

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2005-0336-F

FOIA Number:
2005-0336-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Organization Files - Non-Government Organizations

OA/ID Number: 62086
Folder ID Number: 62086-009

Folder Title:
Association - Packard [1990-92]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
	0	0	0	0

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 21, 1992

Dear Lynn:

It was good to see you at the recent annual meeting of the Packard Foundation and I think all of us can be extremely proud of the way the program has developed.

Because I really feel that an alumni association, either of the Packard Fellows alone or of an expanded group that would include the Packard Fellows as well as the quasi Packard Fellows that we in the Federal Government produce each year, could be extremely important. I would like simply to follow up on our discussions with some of the top of the head suggestions as to ways in which we might consider starting such an association if you and the other members of the Foundation consider it to be a good idea.

It would be, I think, an excellent idea if we could get for each of the 100 Packard Fellows a two page spread that would include on the first page a photograph together with brief biographical information -- where did they grow up, where were they educated, what positions they held in the past, and what their current positions are as Packard Fellows. Then the facing page (I would limit it rigorously to one page) would have a very brief discussion of what sort of research work they are involved in, what area of teaching they are involved with, and finally, a selection of, let us say, five papers which they think are particularly representative of their research activities. This way if we had this pair of pages facing one another in a booklet, it would be extremely convenient to be able to leaf through it, recognize the face, put it together with the information, and have at one's disposal, in a very convenient and attractive fashion, the kind of information that I, for example, frequently want as I try to find people whom I might call for expert opinion or to serve on various boards or committees. Quite apart from anything else I think that such a record would be a rather remarkable historic document in the years ahead. Perhaps we should consider putting this together so that we updated it every 5 years or whatever interval seems appropriate with interim sections being produced each year as new Fellows are selected.

I think the photographs are important and that such a hard copy item would be a nucleus around which alumni activities could be built.

I see at least two problems: one is the obvious one of funding because in order to be done well this would not be inexpensive and secondly, my experience has always been that obtaining reasonable photographs of any group is extremely difficult and I would hope that we could avoid the scruffy photographs taken with a box camera on the beach at twilight that so often are submitted in response to photographic requests; indeed this is a particular sin on the part of scientists and engineers. I have been appalled in the past at what distinguished authors of papers in volumes that I have edited have submitted for inclusion in the photographic roster of authors.

When I got back to my office I took my brief notes from the banquet and dictated the enclosed hard copy of my remarks at the banquet with the thought that you might wish to pass it on to David.

I think that next year's meeting will be particularly interesting as we hear the graduation reports from the first group of Fellows and I very much look forward to it.

After some shuffling of schedules, I will be back in San Francisco on Thursday, September 24, to give a talk to Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference that is being organized in substantial measure, it seems, by staff from Hewlett-Packard. Perhaps I shall see you in connection with that activity.

I was very disappointed with the support given by John Young, John Sculley, and other CEOs to the Clinton-Gore campaign, but delighted with David Packard's letter that appeared in the September 17th San Jose Mercury.

With warmest best wishes,

Sincerely yours,



D. Allan Bromley
The Assistant to the President
for
Science and Technology

Enclosure

Professor Franklin Orr
David and Lucile Packard Foundation
300 Second Street, Suite 200
Los Altos, California 94022

REMARKS ON THE PACKARD FELLOWSHIP*

D. Allan Bromley

The Science Advisor to the President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

It is rare indeed that a scientific banquet, or indeed any banquet, is ever held in such magnificent surroundings as those provided here in the Monterey Aquarium, and as veteran attendee at scientific banquets, let me say that it is almost as rare to have the quality of the banquet itself match these superb surroundings. Finally, it is perhaps even more rare to have the intellectual content of the banquet conversations and discussion match either these surroundings or this remarkable banquet.

For all these things we are indebted to one remarkable individual: a man who has achieved worldwide recognition as a creative engineer, as a truly exceptional entrepreneur, both personally and on behalf of his entire region, and as a public servant of the highest distinction; a man who has served his region, his state, his nation, and indeed the entire world in dedicated fashion. David Packard is all these things and more. Tonight we would specially recognize him for the pioneering role that he has played in recognizing true excellence in our academic faculties and, through the Packard Fellowships, in encouraging some of the very best young people in our nation to commit themselves to academic careers in universities across our nation.

