

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: 12029
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Notes on Draft Proposal [National Disability Policy Review]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	97	3	1	2

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

16-Sep-1994 05:04pm

TO: Stanley S. Herr

FROM: Jeremy D. Benami
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Friday update

Haven't seen you today, so here's my latest news:

- Spoke to Lisa. Word from OMB is we have the green light from Alice on the memo and on moving ahead.

- Next steps:

- meeting Monday with Lux. Can you let Lisa and Richard know what room it's in. [Me too!!]

- I am working to set up a legislative meeting. I am trading phone calls with folks but hope to nail it down for next week.

- Can you provide Pat Romani with the names and phone numbers of the three people we need to set conference calls with so she can begin to schedule for next week.

- I will take a crack at a draft one page memo from Carol and Alice to the agencies that will initiate discussions with them about this process.

Also: we have a 3:00 meeting today on the Childhood Disability Commission in Carol's office.

See you Monday.

rwk: Stangled in its crib?

N T
N T

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

18-Aug-1994 01:58pm

TO: Stanley S. Herr
TO: Lisa B. Fairhall
TO: Richard E. Green

FROM: Jeremy D. Benami
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Thoughts on Disability Review

August 18, 1994

To: Stan Herr
Lisa Fairhall
Richard Green

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami

Re: Thoughts on Disability Review

The following are some thoughts on the process and politics of pulling off an ambitious national review of disability policy -- shaped by experiences in New York with similar complex issues and here with welfare reform. Most important, I would raise an early warning to be aware of the size, importance, and potential controversy of the effort we are about to undertake. How it is launched and how the groundwork is laid, internally in the administration and externally, is vital important.

Given the scope of this effort, I would suggest devoting all of September to laying the groundwork before beginning: meeting with agencies and outside players. In October, through a series of meetings and discussions, we would actually lay out an agenda, timetable and structure the process. The full-fledged review could begin within 2-3 months from now.

1. External Relations

Given the potential scope of this review, the early involvement

of key non-federal players will be important. This includes:

- Congressional leaders - including staff
- State/local representatives
- Interest Groups
- Existing Commissions

Before a process or an agenda begins to float, we should hold early meetings with key players in each of these areas to solicit ideas and advice and coordinate a process that will allow them input and involvement. In light of the FACA restrictions, we will need to structure this as a federal working group. However, we can make every effort to lay out a framework for our work that permits outside groups and individuals to have constructive input into the process.

I would suggest the following steps:

- early development of an outreach strategy that identifies key leaders in the advocacy, legislative, and intergovernmental arenas with whom we need to work. A couple of political shepherds within the administration who understand the politics of the community and can help act as liaison would be helpful in this process (late August)
- meetings in September with identified leaders to share initial thoughts about such a process, to solicit ideas about agenda, framework, process, etc.

2. Internal Administration

Just as important as getting the outside players on board is ensuring that the agencies and key appointees are part of the process from the beginning. They have to have room to shape the agenda and the process from the outset or they will not be bought in.

My suggestions here:

- Laying the groundwork for this process will require a series of meetings
- Start with a Carol/Alice meeting with high-level players which opens with a review (like the OMB disability review) and raises some questions, opening the door to the introduction the task force idea and the review. I would leave all issues open - membership, agenda, structure - rather than walking into a meeting with a blueprint. We'll end up with something we can live with and we'll start off on the right foot.
- Follow this meeting with a series of meetings with designated agency representatives to get their input and advice during September.
- Close this process with the first meeting of the actual working group in early October where the results of these initial meetings are laid out for group consideration as to agenda, structure, and process.

One tricky question: Who should actually be on the task force? If you name the Secretaries, you won't get their involvement - see, e.g., Interagency Council on the Homeless. However, strategically picking people at the Dep, Asst, and DAS level may get their personal involvement. Let's discuss.

I hope these thoughts are helpful. I look forward to lunch tomorrow.

FIRST DRAFT

DRAFT

saved as C:dispol

To: Carol H. Rasco

From: Stan Herr and Jeremy Ben-Ami

Subject: Options Paper on National Disability Policy Review

Date: August 11, 1994

We had a good discussion with Belle and four members of her staff this morning. Here are the discussion points we briefly raised. Appendix 1). Belle said she liked many of the ideas we canvassed, such as the broad approach that is values-based and draws on the President's overall philosophy on disability policy. She also liked the reference to the overseas experience, and noted that Alice Rivlin had written book on Swedish policy that might be usefully consulted. On time table, OMB initially ventured an ambitious April-June 1995 product, but quickly acknowledged that June 1995 or June 1996 might prove more realistic. We talked of the possibility of some interim report that could influence the 1997 budget process. On structure, they suggested a Task force co-chaired by you and Alice with some Secretaries, and a Working group level with DPC-OMB leadership and design from various timetables. To advance our discussion further, they asked for our writings and we shared the following outline which we noted was purely a rough draft. In all, it seemed a positive initial exchange. Based on our discussion and input, they will work up a next draft on options.

