

FOIA MARKER

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

Folder Title:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

Staff Office-Individual:

Defense Policy-Bell, Robert

Original OA/ID Number:

46

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
31	3	2	2	v

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Legislative Referral Memorandum #D-336. [CIA Act] [partial] (1 page)	08/05/1993	P3/b(3)
002. cable	re: Message from Vice President Albert Gore to Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. (3 pages)	08/14/1993	P1/b(1)
003. cable	Letter from Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev to Warren Christopher. Subject: Kozyrev Requests Heads-Up on Strikes. (2 pages)	08/11/1993	P1/b(1)
004. report	PRD Status Report. (5 pages)	08/16/1993	P1/b(1)
005. memo	For Anthony Lake from Robert Bell. Subject: Meeting with Panetta and Aspin on BUR Shortfall Issue. Record ID: 9306243. (3 pages)	08/18/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 11, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *R.B.*FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*SUBJECT: Joint Defense/State Proposed Report on S 802 and
HR 1621, Two Bills Requiring Increased Allied
Burdensharing

At Tab II is a joint DoD/State response to two bills which would require increased allied burdensharing for U.S. defense expenditures in allied countries. Both bills require that allies contribute not less than 75% of the operations costs and up to 50% of the personnel costs associated with maintaining U.S. forces in Europe. State and Defense argue that this legislation would result in the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Europe, thereby diminishing U.S. prestige, leadership, presence and influence. They recommend that the goal of increased burdensharing be pursued through continued negotiations with our allies, rather than through legislation.

Concurrences by: *AAW* Anne Witkowsky, Rose Gottemoeller, *W* Barry
Lowenkron and Jeremy Rosner *R*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the proposed joint report.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

MEMORANDUM FOR RONALD K. PETERSON

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Joint Defense/State Proposed Report on S 802 and
HR 1621, Two Bills Requiring Increased Allied
Burdensharing

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed joint report.

6022

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

August 10, 1993

SPECIAL

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #M-607

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

JUSTICE - Sheila F. Anthony - (202)514-2141 - 217

NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249

STATE - Julia C. Norton - (202)647-2137 - 225

FROM: RONALD K. PETERSON (for) *Ronald K. Peterson*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: MIKE GOAD (395-7301)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-6194

SUBJECT: JOINT DEFENSE/STATE Proposed Report on S 802
and HR 1621, two bills requiring increased
allied burdensharing.

DEADLINE: 4:00 P.M., Thursday, August 14, 1993 - TODAY Aug. 11

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before
advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in
accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or
receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of
Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

T. Davis
B. Smith
B. Thierwechter
K. MacIntyre
J. Palmieri
H. Paster
C. Sloan

RESPONSE TO LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

_____ Concur _____
 _____ No objection _____
 _____ No comment _____
 _____ See proposed edits on pages _____
 _____ Other: _____
 _____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
 _____ response sheet _____

AUG 10 '93 15:08 FROM OSD-LRS

TO PETERSON

PAGE.003

Dear Senator/Representative/Chairman:

Recent proposed legislation in both houses of Congress requiring increased allied burdensharing would jeopardize our country's ability to sustain its strategic interests abroad.

S. 802 and H.R. 1621 call on the Administration to negotiate agreements with allies requiring them to contribute not less than 75 percent of the operations costs of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe and, in H.R. 1621, up to 50 percent of the U.S. personnel costs, to include pay and allowances. This legislation further stipulates that Congress discontinue funding U.S. forces stationed in host countries which fail to comply. These, and any similar amendments, if enacted into law, would force the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, and with them would go our leadership position in European affairs, and our ability to promote and protect our vital national interests there.

The President has reaffirmed the United States commitments to NATO, Japan and Korea to maintain our forward military presence. The President made these commitments largely because they represent our own vital strategic interests. The post Cold War has brought new dangers and instability that threaten our fundamental interests.

Our allied security arrangements with the U.S. forward deployed presence are the underpinning of our larger vital interests in the world. They contribute immeasurably to world peace; the expansion of democracy and human rights; access to open markets and economic growth opportunities; long-term stability; and democratic consolidation across the region, especially in Eastern Europe, Russia and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union.

We share the Congress' concern about equitable burdensharing, and this remains a primary Administration policy. However the proposed legislation runs contrary to U.S. interests and would portend disastrous consequences, certainly a diminution of American prestige and leadership, U.S. European presence, and regional and world influence. What the U.S. has achieved in Europe over the past half century would be in jeopardy. Contrary to legislative intent, our burdensharing negotiations with major European allies will not yield the contributions called for by these proposals.

We will continue to negotiate arrangements with our allies that seek to be more beneficial to the U.S. The Administration pledges to do its utmost to achieve the lowest

AUG 18 '93 15:00 FROM OSD-LRS

TO PETERSON

PAGE.004

possible stationing costs through continuing negotiations with our allies, in return for a reasonable level of funding for an adequate forward deployed force that is ready and capable of carrying out U.S. and collective missions.

But more importantly, the Clinton Administration intends to undertake with our NATO allies a wide-ranging review of our mutual commitments to trans-Atlantic and European regional security through an enlarged concept of security responsibility sharing. The objective is to take us beyond the old and sterile approaches of the Cold War and seek a new understanding with our allies in the areas of defense planning; resource management; cost sharing and policy management, including sharing new roles and missions involving the emerging democracies of central and eastern Europe, peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and humanitarian relief, among others.

NATO remains the key to stability in Europe. U.S. leadership is vital to the Alliance's future, and we can continue to lead only as long as we maintain the readiness of our credible forward forces. We will keep you and other members of Congress fully apprised of our progress in achieving the goals and objectives of our new strategy. We need Congress as a partner in this endeavor.

Warren M. Christopher
Secretary of State

Les Aspin
Secretary of Defense

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

5963

August 10, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RCB*

FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*

SUBJECT: DoD Draft Bill NATO Airborne Warning and Control System Program Reimbursement Waiver

At Tab II DoD proposes to extend existing legislative authority to waive charges incurred by the U.S. in the NATO Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) program. The countries that participate in the NATO AWACS program agreed that costs could be minimized by sharing certain overhead costs. Some costs incurred by the Air Force Program Office, however, require reimbursement by NATO.

In the past, DoD received legislative authorization to waive these costs. However, because existing legislative authority applied only to the original aircraft acquisition and follow-on support, DoD subsequently sought legislative authority to waive this reimbursement for modernization programs as well. This bill extends the authority to waive support costs for the modernization program.

Concurrences by: *AW* Anne Witkowsky and *E* Jeremy Rosner

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the DoD draft bill.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

MEMORANDUM FOR RONALD K. PETERSON

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Draft Bill NATO Airborne Warning and
Control System Program Reimbursement Waiver

The National Security Council staff concurs in the Defense draft bill.

