



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Assistant Secretary  
for Legislation

Washington, D.C. 20201

TO: The Secretary  
Through: COS \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Rich Tarplin  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation

THROUGH: Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meetings with Congressional Leaders and Committee Chairs Concerning  
Welfare Reform

Please find attached a briefing book for your meetings with congressional leaders and committee chairs concerning the "rollout" of the Administration's welfare reform plan. While meetings with Senator Moynihan and Majority Leader Gephardt have not yet been confirmed, we have included preparatory materials for those meetings in case they are scheduled on short notice. Three meetings are confirmed as follows:

- o Ways and Means Committee Acting Chairman Sam Gibbons -- June 9 at 9:30 am.
- o Education and Labor Committee Chairman Bill Ford -- June 9 at 10:15 am.
- o Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell -- June 9 at 12:00 pm.
- o House Majority Leader Dick Gephardt -- To be Scheduled.
- o Finance Committee Chairman Daniel Patrick Moynihan -- To be Scheduled.

Please note that your briefing book also contains supplementary materials, including a five-page summary of the Administration's plan, talking points on the overall plan, financing information, and a comparison of major welfare reform legislation in the 103rd Congress.



TO : The Secretary  
Through: DS \_\_\_\_\_  
COS \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

FROM : Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meeting with Representative Sam M. Gibbons on  
June 9 at 9:30 a.m. in 2204 Rayburn House Office  
Building - BRIEFING

CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Representative Sam M. Gibbons (D-FL)

ADMINISTRATION PARTICIPANTS (Subject to Change)

Jerry Klepner, Assistant Secretary for Legislation

David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and  
Evaluation

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families

Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic  
Policy

BACKGROUND

On June 9 at 9:30 a.m., you will meet with Representative Sam M. Gibbons in his Washington Office. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss briefly the content and financing of the Administration's Welfare Reform initiative and the expected "rollout" of the plan next week. This meeting is one in a series of Congressional meetings that you are having this week with House and Senate leadership and Committee chairs on welfare reform. Because he is not a member of the Human Resources subcommittee, the Co-chairs have not met personally with Representative Gibbons. HHS staff has talked with Rep. Gibbons' staff.

A complete congressional biography of Representative Gibbons is attached.

POINTS OF DISCUSSION

Congressman Gibbons' staff indicated that he has been primarily focused on health care reform. However, he is in favor of moving forward on welfare reform.

On May 2, 1994, the House Ways and Means Committee, subcommittee on Human Resources held a field hearing in Tampa, Florida, on Florida's efforts to reform welfare under JOBS, the child care provisions of the Family Support Act of 1988, and Federal demonstration authority.

Project Independence is the State of Florida's JOBS program. Under Project Independence, parents with children under age 3 are exempt from participation, but may volunteer. The State emphasizes job placement services but also has implemented an education and training component. Based on an assessment, participants are referred to either a job search sequence or an education/training sequence. According to a recent research study, originally a large proportion of parents were considered job ready and referred to job search. The State has since modified the job-readiness criteria and more parents are entering the education/training sequence. An independent evaluation of the program is ongoing, focusing on those who began to participate when job search was more heavily emphasized.

In addition to Project Independence, Florida is now beginning to operate a two-county (Alachua County in the Gainesville area and Escambia County in the Pensacola area) welfare reform demonstration under Federal waiver authority. The demonstration, called the "Family Transition Program," will test one approach to time-limiting welfare benefits. There are certain exceptions: families in the demonstration will not be able to receive AFDC for more than 24 months in any 5-year period. Families who exhaust the time limit and cannot find a job will be able to enter a program of transitional employment where they will work in either private or public jobs. Under the demonstration, a more liberal treatment of earnings and resources also will apply; transitional child care benefits will be available for additional months; AFDC benefit levels will be tied to school attendance; and the young-child exemption from participation in JOBS will apply only to families with a child age 6 months or younger.

According to an article in The Wall Street Journal on March 28, 1994, with Florida being several months into their pioneering reform program, the word from Pensacola welfare workers is "that ending decades of dependency will be more painful and expensive than politicians are willing to acknowledge".

Staff indicated that Congressman Gibbons is particularly concerned about the financing of the Administration's welfare reform proposal. Staff did not mention any specific proposal but indicated that he is generally concerned.

ATTACHMENTS FOR THE MEETINGS

Attached are the following briefing materials:

1. Congressional Biography of Representative Gibbons.
2. Wall Street Journal Article.
3. General Talking Points Prepared by ASPA on the Administration's Plan.
4. A 5-page Summary of the Administration's Plan.
5. A Description of the Current Status of the Financing Provisions for the Administration's Plan.
6. A Comparison of Major Welfare Reform Legislation Before the Congress.

## POLITICAL PROFILE

Although Congressman Sam Gibbons has been in the House for over three decades and involved in many major debates, he has always been a step or two away from real power. For a decade he has held the No. 2 spot on Ways and Means and most recently acquired the Chairmanship in an acting position after former Chairman Rostenkowski had to relinquish the gavel because of his indictment on felony charges.

Gibbons was the floor manager for many of the social programs of the Great Society during the Johnson Administration. However, he voted against school busing and the Civil Rights Amendments of 1964 and 1968. He has since changed his stand on civil rights.

Gibbons' principle issue is free trade. As chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, he has blocked numerous Democratic attempts to raise trade barriers. Gibbons is an agreeable, but stubborn politician.

## HEALTH CARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Rep. Gibbons has not been a major player on health care legislation, but that position will change now that he is the Acting Chairman of Ways and Means. It is expected that his proposal will be based largely on the work begun by Rep. Rostenkowski.

Gibbons has long advocated extending Medicare to all Americans. The effect of health reform on U.S. competitiveness has also been important to him.

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

The principals of the Welfare Reform Team have not met individually with Rep. Gibbons. There have been numerous meetings and briefings with Ways and Means Committee members and staff. Rep. Gibbons' staff has indicated that although primarily focused on health care reform, he is in favor of moving ahead on welfare reform. Also, staff indicated that Rep. Gibbons is particularly concerned about the proposed financing of the Administration's welfare reform

## Cong. Sam Gibbons (D-FL) 11th



Born:	1/20/20, Tampa, FL
Education:	U. of FL, B.A., J.D.
Military:	Army, 1941-45
Prev. Occup:	Lawyer
Family:	Wife, Martha Hanley, 3 children
Religion:	Presbyterian
Pol. Career:	FL House, 1953-59; FL Senate, 1959-63
Elected:	1962
Residence:	Tampa
Committees:	Ways and Means

proposal. Staff, however, did not mention any particular financing proposal that was the focus of concern.

## **LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS**

102nd: Gibbons introduced legislation to provide universal health care coverage by removing the age limit from Medicare (H.R. 1777). He also cosponsored Rep. Stark's bill to reform the health insurance market (H.R. 650).

103rd: Cong. Gibbons cosponsored the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-3). Gibbons is also a cosponsor of H.R. 1200, the single payer bill sponsored by Rep. McDermott.

# Florida's Experiment in Time Limit for Welfare Underscores Snares Facing Clinton's Proposal

By Ron Suskind

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL  
**PENSACOLA, Fla.**—Marie McGill— with a 10th-grade education, a four-year-old daughter, an ex-husband she just raced across two states to escape, no job and no money — fidgets in her faded jeans as she peruses America's fast-changing social contract.

"This is great; I'll get all this job training and child care," says the 23-year-old welfare mother, before reading down a few paragraphs of small print. "Hey, What's this about 24 months? About this being only for two years? What's going on?"

Her case worker explains, in a measured cadence, that "we'll just have to figure a way to make you self-sufficient before we hit that deadline."

Ms. McGill smiles warty. "They don't realize how hard it is these days to get off welfare," she says. "I know, I done tried."

## Painful Experience

Setting a two-year limit on benefits — a mantra now hummed by President Clinton and almost every U.S. governor — was the easy part. But, a month into Florida's pioneering reform program, the word from Pensacola welfare workers is that ending decades of dependency will be more painful and expensive than politicians are willing to acknowledge.

"We're looking at an avalanche of needs, people who've been neglected for so long," says Shirley Jacques, who's helping run this pilot program in northern Florida. The first mandatory program that combines a two-year time limit with almost all the features in a welfare-reform proposal President Clinton is preparing to send to Congress. "Our case workers can't believe the depth and array of the problems. Two years, and off? I wouldn't bet on it."

While policies are being mapped out in Washington, states are racing ahead. Next up is Vermont, where about 60% of the state's recipients will start signing onto a 30-month time limit in July. In all, 19 states have received federal waivers to try their

ents, works periodically in local fast-food restaurants — signs a commitment contract, officially entering a program that may soon be commonplace across the country. She'll get assessed as to her educational level, take some basic education classes, maybe work part-time, get job training and eventually be assisted in finding a secure job. If one isn't found after two years, she probably will be put into a community work program in exchange for continuing benefits.

Of course, the troubled lives of many welfare recipients tend to resist such neat progressions. "Job training — you've got to be kidding," says supervisor Linda Jenkins, whose caseworkers have found themselves neck-deep in issues such as domes-

Welfare Resumé	
Most welfare recipients have recently worked, have small children, but are hampered by poor education and skills.	
Recipients of aid to families with dependent children in U.S. who have:	
Worked in past two years	59.8%
At least one child under 3 years old	50.4%
11 years or less of education	51.5%
*1991 census. Source: Department of Health and Human Services.	

own welfare plans and will soon walk the same path Florida is now treading.

In trailer parks and public-housing projects on the gritty panhandle where Florida meets Alabama, abstractions found in the Clinton proposal, like "changing the culture of welfare offices," promoting "parental responsibility" and "making work pay," meet flesh and are often found wanting.

"There's no magic bullet," says Ron Mincy, a Ford Foundation program manager who worked with the president's welfare-reform task force until a few months ago. To reduce the welfare population — now at 14 million, a daunting 5% of the U.S. population — "means inventing a way to attack underlying causes" he asserts, such as crime, drugs and illegitimacy, along with the inadequate education and skills of 70% of recipients who get off public assistance in their first two years — generally into low-rung, service-sector jobs — only to have most slip back onto welfare over the next three years.

Those who have studied state experiments that have road-tested parts of what the president is now proposing say the Clinton plan overstates effectiveness, and understates costs, of many welfare-reform programs.

"I wish he hadn't promised so much," says Judith Gueron, president of Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., a

firm whose studies of state programs are relied upon by Clinton aides, "because we're sure to end up with a plan that spreads limited resources thinly across the whole country, and won't end up doing much, or even teaching us much about what works."

## New Dialogue

In Pensacola, the two-year clocks began ticking Feb. 11, with about one in four of those applying for welfare benefits being randomly selected — in all, now, about 60 participants. One morning last week, at a makeshift "family transition" office north of town, the new dialogue between welfare caseworkers and recipients — with increased obligations on both sides — is beginning.

Caseworker: "Would you be interested in seeing a counselor, to talk about some of your problems?"

Recipient: "Forget it. Counselors don't do no damn good."

Caseworker: "Well, can we help you get a dress you can wear to a job interview?"

Recipient: "Got one, a church dress. I'll be fine."

The recipient, Theresa Sledge, a pudgy 19-year-old sporting sneakers, a baseball cap and a don't-mess attitude, softens a bit when talk turns to her four-year-old son and how they'll manage if she is still jobless 24 months from now, when her welfare runs out. "I have to make my own safety net," she says quietly. "I don't know; I guess I have to start some kind of savings account, and put money in it."

Ms. Sledge — who, like many recipi-

Two months ago, Ms. Taylor had 200 welfare cases, seeing each recipient at six-month intervals. Now she handles half a dozen recipients and is working harder than ever, running into the complacency and scarce resources of state agencies where attitudes haven't changed. Success is often in simple acts: she buys a rocking chair for one welfare mother so she can rock her baby to sleep, helps another move from a cinder-block shack to adequate housing. Caseloads will rise to a

still-modest 80 per caseworker as the program expands to 2,500 participants over the coming year, a ratio probably too costly to replicate nationally, with the administration anticipating 1.8 million recipients in its proposed program.

WSJ  
 3/28/94  
 A14

they need their electric bills paid. They need to learn how to be parents, how to budget money."

Such realizations have helped transform the hostile culture that has defined offices like this one in the past few years, as caseloads grew and resources shrank.

"The idea was to make sure they're eligible for continued benefits, and to get them out as fast as you could,"

says Lori Taylor, who worked in a nearby welfare office before becoming one of a few dozen caseworkers selected for the pilot.

"Sometimes, when they'd want to talk about their problems, you'd try to cut them off before it got too far. You didn't even look at them."

Welfare administrators here are quietly talking about loopholes, figuring that even their intensive program will

leave many recipients without secure work when the two-year clocks run out.

"If we can't find them a job at the end of two years, we haven't held up our end," says Mamun Rashied, area social-services administrator and welfare-reform advocate, speaking of how fragile a new social contract may prove. "Then the contract is broken."



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Assistant Secretary  
for Legislation

Washington, D.C. 20201

TO: The Secretary  
Through: DS \_\_\_\_\_  
COS \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meeting with Chairman William Ford, House Education and Labor Committee  
on June 9 at 10:15 a.m. in 2107 Rayburn BRIEFING

Congressional Participants

Chairman William Ford (D-MI)

Administration Participants (Subject to Change)

Jerry Klepner, Assistant Secretary for Legislation

David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Administration for Children and Families

Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

Background

On June 9, you will meet with Chairman Ford in his Washington office. The purpose of this meeting is to brief Chairman Ford on the President's welfare reform proposal. The meeting is one in a series of meetings with Congressional and Committee leadership to be scheduled with you and the co-chairs of the Welfare Reform Working Group.

On May 26, the co-chairs were scheduled to meet with Chairman Ford but the Chairman was unable to attend. The Chairman's staff, Pat Rissler and Pierce Myers, were present at the meeting. On May 5, David Ellwood and Mary Jo Bane conducted a bipartisan briefing for all Education and Labor Committee staff, and an additional briefing was conducted by HHS staff June 3. Generally, the Committee Chairman and staff have been preoccupied with health care reform.

## Points of Discussion

As you know, the Committee on Education and Labor shares jurisdiction with the Ways and Means Committee on key elements of the JOBS and child care programs that affect welfare recipients. Committee staff have expressed interest in the President's welfare reform plan as it relates to programs within the Committee's jurisdiction, including:

**Education and Job Training:** Committee staff have inquired as to the coordination between the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor. Staff are especially concerned about the relationship between the President's welfare reform plan and the Reemployment Act. They also raised concerns about accountability of job training programs when localities contract out this service.

**Child Care:** Committee staff stressed the importance of quality and affordable child care as part of the President's welfare reform proposal.

**Jurisdiction:** Committee staff have indicated concerns about maintaining jurisdiction over the education, job training and child care issues.

## Attachments for the Meeting

Attached are the following briefing materials:

1. Congressional biography of Chairman Ford.
2. General Talking points prepared by ASPA on the Administration's plan.
3. A 5-page summary of the Administration's plan.
4. Description of the current status of the financing provisions for the Administration's plan.
5. Comparison of major welfare reform legislation before the Congress.

## POLITICAL PROFILE

Congressman William Ford, one of the most senior Democrats in the House, is still a firm believer in the Great Society programs. Elected in 1962, he is one of several members who are credited with the passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act and the overhaul of the Hatch Act, which passed the House in 1993 and were signed into law by President Clinton.

Ford has traditionally received much support from his district in his elections. Redistricting in 1992 created a more Republican territory in the new 13th District. Ford won the narrow reelection with over 60% of the vote in a challenging primary and won overall with 52% during an anti-incumbent year, but has announced that he will not seek reelection in 1994.

## HEALTH REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Chairman Ford believes the opportunity to reform health care will only come once, and that universal access and cost containment should be the primary focuses of the plan. Like the rest of the Michigan delegation, he is particularly concerned about the cost of retirees' health care.

Rep. Ford introduced a health care reform bill in the last session of Congress, which would create a single unified system providing universal access to health insurance for all Americans through three different programs -- an employer mandate (MediWorkers), coverage for children (MediKids) and an element to cover adults not connected to the workforce (MediWrap).

As a former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Congressman Ford will care about Federal and postal workers. He strongly supports expansion of Medicare to include prescription drugs.

## Congressman William Ford

(D-MI) 13th



**Born:** 9/6/27, Detroit  
**Education:** Wayne State U., 1947-48; U. of Denver, B.S., J.D.  
**Military:** Navy 1944-46; Air Force Reserve, 1950-58  
**Prev. Occup:** Lawyer  
**Family:** Wife, Mary Whalen; 3 children  
**Religion:** United Church of Christ  
**Pol. Career:** Taylor Township justice of the peace, 1955-57; Melvindale city attorney, 1957-59; Taylor Township attorney, 1957-64; MI Senate, 1963-65  
**Elected:** 1964  
**Residence:** Ypsilanti  
**Committees:** Education and Labor (Chrman.)

## **WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES**

Principals from the Welfare Reform Team have not met individually with Rep. Ford. They have met with his committee staff in bi-partisan briefings (5/5/94 and 5/26/94). Their overall concerns focus on child care and the coordination of welfare reform with the Reemployment Act.

## **LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS**

103rd: Cong. Ford has not sponsored or co-sponsored any key health care reform legislation.

6/6/94



TO: The Secretary  
Through: DS \_\_\_\_\_  
COS \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meeting with Senator George Mitchell on  
Thursday, June 9, 1994 at 12:00 in S221 Capitol -  
BRIEFING

CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Senator George Mitchell (D-ME)

ADMINISTRATION PARTICIPANTS (Subject to Change)

Jerry Klepner, Assistant Secretary for Legislation

David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and  
Evaluation

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families

Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic  
Policy

BACKGROUND

On Thursday, June 9, 1994, you will meet with Senator George Mitchell, the Majority Leader, in his Washington office. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss briefly the content and financing of the Administration's Welfare Reform initiative and the "rollout" of the plan scheduled for next week. The meeting is one in a series of meetings with Congressional and Committee leadership scheduled with you and the co-chairs of the Welfare Reform Working Group this week. The co-chairs met with Senator Mitchell once last year. The Working Group co-chairs and HHS staff also have met with the Majority Leader's staff several

times this spring.

A complete congressional biography of Senator Mitchell is attached.

#### POINTS OF DISCUSSION

Senator Mitchell has been primarily focused on health care reform at the moment and has not been personally involved in welfare reform discussions. HHS staff have, however, had a number of discussions with his staff about the substance of the bill as well as the political issues concerning introduction and Committee referral. Staff have indicated that Senator Mitchell supports the decision to draft the bill based on the existing AFDC entitlement programs which means that the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee. He is also aware of the concerns raised by members of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, particularly Senators Kennedy and Dodd, that job training, child care, and teen pregnancy prevention programs more properly belong in the Labor Committee's jurisdiction.

