

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: President, Office of the: Presidential
Briefing Papers: Records, 1981-1989
Folder Title: 05/12/1983 (Case File: 144712)
Box: 30
(1)

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

gg

WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
WORKSHEET



- ☐ X-MEDIA
- ☐ H-INTERNAL

Name of Document: BRIEFING PAPERS
FOR PRESIDENT'S
SCHEDULED
APPOINTMENTS FOR

M A Y 1 2 8 3

Subject Codes:

P	R	0	0	7	-	0	1
C	0	0	2	3	-		
S	0	0	0	3	-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
B	E	0	0	3	-	0	4
					-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
F	G	3	8	4	-		
					-		
					-		
					-		
F	G	0	0	6	-	2	7
					-		
					-		
					-		

- 1) Subject: List of invitees for meetings and luncheon during the working visit of George C. Price, Prime Minister of Belize
- 2) Meeting with Congressman Dan Schaefer and Mildred Powell, who worked with the President at radio station WFO during the 1940's.
- 3) Meeting with J. Peter Grace to discuss the progress of the ~~Task Force~~ ^{President's} Private Sector Survey on Cost Control.
- 4) Meeting with President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL		RSZ			C	

Referral Note:

WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT
WORKSHEET

☐ X-MEDIA
☐ H-INTERNAL

Name of Document: BRIEFING PAPERS
FOR PRESIDENT'S
SCHEDULED
APPOINTMENTS FOR

MAY 12 8 3

Subject Codes:

P	R	0	0	7	-	0	1
F	G	0	1	0	-	0	2
					-		
					-		
					-		
N	R	0	0	6	-	0	1
H	E	0	0	3	-		
W	E	0	1	0	-		
					-		
L	A	0	0	2	-		
I	S				-		
					-		
S	O	0	0	4	-		
P	E	0	1	0	-		
P	R	0	0	5	-	0	1
P	L	0	0	5	-	0	4
P	L	0	0	2	-		
S	O	0	0	2	-		
T	R	0	0	1	-		

5) Subject: Meeting with the Cabinet Councils
on Natural Resources and the Environment;
Human Resources; and Economic Affairs
to discuss:
A) Strategic Petroleum Reserves
B) Food Stamp Regulatory Reform
(copy of Presidentially initialed decision
memo included)
C) Unemployment Benefits for Training or
Education

6) Reception for White House Fellows Alumni
selected

7) Photo Opportunity with Senate/House Dinner
Vice Chairmen followed by a reception.

8) Republican Senate/House Dinner at the
Washington Hilton Hotel.

ROUTE TO:		ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency	(Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL		RSZ			C	

Referral Note:

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

The President has seen



Thursday, May 12, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark)	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Peter Grace</u> (Fuller) (TAB A)	Oval Office
10:00 am (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:45 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board</u> (Clark) (TAB B)	Cabinet Room
11:15 am (15 min)	<u>Briefing for Price Meeting</u> (Clark) (distributed separately) (please note draft departure remarks)	Oval Office
11:30 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Prime Minister George Price of Belize</u> (Clark)	Oval Office/ Cabinet Room
12:00 pm (45 min)	<u>Lunch with Prime Minister Price</u> (Clark/Rosebush)	Residence
12:45 pm (10 min)	<u>Departure Statements</u> (Clark)	Diplomatic Entrance
1:15 pm (30 min)	<u>Clark Briefing</u> (Clark) (distributed separately)	Oval Office
2:00 pm (75 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (TAB C)	Cabinet Room
3:15 pm (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
4:00 pm (30 min)	<u>Personnel Time</u> (von Damm)	Oval Office
4:30 pm (20 min)	<u>Reception for White House Fellows</u> (Fielding/Henkel) (TAB D) (draft remarks attached)	Rose Garden
5:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Photo with selected Senate/House Dinner Vice Chairmen</u> (Rollins) (TAB E)	Oval Office
5:30 pm (15 min)	N <u>Reception for Fundraisers for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Rollins/Rosebush) (TAB F) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
7:25 pm (3hrs5min)	N <u>Depart for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Henkel/Rollins) (BLACK TIE) (TAB G) (draft remarks attached)	Washington Hilton

UNP 5/11/83
4:00 pm

BCE

THE SCHEDULE OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Thursday, May 12, 1983