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

5963
SPECIAL

August 5, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #D-338
DRAFT #313

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

✓ NSC - William H. Itoh - (202) 395-3723 - 249
STATE - Julie C. Norton - (202) 647-2137 - 225

FROM: RONALD K. PETERSON (for) *Ronald K. Peterson*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: MIKE GOAD (395-7301)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-6194

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Draft Bill NATO Airborne Warning and
Control System Program Reimbursement Waiver
(DOD 103-026)

DEADLINE: 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, August 30, 1993

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before
advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in
accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or
receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of
Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

S. Dotson
B. Thierwechter
K. MacIntyre
B. Sasser


H. Paster

You may also respond by (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); (2) sending us a memo or letter; or (3) if you are an OASIS user in the Executive Office of the President, sending an E-mail message. Please include the LRM number shown above, and the **subject** shown below.

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

_____ Concur

_____ No objection

_____ No comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
_____ response sheet

**DRAFT
FOR
OMB A-19
REVIEW**

Honorable Thomas S. Foley
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515-4705

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed is proposed legislation, "To amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement for certain costs incurred in the NATO Airborne Warning and Control System program."

The proposed legislation is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 103d Congress. The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Purpose of the Legislation

The NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Program has been described as the largest and most successful cooperative development and production program in the history of the NATO Alliance. It represents the combined contributions of thirteen of the sixteen NATO nations, involving the expenditure of more than \$3 billion under a joint management program. The program has resulted in the creation of the first fully integrated, multi-national force in the world. The acquisition phase of the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Program has been accomplished under the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding, on the NATO E-3A Cooperative Program, dated December 6, 1978. The operations and support of the NATO E-3A fleet is pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding for Operation and Support of the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Force, dated September 26, 1984.

To meet the changing threat and to maintain interoperability with the United States, United Kingdom, and French Airborne Warning and Control System fleets, the Tri-Major NATO Commanders determined that the NATO fleet required certain modernization, and developed an improvement plan for that purpose. This plan has been approved by SHAPE, the NATO Military Committee, the North Atlantic Council, and the participating nations. The nations recently concluded an Addendum to the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding, dated December 7, 1990, which sets forth the principles under which modernization will be accomplished.

As set forth in the Addendum, this modernization program consists of eight projects and will have a \$700 million ceiling. The participating nations will share the costs of the program in accordance with percentage shares, the same percentage the nations

currently contribute to the Operations and Support budget of the NATO Airborne Warning and Control System program. U.S. contributions began in fiscal year 1992.

From the very beginning of the program, the nations understood that direct financial contributions should be kept as low as possible due, in part, to pressures on national defense budgets. The same concerns are present today. One of the several ways to reduce the necessity for monetary contributions is to provide waivers for certain movement services to be provided to the Program.

The Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding obligated participating nations to provide all possible assistance to minimize program costs. Specific examples include providing, "free of charge on a reciprocal basis, nominal "government services related to activities occurring within their countries when requested by contracting officers." These services are auditing, quality assurance, codification, inspection, contract administration services, acceptance testing, certification and planning, programming, and management. Costs for these services incurred at the Air Force Program Office are however, reimbursed by NATO. Pursuant to the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding, in 1978 the Department of Defense sought and obtained special legislation allowing the waiver of these and other costs for implementation of the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding. The legislation was subsequently extended to apply to the follow-on support phase of the program (10 U.S.C. 2350e, added by Section 932(a) of Public Law 101-189, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, Nov. 29, 1989).

Because this existing legislative authority applied only to the original aircraft acquisition and follow-on support, Department of Defense obtained a further extension of the authority to include the modernization activities under the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding Addendum from the 102d Congress (Section 1051 of Public Law 102-190, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, December 5, 1991). This legislation allowed the Department of Defense to continue waiving charges for these same government services through September 30, 1993. As before, the waivers were made reciprocal to similar waivers by other participating nations. The proposed legislation would extend the authority to waive these charges for government services through the life of the program.

The NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Program was created under the initiative of the United States Government, and has operated as the premiere NATO cooperative project since its inception. Extension of existing legislative authority would serve to reaffirm the special character and great value of this program

in the NATO Alliance.

Cost and Budget Data

The value of these waivers by the United States and by the European participating nations cannot be estimated at this time.

Sincerely,

A BILL

To amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement for certain costs incurred in the NATO Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States*
2 *of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. MAKE PERMANENT THE AUTHORITY TO WAIVE**
4 **REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN COSTS INCURRED**
5 **IN THE NATO AWACS PROGRAM.**

6 Section 2350e(d) of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

**DRAFT
FOR
OMB A-19
REVIEW**

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D C 20506

August 10, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RBB*FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*SUBJECT: Defense Draft Bill National Guard Community
Medical Service Program Amendments (DoD 103-025)

The draft bill at Tab II would allow the National Guard to provide medical services to underserved populations under a pilot program that would use National Guard personnel during their drill periods. The present law (102-484) authorizes the Secretary of Defense only to provide funds to states for personnel and other costs expended while National Guard personnel are in state active duty status, and not to permit providing medical services while in full-time National Guard duty status for training or in inactive duty training status. Reimbursed state active duty status does not qualify for federal pay and benefits, such as accrual of credit for non-regular retirement.

The bill also clarifies that the pilot program may be conducted in any of the territories or Puerto Rico or the District of Columbia as well as the states. It would also clearly authorize dental services to be provided and equipment and supplies other than those of the National Guard to be used by the National Guard in this pilot program.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner *JR*RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the draft Defense bill.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

5964

MEMORANDUM FOR RONALD K. PETERSON

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Draft Bill National Guard Community
Medical Service Program Amendments

The National Security Council staff concurs in the Defense draft bill.

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

5964
SPECIAL

August 5, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #D-337
DRAFT #312

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

✓ NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
OPM - James N. Woodruff - (202)606-1424 - 331
TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226

FROM: RONALD K. PETERSON (for) *Ronald K. Peterson*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: MIKE GOAD (395-7301)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-6194

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Draft Bill National Guard Community
Medical Service Program Amendments (DOD
103-025)

DEADLINE: 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, August 30, 1993

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

T. Stanners
B. Thierwechter
K. MacIntyre
B. Rideout
[REDACTED]
H. Paster

You may also respond by (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); (2) sending us a memo or letter; or (3) if you are an OASIS user in the Executive Office of the President, sending an E-mail message. Please include the LRM number shown above, and the **subject** shown below.

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

The following is the response of our agency to your request for views on the above-captioned subject:

_____ Concur

_____ No objection

_____ No comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
response sheet

**DRAFT
FOR
OMB A-19
REVIEW**

Honorable Thomas S. Foley
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed is a draft of legislation "to clarify and strengthen the pilot program to use National Guard personnel in medically underserved communities.

The proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the 103rd Congress. The office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Purpose of the Legislation

The purpose of the legislation is to make clarifying and strengthening amendments to section 376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102-484, relating to the pilot program to use National Guard personnel in medically underserved communities.