Given unemployment levels in Maine and the fact that it is a rural state, he may also be concerned about how the WORK program would operate in areas of high unemployment and access to job training services, child care and transportation for people in rural areas.

#### ATTACHMENTS FOR THE MEETING

Attached are the following briefing materials:

1. Congressional Biography of Senator Mitchell.
2. General talking Points Prepared by ASPA on the Administration's Plan.
3. A 5-page Summary of the Administration's Plan.
4. A Description of the Current Status of Financing Provisions for the Administration's Plan.
5. A Comparison of Major Welfare Reform Legislation Before the Congress

## POLITICAL PROFILE

As Majority Leader, Senator Mitchell is known both for his even temper and tenacity. His leadership position has enabled him to be involved in both the substance and strategy of nearly every piece of important legislation brought to the floor. Mitchell's top legislative priority has been health care, which was also his key interest when he sat on the Finance Committee. Along with Senator Kennedy, he favors an employer-based approach to health care reform. Senator Mitchell has announced he will not run for re-election in 1994.

## HEALTH REFORM ISSUES/ PRIORITIES

The Majority Leader continues to be committed to passing comprehensive health care reform in this Congress and has been a moving force behind the Message Group. Senator Mitchell has stated his belief that there should be no tax on alcohol and has spoken favorably about possible cuts to Medicare and Medicaid as a way to bring down the cost of health care for all Americans. In the last Congress, the Senator sponsored legislation to reform the nation's health care system modeled on the concept of "play or pay".

At the September 30 Finance hearing, Senator Mitchell asked about critics claims that the health care reform plan would create a one size fits all health care system and the \$700 billion dollar budget figure represents new spending for health care.

## Senator George Mitchell (D-ME)



**Born:** 8/20/33  
Waterville, ME

**Education:** Bowdoin College, B.A.;  
Georgetown University,  
L.L.B.

**Military:** Army, 1954-56

**Prev. Occup:** Lawyer; judge

**Family:** Divorced, 1 child

**Religion:** Roman Catholic

**Pol. Career:** Maine Democratic Party  
chairman, 1966-68;  
Democratic National  
Committee, 1969-77;  
assistant county attorney,  
1971-77; U.S. attorney,  
1977-79; U.S. District  
Court Judge, 1979-80;  
Democratic nominee for  
governor, 1974

**Residence:** Portland

**Elected:** Appointed 1980, elected  
1980 [Re-election 1994]

**Committees:** Majority Leader,  
Environment and Public  
Works, Finance, Veterans  
Affairs

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Senator Mitchell has been primarily focused on health care reform, but has stated that welfare reform is a top priority on this year's legislative agenda. The Senator's staff has indicated that the Majority Leader supports the decision to draft the bill based on the existing AFDC entitlement programs. Upon introduction the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee. However, Mitchell is aware of Labor and Human Resources's concern that programs like job training, child care, and teen pregnancy prevention more properly belong in the Labor Committee's jurisdiction.

Given unemployment levels in Maine and the fact that it is a rural state, Mitchell may be interested in how the WORK program would operate in areas of high unemployment and how access to job training services, child care, and transportation would be guaranteed for individuals in rural areas.

## LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

102nd: The Senator focused attention on improving long-term care services for the elderly.

103rd: Senator Mitchell introduced legislation to protect the reproductive rights of women (S. 25). He also cosponsored legislation to combat violent crimes against women (Biden, S. 11); and to improve child welfare services (Rockefeller, S. 596). Senator Mitchell is the prime sponsor of the Health Security Act in the Senate.



TO : The Secretary  
Through: DS \_\_\_  
COS \_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_

FROM : Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meeting with Representative Richard Gephardt at  
\_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_ - **BRIEFING**

**CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPANTS**

Majority Leader Richard A. Gephardt (D-MO)

**ADMINISTRATION PARTICIPANTS** (Subject to Change)

Jerry Klepner, Assistant Secretary for Legislation

David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families

Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

**BACKGROUND**

On \_\_\_\_\_, you will meet with Majority Leader Richard A. Gephardt in his Washington office. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss briefly the content and financing of the Administration's Welfare Reform initiative and the expected "rollout" of the plan next week. This meeting is one in a series of Congressional meetings that you are having this week with House and Senate leadership and Committee chairs on welfare Reform. On May 17, 1994 you met with the House Democratic Leadership, including Representative Gephardt. At this meeting, there was particular concern about on the financing of the Administration's proposal. HHS staff have had several meetings on welfare reform with Mr. Gephardt's staff over the past year.

A complete congressional biography of Representative Gephardt is attached.

**POINTS OF DISCUSSIONS**

As a result of discussions with his staff, it is anticipated that the following concerns may be raised:

- (1) **Impact** -- He is concerned about the political effect of the welfare reform legislation on health care reform, particularly among House liberals, and members of the Black and Hispanic caucuses.
- (2) **Alien Deeming** -- He has deep concerns about the reaction of the Hispanic Caucus to the alien deeming financing proposal.
- (3) **Reaction** -- He would like to discuss other groups of Democratic members reactions (African-American, Women, Mainstream Forum, Progressives) to various policies set forth in the initiative.

**ATTACHMENTS FOR THE MEETING**

Attached are the following briefing materials:

1. Congressional Biography of Representative Gephardt.
2. General Talking Points Prepared by ASPA on the Administration's Plan.
3. A 5-page summary of the Administration's Plan.
4. A Description of the Current Status of the Financing Provisions for the Administration's plan.
5. A Comparison of Major Welfare Reform Legislation Before the Congress.
6. A State Profile of Welfare Reform Activities in Missouri.



## **POLITICAL PROFILE**

Majority Leader Richard Gephardt, one of America's national political leaders, is from the south side of St. Louis and was elected to Congress when 3d District Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan announced her retirement. Gephardt was one of the founders of the moderate Democratic Leadership Council. He departed his anti-big government and higher taxes base in the mid-80s shifting to more liberal positions after being elected Democratic Caucus chairman in 1984. In 1986, he dropped his longtime opposition to abortion.

Rep. Gephardt has the support of dozens of House colleagues when he ran for President in 1988. He won the Iowa caucus with 31% of the vote, but did poorly in New Hampshire and only won one state (Missouri) on Super Tuesday.

Gephardt ran for majority leader in 1989 with the resignations of Speaker Jim Wright and Majority Whip Tony Coelho, and the succession of Tom Foley to the Speaker's chair. Gephardt was successful with creating camaraderie in a dispirited Caucus. He attacked the Bush Administration for favoring the rich in seeking to cut capital gains taxes; he criticized Bush for his lack of leadership on foreign policy. In September 1990, Gephardt supported Bush's dispatch of troops to the Persian Gulf, but in December and into 1991, he led the opposition to the Gulf War resolution.

Gephardt supported Clinton in the 1992 Presidential race and he has been recognized as a national leader on several issues during the Clinton Administration. On trade, his refusal to come out against NAFTA in spring 1992 helped make NAFTA possible; he was one of the forces urging Clinton to seek new environmental and economic protections in 1992 and 1993. He continually hits Japan for running a trade surplus with the United States and calls for restrictions on Japanese imports.

Gephardt can count on reelection, and would certainly be the Democrats' choice for speaker should Foley retire.

## **HEALTH CARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES**

Majority Leader Gephardt is the prime sponsor of the President's health care plan in the House.

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

The principals of the welfare reform team have met several times with Gephardt's staff person, Andie King. King has expressed Rep. Gephardt's concern for the political relationship of welfare reform with health care reform. He wants health care reform to remain a priority right now. Gephardt has mentioned his great concern over the financing mechanisms for the proposed welfare reform program. Gephardt does not want to repeat the fight between the Caucus groups over alien immigration issues that occurred during the unemployment compensation bill.

## LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

103rd: Rep. Gephardt is the House sponsor of the Health Security Act. He is also a cosponsor of several pieces of campaign financing legislation including the Congressional Campaign Spending Limit and Election Reform Act (Gejdenson, H.R. 3); and he was a cosponsor of the Reemployment Act (Rostenkowski, H.R. 4040).

## PERSONAL

- \* Born: 1/31/41, St. Louis; Home: St. Louis
- \* Elected: 1976
- \* Military: Air National Guard
- \* Education: Northwestern U., B.S.; U. of MI, J.D.
- \* Political Experience: Practicing atty., 1965-71; St. Louis City Alderman, 1971-76; Dem. Candidate for Pres., 1988.
- \* Committees: Majority Leader. Budget

5/16/94

## Missouri

<u>Demographics</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Population (7/1/92)	5.19m	255.1m (T)	15
Child Population (4/1/90)	1.32m	63.9m (T)	15
Percent of Population that are children (7/1/92)	25.8%	25.7% (T)	31
Per Capita Personal Income-FY 89	16,431	17,567 (A)	23
Poverty Rate			
1991	14.8%	13.7% (A)	19
1989	12.6%	12.7% (A)	22
1983	16.7%	15.4% (A)	16
1979	12.2%	12.4% (A)	23
Change in Rate (1979-1991)	+2.6%	+1.3% (A)	

### Aid to Families with Dependent Children

<u>AFDC - Benefits</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total assistance payments-FY 92	273.9m	22,223.5m (T)
AFDC Grant-Jan 93 (Mother-two children-0 income)	292	367 (M)
Food Stamp benefit-Jan 93	292	285 (M)
Combined benefits-Jan 93	584	652 (M)
Percent of poverty threshold-Jan 93	63%	70% (M)
Percent change in AFDC benefit levels since 1980	-31%	-22.4% (A)

<u>AFDC - Caseloads</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Average Monthly AFDC Caseload-FY 92	85,200	4,768,600 (T)
AFDC Reciprocity Rate-FY 92	4.8%	5.3% (A)
Change in AFDC Reciprocity-FY 88-92	+22%	+20% (A)
Average Payment per Family-FY 92	268	388 (A)
Average Number in AFDC Unit (10/90-9/91)	2.9	2.9 (A)
Food Stamp Reciprocity FY 92	10.57%	9.95% (A)

<u>AFDC - Income Data</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Percent of Families with Unemployed Parent-9/92	5.3%	5.7% (A)
Percent with Earned Income-10/90-9/91	7.0%	7.9% (A)
Percent Receiving Public Housing/ HUD Rent Subsidy-10/90-9/91	23.9%	21.0% (A)
Number of JOBS participants on AFDC-FY 91	1,733	460,914 (T)

### Child Support Enforcement

<u>Collections and Expenditures</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total Collections-FY 92	166.3m	7,951.1m (T)
AFDC Collections-FY 92	49.7m	2,252.6m (T)
Child Support Collections per \$ of Total Admin. Expend.-FY 92	4.88	3.99 (A)
Average Number AFDC Cases in which a Collection was Made-FY 92	13,430	830,713 (T)
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1983	+818%	+203% (T)
Total Number of Paternities Established-FY 92	23,982	515,393 (T)
Number of out-of-wedlock births-1990	22,643	1,165,384 (T)

\*Type: A=average, M=median, T=total

Source: 1993 Green Book

## STATE WELFARE POLICY

Missouri implements the provisions of the Family Support Act through its statewide FUTURES program. FUTURES was begun in July, 1990 and does not currently require any waivers to federal law. However, Governor Carnahan expects to introduce a family self-sufficiency initiative in 1994 entitled "Beyond Welfare" which would attempt to replace welfare with wages. The Governor's plan involves four measures aimed at:

- **Wages not Welfare:** AFDC grants will be used as wage supplements to create jobs, reward work and promote economic development; earning disregards will be increased.
- **Family Self-Sufficiency:** Increased assessment, case management, and family planning with time-limited assistance tailored to the needs of the family; the state will provide needed support services.
- **Fathers and Their Children:** Increased role of non-custodial parents in the community and in the lives of their children; will include savings accounts for the children established with their support payments.
- **Educare:** Child care funding will be used to increase the educational quality of day care.

The Governor's plan calls for about \$4 million in new spending financed out of general revenue. The anticipated waiver application will probably include measures to: impose a time-limit on welfare based on family circumstances; divert AFDC grants as wage supplements; increase earned income disregards; allow noncustodial fathers to earn credit for child support debts by involvement in community work and training programs; increase access to mentoring and employment opportunities for young adults formerly in foster care or the juvenile-justice system; prepare non-college bound high schoolers for jobs at graduation; expand Parents' Fair Share program; condition benefit receipt on paternity establishment; disregard wages of non-parent teens attending school and living at home; provide advanced EITC credits; disregard resources for restricted-use savings accounts; train AFDC recipients and neighborhood residents in community service jobs.

### Demonstration Programs

During recent years, Missouri has had multiple demonstration projects underway across the State. Current programs include:

- **Parents' Fair Share:** With nine sites across the nation, the Parents' Fair Share program was implemented from May of 1992 through December 1993 as a test of employment and training services, peer support, enhanced child support enforcement and mediation services for unemployed noncustodial parents of AFDC children. The Missouri program is based in Kansas City. MDRC is conducting an evaluation.
- **People Attaining Self-Sufficiency (PASS):** PASS would create a mandatory school attendance program for AFDC children from the seventh grade on and for teens receiving AFDC as parents, until completion of high school or receipt of a GED. Students must not be absent from school without good cause for more than four days per month. Failure to meet the attendance requirement would result in the removal of the individual's needs in calculation of the AFDC grant amount. Case management and support services would be provided through the local schools through cooperative agreements with the State JOBS program.

Although waivers have been granted for PASS, the program has not been implemented. The waivers granted relate to the statewideness requirement and the requirement to provide initial assessments or employability plans before assignment. The application was received on August 4, 1992 and was approved on October 26, 1992.

• **21st Century Communities Demonstration Project:** This program, still in its developmental stages, involves one community in a wage supplementation program under which eligible individuals can voluntarily participate in wage supplemented employment. Eligible individuals include those receiving AFDC or Food Stamps and their spouses who reside in the recipient's household and share responsibility for minor children in the household. The program seeks to promote the development of community based enterprises, to design job entry and job progression education and training, and to include learning readiness programs, various supportive services, and preference for participants in a home ownership program.

The Waivers granted allow the State to: 1) use AFDC funds to supplement wages for individuals who volunteer for employment under this component of the JOBS program for up to 48 months; supplements are paid through electronic benefit transfers and are paid regardless of work performance; 2) pay child support in excess of the AFDC funds diverted to employers directly to the AFDC family; 3) allow individuals participating in the subsidized jobs to accumulate resources up to \$10,000; and 4) provide AFDC benefits to AFDC-UP cases when the primary earner works more than 100 hours in subsidized employment.

The application was received on January 8, 1993 and approved on January 15, 1993. The program was implemented on January 31, 1993, with an initial capacity for 3,000 participants. The program is expected to run through 2005. A process evaluation will be conducted.



TO: The Secretary  
Through: DS \_\_\_\_\_  
COS \_\_\_\_\_  
ES \_\_\_\_\_

FROM: Jerry Klepner  
Assistant Secretary for Legislation

SUBJECT: Meeting with Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan on  
at in 464 Russell -  
BRIEFING

CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPANTS

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY)

ADMINISTRATION PARTICIPANTS (Subject to Change)

Jerry Klepner, Assistant Secretary for Legislation

David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and  
Evaluation

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Secretary for Children and Families

Bruce Reed, Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic  
Policy

BACKGROUND

On \_\_\_\_\_, you will meet with Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan in his Washington office. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss briefly the conduct and financing of the Administration's Welfare Reform initiative and the "rollout" of the plan scheduled for next week. The meeting is one in a series of meetings with Congressional and Committee leadership scheduled with you and the co-chairs of the Welfare Reform Working Group this week. The co-chairs have met with Senator Moynihan at least four times during the past year. HHS staff also have met frequently with Finance Committee staff.

A complete congressional biography of Senator Moynihan is attached.

#### POINTS OF DISCUSSION

As you might expect, Senator Moynihan's staff has indicated that he is primarily focused on health care reform at the moment. Welfare reform is, however, an issue of longstanding interest to the Senator and he is concerned about the effects on New York. Generally he believes that the Administration's initiative is moving welfare in the right direction. He is particularly concerned about several issues:

(1) **Timing** -- As you know, Senator Moynihan has publicly criticized the Administration's "delay" in submitting the welfare plan to Congress. His view is that a new President has a brief window to tackle controversial issues and that it will be extremely difficult to enact welfare reform in the last half of this year.

(2) **Financing** -- He is interested in the financing proposals and has indicated concern about the legal alien deeming provision and its possible impact on New York. In addition, New York currently receives a large share of HHS Emergency Assistance funds which would be capped under the Administration's welfare reform proposal.

(3) **Termination of Benefits** -- He has also expressed interest in the point at which recipients will be terminated from the program and for what cause. He may ask about the WORK program and what happens to people who fulfill all of their obligations, complete the number of allowed WORK placements, and still are not able to find jobs in the private sector.

(4) **Teenage Pregnancy Prevention** -- Teenage pregnancy prevention has been an issue of major concern to Senator Moynihan for many years. His staff has repeatedly emphasized in meetings that the initiative needs to focus on preventing teenage pregnancies.

#### ATTACHMENTS FOR THE MEETING

Attached are the following briefing materials:

1. Congressional Biography of Senator Moynihan.
2. General Talking Points Prepared by ASPA on the Administration's Plan.
3. A 5-page Summary of the Administration's Plan.

4. A Description of the Current Status of the Financing Provisions for the Administration's Plan.
5. A Comparison of Major Welfare Reform Legislation Before the Congress.
6. A State Profile of Welfare Reform Activities in New York State.

## POLITICAL PROFILE

Senator Moynihan succeeded Senator Lloyd Bentsen as Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. He has had one of the most varied public service careers of modern times. He is a former Harvard University professor; aide to New York Governor Averell Harriman; Assistant Secretary of Labor under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; domestic policy advisor to President Nixon; and UN Ambassador under President Ford. While with Nixon, he conceived the controversial Family Assistance Plan (FAP), a welfare reform proposal that was fiercely criticized by both liberals and conservatives.

In 1976, Moynihan, who had denied any interest in elective office, reversed himself and ran for Senate. He won a narrow primary victory, and then upset incumbent James Buckley in the general election. He easily won reelection in 1982 and 1988. Moynihan has made the transition from conservative to liberal and is an unabashed supporter of the New Deal and Great Society programs. Moynihan established himself as one of the Reagan Administration's most persistent critics on health and social services policy.

Senator Moynihan has been an authority on work and the family; his interests lie primarily in Social Security and welfare reform issues, rather than in health care. He opposed the Reagan Administration's proposals to cut back Social Security in 1981 and was instrumental in developing the compromise that led to the Social Security reform legislation of 1983.

