

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Domestic Policy Council

Series/Staff Member: Diana Fortuna

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 12028

FolderID:

Folder Title:
[National Disability Policy Review] Minutes

Stack:

S

Row:

97

Section:

3

Shelf:

1

Position:

1

1130 → Eddie E (PCED), Linn, W

work group language re: coms as team members

interested in · employment

· school to work

· accommodations

} materials

EMPL : BLN → business leadership network
- go out: find model employers who
~~employ~~ employ b/c it makes good business
sense → understand: can
educate re: realities from a
business perspective: draw on
other bus to do the same

ACCOM : JAN → jobs accom network → West VA. →
to get into re: accom: make
matches

Minutes of January 9, 1995 meeting of the National Disability Policy Review Convenors.

The first meeting of the convenors of the National Disability Policy Review (NDPR) was held from 3:15-4:15 in room 211 OEOB and was attended by the following participants:

Carol Rasco, Jeremy Ben-Ami, Bob Williams (HHS), Kate Warren (HHS), Judy Huemann (Educ.), Connie Garner (Educ.), Susan Daniels (SSA), Ken McGill (SSA), Judy Feder (HHS), Lynn Margherio, Lisa Fairhall (OMB), Richard Green (OMB), Diana Fortuna, Liz Savage (DOJ), Elisabeth Cohen.

INTRODUCTION/ REVIEW FOCUS AND DIRECTION:

Carol Rasco, who facilitated the meeting, welcomed convenors, commented on official membership of commissioners on the review team and encouraged work groups to enlist their participation;

Judy Huemann then stressed the challenge of over-arching principles incorporating the various perspectives of the working groups;

NEXT MEETING OF FULL REVIEW TEAM/ AGENCY INFORMATION REQUEST:

* stressed the importance for convenors to meet regularly (at least once before each meeting of full review team (Carol Rasco);

a sample agency information request form was then distributed by Lisa Fairhall; before next full meeting of the team, Lisa and Richard plan to present information thus providing a common starting point; (the group agreed to get comments to Lisa by close of business Wednesday 1/11 - final request form to be sent out with updated work plan and letter from Carol Rasco and Alice Rivlin requesting form completion).

{For the next full meeting of review team we will also presenting the lay of the land/ changing attitudes by bringing in speakers and providing papers either already in existence or drafted by Judy Huemann. The need was also expressed that all review team members be as educated and aware as possible with regard to issues affecting individuals with disabilities}

NEXT STEPS:

Guiding Principles:

* highlighted the importance of giving thought to two issues: 1) how we will get wide spread input from other agencies and the community and how to incorporate this input and 2) whether we intend them to be or not, they will become public and we should be thinking through the consequences of that (Bob Williams).

Adult Employment:

* work group has met and discussed and modified a charter and short-term work plan. Each participant was asked to provide data - no full response at this time. Next meeting scheduled for

Wednesday 1/11; need employment and training side -- working on labor representation at next meeting (Susan Daniels);

School-to-Work:

* highlighted the importance that review principles remain in sync with over-all administration view. Example: cash benefit programs -- helpful for DPC staff to provide information to ensure consistent direction (Judy Heumann);

* balance between cash and in-kind benefits is difficult to discuss when we're not sure what other thinking is taking place (Susan Daniels);

* the group will be meeting next week -- pushing for labor to attend -- will look at data and charter and use Lisa's information request (Judy Heumann);

Accommodations:

* currently looking at accommodations policy developed in Bush administration and adopted by all agencies; will meet by the end of the month to review/ reality check (Liz Savage);

Childhood:

* the short-term agenda will include: IDEA and SSI options; and the long-term agenda will identify broad areas - health, education, income support, data (in terms of what data do we need?), consolidation and streamlining issues; asked each member to take the lead on an issue; meeting with advocacy groups late next week (Judy Feder);

ADVOCACY GROUPS:

Jeremy Ben-Ami expressed an interest in a meeting of convenors and advocacy groups, the timing and list of groups were then discussed; some comments listed below;

* might be wise to have more meat on the bones: data/ clarity/ time line; we are currently meeting with advocacy community to discuss IDEA -- mentioned possibility of sending a letter or an over-view memo (Judy Heumann);

* mentioned the possibility of including advocacy groups in the discussion of the guiding principles amongst the convenors prior to presenting the principles to the full team -- possibly in 3 or 4 weeks? (Carol Rasco and Jeremy Ben-Ami);

* February is more realistic (Bob Williams/ group agreed);

Jeremy Ben-Ami gave an overview of activity on the legislative end including the bi-partisan composition of meetings on the hill. Carol Rasco highlighted the importance of including representatives early.

Group agreed to meet at the end of the week of 1/31 to discuss guiding principles.

Minutes of January 9, 1995 meeting of the National Disability Policy Review Convenors.

The first meeting of the convenors of the National Disability Policy Review (NDPR) was held from 3:15-4:15 in room 211 OEOB and was attended by the following participants:

Carol Rasco, Jeremy Ben-Ami, Bob Williams (HHS), Kate Warren (HHS), Judy Huemann (Educ.), Connie Garner (Educ.), Susan Daniels (SSA), Ken McGill (SSA), Judy Feder (HHS), Lynn Margherio, Lisa Fairhall (OMB), Richard Green (OMB), Diana Fortuna, Liz Savage (DOJ), Elisabeth Cohen.

INTRODUCTION/ REVIEW FOCUS AND DIRECTION:

Carol Rasco, who facilitated the meeting, welcomed convenors, commented on official membership of commissioners on the review team and encouraged work groups to enlist their participation;

Judy Heumann then stressed the challenge of over-arching principles incorporating the various perspectives of the working groups;

NEXT MEETING OF FULL REVIEW TEAM/ AGENCY INFORMATION REQUEST:

* stressed the importance for convenors to meet regularly (at least once before each meeting of full review team (Carol Rasco);

a sample agency information request form was then distributed by Lisa Fairhall; before next full meeting of the team, Lisa and Richard plan to present information thus providing a common starting point; (the group agreed to get comments to Lisa by close of business Wednesday 1/11 - final request form to be sent out with updated work plan and letter from Carol Rasco and Alice Rivlin requesting form completion).

{For the next full meeting of review team we will also presenting the lay of the land/ changing attitudes by bringing in speakers and providing papers either already in existence or drafted by Judy Heumann. The need was also expressed that all review team members be as educated and aware as possible with regard to issues affecting individuals with disabilities}

NEXT STEPS:

Guiding Principles:

* highlighted the importance of giving thought to two issues: 1) how we will get wide spread input from other agencies and the community and how to incorporate this input and 2) whether we intend them to be or not, they will become public and we should be thinking through the consequences of that (Bob Williams).

Adult Employment:

* work group has met and discussed and modified a charter and short-term work plan. Each participant was asked to provide data - no full response at this time. Next meeting scheduled for

Wednesday 1/11; need employment and training side -- working on labor representation at next meeting (Susan Daniels);

School-to-Work:

- * highlighted the importance that review principles remain in sync with over-all administration view. Example: cash benefit programs -- helpful for DPC staff to provide information to ensure consistent direction (Judy Heumann);

- * balance between cash and in-kind benefits is difficult to discuss when we're not sure what other thinking is taking place (Susan Daniels);

- * the group will be meeting next week -- pushing for labor to attend -- will look at data and charter and use Lisa's information request (Judy Heumann);

Accommodations:

- * currently looking at accommodations policy developed in Bush administration and adopted by all agencies; will meet by the end of the month to review/ reality check (Liz Savage);

Childhood:

- * the short-term agenda will include: IDEA and SSI options; and the long-term agenda will identify broad areas - health, education, income support, data (in terms of what data do we need?), consolidation and streamlining issues; asked each member to take the lead on an issue; meeting with advocacy groups late next week (Judy Feder);

ADVOCACY GROUPS:

Jeremy Ben-Ami expressed an interest in a meeting of convenors and advocacy groups, the timing and list of groups were then discussed; some comments listed below;

- * might be wise to have more meat on the bones: data/ clarity/ time line; we are currently meeting with advocacy community to discuss IDEA -- mentioned possibility of sending a letter or an over-view memo (Judy Heumann);

- * mentioned the possibility of including advocacy groups in the discussion of the guiding principles amongst the convenors prior to presenting the principles to the full team -- possibly in 3 or 4 weeks? (Carol Rasco and Jeremy Ben-Ami);

- * February is more realistic (Bob Williams/ group agreed);

Jeremy Ben-Ami gave an overview of activity on the legislative end including the bi-partisan composition of meetings on the hill. Carol Rasco highlighted the importance of including representatives early.

Group agreed to meet at the end of the week of 1/31 to discuss guiding principles.

Minutes from 1/9/95 meeting of National Disability Policy Review Convenors.

Present: Carol Rasco, Jeremy Ben-Ami, Bob Williams (HHS), Kate Warren (HHS), Judy Huemann (Educ.), Connie Garner (Educ.), Susan Daniels (SSA), Ken McGill (SSA), Judy Feder (HHS), Lynn Margherio, Lisa Fairhall (OMB), Richard Green (OMB), Diana Fortuna, Liz Savage (DOJ), Elisabeth Cohen.

INTRODUCTION/ REVIEW FOCUS AND DIRECTION:

Rasco: commented on official membership of commissioners on the review team and encouraged work groups to enlist their participation;

Huemann: stressed the challenge of over-arching principles incorporating various perspectives;

NEXT MEETING OF FULL REVIEW TEAM/ AGENCY INFORMATION REQUEST:

Rasco: important for convenors to meet regularly (at least once before each meeting of full review team;

Fairhall: distributed sample agency information request form; before next full meeting of the team, Lisa and Richard to present information -- provision of common starting point; (group agreed to get comments to Lisa by close of business Wednesday 1/11 - final request form to be sent out with updated work plan and letter from Carol Rasco and Alice Rivlin requesting form completion).

{For the next full meeting of review team we will also presenting the lay of the land/ changing attitudes by bringing in speakers and providing papers either already in existence or drafted by Judy Heumann.}

NEXT STEPS:

Guiding Principles:

Williams: *Highlighted importance of giving thought to 2 issues: 1. Trust*
Judy give the sum, but important to highlight two issues on principles once this small group has hammered them out. Must give great thought to both 1) how we will get wide spread input from other agencies and the community and how to incorporate and 2) whether we intend them to be or not, they will become public and we should be thinking through the consequences of that.

Adult Employment:

Daniels: work group met and discussed and modified charter and short-term work plan. Each participant was asked to provide data - no full response at this time. Next meeting scheduled for Wednesday 1/11; need employment and training side -- working on labor representation at next meeting;

School-to-Work:

Heumann: helpful to keep principles in sync with over-all administration view. Example: cash benefit programs -- helpful for DPC staff to provide info. to ensure consistent direction;

Daniels: balance between cash and in-kind benefits is difficult to discuss when we're not sure what other thinking is taking place;

Heumann: meeting next week -- pushing for labor to attend -- will look at data and charter and use Lisa's information request;

Accommodations:

Savage: looking at accommodations policy developed in Bush administration and adopted by all agencies; will meet by the end of the month for reality check;

Childhood:

on SSF

★ Feder: short-term agenda: IDEA and options;
long-term: identified broad areas - health, education, income support, data (in terms of what data do we need?), consolidation and streamlining issues; asked each member to take the lead on an issue; meeting with advocacy groups late next week;

ADVOCACY GROUPS:

Ben-Ami: plan on meeting of convenors and advocacy groups -- let's discuss timing;

Heumann: would like to have more meat on the bones: data/ clarity/ time line; we are meeting with advocacy community to discuss IDEA -- could we send a letter/ over-view memo?

Rasco/ when 5 convenors meet to discuss guiding principles,
Ben-Ami: could we include advocacy groups and discuss principles with them before bringing it to the full review team -- 3 or 4 weeks?

Williams: February is more realistic (group agreed);

Ben-Ami/ overview of legislative end; bi-partisan basis,
Rasco: important to include representatives early.

Group agreed to meet at the end of the week of 1/31 to discuss guiding principles.

*Need expressed all group members to
be fully aware of ~~the~~ issues abloom
involving & constituents*

1994

Minutes from December 21, meeting of the National Disability Policy Review (NDPR)

The second meeting of the NDPR was held from 2-3:35 and

Accommodations: was attended by 31 participants. Belle Sawhill and Stan Herr explained that 2 of the 4 recommendations of the Federal Disability Accommodations Working Group will proceed -- and Alice Rivlin (who were in meetings with the President) and facilitated much of the work of this group will be folded into the Accommodations Work Group to be convened by Deval Patrick.

Adult Employment:

Charter distributed, and Susan Daniels explained that a very rough draft was discussed at the first Adult Employment Work Group meeting and revisions were made as a group. (The possibility of incorporating some of the language in this group's charter when revising the Guiding Principles document was later mentioned.)

School-to-Work Transitions:

Judy Heumann explained that most of the programs are not part of the broader re-employment programs. She raised the concern that as one-stop shopping models are being designed, we must be sure that they will be qualified to serve individuals with disabilities. There is clear agreement that collaboration has strong benefits, but we must pay attention to service-delivery issues.