The legislation would: (1) modify the authority to provide that such medical services may be provided in the course of and incidental to National Guard training, rather than authorizing the Secretary of Defense to provide funds to states for personnel and other costs expended while National Guard members are in state active duty status; (2) clarify that the pilot program may include dental care and may be conducted in any of the territories or Puerto Rico or the District of Columbia as well as the states; (3) authorize supplies and equipment other than those of the National Guard to be used by the National Guard in the provision of these services; and (4) state that service by National Guard personnel performed prior to enactment of this legislation under the pilot program will count toward retirement point credit.

Cost and Budget Data

This legislation will not result in an increase in the budgetary outlays of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

Enclosure:

A BILL

**DRAFT
FOR
OMB A-19
REVIEW**

To clarify and strengthen the pilot program to use National Guard personnel in medically underserved communities.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States*
2 *of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO THE PILOT PROGRAM TO USE**
4 **NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL IN MEDICALLY**
5 **UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.**

6 (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for
7 Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2315, 2385) is amended—

8 (1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

9 "(b) TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Under the agreement, training conducted
10 pursuant to section 270 of title 10, United States Code, and section 502 of title
11 32, United States Code, may include as an activity conducted in the course of
12 and incident to such required or additional National Guard training the
13 provision of health care to medically underserved populations."; and

14 (2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

15 "(e) ADMINISTRATION.—(1) In this section, 'States' includes the Commonwealth
16 of Puerto Rico, territories (as defined in section 101(1) of title 32, United States
17 Code) and the District of Columbia (in which case the agreement shall be with
18 the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard).

19 "(2) In this section, 'health care' includes medical and dental care services.

20 "(3) In conducting the program authorized by this section, funds appropriated

2

1 for operation and maintenance of the National Guard may be used for supplies
2 and equipment necessary for the provision of health care to medically
3 underserved populations. Supplies and equipment furnished by the State, any
4 authorized Federal agency, or any private organization or individual may also
5 be used.".

6 (b) RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR SERVICE PRIOR TO ENACTMENT.—Service by National
7 Guard personnel prior to enactment of this Act pursuant to an agreement
8 under section 376 shall be counted as service under section 502 of title 32,
9 United States Code, for purposes of computation of years of service in
10 determining entitlement to retired pay under section 1332(a)(2)(A) or (B).

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 10, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RB*

FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*

SUBJECT: Defense Draft Bill Lost or Damaged Property
Recovered Funds Credit Act (DoD 103-023)

The purpose of this legislation is to permit DoD activities to retain funds collected through admitted or assessed liability for damaged or lost property under the control of DoD. The retained funds could then be used to repair or to replace the lost or damaged property. Presently, these recovered funds must be deposited in the Treasury and are not available to the department, agency or activity suffering the loss or damage. Tab II provides additional background information.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner *JR*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the Defense draft bill.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

5961

MEMORANDUM FOR RONALD K. PETERSON

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Draft Bill Lost or Damaged Property
Recovered Funds Credit Act (DoD 103-023)

The National Security Council staff concurs in the draft Defense bill.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Legislative Referral Memorandum #D-336. [CIA Act] [partial] (1 page)	08/05/1993	P3/b(3)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

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

August 5, 1993

596/
SPECIAL

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #D-336
DRAFT #311

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

CIA - [redacted] (b)(3) [001]
ENERGY - Bob Rabben - (202)586-6718 - 209
GSA - William R. Ratchford - (202)501-0563 - 237
JUSTICE - Sheila F. Anthony - (202)514-2141 - 217
~~USA~~ William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226
TREASURY - Richard S. Carro - (202)622-1146 - 228

FROM: RONALD K. PETERSON (for) *Ronald K Peterson*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: MIKE GOAD (395-7301)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-6194

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Draft Bill Lost or Damaged Property
Recovered Funds Credit Act (DOD 103-023)

DEADLINE: 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, August 30, 1993

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

J. Schuhart
B. Thierwechter
K. MacIntyre
D. Hahn

[redacted]
H. Paster

RESPONSE TO LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

If your response to this request for views is simple (e.g., concur/no comment) we prefer that you respond by faxing us this response sheet. If the response is simple and you prefer to call, please call the branch-wide line shown below (NOT the analyst's line) to leave a message with a secretary.

You may also respond by (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); (2) sending us a memo or letter; or (3) if you are an OASIS user in the Executive Office of the President, sending an E-mail message. Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

TO: MIKE GOAD
Office of Management and Budget
Fax Number: (202) 395-5691
Analyst/Attorney's Direct Number: (202) 395-7301
Branch-Wide Line (to reach secretary): (202) 395-6194

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

**SUBJECT: DEFENSE Draft Bill Lost or Damaged Property
Recovered Funds Credit Act (DOD 103-023)**

The following is the response of our agency to your request for views on the above-captioned subject:

_____ Concur
_____ No objection
_____ No comment
_____ See proposed edits on pages _____
_____ Other: _____
_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
_____ response sheet



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1600

REVIEW
OAS A-19
FOR
DRAFT

Honorable Thomas S. Foley
Speaker of the House
of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed is a draft of legislation "To amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the military departments, Department of Defense Field Activities, and Defense Agencies to retain and to credit to current appropriations, funds recovered for lost or damaged Department of Defense property."

The proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the 103d Congress. The Office of Management and Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Purpose of the Legislation

The purpose of the legislation is to permit the military departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities to retain funds collected through admitted or assessed liability for damaged or lost property under the control of the Department of Defense. The retained funds could then be used to repair or to replace the lost or damaged property.

Section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, requires an officer or employee of the Government who receives funds for the Government from any source to deposit those funds in the Treasury without delay and without deduction for any charge or claim. As an exception, funds may be credited to an appropriation, rather than deposited into the Treasury, when a statute specifically authorizes the credit. One such statute, section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, permits funds deducted from the pay of members of the armed forces who damage their government quarters to be credited to the family housing operations and maintenance appropriation.

The proposed legislation would also make funds recovered for other damaged or lost Department of Defense property available to repair or to replace such property without the need to seek additional appropriations. Presently, these recovered funds must be deposited in the Treasury and are not available to the department, agency, or activity suffering the loss or damage.

-2-

As appropriations shrink, damaged or lost property becomes increasingly more difficult to repair or to replace through normal supply channels. During fiscal year 1992, the military departments alone deposited \$18.3M in the Treasury for lost or damaged Government property. The proposed legislation would give commanders or heads of agencies or activities the ability to retain recovered funds and to repair property vital to mission accomplishment.

The proposed legislation also emphasizes the importance of the report of survey system as a tool for property accountability. It provides a potent incentive to ensure that losses and damages are thoroughly investigated within any regulatory time constraints. Ultimately, an aggressive report of survey system should reduce loss and damage by increasing the care shown toward Department of Defense controlled property by those responsible for its safekeeping.