## Senator Daniel Moynihan (D-NY)



**Born:** 3/16/27, Tulsa, OK  
**Education:** City College, NY; Tufts U., B.N.S., B.A.; Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, M.A., Ph.D.  
**Military:** Navy, 1944-47  
**Prev. Occup:** Professor of government, writer, Assistant Secretary of Labor, White House Advisor, UN Ambassador  
**Family:** Wife, Elizabeth Brennan; 3 children  
**Religion:** Roman Catholic  
**Residence:** Pindars Corners  
**Elected:** 1976 (Re-election 1982, 1988)  
**Committees:** Finance, Foreign Relations, Environment and Public Works, Rules and Administration, Joint Committee on Taxation

## HEALTH REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

While Moynihan's initial comments about "fantasy" numbers caused alarm and received widespread national publicity, he seems now to be ready to proceed - albeit cautiously - on health care. Moynihan was quoted in a New York Newsday editorial on September 9 saying "You have to be very careful about what you bring into the public sector. There is a danger that government will become too important in our lives." In the 102nd Congress, Senator Moynihan cosponsored Senator Bentsen's small group market reform legislation. In hearings, Senator Moynihan questioned the feasibility of the plan to reach zero growth in Medicare and Medicaid, discussed the unanticipated consequences of social actions, and noted that the Administration already has the authority to tax ammunition.

Moynihan has long advocated changing the format of the Social Security card and has suggested using the same card to obtain health benefits.

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Senator Moynihan considers the nation's welfare system a "true crisis in domestic policy" and has expressed impatience with perceived delays in the introduction of the Administration's proposal. Senator Moynihan's staff, has indicated that: the Senator is enthusiastic about addressing the rising rate of teen pregnancies and the responsibilities of teen fathers. The Senator has expressed concern that the WORK program is too small, and wants the states to be given money to construct demonstration programs to put everyone to work who needs a subsidized job. Moynihan had indicated that he would consider a gambling tax to help fund welfare reform, but recent discussions with members of the Nevada and New Jersey delegations have greatly diminished his enthusiasm. Senator Moynihan also is concerned about the effect of the Administration's "alien deeming" and emergency assistance proposals on New York state.

In a May New York Times article, Moynihan stated he would be happy with more money and more teeth in his 1988 Family Support Act, which required states to expand job training and placement programs for welfare recipients.

## LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

102nd: Senator Moynihan sponsored legislation to reduce welfare dependency, establish SSA as an independent agency, liberalize the retirement earnings test, and to cut Social Security contribution rates and return to pay-as-you-go financing. His health interests also included managed care and mental health care.

103rd: The Senator has re-introduced legislation to require full funding for job opportunity and basic skills training (S. 16), and to direct the Secretary of HHS to develop and implement an information gathering system to measure and analyze welfare dependency (S. 111). He has also cosponsored bills to: protect the reproductive rights of women (S. 25, Mitchell); strengthen the Family and Medical Leave Act (PL 103-3); amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic act to clarify the uses of animal drugs and new drugs (S 340, Heflin); and to provide for the expanded studies and programs for traumatic brain injury victims (S. 725, Kennedy).

# NEW YORK

<u>DEMOGRAPHICS</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Population (7/1/92)	18,119	255.1M (T)	2
Child Population (4/1/90)	4,292,000	63.9M (T)	3
Percent of Population that are children (7/1/92)	23.9%	25.7% (A)	44
Per Capita Personal Income-FY 89	20,540	17,567 (A)	6
Poverty Rate			
1991	15.3%	13.7% (A)	18
1989	12.6%	12.7% (A)	22
1983	15.8%	15.4% (A)	22
1979	13.5%	12.4% (A)	15
Change in Rate (1979-1991)	1.9%	+1.3% (A)	

## Aid to Families with Dependent Children

<u>AFDC -- Benefits</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total assistance payments-FY 92	2,972.2m	22,223.5m(T)
AFDC Grant-Jan 93 (Mother-two children-0 income)	577(NYC) 703(SC)*	367 (M)
Food Stamp benefit-Jan 93	232(NYC) 195(SC)	285 (M)
Combined benefits-Jan 93	809(NYC) 898(SC)	652 (M)
% of poverty threshold-Jan 93	62%(NYC) 75%(SC)	70%
% change in AFDC benefit levels since 1980	-14.1%(NYC)	-22.4%

<u>AFDC -- Caseloads</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Average Monthly AFDC Caseload (people)-FY 92	397,200	4,768,600 (T)
AFDC Reciprocity Rate-FY 92	6.2	5.3% (A)
Change in AFDC Reciprocity-FY 88-92	+9%	+20% (A)
Average Payment per Family-FY 92	614	388 (A)
Average Number in AFDC Unit (10/90-9/91)	2.9	2.9 (A)
Food Stamp Reciprocity FY 92	10.40%	9.95% (A)

<u>AFDC -- Income Data</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Percent of Families with Unemployed Parent-9/92	3.3%	5.7% (A)
Percent with Earned Income-10/90-9/91	6.2%	7.9% (A)
Percent Receiving Public Housing/ HUD Rent Subsidy-10/90-9/91	25.4%	21.0% (A)
Number of JOBS participants on AFDC-FY 91	21,986	460,914 (T)

### Child Support Enforcement

<u>Collections and Expenditures</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>U.S. (*)</u>
Total Collections-FY 92	487.7m	7,951.1m (T)
AFDC Collections-FY 92	174.6m	2,252.6m (T)
Child Support Collections per \$ of Total Admin. Expend.-FY 92	3.22	3.99 (A)
Average Number AFDC Cases in which a Collection was Made-FY 92	51,290	830,713 (T)
Percentage Change in Total Real Collections since 1983	+180%	+203%
Total Number of Paternities Established-FY 92	34,434	515,393 (T)
Number of out-of-wedlock births-1990	98,110	1,165,384 (T)

\*Type: A=average, M=median, T=total SC=Suffolk County NYC=New York City

Source: 1993 Green Book

## STATE WELFARE POLICY

In January of 1994, the New York State Department of Social Services announced a new welfare reform strategy, "Jobs First". The program builds on the CAP program, a demonstration project conducted in seven sites in New York State, which promotes welfare over work and embodies the principle that both parents are responsible for the support of their children. The prime tenet of Jobs FIRST is to reconnect an individual to the labor force as quickly as possible and to do it whenever possible without engaging ADC or Home Relief.

Some services which the state can provide to keep a person from needing long-term welfare support include emergency one-time cash assistance if just a temporary setback has occurred, help in accessing other income supports such as child support payments, and immediate job search and participation in job readiness training or referral to transitional/permanent employment if the applicant is job-ready.

For those individuals who need long-term assistance, an individualized self-sufficiency plan will be developed with a job as the ultimate goal. Education, training, counseling, day care and other support services are but means to that end.

Jobs FIRST also promotes family formation by expanding in-hospital paternity establishment, making minor live at home in order to receive ADC, and rewarding parents whose children regularly attend school.

Under the new program, the CAP program will be expanded. CAP is based on a holistic, case management system in which recipients develop their own plan for improving their family's economic and social situation. Case workers have a much smaller caseload, thus they can give more individualized attention and help clients receive necessary services quickly.

CAP was a very successful program which involved a major restricting of benefit levels and service delivery. CAP benefits are reduced by only 10 cents on the dollar up to the poverty level and then 67 cents on the dollar up to the benefit limit at 150% of the poverty level, whereas AFDC takes away benefits almost dollar for dollar. CAP also pays recipients their benefits, as well as child care support, directly and allows them to manage a personal budget. If recipients need training, it ties directly into JTPA or other pre-existing employment and training services.

Waivers for AFDC, Child Support, Medicaid and the Food Stamp Program were granted in September, 1988. CAP requires AFDC waivers for certain provisions, including: 1) replacing earnings disregards with incentives; 2) eliminating the resource test; and 3) eliminating certain employment rules.

Operating in seven counties since 1988, CAP is available to all single AFDC recipients with children who are able to get a support order on a voluntary basis. The program was implemented in counties between October, 1988 and April, 1989. CAP was originally authorized to run through April, 1994 has the original sites have been extended through 1998 and six additional sites will be phased in.

A demonstration group of approximately 4200 participating families has been evaluated by

Abt Associates, Inc., whose final report was released earlier this year. According to Abt results, two years after recipients learned about CAP, significant progress was demonstrated. Those clients informed about CAP:

- had earnings from employment 27 percent higher than those uninformed about CAP;
- were 25 percent more likely to have obtained a support order for all children lacking one than those uninformed about CAP;
- were 18 percent more likely to have income exceeding 125 percent of poverty than those uninformed about CAP.

Additionally, the evaluation's cost-benefit analysis found CAP able to achieve these impacts without any increase or decrease in government expenditures.

As of March 17, 1994, New York State had not requested a waiver from HHS to expand, but state officials had met with HHS representatives and indicated that they will request a waiver for the following: to permit payments and loans for one-time emergencies to avoid eventual welfare dependency; modify allowable work experience and job training for AFDC and food stamp recipients; consolidate and streamline food stamp and AFDC eligibility requirements; provide incentives for children to attend school; make non-custodial parents eligible for JOBS programs; expand and broaden eligibility for CAP; require minors to live at home

Welfare Reform Working Group  
Talking Points: **OVERALL PLAN**  
June 7, 1994

"It's time to honor and reward people who work hard and play by the rules. That means ending welfare as we know it--not by punishing the poor or preaching to them, but by empowering Americans to take care of their children and improve their lives. No one who works full-time and has children at home should be poor anymore. No one who can work should be able to stay on welfare forever. We can provide opportunity, demand responsibility, and end welfare as we know it."

President Clinton, Putting People First, p. 164.

**Welfare reform is based on two simple principles: work and responsibility.**

Unfortunately, the current welfare system undermines these values by making welfare more attractive than work, and allowing parents to avoid responsibility for supporting their children. The President's plan would restore the basic values of work and responsibility, provide opportunity, and promote the family.

**Under the President's plan, welfare will be about a paycheck, not a welfare check.** To reinforce and reward work, our approach is based on a simple compact. Each recipient will immediately design a personal employability plan designed to move her into the workforce as quickly as possible. Support, job training, and child care will be provided to help people move from dependence to independence. But the first time limits ever imposed on welfare will ensure that anyone who can work, must work--in the private sector if possible, in a subsidized job if necessary.

**From the very first day, welfare will be a transitional system leading to work.** With child care and job search assistance, many people will move into the workforce well before the two-year time limit. And from the very first day, teenage mothers will be required to live with their parents, stay in school, and attend job training or parenting classes. Everyone will be moving toward work.

**Our approach also correctly focuses on ending welfare for the next generation--teenagers who have the most to gain and the most at risk.** By initially focusing our resources on younger recipients, we will send a strong signal to teenagers that welfare as we know it has ended. They must get the message that staying in school, postponing pregnancy, preparing to work, and supporting their children are the right things to do. Welfare reform will include new measures to prevent teen pregnancy, and real incentives to ensure responsibility.

**To support work and responsibility, work must pay.** Already, 70 percent of welfare recipients leave the welfare rolls within two years--but most eventually return. That's why we must use the Earned Income Tax Credit, guaranteed health care at work, and child care to make any job more attractive than welfare. The EITC alone will effectively make a minimum wage job pay \$6.00 an hour, helping to lift millions of people who work out of poverty. The combination of work opportunities, the EITC, health care, child care, and improved child support will make the lives of millions of women and children demonstrably better.

**To reinforce personal responsibility, the plan will take new steps to require full payment of child support. It sets up a new system of paternity establishment to enforce the responsibility of both parents from the moment the child is born. It involves the IRS in tracking delinquent parents from the moment they start a new job to the point that child support is delivered to the family. And it sets up a computer system to be sure that parents don't avoid their responsibilities by crossing state lines.**

**Welfare reform will mean real consequences for people who don't play by the rules. The new system will require mutual responsibility. We will provide recipients with services and work opportunities, but those who refuse to follow the rules will face tough, new sanctions. And attempts to cheat the system will be promptly detected and swiftly punished.**

**Responsibility and accountability must also extend to the welfare office itself. Unfortunately, the current system focuses too often on simply sending out welfare checks. We must change the culture of the welfare office to become a place that is fundamentally about moving people into the workforce. To do that, we must reward performance, not process. That means reducing paperwork and focusing on results.**

**Our approach builds on the successful philosophy of the Family Support Act, championed by then-Governor Clinton and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan in 1988. As welfare reform is phased in, a larger percentage of the caseload will be covered by the new rules; and states that want to move even faster will be able to use federal matching funds to do so. And more federal funds will provide increased job-training and development opportunities to older recipients under current guidelines.**

## Welfare Reform Financing Options

6/7/94 14:41

5 Year Savings Billions of Dollars  
 17-May-94      Possible  
 Offset Table \*      Outcome

**Summary:**

A. Program Savings	6.93	5.96
B. Enforcement Savings	0.29	0.29
C. Extend Expiring Provisions	2.01	1.82

**Total: Financing Options**

9.23	8.07
------	------

\* This column represents the numbers shared with the President in a memo from the Director, sent on May 17, 1994.

# Welfare Reform Financing Options

	<u>5 Year Savings Billions of Dollars</u>	
	17-May-94 Offset Table *	Possible Outcome
<i>6/7/94 14:41</i>		
<b>A. Program Savings</b>		
• Limit Emergency Assistance	1.89	1.60
• Limit SSI, Medicaid and AFDC Assistance to some PRUCOLs and Col 1: Make Current 5 Year SSI Deeming Rules 10 Years and Permanent. Extend 10 Year Deeming to AFDC and Food Stamps. <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Col 2: Make Current 5 Year Deeming Permanent and Limit Eligibility thereafter to Aliens Whose Sponsor's Income Falls Below Median Family Income.</span>	2.64	3.95 <del>3.50</del>
• Income Test Meal Reimbursements to Family Day Care Homes	0.52	0.52
• Graduated Interest Rates for Early Redemption of Savings Bonds <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"><i>Bentsen opposes</i></span>	0.30	0.00
• Time Limit SSI Benefits for Drug and Alcohol Addicted Recipients	1.59 1/	<del>0.34 1/</del>
<i>Subtotal</i>	<del>6.93</del>	<del>5.96</del>
<b>B. Enforcement Savings</b>		
<i>EITC:</i>		
• Deny to Non-Resident Aliens	0.13	0.13
• Require Reporting for DOD Personnel	0.16	0.16
<i>Subtotal</i>	0.29	0.29

*(use .6 and say we will make up difference if conference savings come up short).*

1/ The figure in Col. 1 is a staff estimate of CBP scoring. OMB adopted CBO scoring of the DAA proposal in the memo to the President. The figure in Col.2 is OMB scoring of the legislation to be enacted with our support.

# Welfare Reform Financing Options

6/7/94 14:41	<u>5 Year Savings Billions of Dollars</u>	
	17-May-94 Offset Table *	Possible Outcome
<b>C. Extend Expiring Provisions*</b>		
• Hold Constant the Portion of Food Stamp Overpayment Recoveries that States May Keep	0.05	0.05
• Fees for Passenger Processing and other Customs Services (savings in second 5 years)	0.00	0.00
• Extend Railroad Safety User Fees	0.16	0.16
• Extend Corporate Environmental Income (Superfund) Tax and (Net of 20% corporate income tax offset and Orphan Shares)	1.79	1.60 1/
<i>Subtotal</i>	2.01	1.82

**Total: Financing Options**

9.23	8.07
------	------

*.45 - Additional Aliens Savings*  
 $\frac{8.52}{.49}$  *Wealthy Farmers?*

# Welfare Reform Financing Options

6/7/94 14:41

**5 Year Savings Billions of Dollars**

17-May-94      Possible  
Offset Table \*    Outcome

**Total: Financing Options**

	9.23	8.07
--	------	------

Options to Fill the Gap

<i>Wealthy Farmers</i>		<i>+9</i>
• Increase the Emergency Assistance Savings		0.29
• Support a Tougher Policy on DAA.		0.24
• Propose Other SSI Reforms (e.g. Zebly children)		?
• Propose a Tougher Version of the Alien Deeming		?
• Reduce the Costs of the Program		0.32
Subtotal		0.85

## FINANCING

The financing for welfare reform comes from three areas: (1) reductions in entitlement programs; (2) better enforcement of revenue-raising measures and reductions in tax expenditures; and (3) extensions of various savings provisions set to expire in the future. Total estimated savings for all proposals are roughly \$\_\_\_ over five years and \$\_\_\_ over ten years.

### Entitlement Reforms

Cap the Emergency Assistance Program. The little known AFDC-Emergency Assistance (EA) Program is an uncapped entitlement program which has skyrocketed in recent years. In FY90, expenditures totalled \$189 million; in FY 1995, it is estimated that expenditures will be \$644 million and by FY 1999 almost \$1 billion. While the intent of the EA program is to meet short-term emergency needs and help keep people off welfare, States currently have wide latitude to determine the scope of their EA programs. Recently, States have realized that the definition of the program is so broad that it can fund almost any critical services to low-income persons. Since the EA program has a Federal match, States have rapidly begun shifting costs from programs which the States fund on their own such as foster care, family preservation, and homeless services into the matched EA program. States appear to be funding services that address long-term problems as well as true emergency issues.

We propose to modify the current Emergency Assistance program by establishing a Federal matching cap for each State's EA expenditures.

The Federal match will continue at 50 percent up to the cap. Under the new capped program, States will also be given the flexibility to determine their own definition of emergency services. This will give the States flexibility to address various special emergency problems. We would use the FY94 expenditures for setting caps. [to be updated after policy decisions are made 6/7]

Tighten Sponsorship and Eligibility Rules for Non-Citizens. In recent years, the number of non-citizens lawfully residing in the U.S. who collect SSI has risen dramatically. The chart below shows that immigrants rose from 5 percent of the SSI aged caseload in 1982 to over 25 percent of the caseload in 1992. Since 1982, applications for SSI from immigrants have tripled, while immigration rose by only about 50 percent over the period.

Most of the legal permanent resident applicants enter the country sponsored by their relatives. Until this year, current law required that for 3 years, a portion of the sponsor's income in

excess of 110 percent of poverty be "deemed" as available to help support the legal permanent resident (LPR) immigrant should they need public assistance. Currently, about one-third of the LPR immigrants on SSI subject to the deeming rules apply in their 4th year of residency. Last fall, to pay for extended unemployment benefits, Congress extended the time of deeming under SSI from 3 years to 5 years until 1996 when it reverts to 3 years again.

The Administration proposal related to non-citizens contains two parts--extending the deeming period for sponsor income and coordinating eligibility criteria under four Federal assistance programs.