OUTLINE OF IDEAS

I. Summary

- A. Carol's request to us
- B. Alice's concurrence with a "very big deal" review
- C. The whole enchilada approach versus sectorial reviews
- D. Federal disability review v. "anonymous horde" review
(see NYT, 8-10-94 re settlement discussions on the health care advisory task force suit, the quoted matter being the US position)
- E. Constraints imposed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act 5 U.S.C., App. 2 -- public forums can be held by the 3 presidential advisory committees

II. Background

- A. The Campaign promises on disability policy
- B. The centrality of the ADA
- C. The positive services to make the ADA work
- D. the mandate (and interest) of the National Council on Disability (NCD) to make recommendations on disability
- E. ditto -- the President's Comm. on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD)
- F. ditto within the mental retardation/developmental disabilities fields for the President's Committee on mental

Retardation (PCMR)

- G. OMB reviews on disability programs
- H. DPC paper on the status of the implementation of the ADA
- I. Highlights of other nations' experience: the Swedish plan; query Canada; Germany

III. Scope options

A. Conceptual issues raised in Belle's list of questions (see Appendix 2) concerning federal responsibilities, & policies advancing the President's disability credo: inclusion, independence and empowerment, and applied to the following program and topic clusters, such as:

- B. infant and toddler programs
- C. education programs (age 3 to 21)
- D. cash benefit programs
- E. medical and other health programs
- F. social services and family supports
- G. school to work transitional services, rehabilitation services and training; employment services
- H. access to, and integration with state and local government programs
- I. access to transportation systems
- J. access to housing
- K. shifts away from institutional settings to community-based options
- L. advocacy services and civil rights enforcement
- M. information and referral; & other government actions aimed at greater empowerment, inclusion, dignity, and independence
- N. services for older persons
- O. personal assistance, mentoring, surrogate decision-making options; guardianship reforms
- P. access to telecommunications and other assistive technology
- Q. services for prevention or minimization of disability
- R. federal government as model employer and other disability accommodations to job applicants, customers, and visitors (note: Federal Disability accommodations Working Group underway)
- S. all the rest of the items one could imagine

IV. Process options

- A. DPC/OMB joint working group on national disability policy
- B. augmented by federal employees from the three national advisory committees;
- C. or further augmented by agencies with specialized jurisdictions, e.g. the Access Board; EEOC; FCC.
- D. on a purely advisory level, and without direct connection to the working group, the NCD, PCEPWD, and PCMR can have their own outreach and policy recommendation groups to offer broader range of input and political base-touching. They may also be preparing their own policy recommendations on a national disability policy that could feed into this process. See App. 3.
- E. The Disability appointees meeting that you chair can also be a forum for this policy development and as a focus group.

V. Recommendations

A. WHEN TO START?

B. Who starts?

C. Outcomes desired?

D. desire to bring some overall structure to the small, limited and uncoordinated national disability policy efforts to date

E. Chinese proverb: journey of 1000 miles begins with a single step

Appendices 1-3

Appendices 3

MEMORANDUM TO CAROL H. RASCO FOR BRIEFING OF PRESIDENT CLINTON

FROM: Stanley S. Herr

SUBJ: Summary of "Operation People First: Toward a National Disability Policy"

DATE: April 29, 1994

Summary. Justin Dart and the staff of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD) have produced a good overview of the task of framing a coordinated and comprehensive national disability policy. The policy they urge would reshape laws, regulations, programs, and services at both the federal and state levels to conform to "the spirit and the letter of ADA" (the Americans with Disabilities Act). They see the overall goal of that policy as empowering people with disabilities to maximize their potential. Tony Coelho, as our newly appointed PCEPD chair, concurs in the report's findings and recommendations and echoes the "need for a cohesive national policy on disability," supportive of the ADA and designed to bring people into the mainstreams of our culture. Although the recommendations range from the highly general to the narrowly specific, they appear to reflect the Administration's main priorities in this field -- health care reform to ensure universal coverage and end pre-existing condition exclusions, and a broad array of ADA education, implementation and enforcement activities.

Report-making Process. "The Operation People First" report (the Report) is based on 60 teleconferences with 1200 "disability constituency leaders" in the 50 states, DC and the territories. Those conference calls were held from March 1993 to September 1993, and lasted for up to two hours. The aim was to represent the views of a cross-section of major disability constituencies (see pp. 5-6). The tone and substance reflects Mr. Dart's input and his strong empowerment rhetoric and dedication to vigorous ADA enforcement and health care reform enactment. It leads with our campaign pledges of fully integrating all persons with disabilities into mainstream society, and actively involving people with disabilities in "developing a national policy that promotes equality and opportunity." (p. 1). It sees President Clinton's participatory aims as consistent with the historical movement from "authoritarian paternalism" to a "society that puts individuals first" and will bring into the decision-making processes the "vast majority" of excluded Americans with disabilities. (p. 2).

Main Recommendations. The crux of the Report is that the U.S.

lacks a coordinated and comprehensive policy consistent with the ADA, and that a major overhaul of our disjointed laws and fragmented services is long overdue. (p. 23)

The recommendations which follow from those premises include:

- enactment of a right to health care for all persons regardless of income, health or disability status, thus eliminating a powerful work disincentive to stay on the disability rolls, and achieving parity of coverage and civil rights protection for mental disability needs (pp. 10-12, 17-18)

- dedication of more resources at federal and state levels to implement the ADA through wider information dissemination, White House and other governmental leadership, "forceful, proactive steps" to speed compliance, carrot and stick approaches to eliminate what is perceived as local and state governments' "footdragging", etc. (pp. 12-15, 24)

- initiation of an array of government actions from changing Medicaid-waivers to open more community-based services to closing "dehumanizing institutions for people with developmental and psychiatric disabilities;

from a national database of job opportunities and training programs to removal of a host of work disincentives; from targeting undeserved populations of minority, elderly, or rural Americans with disabilities to developing transition programs ... for graduating students with disabilities." (pp. 8-9, 20, 25)

- launching of media and multi-sector campaigns to change attitudes and overcome the pervasive stigma against people with disabilities, especially those with mental disabilities or AIDS (pp. 21-22, 25-26)

- reform of various service-delivery sectors to promote full and meaningful inclusion in schools, accessible, integrated and safe housing, effective and available transportation systems (especially in rural areas), affordable and consumer-controlled personal assistance services, and other changes (pp. 8-9, 19-21)

- improvement of advocacy, empowerment, and equal citizenship status and strategies through training in substantive rights and self-advocacy skills, affirmative action, coalitions

- creation of programs that focus attention on the difficulties of school-to-work/adulthood transitions, and the need for work-study programs, vocational training programs, internships, business partnerships with schools, and others steps to aid 18-year-olds who are now unprepared to work and are abruptly severed from sources of vocational, aid, counselling, assistance, and structured activity (pp. 9, 20-21).