	9:00 am 0909 (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
VP	9:30 am 0920- (15 min) 0950	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark) <i>KEN deGRAFFENROD KEN DOBERSTEIN</i>	Oval Office
VP	9:45 am 0951- (15 min) 1005	<u>Meeting with Peter Grace</u> (Fuller) (TAB A)	Oval Office
	10:00 am (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 10:05-	Oval Office
VP	10:45 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Foreign Intelligence</u> 10:47-11:22 <u>Advisory Board</u> (Clark)	Cabinet Room
VP	11:15 am (15 min)	<u>Briefing for Price Meeting</u> 11:23 (Clark), <i>At SAPA Booth, Bush</i> (distributed separately) (please note draft departure remarks)	Oval Office
VP	11:30 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Prime Minister</u> 11:33- <u>George Price of Belize</u> (Clark)	Oval Office/ Cabinet Room
VP	12:00 pm (45 min)	<u>Lunch with Prime Minister Price</u> (Clark/Rosebush) 12:00-12:45	Residence
	12:45 pm (10 min)	<u>Departure Statements</u> 12:46 - (Clark)	Diplomatic Entrance
VP	1:15 pm (30 min)	<u>Clark Briefing</u> <i>12:52-1:15</i> (Clark) <i>1:15-1:46</i> <i>1:50-1:57 Bush, etc</i> (distributed separately)	Oval Office
	2:00 pm (75 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> 2:08 - 3:24 (Fuller) (TAB C)	Cabinet Room
	3:15 pm (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 3:24-3:59	Oval Office
VP	3:55 pm (30 min)	Personnel Time <i>3:59-4:30</i> (von Damm), <i>Bill Clark, J. Harrington, J.B. - LATE</i>	Oval Office Oval Office
	4:30 pm (20 min)	<u>Reception for White House Fellows</u> 4:40-4:45 (Fielding/Henkel) (TAB D) (draft remarks attached)	Rose Garden
	5:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Photo with selected Senate/House</u> 5:15- <u>Dinner Vice Chairmen</u> (Rollins) (TAB E)	Oval Office
	5:30 pm (15 min)	<u>Reception for Fundraisers for</u> 5:35-5:50 <u>Senate/House Dinner</u> (Rollins/Rosebush) (TAB F) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
VP	7:25 pm (3hrs5min)	<u>Depart for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Henkel/Rollins) (BLACK TIE) (TAB G)	Washington Hilton
		(draft remarks attached)	UNP 5/11/83 4:00 pm

BCK

THE SCHEDULE OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

Thursday, May 12, 1983



	9:00 am 0909 (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
VP	9:30 am 0920-0950 (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (Clark) <i>KCN deGRAFFENROD KCN DUBERSTEIN</i> <i>VPK, McFarlane Jorman</i>	Oval Office
VP	9:45 am 0951-1005 (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Peter Grace</u> (Fuller) (TAB A)	Oval Office
	10:00 am (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 10:05-	Oval Office
VP	10:45 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Foreign Intelligence</u> 10:47-11:22 <u>Advisory Board</u> (Clark) (TAB B)	Cabinet Room
VP	11:15 am (15 min)	<u>Briefing for Price Meeting</u> 11:23 (Clark), <i>McSAPPA BOSH, BUSH</i> (distributed separately) (please note draft departure remarks)	Oval Office
VP	11:30 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Prime Minister</u> 11:33- <u>George Price of Belize</u> (Clark)	Oval Office/ Cabinet Room
VP	12:00 pm (45 min)	<u>Lunch with Prime Minister Price</u> (Clark/Rosebush) 12:00-12:45	Residence
	12:45 pm (10 min)	<u>Departure Statements</u> 12:46 - (Clark)	Diplomatic Entrance
VP	1:15 pm (30 min)	<u>Clark Briefing</u> <i>PAUL N. ETZ</i> 1:15-1:48 (Clark) (distributed separately) <i>1:50-1:57 BUSH, SA</i>	Oval Office
	2:00 pm (75 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> 2:08 - 3:24 (Fuller) (TAB C)	Cabinet Room
	3:15 pm (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> 3:24 - 3:59	Oval Office
VP	3:55 pm (30 min)	PHOTO WITH MICHAEL POWELL (CONGRESSMAN) <u>Personnel Time</u> 3:59 - 4:39 (von Damm), <i>BILL CLARK, J. HARRINGTON,</i> <i>JB, em - LATE</i>	Oval Office Oval Office
	4:30 pm (20 min)	<u>Reception for White House Fellows</u> 4:40-4:45 (Fielding/Henkel) (TAB D) (draft remarks attached)	Rose Garden
	5:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Photo with selected Senate/House</u> 5:15 - <u>Dinner Vice Chairmen</u> (Rollins) (TAB E)	Oval Office
	5:30 pm (15 min)	<u>Reception for Fundraisers for</u> 5:35-5:50 <u>Senate/House Dinner</u> (Rollins/Rosebush) (TAB F) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
VP	7:25 pm (3hrs5min)	<u>Depart for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Henkel/Rollins) (BLACK TIE) (TAB G)	Washington Hilton
		(draft remarks attached)	UNP 5/11/83 4:00 pm

VP also there

Peter will have met with Ed Meese and members of the Cabinet at breakfast (Thursday morning) and made a brief presentation. He will present the Cabinet and you with an update on the Private Sector Survey and the trends, as he sees them, for federal spending.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Edwin Meese III ✓
James A. Baker III ✓
~~Michael K. Deaver~~
Craig L. Fuller ✓

J. Peter Grace ✓
~~J. P. Bolduc~~
~~VICE PRESIDENT ?~~

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer only.

V. SEQUENCE

Welcome Peter Grace and J. P. (he uses his initials in lieu of his first name) Bolduc. Peter will make a brief presentation. (He will use a few charts.)