Belle Sawhill noted the need to allow our proposals with the proposed M-C Bill of Rights.

It was noted that to effectively various labor issues, Labor and Commerce must be part of the discussion -- how do you want to transcribe this part of the discussion? is essential

Guiding Principles:

Post-It Fax Note	7671	Date	1-10-95	# of pages	1
To	Elizabeth Cohen	From	Stan Herr		
Co/Dept	DPC	Co.	Mr. Lane		
Phone #	202-456-2846	Phone #	(410) 706-3191		
Fax #	(202) 456-7028	Fax #	(410) 706-3856		

things that should be going on in school and work -- access is one of the life cycle issues that we are able to address this;

the specific areas to which it which is recreation;

Belle Sawhill: The Architectural Barriers Compliance Board is also addressing these issues;

B.J.??: re deck chair -- executive Camp -- convenors

in addition to school and work settings; has additional merit of bringing fresh perspective to look at our federal programs (Lisa Fairhall and Belle Sawhill)

- * ADA principles and purpose language is incorporated in this draft, and ADA reaches recreational and other public accommodations (Bob Williams)

- * Jeffersonian principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) also embody notion that people should have equal access to full range of life activities, and bear reference in this document (Stan Herr)

- * The Architectural Barriers Compliance Board also addresses these issues (Belle Sawhill)

- * importance of early meeting of the five convenors with Review co-leaders to coordinate work of the overall Review (Belle Sawhill with concurrence of others)

- * importance of reference to racial equality and fair distribution of goods and services to "all persons with disabilities regardless of race" (John Kraft check name Elizabeth)

- * commending draftsmen for this "excellent statement" that might work perfectly a preamble or executive summary, but expressing need for a more concise and discrete statement of principles if possible (Paul Miller)

- * subsequent concurrence that a briefer, more selective statement of principles was needed to really guide and drive the Review (Belle Sawhill and others)

- * various individuals noted portions of this statement that expressed such core principles, drawing attention to Page three, second full paragraph: (beginning "One of the most critical challenges we face... towards independence." etc, followed by two bullet points ending with "full and productive lives."

and to page 4 and the its first bullet point on equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency

- * utility of cost-benefit analysis was raised (David Levine)

- *

Need to clarify the role of the Federal government in disability policy (Judy Heumann)

- * need to define the federal role vis-a-vis state and local government roles (Ron Glaser)

- * need for nuanced discussion of the allocation of resources and responsibilities between the federal and state levels of government; concern expressed on interpretation that could be seen as handing everything back to the states (Paul Miller)

elizabeth under this section continue to put speakers name in parentheses after item as above Bob Williams: * strong concern expressed that diminution of the federal role could produce conditions that fostered historic discrimination in this field; need for further conversation before we can know how to

draft a principle on federalism and disability policy

Roberta Achtenberg: Need to recognize this as an

issue of constitutional proportions

Belle Sawhill: *Re-direction of policies aimed at increasing capabilities to live independently is the essence (Belle Sawhill and others)

Bob Williams: Caution expressed that when states at one time had full play and plenary power over our issues, massive discrimination resulted

Stan Herr: Difficult to make generalizations regarding the Federal role in issues that vary from civil rights where federal interest is strongest to different types of services and supports; reference to five bullets on page 2 of the statement that offer concise guidance to this National Disability Policy Review on federal legislative finds on rights and responsibilities of people with disabilities (Stan Herr)

Jeremy Ben-Ami: *Query; Are we getting to what the group had in mind when

we initially agreed that a statement of guiding principles is needed?

Judy Heumann: * noting that Bob had done an incredible job and his draft provided a vehicle for moving the dialogue forward; observing that this type of discussion was helpful as we moved to a briefer, clearer public document

Jeff Levi: *observing that as this goes beyond an inside conversation and becomes a public document, important to stress that everyone is at risk of becoming disabled at some point in one's life, that disability is not limited to a static group of people, and that the issues are of universal interest and importance (

Marilyn W. Thornton: * greater stress should be devoted to the principles underlying the ADA since every area of a person's life is implicated by the ADA's principles;

Lisa Fairhall: * suggesting ADA implications for income support;

Liz Savage: * noting the breadth of government purposes covered under the ADA;

Susan Daniels: * questioning whether the principles stated give us an answer when competing values conflict or to the question of means; although we all probably agree on the goals of ADA, this will not settle some disagreements regarding the means or other programmatic decisions

* suggesting that we may not be able to resolve such issues at the front end of this process, but may first need to look at the findings of our five work groups

Judy Heumann: Query: Are we spending the \$170 billion on disability matters in the most effective way? For her, crux of the question is that we don't need to do a lot of research to say we aren't, but we need to know if there are certain values we can apply to move forward

Belle Sawhill: agreeing that we absolutely should be thinking in a very zero-based way and thinking about an entire set of programs and how they interact with each other; the offer was made to have a meeting to present data on how monies are now spent, with general agreement from the group that this would be a good idea. Purpose of formulating principles is to give us discipline in governmental process
(Belle Sawhill)

Paul Miller: stressing importance of Federal government serving as a model of access since others look to us in compliance with legislation and guidelines

Closing Comments

Jeremy Ben-Ami made the following points:

- * NDPR has broad-based purposes, including a look from from the ground up at our disability programs to furthering the goals of ADA; Team members were asked to please inform their staff that the goals and scope of the review are indeed broad

- * It is critical to attend meeting so that progress can occur and that there is continuity of participation by all agencies

- * Alice Rivlin and Carol Rasco are committed to the review and reiterating that a meeting with the President precluded their attendance on this date

- * Work groups to flesh out detailed steps and come back in January with a work plan for each group;

- * the convenors would meet in the beginning of January per the suggestion today

- * NDPR would have a full meeting in late January

- * Expanded list of advocates to be consulted and the revised workplan contained in the packet. Members urged to please submit any comments to those documents

- * Presentation on data/ baseline spending will be scheduled

Lisa Fairhall:

- * Helpful for agencies to present data with brief program description;
- * Memo to be distributed with specifications.

Jeremy Ben-Ami:

* Expressed thanks to Stan Herr whose fellowship is ending for his help in this Review and other disability policy matters.

Belle Sawhill and Jeremy Ben-Ami adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m..

saved as: dec21.minLisa Fairhall/ There are other things that should be going on in Belle Sawhill: addition to school and work -- access is one of them -- not just school and work. The life cycle approach will enable us to address this;

Bob Williams: Lift from the ADA the specific areas to which it applies, one of which is recreation;

Belle Sawhill: The Architectural Barriers Compliance Board is also addressing these issues;

B.J.???: re deck chair -- executive Camp -- convenors

Shaw

Minutes from December 21 meeting of the National Disability Policy Review

Accommodations:

Stan Herr explained that 3 of the 4 recommendations of the *Federal Disability Accommodations Working Group* will proceed -- much of the work of this group will be folded into the *Accommodations Work Group* to be convened by Deval Patrick.

Adult Employment:

Charter distributed and Susan Daniels explained that a very rough draft was discussed at the first *Adult Employment Work Group* meeting and revisions were made as a group. (The possibility of incorporating some of the language in this group's charter when revising the *Guiding Principles* document was later mentioned.)

School-to-Work Transitions:

Judy Heumann explained that most of the programs are not part of re-employment programs. She raised the concern that as one-stop shopping models are being designed, we must be sure that they will be qualified to serve individuals with disabilities. There is clear agreement that collaboration has strong benefits, but we must pay attention to service delivery issues.

Belle Sawhill: 4 planks -- input on President's Tax -- M-C Bill of Rights.

**** if we are going to work on labor issues -- labor and commerce must be apart of the discussion ** how do you want to transcribe this part of the discussion????**

Guiding Principles:

Jim Lyons: How are we addressing the access question?

Lisa Fairhall/ There are other things that should be going on in addition to school and work -- access is one of them -- not just school and work. The life cycle approach will enable us to address this;

Bob Williams: Lift from the ADA the specific areas to which it applies, one of which is recreation;

Belle Sawhill: The Architectural Barriers Compliance Board is also addressing these issues;

B.J.???: re deck chair -- executive Camp -- convenors

group should meet (check stan's notes)

John Kraft: Mention of minorities needs to be added -- "all persons with disabilities regardless of race" is an important component of this document;

Paul Miller: This excellent statement might work perfectly as a preamble / executive summary. Concern re: a more precise/ discrete statement if possible; (Belle Sawhill later mentioned that she also envisioned a more concise and selective version -- others agreed);

Page three, second full paragraph: (beginning "One of the most critical challenges we face..." and followed by 2 bullet points might work in the more concise draft)

David Levine: Costs and benefits -- to what extent will we consider these tough questions -- Belle agreed this issue needs to be further discussed;

Judy Heumann: Need to establish the role of the Federal Government in disability policy;

Ronald Glaser?: Federal role vis-a-vis state and local roles;

Paul Miller: Allocation of resources/ federal/state -- more specific; concern re: interpretation of handing everything back to the states;

Bob Williams: Would you link the federal role back to historic discrimination? I think we need to have that conversation before any of us can know how to draft that principle;

Belle Sawhill: Re-direction aimed at increasing capabilities to live independently -- general agreement that this is the essence;

Gary Blumenthal: Relationship for sight? (check stan's notes)

Roberta Achtenberg: Need to lead that this is an issue of constitutional proportions;

Bob Williams: The states at one time had full play over our issues and what resulted was massive discrimination;

Stan Herr: Difficult to make generalizations regarding the Federal role; interests vary (stan - you also discussed the 5 bullets on page 2 - general statement)

Jeremy Ben-Ami: Are we getting to what the group had in mind when we initially agreed that a statement of guiding principles is needed?

Judy Heumann: Bob has done an incredible job and is allowing the dialogue to move forward -- we need to go through this type of discussion; too long, not clear enough -- public document - why doing it?

Jeff Levi: Needs to also be something of a public document - almost an inside conversation; important to stress that everyone is at risk of becoming disabled at one point in their lives -- not a static group of people;

Marilyn W. Thornton: Every area of a person's life is addressed in the ADA principles;

Lisa Fairhall: ADA/ income support;

Liz Savage: All purposes of government stated in ADA;

Susan Daniels: Will the principles give us an answer to the question of means? We all probably agree on the goals of ADA, but may have some disagreement regarding the means (programmatic and others); Example -- SSI as based on ???, not lack of ??? **stan's notes!

Jeremy Ben-Ami: I don't know if we can do that at the front end -- we may need to look at the findings of the work groups first;

Judy Heumann: Are we spending the 170 billion in the most effective way? Crux of the question; We don't need to do a lot of research to say we aren't, but we need to know if there are certain values we can then move forward on;

Belle Sawhill: Absolutely -- you should be thinking in a very zero-based way and think about an entire set of programs and how they inter-act with each other; Would it be helpful to have a meeting of data presentations -- \$\$\$ spent? (General agreement that this would be a good idea);

Principles give us discipline

Paul Miller: Role of Federal government -- not lose sight of the fact that with respect to legislation, we ask the Federal government to pay attention to certain guidelines -- we need to set this example;

Closing -- Jeremy Ben-Ami:

- * Purpose: broad-based look from ground zero - to further goals of ADA; please share with your staffs that the goals and scope of the review are broad;
- * It is critical to attend meeting so that progress can occur;
- * Alice Rivlin and Carol Rasco are committed to the review (meeting with the President so unable to attend);
- * Work groups to flesh out detailed steps and come back in January with a work plan for each group;
- * Judy's suggestion that the convernors meet -- beginning of January;
- * Full meeting in late January;
- * Expanded list of advocates and workplan in packet -- please submit any comments;
- * Information presentation with data/ baseline spending;

Lisa Fairhall:

- * Helpful for agencies to present data with brief program description;
- * Memo to be distributed with specifications.

saved as: dec21.min

Jim Lyons (AG) --

P. H.

Activity

Hammer

Berkley

John Paul

Spaul Drive

(3rd committee)
Paul Miller

(Blumenthal/Miller)

recreation
Access Bd --

HTJ unrepresented;

JH: Judy & Susan → pulling together Eastland + S-T-L
BS: 4 planks -- (insert on Preamble) T & M-C Billy R

JH S-T-W Camp -- reemployment group;

* DOL -- Need attention of D.O.L.
1 stop shopping

BJ -- reorganize deck chair

Exec. Camp - Conner's group

JH: on Comm

Jefferson -- "having fun"

- Minorities
- racial
- Equal access --

Miller: excellent statement -- preamble
~~was~~ lot of draft
looking discrete + concise //

David Colman - CEA -- costs and benefits
Economics
"greatest extent possible"
argument: ? to be discussed
further

Judy H -- Rule of Fed govt in DP

Paul M -- Allocation / response /
Fed State -- more specific

Belle Sanbrell -- more concise +
selective -- intellectually
discriminating

policy criteria
Gary Blumenthal -- relationship for right

JH: • Bob's incredible job;
Too long
Not clear enough
as guide
public document -- why doing it?

Levy - AIDS guy -- Levy;
too much inside document
49 mol -- not a lot /
evaluation for every person
at some point in life --

Thornton -- ADA principles.