Analysis. The executive summary displays a formidable array of building blocks to set in place for the desired national disability policy. (pp. 8-9). And this list is not even comprehensive. It says little about an accessible telecommunications system; the need for a full array of personal and family supports to avoid unnecessary guardianships, institutional stays, and other stigmatizing differences; reform of welfare and social security disability programs; the need for sports and recreation to minimize isolation and boredom; and a

jobs or work-activity program commensurate with the unemployment rate cited in the Report (76% of persons with severe disabilities unemployed). Nevertheless the Report's priorities are a good faith starting point. Although the Report acknowledges that the development of coordinated national disability will take several years and require cooperative work with the National Council on Disability, it does not spell out the appropriate next steps to do this task. The overlapping missions and charges of the President's Committee and the National Council on Disability will require some White House oversight. In line with your query yesterday, this appears to be a matter relevant to the DPC since we also receive the recommendations from the President's Committee on Mental Retardation which is now reenergized and soon will be capable of contributing to national disability policy.

Please let me know if I can offer you any further assistance or elaboration.

FIRST DRAFT DRAFT saved as C:dispol

To: Carol H. Rasco

From: Stan Herr and Jeremy Ben-Ami

Subject: Options Paper on National Disability Policy Review

Date: August 11, 1994

We had a good discussion with Belle and four members of her staff this morning. Here is the discussion points we briefly raised. Appendix 1). Belle said she liked many of the ideas we canvassed, such as the broad approach that is values-based and draws on the President's overall philosophy on disability policy. She also liked the reference to the overseas experience, and noted that Alice Rivlin had written book on Swedish policy that might be usefully consulted. On time table, OMB initially ventured an ambitious April-June 1995 product, but quickly acknowledged that June 1995 or June 1996 might prove more realistic. We talked of the possibility of some interim report that could influence the 1997 budget process. On structure, they suggested a Task force co-chaired by you and Alice with some Secretaries, and a Working group level with DPC-OMB leadership and design from various timetables. To advance our discussion further, they asked for our writings and we shared the following outline which we noted was purely a rough draft. In all, it seemed a positive initial exchange. Based on our discussion and input, they will work up a next draft on options.

OUTLINE OF IDEAS

I. Summary

- A. Carol's request to us
- B. Alice's concurrence with a "very big deal" review
- C. The whole enchilada approach versus sectorial reviews
- D. Federal disability review v. "anonymous horde" review
(see NYT, 8-10-94 re settlement discussions on the health care advisory task force suit, the quoted matter being the US position)
- E. Constraints imposed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act 5 U.S.C., App. 2 -- public forums can be held by the 3 presidential advisory committees

II. Background

- A. The Campaign promises on disability policy
- B. The centrality of the ADA
- C. The positive services to make the ADA work
- D. the mandate (and interest) of the National Council on Disability (NCD) to make recommendations on disability
- E. ditto -- the President's Comm. on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD)
- F. ditto within the mental retardation/developmental disabilities fields for the President's Committee on mental Retardation (PCMR)

FIRST DRAFT

DRAFT

saved as C:dispol

To: Carol H. Rasco

From: Stan Herr and Jeremy Ben-Ami

Subject: Options Paper on National Disability Policy Review

Date: August 11, 1994

We had a good discussion with Belle and four members of her staff this morning. Here is the discussion points we briefly raised. Appendix 1). Belle said she liked many of the ideas we canvassed, such as the broad approach that is values-based and draws on the President's overall philosophy on disability policy. She also liked the reference to the overseas experience, and noted that Alice Rivlin had written book on Swedish policy that might be usefully consulted. On time table, OMB initially ventured an ambitious April-June 1995 product, but quickly acknowledged that June 1995 or June 1996 might prove more realistic. We talked of the possibility of some interim report that could influence the 1997 budget process. On structure, they suggested a Task force co-chaired by you and Alice with some Secretaries, and a Working group level with DPC-OMB leadership and designess from various timetables. To advance our discussion further, they asked for our writings and we shared the following outline which we noted was purely a rough draft. In all, it seemed a positive initial exchange. Based on our discussion and input, they will work up a next draft on options.

OUTLINE OF IDEAS

I. Summary

- A. Carol's request to us
- B. Alice's concurrence with a "very big deal" review
- C. The whole enchilada approach versus sectorial reviews
- D. Federal disability review v. "anonymous horde" review
(see NYT, 8-10-94 re settlement discussions on the health care advisory task force suit, the quoted matter being the US position)
- E. Constraints imposed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act 5 U.S.C., App. 2 -- public forums can be held by the 3 presidential advisory committees

II. Background

- A. The Campaign promises on disability policy
- B. The centrality of the ADA
- C. The positive services to make the ADA work
- D. the mandate (and interest) of the National Council on Disability (NCD) to make recommendations on disability
- E. ditto -- the President's Comm. on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD)
- F. ditto within the mental retardation/developmental disabilities fields for the President's Committee on mental Retardation (PCMR)

- G. OMB reviews on disability programs
- H. DPC paper on the status of the implementation of the ADA
- I. Highlights of other nations' experience: the Swedish plan; query Canada; Germany

III. Scope options

A. Conceptual issues raised in Belle's list of questions (see Appendix 2) concerning federal responsibilities, & policies advancing the President's disability credo: inclusion, independence and empowerment, and applied to the following program and topic clusters, such as:

