Case Number: 2016-0152-F

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 - September 1993 #2 [2]				
Staff Office-Individual: Defense Policy-Bell, Robert				
Original OA/ID Number: 47				
Row: 31	Section: 3	Shelf: 2	Position: 3	Stack: V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. letter	[Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	08/13/1993	b(6)
001b. resume	Resume of Service Career of Johnnie Edward Wilson. (2 pages)	01/19/1993	b(6)
002a. letter	Duplicate of 001a. (1 page)	08/13/1993	b(6)
002b. resume	Duplicate of 001b. (2 pages)	01/19/1993	b(6)
003. resume	[Resume of Service Career] Marcus Antone Anderson. (3 pages)	06/07/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:
Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

UNCLASSIFIED
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9306902
RECEIVED: 13 SEP 93 16

TO: PODESTA, J

FROM: LAKE

DOC DATE: 16 SEP 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: MILITARY NOMINATIONS WH REFERRAL

PERSONS: WILSON, JOHNNIE E

SUBJECT: MILITARY NOMINATION FOR MAJ GEN WILSON

ACTION: LAKE APPROVED RECOM DUE DATE: 16 SEP 93 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: HAHN 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
		NSC CHRON

COMMENTS: ____________________

DISPATCHED BY ____________ DATE ________ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSWEA CLOSED BY: NSWEA DOC 2 OF 2

UNCLASSIFIED

6902

Document No. 035750SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 11, 1993 **ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:** 9/16

SUBJECT: Army General Officer Nomination - Major General Johnnie E. Wilson

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	PASTER	☐	☐
McLARTY	☐	☐	RASCO	☐	☐
NEEL	☐	☐	RUBIN	☐	☐
PANETTA	☐	☐	SEGAL	☐	☐
BAGGETT	☐	☐	SEIDMAN	☐	☐
EMANUEL	☐	☐	STEPHANOPOULOS	☐	☐
GEARAN	☐	☐	TYSON	☐	☐
GERGEN	☐	☐	VARNEY	☐	☐
GIBBONS	☐	☐	WATKINS	☐	☐
HALE	☐	☐	WILLIAMS	☐	☐
HERMAN	☐	☐	Clark	☐	☑
LAKE	☐	☐	Bob Bell	☑	☐
LINDSEY	☐	☐		☐	☐
McGINTY	☐	☐		☐	☐
MONTOYA	☐	☐		☐	☐
NUSSBAUM	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

RESPONSE:

September 16, 1993

The National Security Council staff concurs in the attached military nomination.

Tony Lake

Anthony Lake

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 7, 1993

'93 SEP 8 P1:25

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOHN A. GAUGHAN
DIRECTOR, WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE

SUBJECT: <u>Army General Officer Nomination</u>

Forwarded for your approval and signature is the nomination of Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general and a recommendation for his assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army.

This nomination was staffed by the Acting Secretary of the Army and approved by the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

<u>Recommendation</u>

That you approve and sign the attached.

Attachment

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1000

31 AUG 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Army General Officer Nomination

On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I recommend the assignment of Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army, a position previously designated to carry the grade of lieutenant general, and his nomination for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general. General Wilson, age 49, is currently assigned as Chief of Staff, United States Army Materiel Command. He will succeed Lieutenant General Leon E. Salomon, who is being nominated for another position.

In order to carry out the duties of the proposed assignment, a general officer must have demonstrated highly effective performance in a number of senior leadership positions. He must possess a thorough and detailed understanding of the logistics field including Active and Reserve Component logistics and security assistance matters. General Wilson meets these requirements.

This action will not result in the Army exceeding the number of officers authorized to be serving in the grade of lieutenant general. General Wilson has not served a joint duty assignment. The requirement for joint duty was waived because his selection as a general officer was based primarily on his scientific and technical qualifications.