Eachall -- ADA -- more support /

Savage -- all programs of govt in support of ADA

Familar
BS -- 175 bil better way // to spend it

Principles giving us discipline --
Goals v. means.

Sum -- Flexibility / trade-off / compromise
(examples) -- conflict in principles

Meaningful discussion -- re use of
use of \$175 bil.

SSI as based on 2 MDLs, not
not on lack of benefits.

Jeremy stresses: Focus on a 0-based way about
this

BS -- life cycle. people not paying
affers program over
errors

CEA says

2000 --

optimizing res -- transact costs
costs in civil service --
others say v. low.

Fairhall -- union on collab

Accomoda

3/4 recomenda will be processed

Adolt

Charter distributed

Susan explained
draft was
distributed -
discussed
revised

* Today suggested sm. mtg of chairs: a few
others to keep on track

Transition -

ReEmployment - most of our programs
now are not partic. reempl. program.
-- of concern -- as these 1 stop
shopping models are being
designed -- how can we be
sure they will be qualified to
serve -- collab has benef. but
~~overage~~ must pay attn to serving
indiv & disab

If were going to work on labor issues --
labor : commerce should be a part

Jim Lyons: access question

Disability - other things that should be
Beck - going on in addition to school
: work - access

Bob - 1.1 ft from ADA in specific areas

to which it applies one
of which is recreation

Belle - American Barriers Compliance Board
also addressing these issues

? mention of minorities
adhering to principles - important
to ~~also~~ mention importance of
= also regardless of race

Paul Miller: excellent statement
concern re: whatever comes out
of review - 1st draft preamble
but was thinking about something
more discrete/precise

David: costs: benefits & to what extent
to we ^{consider} ~~make~~ these tough
decisions

Belle: important question we need
to discuss it more

Judy: need to establish role in Fed govt in
sub policy

(Guy next to Judy)
Fed role vis a vis State: local
roles.

Barb I think we need to have that
conversation 13-4 any way US can
know how to draft that principle

Zeile → similar reaction - nice preamble

2nd Bill # ;

Paul → p. 30 E 2 bullet points

Zeile → redirection aimed at increasing capabilities to live independently

- general agreement that this
is the essence →

Paul → warn re: interpretation of handing back to ^{states}

Bob → would you like the full role back
to historic discriminating

Pohor → need to lead that this is a ~~not~~ issue of
constitutional proportions

Bob → he ~~creates~~ ^{at} 1 time had all
plays over ~~our~~ issues what
resulted was massive
discrimination -- ~~we do not~~
~~want to be~~

Stan → can't make generalization:
Federal role -- interests vary
~~critical~~

p. 2 - 5 bullets → primary central statement
Σ

Jeremy → are we getting to what you
have in mind →

Judy - allowing dialogue to move forward -- need to go through this type of discussion

Jebb
Cui needs to also be something of a public clown -- almost an inside conversation -- important to stress that everyone at risk of becoming disabled at some point in their lives -- not a static group of people

First
to Liz
(Marilyn
Thornton) from what I've learned - not every area of a person's life addressed in ADA

Susan - will the principles give us answer to question of means

we all probably agree on goals of ADA but may have some disagreement: means (programmatic: others,) to achieve these goals

JBA: I don't know if we can do that at the front end -- we may need to look at findings of work groups first

Judy - we are spending the 170 billion
dollars in the most effective way
-- cross of question
- continued to do a lot of research
to say we aren't so but we
need to know where
certain values we can
then move forward on?

Jelle - how so when - you should
be thinking in a very zero-based
way: think about entire set of
programs: how they interact
each other

→ would it be helpful to have
amtz. of data presentations
-- ~~spend~~

Paul Miller: role of fed govt -- not lose sight
of fact that in respect to
regulation - we ask fed govt
to pay attention to certain
guidelines -- we need to
set this example

purpose:

JBA - Broad based look from ground
zero to higher goals of ADA
- share in global goals of review -
verbal scope

- Carol: Alice would attend if it weren't for my President
- now for subgroups he flesh out detailed steps -- come back in Jan to work plan for each group
- Judy's suggestion - begin Jan - corners late Jan - full my
- + baseline view - information presentation
re: data / baseline spending

USA: helpful for agencies to present 94/5 data - brief description of programs
memo out to specify →

Minutes of December 21, 1994 meeting of the National Disability Policy Review (NDPR)

The second meeting of the NDPR was held from 2:00-3:35 p.m. and was attended by 31 participants. Belle Sawhill and Jeremy Ben-Ami conveyed the regrets of Carol Rasco and Alice Rivlin (who were in meetings with the President) and facilitated the meeting.

Accommodations:

Liz Savage noted that the group would meet soon and Stan Herr explained that recommendations of the *Federal Disability Accommodations Working Group* were forwarded and that much of the work of this group will be folded into the *Accommodations Work Group* to be convened by Deval Patrick.

Adult Employment:

Susan Daniels distributed the group's charter and explained that at their first *Adult Employment Work Group* meeting, the group discussed some principles relevant to employment. (The possibility of incorporating some of this language in a revised set of *Guiding Principles* was later mentioned.)

School-to-Work Transitions:

Judy Heumann explained that most of the school-to-work programs are not part of the broader re-employment programs. She raised the concern that as one-stop shopping models in this field are being designed, the NDPR must be sure that they will be qualified to serve individuals with disabilities. Although there is clear agreement that collaboration has strong benefits, the collaboration process must be sensitive to service delivery issues.

Belle Sawhill noted the need to align our proposals with the President's proposed Middle Class Bill of Rights.

It was noted that to work effectively on various labor issues, Labor and Commerce participation is essential.

Guiding Principles:

Bob Williams, the convenor of the Guiding Principles group, distributed a preliminary draft based on the initial meeting of the group held on December 14. He summarized the document and the bulk of the meeting was then devoted to comments and reactions. This feedback included the following points:

- * desirability of addressing access to recreational facilities and other activities that contribute to the enjoyment of life

(Jim Lyons);

* potential of the life cycle approach to address access issues in a variety of contexts in addition of school and work settings; this approach has additional merit of bringing fresh perspective to look at our federal programs (Lisa Fairhall and Belle Sawhill);

* ADA principles and purpose language is incorporated in this draft, and ADA reaches recreational and other public accommodations (Bob Williams);

* Jeffersonian principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence (life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness) also embody notion that people should have equal access to full range of life activities, and bear reference in this document (Stan Herr);

* The Architectural Barriers Compliance Board is also addresses these issues (Belle Sawhill);

* importance of scheduling an early meeting of the five convenors and Review co-leaders to coordinate work of the overall Review (Belle Sawhill and others);

* importance of reference to racial equality and fair distribution of goods and services to "all persons with disabilities regardless of race" (John Kraft);

* commended draftsmen for this "excellent statement" that might work perfectly as a preamble or executive summary., but expressed need for a more concise and discrete statement if possible (Paul Miller);

* subsequent concurrence that a briefer, more selective statement of principles is needed to really guide and drive the Review (Belle Sawhill and others);

* various individuals noted portions of this statement that expressed such core principles, drawing attention to Page three, second full paragraph: (beginning "One of the most critical challenges we face..." and followed by 2 bullet points ending with "full and productive lives.") and to page 4 and its first bullet point on equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency;

* utility of cost-benefit analysis raised (David Levine)

* need to clarify the role of the Federal Government in disability policy (Judy Heumann);

* need to define the federal role vis-a-vis state and local government roles (Ron Glaser);

* need for nuanced discussion of the allocation of resources and responsibilities between the federal and state levels of government; concern expressed on interpretation that could be seen as handing everything back to the states (Paul Miller);

* strong concern expressed that diminution of federal role could produce conditions that fostered historic discrimination in this field; need for further conversation before we can know how to draft a principle on federalism and disability policy (Bob Williams);

* need to recognize this as an issue of constitutional proportions (Roberta Achtenberg);

* re-direction of policies aimed at increasing capabilities to live independently is the essence (Belle Sawhill and others);

* caution expressed that when the states at one time had full play and plenary power over our issues, massive discrimination resulted (Bob Williams);

* difficult to make generalizations regarding the federal role in issues that vary from civil rights where federal interest is strongest to different types of services and supports; reference to five bullets on page 2 of the statement that offer concise guidance to this NDPR on federal legislative finds on rights and responsibilities of people with disabilities (Stan Herr);

* query: are we getting to what the group had in mind when we initially agreed that a statement of guiding principles is needed? (Jeremy Ben-Ami);

* noted that Bob has done an incredible job and his draft is providing a vehicle for moving the dialogue forward; observed that this type of discussion is helpful as we move to a briefer, clearer public document (Judy Heumann);

* observed that this goes beyond an inside conversation and becomes a public document, important to stress that everyone is at risk of becoming disabled at one point one's life, that disability is not limited to a static group of people, and that the issues are of universal interest and importance (Jeff Levi);

* greater stress should be devoted to the principles underlying ADA since every area of a persons life is implicated by the ADA principles (Marilyn Thornton);

* suggested ADA implications for income support (Lisa Fairhall);

* noted the breadth of government purposes covered under the ADA (Liz Savage);

* questioned whether the principles stated give us an answer when competing values conflict or to the question of means; although

we all probably agree on the goals of ADA, this will not settle some disagreements regarding the means or other programmatic decisions (Susan Daniels);

* suggested that we may not be able to resolve such issues at the front end of this process, but may first need to look at the finding of our five work groups (Jeremy Ben-Ami);

* query: are we spending the 170 billion on disability matters in the most effective way? For her, the crux of the question is that we don't need to do a lot of research to say we aren't, but we need to know if there are certain values we can apply to move forward (Judy Heumann);

* agreed that we absolutely should be thinking in a very zero-based way and thinking about an entire set of programs and how they inter-act with each other; the offer was made to have a meeting to present data on how monies are spent, with general agreement from the group that this would be a good idea. Purpose of formulating principles is to give us discipline in governmental process (Belle Sawhill);

* stressed importance of federal government serving as a model of access since others look to us in compliance with legislation and guidelines (Paul Miller);

Closing Comments

Jeremy Ben-Ami made the following points:

- * NDPR has broad-based purposes, including a look from the ground up at our disability programs and including furthering the goals of ADA; Team members were asked to please inform their staff that there the goals and scope of the Review are indeed broad;
- * it is critical to attend meetings so that there is continuity of participation by all agencies and progress can occur;
- * Alice Rivlin and Carol Rasco are committed to the Review and reiterating that a meeting with the President precluded their attendance on this date;
- * work groups to flesh out detailed steps and come back in January with a work plan for each group;
- * the convenors should meet in early January as per the suggestion made today;
- * NDPR to hold a full meeting in late January;
- * expanded list of advocates to be consulted and revised workplan contained in the packets; members urges to please

submit any comments on those documents;

- * presentation on data/ baseline spending will be scheduled;

Lisa Fairhall made the following remarks:

- * helpful for agencies to present data with brief program description;
- * memo to be distributed with specifications.

Jeremy Ben-Ami:

- * expressed thanks to Stan Herr whose fellowship is ending for his help in this Review and other disability policy matters

Belle Sawhill and Jeremy Ben-Ami adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

saved as: dec21.min

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

**Second Meeting of the National Disability Policy Review
December 21, 1994
Room 248, Old Executive Office Building**

Agenda

Welcome and Introduction	Carol H. Rasco The White House
	Alice Rivlin Office of Management and Budget
Accommodations Group	Deval Patrick Department of Justice
Guiding Principles Group	Bob Williams Department of Health and Human Services
Adult Employment Group	Susan Daniels Social Security Administration
School-to-Work Group	Judy Heumann Department of Education
Outreach, Next Steps and Closing	Carol H. Rasco

November 30, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, LISA FAIRHALL & RICHARD GREEN

FROM Stan Herr & Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT Minutes from 11/23/94 National Disability Policy Review Meeting with Jeremy Ben-Ami, Stan Herr, Elisabeth Cohen and:

- * Bernard Anderson, Assistant Secretary, Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor
- * Frank Kruesi, Assistant Secretary, Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation

Preliminary work plans disseminated during brief overview of substance and process of review; here are some of the highlights and queries:

Anderson: Which approach (life cycle vs. issue cluster approach) makes sense according to work breakdown? (We should decide at 11/30 meeting)

Kruesi: Election's impact on review process? (Later remarked that he saw the potential for the election to allow some freedom for the review process as review team will be less incumbered by Congress)

He gave an overview on the rule-making on ADA, the over the road bus issue, and his concern on the economic viability of Greyhound, etc. as the only means of transport for isolated poor Americans;

He stressed and agreed with Shalala's comments during 11/21 meeting -- now we need the review more than ever if GOP goes after ADA;

Need to figure out how to highlight ADA's positive accomplishments;

Herr: We still do not have a much needed short paper documenting ADA progress for the interested public;

Anderson: ADA in place only 2 years, so may be too soon to document;

Herr: Basic progress such as institutional changes and changes in transportation structures have been made -- changes based not just on ADA; since 1973, Rehabilitation Act has had some non-discriminations law on the basis of disability;

Kruesi: Agreed that it's better to frame this as an evolving process rather than ADA-based review -- less new-fangled approach;

Stressed an interest in integration: HHS has 2 billion for transit to & from clinics -- there must be ways to consolidate;

How do we establish an overlay of all of the issues?