A

THE SCHEDULE OF
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



Thursday, May 12, 1983

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker, Meese, Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> BOB McFARLANE (Clark) KEN DE GRAFFENREID KEN DOBERSTEIN, DICK GARMAN	Oval Office
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Peter Grace</u> (Fuller) (TAB A)	Oval Office
10:00 am (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
10:45 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board</u> (Clark) (TAB B)	Cabinet Room
11:15 am (15 min)	<u>Briefing for Price Meeting</u> (Clark) (distributed separately) (please note draft departure remarks)	Oval Office
11:30 am (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Prime Minister George Price of Belize</u> (Clark)	Oval Office/ Cabinet Room
12:00 pm (45 min)	<u>Lunch with Prime Minister Price</u> (Clark/Rosebush)	Residence
12:45 pm (10 min)	X <u>Departure Statements</u> (Clark)	Diplomatic Entrance
1:15 pm (30 min)	<u>Clark Briefing</u> (Clark) (distributed separately)	Oval Office
2:00 pm (75 min)	<u>Cabinet Time</u> (Fuller) (TAB C)	Cabinet Room
3:15 pm (45 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
3:55 pm (5 min)	PHOTO - MILDRED POWELL / CORAL SCHAGGAL	OVAL OFC.
4:00 pm (30 min)	<u>Personnel Time</u> (von Damm)	Oval Office
4:30 pm (20 min)	X <u>Reception for White House Fellows</u> (Fielding/Henkel) (TAB D) (draft remarks attached)	Rose Garden
5:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Photo with selected Senate/House Dinner Vice Chairmen</u> (Rollins) (TAB E)	Oval Office
5:30 pm (15 min)	X N <u>Reception for Fundraisers for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Rollins/Rosebush) (TAB F) (draft remarks attached)	Residence
7:25 pm (3hrs5min)	X N <u>Depart for Senate/House Dinner</u> (Henkel/Rollins) (BLACK TIE) (TAB G)	Washington Hilton
	(draft remarks attached)	UNP 5/11/83 4:00 pm

OFFICIAL WORKING VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER PRICE OF BELIZE

Thursday, May 12, 1983

11:30-11:50 AM - Private meeting and photo opportunity in the
Oval Office

United States: The President
The Vice President
Secretary of State Shultz
William P. Clark
Assistant Secretary of State Thomas O. Enders
Ambassador Designate Malcolm R. Barnebey
Alfonso Sapia-Bosch
Messrs. Meese, Baker, Deaver will attend at their
discretion

Belize: Prime Minister George C. Price
David L. McKoy, Minister of Labor and Social Services
Fred Hunter, Minister of Works
Edmund Marshalleck, Financial Secretary and
Ambassador of Belize to the United States

11:50-12:15 AM - Plenary session, Cabinet Room

United States: Same participants as in the private meeting plus:
Richard Stone
AID Administrator M. Peter McPherson
Assistant Administrator for Latin America Otto Reich
Charles P. Tyson
Messrs. Meese, Baker, Deaver will attend at their
discretion

Belize: Same participants as in the private meeting plus:
Florencio Marin, Minister of Natural Resources
Said Musa, Attorney General and Minister of
Education, Sports and Culture
Everal Waight, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of
Foreign Affairs and Chief Protocol Officer
Robert Leslie, Permanent Representative of Belize
to the United Nations

12:15-1:00 PM - President's Luncheon for Prime Minister, State Dining Room

United States: Same participants as in the plenary session except:

Charles P. Tyson
Assistant Administrator for Latin America Otto Reich

Belize: Same participants as in the plenary session plus:

Arthur Quinn, Honorary Consul General of Belize
Washington, D. C.
Louis Humphreys, President of the Private Sector
Organization
Elton Jones, President of Belize Chamber of Commerce

CABINET TIME

May 12, 1983

*to Dave
Fischer*

PARTICIPANTS

- ✓ The President
- ✓ The Vice President
- ✓ Secretary Shultz
- ✓ Secretary Regan
- ✓ Secretary Block
- ✓ Secretary Donovan
- ✓ Secretary Heckler
- ✓ Secretary Pierce
- ✓ Secretary Dole
- ✓ Secretary Hodel
- ✓ Edwin Meese III
- ✓ Director Stockman
- ✓ Edwin Harper
- ✓ Deputy Secretary Thayer
(Representing Secretary Weinberger)
- ~~✓ Acting Attorney General Jensen~~
(Representing Attorney General Smith)
- ✓ Under Secretary Simmons
(Representing Secretary Watt)
- ✓ Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Lighthizer
(Representing Ambassador Brock)
- ~~✓ Richard Darman, Assistant to the President and Deputy to
the Chief of Staff~~
- ✓ Craig Fuller, Assistant to the President for Cabinet Affairs
- ~~✓ David Gergen, Assistant to the President for Communications~~
- ✓ Edwin Rollins, Assistant to the President for Political Affairs
- ✓ Danny Boggs, Executive Secretary for CCNRE
- Robert Carleson, Executive Secretary for CCHR
- Les Denend, Acting Executive Secretary for CCEA
- ✓ Becky Norton Dunlop, Director, Office of Cabinet Affairs

Additional Attendees:

- ✓ Jonathan Vipond, Deputy Assistant to the President for
Public Liaison
- ✓ Nancy Risque, Special Assistant to the President for
Legislative Affairs
- ✓ James Cicconi, Special Assistant to the President and
Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff
- ✓ Robert Dederick, Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs

Jim Medley
Carl Williams, OPD
Mary Jarrett, OCA

Jim Barnes, DOA

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR DAVE FISCHER

FROM: M. B. OGLESBY, JR. 

SUBJECT: ATTENDEES AT OVAL OFFICE MEETING

The following were in attendance at the 3:55 P.M.
meeting today in the Oval Office with the President:

Congressman Daniel L. Schaefer

Mildred Bernice Powell

Staff: David L. Wright

The President's Office

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH CONGRESSMAN DANIEL L. SCHAEFER (R-Colorado)
AND CONSTITUENT, MISS MILDRED B. POWELL

DATE: Thursday, May 12, 1983
LOCATION: The Oval Office
TIME: 3:55 P.M. (5 Minutes)
FROM: Kenneth M. Duberstein *KMD*

I. PURPOSE

To accommodate the request of Congressman Daniel (Dan) Schaefer (R-CO) for a meeting with the President for his constituent, Miss Mildred B. Powell, who is a friend of the President and worked with him when he was an announcer at radio station WHO.