Tomorrow, as the Scientific Advisory Board selects the twenty new candidates whom it will recommend to the Packard Foundation as the 1992 Packard Fellows, we will have completed the full one hundred that hereafter will be the number of Packard Fellows working at any one time. In preparing for this meeting the members of the Advisory Board have read the nominations and proposals submitted on behalf of all the candidates. In the case of winners of Packard Fellowships -- such as those of you present here this evening -- we have read all of these documents several times. Out of this there is only one inescapable conclusion: you are a remarkably select group -- indeed, perhaps the most select group of young scientists and engineers anywhere in the world.

History tells us, although you may not be thinking of it at this stage in your career, that much will be expected of you -- both from your profession and from your nation. Perhaps the best analogs in the past to today's Packard Fellowships are those that were awarded by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations in the 1930s. At the time,

*Remarks delivered at the 1992 Annual Meeting of The David and Lucille Packard Foundation Fellowship.

fellowships were, in many ways, the dominant sources of support for young people entering into science or technology, and because their numbers were relatively small and because they were, as you are, very highly selected, they rather quickly developed a network. This network was to play an absolutely critical role in the years ahead. During World War II -- with its emphasis on the application of science in the radar program, in the Manhattan Project, and equally important but less well known, in the dramatic efforts to improve the delivery of high quality health care, not only to those in the battlefield but to those throughout our society -- the group of Rockefeller and Carnegie Fellows very quickly and very naturally assumed roles of major leadership -- in many cases despite their relative youth. After the war, this same group of individuals played key roles not only in advising the government as to appropriate federal roles in research and development in the postwar period but also in building the academic and high technology industrial enterprises that have served this nation so extraordinarily well in the postwar years.

Networking today, of course, is much easier than it was in the 1930s. Technology has moved forward dramatically, and the possibility of almost instantaneous communication with any individual or group of individuals lies available to us. Indeed, earlier today we were exchanging E-Mail addresses so that Packard Fellows, and happily the members of the Advisory Board, could begin the kind of networking that I believe to be essential to the full realization of the potential of the Packard Fellowship.

Tonight I would like to challenge all of us here to work actively to create the beginning of an alumni organization for Packard Fellows. This is an organization that can have major internal and external benefits and one that I think works toward achieving the goals that David Packard had in mind when he created this program.

I believe that these annual meetings that are now well established are extremely important. First of all, they allow us to put faces to the documents that we, on the Advisory Board, have been reading so carefully. They allow the Fellows to come to know one another and, hopefully, to begin the networking that I have just mentioned. But perhaps most important of all is the fact that these meetings are enormously exciting as we all have an opportunity to hear what some of the most able young people anywhere have chosen to devote their time to during the past year. In my own case, I find these two days that I spend each autumn at this annual meeting to be among the most exciting and valuable that I spend in the entire year. Where else do I find, in such attractive and accessible form, reports from the very frontiers of science and technology presented by the people who are themselves pushing back those frontiers?

I would take this opportunity also to remind you that earlier this year in Washington we announced the selection of the first 30 Presidential Young Faculty Fellows. This is a program which, let me be quite clear, was in almost every respect copied from the Packard Program. The selection process is almost precisely identical, the awards are identical, and the goals are identical, although in the Federal program we have perhaps emphasized even more than in the Packard program the teaching as well as the research aspect of the career objectives that we would like to see for our young faculty members.

I would hope that the 30 young people from the Federal program could be brought somehow into contact with the Packard Fellows because they too are remarkably highly selected, and this total group of 50 young persons selected each year as among the most able in our nation is a very important group indeed.

I am convinced that both as individuals, and as members of this larger group, the Packard Fellowship has not only the potential for great advancement of science and technology in all its areas but also an enormous potential for national service. Who better can represent the new generation of scientists and engineers, and who better can speak for that generation as we develop policies, programs, and facilities that you will use rather than us. Let me assure you that we will be calling on you for advice and counsel. The presence of an alumni association would, I believe, make this interaction more convenient.