Cost and Budget Data

If enacted this proposal will not increase the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense. Rather, it will be an incentive to recover funds for the government.

Sincerely,

A BILL

To amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the military departments, Department of Defense Field Activities, and Defense Agencies to retain and to credit to current appropriations, funds recovered for lost or damaged Department of Defense property.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States*
2 *of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. RETENTION OF FUNDS AS PAYMENT FOR LOST OR**
4 **DAMAGED PROPERTY.**

5 (a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 165 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by
6 adding at the end the following new section:

7 "§ 2783. Retention of funds as payment for lost or damaged property
8 "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, an installation,
9 activity, agency, or command of a military department, Defense Agency, or
10 Department of Defense Field Activity may retain funds recovered for damage to
11 or loss of property under the control of the Department of Defense. The funds
12 recovered shall be credited to the appropriation available to repair or replace the
13 lost or damaged property."

14 (b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Chapter 165 of title 10, United States Code, is
15 amended by adding at the end of the table of sections for such chapter the
16 following new item:

17 "2783. Retention of funds for payment for lost or damaged property."

**DRAFT
FOR
OMB A-19
REVIEW**

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D C 20506

August 12, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RB*FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report RE: HR 1260, National
Aeronautical Research and Competitiveness Act of
1993

At Tab II DoD is responding to legislation that would establish a joint aeronautical research and development program between NASA and DoD. Defense is concerned that HR 1260 would encompass all aeronautical technology development efforts that are not uniquely military in nature, and the DoD involvement in these efforts would be phased out over five years. Since much of the aeronautical development effort of DoD is dual-use in nature, this could slow technology advancements for both military and civil uses. Defense notes that if this is not the intent of the legislation, it would support modified language to alleviate these concerns.

Concurrences by: *M.F.* Steve Jones, Mike Froman and Jeremy RosnerRECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the proposed Defense report.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES J. JUKES

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report RE: HR 1260, National
Aeronautical Research and Competitiveness Act of
1993

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed
Defense report.

6044
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Washington, D.C. 20503

August 11, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #I-1054

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202)482-3086 - 324
ENERGY - Bob Rabben - (202)586-6718 - 209
JUSTICE - Sheila F. Anthony - (202)514-2141 - 217
TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226
NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
CEA - Francine Obermiller - (202)395-5036 - 242
GSA - William R. Ratchford - (202)501-0563 - 237 (sec. 5)
NASA - Jeff Lawrence - (202)358-1948 - 219
NEC - Sonia Mathews - (202)456-6722 - 429
OSTP - Susanne Bachtel - (202)456-7116 - 288

FROM: JAMES J. JUKES (for) *Ji-*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference
OMB CONTACT: *Bumparte Liu (395-3454)*
Jeffrey WEINBERG (395-3457)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-3454
SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report RE: HR 1260, National
Aeronautical Research and Competitiveness Act
of 1993.

DEADLINE: NOON August 20, 1993

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before
advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in
accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or
receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of
Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:
Howard Paster
Greg Simon
Kathy Peroff
Jack Fellows
Steve Isakowitz
Bruce Campbell
Steve Dotson
Greg Henry
Bill McQuaid (sec. 5)



GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1600

Honorable Ronald V. Dellums
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Defense on H.R. 1260, 103rd Congress, a bill "To provide for the establishment of a joint aeronautical research and development program between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes."

The Department of Defense is very concerned about the proposed legislation. The intent and ultimate effect of the legislation is not clear. It potentially could weaken significantly Department of Defense involvement in aeronautics technology development, to the detriment of both national defense and economic competitiveness.

H.R. 1260 would require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Secretary of Defense to develop a five-year plan for a joint aeronautical research and development program. The objectives of the plan include enhancing public and private aeronautical technology development; providing the opportunity for private defense contractors to be involved in transition activities to the civilian sector; and the transfer of Federal Government-developed technologies to the private sector. H.R. 1260 also would establish an Aeronautical Research and Advisory Committee, with a majority of industry representatives, to provide advice and recommendations regarding the five-year plan.

The scope and intent of the joint research and development program contemplated by H.R. 1260 are not clear. Section 3(a) requires a joint program on dual-use aeronautical technologies that includes virtually all areas of defense interest; Section 4(a) requires a five-year plan setting forth the research and development necessary to advance aeronautical technologies, presumably including technologies for both military and civilian needs; Section 4(c) requires a five-year schedule for the decrease of Federal contribution to the plan; and Section 2 suggests that the Department's contributions could be phased out over the five-year period. A possible interpretation of these

provisions is that the plan required by Section 4(a) and the joint program required by section 3(a) are to encompass all aeronautical technology development efforts that are not uniquely military in nature, and that Department of Defense involvement in these efforts could be phased out over five years.

If the foregoing interpretation correctly reflects the intent of H.R. 1260, then the Department of Defense would oppose its enactment. The Department maintains an aggressive aeronautical technology program aimed at high-payoff military goals, and the majority of these efforts are dual-use in nature. Substantially reducing these efforts would be inconsistent with defense needs, and could also result in a significant decrease in the rate of aeronautical technology advancement for both military and civil uses. The military has traditionally led the pace of aeronautical technology development, and this technology has been applied to civil applications; for example, every large civilian aircraft gas-turbine engine has its origins in a military engine and/or in military technology programs. The continuing need for superior air power will continue to provide impetus aeronautical technology development.

If the interpretation stated earlier is not correct, then H.R. 1260 should be modified to define its scope and intent more precisely. In particular, the intended impact of H.R. 1260 on the current and planned programs of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which are well coordinated and complimentary, should be made clear.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9306156
RECEIVED: 14 AUG 93 12

TO: CHERNOMYRDIN, VICTOR

FROM: GORE, A

DOC DATE: 14 AUG 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: RUSSIA

SPACE PROGRAMS

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: VP MS GTO PM CHERNOMYRDIN OF RUSSIA RE JOINT COMMIS ON ENERGY &
SPACE

ACTION: FOR RECORD PURPOSES

DUE DATE: 18 AUG 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: NONE

LOGREF:

FILES: PA

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL

BURNS

GOTTEMOELLER

JONES

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 13526

White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006

By vr NARA, Date 10/3/2006

2016-052-E

COMMENTS:

DISPATCHED BY

DATE

BY HAND

W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA

CLOSED BY: NSWEA

DOC 1 OF 1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. cable	re: Message from Vice President Albert Gore to Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. (3 pages)	08/14/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

TO: ZUMWALT, E R

FROM: PRESIDENT

DOC DATE: 03 AUG 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY

MP

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: PRES REPLY TO ADM ZUMWALT RE SUGGESTION FOR MONTHLY PRES VIDEO MSG
TO MILITARY PERSONNEL

ACTION: PRES SGD LTR

DUE DATE: 18 AUG 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: NONE

LOGREF:

FILES: WH

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL
GOTTEMOELLER
HAHN
JONES

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA

CLOSED BY: NSWEA

DOC 2 OF 2

UNCLASSIFIED

August 3, 1993

Admiral E. R. Zumwalt, Jr., USN, Ret.
Suite 641
1500 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dear Bud:

Thank you for your insightful suggestions. I am sorry I have not responded sooner, but the volume of mail I've received has been overwhelming.