- B. infant and toddler programs
- C. education programs (age 3 to 21)
- D. cash benefit programs
- E. medical and other health programs
- F. social services and family supports
- G. school to work transitional services, rehabilitation services and training; employment services
- H. access to, and integration with state and local government programs
- I. access to transportation systems
- J. access to housing
- K. shifts away from institutional settings to community-based options
- L. advocacy services and civil rights enforcement
- M. information and referral; & other government actions aimed at greater empowerment, inclusion, dignity, and independence
- N. services for older persons
- O. personal assistance, mentoring, surrogate decision-making options; guardianship reforms
- P. access to telecommunications and other assistive technology
- Q. services for prevention or minimization of disability
- R. federal government as model employer and other disability accommodations to job applicants, customers, and visitors (note: Federal Disability accommodations Working Group underway)
- S. all the rest of the items one could imagine

IV. Process options

- A. DPC/OMB joint working group on national disability policy
- B. augmented by federal employees from the three national advisory committees;
- C. or further augmented by agencies with specialized jurisdictions, e.g. the Access Board; EEOC; FCC.
- D. on a purely advisory level, and without direct connection to the working group, the NCD, PCEPWD, and PCMR can have their own outreach and policy recommendation groups to offer broader range of input and political base-touching. They may also be preparing their own policy recommendations on a national disability policy that could feed into this process. See App. 3.
- E. The Disability appointees meeting that you chair can also be a forum for this policy development and as a focus group.

V. Recommendations

- A. WHEN TO START?
- B. Who starts?
- C. Outcomes desired?
- D. desire to bring some overall structure to the small, limited and uncoordinated national disability policy efforts to date
- E. Chinese proverb: journey of 1000 miles begins with a single step

Appendices 1-3

DISCUSSION POINTS

Disability Policy Review

Some possible items for discussion today:

- What is the goal/scope of this effort:

- o broadest: a new national disability policy integrating all aspects of disability programs/policy

- o more narrow: better integration of income, health and education programs

- Timeframe

- o relates to goal - anywhere from one to three years

- Process

- o internal vs. public
 - o what level of agency involvement
 - o relation to existing bodies
 - o other outside involvement

- Product

- o report, recommendations, new legislation, etc.

cc: Jeremy
Stan

8/8

Per E-mail - Belle's list

QUESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE DPC/OMB REVIEW OF DISABILITY

- ✓ o What is the Federal responsibility for people with disabilities? What is the rationale for assuming responsibility (e.g., insurance, indemnity, need)? Does the scope and nature of the responsibility differ based on age (children vs. adults?)
- o How are we meeting those responsibilities? What is the current array of programs? What services/benefits are they providing? How delivered? To whom? What are the gaps and overlaps?
- o What do we know about how recipients are doing? What data are we currently collecting, and what do we need?
- o What changes are needed to program purposes, and to program structure, to better meet Federal responsibilities? Are we currently targeting the correct individuals? Are we providing the correct array of services and benefits?
- o Should we revise statutes and regulations to align definitions of disability? 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 participant outcomes?
- o Should we move program focus towards participant outcomes?
- ✓ o Should we develop a legislative strategy to integrate cash benefit programs with service programs to promote beneficiary independence and self sufficiency and reduce the need for benefits?

From Belle

Appendices 3

MEMORANDUM TO CAROL H. RASCO FOR BRIEFING OF PRESIDENT CLINTON

FROM: Stanley S. Herr

SUBJ: Summary of "Operation People First: Toward a National Disability Policy"

DATE: April 29, 1994

Summary. Justin Dart and the staff of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD) have produced a good overview of the task of framing a coordinated and comprehensive national disability policy. The policy they urge would reshape laws, regulations, programs, and services at both the federal and state levels to conform to "the spirit and the letter of ADA" (the Americans with Disabilities Act). They see the overall goal of that policy as empowering people with disabilities to maximize their potential. Tony Coelho, as our newly appointed PCEPD chair, concurs in the report's findings and recommendations and echoes the "need for a cohesive national policy on disability," supportive of the ADA and designed to bring people into the mainstreams of our culture. Although the recommendations range from the highly general to the narrowly specific, they appear to reflect the Administration's main priorities in this field -- health care reform to ensure universal coverage and end pre-existing condition exclusions, and a broad array of ADA education, implementation and enforcement activities.

Report-making Process. "The Operation People First" report (the Report) is based on 60 teleconferences with 1200 "disability constituency leaders" in the 50 states, DC and the territories. Those conference calls were held from March 1993 to September 1993, and lasted for up to two hours. The aim was to represent the views of a cross-section of major disability constituencies (see pp. 5-6). The tone and substance reflects Mr. Dart's input and his strong empowerment rhetoric and dedication to vigorous ADA enforcement and health care reform enactment. It leads with our campaign pledges of fully integrating all persons with disabilities into mainstream society, and actively involving people with disabilities in "developing a national policy that promotes equality and opportunity." (p. 1). It sees President Clinton's participatory aims as consistent with the historical movement from "authoritarian paternalism" to a "society that puts individuals first" and will bring into the decision-making processes the "vast majority" of excluded Americans with disabilities. (p. 2).