This meeting, then, represents the end of the beginning of the Packard Fellowship. You and your predecessors have demonstrated that we have indeed evolved a highly effective selection mechanism. I have talked at length with David Packard about this program and have had the privilege of being involved with it since its inception. I know that he had very much looked forward to being here tonight and that only the most vigorous efforts on the part of his physicians have kept him from being here. I know, too, that he is delighted with the program and intensely proud of each of you who have become members of the Packard Fellowship.

Last Monday was David's 80th birthday. Let me then ask all of you to rise and join me in a slightly belated toast to David on this occasion. May he celebrate a great many more happy and healthy ones in the years ahead. To David Packard.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

DATE: 7/5/91

TO: Annedore Kushner
David & Lucille Packard Foundation
ADDRESS:

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 415/948-7658

FAX NUMBER: 415/948-5793

FROM: Marian Nida

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 456-7116

FAX NUMBER: (202)395-3261

NUMBER OF PAGES, INCLUDING COVER SHEET 2

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01a. List	Ranking of nominees [personal information redacted] (2 pp.)		(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Organization Files - Non-Government Organizations
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Association - Packard [1990-92]

Date Closed: 5/19/2010	OA/ID Number: 62086-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

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

DAVID and LUCILE
PACKARD FELLOWSHIPS

FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

THE DAVID AND LUCILE PACKARD FOUNDATION
300 SECOND STREET, SUITE 200
LOS ALTOS, CA 94022

Annedore Kushner
Program Coordinator

To: Allan B., Tom, Millie, David, Stuart Rice, Allan S.
Date: June 14, 1991
Re: LATE REFERENCE LETTERS

Attached are for your review are copies of LATE reference letters
for individuals that are on your respective review lists.



Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01b. List	Ranking of nominees [personal information redacted] (3 pp.)		(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Organization Files - Non-Government Organizations
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Association - Packard [1990-92]

Date Closed: 5/19/2010	OA/ID Number: 62086-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

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

9121776

DAVID and LUCILE
PACKARD FELLOWSHIPS

FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

June 14, 1991

D. Allan Bromley
Executive Office of the President
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Old Executive Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20506

91 JUN 18 6:10:49

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR

Dear Allan,

We received 94 nominations for 1991 (out of 104 possible submissions). We have sent a three-volume set of nominations by UPS. Enclosed with this letter are:

- (1) A list of names of nominees assigned to you for review in the first pass.
- (2) A summary listing in alphabetical order.
- (3) A summary listing sorted by field.
- (4) A summary listing sorted by university.

As was the case last year, three reviewers will rank each nomination in the first pass. We should each rank our nominees from 1 to 26 (or 25 in some cases). We will then produce an overall ranked list from which we can select the top 40 or so for the second reading by all of us.

This year we suggest the following schedule:

July 23: First pass rankings due.

August 30: Second pass rankings due.

September 6: Selection committee meeting.

Please write your rankings on the enclosed alphabetical list of your nominees and fax it to Annedore at the Foundation (FAX No.: 415-948-5793) or phone in your numbers.

Thanks for all the hard work you are about to undertake. If you have questions, comments, or suggestions, please call Annedore (at 415-948-7658).

Sincerely,



Franklin M. Orr, Jr.

FMO/ak

Enclosures

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01c. Table	Packard Foundation Fellowships: 1991 Applicants [personal information redacted] (9 pp.)	6/14/91	(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Organization Files - Non-Government Organizations
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Association - Packard [1990-92]

Date Closed: 5/19/2010	OA/ID Number: 62086-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 31, 1991

Dear David:

Many thanks for sending me a copy of your letter to Chairman Boucher and members of his subcommittee. You make a whole series of excellent points and this input will be extremely helpful in all that we are trying to do.

There is one paragraph, the second from the bottom on page 2, that addresses the need for operating costs subsidies which leaves me slightly puzzled and when next we get together I would look forward to discussing it with you.

As things now stand, I expect to arrive in Palo Alto late on Wednesday, September 4 and will be present for the entire meeting with the Packard Fellows. I very much look forward to seeing you and to hearing from them and I hope that you will be able to join us for the PCAST meeting scheduled for September 12 and 13.