I am working hard to maintain a close dialogue with the members of the Armed Forces. I'll keep your views in mind as I formulate ways to communicate with our nation's military personnel.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

BC/KB/CV/tex (Corres. #797975)

cc: Tony Lake, NSC with inc.



E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.
ADMIRAL, U. S. NAVY (RET.)

May 26, 1993

The President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Despite the obviously very full plate you have at the moment, I wanted to recommend that you consider the following as a means of communication with the military.

I believe that a video message recorded by you monthly for distribution to all military activities would make an important contribution to strengthening the personal awareness of individual military persons of their Commander-in-Chief with regard to his policies, his concerns for them, and his interest in establishing good communications with them.

The technique is one that I used as Chief of Naval Operations to communicate with personnel of all ships and stations. I believed it to have been very effective at the time; and over the ensuing 19 years, I have received countless appreciative comments on the use of this medium by the recipients.

If you could possibly take 15 minutes each month to record your thoughts on a single major issue or on a medley of issues affecting the military, I believe that there would be great payoff in morale during these years when so many changes are coming about.

An introduction of each video by the Secretary of Defense or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would make it clear that you are doing this through rather than by-passing the chain of command.

Very respectfully,

E. R. Zumwalt, Jr.

1500 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 641
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(703) 527-5380

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 16, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RB*
FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*
SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Simplified Acquisition Threshold

At Tab II Deputy Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, provides a proposed report to the SASC on the issue of a Simplified Acquisition Threshold. We reviewed this proposal two months ago and concurred in its general outline. The simplified threshold would raise from \$25,000 to \$100,000 the small purchase threshold for DoD. This would decrease the number of contracts that would have to undergo government-unique purchasing procedures.

DoD has also identified several candidates for pilot programs to increase the efficiency of the Defense acquisition process. The draft report notes that some socioeconomic requirements will have to be waived to put these initiatives into effect, but that the need for Defense efficiencies argue strongly for these waivers.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner *JR*

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the proposed Defense report.

Attachments:

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES J. JUKES

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Simplified Acquisition
Threshold

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed
Defense report.

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

August 13, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

6142
5 pages
total
LRM #M-609

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202)482-3086 - 324
ENERGY - Bob Rabben - (202)586-6718 - 209
HHS - Frances White - (202)690-7760 - 328
JUSTICE - Sheila F. Anthony - (202)514-2141 - 217
LABOR - Robert A. Shapiro - (202)219-8201 - 330
VA - Robert Coy - (202)535-8113 - 229
NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
CEA - Francine Obermiller - (202)395-5036 - 242
GSA - William R. Ratchford - (202)501-0563 - 237
NASA - Jeff Lawrence - (202)358-1948 - 219
NEC - Sonia Mathews - (202)456-6722 - 429
OSTP - Susanne Bachtel - (202)456-7116 - 288
SBA - Christine Swedin - (202)205-6702 - 315

FROM:

JAMES J. JUKES (for)
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: Jim BROWN (395-3473)

Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-3454

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report on Simplified
Acquisition Threshold

DEADLINE: 10 AM August 19, 1993

COMMENTS: A list of agency contacts who were sent this letter for review directly by Defense is attached. If you wish to recommend changes to the letter, please supply the specific language.

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

Howard Paster
C. Cerda
C. Walden
Don Gessaman
Steve Dotson
Greg Enry
John McClelland

Bob Danus
Barbara Selfridge
Larry Matlack
Sheryll Cashin
Bernie Martin
Frank Reader

Gordon Adams
Chris Edley
Al Burman
Allan Brown
Wayne Wittig
Robert Neal
Adrien Silas
Doug Criscitello

Jim MacRae
Cyndi Vallina
Cora Beebe
Ken Schwartz
Louisa Koch
Greg Simon
Elaine Kark
Donsia Trong

_____ Concur

_____ No objection

_____ No comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
_____ response sheet

DRAFT

**Senator Sam Nunn
Chairman, Armed Services Committee
U.S. Senate
228 Russell Building
Washington, D.C. 20510**

Dear Senator Nunn:

As I promised in testimony before the committee, the Department of Defense has developed our position on a Simplified Acquisition Threshold. Consistent with the recommendation of the Section 800 Acquisition Streamlining Panel, our proposal would raise the current small purchase threshold -- which removes small contracts from most complex, government-unique purchasing procedures -- from \$25,000 to \$100,000. It would reserve all purchases under the threshold for small businesses, and allow awards to small and disadvantaged businesses under the 8(a), the DoD section 1207 program, and the emerging small businesses program. It would increase the threshold for posting notice of simplified purchases to \$10,000, exempt them from publication in the Commerce Business Daily, and waive the attendant waiting requirements if the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy determines that there is adequate notice to small businesses, through such electronic means as electronic bulletin boards. It would also exempt purchases under that threshold from all government-unique statutory requirements, including socio-economic requirements.

Although contracts below \$100,000 account for only 6 percent of DoD expenditures, they represent 99 percent of contract actions. A \$100,000 threshold would greatly reduce the burdens on contracting staffs and allow them to focus on more complex purchases. The higher threshold would also significantly enhance the opportunities for small businesses by potentially adding over 120,000 contract actions with a value of \$5.5 billion to the small business reservation program.

As I also promised, DoD has identified several candidates (along with the specific laws for which waivers are requested) for consideration as Defense Acquisition Pilot Programs pursuant to section 809 of Public Law 101-510, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991. As 809 states, the purpose of the pilot programs is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the acquisition process by conducting the acquisitions in accordance with standard commercial, industrial procurement practices. The Department's existing practices -- many of them based on statutes -- are so burdensome that many commercial manufacturers refuse to do business with DoD altogether, and those that do often segregate their defense production from commercial production. This results in higher prices to DoD, loss of the use of a broad integrated domestic industrial base, and a lack of access to commercial state-of-the-art technologies.

DRAFT

Senator Nunn
page two

The proposed Simplified Acquisition Threshold and pilot programs require waivers of various socioeconomic requirements that are unique to federal contracts. The Defense Department acknowledges the importance of the social policies underlying these requirements. In addition to lowering the defense department's cost of doing business, it will enable DoD to acquire commercial state-of-the-art technology now unavailable to DoD. However, acquisition reform is critical to DoD's ability to meet future military needs with a rapidly shrinking defense budget.