Main Recommendations. The crux of the Report is that the U.S. lacks a coordinated and comprehensive policy consistent with the

ADA, and that a major overhaul of our disjointed laws and fragmented services is long overdue. (p. 23)

The recommendations which follow from those premises include:

- enactment of a right to health care for all persons regardless of income, health or disability status, thus eliminating a powerful work disincentive to stay on the disability rolls, and achieving parity of coverage and civil rights protection for mental disability needs (pp. 10-12, 17-18)

- dedication of more resources at federal and state levels to implement the ADA through wider information dissemination, White House and other governmental leadership, "forceful, proactive steps" to speed compliance, carrot and stick approaches to eliminate what is perceived as local and state governments' "footdragging", etc. (pp. 12-15, 24)

- initiation of an array of government actions from changing Medicaid-waivers to open more community-based services to closing "dehumanizing institutions for people with developmental and psychiatric disabilities;

from a national database of job opportunities and training programs to removal of a host of work disincentives; from targeting undeserved populations of minority, elderly, or rural Americans with disabilities to developing transition programs ... for graduating students with disabilities." (pp. 8-9, 20, 25)

- launching of media and multi-sector campaigns to change attitudes and overcome the pervasive stigma against people with disabilities, especially those with mental disabilities or AIDS (pp. 21-22, 25-26)

- reform of various service-delivery sectors to promote full and meaningful inclusion in schools, accessible, integrated and safe housing, effective and available transportation systems (especially in rural areas), affordable and consumer-controlled personal assistance services, and other changes (pp. 8-9, 19-21)

- improvement of advocacy, empowerment, and equal citizenship status and strategies through training in substantive rights and self-advocacy skills, affirmative action, coalitions

- creation of programs that focus attention on the difficulties of school-to-work/adulthood transitions, and the need for work-study programs, vocational training programs, internships, business partnerships with schools, and others steps to aid 18-year-olds who are now unprepared to work and are abruptly severed from sources of vocational, aid, counselling, assistance, and structured activity (pp. 9, 20-21).

Analysis. The executive summary displays a formidable array of building blocks to set in place for the desired national disability policy. (pp. 8-9). And this list is not even comprehensive. It says little about an accessible telecommunications system; the need for a full array of personal and family supports to avoid unnecessary guardianships, institutional stays, and other stigmatizing differences; reform of welfare and social security disability programs; the need for sports and recreation to minimize isolation and boredom; and a jobs or work-activity program commensurate with the unemployment

rate cited in the Report (76% of persons with severe disabilities unemployed). Nevertheless the Report's priorities are a good faith starting point. Although the Report acknowledges that the development of coordinated national disability will take several years and require cooperative work with the National Council on Disability, it does not spell out the appropriate next steps to do this task. The overlapping missions and charges of the President's Committee and the National Council on Disability will require some White House oversight. In line with your query yesterday, this appears to be a matter relevant to the DPC since we also receive the recommendations from the President's Committee on Mental Retardation which is now reenergized and soon will be capable of contributing to national disability policy.

Please let me know if I can offer you any further assistance or elaboration.

ROUGH DRAFT

DRAFT

saved as C:dispol

Jeremy -- draft memo re Disability Policy Review; is this rough initial draft something we can work from? anything to add? cautions?

Subject: Options Paper on National Disability Policy Review

Date: August 10, 1994

OUTLINE OF IDEAS

I. Summary

- A. Carol's request to us
- B. Alice's concurrence with a very big deal
- C. The whole enchilada approach versus sectorial reviews
- D. Federal disability review v. "anonymous horde" review
(see NYT, 8-10-94 re settlement discussions on the health care advisory task force suit, the quoted matter being the US position)
- E. Constraints imposed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act

II. Background

- A. The Campaign promises on disability policy
- B. The centrality of the ADA
- C. The positive services to make the ADA work
- D. the mandate (and interest) of the National Council on Disability (NCD) to make recommendations on disability
- E. ditto -- the President's Comm. on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD)
- F. ditto within the mental retardation/developmental disabilities fields for the President's Committee on mental Retardation (PCMR)
- G. OMB reviews on disability programs
- H. DPC paper on the status of the implementation of the ADA
- I. Highlights of other nations' experience: the Swedish plan; query Canada; Germany

III. Scope options

- A. infant and toddler programs
- B. education programs (age 3 to 21)
- C. cash benefit programs
- D. medical and other health programs
- E. social services and family supports
- F. school to work transitional services, rehabilitation services and training; employment services
- G. access to, and integration with state and local government programs
- H. access to transportation systems
- I. access to housing
- J. shifts away from institutional settings to community-based options
- K. advocacy services and civil rights enforcement
- L. information and referral; & other government actions aimed at greater empowerment, inclusion, dignity, and independence

- M. services for older persons
 - N. personal assistance, mentoring, surrogate decision-making options; guardianship reforms
 - O. access to telecommunications and other assistive technology
 - P. services for prevention or minimization of disability
 - Q. federal government as model employer and other disability accommodations to job applicants, customers, and visitors
 - R. all the rest of the items one could imagine
- IV. Process options
- A. DPC/OMB joint working group on national disability policy
 - B. augmented by federal employees from the three national advisory committees;
 - C. or further augmented by agencies with specialized jurisdictions, e.g. the Access Board; EEOC; FCC.
 - D. on a purely advisory level, and without direct connection to the working group, the NCD, PCEPWD, and PCMR can have their own outreach and policy recommendation groups to offer broader range of input and political base-touching
- V. Recommendations
- HELP!
- A. WHEN TO START?
 - B. Who starts?
 - C. Outcomes desired?
 - D. desire to bring some overall structure to the small, limited and uncoordinated national disability policy efforts to date
 - E. Chinese proverb: journey of 1000 miles begins with a single step

Jeremy --FYI Carol had asked me to summarize this report on framing a national disability policy.

