharing lessons learned with school districts around the country.

A CLEAR FOCUS ON HIGH STANDARDS AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS. To be selected as Education Opportunity Zones, school districts will have to demonstrate how they will address some key aspects of effective local reform efforts: ■ holding schools accountable for helping students reach high academic standards, including rewarding schools that succeed and intervening in schools that fail to make progress; ■ holding teachers and principals accountable for quality, including rewarding outstanding teachers, and fairly and quickly removing ineffective teachers; ■ ending social promotions and requiring students to meet academic standards at key transition points in their academic careers; and ■ providing students and parents with school report cards and expanded choice within public education.

EXTRA RESOURCES TO IMPROVE TEACHING, LEARNING, AND LEADERSHIP. School districts will use Education Opportunity Zone funds for key activities such as: ■ providing extra help to students who need it to meet challenging standards, through after-school, Saturday, and/or summer school programs; ■ providing bonuses to schools that make significant gains in student achievement; ■ turning around failing schools by implementing proven reform models, or closing them down and reconstituting them or reopening them as charter schools; ■ building stronger partnerships between schools and parents, businesses, and communities; ■ implementing sound management practices and accountability systems; ■ providing intensive professional development to teachers and principals; ■ helping outstanding teachers earn master teacher certification from the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards and giving them bonuses when they do; and
■ implementing programs to identify low performing teachers, assist them to improve, and

remove them if they fail to do so.

COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO SUPPORT PROMISING MODELS. Districts will be selected as Education Opportunity Zones under a competitive, peer-review process. A mix of large and smaller urban areas will be selected to participate, as well as rural school districts and consortia. Each urban Education Opportunity Zone will receive a 3-year grant worth up to \$10-25 million per year (depending upon size and proposed activities), and each rural Zone could receive from \$250,000 to \$3 million (for consortia). Zones will be selected in two rounds, the first in FY 1999, and the second in FY 2001. Successful applicants will have broad-based partnerships to support their reforms -- including parents, teachers, local government, business and civic groups, institutions of higher education and other key stakeholders. Successful applications will show how the district will use all available resources -- federal, state, and local, as well as any business or foundation funds -- to carry out its reform strategy and maintain it once these federal funds are no longer available. Eligible districts often have substantial numbers of disabled and limited English proficient children, and successful applications will address how these children will be assisted to meet high standards.

REWARDS FOR DEMONSTRATED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT GAINS. Each Education Opportunity Zone will agree to a rigorous performance partnership with the Secretary of Education, agreeing to set specific, ambitious, benchmarks in student achievement, dropout rates and other indicators of success. Districts may receive further support in years 4 and 5 only if they have demonstrated success in reaching the agreed benchmarks.

GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN USING OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES. All schools in an Education Opportunity Zone school district -- regardless of poverty level -- will become eligible to combine all their federal education funds, together with state and local funds, in schoolwide programs to raise student achievement. Requirements pertaining to school accountability, as well as special education, health, safety, and civil rights, will continue to be met.

ASSISTANCE TO HELP DISTRICTS FIND AND SHARE WHAT WORKS. The Department of Education will offer technical assistance, use technology to help districts consult with each other, and disseminate lessons learned to urban and rural communities across the U.S. In addition, a national evaluation of the Zones will be conducted, with the results helping to inform the next reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

BOLD ACTION TO HELP CHILDREN IN OUR CITIES AND RURAL AREAS. Education opportunity zones are part of a broader set of initiatives to help strengthen urban and rural schools. President Clinton has proposed a national campaign to rebuild crumbling schools, a \$350 million initiative to recruit and prepare teachers for underserved urban and rural areas, and a dramatic commitment to expanding the availability and quality of child care and after-school learning opportunities. These and additional proposals still to be announced will have a powerful impact on improving the prospects of children in some of our poorest communities.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Janet Murguia (CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 15:33:06.00

SUBJECT: Hill briefings on Monday

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

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

TEXT:

There are two firm briefings set for Monday, January 26. I would like to have as many of you up on the Hill as possible to brief the key policy staff from the House and Senate. Please let me know if you are available to attend. I will let you know about the additional briefings as the times are set.