Herr: (When Anderson pointed to Labor's 159 employment programs), looking at accessibility to these employment programs mentioned as review possibility;

Formation of review's terms reflects moving outside the usual issues; compared to other countries, we have not looked at the forest, only the trees -- no blueprint;

Referred to bipartisan component of disability issues and Dole's stake in disability policy;

Kruesi: Must be sensitive to the possibility of ADA being attacked as an unfunded mandate;

Herr: Importance of early achievable goals & not creating expectations we can't meet:

- 1) Establish what we have accomplished and what we would like to accomplish over the next 5 years;
- 2) Define which programs have potential to employ and what programs effectively get people where they want to go;

We are starting something no one in the federal government has previously done;

Kruesi: If review leads to efficiencies, where do the savings go?

Herr: Review could help to define federal and state pieces -- in any program, there is an unserved/ under-served group; for example, there are not enough slots for people coming out of school; a more efficient program could reach more people.

November 30, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, LISA FAIRHALL & RICHARD GREEN

FROM Stan Herr & Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT Minutes from 11/23/94 National Disability Policy Review Meeting with Jeremy Ben-Ami, Stan Herr, Elisabeth Cohen and:

- * Bernard Anderson, Assistant Secretary, Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor
- * Frank Kruesi, Assistant Secretary, Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation

Preliminary work plans disseminated during brief overview of substance and process of review; here are some of the highlights and queries:

Anderson: Which approach (life cycle vs. issue cluster approach) makes sense according to work breakdown? (We should decide at 11/30 meeting)

Kruesi: Election's impact on review process? (Later remarked that he saw the potential for the election to allow some freedom for the review process as review team will be less incumbered by Congress)

He gave an overview on the rule-making on ADA, the over the road bus issue, and his concern on the economic viability of Greyhound, etc. as the only means of transport for isolated poor Americans;

He stressed and agreed with Shalala's comments during 11/21 meeting -- now we need the review more than ever if GOP goes after ADA;

Need to figure out how to highlight ADA's positive accomplishments;

Herr: We still do not have a much needed short paper documenting ADA progress for the interested public;

Anderson: ADA in place only 2 years, so may be too soon to document;

Herr: Basic progress such as institutional changes and changes in transportation structures have been made -- changes based not just on ADA; since 1973, Rehabilitation Act has had some non-discriminations law on the basis of disability;

Kruesi: Agreed that it's better to frame this as an evolving process rather than ADA-based review -- less new-fangled approach;

Stressed an interest in integration: HHS has 2 billion for transit to & from clinics -- there must be ways to consolidate;

How do we establish an overlay of all of the issues?

Herr: (When Anderson pointed to Labor's 159 employment programs), looking at accessibility to these employment programs mentioned as review possibility;

Formation of review's terms reflects moving outside the usual issues; compared to other countries, we have not looked at the forest, only the trees -- no blueprint;

Referred to bipartisan component of disability issues and Dole's stake in disability policy;

Kruesi: Must be sensitive to the possibility of ADA being attacked as an unfunded mandate;

Herr: Importance of early achievable goals & not creating expectations we can't meet:

- 1) Establish what we have accomplished and what we would like to accomplish over the next 5 years;
- 2) Define which programs have potential to employ and what programs effectively get people where they want to go;

We are starting something no one in the federal government has previously done;

Kruesi: If review leads to efficiencies, where do the savings go?

Herr: Review could help to define federal and state pieces -- in any program, there is an unserved/ under-served group; for example, there are not enough slots for people coming out of school; a more efficient program could reach more people.

November 9, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO CAROL H. RASCO

FROM: STAN HERR AND ELISABETH COHEN

SUBJECT: MINUTES FROM 11/8 MEETING OF APPOINTEES WITH
DISABILITIES

We had a full complement (29 attendees) and all listed speakers gave brisk -- even impassioned -- talks on federal advocacy roles. The main themes were the need for collaboration, coordination, reinvention of these fragmented programs, and more pooling of T A and other central administration resources.

(Attached please find a packet of the hand-outs distributed at this meeting)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: Stan Herr

- * Stan gave a brief overview of meeting's goals and explained that he and Carol Rasco see this overview as a first step towards increasing the quality and accessibility of various sources and improving coordination and reach of these programs.

PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY (P&A) SYSTEMS:

P&A for Persons with Developmental Disabilities:

Bob Williams, HHS

One important caution uttered by Bob Williams was the old physician's admonition -- first do no harm, i.e., don't present too fate a target for critics of P & A to go after in a more conservative political environment;

(Full text of William's remarks is attached.)

P&A for Individuals with Mental Illness,

Natalie Reatig, Center for Mental Health Services, HHS

You would have been moved by one of the first speakers -- Natalie Reatig who described today's meeting as the crowning moment in a career in federal services that stretched back to the Kennedy Administration and who made an eloquent plea for advocates who champion the expressed wishes of their clients with mental disabilities.

- * PAIMI: NIMH was not at all desirous of having bill passed;
- * under new leadership, experienced a happier fate;
- * plays out as a political issue -- PAIMI complaints re: lack of effective treatment in facilities;
- * prior to PAIMI, we could only make boiler-plate responses to complaints and suggest people contact the Director of Mental Health Service in their state;

- * pleasure to respond to heart-felt complaints of citizens by referring them to an agency with independent federal authority to access resources and the courts if necessary;
- * number of agencies where there was an opportunity for government to create separate organizations to oversee P&A - inefficient way to practice (works in NY but usually doesn't work);
- * issue of forced treatment - Reatig challenged us to think about way this issue carries itself out in health care reform debate; true, some are a danger to themselves or others, BUT to assume individual is somehow committing act worthy of police intervention simply because they do not want to take medication is the core of the heat existing between communities and clients/ patents and children.

**P&A for Individual Rights and the Client Assistance Program,
Parma Yarkin, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration,
Department of Education**

- * 2 flavors - client assistance programs and new protection/ advocacy of individual rights;
- * CAP, first seen as an ombudsman - evolution from neutral to advocacy program;
- * CAPs have maintained focus as information/ complaint resolution;
- * PAIR, most liberal mandate of the P&As and most liberal eligibility criteria;
- * in RSA, perception that protection & advocacy takes away funding for service delivery;
- * Yarkin stressed the importance of eliminating red tape, enabling program offices to be the decision makers, and making government work through inter-agency coordination.

**P&A for Users of Assistive Technology
Carol Cohen, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation
Research, Department of Education**

Cohen explained that while tremendous gains have been made regarding information dissemination and knowledge base building, we have not removed many barriers to families who could really benefit from assistive technology;

- * new amendments are extremely prescriptive, much to the chagrin of many states -- must have measurable outcomes that show barriers removed from attainment of assistive devices;
- * P&As piece added to new amendments -- without legal advocacy, couldn't achieve full level of technology attainment;
- * now that agencies can sue each other, interesting challenges to collaboration have arisen;
- * with 2 departments, 5 agencies: we have conflicting administrative needs; how will we face this in future years?
- * must take a hard look at coordinating programs.

OTHER SOURCES OF ADVOCACY ASSISTANCE

Legal Services Corporation, John Tull

Tull overviewed corporation structure explaining it was created by Congress, appropriations come from Congress, and local programs provide services in 323 counties. Invariably, however, problems outweigh resources available;

(See attached Legal Services Corporation memo)

- * Access to income/ persons seeking access to eligibility make up large portion of caseload (80,000 SSI cases/ Zebly case also brought by a legal services office with others);
- * Under its new administration, corporation in process of developing initiatives affecting population served;

The best part of this gathering was that all the P & As finally sat down with the Legal Services Corporation representative to discuss areas for collaboration. I've only been trying to do that since 1977 and I've now finally succeeded! (They all stayed behind for 15 minutes to start that process).

Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, Liz Savage (for Paul S. Miller who was paged during meeting)

EOEC interacts with disability community in 2 ways:

- 1) section 501, 1973 act
 - 2) major responsibility for enforcement of title 1, ADA
- * prohibits discrimination of state or local government as an employer;
 - * suffers from enormous back-log, very difficult to effectively investigate as disability cases are very fact-specific;
 - * however; have settled many cases with \$21,995 as average settlement figure.

Department of Justice, Liz Savage

Interacts with disability community in 2 areas:

- 1) Title 2 ADA - prohibits discrimination of state and local government as service providers;
 - 2) Title 3 ADA - accessibility issues;
- * can refer complaints to other agencies (HHS, Transportation, & Education) and keep anything pertaining to legal system;
 - * working with education on compliance reviews and litigation

CLOSING AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Stan thanked presenters for helping to lay out complex map of advocacy resources. He also overviewed distinctions between various DPC efforts relating to disability issues. We closed by inviting anyone to contact Stan with follow-up ideas on this advocacy topic.

As to future topics, there could be:

1) a brief follow-up from the various P&As, EEOC, DOJ, and LSC as to how they will increase their mutually supportive activities and improve access for potential clients with disabilities (it would be a nice change of pace to actually pick-up the same topic from one meeting to the next and demonstrate some forward progress); Howard Moses strongly concurs and thinks DPC could have useful role in more uniform eligibility guidelines, etc.)

2) Fernando Torres-Gil would like to tell this group more about the White House Conference on Aging and its implications for the disability community;

3) an introduction to the National Disability Policy Review, its relationship to the Federal Disability Accommodations Working Group, and to getting input and involvement from this overlapping group of appointees.

Minutes from 11/2/94 National Disability Policy Review meeting.
with outside advocates.

Present: Paul Marchand (Chair of CCD and Director, Govt Relations for the ARC), Diane Lipton (DREDF), Ann Marie Hughey (Exec. Dir., NCIL), Nancy Bloch (Exec. Dir., National Association of the Deaf), Anita Farb (National Association of the Deaf), Denise Rozell (American Foundation for the Blind), Joe Manes (Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law), Al Guida (Exec. Dir., National Mental Health Association), Aimee Berenson (AIDS Action Council), Oral Miller (Exec. Dir., American Council of the Blind), Debra Fine (Public Liaison), Jeremy Ben-Ami (DPC), Stan Herr (DPC), Elisabeth Cohen (DPC).

- * Stan stressed the confidential nature of memo and memos were returned at the close of the meeting; Stan gave the overview and Jeremy discussed the process;
- * CONSENSUS OF THE GROUP WAS THAT THIS TYPE OF REVIEW IS IMPORTANT, LONG OVER DUE, AND THE ADMINISTRATION IS TO BE COMMENDED FOR LAUNCHING THIS EFFORT;
- * Berenson: National AIDS Policy Coordinator's office must be added;
- * Marchand: caution: look at the big picture instead of the trees - we need to have a clear total vision of Federal Government's disability policy - state it and then analyze the trees;
- * Hughey: there is woefully inadequate consumer input in this process - we need a "partnership" - not occasional conversations; (Jeremy asked if a partnership with the President's commissions would satisfy this -- no -- need partnership with private sector/ direct consumer participation & federal government);
- * Hughey: we need diversity in the group; we have the pulse of the disability community; if its not done right, we'll be the one's to say it needs to be re-done; bringing us in at the onset is the right way to go;

How to make diversity & range?

- * Miller: when you want true grass roots input, can still break it down to a few dozen organizations; those of us around the table and a few others can really form a coalition to make this happen; just give us the challenge;

How can the councils contribute to this process?

- * Miller: some of the councils have their own agendas already - there's a lot on their plate; (Stan noted NCD statutory responsibility)

- * Bloch: we need a level playing field and to be an active part of the task force; (Jeremy discussed strict federal laws re: task force membership & commitment to a partnership in compliance with federal laws expressed)
- * Berenson: from grassroots, I can tell you where nice policies and mission statements are not operationalized; to really address this issue, need to be looking to grassroots constituencies & empower them;
- * Lipton: concern re: the credibility of taking on this task; most of us support the President but feel we've been waiting to have the ADA laws actually enforced; must also have statement re: policy enforcement - without it, announcement of review would seem hollow; (Stan mentioned Deval Patrick and Paul Miller in response to this issue re: their enforcement credibility)
- * Guida: will legislation be a goal? -- (Jeremy noted that possibility);
- * Manes: in relationship to social security issues -- timing is not good -- also fair housing attacks on persons with mental illness;
- * Bloch: need to have frequent reassurances that there is support for the programs that now exist -- perception of administration's commitment beyond statements; ADA has been supported in spirit, but where are the teeth?

Big-picture issues to address:

- * Berenson: one issue may be more important to one group -- but all issues of equal importance
- * Manes: - protection and enhancement of rights
 - income support - housing/ food/ clothing
 - incentives to employment - job training
 - access to SSD & healthcare
- * civil rights
- * Bloch: communication accessibility
- * Rozell: technology issues - as information super-highway takes off - make sure visually/ hearing impaired are on it from the start rather than having to modify
- * Lipton: - education (including school to work)- involve agencies serving children/ populations at-risk of disability - unless we pay more attention to children with disabilities, the rest just becomes a band aid approach (Stan asked what particular children's issues? response: perception that IDEA taking care of education issues - but law enforcement & implementation has been terrible)

In general, attendees expressed support of the DPC/ OMB for the decision to implement this review and for our readiness to have an inclusive participatory review process.