I plan to be in Europe for the first week in August meeting with the Science Advisors in Bonn, Paris, and Rome and then expect to take the last two weeks of August as vacation when, for the first time in a long while, I will get all my family together at our place up in Canada.

With warmest best wishes,

Sincerely yours,



D. Allan Bromley
The Assistant to the President
for
Science and Technology

Mr. David Packard
26580 Taaffe Road
Los Altos Hills, California 94022

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

July 12, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR D. ALLAN BROMLEY

FROM:

D.A. HENDERSON

SUBJECT:

PACKARD LETTER

David and I had discussed the contents of this letter prior to his sending it and, from our discussions, we had identified specific areas of his testimony needing clarification. Except for paragraph 5 on page 2, it is an eminently sound statement, in my view. The paragraph in question simply makes no sense to me and, even with our earlier discussions as background, I can make no sense out of it. I would suggest a simple letter to David expressing your thanks for the letter and his interest.

Attachment

C O P Y

RECEIVED
DAVID PACKARD
2655 DOW STAFFE ROAD
LOS ALTOS HILLS, CALIFORNIA 94022

91 MAY 13 12:34

May 6, 1991

OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR

U. S. House of Representatives
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Subcommittee on Science
Suite 2320, Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Boucher and Members of the Subcommittee:

There were several issues discussed at the hearing on April 25 that need clarification.

There seemed to be general agreement that a fixed rate for administrative overhead would be desirable. There was a suggestion that it should contain a cost of living factor.

This fixed percentage will be applied to the adjusted direct cost base which will be the actual direct costs at the various universities. These direct costs will have the variations in the costs caused by cost of living automatically built in.

RIGHT

It follows that this fixed-cost rate should not have a cost of living bias of any kind.

There was also the suggestion that this fixed rate should be subject to negotiation by universities which considered it unfair. I would strongly oppose this position. One of the most important arguments for a fixed rate is to eliminate the extensive auditing and negotiating about administrative overhead costs and charges. This would save both the Federal Government and the universities millions of dollars every year; dollars that are spent under the present system and are a total waste.

✓

The fixed administrative overhead rate might be set a bit on the high side because it will save money even then. It should be reviewed after the first three years and probably every five years thereafter.

✓

The direct costs of university research should be defined to be as specific as possible. All federal agencies awarding contracts for university research should be required to use the same precise definition of direct costs.

✓

May 6, 1991

The most serious problem comes from the fact that federal contracts provide for depreciation whereas most universities have no depreciation costs. There are exceptions in cases where universities borrow money for buildings and equipment. In these cases the Federal Government should, and I believe generally does, pay its fair share of the cost of interest and amortization of the money borrowed.

The depreciation allowances on government contracts are generally paid into the general funds of the university. As one Stanford study admitted, ".....these funds play an extremely important role as a source of income to the Operating Budget." I do not think Stanford's situation is different from most universities. Furthermore, this has been done with the cooperation of the ONR as well as other funding agencies.

This committee should not consider it fundamentally wrong for the Federal Government to underwrite some of the operating costs of our universities. That is a subject you must address. If you agree, the only issue is whether there is a better way for this to be done.

If you agree, I would make this recommendation. All depreciation allowances which do not go to debit service should be allocated to a special building account and should not go to the general fund account. Allocations from this building fund account should be applied to new research buildings and equipment or major renovations of research facilities. Ten percent of this special building fund account could be allocated to buildings or equipment that are used primarily for administrative activities rather than research.

The need for operating costs subsidies should then be addressed as a separate issue. It could be a surcharge on all federal funding. It could be a special allocation from the special building account I have recommended. If the depreciation periods were reduced to twenty years for buildings and five to ten years for equipment, and the cost base brought up to a realistic level, there would be a substantial increase in the depreciation allowances. This would allow more room to make specific allocations for routine operating costs.

Anything that can be done to deal with this problem in a realistic way will cost the Federal Government more money. If the Federal Government is not willing to provide more

Subcommittee on Science
Page three

May 6, 1991

money to support this nation's universities, there is only one possible outcome. American universities will have to retrench.

This is the basic decision this committee has to address. Should the Federal Government provide more money to support our universities or not. I personally do not think retrenchment would necessarily be a disaster.