Monday:

10:00 am House Policy Staff in Cannon Caucus Room, Rm 245 CHOB
(House Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants,
and select Committee Staff)
Briefers: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala

11:30am Senate Policy Staff in 562 Dirksen Senate Office Building
(Senate Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants,
and select Committee Staff)
Briefers: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 20:05:24.00

SUBJECT: SOTU One-Pager

TO: Paul J. Weinstein Jr. (CN=Paul J. Weinstein Jr./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

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

TEXT:
EK/PJW:

We've tied a few initiatives together to make this seem more complete.
Hope it works. Please note the prosecutors # includes the community
prosecutors initiative, even though we really don't touch on it in the
text.

jc3

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D42]MAIL453527224.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043CE050000010A02010000000205000000AB1700000002000050FE90B07BF08F46792B52

PRESIDENT CLINTON: FIGHTING JUVENILE CRIME AND DRUG USE

“Now, we must work together to do more, to protect our children from the scourge of violent crime and especially from crimes committed by other young people. This is now my highest law enforcement priority. We must provide for more prosecutors and probation officers, tougher penalties, and also better gang prevention efforts, including after school programs, so that young people have something to say yes to and some way of staying out of trouble.”

--President Clinton, October 9, 1997

While overall crime rates have been declining, juvenile crime and drug use remains a serious problem.

Juvenile gun murders have quadrupled, teenage drug use has risen, and youth gangs have spread to large cities and rural towns throughout America. In the State of the Union, the President again challenged Congress to confront this issue and pass his Anti-Gang and Youth Violence Strategy. Specifically, his strategy and budget call for:

- **Targeting Gangs and Violent Juveniles.** To help state and local prosecutors crackdown on gang members and violent juveniles, the President has proposed \$150 million to hire new prosecutors and expand anti-gang task forces; \$60 million to establish juvenile gun and drug courts that ensure swift and certain punishment for youthful offenders; and tough new penalties and prosecutorial tools.
- **Cracking Down on Guns and Gun Traffickers.** To keep violent juveniles from buying guns as adults, the President’s strategy also proposes to ban violent juvenile from buying guns on their 21st birthday. His strategy also increases penalties for selling handguns to juveniles and other offenses, and includes \$28 million to expand the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative (YCGII) that helps local law enforcement trace illegal firearms to their source.
- **Keeping Kids In School, Off Drugs and Out of Trouble.** To ensure that kids are supervised from 3 to 8 pm -- the time when most violent juvenile crimes are committed -- the President’s strategy proposes \$95 million for the Justice Department to help keep schools open later and to promote anti-truancy initiatives and curfews. The President’s Child Care Initiative also quadruples funding for Department of Education-sponsored after school programs, and his Drug Strategy includes new funds for Safe and Drug-Free schools.

Key Components of the President’s Juvenile Crime Strategy in the FY 1999 Budget:

Prosecutorial Initiatives	-- \$150 million
Courts and Probations	-- \$60 million
At-Risk Youth Initiative	-- \$95 million
Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative	-- \$28 million
Safe and Drug-Free Schools/Coordinators	-- \$606 million
21st Century Learning Centers	-- \$200 million
Anti-Drug Media Campaign	-- \$195 million

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 17:13:49.00

SUBJECT: Draft SOTU/Education Initiatives One-Pager

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

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

TEXT:

Bob Shireman is currently adding in NEC pieces on school construction and mentoring. He should be sending the document directly to you as soon as those are incorporated.

Thanks.

-- Bill

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 21:21:43.00

SUBJECT: Re: Education

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

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Mickey Ibarra/WHO/EOP on 01/23/98
09:09 PM -----

Bruce N. Reed
01/20/98 08:40:46 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Mickey Ibarra/WHO/EOP
cc: Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Michael Cohen/OPD/EOP
Subject: Re: Education

We'll wrap up the memo. My guess is that by the 30th we'll be in a position to announce the USCM conference, but not the WH one.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 17:37:05.00

SUBJECT: Min wage and workfare sheet

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

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

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:

Elena -- Diana did the work sheet you asked for, comparing how many states will have trouble paying for workfare under the current and increased minimum wage.

----- Forwarded by Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP on 01/23/98
05:31 PM -----

Diana Fortuna
01/23/98 05:03:23 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Cynthia A. Rice/OPD/EOP
cc:
Subject: Min wage and workfare sheet

I couldn't do each year individually because there is a food stamp cost of living adjustment (which actually our previous analysis from HHS ignored). But I think this works pretty well. I got some numbers from Jeff Farkas to do it.

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D23]MAIL483846229.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043DE0B0000010A02010000000205000000891600000002000020AAB68910B504CEE8D8F1

States With Problems in 2001 (assumes 20 hours of work per week) -- Factors in rough food stamp cost of living increase in 2001			
	Families of 2	Families of 3 (average family size)	Families of 4
Current Minimum Wage -- \$5.15	8 states	No states (Miss.'s problem disappears by 2001 because of increase in food stamp allotment)	No states
Year 2001 minimum wage: \$6.20	24 states	4 states	No states

Recall that the number of hours of work required per week increases from 20 hours in 1997 and 1998 to 25 hours in 1999, and 30 hours in 2000 and thereafter. However, the increase from 20 to 30 hours can be in the form of training directly related to employment, so it is possible to argue that 20 hours is the more useful reference point. But below is the 30 hour chart.