November 9, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, LISA FAIRHALL & RICHARD GREEN

FROM Stan Herr & Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT Minutes from 11/1/94 National Disability Policy Review meeting with:

- * Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (Ed.)
- * Michael Grant, Counsellor to the Director/ Director of Agency Initiatives (OPM)
- * Bob Williams, Commissioner, Administration on Developmental Disabilities (HHS)
- * David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary, Planning and Evaluation (HHS)
- * also present: Judy Wurtzel (Ed.), Carol Cichowski (Ed.), Kate Warren (HHS), Robin Stone (HHS), Mary Harahan (HHS), Howard Moses (Ed.)
- * Herr: the usual presentation on substance and process; review gives us a chance to see how various disability agendas mesh -- designees and assistants will be main players -- we will also reach out to 3 advisory councils and outside advocates -- looking to identify big-picture options in strategic review and we want your input;

Review objectives:

- * Williams: how do we in this post-ADA era grapple with the links between disability and poverty?
- * Heumann: looking for meaningful outcomes and ways to look at the non-system that currently exists -- lack of coordination between agencies is striking -- interest in identifying a few critical areas where we can make a significant difference;
- * Stone: relationship between long-term services & assistive technology -- how to form a bridge and get people into labor force;
- * Warren: how can fragmented services make more sense for families as they move through system -- early intervention - employment - independent living;
- * (Wurtzel) policy objectives sometimes seem at cross purposes with other agency objectives, particularly in areas of employment;
- * (Moses) sense of self-empowerment that work represents for everyone in society is just as important to everyone with a disability;

- * (Stan Herr listed some activities going forward under Carol's leadership and explained that we see these kinds of efforts flowing into the review).

Are there any issues missing from DPC's initial memoranda, and is there anything else to consider in refining it?

- * entitlement commission;
- * budget commission;
- * National Academy of Social Insurance (group chaired by Jerry Mashaw of Yale Law School);
- * Ellwood: concern re: timing in relationship to our state of knowledge - we are in a position to make some things better - but we may not be in a position to form a cohesive vision since we don't have good studies on how programs interact with each other;
- * are we setting up unrealistic expectations since new money unlikely?
- * Heumann: let's discuss real obstacles to people with disabilities in relationship to implementing existing legislation; explore more deeply the non-disabled person's view of the disabled person;
- * Heumann: reduction of SSI vs. those always on SSI - employers say they want to hire but don't follow through; so how do we get a better handle on public perception of what people are able to do;
- * (Stone): problem - extent to which we know how public policies and programs interact -- we don't really know what's going on with SSI;
- * Heumann: we need to focus on short-term and long-term agendas - disability community is very interested in employment; should we attempt to make some measurable difference in this area?

Promising short-term issue areas:

- * Williams: focus on putting people to work - many of us had to grit our teeth during ADA over the hype about disability being the "bipartisan issue" (using issue for measurable political gains);
- * reaching out in bipartisan way may have political gains as well;
- * Heumann: non-player agencies shouldn't have the same role as player agencies;
- * Wurtzel: identify principles of review at the onset;
- * Herr: by the 9 month mark - document with specific principles and philosophies -- can be historic opportunity if we have involvement across the government and can put mapping of this issue on the national agenda;

- * Ellwood: we can do a lot without \$\$ - but let's be realistic about the kind of congress we'll be working with -- focus on work / programs are set up as an alternative to work -- but how do we change that? Also, it's a political mine-field;
- * Heumann: vision important, there are technical steps we can take in the areas of personal assistants;
- * (Harahan): clarify that you are limiting your concern to disabled elders; players become very different when addressing older americans;

Political caution:

- * Heumann: concern that message is not given out that people should not be on SSI; we must be conscious of this.

Is there a sense of greater priority in age cohorts?:

- * working, personal assistants, assistive technology/ not bound by age;
- * Ellwood: with children and service delivery - may be many inconsistent mechanisms - but we do have a commission - let's see what they discover;
- * (Stone) the word "review" may scare some people and imply negativity - what do we want for our short-term goals?
- * Heumann: with coordination of \$\$ across agencies this can be an opportunity to look at issues and gain data -- positive and constructive things we can look at that would be consistent with the President's message and have an impact;
- * Herr: review could also identify accomplishments by and for the disability community - identify parts of the country where positive things are going on that we would like to see emulated/ replicated;
- * Heumann: as we move towards greater clarity, we'll make decisions re: who to look at -- let's look at pooling \$\$ across agencies, joint RFPs, other government efficiency issues, other technical improvements.

Minutes from 11/1/94 National Disability Policy Review meeting
with:

- * Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (Ed.)
- * Michael Grant, Counsellor to the Director/ Director of Agency Initiatives (OPM)
- * Bob Williams, Commissioner, Administration on Developmental Disabilities (HHS)
- * David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary, Planning and Evaluation (HHS)
- * also present: Judy Wurtzel (Ed.), Carol Cichowski (Ed.), Kate Warren (HHS), Robyn Stone (HHS), Mary Harahan (HHS); *Howard Moses (Ed.)*
the usual presentation on substance and process;
- * Herr: review gives us a chance to see how various disability agendas mesh -- designees and assistants will be main players -- we will also reach out to 3 advisory councils and outside advocates -- looking to identify big-picture options in strategic review and we want your input;

Review objectives:

- * Williams: how do we in this post-ADA era grapple with the links between disability and poverty?
- * Heumann: looking for meaningful outcomes and ways to look at the non-system that currently exists -- lack of coordination between agencies is striking -- interest in identifying a few critical areas where we can make a significant difference;
- * Stone: relationship between long-term services & assistive technology -- how to form a bridge and get people into labor force;
- * Warren: how can fragmented services make more sense for families as they move through system -- early intervention - employment - independent living;
- * *Wurtzel*
~~(?? sitting next to warren)~~ policy objectives sometimes seem at cross purposes with other agency objectives, particularly in areas of employment;
- * *Moses*
~~(? dep assist sec. spec ed.)~~ sense of self-empowerment that work represents for everyone in society is just as important to everyone with a disability;
- * (Stan Herr listed some activities going forward under Carol's leadership and explained that we see these kinds of efforts flowing into the review).

- Are there any issues missing from DPC's initial memorandum *and anything else to consider in refining it?*
- * entitlement commission;

- (Group chaired by Terry Marshaw
of Yale Law School)*
- * budget commission;
 - * national academy of social insurance;
 - * Ellwood: concern re: timing in relationship to our state of knowledge - we are in a position to make some things better - but we may not be in a position to form a cohesive vision? *since don't have good studies on how programs interact with each other*
 - * are we setting up unrealistic expectations? *by since each other*
 - * Heumann: let's discuss real obstacles to people with disabilities in relationship to legislation; *explore more deeply the non-disabled person's view of the disabled person; new money to unlikely?*
 - * Heumann: reduction of SSI vs. those always on SSI - employers say they want to hire but don't follow through; so how do we get a better handle on public perception of what people are able to do;
 - * *Stone:* ~~(woman with short dark hair)~~: problem - extent to which we know how public policies and programs interact -- we don't really know what's going on with SSI; *990ndas*
 - * Heumann: we need to focus on short-term and long-term/-disability community is very interested in employment; should we attempt to make some measurable difference in this area?

Promising short-term issue areas:

- * Williams: focus on putting people to work - many of us had to grit our teeth during ADA over the hype about disability being the "bipartisan issue" (using issue for measurable political gains);
- * reaching out in bipartisan way may have political gains as well;
- * Heumann: non-player agencies shouldn't have the same role as player agencies;
- * Wurtzel: identify principles of review at the onset;
- * Herr: by the 9 month mark - document with specific principles and philosophies -- can be historic opportunity if we have involvement across the government; *and can get put mapping of this issue on the national agenda*
- * Ellwood: we can do a lot without \$\$ - but let's be realistic about the kind of congress we'll be working with -- focus on work / programs are set up as an alternative to work -- but how do we change that? Also, it's a political mine-field;
- * Heumann: vision important, there are technical steps we can take in the areas of personal assistants;
- * *Harahan:* clarify that young (imaging) young concerned *disabled elders;*
- * ~~Ellwood~~: players become very different when addressing older americans;
- * *Political caution:* Heumann: concern that message is not given out that people

should not be on SSI; we must be conscious of this.

Is there a sense of greater priority in age cohorts?:

- * working, personal assistants, assistive technology/ not bound by age;
- * Ellwood: with children and service delivery - may be many inconsistent mechanisms - but we do have a commission - let's see what they discover;
- * *Stone: the word "Review" may scare some people and imply*
~~(woman with short dark hair) there's a lot of negativity in~~
a "review" - what do we want for our short-term goals?
- * Heumann: with coordination of \$\$ across agencies this can be an opportunity to look at issues and gain data -- positive and constructive things we can look at that would be consistent with the President's message and have an impact;
- * *Review could also identify accomplishments by and for*
Herr: ~~look at what we have done~~ for the disability community
- identify parts of the country where things are going on *positive*
that we would like to see emulated/ replicated;
- * Heumann: as we move towards greater clarity, we'll make decisions re: who to look at -- let's look at pooling \$\$ across agencies, joint RFPs, other government efficiency issues, other technical improvements.

November 9, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, LISA FAIRHALL & RICHARD GREEN

FROM Stan Herr & Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT Minutes from 10/31/94 National Disability Policy Review meeting with:

Carolyn W. Colvin, Deputy Commissioner for Policy and External Affairs, (SSA)
Susan M. Daniels, Associate Commissioner for the Office of Disability, (SSA)
W. Scott Gould, Deputy Assistant Secretary, (Treas.)
Deval Patrick, Assistant Attorney General, (Justice)
Elizabeth Savage, (Justice)
Stan Herr, (DPC)
Jeremy Ben-Ami, (DPC)
Elisabeth Cohen, (DPC)

- * need to evaluate where programs merely maintain people in dependency and where they encourage individuals to move forward;
- * Patrick: civil rights working group is taking up disability issues -- their work would be relevant to review process/ looking at how to encourage maximum independence & self-reliance - (should DPC rep. sit in on an initial meeting?);
- * Savage: transportation is swamped with ADA & 504 -- they have exponentially more compliance cases;
- * Gould: mentioned John Kemp, Walter Reich, Paul Herne and Susan Parker (all republicans) as possible contacts in bipartisan effort -- later mentioned Fernando Torres-Gil;
- * Gould: need to build a fence around expectations --
 - if programmatically based, it may be easier to get others to the table
 - timing of work plan seems aggressive
 - will find that many of us know more than others (mentioned his relative lack of experience with disability issues);
- * Herr: varying bodies of knowledge are often related to specific areas, and we need to ask if we have the expertise within the departments or if we will need to pull in consultants;
- * Colvin: importance of studying what's been done and defining who we will focus on -- children/ older Americans/ transition to work force -- very different issue areas;
- * Daniels: identifying points of conflict now - identify major incoherences in policy -- income maintenance vs.

disincentives to employment (this issue has a civil rights component);

- * if we can link review to high-level policy choices already made, we can actually do something;
- * most conflicts exist at statutory level - not at administrative level; (ex: is drug addiction a disability?);
- * Daniels: we should make a decision re: is this across the age range -- seniors/ children/ prevention -- argued for emphasis on working-age population;
- * Savage: could consider a work-related review -- but is there principled reason to not look at movement through the life cycle?;
- * Daniels: we're confused in the middle -- we know what we want for children and seniors; greatest potential to do something good lies in the area of bringing people to the workplace;
- * National Academy of Social Insurance (842-1266) - independent think tank -- disability policy panel/ could do literature review/ sampling from other countries;
- * hold November 14 - 5:30 p.m.