II. BACKGROUND

Congressman Dan Schaefer is a newly elected Republican from Colorado's Sixth District, which includes Denver. Schaefer was elected in a special election held after the death of Congressman-elect Jack Swigert.

Congressman Schaefer met the President during a photo opportunity held in the Oval Office on April 11, 1983.

Mildred B. Powell is a friend of the President's who worked with him at radio station WHO during the 1940's. She is here in Washington, D. C. for just a few days and would like to say hello to the President.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President
Congressman Daniel L. Schaefer (R-CO)
Mildred B. Powell

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House Photographer only.

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

President to greet Mildred Powell and the Congressman, to be followed by photo.

Attachment: Talking Points

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 11, 1983

BRIEFING PAPER FOR THE PRESIDENT

MEETING: J. PETER GRACE
DATE: MAY 12, 1983
TIME: 9:45 A.M. (15 MINUTES)
LOCATION: OVAL OFFICE

FROM: CRAIG L. FULLER

CF

I. PURPOSE

Peter Grace and the Private Sector Survey on Cost Control are nearing the halfway point in the release of the 38 Task Force Reports. Peter asked for time to visit with you briefly on their progress and mention some of the trends he has observed about Federal spending while working on this project.

II. BACKGROUND

As you are aware, more than 160 chief executives from the nation's businesses and another 1,200 businessmen from across the country have worked on the 38 Task Force reports that are in the process of being finalized. Peter Grace, as the head of the Private Sector Survey, and J.P. Bolduc, as the top staff person on the Private Sector survey, have had the task of bringing this project to a conclusion. One of the greatest fears that the participants in this effort have had is that the government would not pay attention to the report once it was finished.

Ed Meese and I have assured Peter that we are set to receive his reports and give them very thorough consideration. (In fact, my office is now prepared to receive, staff-out for agency comment and track every single recommendation produced by the Private Sector Survey.

However, Peter would like to give you a very brief update in person. And, the fact that he can tell "the troops" that he met with you and discussed the project will help in encouraging others to complete their work.

Peter will have met with Ed Meese and members of the Cabinet at breakfast (Thursday morning) and made a brief presentation. He will present the Cabinet and you with an update on the Private Sector Survey and the trends, as he sees them, for federal spending.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Edwin Meese III
James A. Baker III
Michael K. Deaver
Craig L. Fuller

J. Peter Grace
J. P. Bolduc

IV. PRESS PLAN

White House photographer only.

V. SEQUENCE

Welcome Peter Grace and J. P. (he uses his initials in lieu of his first name) Bolduc. Peter will make a brief presentation. (He will use a few charts.)

B

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

MEETING WITH PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN
INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

DATE: May 12, 1983

LOCATION: Cabinet Room

TIME: 10:45 - 11:15 a.m.

FROM: WILLIAM P. CLARK *wpc*

I. PURPOSE

Provide the President with an opportunity to review the results of the Board's recommendations during the last year, discuss the progress of several Presidentially-directed tasks, and assign additional tasks.

II. BACKGROUND

The PFIAB began its work in January 1982 and since then the full Board has met eight times with task forces meeting far more frequently. The Board submitted its second semiannual report, containing 13 recommendations on various topics, on February 15, 1983.

III. PARTICIPANTS

See attached list.

IV. PRESS PLAN

No press coverage. White House photographer only (at the beginning of the meeting).

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- Remarks by the President in greeting the Board members.
- Brief response by Chairman Armstrong and a short synopsis of the Board's current work.
- The President would briefly address a few specific areas of the Board's current work and task additional assignments.
- Discussion.
- The President will give a few closing remarks at the end of the meeting.

(Remarks will be provided separately.)

Attachment

List of Participants

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Anne Armstrong, Chairman

Leo Cherne, Vice Chairman

David M. Abshire

Martin Anderson

William O. Baker

W. Glenn Campbell

John S. Foster, Jr.

Alan Greenspan

Clare Boothe Luce

Thomas H. Moorer

Peter O'Donnell, Jr.

H. Ross Perot

Joe M. Rodgers

Eugene Rostow

Paul Seabury

Robert F. Six

Seymour Weiss

Edward Bennett Williams

Staff:

Col. C. Norman Wood

Capt. Fred R. Demech

Mr. Randall Fort

Mrs. Gwen Watson

Mrs. Sandra Van Namee

William P. Clark

Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Kenneth E. deGraffenreid

NSC Staff Member

C

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 11, 1983

CABINET TIME

DATE: May 12, 1983
LOCATION: Cabinet Room
TIME: 2 PM (75 min)
FROM: Craig L. Fuller

CS

- I. PURPOSE: To review Administration's options regarding: Strategic Petroleum Reserves; Food Stamp Regulatory Reform, and Utilization of Unemployment Benefits for Training or Education.
- II. BACKGROUND
Strategic Petroleum Reserves: The Cabinet Council will discuss the appropriate rate at which the government should refill our strategic petroleum reserves. This discussion becomes necessary because the reduction in world prices could permit significant budget savings if the refill rate remains as projected. However, some are recommending that the refill rate be increased to provide for greater purchases at current prices. The overall effects of the oil price decline will also be discussed. A decision will be requested.
Food Stamp Regulatory Reform: In response to your State of the Union call to reduce food stamp fraud by \$1 billion, a comprehensive and unambiguous set of regulations was developed. Eight major issue recommendations have been identified for review by the Cabinet. Decisions will be requested.
Unemployment Benefits for Training or Education: Secretary Donovan will brief the Cabinet on the policy of displaced workers receiving unemployment benefits while enrolled in training or education.
- III. PARTICIPANTS: Members of Cabinet Councils on Natural Resources and the Environment; Human Resources and Economic Affairs. (list attached to the agenda).
- IV. PRESS PLAN None
- V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS
 - ° Secretary Hodel will make the presentation on Strategic Petroleum Reserves
 - ° Secretary Block will present the Food Stamp package
 - ° Secretary Donovan will brief the Cabinet on the issue of unemployment benefits for training

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 11, 1983

Mr. President

This issue paper addresses the recent decline in oil prices and demand.