States With Problems in 2001 (assumes 30 hours of work per week) -- Factors in rough food stamp cost of living increase in 2001			
	Families of 2	Families of 3 (average family size)	Families of 4
Current Minimum Wage -- \$5.15	38 states	14 states	2 states
Year 2001 minimum wage: \$6.20	48 states	36 states	12 states

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 11:55:06.00

SUBJECT: Guidance on civil rights and welfare reform

TO: Cynthia A. Rice (CN=Cynthia A. Rice/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

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

TEXT:

HHS's civil rights person (Dennis Hayashi) just told me that HHS has prepared guidance for states on civil rights laws and welfare reform, in consultation with EEOC, Labor, Education, USDA, and DOJ. (Who knew?) Anyway, they have a 20 page draft they just sent me that I will forward to you. There is a letter with an overview of the laws and a "technical assistance for caseworkers" document in the form of Q&A's and examples. I don't think the timing is urgent in any way.

It doesn't seem like a terrible idea to remind states and their agents of laws against discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, disability, age, etc., just as states are making this major change in their welfare programs. Most of the examples given are common sense but, of course, there are some issues. Three or four examples seemed odd to me, but since I don't know civil rights laws that well, perhaps they are natural extensions of the law. By far the most glaring one to me is as follows:

"The Act imposes a 5-year time limit on receipt of TANF benefits. However, a state may allow hardship exemptions from the time limit for up to 20% of its caseload. States and counties may not use a neutral criterion that has a disproportionate impact on minorities to determine who will be granted this exemption, unless it can be shown that this is necessary, and no less discriminatory alternative is available."

I assume we would like Rob Weiner (or whoever is the appropriate person in counsel's office) to review this. Let me know if you want to take a different approach.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 11:05:39.00

SUBJECT: Women's mtg

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Unfortunately, in addition to our mtg w. the CHC at 11:30am on Mon, Jan 26th, the Women's Caucus is also doing their monthly meeting on Monday. Can anyone cover the women's mtg from 2-3pm on Monday in 1640 Longworth. I understand that it is an extremely inconvenient time, but I am forced to work within their schedules. I guess we will try to do the best that we can to cover. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Emily Bromberg (CN=Emily Bromberg/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 16:13:09.00

SUBJECT: tobacco

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

will you be able to say anything about growers when you brief on monday?
kentucky and NC wll ask.

aslo, will you have paper for the hill/govs briefings? if so when will it
be ready?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Janet Murguia (CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 21:41:57.00

SUBJECT: MOC briefings on SOTU

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/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: Stacie Spector (CN=Stacie Spector/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: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/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: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

This is a draft Congressional Roll-out which will be updated over the weekend. Please let me know if folks have suggestions or concerns

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D15]MAIL46438722I.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504370040000010A0201000000020500000027110000000200005C28F93FE3F6CA797FD98B

Hill Briefings on the State of the Union

Monday:

- 10:00 am House Policy Staff in Cannon Caucus Room, Rm 345
(House Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants, and select Committee Staff)
White House Participants: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala, Murguia
- 11:30 am Senate Policy Staff in 562 Dirksen Senate Office Building
(Senate Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants, and select Committee Staff)
White House Participants: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala, Murguia
- 1:00 pm Congressional Hispanic Caucus Member Conference Call
(Congressional Hispanic Caucus House Members)
White House Participants: Murguia, Sperling, Raines, Riley, Reed, Echaveste, Ibarra, Shireman, Cohen
- 1:00 pm New Democrats Coalition (Co-Chairs: Roemer, Dooley, and Moran) approx. 20 to 30 Members expected. Site: TBD
White House Participants: VPOTUS
- TBD pm? Congressional Black Caucus Member Conference Call
(Could be (Congressional Black Caucus House Members)
Tuesday) White House Participants: Raines, Sperling, Kagan, Moore, Murguia
(alert--Mathews/Bowles)
- TBD pm? Phone call to Blue Dog Coalition Chair, Congressman Gary Condit
White House Contact: Bruce Reed or Monica Dixon
- TBD pm? Phone call to Asian Pacific Caucus Chair, Congresswoman Patsy Mink
White House Contact: Janet Murguia
- TBD pm? Phone call to Progressive Caucus Chair, Congressman Bernie Sanders
White House Contact: Erskine Bowles

Tuesday:

- AM/PM Assigned Calls for Principals/Cabinet Secretaries of targeted Members and Senators
- 2:00 pm Joint Democratic Leadership Members in Daschle's Conference Room
(House and Senate Democratic Leadership Members)
White House Participants: TBD

5:00 pm

House and Senate Democratic Press Secretaries
(House and Senate Press Secretaries)

White House Participants: Lewis, McCurry, Weiss-Tobey, Begala, Murguia

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 10:27:53.00

SUBJECT: Re: Time Off To Vote

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI

----- Forwarded by Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP on
01/23/98 10:27 AM -----

Morley A. Winograd @ OVP

01/23/98 07:45:05 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Time Off To Vote

Paul:

You are right. This is not aSOTU issue.