*Deeming.* Our proposal extends the 5-year deeming provision permanently under SSI, AFDC, and Food Stamps. Beyond the 5 years it continues to make an LPR immigrant ineligible for welfare if the sponsor's income is in the top half of the income distribution. Once these immigrants with relatively wealthy sponsors attain citizenship, they will be potentially eligible for benefits. INS proposals to speed and simplify the citizenship process will help improve the current naturalization system. The proposal affects applications after the date of enactment (i.e., it would grandfather current recipients as long as they remained continuously eligible for benefits). This part of the proposal saves \$3.1 billion over 5 years.

The proposal sets consistent deeming rules for LPR immigrants across three Federal programs (SSI, AFDC, and Food Stamps). Extended deeming is based on longstanding immigration policy that LPR immigrants should not become public charges. Sponsored LPR immigrants most often apply for SSI benefits on the basis of being aged, and are different from most citizens in that the latter typically spent their life working and paying taxes in the U.S. At the same time, this proposal ensures that truly needy sponsored immigrants will not be denied welfare benefits if they can establish that their sponsors are no longer able to support them, if their sponsors die, or if the immigrant becomes blind or disabled after entry into the U.S. The policy would not affect refugees or asylees.

*Eligibility criteria.* The second element of this proposal establishes similar eligibility criteria under four Federal programs (SSI, AFDC, Medicaid, and Food Stamps) for all categories of immigrants who are not legal permanent residents. This element establishes in statute a consistent definition of which non-LPR immigrants are eligible for welfare benefits. Currently, due to different eligibility criteria in statute, and litigation over how to interpret statutory language, the four Federal programs do not cover the same categories of non-LPR immigrants. The Food Stamp program has the most restrictive definition of which categories of non-LPR immigrants are eligible for benefits (i.e., the eligibility criteria encompass a fewer number of INS statuses). SSI and Medicaid have the most expansive definition of which categories of non-LPR immigrants

are eligible for benefits, and the AFDC program falls between these extremes.

This proposal creates eligibility criteria in the SSI, Medicaid, and AFDC programs that are similar to the criteria that currently exists in the Food Stamp program. The new list of INS statuses required for potential eligibility to the SSI, Medicaid, and AFDC programs is also virtually identical to those listed in the Health Security Act providing eligibility for the Health Security Card. Like the extended deeming provisions, this part of the proposal affects applications after date of enactment (i.e., it would grandfather current recipients as long as they remained continuously eligible for benefits). This part of the proposal saves \$900 million over 5 years.

Time Limit SSI Benefits for Drug and Alcohol Addicted Recipients. Current law requires that all SSI disability recipients for whom substance abuse is material to the finding of disability must be in available treatment and must have their payments made through a representative payee (a third party who receives and manages the funds). Payments to these SSI drug addict and alcoholic (DA&A) beneficiaries are suspended if the individual fails to participate in appropriate alcohol or drug treatment, if such treatment is available. No similar requirements are made of Title II disability beneficiaries who receive benefits on the basis of addictions. The representative payee and treatment requirements have been part of the SSI program since its inception over 20 years ago. However, the provisions have not been implemented effectively.

Under the proposal, strengthened sanctions and new time limits will be applied to benefits paid to individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) benefits who have substance abuse problems that are material to their disability finding. These requirements will be applied to new Title II beneficiaries and to current and future SSI beneficiaries who are classified as DA&As.

Benefits would be suspended to individuals failing to participate in required drug or alcohol treatment programs as is current law. New requirements would specify that in order for benefits to be reinstated, these individuals would have to demonstrate compliance with treatment for progressively longer periods after each instance of noncompliance. For the first instance of noncompliance, benefits would be reinstated only after the individual complies with treatment for at least two months. In a second instance, benefits would be reinstated only after three months of compliance, and for third and subsequent instances, the required period of compliance would be six months.

In addition, benefits would be limited to 36 months for DA&As, after which they may not receive benefits unless they continue to be disabled without regard to their substance abuse. The 36-month time clock will begin once an individual has been assessed

and referred to a treatment program and would not run during periods of suspension, or while the individual is on a waiting list for treatment.

Finally, lump-sum retroactive benefits payments to these beneficiaries will be prorated such that the total monthly payment (regular benefit plus prorated lump sum) does not exceed two times the individual's normal benefit amount.

Income Test Meal Reimbursements to Family Day Care Homes. The Child Care Food Program provides food subsidies for children in two types of settings: child care centers and family day care homes. They are administered quite differently. The subsidies in centers are well targeted because they are means-tested; USDA believes that over 90 percent of Federal dollars support meals served to low-income (below 185 percent of poverty) children. The family day care part of the program is not well targeted because it has no means test (due to the lack of administrative ability of the providers). A USDA-commissioned study estimates that 71 percent of Federal dollars support meals for children above 185 percent of the poverty line. While the child care center funding levels have been growing at a modest rate, the family day care funding levels are growing rapidly--16.5 percent between 1991 and 1992.

The following approach better targets the family day care funding to low-income children and creates minimal administrative requirements for providers. It would raise roughly \$0.5 billion over 5 years.

- Family day care homes located in low-income areas (e.g., census tracts where half of the children are below 185 percent of the poverty line) would receive \$.84 and \$1.67 in breakfast and lunch reimbursements, respectively, during school year 1995. This is roughly equivalent to the "free meal" rate paid on behalf of low-income children in day care centers, whose families have incomes under 130 percent of poverty.
- All other homes would have a choice. They could elect not to use a means-test; if they elect this option, they would receive reimbursements at the reduced levels of \$.54 and \$1.27, respectively. Alternatively, a family day care home could administer a simplified, two-part means-test. Meals served to children below 185 percent of the poverty line would be reimbursed at the "free meal" rate. Meals served to children above 185 percent of the poverty line would be reimbursed at the reduced-price rate.
- Intermediaries that serve family day care homes in low-income areas would be reimbursed an extra \$10 per month for ongoing administrative costs, and a \$5 million set-aside would help such day care homes to become licensed (or registered).

### Graduated Interest Rates for Early Redemption of Savings Bonds.

The Savings Bond program is intended to provide a safe and attractive long-term investment opportunity for individual savers, and a cost-effective form of public debt financing. Savings Bonds pay at least 4 percent interest (possibly higher after 5 years if market rates are higher) and may be redeemed on demand, without penalty, after 6 months. Each year, 40 percent of the bonds redeemed were outstanding for one year or less (65 percent were 3 years or less). For these "early redeemers," the Savings Bond program is overly generous and, due to the relatively high transaction costs, is not a cost-effective means of debt financing.

This proposal would eliminate the 4-percent interest floor, enacted in 1976, below which Treasury cannot lower the guaranteed rate. Treasury would issue new bonds with a 2-percent guaranteed rate that would rise, over a 5-year period, so that the cumulative percentage yield would reach 4 percent at the end of the fifth year. Graduated guaranteed rates have been used successfully in the past to make the yield to early redeemers similar to private market alternatives. It would have no effect on (a) Savings Bonds already outstanding, or (b) Savings Bonds held for at least 5 years. No change is proposed to the market-based rates that apply after 5 years. Estimated savings are true savings and do not include the artificial savings that could arise from changes in the timing of interest payments. Although Treasury does not maintain statistics on who purchases savings bonds, there is no reason to believe that a disproportionate share of such investors are low-income.

### Tax Compliance Measures

Deny EITC to Nonresident Aliens. Under current law, non-resident aliens may receive the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). Because non-resident taxpayers are not required to report their worldwide income, it is currently impossible for the IRS to determine whether ineligible individuals (such as high-income nonresident aliens) are claiming the EITC. The proposal will deny the EITC to non-resident aliens completely. We estimate that about 50,000 taxpayers will be affected, mainly visiting foreign students and professors. The proposal would raise \$130 million over 5 years.

Require Income Reporting for EITC Purposes for Department of Defense (DoD) Personnel. Under current law, families living overseas are ineligible for the EITC. The first part of this proposal would extend the EITC to active military families living overseas. To pay for this proposal, and to raise net revenues, the DoD would be required to report the nontaxable earned income paid to military personnel (both overseas and States-side) on Form W-2. Such nontaxable earned income includes basic allowances for subsistence and quarters. Because current law provides that in determining earned income for EITC purposes such nontaxable earned income must be taken into account, the

additional information reporting would enhance compliance with the EITC rules. This proposal is supported by DoD.

The combination of these two proposals would raise \$160 million over 5 years.

#### **Extend Expiring Provisions**

Hold Constant the Portion of Food Stamp Overpayment Recoveries that States May Retain. States are permitted to keep some portion of the 100-percent Federal Food Stamp recoveries as an incentive payment for pursuing fraud cases. This proposal would extend the 1990 Farm Bill provision which reduced the percentage of recovered Food Stamp overissuances retainable by State agencies for fiscal years 1991-95. Under this provision, which would be extended to fiscal years 1996-2004, States could retain 25 percent of recoveries from fraud/intentional program violations (previously 50 percent) and 10 percent of other recoveries (previously 25 percent).

This proposal would raise \$50 million over 5 years.

Extend Fees for Passenger Processing and Other Custom Services. A flat-rate merchandise processing fee (MPF) is charged by U.S. customs for processing of commercial and non-commercial merchandise that enters or leaves U.S. warehouses. The fee, adopted by OBRA 1986, generally is set at 0.19 percent of the value of the good. Other variable customs fees are charged for: passenger processing; commercial truck arrivals; railroad car arrivals; private vessel or private aircraft entries; dutiable mail; broker permits; and barge/bulk carriers. NAFTA extended the MPF and other fees through September, 2003. The proposal extends the fees charged permanently.

Extend Railroad Safety User Fees. Railroad safety inspection fees were enacted in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to pay for the costs of the Federal rail safety inspection program. The railroads are assessed fees according to a formula based on three criteria: road miles, as a measure of system size; train miles as a measure of volume; and employee hours as a measure of employee activity. The formula is applied across the board to all railroads to cover the full costs of the Federal railroad safety inspection program. The fees are set to expire in 1996. The 1995 President's Budget proposed to extend the fees through 1999 and expand them, effective in 1995, to cover other railroad safety costs. The proposal extends the fees permanently.

This proposal would raise \$160 over 5 years.

Extend Expiring Corporate Superfund Payments. [description to come]

This proposal would raise \$1.8 billion over 5 years.

**WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,  
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE**

---

May 25, 1994

Attached is a comparison of key provisions of:

1. Current Welfare Law
2. Administration draft proposal - as of May 24, 1994
3. House Republican Bill (H.R. 3500)
4. Senate Republican Plan (S. 1795)
5. Mainstream Forum Welfare Reform Proposal
6. APWA Recommendations - released January 11, 1994

The comparison is up to date as of May 24, 1994. However, we will update the chart once the Administration plan is finalized. Additional welfare reform bills which have been, or will be proposed, may also be added, as needed.

The document is for reference and internal use only.

If you have any questions please call Abbie Gottesman at 205-3600 or John Wolff at 690-7507.

# COMPARISON OF WELFARE REFORM PROVISIONS

## I. ENHANCING JOBS PROGRAM

### A. AFDC Transition Program

#### 1. Current Law:

The current AFDC program is an income support program with an employment training component for JOBS mandatory recipients. Potential eligibility for benefits is in perpetuity.

#### 2. Administration Proposal:

Transition program would offer all services under current JOBS program. Requires phased-in population to participation in the JOBS program, unless meets criteria for pre-JOBS (see below). Requires supervised job search from date of approval for job ready. Every recipient will be required to develop an employability plan within 90 days of application or redetermination. Welfare agency required to help recipient gain access to the education, training, and employment services they need to find jobs; reassessment by welfare agency every six months. Requires participation in job search for a period of not less than 45 day (up to 90 days at State option) before hitting the time limit and taking a work assignment. State option to provide services to assist individuals who find employment stay employed.

#### 3. House Republican Plan:

Transition program would offer all services under current JOBS program. States would assess the progress of recipients after first year of participation or could delay the entry of a work-ready recipient into the JOBS program. A recipient deemed work ready could be required to go straight into a work program. employability plans would be required for all recipients.

#### 4. Senate Republican Plan:

Transition program with education, job skills, job readiness, job development and placement and OJT. Recipient deemed work ready must go straight into the work program. Requires assessments every 6 months. Except in educational activities, participation must average 20 hours a week. States shall establish guidelines for satisfying requirements in educational institutions. Mandatory applicant job search unless States exempt themselves.

#### 5. Mainstream Forum:

As part of its Work First program, job search must begin immediately upon eligibility for AFDC and continue for the duration of enrollment in AFDC. Within 30 days of eligibility (90 days at State option), each recipient must meet with a case management team to develop an individual employability plan. Focus on employment-focused activities, but education and training services are provided where necessary. Work First also includes job development, employee training and incentives to focus on unsubsidized employment, and one-stop employment service shops.

### B. Participation Requirements

#### 1. Current Law:

The participation rate is currently 15% of those eligible, and it will rise to 20% in FY 1995. Must participate for 75 percent of time in activities scheduled for an average of 20 hours per week in any of the allowable activities which include: high school level education or remedial studies (some States may offer college level education); job skills training; job readiness activities; job development and placement; group and individual job search, on the job training, work supplementation, and CWEP.

#### 2. Administration Proposal:

Two separate rates participation standards in JOBS: (1) a "coverage" rate, which measures the proportion of the mandatory population served, is set at 85 percent; and (2) a monthly participation rate of 45 percent. For WORK, a State would be required to provide a number of WORK assignments equal to either a number set by the Secretary based on the State's capped allocation or a number equal to 80 percent of those who reach the time limit. Current definitions of participation will not be used; new definitions will be specified in regulation.

#### 3. House Republican Plan:

Phase-in higher participation standards 10% per year until a 90% participation rate is reached in 2002;

Expand allowable activities; Cut participation requirements to a total of 520 hours which averages out to just 10 hours per week instead of the current 20 hours.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Overall JOBS participation rates increase to 20% by FY 1998. Rates for recipients who came on the rolls between FY 95 and FY 98 increase from 20% in FY 95 to 50% in FY 98. Rates for recipients who come on after FY 1998 increase from 60% in FY 99 to 90 percent in FY 02.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Participation for a minimum of 20 hours per week is required, which must include job search.

## II. TIME LIMITS

### A. Duration of Eligibility for Benefits

1. Current Law:

Duration of benefits is in perpetuity as long as eligibility criteria is met.

2. Administration Proposal:

Maximum of two years of cash aid. Extensions of the two year limit could be granted for those who had to complete an educational or training program, up to a fixed percentage in each State. For those who left AFDC with less than six months of eligibility remaining, individuals could "earn-back" 1 month of AFDC eligibility for each 4 months off AFDC/WORK.

3. House Republican Plan:

States may impose mandatory work obligation after 2 years, and 1 year for job-ready recipients, with no earn-back.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Two year life-time limit, 1 year at State option for work-ready recipients, with no earn-back.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Two year life-time limit, 1 year at State option for work-ready recipients, with no earn-back.

### B. Exemptions from the Time-limit

1. Current Law:

There are many exemptions to the JOBS participation requirements including those who are ill, incapacitated, or elderly, the parent of a child under three, someone employed for more than 30 hours per week, a child under age 16, a woman in at least the second trimester of pregnancy, someone who resides where the program is not available.

2. Administration Proposal:

Individuals are not subject to the time limit if they meet criteria for pre-JOBS status. The criteria are: Parent of a child under one, provided the child was not conceived while on assistance; suffers from illness or injury that is serious enough to prevent entry into a employment or training program; is incapacitated; has an application pending for the SSI or SSDI program; is 60 years of age or older; is needed in the home to care for care other household member; is in the third trimester of pregnancy; or is living in a remote area. Each State permitted to place a fixed percentage in pre-JOBS for good cause (in addition to criteria defined above). Pregnant women get leave equal to Family and Medical Leave. States would have option of requiring persons to participate in substance abuse treatment as a pre-JOBS activity, with sanctions applied for non-participation. Only one-parent in an AFDC-UP family could be placed in pre-JOBS. Time limits would not apply until the recipients' 18th birthday.

3. House Republican Plan:

Exemptions for persons who are ill, disabled, caring for a disabled relative, or working 30 hours per week. States would have the option to provide exemptions for those enrolled in drug and alcohol abuse programs.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Exemptions for persons who are ill, incapacitated (not to include substance abusers), elderly, in their third trimester of pregnancy, had child while the family was on AFDC (six month exemption for first child, 4 months for each subsequent child), is caring for disabled dependents full-time, working 35 or more hours per week, has a child under age 16 attending school full-time, or is living in a remote area. States would

have the option to provide exemptions for those enrolled in drug and alcohol abuse programs.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Exemptions for persons who are under 20 completing high school or GED; clients in part-time technical/vocational education in combination with work; clients who are disabled, ill, or those caring for disabled relative. Pregnant women get leave equal to Family and Medical Leave. Substance abusers must get treatment but also participate in JOBS.

III. POST-TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A. Work Requirement

1. Current Law:

No mandated work for benefits program; States have option to run Community Work Experience Programs (CWEP). People in CWEP work in the public sector for the number of hours equal to their AFDC benefit divided by the minimum wage. In FY 1991 there were 13,112 slots for CWEP participants; Optional Work Supplementation Program. In FY 1991 there were 707 slots for the program.

2. Administration Proposal:

Those recipients who have exceeded their time-limit and who are unable to obtain unsubsidized employment will be required to participate in the WORK program. Individual WORK slots would be limited to 12 months and States could pursue a wide range of strategies in designing such slots.

3. House Republican Plan:

After receiving two years of benefits (one year at State option), work is required. Work program can expand CWEP, work supplementation, or create a new program. Requires recipients to work for 35 hours per week. Eliminates requirement that work supplementation participants be assigned only to unfilled, newly created jobs. States can require participation in the work supplementation program in which the AFDC benefit is used to subsidize a private sector job.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

After receiving two years of benefits (one year at State option), work is required. Work program must include work supplementation, CWEP, employment voucher or other approved work program. States can require participation in the work supplementation program in which the AFDC benefit is used to subsidize a private sector job. AFDC or food stamp only recipients can find a private sector job with an employment voucher valued at the family's combined AFDC and food stamp benefit level and, after six months, half that amount. Employers must pay the employee at least twice the value of the voucher.

5. Mainstream Forum:

After two years a person is out of AFDC system but will have option to work at least 30 hours a week at a minimum wage community service job and/or have access to placement and support agencies and/or subsidized jobs. Participants encouraged work for wages, not for benefits; community service jobs are last resort. An additional five hours of job search would also be required.

B. Time-Limits on Post-Transitional Assistance

1. Current Law:

Not applicable.

2. Administration Proposal:

There is no overall time-limit on WORK participation, so long as participants have met all requirements.