William J. Perry
William J. Perry

Attachment

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. letter	[Personally Identifiable Information] [partial] (1 page)	08/13/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

The White House

Washington

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate:

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, United States Code, Section 601(a):

To be Lieutenant General

Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, (b)(6), United States Army [001a]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001b. resume	Resume of Service Career of Johnnie Edward Wilson. (2 pages)	01/19/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

No.
(703) 697-5131 (info)
(703) 697-3189 (copies)
(703) 697-5737 (public/industry)

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

GENERAL OFFICER ANNOUNCEMENT

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin announced today that the President has nominated Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general and assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army, Washington, DC. Since July 1992, he has served as the Chief of Staff, United States Army Materiel Command, Alexandria, Virginia.

Major General Wilson was born on February 4, 1944, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

-END-

UNCLASSIFIED
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9306839
RECEIVED: 10 SEP 93 10

TO: FORSGREN, J

FROM: ITOH

DOC DATE: 16 SEP 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY   LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: DOD PROPOSED RPT RE CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY & VA DISABILITY COMPENSATION

ACTION: KENNEY SGD MEMO   DUE DATE: 14 SEP 93   STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: HAHN   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
		EXECSEC
		FEAVER
		HAHN
		ROSNER

COMMENTS: ______________________

DISPATCHED BY ___PH___ DATE ___9/16___ BY HAND   W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSMEM   CLOSED BY: NSKDB   DOC 3 OF 3

UNCLASSIFIED

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

September 16, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR JANET R. FORSGREN

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed report.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON. D.C 20506

September 14, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL

FROM: PETER FEAVER PDF

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

Tab II provides the proposed report, prepared by the Department of Defense, outlining options for dealing with the issue of the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and VA disability compensation. Although the report itself only outlines options, the cover letter makes clear DoD's desire not to change current policy whereby retirement pay is reduced by the amount of VA disability compensation an individual receives. The Senate Armed Services Committee had expressed interest in revising the policy on equity grounds, and asked for a report on the costs of permitting concurrent receipt.

Although the civil service does allow concurrent receipt from other agencies, the DoD policy is consonant with compensation practices in the business world. Moreover, the report convincingly demonstrates that the cost of changing the policy would be prohibitive.

Concurrences by: Jeremy Rosner and Keith Hahn In Draft

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments
Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

6839

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

September 9, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #M-638

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226
VA - Robert Coy - (202)535-8113 - 229
NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
OPM - James N. Woodruff - (202)606-1424 - 331
HHS - Frances White - (202)690-7760 - 328
COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202)482-3086 - 324

FROM: JANET R. FORSGREN (for) Janet Rice Forsgren
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: Melissa COOK (395-3924)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-7362

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

DEADLINE: C.O.B. September 23, 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:

Tom Stanners	Cora Beebe
Wendell Waites	Jeff Payne
Todd Grams	Howard Paster
Don Blanchon	Jennifer Palmieri
Chris Bertram	Bernie Martin
Bob Rideout	Janet Forsgren
Carol Johnson	
Barry Clendenin	

1088

LRM #M-638

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: Melissa COOK (395-3924)
Office of Management and Budget
Fax Number: (202) 395-6148
Analyst/Attorney's Direct Number: (202) 395-3924
Branch-Wide Line (to reach secretary): (202) 395-7362

FROM: ______________________ (Date)

______________________ (Name)

______________________ (Agency)

______________________ (Telephone)

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

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

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-4000

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am enclosing the Department of Defense report required by section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992. The requirement is to provide a report of possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay along with disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition, we are developing detailed cost projections, including actuarial assessments for the next several years and the impact on the DOD budget (accrual payments for the Military Retirement Fund). This information will be provided in a supplemental report as soon as possible.

Four aspects of this issue are crucial: (1) Concurrent receipt is not a matter of equity because offsetting longevity and disability retired payments are standard compensation practice, (2) No military member was promised additive entitlements, (3) The cost of concurrent receipt is substantial, and (4) Increasing payments to a group who was not promised additive benefits would be inappropriate while delaying payments to others whose entitlement is a matter of existing law (i.e., Cost-of-Living Adjustments or COLAs for retired military and civilian personnel).