There are four areas which the working group will present, eventually, for decisions. The first area, however, pertains to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and only that portion of the paper (pages 14-17) has been attached for your review tonight.

Fuller

Craig L. Fuller

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 10, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CABINET COUNCIL ON NATURAL RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT

FROM: THE OIL PRICE DECLINE WORKING GROUP
DANNY J. BOGGS, CHAIRMAN



ISSUE: What policy decisions, if any, should be made in light of recent oil price declines and changes, in expectation for future oil prices and demand?

Background

This working group was established to examine the effects (if any) on energy policy of recent declines in world oil prices, and the prospect of future declines. The group's basic finding is that oil price declines are consistent with current policy, and beneficial to the American and world economy. There are two major issues where the group believes that existing Administration policy should be re-examined as a result of lower oil prices and lower U.S. imports: Synthetic Fuels and Strategic Petroleum Reserve policy (SPR). Option papers on those two issues are attached.

Oil price declines are not just a phenomenon of the past three months. The United States refiner acquisition cost of imported crude oil fell by more than 25 percent in real terms between January of 1981 and October of 1982. The decline since that time has been an additional 15 percent. These declines have been very helpful to the United States and world economy. They have meant that over \$30 billion annually will remain with the consuming countries rather than being sent to producing countries. Econometric analysis done within the U.S. government suggests that every \$5 dollar decline in oil prices results in approximately 1 percent increase in GNP and 1 percent decline in rate of reported price change each year for 2-3 years.

We summarize briefly below some of the effects of past declines and the effect of stability or further decline in oil prices on these major areas of Administration policy:

1. Synthetic Fuels (Option Paper)
2. Strategic Petroleum Reserve Policy (Option Paper)

3. Natural Gas

4. Oil and Gas Leasing

On each issue, the group considered whether it was appropriate to delay consideration to allow for multi-lateral consideration with other countries. In each case, we decided that American action need not depend on other countries, though international aspects were considered where appropriate.

II. STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

America has made very substantial progress in filling its Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR). Between 1977 and 1979, 91 million barrels (mb) were placed in storage. There was then an 18 month hiatus when no oil was stored because the Carter Administration feared additional upward pressure on oil prices, and did not wish to offend Saudi Arabia. Filling began again late in 1980, and at the beginning of 1981 there were about 100 mb in storage, an amount equal to about 6 weeks of our imports at that time from Arab OPEC countries. Today there are more than 315 mb in reserve, an amount equal to about 80 days of net oil imports, and well over one year's supply of Arab OPEC imports at this time. By the end of 1983, we will have well over 350 mb in storage, an amount probably equal to the highest 3-month period of crude oil imports during the 1982-83 period. This latter standard was one of those established in the original 1975 law establishing the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

When it appeared that American imports might be as high as 11 mb a day during the 1985 timeframe, and world oil production levels were at or near sustainable capacity, the urgency of crash efforts to build a large Reserve immediately was much stronger. With the decline in American imports and the current estimated 10 mb/d excess world oil production capacity, the analytical case for extremely rapid fill above the levels proposed in the President's FY84 budget becomes much weaker. However, continuation of a reduced fill rate would mean a somewhat smaller reserve in the 1990s, when some project tighter world oil markets.

The SPR is also important as a defense for our policy of market reliance (opposition to price and allocation controls for oil). Therefore, investments in the SPR are in part investments in the continue political feasibility of efficient resource allocation policies during oil supply disruptions. If this effect of the SPR is credible to private parties, the SPR may enhance incentives (or reduce disincentives) for private sector preparation as well.

Key members of the congressional committees with jurisdiction have been quite active in pushing for higher fill rates. Their concern stems largely from the 1979-80 Carter policy of stopping SPR purchases. After a series of negotiations, the Senate Energy Committee proposed and Congress adopted a law requiring the Administration to fill the Reserve at 300,000 barrels a day unless the President finds that filling at such a rate is not in the national interest. The President made such a finding on December 1, 1982. For fiscal year 1983, we are filling at 220,000 b/d. The key issue at this stage is the question of what is the appropriate fill rate in light of both our national energy posture and our budget situation.

Analytically, there is very little difference in the cumulative SPR fill levels for FY83 and FY84, between the President's budget and the Energy Emergency Petroleum Act provisions calling for 220 kb/d until 500 mb level is achieved (subject to fund availability). The difference becomes significant only if the reduced fill rate is maintained through the rest of the 1980s. Shown below are the differences assuming 220 kb/d in FY83.

<u>Fill Rate</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>84</u>
EEPA	220,000	220,000
President's Budget	220,000	145,000
<u>Cumulative Fill</u>		
EEPA	358	438
President's Budget	358	410
Difference	-0-	28

In a world oil market with an estimated 10 mb/d of excess capacity over the next few years, the difference in cumulative SPR fill is rather insignificant over the next 2 years, especially since free world petroleum stocks (government and private) are in excess of 4 billion bbls (including necessary working stocks).