Morley

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 09:14:15.00

SUBJECT: EEOC rule

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:
Elena,

OMB spoke yesterday with the agencies that commented on the new EEOC rule to let them know the modifications that the EEOC had agreed to make pursuant to their comments. The agencies were not pleased. Sally is holding a meeting with them on Monday at 2pm to discuss their remaining concerns.

The agencies are particularly upset with the provision of the EEOC rule that would remove the agency's ability to review AJ decisions. The agencies have argued that the EEOC does not have the authority, under Title VII, to remove the agency from the process. The General Counsel from OPM (Lorraine Lewis) called Sally and Don Arbuckle and requested that OMB put this question to OLC. OMB may want to seek informal advice, rather than a legal opinion, in order to expedite the response. I have told OMB that I would be happy to make the contact with OLC on this question. Does that sound o.k.? Thanks.

Julie

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 15:17:40.00

SUBJECT: cloning memo

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

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

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

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

CC: gips_d (gips_d @ al.eop.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN]) (VPO)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[MESSAGE.D56]MAIL40085522F.026

The following is a HEX dump of the file:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D56]MAIL40085522G.026 to ASCII,

The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF5750435A070000010A020100000002050000000F4C00000002000002C4AEC206740FCD0AEF0F0
35A8431C1A73AC0FEDE21C157AD9F037FD754051842F61C7BFD2A992B9F25C800D922D2826DFEE

DRAFT MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

SUBJECT: Cloning: Legislative Options

Interest in cloning legislation was renewed by reports that a Chicago physicist plans to attempt to use this technology to create a child. Your January 10 radio address challenged Congress to enact a ban on private sector activities like the one you have imposed on the use of public funds. Congressional staff inquiries indicate that your challenge will be accepted. Both critics and supporters of your draft bill agree that this issue raises complex drafting problems. You have the opportunity at this juncture to stay with existing language or, alternatively, propose new wording that clarifies your position. Given the strong possibility that Congressional measures may deviate from the principles outlined in your draft bill, it may be desirable to assert your leadership and encourage your allies by providing more specific language.

Your June 9, 1997 draft legislation (Tab A): 1) prohibits the production of a child using somatic cell nuclear transfer, 2) protects valuable research, especially embryo research conducted without the use of Federal funds, 3) provides no new incentives for abortion, and 4) establishes a sunset provision. We believe these principles should underpin any cloning legislation. The prohibition wording options presented below are designed to clarify our position.

Whichever option you choose, you will have to struggle with the dichotomy between allowing most embryo research in the private sector, while maintaining a ban on the use of Federal funds with which much valuable science might be conducted. You addressed this issue in developing the current draft bill and might refer to the June 8 decision memorandum for useful discussion (Tab B). It is probable that cloning legislation will be viewed by some members of Congress as a vehicle for extending a more permanent, broad ban on embryo research.

The memorandum also presents the pros and cons associated with a clause pre-empting state legislation of human cloning, and a possible legislative strategy.

I. Prohibition Wording Options

A. Support current language without changes

Current language:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to perform or use somatic cell nuclear transfer with the intent of introducing the product of that transfer into a woman's womb or in any other way creating a human being.

Your bill has been praised by the biomedical industry and professional societies for its narrow focus on the act of creating a human being through somatic cell nuclear transfer--the technology used to create Dolly the sheep--and the absence of any mention of embryo research. These groups also applaud your protection of noncontroversial biomedical research and the

5-year sunset provision. Current language maintains the status quo with respect to freedom to carry out embryo research in the private sector under existing (albeit limited) Federal oversight, and does not affect nor address the ban on Federal funding for a much broader class of embryo research.

The biotechnology industry and fertility research community have identified three problems with this language: (1) it appears to equate introduction into the womb with creating a human being, (2) the meaning of the word “intent” is ambiguous, and (3) the meaning of the phrase “or in any other way” is unclear. Option B describes a solution for these problems, while continuing to uphold the principles expressed in your draft bill .