Therefore, we oppose any change in the present concurrent receipt laws. The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to presentation of this report for consideration by Congress.

I have sent a similar letter to the Chairman and Ranking Republican of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

Edwin Dorn

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc:
Honorable Strom Thurmond,
Ranking Republican

Printed on Recycled Paper

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-4000

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am enclosing the Department of Defense report required by section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992. The requirement is to provide a report of possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay along with disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition, we are developing detailed cost projections, including actuarial assessments for the next several years and the impact on the DOD budget (accrual payments for the Military Retirement Fund). This information will be provided in a supplemental report as soon as possible.

Four aspects of this issue are crucial: (1) Concurrent receipt is not a matter of equity because offsetting longevity and disability retired payments are standard compensation practice, (2) No military member was promised additive entitlements, (3) The cost of concurrent receipt is substantial, and (4) Increasing payments to a group who was not promised additive benefits would be inappropriate while delaying payments to others whose entitlement is a matter of existing law (i.e., Cost-of-Living Adjustments or COLAs for retired military and civilian personnel).

Therefore, we oppose any change in the present concurrent receipt laws. The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to presentation of this report for consideration by Congress.

I have sent a similar letter to the Chairman and Ranking Republican of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

Edwin Dorn

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc:
Honorable Floyd D. Spence,
Ranking Republican

Printed on Recycled Paper

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
REPORT ON
THE CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY AND VA DISABILITY COMPENSATION

PREPARED BY

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEPTEMBER 1993

Department of Defense Report on the Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT

In deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, the Senate recommended a provision that would have required the Department of Defense to submit legislation that would permit the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), or another formula that would accomplish such a result. The Department would have been required to set aside sufficient funds in a legislative contingency fund to pay for enactment of such legislation for fiscal year 1994.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services was making this proposal because it believed inequitable the current requirement for military retired pay received by an individual to be offset dollar-for-dollar by any veterans' disability compensation pay received. As stated in the committee report,

> "The committee believes that nondisability military retired pay is post-service compensation for services rendered. Veterans' disability compensation pay, on the other hand is compensation for a physical or mental disability incurred from performance of such service. The two pays are for different purposes, one for service and the other for physical or mental 'pain and suffering.'
>
> The committee believes this inequity should be corrected, and has considered a number of proposals. These include a proposal to repeal the offset entirely, a proposal to require a sliding scale of offsets that would reduce as disability ratings increase, a proposal for a phase-in over a number of years of either one of the first two proposals, a proposal to apply the offset only to individuals who have a 30 percent or less rated disability, and a number of other variations on these themes. Because of the complexity of some of these proposals and the costs associated with them, the committee believes that DoD should be required to carefully study these proposals and then submit legislation that it considers appropriate."

The House version of the bill contained no similar provision, and the Conference report and final Act compromised by requiring only a report on the possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation. This requirement is contained in section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992.

CURRENT PROVISIONS OF LAW

The current provisions of law requiring the offset are set forth in sections 5304 and 5305, title 38, United States Code. These two sections of law prevent the duplication of benefits by prohibiting more than one award of "pension, compensation,...., regular, or reserve retirement pay, ...concurrently to any person based upon such person's own service...." In practice, multiple awards may be made, but the person receiving benefits must waive an equal amount of retired pay as is to be paid in disability compensation. The interaction of VA disability compensation and various forms of separation and severance pays are established in sections 1212, 1174, 1174a, and 1175 of title 10, United States Code.

Thus, all payments compensating the discontinuance of military service require an offset of VA disability compensation, or vice versa. Disability severance pay, involuntary separation pay, and the special separation benefit (SSB) are offset from VA compensation while VA disability compensation is offset from military retired pay and the Voluntary Separation Incentive (VSI).