A related and important issue regarding fill rates is whether centralized, permanent low cost salt dome storage is used or whether high-cost, widely dispersed interim storage is required. To date, all SPR oil is stored in salt domes/mines at an average total cost per barrel of approximately \$3.75. Permanent SPR storage capacity is projected by DOE to be available for a 220 kb/d fill rate in FY83 and about 193,000 kb/d in FY84. Interim storage would be required for fill rates above those amounts.

Interim storage is far more costly (DOE's estimate for planning purposes is \$3.60 per barrel per year) and would require a large number of widely dispersed sites. Storage costs would substantially exceed that for salt dome storage and political pressure would mount for storage in Hawaii, Northeast, etc., probably covering product as well. This would result in substantially higher storage costs for very little incremental protection.

Options -- Summary

	<u>Cumulative Fill (MB)</u>	<u>Annual Average Fill Rate</u>	<u>Budget Outlays</u>
<u>1984 Options</u>			
1. President's Budget fill rate.....	411	145,000	1,520

2. Increase fill rate to take advantage of lower prices; maintain President's budget outlay ceiling.....	424	179,000	1,866
3. Fill-to-permanent capacity.....	429	193,000	2,008
4. Fill at EEPA "minimum" rate.....	438	220,000	2,279

The Treasury Department wished it made clear that for Options I and II, the outlay amount rather than the fill rate would be binding. In extraordinary cases, if a significant reduction in oil price were available through a special financial arrangement, the choice of a fill rate less than 193,000 b/d would not be an absolute bar, if the transaction could be done within appropriated funds, and without exceeding permanent storage capacity.

FY 1984 Fill Rate

OPTION I. Maintain existing policy of 145,000 b/d.

Advantages:

- o Maintains existing policy that was arrived at by the Administration during the fall budget process, based on evaluation of energy emergency preparedness and budgetary considerations.
- o New oil prices allow FY84 deliveries to be purchased at a savings of approximately \$350 million.

Disadvantages:

- o Subjects the Administration to criticism for failing to fill faster and for not filling the existing permanent storage capacity.
- o Reduces level of energy security from oil reserve.

OPTION II. Use decrease in oil prices to increase FY84 fill rate up to the January budget outlay amount.

Advantages:

- o Increases FY84 fill by 12 mb (3 percent) at no additional cost over January budget.
- o Additional oil can be stored in existing permanent storage facilities.

Disadvantages:

- o Subjects the Administration to criticism from SPR advocates for failing to fill faster.
- o Reduced level of energy security from oil reserve.

OPTION III. Increase FY84 fill rate to fill all available permanent storage capacity.

Advantages:

- o Removes the budget windfall resulting from lower oil prices and avoids criticism for failing to spend budgeted amounts in FY83.
- o Additional oil fills existing permanent facilities without resorting to interim storage, making this option consistent with our FY83 policy of fill to available capacity.

Disadvantages:

- o Increases FY84 outlays by approximately \$140 million, although outlay savings occur in the outyears.

OPTION IV. Fill at 220,000 bd.

Advantages:

- o Provides increased levels of protection.
- o Will probably satisfy congressional interests.

Disadvantages:

- o Requires use of interim storage at a cumulative additional cost of \$139 million.
- o Would increase outlays in FY84 by \$779 million.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 9, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Robert B. Carleson, Executive Secretary
Cabinet Council on Human Resources



SUBJECT: Food Stamp Regulatory Reform

I. ACTION FORCING EVENT:

In response to the President's State of the Union call to reduce the over \$1 billion in food stamp program fraud, waste and abuse, the White House Office of Policy Development and the Secretary of Agriculture initiated an effort to review, revise, and tighten major portions of existing regulations.

II. ANALYSIS:

A task force was created in the Department of Agriculture to critically review, rewrite and reduce those sections of the food stamp regulations dealing with Definitions, State Requirements, Eligibility and Issuance. The piecemeal approach to rulemaking over the past seven years led to redundant and ambiguous regulations. In order to strengthen program accountability, a comprehensive approach designed to produce a clear, concise, and unambiguous set of regulations was developed.

The seven person task force began work in February 1983 and completed a draft in April 1983.

In addition to numerous organizational and editorial changes, the draft regulations reflect significant policy changes designed, among other things to, improve verification of facts supporting eligibility, require basic verification in all emergency applications (expedited service), minimize eligibility worker discretion; eliminate ambiguous terms and definitions, standardize processing timeframes and reduce the volume of regulations by over 50 percent.

III. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Attached are background memos for each of the major issues and recommendations identified.

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

- REFERRAL OF MINORS
- STATE ABUSE OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE
- VERIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY
- APPLICATION PROCESSING TIMEFRAMES
- EMERGENCY APPLICATION PROCESSING TIMEFRAMES
- THIRD PARTY PAYMENTS AS INCOME
- JOB SEARCH/WORK REQUIREMENTS
- PHOTO IDENTIFICATION CARDS

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

REFERRAL OF MINORS

ISSUE: Should food stamp rules require that minors who live without an adult and who apply for benefits be referred to an agency responsible for child welfare?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Require State agencies to refer to the appropriate agency, at the time of application, any household comprised entirely of unemancipated minors. These households would receive benefits if otherwise eligible.