It would also significantly enhance U.S. industry's competitiveness: the existing acquisition system has created a virtual wall between the defense and commercial sectors. If the federal government can eliminate that wall, it will enable defense firms to compete in commercial markets and allow DoD's continuing investments in technology to contribute substantially more to the nation's commercial performance and economic growth. In sum, acquisition reform will enhance our national security while in the larger sense expanding the economic opportunities that socio-economic preferences seek to achieve.

We have transmitted these proposals for coordination and review through the interagency process. That process has begun and we expect to have an Administration-wide legislative proposal by September.

Sincerely,

William J. Perry
Deputy Secretary of Defense

Distribution List

Jack Donahue, DOL
Tom Williamson, DOL
Glenn Gutierrez, DDC
Katie Broeren, SBA
Dennis Flecher, GSA
Gary Krump, VA
Chris Edley, OMB
Gordon Adams, OMB
Phil Lader, OMB
Allen Burman, OFPP
Joe Stiglitz, CEA
Bob Bell, NSC
Donela Strong, DPC
Elaine Kamarcik, OVP
Jack Gibbons, OSTP
Dorothy Robyn, NEO
Bo Cutter, NEC

TO: NSC

FROM: UNRECORDED

DOC DATE: 11 AUG 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: RUSSIA

BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA

PERSONS: KOZYREV, ANDREI

SUBJECT: CABLE FM MOSCOW RE FOMIN KOZYREV OF RUSSIA REQUEST FOR ADVANCE
NOTICE ON AIR STRIKES OVER BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA

ACTION: NOTED BY LAKE

DUE DATE: 24 AUG 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: NONE

LOGREF:

FILES: PA

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL
BURNS
CLARKE
GOTTEMOELLER
HOLL
NSC CHRON
WALKER

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
White House Guidelines, September 11, 2006
By VL NARA, Date 10/3/2016
2016-0152-F

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA

CLOSED BY: NSWEA

DOC 1 OF 1

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. cable	Letter from Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev to Warren Christopher. Subject: Kozyrev Requests Heads-Up on Strikes. (2 pages)	08/11/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

8/17

To: Cathy Millison

Cathy - please see attached
updates. Thx.

Bob

UNCLASSIFIED with
~~SECRET~~ attachment

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 16, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB BELL
NICK BURNS
RICHARD CLARKE
EILEEN CLAUSSEN
RICHARD FEINBERG
MARTIN INDYK
ALAN KRECZKO
DAN PONEMAN
GEORGE TENET
JENONNE WALKER
JENNIFER WARD
KENT WIEDEMANN

FROM: CATHY MILLISON *clm*
SUBJECT: PRD STATUS REPORT

Attached is the latest version of the PRD Status Report. Can you please review the attached and return any edits or comments to me no later than Noon, Wednesday, August 18. Thanks.

UNCLASSIFIED with
~~SECRET~~ attachment

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
004. report	PRD Status Report. (5 pages)	08/16/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

TO: ITOH

FROM: SHERFIELD, M

DOC DATE: 17 AUG 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: DUAL ABSENCE OF SECDEF & DEP SECDEF ON 19 & 20 AUG

ACTION: FOR RECORD PURPOSES

DUE DATE: 21 AUG 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: NONE

LOGREF:

FILES: WH

NSCP:

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

BELL
GOTTEMOELLER
HAHN
ITOH
JONES
KENNEY
SODERBERG

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSJDA

CLOSED BY: NSJDA

DOC 1 OF 1

UNCLASSIFIED
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 9306231

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001

X 93081811 FOR RECORD PURPOSES

UNCLASSIFIED



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1000

6231

17 AUG 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SUBJECT: Dual Absence of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary
of Defense

The Secretary of Defense is in Wisconsin and will return to Washington, D.C. on Monday, 23 August 1993. The Deputy Secretary of Defense will depart Washington, D.C. on Thursday, 19 August at 1140 for California, and will return to Washington, D.C. on Friday, 20 August at 2050.

Accordingly, during the following period of time, the official indicated will be the Acting Secretary of Defense:

Date/Times

Acting Secretary of Defense

1140, Thursday, 19 August
through
2050, Friday, 20 August

Honorable John H. Dalton
Secretary of the Navy

fn 
Michael B. Sherfield
Executive Secretary

cc: SecDef
DepSecDef
SecArmy
SecNavy
SecAF
DoD GC
Dir, WHMO
CJCS
NMCC
OSD Cables

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

6184

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 17, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH:

~~ROBERT BELL~~ *RB*

FROM:

KEITH HAHN *✓*SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report RE: S 131, Authorized
Grade Strength Computation Exclusion for Nurse
Officers

The proposed Defense report at Tab II responds to a Senate bill that would exclude military nurse officers from the computation of authorized grade strength. At first glance, this would appear to provide DoD some desired flexibility from mandated officer levels. All military doctors, dentists nurses are officers. This legislation would exempt nurses from the end strength restrictions - as is currently the case with doctors and dentists. This would enable the services to manage officer promotions without concern for the disproportionate number of officer slots being used by the medical community.

Surprisingly, DoD would prefer not to adopt this exemption for nurses, arguing that it would result in "grade creep." Instead, it proposes the adoption of a RAND initiative that would lag the effect of officer grade requirements by one or more years. The initiative is discussed in greater detail at Tab II. We believe that DoD should be provided the flexibility to manage officer promotion policies within the broad guidelines provided by Congress. In this case, if DoD does not feel it needs to exempt another group of officers from DOPMA requirements, they should be allowed to pursue alternative methods for managing their personnel.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner *5*RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I concurring in the proposed Defense report.

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

6184

MEMORANDUM FOR RONALD K. PETERSON

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report RE: S 131, Authorized
Grade Strength Computation Exclusion for Nurse
Officers

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed
Defense report.

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

August 13, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #I-1094

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

HHS - Frances White - (202)690-7760 - 328

NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249

TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226

**FROM: RONALD K. PETERSON (for) *Ronald K. Peterson*
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference**

**OMB CONTACT: MIKE GOAD (395-7301)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-6194**

**SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report RE: S 131, Authorized
Grade Strength Computation Exclusion for
Nurse Officers**

DEADLINE: 10:00 A.M., MONDAY, August 30, 1993

OMB requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please advise us if this item will affect direct spending or receipts for purposes of the the "Pay-As-You-Go" provisions of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

CC:

T. Stanners

J. Palmieri

H. Paster

R. Rideout

B. Thierwechter

Please staff
6184
SPECIAL

You may also respond by (1) calling the analyst/attorney's direct line (you will be connected to voice mail if the analyst does not answer); (2) sending us a memo or letter; or (3) if you are an OASIS user in the Executive Office of the President, sending an E-mail message. Please include the LRM number shown above, and the subject shown below.