B. Refine current language

Suggested modification:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to introduce the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer into a woman’s womb in order to create a child.

This language is an improvement in that it makes it clear that violation would occur at the time of introduction into the womb of the product of cloning. However, the phrase “in order to create child” carries with it two problems: (1) defining a child and when life begins, and (2) “in order to” still implies intent. Option C avoids these pitfalls/difficulties.

C. Continue to support the principles in the existing bill, but clarify its scope

Suggested modification:

It shall be unlawful for any person or other legal entity, public or private, to introduce the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer into a woman’s womb.

You have been sensitive to the need to be very careful in setting a boundary around permissible biomedical research; hence this bills narrow focus. The phrase “in order to create a child” maintains that view. However, it suggests two potentially troubling scenarios of which you should be aware. First, it could be interpreted that it encourages abortion because transfer of the product of cloning would be prohibited only if it was done to create a child, but not if it was done with the intention to abort. Second, someone caught in the act of attempting to create a child using this method could avoid liability simply by aborting the cloned embryo or fetus. Therefore, we would suggest that “in order to create a child” be deleted.

This clear language means that during the time this law is in effect, no one in the public or private sectors may perform somatic cell nuclear transfer and implant the resulting product in a woman’s uterus. Today, this is legal in the private sector, although it may be possible to exert some regulatory oversight, as discussed in the background attachment. Some fertility research would be precluded under this option, although it is difficult to determine how much because

efforts are generally made to sustain a pregnancy after implantation, not to perform experiments with the intention of aborting. Your National Bioethics Advisory Commission recommended a temporary ban on the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer to create child only after hearing testimony that a 3-5 year prohibition would not impede medical research progress, as long as animal cloning experiments were permitted. We have been told that the fertility research community would not object to this approach.

The right-to-life community has criticized your bill based on their interpretation that it would allow the creation of embryos for research purposes using private funds as long as those embryos were aborted subsequently. Option C still permits the creation of embryos, but removes the incentive for abortion. While the scientific and medical communities supported your earlier version, it is likely that you will retain their support even with this change in view of the larger threats that Congress might impose on research. However, it does make retention of the **sunset clause** all the more crucial. Sen. Bond, Rep. Ehlert, and others will oppose a sunset clause.

D. Adopt a more general prohibition

Your bill is intended to prevent anyone from creating a child who is a genetically identical copy of an existing or previously existing person. Somatic cell nuclear transfer is one way of accomplishing this feat and you endorsed the recommendation of your National Bioethics Advisory Commission in limiting the scope of your bill to the use of such technology to create a child. However, other groups including the American Society for Reproductive Medicine and Council of Europe have proposed more general, non-technology specific bans. One example might be the following:

It shall be unlawful to create a child who is genetically identical to an existing or previously existing child or adult.

We oppose this approach because it raises many of the same problems addressed in Options A and B; namely, defining a child and when life begins. It would also bar reproductive technology currently in use in the U.S.

Recommendation:

We propose that you select Option C so as to: maintain a narrowly focused prohibition, thus protecting the widest possible range of biomedical research while not creating any new incentives for abortion.

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Discuss: _____

II. Federal Pre-emption of State Regulation

The industry is strongly advocating that the Administration use this bill to pre-empt state laws restricting cloning research. The industry cites the California Bill as an example of the type of provision that would prohibit appropriate biomedical research on cloning and they fear that the political climate would likely pressure states to adopt unduly restrictive measures.

There are also a number of reasons arguing against pre-emption at this time. For example, federalism concerns would normally militate against preemption unless it could be shown that such action is necessary (e.g. when there is a need for national standards). In this case, although the industry might be inconvenienced by the existence of differing laws, there is no clear reason why uniform standards are required. Indeed, in the area of biomedical research, there is a strong argument in favor of allowing the states to experiment with a wide range of options because no single correct approach to this issue is immediately obvious. Moreover, the industry's fears that the states would act in concert to preclude important biomedical research, beyond the use of cloning to create a child, seem unwarranted. It is not likely that every state would choose to ban all research because the states that elect to forego restrictive regulation would be likely, on that account, to attract new industry. Finally, using this particular bill to preclude all state regulation of biomedical research is inconsistent with our position that this bill is designed to address only the limited issue of cloning and is not an attempt to address broader research issues.

Recommendation:

We recommend against adding a pre-emption clause.

Approve: _____

Disapprove: _____

Discuss: _____

III. Legislative Strategy

Because the amendment process is difficult to control and extreme amendments may make ultimate support of transmitted Administration legislation undesirable, we recommend encouraging our allies in Congress to incorporate your improved language into their legislation. Senator Diane Feinstein is currently drafting legislation and might be receptive.