MEMORANDUM TO CAROL H. RASCO FOR BRIEFING OF PRESIDENT CLINTON

FROM: Stanley S. Herr

SUBJ: Summary of "Operation People First: Toward a National Disability Policy"

DATE: April 29, 1994

Summary. Justin Dart and the staff of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities (PCEPD) have produced a good overview of the task of framing a coordinated and

comprehensive national disability policy. The policy they urge would reshape laws, regulations, programs, and services at both the federal and state levels to conform to "the spirit and the letter of ADA" (the Americans with Disabilities Act). They see the overall goal of that policy as empowering people with disabilities to maximize their potential. Tony Coelho, as our newly appointed PCEPD chair, concurs in the report's findings and recommendations and echoes the "need for a cohesive national policy on disability," supportive of the ADA and designed to bring people into the mainstreams of our culture. Although the recommendations range from the highly general to the narrowly specific, they appear to reflect the Administration's main priorities in this field -- health care reform to ensure universal coverage and end pre-existing condition exclusions, and a broad array of ADA education, implementation and enforcement activities.

Report-making Process. "The Operation People First" report (the Report) is based on 60 teleconferences with 1200 "disability constituency leaders" in the 50 states, DC and the territories. Those conference calls were held from March 1993 to September 1993, and lasted for up to two hours. The aim was to represent the views of a cross-section of major disability constituencies (see pp. 5-6). The tone and substance reflects Mr. Dart's input and his strong empowerment rhetoric and dedication to vigorous ADA enforcement and health care reform enactment. It leads with our campaign pledges of fully integrating all persons with disabilities into mainstream society, and actively involving people with disabilities in "developing a national policy that promotes equality and opportunity." (p. 1). It sees President Clinton's participatory aims as consistent with the historical movement from "authoritarian paternalism" to a "society that puts individuals first" and will bring into the decision-making processes the "vast majority" of excluded Americans with disabilities. (p. 2).

Main Recommendations. The crux of the Report is that the U.S. lacks a coordinated and comprehensive policy consistent with the ADA, and that a major overhaul of our disjointed laws and fragmented services is long overdue. (p. 23)

The recommendations which follow from those premises include:

- enactment of a right to health care for all persons regardless of income, health or disability status, thus eliminating a powerful work disincentive to stay on the disability rolls, and achieving parity of coverage and civil rights protection for mental disability needs (pp. 10-12, 17-18)

- dedication of more resources at federal and state levels to implement the ADA through wider information dissemination, White House and other governmental leadership, "forceful, proactive steps" to speed compliance, carrot and stick approaches to eliminate what is perceived as local and state governments' "footdragging", etc. (pp. 12-15, 24)

- initiation of an array of government actions from changing Medicaid-waivers to open more community-based services to closing

"dehumanizing institutions for people with developmental and psychiatric disabilities; from a national database of job opportunities and training programs to removal of a host of work disincentives; from targeting undeserved populations of minority, elderly, or rural Americans with disabilities to developing transition programs ... for graduating students with disabilities." (pp. 8-9, 20, 25)

- launching of media and multi-sector campaigns to change attitudes and overcome the pervasive stigma against people with disabilities, especially those with mental disabilities or AIDS (pp. 21-22, 25-26)

- reform of various service-delivery sectors to promote full and meaningful inclusion in schools, accessible, integrated and safe housing, effective and available transportation systems (especially in rural areas), affordable and consumer-controlled personal assistance services, and other changes (pp. 8-9, 19-21)

- improvement of advocacy, empowerment, and equal citizenship status and strategies through training in substantive rights and self-advocacy skills, affirmative action, coalitions

- creation of programs that focus attention on the difficulties of school-to-work/adulthood transitions, and the need for work-study programs, vocational training programs, internships, business partnerships with schools, and others steps to aid 18-year-olds who are now unprepared to work and are abruptly severed from sources of vocational, aid, counselling, assistance, and structured activity (pp. 9, 20-21).

Analysis. The executive summary displays a formidable array of building blocks to set in place for the desired national disability policy. (pp. 8-9). And this list is not even comprehensive. It says little about an accessible telecommunications system; the need for a full array of personal and family supports to avoid unnecessary guardianships, institutional stays, and other stigmatizing differences; reform of welfare and social security disability programs; the need for sports and recreation to minimize isolation and boredom; and a jobs or work-activity program commensurate with the unemployment rate cited in the Report (76% of persons with severe disabilities unemployed). Nevertheless the Report's priorities are a good faith starting point. Although the Report acknowledges that the development of coordinated national disability will take several years and require cooperative work with the National Council on Disability, it does not spell out the appropriate next steps to do this task. The overlapping missions and charges of the President's Committee and the National Council on Disability will require some White House oversight. In line with your query yesterday, this appears to be a matter relevant to the DPC since we also receive the recommendations from the President's Committee on Mental Retardation which is now reenergized and soon will be capable of contributing to national disability policy.

Please let me know if I can offer you any further assistance or elaboration.

September 26, 1994

NOTE TO CAROL:

This is the last draft on the National disability Policy Review we have from our OMB colleagues. I gather that they have incorporated our suggested edits (handwritten) on their word-processed version.

One model for this type of national review is provided by Sweden. The 1989 Disability Commission was appointed by Government in that year to investigate the "situation for children, young persons, and adults in Sweden with severe functional impairments. Their main report, Disability, Welfare, Justice, was presented in May 1991. They also had interim reports on various subjects. Its sixth and final report was titled A Society for All, and comprised 23 chapters on various accessibility and integration topics. The fundamental principles guiding their review seem analogous to President Clinton's disability credo, or in the words of the Swedish commission: "We have been guided by our fundamental principle, which express qualitative demands and stand for self-determination and influence, participation, availability, a holistic perspective and continuity."

The idea of interim reports makes a lot of sense in terms of phasing the workload of a large review such as the one we contemplated. I think we also need the whole picture to ensure that our disability programs and policies are coherent and fit together at various life stages.