Minutes from 10/31/94 National Disability Policy Review meeting with:

Carolyn W. Colvin, Deputy Commissioner for Policy and External Affairs, (SSA)

Susan M. Daniels, Associate Commissioner for the Office of Disability, (SSA)

W. Scott Gould, Deputy Assistant Secretary, (Treas.)

Deval Patrick, Assistant Attorney General, (Justice)

Elizabeth Savage, (Justice)

Stan Herr, (DPC)

Jeremy Ben-Ami, (DPC)

Elisabeth Cohen, (DPC)

~~main point from paper~~ need to evaluate where programs merely maintain *people in dependency* and where they encourage individuals to move forward;

- * Patrick: civil rights working group is taking up disability issues -- their work would be relevant to review process/ looking at how to encourage maximum independence & self-reliance - (should DPC rep. sit in on an initial meeting?);

- * *Savage* transportation is swamped with ADA & 504 -- they have exponentially more compliance cases;

- * Gould: *all Republicans* mentioned John Kemp, *Walter* ~~Ellen~~ Reich, Paul H^ern and Susan Parker, as possible contacts in bipartisan effort -- later mentioned ~~Fernando Forresgit~~; *Purves-Gil*

- * Gould: need to build a fence around expectations --
 - if programmatically based, it may be easier to get others to the table *of working plan*
 - timing *seems aggressive*
 - will find that many of us know more than others (mentioned his relative lack of experience with disability issues);

- * ✓ Herr: varying bodies of knowledge are often related to specific areas, and we need to ask if we have the expertise within ~~our~~ *the* departments or if we will need to pull in consultants;

- * Colvin: importance of studying what's been done and defining who we will focus on -- children/ older americans/ transition to work force -- very different issue areas;

- * Daniels: identifying points of conflict now - identify major incoherences in policy -- income maintenance vs. *employment* *disincentive* (this issue has a civil rights component);

- * ✓ if we can link review to high-level policy choices already made, we can actually do something;

- * most conflicts exist at statutory level - not at administrative level; (ex: is drug addiction a disability?);

- * Daniels: we should make a decision re: is this across the age range -- seniors/ children/ prevention; *argued for emphasis on working-age population*
- * Savage: could consider a work-related review -- *but* is there principled reasons ~~to~~ to not look at movement through the life cycle?;
- * Daniels: we're confused in the middle -- we know what we want for children and seniors; *→*
- * *→* greatest potential to do something good lies in the area of bringing people to the workplace;
- * National Academy of Social Insurance (842-1266) - *could do* independent think tank -- disability policy panel/ *literature* review/ sampling from other countries;

~~held November 14 - 5:30 p.m.~~

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, STAN HERR, LISA FAIRHALL AND
RICHARD GREEN

FROM Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT National Disability Policy Review minutes from 10/26/94
meeting with Dennis Duffy (VA), Fred Pang (Defense),
Jeremy Ben-Ami, Stan Herr, & Elisabeth Cohen

Assistant Secretary Pang and Deputy Assistant Secretary Duffy both expressed their interest in and support of proposed National Disability Policy Review.

Assistant Secretary Pang pointed to Defense's specific interest in assistive technologies and defense conversion for adaptation purposes. He is in charge of human resources and stressed the importance of defining the problem(s), determining the facts bearing on the problem(s) and analyzing these facts. They would be "happy to work with" us in the definition/ analysis process.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Duffy expressed the VA's commitment to be a "major player" in the proposed review. (Roughly 4.9 million of the 21 million veterans are disabled) He explained they are the Federal Government's largest direct health care provider thus opening up a lot of doors. He stated a willingness to provide resources and feels the review is an opportunity to take a good look at their own programs and determine where restructuring may be needed.

The following agreements were made:

- * Assistant Secretary Duffy agreed to pursue meeting of key staff people from veterans congressional committees -- they'll take the lead/arrange meetings, we'll attend;
- * It was explained we envision a multi-year effort, but both parties agreed to consider specific administrative steps that can be taken early on speaking to administration's vision in area of disability policy;

MEMORANDUM TO JEREMY BEN-AMI, STAN HERR, LISA FAIRHALL AND
RICHARD GREEN

FROM Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT National Disability Policy Review minutes from 10/26/94
meeting with Dennis Duffy (VA), Fred Pang (Defense),
Jeremy Ben-Ami, Stan Herr, & Elisabeth Cohen

Assistant Secretary Pang and Deputy Assistant Secretary Duffy both expressed their interest in and support of proposed National Disability Policy Review.

Assistant Secretary Pang pointed to Defense's specific interest in assistive technologies and defense conversion for adaptation purposes. He is in charge of human resources and stressed the importance of defining the problem(s), determining the facts bearing on the problem(s) and analyzing these facts. They would be "happy to work with" us in the definition/ analysis process.

Deputy Assistant Secretary Duffy expressed the VA's commitment to be a "major player" in the proposed review. (Roughly 4.9 million of the 21 million veterans are disabled) He explained they are the Federal Government's largest direct health care provider thus opening up a lot of doors. He stated a willingness to provide resources and feels the review is an opportunity to take a good look at their own programs and determine where restructuring may be needed.

The following agreements were made:

- * Assistant Secretary Duffy agreed to pursue meeting of key staff people from veterans congressional committees -- they'll take the lead/arrange meetings, we'll attend;
- * It was explained we envision a multi-year effort, but both parties agreed to consider specific administrative steps that can be taken early on speaking to administration's vision in area of disability policy;

National Disability Policy Review Designated Participants

ROBERTA ACHTENBERG
Assistant Secretary
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, S.W.
Room 5100
Washington, D.C. 20410
p-202-708-4252
f-202-708-4483

Carol Lichowski
→ *Dir. Div of Special*
Edu, Rehabilitation
Research Analysis
→ *Office of the Under Sec*
Educ.

BERNARD E. ANDERSON
Assistant Secretary
Employment Standards Administration
Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Room S-2321
Washington, D.C. 20210
p-202-219-6191
f-202-219-8457

CAROLYN W. COLVIN
Deputy Commissioner for Policy and External Affairs
Social Security Administration
6401 Security Boulevard
Altmeyer Building
Room 500
Baltimore, Maryland 21235
p-410-965-2440
f-410-965-9063

SUSAN M. DANIELS
Associate Commissioner for the Office of Disability
Social Security Administration
Office of Disability
6401 Security Boulevard
Altmeyer Building
Room 560
Baltimore, Maryland 21235
p-410-965-3425
f-410-965-6503

DENNIS M. DUFFY
Deputy Assistant Secretary (60C)
Congressional Liaison
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20420
p-202-273-5615
f- 202-273-6791/2

DAVID T. ELLWOOD
Assistant Secretary
Planning and Evaluation
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 415-F
Washington, D.C. 20201
p-202-690-7858
f-202-690-7383

W. SCOTT GOULD
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Departmental Finance and Management
Department of Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 2434
Washington, D.C. 20220
p-202-622-2400
f-202-622-0968

MICHAEL A. GRANT
Counsellor to the Director/ Director of Agency Initiatives
Office of Personnel Management
1900 E Street, N.W.
Room 5305
Washington, D.C. 20415
p-202-606-2086
f-202-606-2573

GLORIA GUTIERREZ
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Administration
Department of Commerce
14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Room 5830
Washington, D.C., 20230
p-202-482-4951
f-202-482-3592

JUDITH E. HEUMANN
Assistant Secretary
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Department of Education
330 C street, S.W.
Switzer Building
Room 3006
Washington, D.C. 20202
p-202-205-5465
f-202-205-9252

FRANK E. KRUESI
Assistant Secretary
Transportation Policy
Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Room 10228
Washington, D.C. 20590
p-202-366-4544
f-202-366-7127

FREDERICK PANG
Assistant Secretary
Force Management
Department of Defense
4000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-4000
p-703-697-2121
f-703-693-0171

DEVAL PATRICK
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
Department of Justice
10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 5643
Washington, D.C. 20530
p-202-514-2151
f-202-514-0293

BOB WILLIAMS
Commissioner
Administration on Developmental Disabilities
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 351-D
Washington, D.C. 20201
p-202-690-5806
f-202-690-6904

(revised 10/26/94, 3pm)

October 31, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO LISA FAIRHALL AND RICHARD GREEN

FROM Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT National Disability Policy Review

Enclosed please find the following:

- * "to do" list documenting progress to date;
- * minutes from today's meeting with Dennis Duffy (VA) and Fred Pang (Defense);
- * list of designated National Disability Policy Review Participants;
- * final memorandum to National Disability Policy Review Members.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require further information (456-2846). I look forward to working with you.

October 26, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO LISA FAIRHALL AND RICHARD GREEN

FROM Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT National Disability Policy Review

Enclosed please find the following:

- * "to do" list documenting progress to date;
- * minutes from today's meeting with Dennis Duffy (VA) and Fred Pang (Defense);
- * list of designated National Disability Policy Review Participants.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require further information (456-2846). I look forward to working with you.

October 26, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO LISA FAIRHALL AND RICHARD GREEN

FROM Elisabeth Cohen

SUBJECT National Disability Policy Review

Enclosed please find the following:

- * "to do" list documenting progress to date;
- * minutes from today's meeting with Dennis Duffy (VA) and Fred Pang (Defense);
- * list of designated National Disability Policy Review Participants;
- * final memorandum to National Disability Policy Review Members.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require further information (456-2846). I look forward to working with you.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 3, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO SECRETARY LLOYD BENTSEN
SECRETARY JESSE BROWN
SECRETARY RONALD BROWN
SECRETARY HENRY CISNEROS
SECRETARY FEDERICO PENA
SECRETARY WILLIAM PERRY
ATTORNEY GENERAL JANET RENO
SECRETARY DONNA SHALALA
SECRETARY ROBERT REICH
SECRETARY RICHARD RILEY
COMMISSIONER SHIRLEY CHATER
DIRECTOR JAMES KING

FROM: Carol Rasco 
Assistant to the President for
Domestic Policy

Alice Rivlin 
Director
Office of Management and Budget

SUBJECT:- Disability Policy

National programs affecting persons with disabilities have developed rapidly over the last quarter century. New policies, laws, and social expectations have dramatically changed the lives of those with disabilities in areas ranging from entitlements to education, civil rights to transportation. With the Census Bureau estimating that 49 million Americans have some type of disability, the issue is of obvious national importance.

Both of us believe the timing is right to organize a review of the direction of, and next steps for, national disability policy. This important undertaking will need to be inclusive and wide-ranging, seeking the views of people with disabilities, their advocates and service providers, experts in the field, members of Congress and their staff, and federal, state and local officials.

We have asked our staffs to think about how such a review could be structured and what issues could be included. The attached memorandum reflects their initial thinking, and we believe it provides an effective starting point for discussions in and out of the Administration about this review.

October 3, 1994

Page 2

We are asking that each Department designate one or more key policy officials, perhaps at the Assistant Secretary level, to serve as participants in this policy review, which we will co-chair. We are asking our staff leads to meet with your designees as part of their outreach in the next month to develop a proposal for the structure, agenda, and work plan for this review. We would greatly appreciate it if your office would notify the DPC of your designated participants by calling 456-5566 by Wednesday October 12.

We have asked the staff coordinators to complete their initial meetings prior to and to prepare a proposal for a meeting of the Domestic Policy Council in early November. We appreciate in advance your cooperation with this important undertaking.

cc: Leon Panetta
Bob Rubin
Christine Varney



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

SEP 30 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR CAROL RASCO AND ALICE RIVLIN

FROM *JB* *SH*
 Jeremy Ben-Ami and Stan Herr
 LF *RG*
 Lisa Fairhead and Richard Green
SUBJECT Draft Proposal for National Disability Policy Review

Background

You have agreed to begin planning a review of the issues surrounding Federal and national responsibilities for providing assistance to and protecting the rights of individuals with disabilities.

Below, we propose an agenda and structure for the Review, and some first organizational steps. The questions we have proposed to form the agenda are provisional; our initial conversations with key individuals will seek to validate their inclusion in the agenda, to determine what other issues must be addressed, and to set priorities for the Task Force that will undertake this effort.

I. PROPOSED AGENDA

The Task Force should be guided by the President's credo of supporting public and private initiatives to enhance the independence, inclusion, and productivity of persons with disabilities. The Task Force should answer, to the extent possible, the following questions, in order to articulate and refine the Administration's overall disability policy:

National Disability Policy:

- Can we articulate a national disability policy to animate or guide Federal law and regulations?
- What is the Federal role in a national disability policy? What is the rationale for each specific Federal responsibility (e.g., constitutional right, insurance, indemnity, need)? Do the scope and nature of the responsibilities differ based on age (children vs. adults) or severity of disability?
- What are the policies and realities in other countries (e.g., Sweden, Canada, Germany) that may offer insight and direction to our policies and programs?

Federal Disability Programs:

- How are we meeting current responsibilities? What is the current array of programs? What services/benefits are they providing? What values do they promote? How delivered? To whom? What are the gaps and overlaps? How are the Federal programs/services integrated with State and local government programs? Are there exemplary State and local government programs? How can good practices be disseminated/encouraged?
- What do we know about the effect of each program and policy on recipients? What data are we currently collecting in each area? What do we need to answer the impact questions better?

Identifying and Implementing Change:

- What changes are needed to program purposes and program structure to better meet current Federal responsibilities? Are we currently identifying and reaching those individuals in need of services? Are we providing the most effective array of services and benefits for the costs incurred by each level of government, the individual, and the private sector?
- For those responsibilities identified but not addressed, what should be done, and by whom?
- How can we make sense of eligibility criteria for various programs, to minimize overlap and duplication of services and benefits, and ease administration and assessment of program performance and move each program's focus towards participant outcomes (e.g., enhanced independence, community integration, self-sufficiency, greater productivity)?
- Are there new strategies to promote independence and self-sufficiency for persons with disabilities?

Federal Government as a Model:

- How well does the Federal Government serve as a model, in both employment policies and practices, and customer service? How can this be improved for the benefit of job applicants, employees, customers, and members of the general public with disabilities?