Cloning legislation already introduced:

HR 922 by Ehlert - prohibition of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans. Passed out of House Science Committee. Jurisdiction claimed by House Commerce. No hearing date set.

HR 923 by Ehlert - prohibition on cloning humans. House Judiciary Committee. No hearing date.

S 368 by Bond - prohibition of use of Federal funds for human cloning research. No action to

date.

Tabs:

- A. June 9, 1997 draft Administration bill
- B. June 8, 1997 Decision memorandum
- C. Discussion of Impact of FDA Regulatory Authority on Legislative Strategy

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 19:45:42.00

SUBJECT: Weekly 1/23 as of 7:45 PM

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D80]MAIL48561722T.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF575043080F0000010A020100000002050000005C2600000002000000C6ECE9F0544FB9F053C92
B179EF4E4692BBCFBFAACE04EB0D448AAFF9798900A334152C4F58AA66D9C0700F840A431261C2

January 23, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Bruce Reed
Elena Kagan

RE: DPC Weekly Report

Crime -- Community Prosecutors Initiative: Next Friday, you are set to launch a new community prosecutors initiative at the National Conference of Mayor's event. Your FY 99 budget request contains \$50 million for a new federal grant program to build on the success of community policing and enable the Administration to help prosecutors' offices join with their police departments in making use of community-based crime strategies. Similar to the COPS Program, direct, competitive grants would be used to increase the number of local prosecutors interacting directly with members of the community ("community prosecutors" or "neighborhood DAs") and to encourage local prosecutors to reorient their emphasis to solving specific crime and quality of life problems in their communities. Some of the cities that have already started to embrace some form of community prosecution include: Portland, Boston, Denver, Chicago, Indianapolis, Kansas City, New York, Milwaukee, Austin, and Washington, DC.

Crime -- Federal Law Enforcement Officers: On Sunday, the Justice Department will release a report showing that as of June 1996, the Federal government employed about 74,500 full-time law enforcement officers authorized to make arrests and carry a gun. This is a 6% increase over the number of officers employed in 1993. The agencies that experienced the largest percentage increases in officers since 1993 include: the Immigration and Naturalization Service (31%); U.S. Marshals Service (23%); Federal Bureau of Prisons (13%); and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (40%). In 1996, 14% of federal officers were women; 72% were white; 13% were Hispanic; 12% were black; 2% were Asian or Pacific Islander; and 1% were American Natives.

Education -- NAGB and National Tests: NAGB met this week and voted to make a number of changes to the test development contract previously awarded by the Department of Education including, as we feared, to delay the initial administration of the tests for one year until 2001. A number of our supporters on the Board, including Roy Romer and Norma Paulus (the Oregon state superintendent), attempted to delay this decision.

However, they faced a unanimous group of testing experts and educators (including Diane Ravitch) who supported the delay.

Education -- Goodling and National Tests: Goodling has scheduled a mark-up the day after the State of the Union Address for a bill to prevent further work on test development (beyond that agreed to in the FY 98 appropriations bill). Secretary Riley has written to Goodling asking him to delay any further action on the tests until after the National Academy of Sciences studies authorized in the appropriations compromise are completed, as was previously agreed to. Civil rights groups that have opposed the test have also asked Goodling to hold off. On Monday Secretary Riley and Director Raines will begin briefing members of the Congressional Hispanic and Black Caucuses on our overall education package and seek their support.

Education -- Republican Senate Education Package: On Tuesday Senate Republicans unveiled a package of education initiatives, much of which is similar to proposals they pursued last year. These include Coverdell's tax-free savings accounts for education; a block grant proposal; a \$75 million voucher demonstration program, a reading initiative similar to one Goodling passed last year, with an emphasis on teacher training and assistance to parents, but with no provision for tutoring as in America Reads; student and teacher safety initiatives; charter school expansion (similar to a House bill you have already endorsed); and authorization for expanded funding of special education.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 19:30:03.00

SUBJECT: Workplace religious freedom

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

We met today with representatives of the religious groups, AFL-CIO, Department of Labor, and Senator Kerry's office. The results were mixed: general agreement on principle but disagreement about a couple of specific aspects of the bill. Bill Marshall thinks we are close enough to say something general about it in the SOTU. Unless we really want it in, I think it would be better to save it and hopefully get an announcement (with everything more explicit) and we can do an event where the religious groups can, hopefully, stand with the President.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dawn M. Chirwa (CN=Dawn M. Chirwa/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 11:55:04.00

SUBJECT: Encyclopedia entry

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

What I thought I'd also do, primarily to aid in your discussion with the encyclopedia publishers, is write a memo for you memorializing my advice. I'll try to get it to you by the end of the day.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 19:17:38.00

SUBJECT: Re: Education "one" pager for Bruce/Gene/Elena review

TO: kagan_e (kagan_e @ al @ cd @ lngtwy [UNKNOWN]) (OPD)
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TEXT:
There is one small change in class size graph, per Mike.