As to what comes first, I think it depends on such factors as:

- what we learn during the course of our groundwork interviews;
- alignment with overall Administration priorities (e.g., attention to the needs of families, and especially those families with children and young persons with disabilities;
- the work of ongoing or proposed reviews (e.g., Childhood benefits; the National academy of science's \$1.2 million study of federal support for rehabilitation science and engineering; the DPC Federal disability accommodations Working Group, etc).

FYI, Alice Rivlin was the author of a book on the Swedish economy so may well be intrigued by learning from the experience of that and other countries to improve our national disability policies. I'm borrowing the book.

See you and Jeremy at 2pm.

Stan

cc: Jeremy

Neeta/Lux/Fine 7-19

①

1. ~~Blind~~ Deaf

Ted Kennedy

Steny Hoyer (D)

2. Silverstein

Strom Thurmond (R)

②

3. Marchand - CCD

bote co-chairs - health
- just start -

HH

4. ~~Other~~ Co. Chamberlin

5.

NAMI -

NAMI AI Guide

Over Mommies

CO-Blind (2 WFB/WCand)
Deaf 1

Vietnam

AIDS (Aids Action Council --

more thoughtful - AIDS Action Council
National Minority

③

Oste
Wright

Q: folks burned up re health
care - not like to be a
corp

open process

Ronnie Ferguson NC Independent Living

Other Program

Members

Robyn Stone
Fernando Tenorio

Day 1 -- and - input --

C/HR re. Walnut ~~in~~ ~~Conley~~ / ~~Brick~~ / ~~Bradley~~
Non-
① Tom ② Val ③ Bradley

Charter - reschedule
Children - SI met by notify Bill

Wice
Junkie
Pickley Riley
SSA FALK

Brandis

Bonnie Day
doctored dissidents

Mash →

No Need for DPC --

2nd week -- Oct -- Oregon
bondsmen

Oct. 24th

Memo to C/HR/HR
1 page (Bancroft)
Representation

Form and FAX

Translator

Non-DPC are Colonial Land
FACA -- Executive Director
Bsee Non, PC

Late September

You present the idea for a National Disability Policy Review to a meeting of the Domestic Policy Council, perhaps prefaced by an abridged presentation of material and questions from the OMB Entitlements Review prepared this summer. You ask Secretaries to designate members of the Review Team at the Assistant or Deputy Assistant Secretary level, as well as staff contacts who will be able to devote some time to this effort.

Early October

First meeting of the Review Team, chaired by the two of you, to ~~begin~~ ^{change} to structure an agenda, process, and work plan. ^{transact}

Late October

By the end of the month, the Review Team would ~~be charged with report back on preparing a broad agenda, work plan~~ ^{to you} and proposed staff structure for the Review ~~to the Chairs~~. ^{their recommendations to you} A couple of meetings during October would build on the groundwork laid at the individual agency meetings in September to reach agreement on process and structure.

Ongoing

The Review Team will provide periodic updates and interim reports to the DPC and OMB.

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 N T

13-Sep-1994 12:53pm

TO: Jeremy D. Benami
TO: Stanley S. Herr

FROM: Carol H. Rasco
 Economic and Domestic Policy

SUBJECT: Disability review

I have now had the chance to read the memo and feel it is right on track with what I had in mind.

The only two things that make me wonder about the advisability of having them in a memo that will form the basis for the initial outline of an agenda are under : Identifying and Implementing Change.....

3rd bullet point: the first two questions suggest a specific course of action in a sense and I wonder if just deleting them (although we will know those are things the group will do) doesn't achieve the same purpose with the question that is left?

4th bullet point: Is the first question perhaps too leading in its direction? Again, as in the point I make for bullet point 3, I feel we can't be seen as pointing in a certain direction even though the direction has merit...I fear it would set off undue fears, expectations from the beginning. Can we reword that question to make it more general for this first cut?

Thanks.

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 N T

13-Sep-1994 02:31pm

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

FROM: Stanley S. Herr
 Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Disability Review edits/Lux meeting appointment

Carol's concerns seem well-taken to me. Also I'm a bit dubious that standard definitions of disability are possible given the many statutory contexts and purposes in which the term disability appears.

to the editing, Jeremy and I think that to reflect Carol's input strike the first two sentences in the third bullet, and revise the 4th bullet along the following more general lines:

"-- Are there new strategies to promote independence and self-sufficiency for persons with disabilities?"

Does this do it?

Mike Lux, and perhaps Debbie Fine, in Public Liason is willing to meet with us on Monday, Sept 19th. I'm trying to pin it down to 1 or 1:30 in his room OEOB 116. Hope those times will work for all.

EDUCATION BRANCH
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

TO: *JEREMY BENAMI*

FAX NUMBER:

67028

FROM: *LISA FAIRHALL* *(57266)*

DATE: *9/12/94*

TIME: *10:05*

NUMBER OF PAGES: *7*

NOTES:

Per conversation.

We'll talk later this afternoon.

OUR FAX NUMBER: 202 395-4875
VOICE CONFIRMATION: 202 395-5880

~~amend to page 4~~

MEMORANDUM FOR ALICE RIVLIN AND CAROL RASCO

alphabetical order
throughout

FROM Lisa Fairhall and Richard Green
Jeremy Ben-Ami and Stan Herr

SUBJECT Draft Proposal for DPC/OMB Disability Task Force

Background

and national responsibilities for,

You have agreed to establish a joint DPC/OMB task force to examine issues surrounding Federal responsibility for individuals with disabilities.

engagement
with, and
rights of

→ *INSERT TEXT* *INSERT re Groundwork*

Below, we propose: a task force agenda, a time frame for task force activities, and task force and support team composition. *The list of questions for this Review are entirely provisional, and we are in the process of validating whether there are the right questions to be asking*

Proposed Task Force Agenda

articulate and refine

The Task Force should be guided by the President's credo of inclusion, independence, and empowerment for persons with disabilities. The Task Force should therefore answer, to the extent possible, the following questions, in order to develop the Administration's overall disability policy:

or runs through

National Disability Policy: *can be identified*

-- *Is there an articulated national disability policy that animates federal law, regulations, and programs?*

Reflected -- What should be the nation's responsibilities to people with disabilities, and how can Federal actions make this a reality? What is the rationale for assuming each specific Federal responsibility (e.g., insurance, indemnity, need)? Do the scope and nature of the responsibilities differ based on age (children vs. adults) or severity of disability?

make this sound local like Dep. for outreach

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:

what values do they promote?