I am quite sure that implementing the recommendations I have given you will allow the American taxpayer to receive more value for the federal dollars that are provided, and my recommendations are more important if the overall decision is not to increase the funding.

A satisfactory solution will be difficult at best. It will be impossible if the pork barrel propensities of the members of the Congress cannot be brought into control.

I hope this communication will be helpful to the important work of your committee.

Sincerely,



David Packard
Chairman of the Board
Hewlett-Packard Company

DP/gd

"CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING"

rec'd 5/15/91

TYPE: INFORMATION

DOCUMENT NUMBER: 9121411

FROM: PACKARD, David: HEWKETT-PACKARD COMPANY

TO: DR. BROMLEY

DATE OF CORRESPONDENCE: 05/06/91

SUBJECT: LETTER TO CHAIRMAN BOUCHER AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE REGARDING THE HEARING ON 4/25/91.

ASSIGNED TO:

ACTION REQUIRED:

SENDER'S DUE DATE:

OSTP DUE DATE:

DATE COMPLETED: -----

COPIES TO: D. A.
Ken
Carl
LIFE

*Dr Henderson to see
& comment*
DOB

WHITE HOUSE TRACI

REMARKS:

DATE RECEIVED: 05/13/91

FILE: LIFE SCIENCES-INDIRECT COST

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 5, 1990

Dear Annedore:

Herewith my ranking of the 32 1990 candidates for Packard Fellowships assigned to me for the first reading.

The quality, in my opinion, has increased over those from last year and it was even more difficult than before to rank these people.

I have not taken into account the fact that I have rated two people from the same institution but will certainly do so in the next round pursuant to David's wishes.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,



D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President
for
Science and Technology

Attachment

Ms. Annedore Kushner
David and Lucille Packard Foundation
300 Second Street
Los Altos, California 94022

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
02. List	Ranking of nominees [personal information redacted] (1 pp.)	7/8/90	(b)(6)	

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Science and Technology Policy, Office of (OSTP)
Series: Bromley, D. Allan, Files
Subseries: Organization Files - Non-Government Organizations
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Association - Packard [1990-92]

Date Closed: 5/19/2010	OA/ID Number: 62086-009
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-0336-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #:
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition:
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date:

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

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

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 23, 1990

Dear David:

This is a belated follow up to our brief conversation during the PSAT meeting concerning your thoughts on next year's Packard fellowships.

I agree with you entirely that it would be desirable to change the rules so that no university in any given year would have more than a single fellowship.

I would also agree with you that it would be desirable, at least for a time, to reduce the fellowship program's emphasis on computer software and at least the basic biology aspects of biotechnology, although I would still be very receptive to people in chemical engineering or process engineering areas who might be prepared to do something constructive in the area of scale-up since I feel this is an area where we in the United States are dropping rapidly behind both our Japanese and European competitors in the whole biotechnology field.

I recognize that many of the fellows whom we have selected in the past two years already have significant support from other sources. I do, however, have a serious problem with our making that a major detriment to receiving a Packard fellowship for the simple reason that the absolutely first class people we are trying to attract to your program almost inevitably will have received significant notice and, consequently, support from one or other of the federal agencies by the time they are selected by their home university. If we insist that we focus only on those who have not been so recognized and have no alternate support, I am afraid we would be excluding a large fraction of the truly outstanding young people in the nation.

While I sympathize with your point of view and with your desire not to simply add Packard foundation resources to an already generous supply, I would suggest that this consideration be one that the advisory committee take into consideration in making recommendations to you and that we not specifically instruct the universities to filter out those having significant support. I'm afraid that by doing the latter we would

exclude from our consideration some of the truly remarkable young people whom I believe should be candidates for the growing prestige and career acceleration that the award of a Packard fellowship conveys.

I want to say again just how much I enjoyed and how much I was impressed by the reports given by almost all of the fellows with whom we met at the Aquarium last September. As I noted there, if we can continue to select people of that quality, then I am totally convinced that within a matter of only a few years the Packard fellows will collectively begin to have an impact on American science and technology that will be comparable to that of the Rockefeller and Carnegie fellows in the 30's, 40's and 50's. Your program, I believe, is off to a flying start and I consider it a personal honor to have been given the opportunity to participate in the program.