3. House Republican Plan:

At State option, participation in the post-transitional work portion of the assistance program may be limited to 3 years.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

At State option, benefits received under the post-transitional work portion of the assistance program may be limited to 12 months for the individual casehead, who would still be eligible for Medicaid and food stamps. The family (i.e., children) would continue to receive a reduced grant.

5. Mainstream Forum:

The community service component would only be available to an individual for three years. A limited

number of individuals (10% of the participants) deemed "not ready for employment" can be readmitted to the program after this point.

C. Pay Compensation

1. Current Law:

People in CWEP work in public sector jobs for the number of hours equal to their AFDC benefit divided by the minimum wage.

2. Administration Proposal:

Total WORK program benefits (wages plus supplemental benefits) would not be less than AFDC grant. States would have the flexibility to determine the number of hours for each WORK assignment, with a minimum of an average of 15 hours per week during a month and for no more than an average of 35 hours per week during a month.

3. House Republican Plan:

People in CWEP work in public sector jobs for the number of hours equal to their AFDC benefit divided by the minimum wage. States could also require participation in a work supplementation program in which the AFDC benefit is used to subsidize a private sector job.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

People in CWEP work in public sector jobs for the number of hours equal to their AFDC benefit divided by the minimum wage. States could also require participation in a work supplementation program in which the AFDC benefit is used to subsidize a private sector job.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Work for wages, at least minimum wage.... Participants in subsidized employment could receive a supplemental benefit from the State.

D. Anti-displacement Provisions

1. Current Law:

Strong anti-displacement provisions as established by FSA of 1988.

2. Administration Proposal:

Strong anti-displacement provisions based on National Service non-displacement measures.

3. House Republican Plan:

Current law provisions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Current law and eliminates requirement that work supplementation participants be assigned only to unfilled, newly created jobs.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Current public sector employees shall not be displaced.

E. Economic Development

1. Current Law:

No provisions.

2. Administration Proposal:

Two test programs. One will test effect of Individual Development Accounts on savings. The other encourages people to start microenterprises; Demonstration program to promote self-employment by providing access to micro-loan funds and technical assistance in obtaining loans and starting businesses.

3. House Republican Plan:

Asset limits are increased to \$10,000 for purposes of micro-enterprise and education.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Supplement wages and tax credits to firms both paid through cashing out Food Stamp benefits. States should be allowed federal grant money to supplement wages. Permit States to use federal community and

rural development and job training funds to make direct loans to nonprofit groups that lend to micro-businesses and poor entrepreneurs.

#### IV. SANCTIONS

##### 1. Current Law:

The sanction for the first instance of failure to participate in JOBS as required (or failure to accept a private sector job or other occurrence of noncompliance) is the loss of the non-compliant individual's share of the grant until the failure to comply ceases. The same sanction is imposed, but for a minimum of 3 months, for the second failure to comply and for a minimum of 6 months for all subsequent instances on non-compliance.

##### 2. Administration Proposal:

In JOBS and WORK, the sanction for refusing a job offer without good cause would be the loss of the family's entire AFDC benefit for 6 months or until the adult accepts a job offer, whichever is shorter. Sanctions for noncompliance in JOBS remain the same as current law. In WORK, noncompliance results in the following penalties: (1) For first occurrence, the family receives a 50 percent reduction in the AFDC grant for one month or until they comply; (2) For the second occurrence, the family receives a 50 percent reduction in the AFDC grant for three months; (3) For the third occurrence, elimination of the family's grant for a period of 3 months; (4) For a fourth and subsequent occurrence, elimination of the family's grant for a period of 6 months.

##### 3. House Republican Plan:

Reduce a family's combined AFDC and food stamp benefits by 25% until the recipient complies or 3 months have passed. If the recipient does not comply within 3 months, the sanction is extended for 3 more months. If the recipient does not comply in 6 months, the whole family's AFDC benefits are eliminated entirely, though the family is still eligible for Food Stamps, Medicaid, and other benefits.

##### 4. Senate Republican Plan:

For the first and second offenses, the family loses the adult share of the AFDC benefit for three and six months, respectively. After the third offense, payments to the parent ends for at least one year and payments to the children shall be made through vendor payments for housing or to representative payees.

##### 5. Mainstream Forum:

AFDC and food stamp benefits reduced for one month by 25% for each act of non-compliance. For work program, individual is given a maximum of three placements of non-compliance may occur after which enrollee will no longer be allowed to participate in work program. Sanctions for those who are offered a private sector job but do not accept job without good reason.

#### V. FUNDING AND MATCHING RATES

##### 1. Current Law:

States are reimbursed at a 90 percent rate for JOBS expenditures up to the amount allotted to the State in FY 1987 for WIN. States face financial penalties if program resources are not targeted towards specified populations. Additional expenditures are reimbursed at the higher of 60 percent and the Medicaid rate for direct costs and personnel costs of full-time JOBS staff and 50 percent for other administrative costs; The cap for JOBS was \$600 million in FY 1989, it increases to \$1.3 Billion in FY 1995, and decreases to \$1 billion for FY 1996 and beyond; Most States have been unable to draw down their entire allocation for JOBS because they cannot find the money for State match.

##### 2. Administration Proposal:

The Federal match rates (for each State) for all JOBS expenditures would be set at the current law JOBS match rate (program cost) plus five to ten percentage points. Spending for direct program and administrative costs would be matched at the same rate. The current law 90 percent match would be eliminated. The JOBS capped entitlement (Federal) would be set at \_\_\_ billion for FY 1996, \_\_\_ billion for FY 1997, and \_\_\_ billion for each of the fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. A separate capped entitlement would be established for the post-transitional WORK program to cover operational costs (the same match rates apply). The WORK capped entitlement (Federal) would be set at \_\_\_ billion for FY 1996, \_\_\_ billion for FY 1997, and \_\_\_ billion for each of the fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. A State

would be permitted to reallocate an amount up to 10% of its combined JOBS and WORK allotments from its JOBS program to its WORK program and vice versa.

3. House Republican Plan:

Greater of 70% or Medicaid percentage for program costs. Drops to 50% in participation rates not met. Child care cost matched as under current law (the greater of 60% or FMAP). Current law targeting provisions in JOBS are dropped.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Greater of 70% or Medicaid percentage for program costs. Drops to 50% in participation rates not met. Amounts authorized for FY 96, FY 97, and FY 98 are \$300 million, 1 billion, and 1.9 billion, respectively.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Federal government share set at 80% and the State share set at 20%. Work First is an uncapped entitlement.

## VI. CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

### A. Paternity Establishment

1. Current Law:

Clients must cooperate with the State in establishing paternity, unless there is "good cause." If client does not cooperate, her portion of the AFDC benefit will be terminated unless no such payee can be found; Under the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993, States must have procedures in place for a simple civil process for voluntarily acknowledging paternity. The act also calls for strengthened paternity establishment standards for each State based upon past figures.

2. Administration Proposal:

Offer States performance-based incentives. Expand in-hospital establishment provisions enacted as part of OBRA '93. Expand education about parental responsibility. Streamline legal process. Must meet new stricter cooperation requirements.

3. House Republican Plan:

Mothers must identify the putative father as a condition of eligibility and family would receive reduced benefits (minus mother's portion of the grant) until paternity is established. Children whose paternity is not established are denied benefits. Increase State requirement to establish paternity for 90% of all out-of-wedlock births or face financial sanctions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Paternity establishment is a condition of receiving benefits. The parent's benefits are denied until paternity of the child is established, a paternity suit is initiated, efforts to establish paternity would result in physical danger, or reduction in aid would impose undue hardship. If an individual is wrongfully named as the father, the adult's benefit is removed. The paternity establishment standard is increased to 90 percent. States must increase their paternity establishment ratio by 10 percent each year if below 50 percent and 6 percent if between 50 and 90 percent.

5. Mainstream Forum:

States must develop simple civil consent procedure for paternity establishment outside of hospital. Benefits contingent on establishment. Increase information recipient must provide in order to "cooperate" and receive AFDC benefits. Require States to establish hospital-based paternity as established in OBRA 1993. Make incentive for paternity establishment by increasing per month pass through of child support benefits to mothers on AFDC to \$100.

### B. Strengthen Enforcement

1. Current Law:

The current system fails to ensure that children receive adequate support from both parents. Currently there is a collection gap of \$34 billion.

2. Administration Proposal:

Create a central registry and payment center in all States and create a Federal Child Support Enforcement

Payment Center to track parents across State lines. Require routine reporting of all new hires via national W-4 reporting and a National Directory of New Hires, and require immediate wage withholding, by the state, on unpaid orders. Adopt Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) to make interstate collection procedures more routine. Strengthen IRS role. Allow States authority to revoke licenses. Create new funding formula and place emphasis on performance-based incentives.

3. House Republican Plan:

Expand Federal parent locator service; streamlined wage withholding; States required to enforce out-of-State wage withholding orders; Require W-4 based new-hire reporting systems and immediate withholding.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

States maintain registries of child support orders to assist other States with interstate searches and to assist both custodial and non custodial parents. Expand the Federal Parent Locator System (FPLS) and establish an interstate locate network linking the FPLS to State child support data bases. Streamline the interstate system of wage withholding by requiring uniform notices and requiring employers to honor the uniform withholding orders of any State within 10 days or be subject to a civil fine. Develop a uniform child support order for use by all State courts. Require States to recognize and enforce interstate orders; States required to enforce out-of-State uniform wage withholding orders.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Require States to maintain registries of child support orders. Modify W-4 to include statement about child support responsibilities. Create National Support guidelines Commission to oversee child support process. Expand functions of parent locator in DHHS. Implement direct income withholding process. Mandate reports to credit bureau of all obligations and arrearages. Allow workers compensation to be subject to income withholding. Require noncustodial parents delinquent in their payments to enter a work program in which they work to pay off benefits going to support their child. Allow States to establish procedures under which liens can be imposed against lottery winnings and other awards.

C. Assured Minimum Benefits

1. Current Law:

None. The New York CAP program guarantees a minimum benefit to families with support orders. Virginia will be implementing a demonstration which features an assurance function.

2. Administration Proposal:

Congress would authorize up to 6 demonstrations to test State child support assurance programs. Demonstrations would last 7 years and would be funded at 90 percent FFP.

3. House Republican Plan:

No provisions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

No provisions.

D. Noncustodial Parents

1. Current Law:

Non-custodial parents have a very limited role in the current welfare system. The FSA of 1988 includes a provision for up to 5 States to provide services under the JOBS program, to non-custodial parents who are unemployed and unable to meet their child support obligations. Project Fair Share operates the demo programs which try to involve non-custodial parents in their children's lives.

2. Administration Proposal:

Create a system with parallel expectations for custodial and noncustodial parents. Reserve a portion of JOBS and WORK funding for noncustodial parent of AFDC recipient children who are unemployed or under employed and cannot pay child support. State option for mandatory work programs for noncustodial parents. Make grants available to States for programs which foster access and visitation by both parents through mediation, counseling, education and visitation enforcement and monitoring.

3. House Republican Plan:

Noncustodial parents may be required to participate in 2-4 weeks of job search and in a State work program.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Noncustodial parents with the equivalent of more than 2 months of arrearage, unless subject to a court approved repayment plan, will be notified they must pay child support and are subject to fines and other penalties. If there is no response within 30 days, the State will seek a court order requiring the noncustodial parent to participate in job search and if the arrearage has not decreased within 30 days after the order is entered, the noncustodial parent must participate in a work program for 35 or more hours a week.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Require States to offer positive paternity establishment/parenting social services for new fathers. Allocate 10 percent of the Work First funds to States to create programs for male non-custodial parents; Require noncustodial parents delinquent in their payments to enter a work program in which they work to pay off benefits going to support their child.

VII. PROMOTE PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

A. Minor Mothers

1. Current Law:

Permitted to collect AFDC as separate filing unit. State option to require minor mothers to reside in their parents home; CT, DE, MN, MI, WI, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands doing by waiver authority.

2. Administration Proposal:

Require to live with parent or other responsible adult. Parental support is included in AFDC eligibility.

3. House Republican Plan:

States must deny AFDC to parents under 18 years old, unless they pass a State law waiving this rule. Minor mothers are required to live at home.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

State option to deny AFDC to minor parents (Medicaid eligibility would continue). Minor custodial parents are required to live at their parents home or in a group home; Parental support is included in AFDC eligibility. States must use savings from these provisions to fund group homes, adoption assistance and "abstinence education."

5. Mainstream Forum:

Require to live in household with responsible adult.

B. Targeting Teens

1. Current Law:

No provisions.

2. Administration Proposal:

Provide enhanced case management to all teens under 20. All custodial parents under 20 who had not completed high school or the equivalent would be required to participate in the JOBS program (as soon as the child reached 12 weeks of age), with education as the presumed activity. State option for incentives to participate in educational and parenting activities.

3. House Republican Plan:

States can impose sanctions on minor parents who do not attend school themselves or whose children do not attend school. State option to require parents to participate in parenting and money management classes.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

State option to disregard savings from the earnings of a dependent child if the funds are used for education.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Parents under 20 who do not have a high school diploma or GED must remain in school and receive a bonus of 25% per month if those requirements are met and 25% penalty if they are not met. Teen parents

required to take parenting classes.

### C. Other Prevention Strategies

1. Current Law:

No provisions.

2. Administration Proposal:

National campaign against teen pregnancy; Every male or female school-age parent would be required to participate in JOBS from moment pregnancy or paternity is established. Require special case management and special services including family planning. Increase Title X Family Planning Funding. Strengthen AFDC Family Planning Requirement. Allow States to utilize older welfare mothers to mentor at-risk school-age parents as part of their community service assignment. Comprehensive neighborhood-based demonstration grants with strong evaluation component.

3. House Republican Plan:

No additional provisions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

State option to require parents to participate in parenting and money management classes; requires States (unless they pass laws exempting themselves) to reward or sanction families \$50 a month based on compliance with immunization and health check requirements for preschoolers. Requires States to conduct education and outreach services related to preventive health and immunizations for preschool children. Requires the Surgeon General to issue recommendations on immunizations periodically.

5. Mainstream Forum:

National campaign to teach that teenage parents are at high risk for welfare dependency; States should ensure that people have access to family planning and comprehensive services.

### D. Family Cap

1. Current Law:

AFDC benefits increase when additional child is born; State waivers to cap benefits exist in: NJ, GA, VA.

2. Administration Proposal:

States will have option to keep AFDC benefits constant when a child is conceived while the parent is on welfare but must assure parents access to family planning services and must do at least one the following: permit the family to earn more or receive more in child support; permit working recipients to disregard a higher amount of earnings equal to the benefits they would have gotten for an additional child.

3. House Republican Plan:

States are not required to pay an additional benefit for a child born 10 months after the date of application for AFDC. Some exceptions apply for families which leave AFDC due to employment but return. States may exempt themselves by passing a State law waiving Federal requirements.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

States are not required to pay an additional benefit born 10 months after the date of application for AFDC. Some exceptions apply for families which leave AFDC due to employment but return.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Do not support increases in AFDC funding to mothers who have additional children while receiving benefits. State may opt of this requirement under State plan.

## VIII. MAKE WORK PAY

### A. Child Care

1. Current Law:

There are a number of entitlement programs, all with different eligibility rules. Some programs include:  
1) Title IV-A provides child care to AFDC recipients. It is an open ended federal entitlement based on FMAP with a State match requirement; 2) Entitlement for one year of transitional child care for people who have left AFDC in the last year and funding is based on FMAP rate with a State match requirement;

3) At-Risk program capped at \$300 million p. year for those the State determines to be at-risk of AFDC receipt, and matched by States at FMAP rate; 4) Child Care Development Block Grants pay for many services including child care and were funded at \$360 million in FY92; No State match.

2. Administration Proposal:

Ensure transitional child care, make child care subsidies available to low-income families to enable them to remain off of welfare.

3. House Republican Plan:

No new provisions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No new provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Support transitional child care benefits in current law. Make Dependent Care Tax Credit refundable; Expand IV-A entitlement program for cash assistance to recipients. IV-A funding will have 80/20 federal State match. Expand At-Risk Child Care Program to \$2 billion by FY 2001. Change eligibility for Transitional Child Care from 1 to 2 years. Require automatic notification of eligibility for Transitional Child Care to AFDC recipients who find work. Support expansion of Head Start; Create jobs in child care field for recipients.

B. Earned Income Tax Credit

1. Current Law:

When fully implemented the EITC will have the effect of making a \$4.25 per hour job pay nearly \$6.00 per hour for a parent with two or more children; The maximum benefit for a family of four with full-time minimum wage earnings is \$3,370; Raised the pay for the wage earner of a two-parent family of four by 16%; The five-year cost of the expansion is \$20.8 billion, with \$7.0 billion spent in FY 1998; Currently the EITC tends to be delivered in a lump sum at the end of the year and the process for ensuring a different distribution schedule is difficult.

2. Administration Proposal:

Ensure that the EITC can be delivered on a regular, advance-payment basis throughout the year. Provisions under development which would allow States to distribute advance payments of EITC through State welfare agencies.

3. House Republican Plan:

EITC is capped at 2% plus inflation (see FUNDING section)

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No new provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Require that welfare recipients be notified, in writing, of availability of EITC. Require that employers inform new employees of option of having advance EITC payments through their payroll. EITC payments be exempt from counting against food stamp and AFDC asset limits for twelve months.

C. Work Should Pay Better Than Welfare

1. Current Law:

Current earned income disregard policy is to exclude \$90 of work expenses and an additional \$30 and 1/3 (for 12 months) from earned income in determining benefit amounts. Additional sums above that amount reduce benefits dollar for dollar. Recipients who leave AFDC due to earnings are eligible for 1 year of transitional medicaid.

2. Administration Proposal:

Replace the current income disregard policy and instead require States to disregard a time invariant minimum of \$120 in earnings, indexed for inflation in rounded increments of \$10. States will have the option to establish their own disregard policies on income above this amount. Additionally, States will have complete flexibility in establishing fill-the-gap policies.

3. House Republican Plan:

States have complete flexibility to modify the current 30 and 1/3 income deduction rule, up to the first \$200

in earned income plus 1/2 the remaining amount.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

States must liberalize the earned-income disregard but must stay within guideline of enacting AFDC countable income tests up to a ceiling whereby maximum monthly disregard is \$225 in addition to 1/3 of all remaining earned income and the minimum is a monthly disregard of \$120. Increase transitional medicaid to two years; pass health care reform. State option to waive the 100 hour rule for two parent families.