BACKGROUND: Current rules do not require State agencies to refer applicant minors to child welfare agencies.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- runaways and other children not under adult supervision could receive protective services.
- some children may be reunited with their families.
- the change would be consistent with policies directed at strengthening families.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- some children will be discouraged from applying for benefits.
- mandatory referral infringes on the applicants' right to privacy.
- the change is not permitted under current law.
- referral in and of itself would not ensure that these children will receive services.
- many States now do this.

DECISION:

RR

APPROVED

APPROVED
AS AMENDED

DISAPPROVED

May 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

STATE ABUSE OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE

ISSUE: Should rules be adopted to prevent States from manipulating energy assistance payments to increase the federal share of welfare?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Exclude from income only those payments labelled as energy assistance which do not exceed the household's actual energy expenses. Any payments exceeding these amounts would be included as income.

BACKGROUND: Under current rules, all payments labelled as energy assistance in State or local law are excluded as income. A few States have manipulated this provision by labelling large portions of existing welfare assistance as energy assistance, thus reducing income that is counted for food stamp purposes. Recently, USDA issued new rules attempting to solve this problem by establishing criteria for approving the exclusion of State or local energy assistance. The proposed change would strengthen USDA's ability to limit this abuse.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the provision would limit the amount of income that could be excluded as "energy assistance" to an amount directly related to actual energy costs.
- cash assistance in excess of actual or standard utility allowances would be appropriately recognized as disposable income.
- the change is consistent with Congressional intent.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the provision is merely a bureaucratic devise to reduce benefits.
- the provision would complicate the eligibility process and result in additional calculations.
- the change is inconsistent with the intent of Congress.
- this problem has already been adequately addressed in USDA's recent regulation designed to limit "energy income."

DECISION:

RR

APPROVED

APPROVED
AS AMENDED

DISAPPROVED

May 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

VERIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY

ISSUE: Should verification requirements be expanded to require specific verification of each factor affecting eligibility and allotment amount?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Mandate uniform verification standards nationwide for all applicants and specify the minimum acceptable forms of verification.

BACKGROUND: Currently, regulations require verification of certain factors affecting eligibility and level of benefits. States have latitude to verify additional factors and to target verification through the use of error prone profiles. Quality control reports indicate high error rates persist with respect to eligibility and benefit amounts.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- all applicants would be treated equitably regardless of the State in which the applicant applies.
- the standards for evidence supporting eligibility would be the same for all households.
- eligibility workers would be relieved of the responsibility to decide which factors are "questionable" and which are not.
- error rates will be reduced as fewer non-eligibles will enter the rolls.
- the public perception of the program will be improved.
- the requirements are within the Secretary's authority to manage the program.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the provision places added administrative burdens on State agencies.
- non-public assistance applicants and recipients will have to provide birth certificates and other documents previously not required.
- the requirements are beyond the Secretary's statutory authority.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISAPPROVED

May 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM
APPLICATION PROCESSING TIMEFRAMES

ISSUE: Should applicants be required to provide verification of eligibility within 45 days of application, and should eligibility for benefits start on the day verification is provided if beyond 30 days?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Establish uniform national timeframes for accepting verification and taking final action on each nonemergency application as follows:

- Normal processing ▪ applicants providing verification by the 20th day after application would receive benefits by the 30th day retroactive to the date of application.
- Delayed processing ▪ applicants providing verification after the 20th day but by the 30th day would receive benefits within 10 days, retroactive to the date of application.
- Late processing ▪ applicants providing verification after the 30th day but by the 45th day would receive benefits within 10 days, benefits start the day verification is provided.

BACKGROUND: Currently, households have 30 days to provide verification of eligibility and if verification is received on the 30th day, benefits must be issued that day. Households are also provided an additional 30 days to establish eligibility. At State option applications may be denied if the verification is not received within 30 days. However, such denials must be reopened, approved, and benefits paid retroactively if verification is submitted by the 60th day. Some States provide applicants with additional time beyond the 60 day period.

Proponents of the recommendation would argue that:

- the provisions simplify processing timeframes nationally.
- the change recognizes that both the State agency and the applicant have interdependent statutory responsibilities.
- three weeks is sufficient time for verification to be obtained except in extreme cases.
- the 45-day limit provides even those applicants having problems in obtaining necessary verification with adequate time.
- the provision creates a time standard similar to that used in AFDC.
- the three week standard is consistent with the timeframe used in emergency applications (as recommended elsewhere).
- the proposed rule avoids the current practice of keeping cases pending and open for 60, 90 days (or longer) and paying retroactive benefits in many instances.
- the current rule interprets the statute as authorizing the Secretary to require applicants to submit verification on a timely basis.

Opponents of the recommendation would argue that:

- 20 days is not enough time to obtain verification.
- applicants will have 15 fewer days to provide eligibility verification without adversely affecting benefit levels.
- applicants will have 10 fewer days in which to obtain verification without delaying benefit issuance.
- applicants who provide verification after the 21st day may not receive benefits within the statutory 30 day period.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISAPPROVED

MAY 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

JOB SEARCH/WORK REQUIREMENTS

ISSUE: Should the Secretary administratively establish job search and related work requirements for able-bodied food stamp applicants and recipients for Fiscal Year 1984?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Legislation should be sought to require job search and related work requirements for food stamp applicants/recipients and to provide performance incentives to States.

ALTERNATIVE: Mandate the work requirements administratively and fund at a 50 percent level.