As I mentioned to you last fall at the September meeting, after considerable discussion I was able to get the office of government ethics to permit me to remain a member of your advisory board - the only external activity indeed that they allowed me to attain - but they require that I relinquish the chairmanship of the advisory committee. If Annedore Kushner would be good enough to send me a brief memorandum acknowledging that I have relinquished the chairmanship as of last September's meeting, I would appreciate it since the office of government ethics now requests a copy of such a document.

I would only tell you how very deeply I appreciate your agreement to join PCAST and your very effective participation at this first PCAST session. As I think you already sensed, the President was extremely pleased by his interaction with PCAST and looks forward to future meetings. Karl Erb and I will be in touch with you within the next few weeks to get your ideas concerning the most effective agenda for our March meeting.

I had the pleasure of meeting a few days ago with John Young and we will be working closely with the Council on Competitiveness in developing the OSTP Technology Plan. We will also, of course, want to obtain your comments and those of other PCAST members on that plan before we make it public.

It will be good to have the opportunity to work with you, both on foundation matters and in PCAST.

I will be sending you very shortly a photograph taken at Camp David that I think you will enjoy. With warmest best wishes.

Sincerely yours,



D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President
for Science and Technology

David Packard
David and Lucille Packard Foundation
300 Second Street, Suite 200
Los Altos, California 94022

"CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING"

TYPE: Action Item

DOCUMENT NUMBER: 8920835

FROM: DAVID PACKARD
DAVID AND LUCILE PACKARD FELLOWSHIPS

TO: BROMLEY

DATE OF
CORRESPONDENCE: 12/19/90

SUBJECT: DISCUSSING THE INTENDED DISTRIBUTION OF THE AWARD
AND ASKING FOR SUGGESTIONS.

ASSIGNED TO: D. Allan Bromley

ACTION REQUIRED: APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

SENDER'S DUE DATE: OSTP DUE DATE: 01/23/90

DATE COMPLETED: -----

COPIES TO:

REMARKS:

DATE RECEIVED: 12/27/90

FILE: NEOB

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 10, 1989

Dear David:

I am writing to bring you up to date on our efforts to bring the President's Council of Science and Technology Advisers into existence. You may have been wondering why the delay.

Both President Bush and I had been under the misapprehension that as President, all he had to do was select the members of his Council and then invite them to serve. On that basis, he asked me to draft a letter for his signature, which I did, but at that point we found that even the President cannot take such direct action.

After a number of discussions with C. Boyden Gray, the Counsel to the President, it became clear that it would be advantageous and would, in fact, strengthen the Council, were it to be established by a formal Executive Order signed by the President. Development of such an Executive Order is a matter of some weeks' duration but it is now essentially complete, apart from sign-off by the Justice Department and a few other legal niceties.

In parallel with a number of discussions with lawyers from the White House Office and the Office of Management and Budget, I was able to arrange for Bruce Smith of the Carnegie Commission to undertake a detailed study of the issues involved for advisory groups operating at a senior level in the Federal Government under today's conflict of interest and ethics laws. Many of you will know him from his study, a few years ago, of the status of U.S. universities. Bruce has done an absolutely scholarly job, and now that the final version is available, I am forwarding it to you herewith.

Now that we have the Executive Order establishing the President's Council essentially in hand, we can proceed to have the President formally invite you to serve. It will be necessary also for the President to provide certain formal waivers of potential conflict of interest to allow us to function without undue restriction. In some special cases, it will be necessary for individual members, despite those waivers, to recuse themselves during discussion of specific matters where they may have a special conflict or appearance of conflict.

Although this all may sound rather formidable, I hasten to emphasize that in Bruce Smith's study, he concludes that there is no reason at all that the necessary requirements cannot be satisfied without really, in any way, hindering the effective activity of the Council.

As part of the formal procedures required under the Executive Order, you will be asked to provide the now standard personal and financial data required of all members of federal advisory bodies, and the pertinent forms will be sent on to you shortly. If there are any questions concerning them, please do not hesitate to call me at (202) 456-7116.