- rights?*
- How are we meeting current responsibilities? *the* What is current array of programs? What services/benefits are they providing? How delivered? To whom? What are the gaps and overlaps? How are the Federal programs/services integrated with State and local government programs? *What exemplary state and local government programs exist? 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 to program structure to better meet

I'm not sure I understand this word -- clarify.

current Federal responsibilities? Are we currently targeting the correct individuals? 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?

why?

-- How should we revise statutes and regulations to align definitions of disability across programs? What specific impact would such revisions have on eligibility and services? 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?

define (parenthetically)

-- Should we develop a legislative strategy to integrate cash benefit programs with service programs to promote beneficiary independence and self-sufficiency and reduce the need for benefits?

sure, but...

Pilot program or demonstration programs to test these ideas out before national legislation.

Federal Government as a Model:

-- How well does the Federal Government serve as a model, in both employment practices and customer service? If not well, how can this be improved? *policies and benefit of job applicants, employees, customers, and the members of the general public with disabilities*

in bold Add header

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

- o services to infants and toddlers
- o education programs
- o cash benefit programs (insurance, subsistence, and retirement)
- o medical and other health programs
- o social services and family supports
- o school-to-work transitional services, rehabilitation services and training, 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 prevention programs

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 administratively to alter the way Federal programs are implemented through either changes to regulation or funding priorities, administrative changes to the Federal Government's own internal activities (e.g., employment and customer service

grants and contracts

practices), or legislative proposals.

Time frame for action

We recommend that the Task Force be constituted, the support team named, and the agenda (see above) be agreed on by ~~the end of September~~. It should complete its activities and submit its report to the President by June 1996. That would give the Administration sufficient time to incorporate recommendations into the FY 1998 Budget. (We originally considered a shorter time frame, with the Task Force reporting by June 1995. However, in order to ensure a comprehensive and thoughtful deliberative process, and ample time to analyze and synthesize the findings of the Task Force and support group and develop recommendations, we have opted for a longer period.) The Task Force itself would meet at least once every three months during this time.

October 3, with annual interim reports.

Interim report

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 (which would include DoD, VA, HHS, SSA, ED, OPM, and DOL) would be invited to participate at the policy level through the Secretaries or their designees, presumably Assistant Secretaries responsible for key program and policy areas.

Sequence

- 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.

reverse order
HHS
(Chambers disabled)
supported
holmes
(SSV)
project
size

in the design of this Review
and ~~the~~ the way it
sets carried out

Task force advisors

- 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. 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.

~ Persons with ~~disabilities~~ an ~~array~~ array of disabilities, and members of their families, and their advocates will need to be regularly consulted (formally and informally).

(Folks - I think
this point
must be
made
explicit)

Have
you can
~~see~~ need
and incorporate
these suggestions.

To	Jeremy Ben-Ami	From	Stan Herr
Co.	DPC/WH	Co.	DPC
Dept.		Phone #	(410) 435-5672
Fax #	(202) 456-7028	Fax #	(410) 206-8354

Jeremy -
Per your
request,
my edit/
comment
memo:

Please relay
to Rick + Richard don't have their FAT.
These 6 pages, as Groundworkings

Monday,
a.m.
I'm
reachable
at
phone
above--
call me
just to
confirm
receipt.
Thanks

I would suggest adding the following at the beginning of the

before the Review Team
begins its
work.

Suggested Kick-off Process

We believe this review will be an important undertaking, subject to a great deal of interest and comment from people both in and out of the administration. To get the review off on the right foot, we propose spending time in September and ~~the first week in~~ ^{October} before formally beginning work laying the groundwork internally and externally through a series of meetings outlined below. This outreach and initial leg-work will buy us a great deal of good will by informing and involving people as early as possible on the front end and developing ways of communicating and providing input.

improve
our design
and

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

Early-mid September

Preliminary meetings with administration officials at key agencies to explore the idea of a Review, brainstorm about its structure, work plan, and agenda

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.

Mid September

With help from the Office of Public Liaison* and Legislative Affairs, 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.

perhaps note

* Mike Lux, in Public Liaison is willing to offer his knowledgeable assistance

Carol

Full

- ① WR... wed afternoon
3 Full-days
- ② Mid-March at latest for POTUS
- ③ crunch time - broader principles
- ④ 11:30-12:30 next Thursday
- Feb 26th -- offsite -- memo present
- ⑤ Immigration Work Group
(Sept-94 report)
Barbara Jordan, chairs
(President too)

⑥ Index
Urban Policy Report -- Congress
reprinted (Paul & Susan)
March 28

-- before Urban Conference

- ⑦ WR bill -- few days before
- ⑧ Ed, Tracy + Regional Work Group
Diamond + Goldstein
Robin + Carol
First Meeting * (Thurs. 1-2

- Fill-in the gap
- Message Group.

⑨ Crime Group

⑩ First Lady -- Co-ordinating
Body for Children's Issues
(HHS meeting)
Ed.

National Option on table
⑫ Disability Policy

- Spring

- Speeches

- President speaks in May

Q: Is there a mandate?
A: taking lead See National Commission on Disability
Time table --