D. Changes in Asset and Resource Limits

1. Current Law:

Under current AFDC law, applicants and recipients are eligible for benefits if their assets do not exceed \$1,000 (or lower at State option), with few exclusions. In the Food Stamp program, the resource limit is \$2,000 (\$3,000 for households with a person aged 60 or older). Additionally, the current AFDC automobile exclusion is set by regulation at \$1,500 equity value (or a lower limit set by the State) in one vehicle with any excess equity value counted toward the \$1,000 AFDC resource limit. The Food Stamp Act provides for the total exclusion of vehicles that are used over 50 percent of the time for income-producing purposes; annually producing income consistent with their FMV; necessary for long distance travel for work (other than daily commute); used as the household's home; or needed to transport a physically disabled household member. For the following vehicles, the amount of the FMV over \$4,500 is counted as a resource: one per household (regardless of use); and vehicles used for work, training or education to prepare for work in accordance with food stamp employment and training requirements. For all other vehicles, the FMV over \$4,500 or the equity value, whichever is more, is counted as a resource.

2. Administration Proposal:

Increase the AFDC resource limit to \$2,000 (or \$3,000 for a household with a member age 60 or over) to conform to the Food Stamp resource limit. Implement Individual Development Accounts which will allow recipients to save up to \$10,000 in accounts to be used for specific purposes.

3. House Republican Plan:

The asset limit is increased to \$10,000 for purposes of micro-enterprise and savings for education or home purchasing.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No provisions.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Increase vehicle asset threshold to \$5,000 following food stamp language in OBRA 1993. Increase non-vehicle asset threshold for either AFDC or food stamps, or increase non-vehicle asset level up to \$10,000 for specific use in setting up a microenterprise, purchasing a car, home, or for higher education.

IX. IMPROVING GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

A. Simplification and Coordination Across Programs

1. Current Law:

Complex and conflicting rules; programs have different missions and serve different populations.

2. Administration Proposal:

Includes many technical provisions which simplify, coordinate, or conform program rules among the AFDC and Food Stamp programs. Client protections and State flexibility would be retained and/or enhanced.

3. House Republican Plan:

No provisions.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Creates an interagency waiver request Board that would assist States and other entities in applying for waivers and implement a 5 year waiver process. Entities must establish a public-private partnership committee to advise them on the plan. Applications not acted upon within 90 days would be automatically

approved. Waiver authority is extended to programs that provide cash assistance, education, employment training, health, housing, nutrition or social services.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Twenty specific proposals to simplify the application process for AFDC and Food Stamps and move toward conformity between the two programs. Simplify the waiver process and encourage State demonstration projects and make it easier for States to continue successful projects on a permanent basis. Decisions on waivers shall not exceed 90 days.

B. Two-Parent Families

1. Current Law:

AFDC-UP covers families in which both parents are living in the household and principal earner is unemployed. As of 9/93 the number of AFDC-UP cases was 355,000; Two-parent families are ineligible if the primary wage earner works more than 100 hours per month, or if neither parent has been employed in six of the previous thirteen quarters. Seven States have received waivers of the 100-hour rule: CA, IL, LA, MI, UT, VT, WI; About half of the States have taken the option to provide only six months of benefits per year to two-parent families.

2. Administration Proposal:

State flexibility to remove or amend special eligibility requirements for two-parent families (applicants and/or recipients), such as the 100 hour rule and the quarters of work rule.

3. House Republican Plan:

States are permitted to allow AFDC recipients who marry someone who is not a parent of their child who subsequently become ineligible for AFDC to keep up to 50 percent of their current benefit if the total family income does not exceed 150 percent of poverty.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

States are permitted to allow AFDC recipients who marry someone who is not a parent of their child who subsequently become ineligible for AFDC to keep up to 50 percent of their current benefit if the total family income does not exceed 150 percent of poverty. Requires at least one parent in UP families to participate in the work program as soon as the family comes on the rolls. States have the option to require the other parent to be in either the transition or work programs. Parents under age 25 who have not completed high school can be required to participate in education activities. CWEP participation rates for UP families are increased to 90% by FY 1998.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Eliminate 100 hour rule and the six month benefit receipt maximum for two parent families. Eliminate the quarters of coverage requirement under AFDC-UP for married individuals if both are under the age of 20.

C. Waste, Fraud, Abuse

1. Current Law:

Multiple programs, complex regulations and uncoordinated programs invite waste, fraud and error.

2. Administration Proposal:

Enhanced information systems will enable large-scale prevention and detection of fraud and abuse.

3. House Republican Plan:

HHS is authorized to conduct demonstrations on EBT. Within 5 years a report must be written for Congress about the study. Appoint a commission to determine cost and feasibility of creating an inter-State system of Social Security numbers of all welfare participants for purposes of identifying fraud.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Requires States to establish fraud control units. Persons found guilty of fraud shall immediately become permanently ineligible for AFDC benefits. HHS is authorized to conduct demonstrations on EBT. Within 5 years a report must be written for Congress about the study. Appoint a commission to determine cost and feasibility of creating an inter-State system of Social Security numbers of all welfare participants for purposes of identifying fraud.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Increase federal commitment to automation. Require the Secretary to conduct a study on the feasibility of a tamper-proof social security card. Proposals for eliminating fraud and abuse in the SSI program.

D. Performance Standards and Evaluation

1. Current Law:

The Family Support Act required that the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate parties, develop a performance standards system proposal for Congressional consideration. The FSA also required various studies and reports to determine the effectiveness of the JOBS program.

2. Administration Proposal:

An outcome based performance measurement program will be implemented over time to monitor State performance on all aspects of the revised transitional assistance program, including client outcomes, provisions of services, and the percent of recipients who reach the time-limit. Funding incentives and penalties will be linked to outcomes. Two percent of total annual capped entitlement funding for JOBS, WORK, and child care to be spent on research, demonstrations, evaluation, and technical assistance.

3. House Republican Plan:

Require HHS to fund research that examines the impacts of education and training programs on exits from AFDC, welfare expenditure, wage rates, employment histories, and repeat spells on AFDC. Funding for JOBS would be reduced to FFP of 50% if a State fails to achieve the required participation rates.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

Requires HHS to conduct 5-year studies evaluating the impact of education and training programs for AFDC families. At least one site must use random assignment to compare a control group with a group that participates in education and training and another group that receives job search and a work program.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Consider focusing primarily on reaching self-sufficiency as the standard for accountability to determine the success of programs. For-profit and non-profit placement companies will be awarded performance-based contracts to place recipients in full-time jobs.

X. PHASE-IN

1. Current Law:

Not applicable.

2. Administration Proposal:

People born on or after January 1, 1972, beginning in 1997 will be subject to the time-limit provisions. States would have the option to define the phase-in group more broadly, provided it included at least the population described above. Other technical changes will be effective immediately. Other time-frames for effective dates of implementation vary.

3. House Republican Plan:

New program starts with applicants in 1994. Work obligation imposed beginning with the new applicants in 1996. Rates: 30% in '96, 40% in '97, 60% in '98. By 2000 rate would be 90%.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

The phase-in rate would be 20% by FY95 and would remain at that rate for families currently receiving benefits. By FY98, 50% of new applicants who enter the system in the period of FY94-FY98 would be phased-in. By FY02, 90% of all new applicants would be phased-in to the new system.

5. Mainstream Forum:

Phase-in of time-limit would begin in 1997 with all people born on/after January 1, 1972. Every year the birth date for phase-in will fall back a year. On January 1, 1998, States would be required to phase-in all people born on/after January 1, 1971, and so on for each successive year until the entire caseload is phased-in. Those born before 1972 who are currently enrolled in JOBS will remain in the restructured system and be subject to the time limit. As this group leaves the system, States are required to include up to 20 percent of the caseload born before 1972, with an emphasis on those at-risk define as those who have been on AFDC 36 months or more and those with the youngest child 16 or older. States would have the option of requiring people born in earlier years to be part of the phased-in group much sooner.

## XI. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

### A. Substance Abuse Provisions

#### 1. Current Law:

No provisions exist for the AFDC program. Under JOBS, States may expend resources to pay for supportive services (i.e., treatment programs) but participants do not count towards a State's JOBS participation rate. Additionally, States could determine that substance abusers are incapacitated and therefore JOBS exempt.

#### 2. Administration Proposal:

At State option, participation in substance abuse programs is required activity under pre-JOBS (sanctions can be applied if appropriate) but time limit does not apply.

#### 3. House Republican Plan:

At State option, participants in treatment programs can be exempted from JOBS for up to 12 months. Recipients of SSI can be tested for drug use which would result in a loss of SSI eligibility.

#### 4. Senate Republican Plan:

Requires AFDC applicants and recipients who are determined to be addicted to drugs or alcohol to participate in treatment. If they do not participate satisfactorily, they will be denied benefits for 2 years, but remain eligible for Medicaid. Random drug tests shall be made of drug and alcohol addicts on SSI, and those who are on illegal drugs or refuse to submit to testing shall become ineligible.

#### 5. Mainstream Forum:

Substance abuse treatment will be required in addition to work/education/training as appropriate.

### B. Reduced Eligibility for Immigrants

#### 1. Current Law:

Eligibility rules vary greatly across various assistance programs depending on the immigration status of an individual. Legal aliens are generally eligible for assistance programs.

#### 2. Administration Proposal:

Proposal under development.

#### 3. House Republican Plan:

Most noncitizens would no longer be eligible for welfare benefits (excluding those over 75). Those currently receiving welfare would retain eligibility for 1 year. Refugees assistance would be time-limited.

#### 4. Senate Republican Plan:

Requires welfare agencies to report to INS all legal immigrants who continue to receive benefits beyond 12 months. INS is then required to treat such immigrants as public charges. Extends current deeming period until citizenship. Requires State agencies to report the names of illegal alien parents of citizen children to the INS.

#### 5. Mainstream Forum:

End welfare for noncitizens except for emergency medical services. Cut SSI, medicaid, food stamps and AFDC benefits. Legal immigrants will be allowed a year grace period before being subject to cuts. Refugees are exempt.

### C. Financing

#### 1. Current Law:

Federal financial participation in the AFDC program is 50% for administrative costs (higher for some costs, such as up to 90% for development of automated systems), and is based on the FMAP for benefits (averaging roughly 55% of all benefit costs). The FFP for JOBS is a capped entitlement of \$1 billion with various rates varying with the State activities, target groups served, or administrative costs.

#### 2. Administration Proposal:

Proposal under development.

3. House Republican Plan:

An annual cap is placed on spending for entitlement programs including AFDC, SSI, public housing and section 8 housing, and food stamps. The cap is set at 2% plus inflation. The increase in program costs are financed by changes in other means-tested programs which result in savings. All nutritional assistance programs are combined into a single capped block grant.

4. Senate Republican Plan:

No provisions specified.

5. Mainstream Forum:

\$21.3 billion saved over five years by cuts in social services programs to non-citizens. \$1.5 billion saved over five years by capping the Emergency Assistance Program. \$1.3 billion saved over five years with the elimination of EITC benefits to illegal aliens. \$700 million saved over five years with the elimination of the Dependent Care Tax Credit for families earning over \$120,000 a year. \$1.6 billion saved over five years through increased paternity establishment and new child support awards which would thereby reduce AFDC caseloads. \$380 million saved over five years through modification of Family Day Care Homes component of child care food program. Also, State offsets for additional costs that may result from program: \$15 billion over five years available to States through a shift on point of collection of State mail order tax from the State to catalogue companies; \$1 billion from above financing provisions will be set aside for States to defer additional costs that they may incur as a result of cuts to immigrants and other provisions in the proposal.

**TALKING POINTS**

**DONNA E. SHALALA**

**U.S. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**AT**

**SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE**

**WELFARE REFORM**

**JUNE 9, 1994**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **OVERVIEW**

- **PRESIDENT WILL UNVEIL PLAN SOON. WELFARE REFORM IS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THIS COUNTRY -- THE NEXT GENERATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE.**
- **WELFARE REFORM PART OF PRESIDENT'S OVERALL AGENDA FOR ASSISTING WORKING AMERICANS:**

**\* EITC, HEALTH**

## **2. RESPONSIBILITY**

- **THIS PLAN ALSO CREATES A SYSTEM OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY.**
  
- **BOTH PARENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR SUPPORTING CHILDREN. GOVERNMENT DOESN'T RAISE CHILDREN -- PARENTS DO.**

■ **NEW STEPS TO**

- NEW STEPS TO REQUIRE FULL PAYMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT -- NEW SYSTEM OF PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT, TRACKING OF DELINQUENT PARENTS, AND A NEW NATIONAL DATABASE TO FOLLOW CASES ACROSS STATE LINES.
  
- AND THE PLAN GUARANTEES ACCOUNTABILITY FOR TAXPAYERS. A NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE WILL FOLLOW PEOPLE WHENEVER AND WHEREVER THEY USE WELFARE -- MONITORING COMPLIANCE WITH TIME LIMITS AND WORK.

■ THE WELFARE SYSTEM

- **THE WELFARE SYSTEM ITSELF MUST ALSO BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE, AND TO DO THAT WE MUST REWARD PERFORMANCE NOT PROCESS -- SIMPLIFICATION AND BETTER COORDINATION IN WELFARE OFFICES, LESS PAPERWORK, EBT.**

### **3. REACHING THE NEXT GENERATION**

- **PREVENTING TEEN PREGNANCY AND OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS IS A CRITICAL PART OF OUR PLAN -- MORE THAN A MILLION TEEN PREGNANCIES EACH YEAR; MORE THAN 200,000 BIRTHS TO TEENS AGED 17 AND YOUNGER. WE MUST REVERSE THESE TRENDS.**

■ **THE LINK BETWEEN**

- **THE LINK BETWEEN TEEN BIRTHS AND POVERTY IS CLEAR -- APPROX. 80 PERCENT OF THE CHILDREN BORN TO TEEN PARENTS WHO DROPPED OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL AND DID NOT MARRY ARE POOR. IN CONTRAST, ONLY 8 PERCENT OF CHILDREN BORN TO MARRIED HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AGED 20 OR OLDER ARE POOR.**

- **ABSTINENCE -- KEY TO PREGNANCY PREVENTION -- ALONG WITH HEALTH EDUCATION AND THE ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT OF SCHOOLS, COMMUNITIES, FAMILIES, AND CHURCHES.**

■ **PHASING IN YOUNG**

- **PHASING IN YOUNG PARENTS FIRST -- MOTHERS UNDER AGE 25 -- TO EMPHASIZE THE NECESSITY OF STAYING IN SCHOOL, POSTPONING PREGNANCY, PREPARING FOR WORK, AND SUPPORTING THEIR CHILDREN.**
  
- **A CLEAR MESSAGE TO TEEN PARENTS -- OUR APPROACH WILL COMBINE SUPPORTS AND REAL SANCTIONS.**

**CONCLUSION**

## **CONCLUSION**

- **I KNOW THE CONGRESSIONAL CALENDAR IS CROWDED -- WITH HEALTH REFORM OUR TOP PRIORITY -- BUT WE NEED YOUR HELP ON THIS. IT'S IMPORTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND TO THE NATION.**
  
- **NOW DAVID ELLWOOD, MARY JO BANE AND BRUCE REED WILL JOIN ME TO ANSWER ANY OF YOUR QUESTIONS.**

# Work

- Making welfare a transition to work:  
Building on the JOBS program
- The WORK program: Work, not welfare,  
after two years
- Supporting working families: EITC,  
health reform, child care

# Responsibility

- Parental responsibility:  
Child support enforcement
- Accountability for taxpayers
- Performance, not process

# Reaching the Next Generation

- Preventing teen pregnancy
- Phasing in young people first
- A clear message for teen parents:  
Supports and sanctions

## DPC MEETING -- KEY MEMBERS' CONCERNS

### LEADERSHIP

The Honorable George Mitchell, Majority Leader -- Mitchell has been focused on health care reform, but his staff indicates he is generally supportive of the Administration's direction on welfare reform. He may have particular concerns about how the proposal works in a rural state with high unemployment.

The Honorable Wendell H. Ford, Majority Whip -- Ford is generally supportive of the Administration's policy direction, and is eager to be helpful in his role as Senate Majority Whip. His staff has expressed his hope, however, that the financing for welfare reform not create the political problems for him in Kentucky that the Administration's health care reform package has.

### FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Chair -- Moynihan is particularly interested in teen pregnancy prevention. He is concerned about the impact of the financing provisions on New York State. He has also expressed concerns about timing and has indicated that he thinks it may be too late to move a bill this year.

The Honorable John B. Breaux, Chair, Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy -- Breaux has been supportive of the Administration's initiative. He supports scaling back the working poor child care and other provisions to lower the cost and avoid new taxes. He has expressed concern about paying minimum wage for WORK assignments. In a low benefit state like Louisiana, paying minimum wage would require doubling the size of its AFDC grant.

The Honorable Bill Bradley -- Bradley is particularly interested in child support issues. He supports public-private partnerships to develop community works projects to provide jobs of benefit to the community and to private businesses.

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller IV -- Rockefeller does not think Congress will act on welfare reform this year, but is generally supportive of the Administration's proposal. He would like to see public WORK assignments continued indefinitely rather than have a cut off, and is particularly concerned about the impact on high unemployment areas. He has emphasized to the White House that the child support demos must receive adequate funding to ensure that they are a valid test of child support assurance. He is also a co-sponsor of S. 1962, Senator Dodd's Child Support Assurance Act of 1994.

The Honorable Donald W. Riegle -- Riegle is supportive of the Administration's plan. He is, however, particularly concerned

about adequate funding for child care, including child care for the working poor. He is also concerned that there be adequate funding for teen pregnancy prevention and about how the WORK program and the time limit would operate in high unemployment communities.

The Honorable Thomas A. Daschle -- He has been busy with health care reform and has not reviewed the details of the Administration's proposal. His staff has indicated that he is generally supportive of the plan, but is concerned about how it will affect reservations which have very high unemployment rates.

The Honorable Max Baucus -- He has been primarily focused on health care, but his staff says he is particularly interested in a good child care package, including coverage for the working poor.

The Honorable David L. Boren -- He is concerned about teen pregnancy prevention and about enforcing time limits. He would also like to see the WPA-type bill he and Senator Simon have introduced incorporated into welfare reform.

The Honorable Kent Conrad -- He is concerned about the number of job training programs and the lack of coordination among them. He is interested in proposal that would send all job training funds to the state and allow the state to have a single entity doing job training.

#### LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, Chair -- Kennedy's staff has indicated that he is very concerned about the jurisdictional issues concerning job training, child care, and teenage pregnancy prevention. In each of these areas, he believes the Labor Committee not the Finance Committee should have primary jurisdiction. He is also chair on the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee and has been very interested in the deeming provisions and other provisions which could affect immigrants' benefits.