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

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D38]MAIL41989622R.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504320070000010A02010000000205000000B02200000002000043046731BD8ACC6DC81059
FF553BE6DFAF479B4F30C391AFABC38787C29A7F00FF5753F1A40C8E4ADEBE185AEAB3849DDF62

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS: NEW EDUCATION INITIATIVES

DRAFT -- January 23, 1998

President Clinton is proposing new initiatives that will dramatically strengthen elementary and secondary education. These proposals will help ensure that all students start out in a small class with a good teacher, in a safe, modern school. They will also help ensure that students, especially in high poverty urban and rural areas, attend schools where high standards are taken seriously and kids are given the help they need to succeed. The President's proposals will dramatically expand access to safe havens for after-school learning, and ensure that low-income students receive the support and encouragement to finish school and continue on to college.

Small Classes with Qualified Teachers to Improve Reading in Grades 1-3. President Clinton is proposing a \$12.4 billion initiative over 7 years (\$7.3 billion over 5 years) to help local schools provide small classes with qualified teachers in the early grades. This will help ensure that every child receives personal attention, learns to read independently and gets a solid foundation for further learning. The new initiative will reduce class size in grades 1-3 to a nationwide average of 18, providing funds to help local school districts hire an additional 100,000 well-prepared teachers. The initiative will also provide funds to states and local school districts to test new teachers, develop more rigorous teacher testing and certification requirements, and train teachers in effective reading instruction practices. Schools districts will be accountable for demonstrating gains in reading achievement. These steps will help ensure that first through third grade students are receiving high-quality reading instruction in smaller classes from competent teachers.

Modern School Buildings to Improve Student Learning. In order for students to learn and to compete in the global economy, schools must be well-equipped and they must be able to accommodate smaller class sizes. To address these and other critical needs, President Clinton is proposing Federal tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. This is more than double the assistance proposed last year, which covered half the interest on an estimated \$20 billion in bonds. The tax credits will cost the Treasury \$5 billion over 5 years, and more than \$10 billion over ten years. Of the \$22 billion in bond authority, nearly \$20 billion is for a new School Modernization Bonds. Half of this bond authority will be allocated to the 100 school districts with the largest number of low-income children, and the other half will be allocated to the States. In addition, the President is proposing a more than \$2.4 billion expansion of the Qualified Zone Academy Bonds, school-business partnerships that will include funding for school construction and renovation.

Education Opportunity Zones: Helping Students in Poor Communities Reach High Standards. This initiative will strengthen public schools and help students master the basic and advanced skills where the need is the greatest: in high poverty urban and rural communities where concentrated poverty, low expectations, too many poorly prepared teachers, and overwhelmed school systems create significant barriers to high achievement. The Education Department will select approximately fifty high poverty urban and rural school districts with: (1) a demonstrated commitment to use high standards and tests of student achievement as tools to identify and provide help to students, teachers and schools who need it; (2) a strategy to prevent

students from falling behind by ensuring quality teaching, challenging curricula, and extended learning time; (3) programs to end social promotion and turn around failing schools; and (4) evidence of improved student achievement. Added investments in these communities will accelerate their progress and provide models of successful, standards-based reform for the nation.

The President's initiative will invest \$200 million in FY99, and \$1.5 billion over 5 years, in raising achievement and sharing lessons learned with school districts around the country.

Expanding Access to Safe After-School Care. To help create safe, positive learning environments for American school-age children who lack adult supervision during a typical week, the President has proposed to increase the 21st Century Learning Center Program by \$800 million over five years. The program will support school-community partnerships that expand or establish programs providing after-school care for up to half a million children a year.

Early Intervention to Promote College Attendance. President Clinton will soon announce a long-term effort to bring college opportunity to children in high-poverty areas by providing their families with early information about financial aid and the best courses to take to be well-prepared for college, as well as support services to help the children stay on track through high school graduation and into college.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-JAN-1998 18:23:03.00

SUBJECT: McCain Tobacco Letter Draft

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

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

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

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

TEXT:

Here's a draft answer back to McCain. McCain's letter stressed the need for specific Administration legislation. This is a general answer with an explanation of the core elements approach that Tarplin is fine with. Tarplin asked that we not specify that it is Donna we would send up to the hearings just commit to a representative.===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D37]MAIL40917622I.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504370040000010A020100000002050000002D0E000000020000BF7851F845A2F4F0E46B82
F1CCFF9165DFCDE15B05BCB3A9F6C4D132F9729FE71587C20F444330A57CE77126FF2F7CD51E06

DRAFT 1/22/98

Dear Senator McCain,

Thank you for your letter regarding the need for tobacco legislation to improve the health of our nation's youth. I believe comprehensive tobacco legislation offers a unique opportunity to impose a system of controls on tobacco companies and limit the devastating effects of cigarettes on our nation.