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO CONCURRENT RECEIPT

Several options have been postulated by members of Congress and by various interested organizations. We postulate a few additional approaches here. Options are presented generically. The costs (savings) are on an estimated FY93 basis if the option had been in effect this fiscal year. One option would result in a savings. All other options could lead to increased costs beyond that shown as more people apply for VA benefits or seek to have their benefits increased.

1. **Full Concurrent Receipt** - Under this option all members entitled would receive both entitlements in full without reduction. This is the only option which will truly satisfy claims of inequity because any group not allowed full concurrent receipt, while others are, will contend that they are receiving inequitable treatment and paying for a portion of their

disability entitlement. The current approximate annual cost of this option would be $2.085 Billion for 496,000 members.

2. **Sliding Scale of Offsets, Allowing Increased Duplication for Increased Disability** - Under the most frequently proposed alternative of this type, those with higher disabilities would receive a higher percentage of concurrent receipt. The formula would be such that the percentage of disability would be the percentage of concurrent receipt; i.e., a person with a 40 percent disability would be allowed to receive 40 percent of his/her VA disability compensation without offset; only 60 percent of such compensation would be subtracted dollar-for-dollar from military retired pay. The estimated annual cost of this plan is $1.227 Billion to $1.395 Billion for 494,000 members.

3. **Concurrent Receipt for the Most Severely Disabled (100%, >90%, etc.)** - Under this option, a cutoff point would be established which would pay full concurrent receipt to persons at or above a certain percentage of disability, such as those with 70 percent or more disability, the costs for which are shown below. Those just below the established cutoff would consider this very inequitable. The current approximate annual cost of this option is:

DISABILITY THRESHOLD	NUMBER RECEIVING (000S)	COST ($M)
100%	43.1	449.7M
90	50.7	527.0
80	65.3	672.4
70	86.5	867.6
60	119.3	1,129.3
50	146.9	1,294.2
40	201.1	1,541.8
30	272.8	1,776.8
20	353.8	1,934.7
10	494.4	2,078.9
0	496.4	2,084.8

4. **Concurrent Receipt for Those with Over 20 Years of Service** - Under this option, concurrent receipt would be allowed only for those who had attained eligibility for longevity retirement, 20 years of active duty service. The current approximate annual cost of this option is a minimum of $1.125 Billion for 342,000 members if limited to those who retired under non-disability provisions. Costs would be substantially higher if those with 20 years or more who retired with disability were included.

5. **Phase-In Concurrent Receipt** - Under this option, concurrent receipt would be phased-in by compensating those with 100 percent disability in FY 1994, those with 90 percent or greater in FY 1995, and so forth until the objective level percentage and greater were being compensated. The current approximate annual cost of this option would follow the cumulative cost column under option 3 above with added cost due to any increase in the levels of compensation from year to year.

6. **50 percent offset** - This would be a compromise offset of the two competing philosophies for either a 100 percent offset or no offset. Such a formula is found, at least in part, in the dual compensation offset of military retired pay of retired regular officers where 50 percent of an amount in excess of a certain threshold is offset, and in the Variable Housing Allowance compensation when a member spends less than the full amount of compensation permitted. The annual cost of this option is in the range of $1.042 to $1.468 Billion for 496,000 members.

7. **No Concurrent Receipt For Those With Civil Service Retirement** This option would deal with the problem which many retired members focus on in claiming inequitable treatment, that of allowing persons who retire as Federal civilians to receive that retired pay without reduction. The current approximate annual savings of this option is about $56.1 Million for 13,380 members who have VA benefits and have waived their military retired pay in favor of a civil service annuity. However, we have no data on the number who have VA compensation and civil service retirement but no military retired status.