FROM: _____ (Date)
 _____ (Name)
 _____ (Agency)
 _____ (Telephone)

The following is the response of our agency to your request for views on the above-captioned subject:

_____ Concur

_____ No objection

_____ No comment

_____ See proposed edits on pages _____

_____ Other: _____

_____ FAX RETURN of _____ pages, attached to this
_____ response sheet

Honorable Sam Nunn
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your request of January 25 for the views of the Secretary of Defense on S. 131, 103d Congress, a bill "To amend title 10, United States Code, to exclude Nurse officers from the computation of authorized grade strength."

S. 131 would exclude officers in the Army Nurse Corps, officers in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, and officers in the Air Force designated as nurses in calculating the number of total field grade officers (O-4, O-5, & O-6) authorized within a Service by 10 U.S.C. 523. This exclusion would enable nurse field grade positions to be established without affecting the number of field grade positions authorized in other officer competitive categories, as similarly authorized for medical and dental officers. As a result, the Services would have more flexibility to adjust nurse promotion opportunity and timing. Under current law, this flexibility already exists, but must be done at the expense of another competitive category's fair share of field grade positions. The problem is further exacerbated by ongoing force reductions which are lowering the total number of field grade positions authorized.

The Department of Defense appreciates the additional flexibility S. 131 would offer in managing the nurse corps. Unfortunately, exclusion would remove the overriding control of field grade strengths inherent in the grade table. Thus only the year-to-year control of the budget process would remain. The likely result would be the so-called "grade creep" we have experienced over the past decade in the physician and dentist competitive categories. Additionally, the exclusion of nurses without other changes to the grade table itself would, by the workings of the grade table, allow proportionally more field grade officers in competitive categories remaining in the grade table, thereby increasing the overall number of field grades in the Services.

The grade tables are the most rigid of DOPMA's many controls, but by including nearly all competitive categories in a single total, they do provide a degree of flexibility in competitive category management, because the Services can move authorized positions between different categories. In other words, the more competitive categories included in the field grade tables, the more flexibility we have to manage those categories.

We believe the alternative to S.131 developed by RAND, would be more beneficial. This proposal is summarized below and described in detail in a recently completed RAND study of DOPMA which will be forwarded to you in the near future. That study also serves as the foundation for the follow-on study of DOPMA and the Service officer personnel management systems mandated by the FY93 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 102-484).

The problem with the grade table is its instantaneous effect in a period of rapid change in strength. The RAND alternative would modify DOPMA to provide more flexibility in managing authorized strengths by inducing a "glide path" in the grade table and by lagging the effect of the grade table by one or more years. No change would be made in the grade table itself. In other words, the officer strength that determines the number of field grades would be based on a previous fiscal year's officer strength and not the current year's end-strength. This allows for flexibility to manage as officer strength decreases. The amount of flexibility would vary with the magnitude of the change but greater control of grades would be exerted whenever officer strength increases. No flexibility is provided during periods when officer strength does not change over time, ensuring control of grades is maintained in a steady state situation.

Another advantage of lagging the grade table by one or more years is that it would maintain the principle of grade control, working only on the speed of required adjustments and not the ultimate number of field grade officers. It would also automatically work during periods of strength increases and decreases to even out sharp changes, which would encourage long-term stability in the factors of the officer management system. In short, the RAND proposal would be self-adjusting and provide the greatest flexibility during periods of greatest change.

Once again, while we appreciate the additional flexibility S.131 would offer in managing the nurse corps, we strongly believe that RAND's proposal to base or compute field grade tables on a previous fiscal year and not the current fiscal year is the best and most effective way of providing much needed flexibility.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely,

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
005. memo	For Anthony Lake from Robert Bell. Subject: Meeting with Panetta and Aspin on BUR Shortfall Issue. Record ID: 9306243. (3 pages)	08/18/1993	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 46

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - August 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F

vz4457

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

DoD News Briefing - August 17th

3

A: No, I'm not saying a policy will be issued. I'm saying that within, hopefully a few months, and don't hold us to that because we don't exactly know what the extent of the problem is, but hopefully within a few months the Secretary will be able to determine whether there needs to be new policies along these lines.

→ Q: Is the Secretary seeking an additional \$20 billion as the Post reported last week? And how would you characterize the discussions between the Secretary and the White House on the Bottom-Up Review?

A: There are no numbers yet associated with the Bottom-Up Review. There are specifically no dollar figures. The Bottom-Up Review, which was started last spring, is not a budget-driven exercise. The idea was to try to start with the dangers of the post- Cold War world and work up from there to end up with something that would say to you what kind of force structure would be optimal, given the new kinds of dangers, the new kinds of threats.

★ The budget part of this is a different exercise. It is an exercise that needs to be undertaken with the White House and, obviously, with Congress. There are decisions the President has to make, and affordability, obviously, is a key issue. But the Bottom-Up Review itself that we'll be releasing in a couple of weeks, is not even going to have dollar figures. It looks at force structure.

Q: Did he brief the NSC staff on this on August 6th? Were there some preliminary discussions? Were these, indeed, the first preliminary discussions with the White House?

A: Not the first. But it was a fairly high level briefing.

Q: So that briefing did, in fact, take place.

A: There was a briefing, and it looked at what the Secretary is moving towards in terms of the strategic review. But I want to stress that there have been no decisions made, because Secretary Aspin is not making those decisions. He'll make recommendations, but even some of those haven't been quite fine tuned and finalized.

Q: Any word on when he'll brief President Clinton on his final recommendations?

A: We hope sometime soon after the President comes back from his vacation.

Q: You said there were no dollar figures associated, but there are force structure options. Are you not addressing the question of affordability of those force structure options? And wouldn't that take you right into dollar figures?

A: Affordability was not the issue driving the Bottom-Up Review, as we've said many times. It was driven by strategy and what are the needs. Affordability is an important question. When you start to fit in what you have with what you can afford, it's an important issue. But that was not what drove this study.

Q: Understood, but I just want to make sure I'm understanding you. There are no cost figures associated with any of the options, whether they're affordable or not affordable. There are no cost figures associated with any of the force structure options that you're going to present to the President?

A: Not that we're going to present as a part of the Bottom-Up Review document that you all will be handed, no. Obviously, you can figure out some prices. You can make up a lot of different

numbers that get you to... We're not saying here's the budget target, let's have a review that gets us to that number. That's not the way we've arranged it.

Q: Will Secretary Aspin, of all the options presented, will he endorse any of them and say to the President that this is the one I recommend that we pursue?

A: I believe he will.

Q: Will we be able to find out which one he's endorsing?

A: Before he gives it to the President?

Q: No, afterwards.

A: I'm sure you'll be able to divine it in some way.

Q: Is the C-17 part of that?

A: No, it's not. The C-17 review, as the Secretary made very clear; the V-22 and the C-17 are outside of the process. That's not to say that the ... airlift, those kinds of issues are going to be looked at in general terms of needs, but the C-17, because the Defense Acquisition Board process was already underway on those two matters. We continue to handle them outside the process.