The Honorable Christopher J. Dodd, Chair, Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism -- Dodd's staff has also expressed concerns about the jurisdictional issues concerning child care. They believe any expansion of child care services should be done through the Child Care Development Block Grant. Dodd also believes there needs to be a strong working poor child care provision. He is supportive of the child support provisions and the child support assurance demos. He has expressed serious concerns about the family cap even as a state option. His staff also expressed serious concerns about the alien deeming provision. Dodd introduced S. 1962, the Child Support Assurance Act of 1994, which was co-sponsored by Senator Rockefeller (D-WV).

about adequate funding for child care, including child care for the working poor. He is also concerned that there be adequate funding for teen pregnancy prevention and about how the WORK program and the time limit would operate in high unemployment communities.

The Honorable Thomas A. Daschle -- He has been busy with health care reform and has not reviewed the details of the Administration's proposal. His staff has indicated that he is generally supportive of the plan, but is concerned about how it will affect reservations which have very high unemployment rates.

The Honorable Max Baucus -- He has been primarily focused on health care, but his staff says he is particularly interested in a good child care package, including coverage for the working poor.

The Honorable David L. Boren -- He is concerned about teen pregnancy prevention and about enforcing time limits. He would also like to see the WPA-type bill he and Senator Simon have introduced incorporated into welfare reform.

The Honorable Kent Conrad -- He is concerned about the number of job training programs and the lack of coordination among them. He is interested in proposal that would send all job training funds to the state and allow the state to have a single entity doing job training.

#### LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, Chair -- Kennedy's staff has indicated that he is very concerned about the jurisdictional issues concerning job training, child care, and teenage pregnancy prevention. In each of these areas, he believes the Labor Committee not the Finance Committee should have primary jurisdiction. He is also chair on the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee and has been very interested in the deeming provisions and other provisions which could affect immigrants' benefits.

The Honorable Christopher J. Dodd, Chair, Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism -- Dodd's staff has also expressed concerns about the jurisdictional issues concerning child care. They believe any expansion of child care services should be done through the Child Care Development Block Grant. Dodd also believes there needs to be a strong working poor child care provision. He is supportive of the child support provisions and the child support assurance demos. He has expressed serious concerns about the family cap even as a state option. His staff also expressed serious concerns about the alien deeming provision. Dodd introduced S. 1962, the Child Support Assurance Act of 1994, which was co-sponsored by Senator Rockefeller (D-WV).

The Honorable Paul Simon, Chair, Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity -- He is interested in how the JOBS program will be coordinated with other programs (but has not raised jurisdictional concerns). He emphasizes the need for job creation strategies in the WORK program and believes states should be able to pursue a WPA-type program such as he and Senator Boren have proposed.

The Honorable Tom Harkin -- Harkin has introduced a bill with Senator Bond that does not have a time limit, but focuses on individual social contracts. He argues that the Administration's proposal will end up as a two-year entitlement and that his bill will get people off welfare faster. His bill does not have a work program, people would remain on AFDC until they find a job in the private sector. He objects to the phase-in proposal. His bill would attempt to phase-in more quickly (90% by 2002), with states choosing the phase-in method. Harkin introduced S. 2009, the Welfare to Self-Sufficiency Act of 1994 on April 11, 1994. The bill is co-sponsored by Senators Bond (R-MO) and Stevens (R-AK).

The Honorable Barbara Mikulski -- Her main concerns are child care, health care, and links to adequate housing. She is also concerned that there be sufficient protections for minor moms to ensure that they have the option to live with another responsible adult and that there is a role for non-profits to link minor moms with responsible adults or an appropriate group home. Mikulski is concerned that JTPA does not adequately serve the welfare population and supports separate services for this population, although the plan should facilitate co-location of services.

## POLITICAL PROFILE

As Majority Leader, Senator Mitchell is known both for his even temper and tenacity. His leadership position has enabled him to be involved in both the substance and strategy of nearly every piece of important legislation brought to the floor. Mitchell's top legislative priority has been health care, which was also his key interest when he sat on the Finance Committee. Along with Senator Kennedy, he favors an employer-based approach to health care reform. Senator Mitchell has announced he will not run for re-election in 1994.

## HEALTH REFORM ISSUES/ PRIORITIES

The Majority Leader continues to be committed to passing comprehensive health care reform in this Congress and has been a moving force behind the Message Group. Senator Mitchell has stated his belief that there should be no tax on alcohol and has spoken favorably about possible cuts to Medicare and Medicaid as a way to bring down the cost of health care for all Americans. In the last Congress, the Senator sponsored legislation to reform the nation's health care system modeled on the concept of "play or pay".

At the September 30 Finance hearing, Senator Mitchell asked about critics claims that the health care reform plan would create a one size fits all health care system and the \$700 billion dollar budget figure represents new spending for health care.

---

## Senator George Mitchell (D-ME)



**Born:** 8/20/33,  
Waterville, ME

**Education:** Bowdoin College, B.A.;  
Georgetown University,  
L.L.B.

**Military:** Army, 1954-56

**Prev. Occup:** Lawyer; judge

**Family:** Divorced; 1 child

**Religion:** Roman Catholic

**Pol. Career:** Maine Democratic Party  
chairman, 1966-68;  
Democratic National  
Committee, 1969-77;  
assistant county attorney,  
1971-77; U.S. attorney,  
1977-79; U.S. District  
Court Judge, 1979-80;  
Democratic nominee for  
governor, 1974.

**Residence:** Portland

**Elected:** Appointed 1980, elected  
1980 [Re-election 1994]

**Committees:** Majority Leader,  
Environment and Public  
Works, Finance, Veterans'  
Affairs

---

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Senator Mitchell has been primarily focused on health care reform, but has stated that welfare reform is a top priority on this year's legislative agenda. The Senator's staff has indicated that the Majority Leader supports the decision to draft the bill based on the existing AFDC entitlement programs. Upon introduction the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee. However, Mitchell is aware of Labor and Human Resources's concern that programs like job training, child care, and teen pregnancy prevention more properly belong in the Labor Committee's jurisdiction.

Given unemployment levels in Maine and the fact that it is a rural state, Mitchell may be interested in how the WORK program would operate in areas of high unemployment and how access to job training services, child care, and transportation would be guaranteed for individuals in rural areas.

## LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS

102nd: The Senator focused attention on improving long-term care services for the elderly.

103rd: Senator Mitchell introduced legislation to protect the reproductive rights of women (S. 25). He also cosponsored legislation to combat violent crimes against women (Biden, S. 11); and to improve child welfare services (Rockefeller, S. 596). Senator Mitchell is the prime sponsor of the Health Security Act in the Senate.

## POLITICAL PROFILE

Senator Tom Daschle is regarded by his colleagues as a savvy, intelligent Senator, skillful at developing relationships that grease the legislative wheels. Daschle has focused his energies primarily on issues of interest to veterans and South Dakota's farmers. Serving on the Agriculture and Finance Committees, he has pursued a "prairie populist's" agenda.

His ability to work within the system has resulted not only in gaining him membership on the Finance Committee but also being named as the co-chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee.

## HEALTH REFORM ISSUES/ PRIORITIES

Senator Daschle continues to be one of the President's strongest stalwarts in the Senate. At the August 4 Small Business Committee meeting, Sen. Daschle stated that phasing in reform will help sell it. In an August 25 USA Today feature, Daschle stated: "my biggest concern is the confusion created by the opposition... you can scare people on health care because it is so expensive, because everyone needs it."

At the September 30 Finance hearing with Mrs. Clinton, Senator Daschle asked if the plan would radically change the way individuals buy insurance; create another unfunded mandate for the states; and enhance home health care benefits. At the subsequent Finance hearings he expressed a desire that the plan deal with substance abuse and alcohol addiction and the impact on pregnant women and their children.

## WELFARE REFORM ISSUES/PRIORITIES

Staff from the Welfare Reform Team met with Patti Mitchell of Sen. Daschle's staff

## Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD)



**Born:** 12/9/47,  
Aberdeen, SD  
**Education:** SD State U., B.A.  
**Military:** Air Force, 1969-72  
**Prev.Occup:** Senate aide  
**Family:** Wife, Linda Hall; 3  
children  
**Religion:** Roman Catholic  
**Pol.Career:** U.S. House, 1979-  
87  
**Residence:** Aberdeen  
**Elected:** 1986 [Re-elect  
1998]  
**Committees:** Finance;  
Agriculture,  
Nutrition, and  
Forestry; Veterans  
Affairs, Indian  
Affairs, Ethics

(4/28/94). As of April, the Senator's staff had not had welfare reform-related discussions with him since January, although he receives written updates. The staff had three concerns: that tribes receive direct funding for JOBS; the purpose of training if there are no jobs available; and financing. A meeting is scheduled with Sen. Daschle and Mary Jo Bane and David Ellwood for June 8, 1994.

## **LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS**

102nd: Senator Daschle sponsored a bill which would replace Medicare and Medicaid with a universal access system based upon a single insurance policy negotiated by each State with income-related premiums.

103rd: Senator Daschle sponsored legislation to increase the health insurance deduction for the self-employed to 100% (S.381); provide coverage for chiropractic services under Medicare (S. 421); give Medicaid incentives to nurses (S.466); provide substance abuse treatment under Medicaid (S. 484); to create a national health safety net infrastructure (S. 726); and to provide comprehensive program for the prevention of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (S. 923). He has cosponsored bills to establish a hospital to home- and community-care linkage development and incentive program (Feingold, S.52); increase access for rural populations (Dole, S. 176); establish Federal long-term care insurance standards; and increase Medicare reimbursement for primary care health practitioners and physician assistants (Grassley, S.833-4).

6/7/94

December 2, 1993

Memorandum to: Mary Jo Bane, David Ellwood, Bruce Reed

From: Toby Graff

Subject: Congressional Site Visit

---

Yesterday morning Congressional staff participated in the first Working Group sponsored site visit. We visited Prince's George's Project Independence office in Seat Pleasant, Maryland. The following Congressional staff attended the event:

- Beverly Gilyard, House Democratic Caucus
- Ron Haskins, Minority Staff, House Committee on Ways and Means
- Kimberly Barnes O'Connor, Minority Staff, Senate Committee on Education and Labor
- Jim Purvis, Legislative Fellow, Senator Breaux's office, Senate Committee on Finance, Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee
- Amy Tucci, Minority Staff, House Committee on Ways and Means
- Gary Visber, Minority Staff, House Education and Labor Committee

Working Group staff that attended the site visit were Jeremy Ben-Ami, Tom Corbett, Patricia Murdock, Jane McNeil, Jim Hickman and I.

The Congressional staff received briefings from state and county representatives of Project Independence, Department of Human Resources, and the Private Industry Council. The majority of the time was spent observing and participating in a Job Readiness class. A few specific issues of note were raised by Minority staff members:

• *Minors on AFDC:* In Maryland, it is possible for minors to have their own AFDC case and remain living at home. Many of the clients were adamantly opposed to this provision. After the session Ron Haskins pressed us about the issue, asking if the Working Group would support a federal mandate against this practice. We said "no comment".

• *Coordination of Services:* It was very apparent in listening to the clients that coordination and duplication of services are big problems. Many of the recipients had three case-managers and had to go to three different locations to receive services. Both Ron Haskins and Gary Visber brought up this point again after the class. They expressed the need for welfare reform to address this issue.

The visit was very valuable in providing Congressional staff members with an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the current welfare services. The Congressional staff members said that they found the visit to be very informative and productive. We have planned a second site visit for Wednesday, December 8 and are we are hoping to schedule additional events in the near future.

cc: Wendell Primus  
Ann Rosewater

*Sent/Logged  
9/22*

*orig: Bruce Reed  
Xc: - CLR*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

SEP 20 REC'D

*Please handle,*

September 20, 1993

SEP 20 REC'D

*CLR*

MEMORANDUM FOR CAROL RASCO

FROM: Howard Paster *HP*

SUBJECT: Welfare reform

Please have the folks working on welfare reform get in touch with Representative Fred Grandy (R-IA) and ask him to bring together interested Republicans to meet with our people for a discussion of the issue. I assume we are already doing this with Democrats, but we should treat this as a bipartisan issue.

If you would like I would be happy to discuss with your people a proper program of Hill consultation. But, for now, please have someone call Grandy and indicate this is a follow-up to my conversation with him. Thanks.

KEY CONGRESSIONAL CONTACTS FOR WELFARE REFORM

HOUSE

Education and Labor

William Ford (D-MI)  
Chair  
2181 Rayburn

Gene Sofer 225-4527  
Omer Waddles 226-3681

Matthew Martinez (D-CA)  
Chair - Subcommittee on Human Resources  
B346C Rayburn

Les Sweeting 225-1850

Dale Kildee (D-MI)  
Chair - Subcomte on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational  
Education  
2239 Rayburn

Matt Bruen 225-3611

George Miller (D-CA)  
2205 Rayburn

Diane Shust 225-2095

William Goodling (R-PA)  
Ranking Minority  
H2-535

Lee Cowen 226-3113  
Mary Gardner 226-3113

Susan Molinari (R-NY)  
123 Cannon

Alison Herwitt 225-3371  
Mary Gardner 226-3113

Thomas Petri (R-WI)  
2262 Rayburn

Joe Slader 225-2476

Ways and Means

Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL)

Chair

1102 Longworth

Rich Hobbie 225-1025  
Debra Colton 225-3704

Harold Ford (D-TN)

Chair - Subcomte on Human Resources

B317 Rayburn

Carole Carr 225-3265  
Yvette Chocolaad 225-1025\*  
Rich Hobbie 225-1025\*

Charles Rangel (D-NY)

2252 Rayburn

John Sheiner 225-4365

Robert Matsui (D-CA)

2231 Rayburn

Azar Kattan 225-7163

Barbara Kennelly (D-CT)

201 Cannon

Dave Buonora 225-2265

Bill Archer (R-TX)

Ranking Minority

1236 Longworth

Ron Haskins 225-4021

Rick Santorum (R-PA)

1222 Longworth

Mike Hershey 225-2135

Nancy Johnson (R-CT)

343 Cannon

Kathy Havey 225-4476

Fred Grandy (R-IA)

418 Cannon

Shawn Couglin 225-5476

\* Assigned to Human Resources Subcommittee but work for  
Chairman Rostenkowski

Leadership

Thomas Foley (D-WA)  
Speaker  
H-226

Bonnie Lowery 225-8550

Richard Gephardt (D-MO)  
Majority Leader  
H-148

Andie King 225-0100

Dave Bonior (D-MI)  
Majority Whip  
2207 Rayburn

Cheri Wallace 225-2106

Bob Michel (R-IL)  
Minority Leader  
H-419E

David Kehl 225-6201

Newt Gingrich (R-GA)  
Minority Whip  
2428 Rayburn

John Duncan 225-4501

SENATE

Labor and Human Resources

Edward Kennedy (D-MA)  
Chair  
SD-428

Marsha Simon

224-6745

Christopher Dodd (D-CT)  
Chair - Subcomte on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism

SH-639

Patricia Cole

224-5630

Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH)  
SH-608

David Fitzgerald

224-5546

Paul Simon (D-IL)  
SD-462

Kelly O'Brien

224-7029

Orrin Hatch (R-UT)  
SR-135

Patrisha Knight

224-5251

Nancy Landon-Kassebaum (R-KS)  
Ranking Minority  
SH-835

Kimberly Barnes-O'Connor 224-6770

Dan Coats (R-IN)  
Ranking Minority - Subcomte. on Children, Family, Drugs and  
Alcoholism  
SR-404

Angela Flood

224-5623

James Jeffords (R-VT)  
SH-513

Peter Caldwell

224-5141

Finance

Daniel P. Moynihan (D-NY)  
Chair  
SD-205

Paul Offner 224-4515  
Margaret Malone 224-4515

John Breaux (D-LA)  
Chair - Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy  
SD-205

Laird Burnett 224-4623

Bill Bradley (D-NJ)  
SH-731

Jessica Roth 224-3224

David Boren (D-OK)  
SR-453

Bob Cater 224-4721

Jay Rockefeller (D-WV)  
SH-109

Barbara Pryor 224-2578  
Tamara Stanton 224-6472

Bob Packwood (R-OR)  
Ranking Minority  
SD-205

Kathy Leonard 224-5315

John Chaffee (R-RI)  
SD-567

Colette Desmarais 224-2921

Dave Durenberger (R-MN)  
SR-154

Susan Heegaard 224-3244

Leadership

George Mitchell (D-ME)  
Majority Leader  
SR-176

Grace Reef

224-5344

Wendell Ford (D-KY)  
Majority Whip  
SR-173A

Kennie Gill

224-4343

Bob Dole (R-KS)  
Minority Leader  
S-230

Sheila Burke

224-5311

## Welfare Reform Contacts

<u>House</u>	<u>Staff Person</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Joe Skeen (R.-NM)	Quinn Dodd	225-2365
Neil Abercrombie (D-HI)	Kathy Eastman	225-2726
Jill Long (D-IN)	Jennifer Bohn	225-4436
Jack Reed (D-RI)	Ronnie Kover	225-2735
Eric Fingerhut (D-OH)	Drew Lindsey	225-5731
Carrie Meek (D-FL)	Angie Sharp	225-4906
Ted Strickland (D-OH)	Susan Zetler	225-5705
Roy Rowland (D-GA)	Joanna White	225-6531
Bill Emerson (R-MO)	Carin Resnick	225-4404
Robert C. Scott (D-VA)	Tamara Copeland	225-8351
<u>Senate</u>	<u>Staff Person</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Ben Highthores Campbell	Eva Burkley	224-5852
Hank Brown	Peg Wheeler	224-5941
Harris Wofford	Julia Frifield	224-6324
<u>Other</u>	<u>Staff Person</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Lt. Governor Don Beyer	Kevin Holt	804-786-2078

7/9/93

Welfare Reform Courtesy Calls

HOUSE

Harold Ford (D-TN)	4/27/93, 7/1/93
Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL)	5/20/93
Matthew Martinez (D-CA)	6/8/93
Bill Archer (R-TX)	6/10/93
Rick Santorum (R-PA)	6/17/93
Fred Grandy (R-IA)	6/22/93
Bob Matsui (D-CA)	6/23/93, 7/1/93
Bill Goodling (R-PA)	6/29/93
Michael Kopetski (D-OR)	7/1/93
Ben Cardin (D-MD)	7/1/93
Sander Levin (D-MI)	7/1/93

SENATE

Daniel P. Moynihan (D-NY)	4/29/93
George Mitchell (D-ME)	5/7/93
Christopher Dodd (D-CT)	5/20/93
Jay Rockefeller (D-WV)	5/24/93
John Breaux (D-LA)	5/24/93
Bill Bradley (D-NJ)	6/16/93
Hank Brown (R-CO)	6/18/93

Thirteen (13) Democrats - Six (6) Senate  
Seven (7) House

Five (5) Republicans - One (1) Senate  
Four (4) House

# WELFARE -

Patrick Kowalczyk, Rep. Lynn Woolsey 225-5161  
~~Wendell Primus~~, Matsui/Posty 225-1025  
John Willey 224-5556  
Geo Kendenis 225-2204  
\* Pal Omer, Morinaka 224-4451  
Grace Reef, Sen. Mitchell (Hitley suggested)  
Laird Barnett, Breaux 224-9741  
\* Beth Garrett, Boren (Pete Bolhower) 224-4721/224-2845