8. **Income Offsets, Combat Casualty Compensation, Distinct systems for VA vice military compensation**

There are clearly other actions which could be taken to provide some form of concurrent receipt. One such option would focus on whether or not the veteran had any other income. It could be done on either a threshold basis, either fixed or increasing with the disability percentage. For example, the income threshold could be set at $30,000. A retired member with income of $36,000 would have up to $6,000 offset from retired pay. Any annual disability compensation exceeding $6,000 could be received concurrently, without offset. An example of basing an offset on the percentage of disability would be to establish the income threshold as $30,000 and offset income in excess of this threshold from retired pay in an amount computed as (Income - Threshold * Disability Percentage). A specific example would be a retired member with a 70 percent disability and an annual income of $45,000. The maximum offset from this member's retired pay would be

($45,000 - $30,000)/(.1 * 70) = $15,000/7 = $2,142.86

Another approach would be to allow some portion of concurrent receipt, according to any of the options described above, only if the disability compensated by the VA was a disability from injuries sustained while on duty, perhaps only while in combat or in training for combat. This would limit the concurrent receipt to those instances in which there was truly pain and suffering unequivocally resulting from conditions of service which is the most legitimate claim to such entitlement.

The final alternative would be to simply make the two systems totally exclusive. If a person wanted to forsake the military retirement system and receive compensation as a veteran, they could do so, but would forgo their military retired status. This would make the systems pure and distinct and discourage the concept of additive systems.

CLOSING COMMENT

All of these alternatives, except those with potential savings (number 7 and parts of number 8), require added funding in the budget. First, they require added accrual costs in the DoD budget to fund the added benefits for members now in service. Second, they require increased outlays from the income security accounts to pay for the added benefits for those already receiving compensation. Third, they will result in substantial increased unfunded liabilities which we are in the process of estimating. The present value of added unfunded liabilitites for each alternative may be as much as 20 times the annual cost shown above. Any of these changes could be implemented rapidly.

UNCLASSIFIED
NSC/RMO PROFILE

RECORD ID: 9306839
RECEIVED: 10 SEP 93 10

TO: FORSGREN, J

FROM: ITOH

DOC DATE: 16 SEP 93
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY   LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: DOD PROPOSED RPT RE CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY & VA DISABILITY COMPENSATION

ACTION: KENNEY SGD MEMO   DUE DATE: 14 SEP 93   STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: HAHN   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
		EXECSEC
		FEAVER
		HAHN
		ROSNER

COMMENTS:

DISPATCHED BY PH   DATE 9/16   BY HAND   W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: NSMEM   CLOSED BY: NSKDB   DOC 3 OF 3

UNCLASSIFIED

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON. D.C. 20506

September 16, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR JANET R. FORSGREN

FROM: WILLIAM H. ITOH

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

The National Security Council staff concurs in the proposed report.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON. D.C. 20506

September 14, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT BELL

FROM: PETER FEAVER PDF

SUBJECT: Defense Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

Tab II provides the proposed report, prepared by the Department of Defense, outlining options for dealing with the issue of the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and VA disability compensation. Although the report itself only outlines options, the cover letter makes clear DoD's desire not to change current policy whereby retirement pay is reduced by the amount of VA disability compensation an individual receives. The Senate Armed Services Committee had expressed interest in revising the policy on equity grounds, and asked for a report on the costs of permitting concurrent receipt.

Although the civil service does allow concurrent receipt from other agencies, the DoD policy is consonant with compensation practices in the business world. Moreover, the report convincingly demonstrates that the cost of changing the policy would be prohibitive.

Concurrences by: Jeremy Rosner and Keith Hahn In Draft

RECOMMENDATION

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

Attachments
Tab I Memorandum for Signature
Tab II Incoming Correspondence

6839

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

September 9, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #M-638

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226
VA - Robert Coy - (202)535-8113 - 229
NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
OPM - James N. Woodruff - (202)606-1424 - 331
HHS - Frances White - (202)690-7760 - 328
COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202)482-3086 - 324

FROM: JANET R. FORSGREN (for) Janet Rice Forsgren
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference

OMB CONTACT: Melissa COOK (395-3924)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-7362

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

DEADLINE: C.O.B. September 23, 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:
Tom Stanners
Wendell Waites
Todd Grams
Don Blanchon
Chris Bertram
Bob Rideout
Carol Johnson
Barry Clendenin