Q: Is that C-17 decision imminent? And will it be announced from here or announced from the Board?

A: I don't know who will announce it. I do know that the next step in the process is for the Defense Acquisition Board to meet, and we expect that meeting to take place in late August.

Q: On Bosnia. Does the U.S. feel that the siege of Sarajevo has been lifted?

A: Well, siege is a military term, and you can define it in many ways. The concern is that the Serbs are still in a position where they can cause the strangulation of Sarajevo any time. What we're trying to avoid is to have the humanitarian efforts cut off. In fact, we'd like to have them opened up again. That is what we're watching closely, to determine whether the Serbs' behavior is being modified in terms, with the UN resolutions.

Q: To what extent has it been modified, and are we pleased with any progress?

A: I wouldn't want to characterize either the behavior at the talks or on the ground, because we don't want to give the Serbs any feeling that they can let up in terms of changing behavior. So we don't want to characterize them in any way, saying we're encouraged or not encouraged. I can say that a few convoys have gotten through on the ground, and we hope that more will be allowed to come through. We want to encourage every type of behavior that allows for food and water and for other things which might alleviate the situation in Sarajevo and other safe areas.

Q: Has the threat of air strikes done any good to encourage the process?

A: I wouldn't want to speculate on that.

Q: On the possibility of the air strikes, again, it got a little cumbersome, and as I understand it, United Nations approval is still required before any air strikes would commence. What I'd like to do is focus on that approval procedure. Does NATO, at this time, have blanket approval from the United Nations? If not, how quickly can approval be obtained? What I'm trying to get at here is, how quickly could air strikes commence if somebody decided to conduct them?

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

August 18, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL *RGB*

FROM: KEITH HAHN *KH*

SUBJECT: Letter to the President Requesting Norman G.
Wear be Commissioned in the USAF Chaplain Corps

At Tab C Bobby Hildebrand of Chidester, AR has written the President asking that he waive the requirement that Norman G. Wear be ordained before he can enter the USAF Reserves as a chaplain. He notes that the Churches of Christ to which Dr. Wear belongs do not operate a seminary to provide formal ordination.

I asked DoD to research this request. The fact sheet at Tab B notes that Dr. Wear does not meet the academic requirements set forth in DoD directives. Furthermore, he is nine years older than the maximum age for commissioning as a chaplain. The letter to Bobby Hildebrand at Tab A notes that the Air Force does have chaplains from the Church of Christ and that all meet academic requirements.

Concurrence by: Steve Jones *J*

RECOMMENDATION

That you forward the memorandum and letter at Tab I to the President.

Attachments

Tab I	Memorandum to the President
Tab A	Letter to Bobby Hildebrand
Tab B	Fact Sheet on Dr. Norman G. Wear
Tab C	Incoming Correspondence

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE

SUBJECT: Letter from Bobby Hildebrand Requesting Waiver for
Norman G. Wear to be Commissioned in the USAF
Chaplain Corps

Purpose

To respond to a letter from Bobby Hildebrand of Chidester, AR asking that you waive the DoD requirement that Dr. Norman G. Wear be an ordained minister before he can enter the USAF Reserves as a chaplain.

Background

In his letter at Tab B, Bobby Hildebrand notes that the Churches of Christ, to which Dr. Wear belongs, do not operate a seminary to provide formal ordination. He asks that you waive this requirement based on other considerations including Dr. Wear's education, experience, character and professional suitability. The fact sheet at Tab C notes that Dr. Wear does not meet DoD requirements for commissioning as a chaplain on two counts. First, his educational background is in Aviation Management, not theology. Second, maximum age for appointment is 40 years old, or up to 43 years old under special circumstances. Dr. Wear is 52 years old. The Air Force does have chaplains from the Churches of Christ who meet these qualifications.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter to Bobby Hildebrand at Tab A.

Attachments

Tab A Letter to Bobby Hildebrand
Tab B Incoming Correspondence
Tab C Fact Sheet on Dr. Norman G. Wear

cc: Vice President
Chief of Staff

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Bobby:

Thank you for your letter regarding the application of Dr. Norman Wear to serve as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserve. As you noted, the regulations that govern appointment of chaplains in all military services stipulate that to be appointed as a chaplain a person must possess a Master of Divinity or equivalent three-year theological degree. Those who do not meet this qualification may be considered if they have completed 90 semester hours of graduate studies in social sciences, the humanities or theology (or a combination) at a regionally accredited institution of higher learning and are involved in full-time religious vocation.

Dr. Wear's graduate degrees are in Aviation Management, and he is not in a full-time religion vocation. In spite of his commendable educational accomplishments, Dr. Wear does not meet the Department of Defense requirements. All Church of Christ chaplains in the Air Force do meet these qualifications.

These same directives also state that the maximum age for appointment as a chaplain is 40 years. This may be waived to age 43. Dr. Wear is currently 52 years old, and therefore does not meet the age criteria.

While I know this is not the answer you hoped for, I trust the information is helpful. It was good hearing from you again.

Sincerely,

Mr. Bobby Hildebrand
3241 Highway 24
Chidester, AR 71726

FACT SHEET
ON
DR. NORMAN G. WEAR

- Request submitted to waive formal ordination to allow entry to USAF Reserve as a chaplain.
 - DoD directive 1304.19 requires a Masters Degree of Divinity or equivalent three-year theological degree.
 - Completion of 90 semester hours of graduate studies in social sciences, humanities or theology and are involved in full time religious vocation may be considered.
- Dr. Wear's graduate degrees are in Aviation Management.
 - He is also not in a full time religious vocation.
- Maximum age for appointment is 43 years old.
 - Dr. Wear is 52 years old.
- Dr. Wear does not meet DoD requirements.

3241 Highway 24
Chidester, AR 71726
(501) 836-9882
June 15, 1993

Honorable Bill Clinton
The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20506

RE: Seminary Waiver for
Norman G. Wear

Dear President Clinton:

Just a note to say thanks for your hospitality and allowing Ben Garner, Paul Lucas and I to visit with you on April 27, 1993.

I am requesting your approval of a seminary waiver for Norman G. Wear to enter the USAF Reserve as a Chaplain for the Churches of Christ. (The Mormons were given such a waiver)

The Churches of Christ do not operate a seminary to provide formal ordination. They do however, provide formal Ecclesiastical Endorsement/approval after a careful review of the individuals education, experience, character and professional suitability to serve in the military services. Norman Wear is a former Air Force officer and meets all the other requirements.

Norman has provided Mr. Ed Fry in Congressman's Ray Thornton's office (202-225-2506) a copy of the total commissioning package which was returned from HDQRTS USAF Reserve pending a waiver and resubmission.

I appreciate your support of Dr. Wear and his seminary waiver.

Warmest personal regards,

Bobby Hildebrand

CC: Mack McClarty