BACKGROUND: Current statutory authority appears to permit the Secretary to require job search and other work requirements which could be funded at a 50 percent level. In the past, however, almost all work related services have been funded entirely with Federal funds. As a result, USDA is required to contract with State agencies or others to perform the function. Thus, the work program is optional and is of questionable effectiveness. States would be reluctant to pay 50 percent of the costs of administering mandatory work requirements because all program savings would be Federal. Also, in litigation States would contend these are Federal responsibilities.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the proposed legislation would create long needed work requirements which would offer food stamp applicants and recipients the opportunity to gain independence.
- those already employed who conceal their income and those unwilling to work would be denied food stamps.
- considerable savings would result from diverting applicants to jobs and away from benefits.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- a work requirement would be costly to administer.
- it would discourage needy people from applying.
- current work requirements in food stamps and past experience with WIN in the AFDC program demonstrate the ineffectiveness of work requirements.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISAPPROVED

May 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

EMERGENCY APPLICATION PROCESSING TIMEFRAMES

ISSUE: Should the initial allotment of food stamps to emergency households cover a uniform time period for all applicants and should applicants be required to submit basic eligibility verification?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Provide a uniform three week allotment for all households regardless of the date of application and require proof of residency, age, citizenship and alien status, exemption for work registration, and social security numbers within four days of application.

BACKGROUND: Households qualifying for emergency (expedited) service receive as few as two weeks benefits if they apply on or prior to the 15th of the month and as much as six weeks benefits if they apply after the 15th. Some recipients must provide verifications within as few as two weeks while those applying after the 15th of the month have up to six weeks in which to obtain verifications.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the provisions will increase program accountability.
- uniform allotment periods reduce incentives to abuse the system.
- the proposal will reduce the excessive use of the emergency system.
- emergency benefits will never exceed a three week allotment during which time necessary verification can be obtained.
- all emergency cases will receive equitable treatment regardless of the day on which application is made.
- emergency cases will be processed under the same 21 day verification timeframe recommended for all households.
- local office directors can accept third party statements verifying eligibility factors in hardship cases.
- the Secretary has authority to require verification of basic eligibility factors in all cases.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the four day time period is unreasonable to obtain proof of residency, citizenship and alien status, establish exemption from work registration, and apply for or provide a SSN and would likely be the subject of a legal challenge.
- limiting emergency allotments discriminates against needy households particularly in State where the majority of cases are processed on an emergency basis. (i.e. 1/4 of all cases in over half the States, 1/2 of all cases in some States and 2/3 of all cases in several States.)
- legitimate emergency cases may be discouraged from applying.
- the 21 day benefit allotment will cause administrative problems when the period extends into a subsequent month.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISAPPROVED

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

THIRD PARTY PAYMENTS AS INCOME

ISSUE: Should a broader range of payments to third parties on behalf of a recipient ("third party payments") be counted as income in computing benefit levels?

RECOMMENDATION: Yes. Count as income those third party payments over which the household has discretion. A conclusive presumption of recipient discretion would apply to payments made by relatives and employers (except for health insurance premiums). The rule would continue to consider public assistance (except for energy assistance) as income even if paid to a third party.

BACKGROUND: The statute provides an income exclusion for "any gain or benefit which is not in the form of money payable directly to a household..." Current rules interpret the term "payable" as "paid to the household" and the rules exclude most third party payments as income.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the provision is more equitable in that households that merely accept payments and pay their own bills will be treated the same as those who arrange to have income diverted to a third party.
- the Secretary's authority to make this change is supported by the statute and the legislative history.

Opponents of the recommendation would argue that

- the rule is unfair to elderly and disabled households in particular in that they are most likely to receive assistance from relatives.
- the provision is not clearly authorized by the Food Stamp Act.
- the rule will be difficult to administer because household discretion would be difficult to establish.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISSAPPROVED

May 12, 1983

FOOD STAMP REGULATORY REFORM

PHOTO ID CARDS

ISSUE: Should the photo ID card requirements be expanded in an effort to prevent Program abuse?

RECOMMENDATION: No. The current regulatory requirement for photo ID cards in project areas reporting excessive duplicate issuances is sufficient.

ALTERNATIVE: Mandate the current photo ID card requirements for all project areas serving more than 1,000 households (40% of all areas and 90% of all households).

BACKGROUND: Current regulations mandate photo ID cards, or an alternative ID system, in all project areas with over 100,000 recipients. Further, current regulations allow the Secretary to mandate the use of photo ID's or alternative issuance systems for smaller project areas with unacceptable duplicate issuance rates. USDA reimburses States for ID cards and equipment at 50%. Each year approximately \$13 - 25 million in duplicate ATPs are redeemed of which \$13 million is known to be improperly transacted ATPs.

Proponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- an efficient system is already implemented which allows the Secretary to target the use of photo ID to areas where they are most needed.
- targeting the use of ID cards is a highly effective approach to controlling duplicate ATP transactions, but serves no other general program use.
- a broader use of photo ID cards than is needed is not a cost efficient use of State and Federal monies since about 60% of food stamps are issued without use of an ATP card.
- the States will not support an expansion of photo ID cards to smaller jurisdictions where they are not cost effective.

Opponents of this recommendation would argue that:

- the alternative would deter fraudulent applications because cheaters are reluctant to be photographed.
- the alternative could yield savings if the same photo ID card were used for other programs such as AFDC.
- in the one State that has gone to Statewide use of a photo ID card (Massachusetts) there has been no major public criticism.

DECISION:

_____ APPROVED

_____ APPROVED
AS AMENDED

_____ DISAPPROVED

May 12, 1983