Program/Issue Areas:

Program areas to be reviewed would include (but need not be limited to):

- o services to infants and toddlers

- o education programs
- o cash benefit programs (insurance, income assistance, and retirement)
- o medical and other health programs
- o social services and family supports
- o school-to-work transitional services
- o rehabilitation services and training
- o employment services
- o transportation services
- o housing
- o advocacy services, information and referral
- o personal assistance
- o civil rights enforcement
- o services for older persons
- o technology-related assistance
- o programs of prevention and minimization of disability severity

The work product should take the form of a report outlining the Task Force's answers to these questions, and recommendations for further action, including actions the Administration can take through changes to law, regulation or funding priorities, grants and contracts, and administration of the Federal Government's own internal activities (e.g., employment and customer service practices). The Task Force should be charged to make recommendations that are "budget neutral."

II. TASK FORCE COMPOSITION

We recommend the following structure for the task force:

- The Task Force would be jointly directed by the White House and OMB, but would rely heavily on agency participation.
- The Task Force would be headed by the two of you, as "co-chairs."
- Each of the key agencies with an interest in disability issues (which would include at least ED, HHS, SSA, DoD, VA, OPM, DOL, HUD, and the Treasury) would be invited to participate at the policy level through designees of the agency heads, presumably Assistant Secretaries responsible for key program and policy areas. Where appropriate, more than one Assistant Secretary could be designated for an agency.

We recommend the following structure for the support team:

- Designate "co-team leaders" from OPD/DPC and OMB staff -- these are the people who would be responsible for making the task force happen. The co-team leaders would be responsible for organizing Task Force meetings and for directing the work of the support team.
- Designate as additional support team members OPD/DPC and OMB staff who are currently involved in the disability area. For OMB, PADs would designate the examiners responsible for accounts funding key disability programs to be members of the support team. The Administrator of OIRA should also designate one or more staff to join the team.
- The agencies would be asked to designate staff to participate as members of the support team. We would expect each policy official to designate two or three people from their areas to be members of the team.
- Even though this could result in a fairly large number of staff, we envision the support team dividing into small subgroups, each tasked with researching specific areas along the lines of the proposed agenda.

We recommend that the Task Force utilize the following for advice:

- Draw on the expertise of the three Presidential advisory councils -- the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities, the National Council on Disability, and the President's Committee on Mental Retardation -- in the design of the agenda and how it will be carried out. These councils could also provide the forum (formally or informally) to tap disability community sentiments.
- Invite the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission to participate as appropriate.
- Individuals with disabilities, members of their families, and their advocates should be consulted regularly (formally and informally).

III. TIME FRAME FOR ACTION

We recommend that the Task Force be constituted, the support team named, and the agenda (see above) agreed on in November. The Task Force could be initiated at a meeting of the DPC, co-chaired by the two of you, with other appropriate department or agency heads invited. We recommend that the timeframe for this Review be lengthy enough to ensure a

comprehensive and thoughtful deliberative process, and to analyze and synthesize the findings of the Task Force and support group and develop recommendations. The specific dates for interim and final reports should be determined by the Task Force. The Task Force itself would meet at least once every three months.

IV. NEXT STEPS

This National Disability Policy Review is a significant undertaking, of tremendous importance to the disability community, and no doubt will be subject to a great deal of comment and scrutiny both in and out of the Administration. To get the review off on the right foot, we propose devoting time in October and early November to laying the groundwork internally and externally through a series of meetings outlined below, before the Task Force Team begins its work. This outreach and initial leg-work will improve our design and create good will by informing and involving people on the front end and ensuring avenues for communication and input throughout the process. We will take care to make very clear that the suggestions received from this outreach process will be considered in the development of the agenda, but that we do not expect every recommendation to be included.

Pending your review and approval, we would propose the following steps and schedule:

Early October: We (working as a kind of DPC/OMB staff "advance team") would hold preliminary meetings with administration officials at key agencies to explore the idea of a Review, brainstorm about its structure, work plan, and agenda. With help from Mike Lux in the Office of Public Liaison and from the Office of Legislative Affairs, we would identify and meet with key advocates and Hill staff to give them advance notice and discuss avenues for their input and consultation throughout the Review.

We would also meet with the three existing Federal advisory groups whose mandate is to provide advice to the President in this area: the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities, the National Council on Disability, and the President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

We believe it is vital to the success of the Review to ensure that there is strong ongoing communication concerning the Review with members of Congress and their staff, advocates, and persons with disabilities. The three national commissions mentioned provide a logical starting point for such communication. Based on meetings with those commissions and their staffs, the Task Force will include in its recommendations a plan for outreach and communication regarding the Review.

Early November: The two of you present the idea for a National Disability Policy Review to a special meeting of the Domestic Policy Council, also attended by other appropriate department and agency heads (e.g., Treasury, Defense), perhaps prefaced by an

abridged presentation of material and questions from the OMB Disability Review prepared this summer. You ask Secretaries to designate members of the Task Force at the Assistant or Deputy Assistant Secretary level, as well as staff level support team who will be able to devote some time to this effort. The Task Force will also be charged with providing periodic updates and interim reports to both the DPC and OMB.

Late November: Convene the first meeting of the Task Force, chaired by the two of you, where you provide the charge to the group, and present it with a proposed agenda and workplan, built on the groundwork laid at the individual agency meetings in October. You will ask the members to react to the proposed work plan and agenda by the middle of the month.

Early December: Convene the staff level support team, to discuss and synthesize Task Force members' comments on the proposed agenda and work plan, and to prepare for the Task Force meeting in late December.

At this point, the two of you may wish to review the proposed agenda, and adjust the list of issues presented so as not to risk committing the Review to more than you think it can achieve. This would help to keep expectations of what the Review will accomplish within manageable bounds.

Late December: The Task Force meets to discuss and finalize agenda, workplan, and staff structure of the Review.

MEMO TO NDPR FILE

FROM: Stan Herr

RE: Silverstein's feedback

DATE: October 24, 1994

As a follow-up to our conversation with Bobbie Silverstein on Friday, October 21st seeking his comments on our draft, he called me Monday at 10:00 am to offer the following brief comments:

1. He would move up the "budget neutral" language to the front page and strengthen the point, especially in light of the damaging press in the Post yesterday. The essence of his sugg

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E

24-Oct-1994 11:04am

TO: Jeremy D. Benami
TO: Lisa B. Fairhall
TO: Richard E. Green

FROM: Stanley S. Herr
 Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: feedback from the Dean of disability Hill staffers

MEMO TO NDPR FILE

FROM: Stan Herr

RE: Silverstein's feedback

DATE: October 24, 1994

As a follow-up to our conversation with Bobbie Silverstein on Friday, October 21st seeking his comments on our draft, he called me Monday at 10:00 am to offer the following brief comments:

1. He would move up the "budget neutral" language to the front page and strengthen the point, especially in light of the damaging press in the Post yesterday. The essence of his suggestion would be along these lines: "The purpose of this policy review is to enhance opportunities to persons with

3. Add DOJ to the list of key agencies to be invited to join the review (p.3). I told him we had already done so in fact. [Commerce also has been invited and should be incorporated in our revised memo.

Overall he thought our memo was fine. On the prospects of the review's outcomes he was of two minds: It could be a disaster or a way to enhance opportunities for persons with disabilities depending on how well it was done, and the watchful attention of key figures involved in it.

The White House
Washington

FAX COVER SHEET

OFFICE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING

Washington, D.C. 20500

TO: Paul S. Miller

FAX NO: 663 7101

FROM: Jeremy Ben-Ami PHONE: 456 5584

DATE: 11/15

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: 16 COMMENT(S):

Paul - attached please find the following:

- 3 memoranda on National Disability Policy Review
- list of review participants
- list of advocacy groups

please call if you
have any questions

Elizabeth 456 2846

11/23/94

Bernard Anderson

- like que-period of transition

- - interrela betw cash benefits & transition

Bern.

approach

from + what makes most sense according to
work breakdown

or What are people doing & lives when
can't have employment?

do we need non-conventional activity
programs

10/15/91 - election impact?

Amtrak serves '11000' common around country
greyhound - only means of transport for isolated
poor people

either for rule & liner were providing funding
for ~~ADA~~ lifts or

There will be a series of ADA & Obstacles

Fed govt exempt from ADA

*not be blindsighted by what we can

- Shalala - now we need review more than ever

- becomes more defensive - if Ging does go
after ADA

1) early achievable goals

2) not creating expectations we can't meet

Bern - what a com

1 - what we'd like to achieve over next 5 yrs - ^{define which} ^{progr have potnt} to employ: get people ^{who} ^{want} ^{to go on}

Kruesi - figuring out how to highlight ADA's $\oplus$ accomplishments

Bern - in place only 2 yrs - maybe early to devel accomp

Stan - some inslim Δ s - Δ s in transportation structures

- not just ADA - since 73 - evolving process - makes ADA less new-fangled

Kruesi - 1) making a transition

2) ways to integrate it its 2 billion \$ for transit

to: from clinics - must be ways to integrate

? how do we get an overlay - review

Stan - formation of review teams reflects moving outside the usu issues

- compared to other countries - we have not

looked at best - only best - no blueprint

Labor - may say 159 empl. program

Stan - how do we show whether there's access to employment programs

Kr - etc can allow is some freedom for ^{review}

unencumbered by Congr the way we were B-4 $\rightarrow$

Bern - but can't be too anxious - loose your base

Stan - of all issues lending self to bi-part ship - its disability

Kr - is attached as on-finded mandate - must be sensitive to these things

- budgetary implications?

Stan - Dole does have large stature - ^{were not be only} ^{person involved}

starting soon no one looked at.

Kr → slash: burn → who
tough to defend

Stan - defining federal: state pieces
in any progr - there is an underserved/underserved
group -- ^{ex} ~~may~~ not have enough
slots for new coming out of school

OMB co-chair involved - so review should
ring loud: resident

To _____

Date _____ Time _____

WHILE YOU WERE OUT

M Michael G - 11 - Tues 11am +

of f. 606-3557

Phone _____

Area Code	Number	Extension
TELEPHONED		PLEASE CALL
CALLED TO SEE YOU		WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU		URGENT

RETURNED YOUR CALL ☐ of 21 min

Message red int. in order - went to

assistive technologies be major

defensive conversion for

adaptation purposes

mention

in charge of human

resources Operator



AMPAD
EFFICIENCY®

23-023

CARBONLESS

10/26/94

Dennis
~~Duffy~~ ^{man} income policy planning
~~###~~

continued to be a major player in review

Fed govt's largest dr. hlt provider

thus opening up a lot of doors.

Willing to provide all resources

Also see no chance to take look at
own program where may need
restructuring

Please review our working document - Feedback -
1st step

- inclusive process from beginning

Fred Pang -

- Vets Cmte - in effort to meet &
key congr staff

- Dennis agreed to meet & key staff people - they'll
take the lead & will follow.

- agreed to consid admin steps that can
be taken early on speaking to admin's
vision in this area & underst^{long term prog}
multi-yr effort.

- Pang
• crucial to define ~~the~~ problem^(s) in clear
then - search out facts bearing on
problem: analyze them.

Will be happy to work with you on that

10/31/94:

maintain people vs. encouraging them
to move forward

despite good laws: efforts - data not always
encouraging

Susan Danielle: dis progress

• Civil rights writing gr is taking up dis.

issues -- should be aware/in sync.

- issues + how to craft cases → ^{maximum} self reliance
(not in the first stages)
→ should one of us sit on initial ground lay^{mk 7th}

• Trans swamped w ADA: 504 + much pressure

Treas:

John Kemp

Ellen Reich

Paul Herr

Susan Parker - rehab interna.

exponentially more compliance
compliance

inclusion voices

Treas:

• bld. fine ground expecta of project

— if its programatically based,
may have easier time getting to table

— timing: seems a period re: going to
Carol Alice in 2 wks.

— will find many process & some
knowing much less than others

Tornando Foresight would be great

★ give comments in writing
by Mon 11

Stem:

do we have expertise in our
depts -- or do we have to
poll in consultants.

= lumpy bodies of knowledge
related to specific areas

Carolyn: importance of studying
what's been done

• defining who we focus on → children vs.
older am.

Susan: identifying points of conflict now

• absolute tensions betw. income matters
two civ. rights employment

• identify major incoherencies in
policy

• if we can look to a high level policy that's
already made -- we can actually
do something

• most of conflicts exist at statutory level -- not
administrative level

--- re: SS/ is being action a disability
Susan
• early -- we should make a legis re: is this across the
age range + SRS + complicated spec. Gen.
of children/presentation

liz: should ~~be~~ work related

is their principle reasoning to not look
at movement thru life cycle

susan: were confused in middle. -
I know what we want in
beginning in ed. (Kudo: Srs)

* biggest disalignment of goals: policy

* biggest potential to do something good.

w/

working - middle age

by telling to progr providers to ask re:

what'r 5 biggest progr areas

* Natl' Academy of Social Insurance

842-1266

(+) think table

AA disability policy ~~com panel~~

lit review

Sampling from other countries

hold Nov 14th - 5:30pm

11/1 +

M Grant
~~David Ellwood~~
Bob William

Robertson

Carol

Joely Wertzell

• operations

• review gives us a chance to see how

various client agencies mesh --

designees: @ will be main

players - we will also reach out

to 3 advisory councils.