Rep. Jim Clyburn, Freshman from SC 225-3315

\* Ari Fitzgerald, Sen Bowdler  
Ken Apfel  
\* Barbara Papp, Sen Rockefeller  
\* Matt Baumgart, Sen Biden  
\* Patti Cole, Sen Dodd  
\* Grace Reef, Sen Mitchell

Caroline Anderson, Rep. Sarpanius 225-3706 (Child Support Enforcement)  
Laura Eford, Rep. Mink 5-4906  
Jennifer Neisner, CLS 707-7307

Bruce Reed's Call List

HOUSE

✓ George Miller (D-CA) 225-2095

Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL) 225-4061

~~Harold Ford (D-TN) 225-3365~~

Thomas Foley (D-WA) 225-5604

✓ Richard Gephardt (D-MO) 225-0100

✓ Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) 225-2265

Jane Mays

George Kundanis 225-2204

Tom O'Donnell

Ranit

SENATE

✓ Daniel P. Moynihan (D-NY) 224-4451

✓ John Breau (D-LA) 224-4623

✓ David Boren (D-OK) 224-4721

George Mitchell (D-ME) 224-5344

✓ Wendell Ford (D-KY) 224-4343

~~✓ John Chafee (R-RI) 224-2921~~

✓ Dave Durenberger (R-MN) 224-224-3244

Paul Offner 224-4515

~~Hanna-Jane Susie~~

Beth Garrett

Grace Reef

Kennie Gill

~~Estelle Desmarais~~ David Sloan

*Handwritten signature*

*Mesi*

KEY CONGRESSIONAL CONTACTS FOR WELFARE REFORM

HOUSE

Education and Labor

William Ford (D-MI)  
Chair  
2181 Rayburn

Gene Sofer 225-4527  
Omer Waddles 226-3681

Matthew Martinez (D-CA)  
Chair - Subcommittee on Human Resources  
B346C Rayburn

Les Sweeting 225-1850

Dale Kildee (D-MI)  
Chair - Subcomte on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational  
Education  
2239 Rayburn

Matt Bruen 225-3611

George Miller (D-CA)  
2205 Rayburn

Diane Shust 225-2095

William Goodling (R-PA)  
Ranking Minority  
H2-535

Lee Cowen 226-3113  
Mary Gardner 226-3113

Susan Molinari (R-NY)  
123 Cannon

Alison Herwitt 225-3371  
Mary Gardner 226-3113

Thomas Petri (R-WI)  
2262 Rayburn

Joe Slader 225-2476

Ways and Means

Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL)

Chair

1102 Longworth

Rich Hobbie 225-1025

Debra Colton 225-3704

Harold Ford (D-TN)

Chair - Subcomte on Human Resources

B317 Rayburn

Carole Carr 225-3265

Yvette Chocolaad 225-1025\*

Rich Hobbie 225-1025\*

Charles Rangel (D-NY)

2252 Rayburn

John Sheiner 225-4365

Robert Matsui (D-CA)

2231 Rayburn

Azar Kattan 225-7163

Barbara Kennelly (D-CT)

201 Cannon

Dave Buonora 225-2265

Bill Archer (R-TX)

Ranking Minority

1236 Longworth

Ron Haskins 225-4021

Rick Santorum (R-PA)

1222 Longworth

Mike Hershey 225-2135

Nancy Johnson (R-CT)

343 Cannon

Kathy Havey 225-4476

Fred Grandy (R-IA)

418 Cannon

Shawn Couglin 225-5476

\* Assigned to Human Resources Subcommittee but work for  
Chairman Rostenkowski

**Leadership**

Thomas Foley (D-WA)  
Speaker  
H-226

Bonnie Lowery 225-8550

Richard Gephardt (D-MO)  
Majority Leader  
H-148

Andie King 225-0100

Dave Bonior (D-MI)  
Majority Whip  
2207 Rayburn

Cheri Wallace 225-2106

Bob Michel (R-IL)  
Minority Leader  
H-419E

David Kehl 225-6201

Newt Gingrich (R-GA)  
Minority Whip  
2428 Rayburn

John Duncan 225-4501

SENATE

Labor and Human Resources

Edward Kennedy (D-MA)

Chair

SD-428

Marsha Simon

224-6745

Christopher Dodd (D-CT)

Chair - Subcomte on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism

SH-639

Patricia Cole

224-5630

Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH)

SH-608

David Fitzgerald

224-5546

Paul Simon (D-IL)

SD-462

Kelly O'Brien

224-7029

Orrin Hatch (R-UT)

SR-135

Patrisha Knight

224-5251

Nancy Landon-Kassebaum (R-KS)

Ranking Minority

SH-835

Kimberly Barnes-O'Connor 224-6770

Dan Coats (R-IN)

Ranking Minority - Subcomte. on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism

SR-404

Angela Flood

224-5623

James Jeffords (R-VT)

SH-513

Peter Caldwell

224-5141

Finance

Daniel P. Moynihan (D-NY)  
Chair  
SD-205

Paul Offner 224-4515  
Margaret Malone 224-4515

John Breaux (D-LA)  
Chair - Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy  
SD-205

Laird Burnett 224-4623

Bill Bradley (D-NJ)  
SH-731

Jessica Roth 224-3224

David Boren (D-OK)  
SR-453

Bob Cater 224-4721

Jay Rockefeller (D-WV)  
SH-109

Barbara Pryor 224-2578  
Tamara Stanton 224-6472

Bob Packwood (R-OR)  
Ranking Minority  
SD-205

Kathy Leonard 224-5315

John Chaffee (R-RI)  
SD-567

Colette Desmarais 224-2921  
David Sloan

Dave Durenberger (R-MN)  
SR-154

Susan Heegaard 224-3244

Leadership

George Mitchell (D-ME)  
Majority Leader  
SR-176

Grace Reef . 224-5344

Wendell Ford (D-KY)  
Majority Whip  
SR-173A

Kennie Gill 224-4343

Bob Dole (R-KS)  
Minority Leader  
S-230

Sheila Burke 224-5311

## HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
FORD, WILLIAM (MI), CHAIRMAN	Gene Sofer/Omer Waddles	225-6261	2107
Clay, William, (MO)	Alissa Bonner	225-2406	2306
Miller, George (CA)	Diane Shust	225-2095	2205
Murphy, Austin (PA)	Ron Ungbarsky	225-4665	2210
Kildee, Dale (MI)	Matt Bruen	225-3611	2239
Williams, Pat (MT)	Diane Hill	225-3211	2457
Martinez, Matthew (CA)	Les Sweeting 225-1850	225-5464	2231
Owens, Major (NY)	Braden Goetz	225-6231	2305
Sawyer, Thomas (OH)	Christine Dodd	225-5231	1414
Payne, Donald (NJ)	Dave Hails	225-3436	417
Unsoeld, Jolene (WA)	Karen Anderson	225-3536	1527
Mink, Patsy (HI)	Burton Reist	225-4906	2135
Andrews, Robert (NJ)	Ted Wang	225-6501	1005
Reed, Jack (RI)	Neil Campbell	225-2735	1510
Roemer, Tim (IN)	John St. Croix	225-3915	415
Engel, Eliot (NY)	Nancy Weist	225-2464	1433
Becerra, Xavier (CA)	Valerie Small-Navarro	225-6235	1710
Scott, Robert (VA)	Tamara Copeland	225-8351	501
Green, Gene (TX)	Robert Scott	225-1688	1004
Woolsey, Lynn (CA)	Jennie Savage	225-5161	439

## HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
Romero-Barcelo, Carlos (PR)	Luis Baco	225-2615	1517
Klink, Ron (PA)	Scott Frye	225-2565	1130
English, Karan (AR)	Keely Varvel	225-2190	1024
Strickland, Ted (OH)	Susan Zettler	225-5705	1429
DeLugo, Ron (VI)	Adrienne Todman-Wesby	225-1790	2427
Faleomavaega, Eni (AS)	John Suisal	225-8577	109
Baesler, Scotty (KY)	Cheryl Brownell	225-4706	508
Goodling, William (PA), Ranking	Mary Gardner 226-3113	225-5836	2263
Petri, Thomas (WI)	Joe Slader 224-2476	225-2476	2262
Roukema, Marge (NJ)	Jim Parette	225-4465	2244
Gunderson, Steve (WI)	Sherry Kaiman	225-5506	2235
Armev, Richard (TX)	Dean Clancy	225-7772	301
Fawell, Harris (IL)	James Stuchell	225-3515	2342
Henry, Paul (MI)	Wil Plaster	225-3831	1526
Ballenger, Cass (NC)	Candice Zouhary	225-2576	2238
Molinari, Susan (NY)	Mary Gardner 226-3113	225-3371	123
Barrett, Bill (NE)	Mark Whitacre	225-6435	1213
Boehner, John (OH)	Steve Seldman	225-6205	1020
Cunningham, Randy (CA)	Erika Otto	225-5452	117
Hoekstra, Peter (MI)	Amy Plaster	225-4401	1319

## HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
McKeon, Howard (CA)	Lauren Coberly	225-1956	307
Miller, Dan (FL)	Avery Warlick	225-5015	510

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
ROSTENKOWSKI, DAN (IL), CHAIRMAN	Rich Hobbie	225-1025	B-318
Gibbon, Sam (FL)	Shannon Edge/Rob Zipaver	225-3376	2204
Pickle, JJ (TX)	Eddie Reeves	225-4865	242
Rangel, Charles (NY)	John Sheiner	225-4365	2252
Stark, Pete (CA)	Mary Popit	225-5065	239
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr. (IN)	David Wildes	225-4011	2313
Ford, Harold (TN)	Carole Carr	225-3265	2211
Matsui, Robert (CA)	Azar Kattan	225-7163	2311
Kennelly, Barbara (CT)	Dave Bvonora	225-2265	201
Coyne, William (PA)	Grace Hailer	225-2301	2455
Andrews, Mike (TX)	Dave Kendall	225-7508	303
Levin, Sander (MI)	Janet Garber	225-4961	106
Cardin, Benjamin (MD)	Chris Lynch	225-4016	227
McDermott, Jim (WA)	Mark Magana	225-3106	1707
Kleczka, Gerald (WI)	Kelly O'Brien	225-4572	2301
Lewis, John (GA)	George Dusenbury	225-3801	329
Payne, Lewis (VA)	Andrea Price	225-4711	1119
Neal, Richard (MA)	Kathy Sullivan	225-5601	131
Hoagland, Peter (NE)	Kathy Dyre	225-4155	1113
McNulty, Michael (NY)	David Torian	225-5076	217

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
Kopetski, Michael (OR)	Scott Barstow	225-5711	218
Jefferson, William (LA)	Darlene Davis	225-6636	428
Brewster, Bill (OK)	Leslie Belcher	225-4565	1727
Reynolds, Mel (IL)	Paul Silver	225-0773	514
Archer, Bill (TX), Ranking	Ron Haskins	225-4021	1236
Crane, Philip (IL)	Donna Swanson	225-3711	233
Thomas, Bill (CA)	Brain Webb	225-2915	2209
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr. (FL)	Amy Stromberg	225-3026	2267
Sundquist, Don (TN)	Kimberly Lorden	225-2811	339
Johnson, Nancy (CT)	Kathy Harey	225-4476	343
Bunning, Jim (KY)	Jon Deusen	225-3465	2437
Grandy, Fred (IA)	Shawn Coughlin	225-5476	418
Houghton, Amo (NY)	Mary Jo Gorney	225-3161	1110
Herger, Wally (CA)	Charles Gormly	225-3076	2433
McCrery, Jim (LA)	Angel Vallillo	225-2777	225
Hancock, Mel (MO)	Sam Coring	225-6536	129
Santorum, Rich (PA)	Mike Hershey	225-2135	1222
Camp, David (MI)	Lori Harju	225-3561	137

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
KENNEDY, EDWARD (MA), CHAIRMAN	Marsha Simon	224-4543	SR-315
Pell, Claiborne (RI)	Lauren Gross	224-4642	SR-335
Metzenbaum, Howard (OH)	David Fitzgerald	224-2315	SR-140
Dodd, Christopher (CT)	Patricia Cole	224-2823	SR-444
Simon, Paul (IL)	Kelly O'Brien	224-2152	SD-462
Harkin, Tom (IA)	Bev Schroeder	224-3254	SH-531
Mikulski, Barbara (MD)	Robin Lipner	224-4654	SH-709
Bingaman, Jeff (NM)	Carrie Billy	224-5521	SH-110
Wellstone, Paul (MN)	David Berris	224-5641	SH-702
Wofford, Harris (PA)	Ms. Darrel Jodrey	224-6324	SR-283
Kassebaum, Nancy (KS), Ranking	Kimberly Barnes-O'Connor	224-4774	SR-302
Jeffords, James (VT)	Peter Caldwell	224-5141	SD-530
Coats, Dan (IN)	Angela Flood	224-5623	SR-404
Gregg, Judd (NH)	Vas Alexopoulos	224-3324	SH-513
Thurmond, Strom (SC)	Todd Atwater	224-5972	SR-217
Hatch, Orrin (UT)	Patrisha Knight	224-5251	SR-135
Durenberger, Dave (MN)	Susan Heegaard	224-3244	SR-154

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

MEMBER	STAFF PERSON	PHONE #	ROOM #
MOYNIHAN, DANIEL (NY) CHAIRMAN	Paul Offner/Margaret Malone	224-4451	SR-464
Baucus, Max (MT)	Maureen Testoni	224-2651	SH-511
Boren, David (OK)	Bob Cater	224-4721	SR-453
Bradley, Bill (NJ)	Jessica Roth	224-3224	SH-731
Mitchell, George (ME)	Grace Reef	224-5344	SR-176
Fryor, David (AR)	Destin Broach	224-2353	SR-267
Reigle, Jr. Donald (MI)	Kevin Avery	224-4822	SD-105
Rockefeller, IV, John (WV)	Barbara Pryor	224-6472	SH-109
Daschle, Thomas (SD)	Rima Cohen	224-2321	SH-317
Breaux, John (LA)	Laird Burnett	224-4623	SH-516
Conrad, Kent (ND)	Craig Obey	224-2043	SH-724
Packwood, Bob (OR), Ranking	Kathy Leonard	224-5244	SR-259
Dole, Robert (KS)	Sheila Burke	224-6521	SH-141
Roth, William (DE)	Jake Townsend	224-2441	SH-104
Danforth, John (MO)	Jeff Ballabon	224-6154	SR-249
Chafee, John (RI)	Colette Desmarais	224-2921	SD-567
Durenberger, Dave (MN)	Susan Heegaard	224-3244	SR-154
Grassley, Charles (IA)	Ted Totman	224-3744	SH-135
Hatch, Orrin (UT)	Patrisha Knight	224-5251	SR-135
Wallop, Malcolm (WY)	Michael Hoon	224-6441	SR-237

David Ellwood's Call List

HOUSE

Dale Kildee (D-MI) 225-3611

~~George Miller (D-CA) 225-2095~~

Robert Matsui (D-CA) 225-7163

~~Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) 225-2265~~

David Bonior (D-MI) 225-2106

Bob Michel (D-IL) 225-6201

Bill Archer (R-TX) 225-2571

Bill Goodling (R-PA) 225-5836

Rick Santorum (R-PA) 225-2135

*Michler*

SENATE

Edward Kennedy (D-MA) 224-4543

Christopher Dodd (D-CT) 224-2823

Paul Simon (D-IL) 224-2152

Nancy Landon-Kassebaum 224-4774

Bill Bradley (D-NJ) 224-3224

Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) 224-6472

Bob Packwood (R-OR) 224-5244

Bob Dole (R-KS) 224-6521

Bruce Reed's Call List

HOUSE

~~William Ford (D-MI) 225-6261~~

~~Matthew Martinez (D-CA) 225-5464~~

Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL) 225-4061

Harold Ford (D-TN) 225-3265

Thomas Foley (D-WA) 225-5604

Richard Gephardt (D-MO) 225-0100

*Newt Gingrich*

*George Miller - 225-2095*

*Barbara Kennelby 225-2265*

SENATE

~~Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH) 224-2315~~

Daniel P. Moynihan (D-NY) 224-4451

John Breaux (D-LA) 224-4623

David Boren (D-OK) 224-4721

George Mitchell (D-ME) 224-5344

Wendell Ford (D-KY) 224-4343

John Chafee (R-RI) 224-2921

Dave Durenberger (R-MN) 224-224-3244

HHS Call List

House

Susan Molinari (R-NY)

Thomas Petri (R-WI)

Nancy Johnson (R-CT)

Fred Grandy (R-IA)

Newt Gingrich (R-GA)

SENATE

Dan Coats (R-IN)

James Jeffords (R-VT)

Orrin Hatch (R-UT)

6/3/93

Welfare Reform Courtesy Calls

for

Mary Jo Bane, Assistant Sec'y for Children and Families  
David Ellwood, Assistant Sec'y for Planning and Evaluation  
Bruce Reed, Deputy Ass't to the President for Domestic Affairs

HOUSE

Harold Ford (D-TN)	4/27/93
Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL)	5/20/93
Matthew Martinez (D-CA)	6/8/93

SENATE

Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY)	4/29/93
George Mitchell (D-ME)	5/7/93
Christopher Dodd (D-CT)	5/20/93
Jay Rockefeller (D-WV)	5/24/93
John Breaux (D-LA)	5/24/93

<u>Member</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>
William Goodling (R-PA) Lee Cowen 5-5836 (2263 Rayburn)	6/9	3 pm
Bill Bradley (D-NJ) Anne Noble 4-3224 (Hart 731)	6/11	Noon
William Ford (D-MI)		
David Boren (D-OK) Phyllis Kreis 4-4721		
John Chafee (R-RI) Donna Davis 4-2921		
David Durenberger (R-MN) Julie Hasler 4-3244		
*Orrin Hatch (R-UT) Ruth Carroll 4-9856		
Nancy Landon Kassebaum (R-KS) Pat Johnson 4-4774		
Robert Dole (R-KS) Yvonne Hopkins 4-6521		
*Bill Archer (R-TX) 5-2571		
*Rick Santorum (R-PA) 5-2135		
Micheal Castle (R-DE) 5-4165		
Richard Gephardt (D-MO) Nina Plank 5-2671	not ready for a meeting at this time	
James Jeffords (R-VT) Trecia 4-5141	did not wish to meet, offered staff	
Bob Packwood (R-OR) Pam Stevens 4-9054	not ready for a meeting at this time	

\* expressed interest in scheduling a meeting