I agree with you that building a consensus will be critical if we are to enact legislation that is in the best interest of the nation. The effort to protect the health of America's youth is not a Democratic or Republican issue, but a public health issue, and one of our country's highest priorities. I am glad that you have scheduled hearings on this important issue, and I can assure you that my Administration will cooperate to the fullest extent possible. I will make appropriate representatives of my Administration available for your hearings and to answer any questions you might have.

As you may know, when I announced my plan for comprehensive tobacco legislation, I noted five key elements that I said must be at the heart of any national tobacco legislation. I took this approach because I wanted to identify the elements that I believe must be at the core of the legislation, and then to work closely with you and the rest of Congress to develop bipartisan legislation that incorporates these elements. I have told my staff that they should be available to meet anytime and anywhere to discuss this issue and provide whatever assistance is useful to work with you in reducing teen smoking. I am confident that together we will avoid counterproductive partisan disputes and, as you note in your letter, build a vital consensus on this issue.

Again, thank you for your commitment to this legislation. I look forward to working closely with you. Together, I believe we will be able to enact comprehensive bipartisan tobacco legislation this year.

Sincerely

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Janet Murguia (CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:24-JAN-1998 20:58:07.00

SUBJECT: UPDATE of Congressional SOTU rollout

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Carole A. Parmelee (CN=Carole A. Parmelee/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: Stacie Spector (CN=Stacie Spector/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: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/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: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

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

TEXT:

Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D83]MAIL43116732R.026 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

FF57504370040000010A02010000000205000000E111000000020000E5AA07C53B24926049B480
B15A5A385D87F7A254869F147B74FB7C7E2F4AE8A69D7DA06FB791445FDFB66B78336DDAC9FFE9

Hill Briefings on the State of the Union

MONDAY

- 10:00 am House Policy Staff - Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants, and select Committee Staff
Cannon Caucus Room, Rm 345
White House Participants: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala, Murguia
- 11:30 am Senate Policy Staff - Legislative Directors, Administrative Assistants, and select Committee Staff
562 Dirksen Senate Office Building
White House Participants: Reed/Kagan, Sperling/Lew, Begala, Murguia
- 1:00 pm Congressional Hispanic Caucus
Member Conference Call
White House Participants: Murguia, Sperling, Raines, Riley, Reed, Echaveste, Ibarra, Shireman, Cohen
- 1:30 pm New Democrats Coalition (Co-Chairs Roemer, Dooley, Moran plus approx. 20 to 30 Members)
2168 Rayburn House Office Building (Gold Room)
White House Participants: VPOTUS, Kay Casstevens, Dave Thomas, Rick Gonzales, Janet Murguia
- TBD pm Congressional Black Caucus
Member Conference Call
White House Participants: Raines, Sperling, Kagan, Moore, Murguia (alert--Mathews/Bowles)
- TBD pm Congressman Gary Condit, Blue Dog Coalition Chair
Phone call
White House Contact: Bruce Reed or Monica Dixon
- TBD pm Congresswoman Patsy Mink, Asian Pacific Caucus Chair
Phone Call
White House Contact: Janet Murguia
- TBD pm Congressman Bernie Sanders, Progressive Caucus Chair
Phone Call
White House Contact: Erskine Bowles

TUESDAY

TBD AM/PM Targeted Members and Senators

Phone Calls

White House Participants: Cabinet Secretaries and Senior Staff
[Assignments on Monday]

2:00 pm House and Senate Democratic Leadership Members
US Capitol, S-214 (Daschle's Conference Room)
White House Participants: TBD

5:00 pm House and Senate Democratic Press Secretaries
US Capitol, SC-5
White House Participants: Lewis, McCurry, Weiss-Tobey, Begala, Murguia

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. email	Cynthia Rice to Elena Kagan et al. re: Success Story (1 page)	01/24/1998	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/21/1998-01/24/1998]

2009-1006-F

bm105

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001b. email attachment	re: Success Story (2 pages)	01/24/1998	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

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

FOLDER TITLE:

[01/21/1998-01/24/1998]

2009-1006-F
bm105

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.