• were looking to identify big picture

options in strategic review --

we want your input

Bow

• how do we "in" this post modern era

grapple to the links between
disability & poverty

• Judy Hermann:

- looking for meaningful outcomes:

ways to look at the non-system

that currently exists

- lack of coordination between agencies

is limiting -- interest in identifying a few

critical areas where we can make

a signif difference

Robinson: • relate between long term services: @ techrol

how to form a bridge get people into labor
force

Kate Warren:

how can fragmented services make more sense for team as they meet thru system - early inter + empl + living

~~Reed~~ : policy objectives seem at cross purposes to other agency objectives
* partic in areas of employment

Judy Wortzel: IDEA reauthorization + transition issues
in that legislation → we realize we need to go beyond IDEA → reach betw services: IDEA

_____ : ^{ASPE} ^{HHS} : connecting of resources

Howard _____ : speed up

Rep Sec : sense of self-empow that work represents
for everyone in soc is just as important
to everyone + disabled

Stam listed
• Some activities going forward under Carol's leadership
- these kinds of efforts we see flowing
into this review ~~and~~

ARE ANY ISSUES MISSING:

David E. : environmental issues - /cdo/SSI commission
must be superior to

- entitlement commission
- budget commission
- Natl academy of social insurance
- worry re: timing vis a vis state's knowledge

-- can be in position to make some things better
but not to form cohesive vision

-- setting up unrealistic expectations

st- lets assume budget-neutral

-- transition to work - an area where there's
a lot we can do -- be careful re
profile/expect

Jody W. lets discuss real obstacles to people
w/ disab

in relation to legisla.

explore more deeply non-dis persons view
of disab

reduce vssf vs. those always on sss
(don't feel their not capable
of making contributions)

~~when~~ employers say they want to hire -- don't follow

so - where do we allow us to get a
better handle on public percep'n
what disab. people are able to do.

short dark
hair

problem - extent to which we know

how public policies/programs interact.

-- we don't really know what's going on

SSF

stan -- outreach / consult / pro-bono advice to ensure we
have right material will be critical

Judy H³
we need to focus on short term & long term
disability contin is very int in employm
- should attempt to make some measurable
difference in this area
3 - something in area of healthcare reform

PROMISING SHORT-TERM AREAS...

David → focus on putting people to work → many
of us had to quit our work during ADA over
the hype about disability being the bi-part issue
but its something we can should try to
get mileage out of

- measurable political gains
- reaching out in bi-part way may have
political gains as well

Judy H: Agencies: SS, HHS, ED, Justice →
labor (non-players) - shouldn't be
in that role as non-players

Judy W: 1st principles →

Stan: 9mo mark - down 2 specific principles: phillips
• can be historic opportunity if you have
involvement across the govt

David → we can do alot of - but lets be realistic
re: kind of congress will be dealing -
focus on work & progr set up as altern to
work but how to & that -- also -

its a polit minefield

- vision important

there are technical steps we can take - -

personal @ → targeted, fairly
narrow kinds of things

- players become different & elderly lens

Judy H & landmines - concern re: message
given out that people shouldn't feel SSI
= must be conscious of this.

Stan → is there a sense of greater priority in
age cohorts:

- working

- pers @ : assist tech not
bound by age

David - & children serv deliv - may be
many inconsistent mechanisms & but
we do have a commission - lets wait
? see what they turn out

Judy H All issues important & coordination is
important value

short dark
hour - there's a lot of @ to find in a review -
what do we want for our short-term

goals

Jody: coord of 8 across agencies in B

- use as support to look at issues:
gain data

- @: constructive things we can look at
saying that would be consist & pos'
message & have an impact

David & we could also receive Children's Comiss.

findings

Stan

• whatv we don for disab comenity

• ident parts v country where things r going
on that wld like to see emulated -
seen withreids replicated

Jody: idea & elec there are missed
opportunities -

↳ as we move towards greater charity - we'll
make decs re: who to look at - lets

look at pulling \$ together across agencies

(3)

S - Deval Patrick: Pawl Miller mentioned in response to Anna Bushing

- will policy be goal
- open at this time

o SSU - can't think worst time to look at some of these issues as

o fair housing - attacks on people in the ^{integration} ~~right to live~~ in

- perception of admin's commitment beyond statements

- needs to be reassurance that there is support for programs that exist now

- would been supporting that in spirit - but where are we been?

BIG PICTURE ISSUES TO ADDRESS →

- enhancement of rights
- income support - food, housing, clothing
- - incentives to employment / ^{job} training

→ ~~broader~~ timing is interesting

- issues are broad - ^{AID-} access to care / SSD, healthcare - critical

- one issue not more important than others - HIV may have different issue but all of = important

- civil rights - communication / accessibility

- technology issues → as info-super highway takes off - make sure vis/hear impaired are on it when we start rather than modify

November 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO DPC STAFF

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami and Elisabeth Cohen

Subject: DPC Fact Sheet

We prepared the attached DPC Fact Sheet in response to several requests, both in and outside the White House. It has been approved by Carol, so please feel free to use and distribute it as needed.

Thanks!

11/2/94 - outside advocates:

~~John M. ...~~

• Confidential: initial nature of memo addressed?

- unique undertaking

- review
- frame work + 1st step → give to various parties
- highlights issues we all want addressed

- Natl AIDS policy coordinators office to be added
to list

• Caution: look at big picture instead of trees & we need
to have a clear total vision of Fed Govt Dis Pol:
clearly state it. - how here and he sees

• There is woefully inadequate consumer input in
this process - we need a "partnership" - not
ocasional conversations → Dis com in partnership Fed Govt.
→ would push in Pres Center/Council

• No-partner in priv sector / direct consumer participation
in part Fed Govt.

• we need diversity in the group & we have pulse of
Dis. Comm: nation → if its not done right, we'd
be the force to come back: say it needs to
be done again & bringing us in at the begin
is right way to go.

HOW TO MNG DIVERSITY: RANGE?

• ~~when dealing with a large number of people~~ →

when you want the grassroots input, can still widdle
it down to a few dozen organiza - these are
around the table: a few others can really
form a coal to make this happen - just give
us the challenge: make it happen

November 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO DPC STAFF

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami and Elisabeth Cohen

Subject: DPC Fact Sheet

We prepared the attached DPC Fact Sheet in response to several requests, both in and outside the White House. It has been approved by Carol, so please feel free to use and distribute it as needed.

Thanks!

(2)

It can be cut down to negative level ~~to 0.05~~ ~~some~~
~~unusually poor~~

What can councils do to contrib to this process?

• NCD - visiting & states - helpful, but only
limited portion

• Some of the councils have their own agencies already
- to some extent they'd have to wipe their slate
clean to

- but they have important work to do

• Our commitment is to work in you - figure out how to get
right folks around table

- we need a level playing field - we also need
to be a ^{active} part of the task force →

- federal law - strict laws re: formally/informal making
people part of but we are comitted to making a
partnership: work in you. - spirit of partnership to achieve
real world in compliance in fed laws

• From grassroots I can tell you where nice policies;
mission statements are not operationalized &
to really address issue & need to be looking to
organize in grassroots const: empower them
- it's the only way to find out what's happening
out here

- concern: credibility prob admin has in talking on this
task ^{mostly w/ us} & we support feds but feel we've been wanting to enforce
laws (ADA) must also be statement of enforcement policy -
is that - announcement of review would seem hollow

November 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO DPC STAFF

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami and Elisabeth Cohen

Subject: DPC Fact Sheet

We prepared the attached DPC Fact Sheet in response to several requests, both in and outside the White House. It has been approved by Carol, so please feel free to use and distribute it as needed.

Thanks!

(4)

→ importance of involvement of agencies serving people at risk of disability

→ education

→ disability issues - unless we pay more attn to that the rest just becomes band aids

→ Children's issues → skin & what partic not addressed?
- percept that IDEA taking care of ed issues - but law enforcement / implementation has been terrible
(~~problematic in itself~~)

→ skin & employment → school to work

November 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO DPC STAFF

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami and Elisabeth Cohen

Subject: DPC Fact Sheet

We prepared the attached DPC Fact Sheet in response to several requests, both in and outside the White House. It has been approved by Carol, so please feel free to use and distribute it as needed.

Thanks!

11/8/94 Mtg of Appointees & disabilities

Carol: I see this

Herr: ^{mtg is} overview - 1st step increase quality:

accounting of various sources: improve
coordination reach of these programs

Bob Williams + HHS - PIA for Persons & Devel Disabilities

- PIA agencies have maintained orig. purposes
- abuse neglect $\approx 17\%$
- 50% case load - common service
- 30% special issues - of growing concern
 - 1- those under 22 - small % of people & ^{severe} disab.
 - 3- ~~good~~ concern many progr don't have complete comitment to inclusive block
 - 4- way they decide which kids to take on

- Lawton + # of former steps who could: should to create a more unified approach to protect advocacy services
- creating a single PIA could offer ^{over} congress a single target to take pot shots at

Nature Rating:

Pane Program - NIMH not at all desirous of having bill passed

- ^{under} new leadership - experienced a happier fate
- plays out as a political issues - customers of PIA programs - prior to PANNE - complaints re: lack of effective tx in facilities

Stam

Mike Tettenberg

Don Itskof

Fernando

Liz Savage

Paul Miller

Rita Davis + St Dept

Pat Bergs + Dept Ed.

Joe - interpreter

Natalie
Redding

parma
Yarkin

Gary
Blumenthal

John Taul - heard

Speed Davis

Judy
Heumann wk

Bob Jones

Thita Iwanga, Eugene
Brak hosse

- prior to PANNE - could ^{contact} only make boiler plate response for dir mH serv in state
- pleasure to respond to heart felt complaints by refer to agency & I'd call attorney to access resources: courts if nec.
- # of agencies where was sport for gov to create separate organization versus P.A. & inefficient way to practice (works well in some states - NY - but VSU doesn't work)
- issue of forced tx - think about way this issue carries itself out in healthcare reform debate → to assume indiv is somehow committing act w/out working w/ police interv bc they simply don't take a medical core of heart existing betw comon: clients & parents: children

Parma Perkins: voca rehab & Ind rights: CAST progr.

2 flavors

• client @ progr

• new protect advocacy: Ind rights

CAP → ~~proposed~~ 1st seen as an obstacle to man

evolving from neutral to advoc. progr

CAPs have maintained focus as inform. complaints resolution

PAIN & only finding since 90s

- should get 1st reports in Jan

PAIR - diff from other P:A progs
most liberal mandate

" elig criteria (available
to those not elig for cap: other P:A
progs)

- as prog mgr - P:A have served members
to content of grantees - fed @
programs

- in RSA - perception that protection: advocacy
takes away funding for service delivery
- we must elim red tape

" main deus makers / prog offices -

- must recog were here to make
govt work - interag. coord viable

Carol Cohen: P:A for users of @ technol.

• overview of Agisa tech @ tx

• ~~agisa~~ hearings - had made tremend info. dissemin
knowledge past gains

but still had not removed many barriers -
to fam who could really benefit from @ tech
new amendments, extremely prescriptive - much to
chagrin of many states - must have
measurable outcomes that have removed
barriers from attaining @ devices
(must be done in measurable way)

P:A is piece added to new amendn - 5th US at
advocacy/potential piece - couldn't achieve

full level of attainment in tech.

- forces + collabora betw 2 state agencies b/c ^{can sit} each other has caused very intersting challenges
- many of these projects are housed in few agencies
- 2 dept / 5 agencies + we have conflicting administrative needs - how'll we face this in future yrs.
- must take hard look at how we coord progrs - overlapping charges missions

Gary Blumenthal

What'r you doing to coordinate?

Carol Cohen: making every effort to coord active + when have problem state -- agencies work together + it's a polit

OTHER SOURCES or ADVIS

Issue much bigger than these programs

John Fowe

Legal Services Corp.

→ structure: created by Congr - ap prop from Congr.

→ in theory → local progr prov services (323 local progr) in every county + invariably problems outweigh resources available

→ access to income - nearly 80m-551 cases

→ persons seeking access to eligibility

- access issues

- specific case - benefit for disab children

→ corp does have new administrtion - in process of devel initiatives affecting popula served.

Liz Savage:

EEOC's work interact c disab common in 2 areas

1. su 501 73' act → has affirmative req

2. major respons for enforcement title 1 - ADA prohibits ^{discrimination} of local govt ^{and} employer (over employees)

has regional offices
suffer from adequate press opera + enormous
backlog + very diffic esp since disab
cases are very fact-specific -

- yet have settled # of cases + 21,995\$ aver.
settlement + cumulative total

- 37 lawsuits pending in Fedl' courts
13^{of them} pert to HIV, also dealing w/

Justice Dept - oversees enforcement

tithe: 2 - prohib discrim st: loc govt as service providers
ADA 3 - accessibility

don't need to be disab

2 - ~~interagency~~

3 - received ~ 3m

can refer complaints to other agencies + HHS, Trans, Ed
- keep another pertaining to law system:
miscellaneous

working w/ educ on compliance reviews + litigation if cant
achieve compl. w/ law

STAN + complex map of advocacy resources

Fernando +

Stan + John + posiblv setting town c interf. group to collaborate

highlighted distinct betw + a com wrk group
• Natl review
• appointees w/ disabilities