You will be hearing from President Bush in the near future and I am very much looking forward to the pleasure of working with you.

With warmest best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Allan Bromley

D. Allan Bromley
Assistant to the President
for
Science and Technology

The Honorable David Packard
Chairman of the Board
Hewlett-Packard Company
1501 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

Enclosure

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 11, 1992

Dear David:

This is just a brief note, first of all, to express to you my appreciation of your warm and delightful hospitality at our recent PCAST meeting. Our discussions under the relaxed conditions that you provided were, I think, extremely useful and we will get the promised material for your letter to the President to you as quickly as possible.

Let me then add my warmest best wishes and congratulations on the occasion of your 80th birthday! I very much regret that I will be unable to join in the celebration of that auspicious event on September 7, but unfortunately I have a commitment, at the President's request, that I must honor here in Washington. I will, however, be joining you on September 10 and 11 for the meeting of the Packard Foundation and look forward to seeing you then.

In my opinion, the candidates who have applied for Packard Fellowships this year are even more outstanding across the board than those in previous years and consequently rating them has turned out to be a more difficult task than in any prior year. You can be extremely proud of the group that you have assembled, of the reputation that has already been established for the Packard Fellowships, and I hope of the copy of your program that has now been established under Presidential auspices here in the Federal Government. From what we have seen in the present applicant pool there clearly are worthy candidates for the 50 slots that are now open each year. But I do have some question as to how much further one can expand this kind of program without seeing some decrease in the quality which is now superb.

Noting that a substantial number of this year's applicants for Packard Fellowships have already been granted Sloan Foundation Fellowships we must begin to consider, as a matter of policy, whether we wish to avoid overlapping fellowships or whether we should take the point that truly outstanding candidates should not be precluded from holding more than one of the most prestigious awards simultaneously. We must also address the question of whether you wish to focus your fellowships on young persons who effectively are moving directly through academic careers or whether a few of the applicants this year, for example, who have spent something like five to ten years in industry prior to coming back to the universities, should be treated on an equal footing.

I look forward to seeing you on the 10th of September and, in the meantime, every good wish for a very happy birthday and a great many happy and healthy ones to follow.

Sincerely yours,



D. Allan Bromley
The Assistant to the President
for
Science and Technology

Mr. David Packard
Chairman of the Board
Hewlett-Packard Company
1501 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 7, 1992

Dear David:

Barbara and I send heartiest congratulations on your 80th birthday.

This is also a good chance to say, once again, just how much the Nation appreciates the many times and ways you have served your country. Your advice and counsel have been particularly valuable to me through the years.

Our warmest wishes to you, David, for a wonderful year ahead and for many returns of this happy occasion.

Sincerely,



The Honorable David Packard
26580 Taaffe Road
Los Altos Hills, California 94022

P.S. Many Happy Returns -



Packard to Leave \$2 Billion to Foundation

Washington Post, 4/29/88, p. G4

Associated Press

SAN FRANCISCO, April 28—David Packard, the 75-year-old cofounder of the pioneering Hewlett-Packard computer company, plans to leave \$2 billion to the charitable foundation he set up, executive director Cole Wilbur said today.

The donation to the David and Lucile Packard Foundation of Los Alamos, created in 1964 by Packard and his wife to finance education and health projects worldwide, will consist of Hewlett-Packard Corp. stock, Wilbur said.

The foundation, with a current wealth of \$145 million, would become

one of the 10 richest charities in the nation, ranking with others such as the Ford Foundation, which is valued at \$4.7 billion, said Wilbur.

Packard will also make smaller donations to other charities not yet designated, Wilbur said.

"His feeling is that there are a lot of important concerns in research and education, and he'd like to help develop them and to help really make a difference in this community and the world," said Wilbur.

Packard, chairman of the Palo Alto-based Hewlett-Packard Corp., was not available for comment.

Packard works about two days a week at the scientific instrument and computer research and development company he founded in 1939 with William Hewlett.

Packard's wife died in 1987. The couple's four children are closely involved in planning the donation, Wilbur said. He said Packard made his intentions known April 22.

The foundation's programs include fellowships in science and engineering for young professors; family planning programs in the United States and in developing countries; and environmental projects.