Cora Beebe
Jeff Payne
Howard Paster
Jennifer Palmieri
Bernie Martin
Janet Forsgren

10 PP

LRM #M-638

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: Melissa COOK (395-3924)
Office of Management and Budget
Fax Number: (202) 395-6148
Analyst/Attorney's Direct Number: (202) 395-3924
Branch-Wide Line (to reach secretary): (202) 395-7362

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

SUBJECT: DEFENSE Proposed Report on Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

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

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-4000

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am enclosing the Department of Defense report required by section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992. The requirement is to provide a report of possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay along with disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition, we are developing detailed cost projections, including actuarial assessments for the next several years and the impact on the DOD budget (accrual payments for the Military Retirement Fund). This information will be provided in a supplemental report as soon as possible.

Four aspects of this issue are crucial: (1) Concurrent receipt is not a matter of equity because offsetting longevity and disability retired payments are standard compensation practice, (2) No military member was promised additive entitlements, (3) The cost of concurrent receipt is substantial, and (4) Increasing payments to a group who was not promised additive benefits would be inappropriate while delaying payments to others whose entitlement is a matter of existing law (i.e., Cost-of-Living Adjustments or COLAs for retired military and civilian personnel).

Therefore, we oppose any change in the present concurrent receipt laws. The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to presentation of this report for consideration by Congress.

I have sent a similar letter to the Chairman and Ranking Republican of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

Edwin Dorn

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc:
Honorable Strom Thurmond,
Ranking Republican

Printed on Recycled Paper

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-4000

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

50

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am enclosing the Department of Defense report required by section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992. The requirement is to provide a report of possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay along with disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition, we are developing detailed cost projections, including actuarial assessments for the next several years and the impact on the DOD budget (accrual payments for the Military Retirement Fund). This information will be provided in a supplemental report as soon as possible.

Four aspects of this issue are crucial: (1) Concurrent receipt is not a matter of equity because offsetting longevity and disability retired payments are standard compensation practice, (2) No military member was promised additive entitlements, (3) The cost of concurrent receipt is substantial, and (4) Increasing payments to a group who was not promised additive benefits would be inappropriate while delaying payments to others whose entitlement is a matter of existing law (i.e., Cost-of-Living Adjustments or COLAs for retired military and civilian personnel).

Therefore, we oppose any change in the present concurrent receipt laws. The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to presentation of this report for consideration by Congress.

I have sent a similar letter to the Chairman and Ranking Republican of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

Edwin Dorn

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc:
Honorable Floyd D. Spence,
Ranking Republican

Printed on Recycled Paper

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT ON THE CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY AND VA DISABILITY COMPENSATION

PREPARED BY

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEPTEMBER 1993

Department of Defense Report on the Concurrent Receipt of Military Retired Pay and VA Disability Compensation

REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT

In deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, the Senate recommended a provision that would have required the Department of Defense to submit legislation that would permit the concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), or another formula that would accomplish such a result. The Department would have been required to set aside sufficient funds in a legislative contingency fund to pay for enactment of such legislation for fiscal year 1994.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services was making this proposal because it believed inequitable the current requirement for military retired pay received by an individual to be offset dollar-for-dollar by any veterans' disability compensation pay received. As stated in the committee report,

> "The committee believes that nondisability military retired pay is post-service compensation for services rendered. Veterans' disability compensation pay, on the other hand is compensation for a physical or mental disability incurred from performance of such service. The two pays are for different purposes, one for service and the other for physical or mental 'pain and suffering.'
>
> The committee believes this inequity should be corrected, and has considered a number of proposals. These include a proposal to repeal the offset entirely, a proposal to require a sliding scale of offsets that would reduce as disability ratings increase, a proposal for a phase-in over a number of years of either one of the first two proposals, a proposal to apply the offset only to individuals who have a 30 percent or less rated disability, and a number of other variations on these themes. Because of the complexity of some of these proposals and the costs associated with them, the committee believes that DoD should be required to carefully study these proposals and then submit legislation that it considers appropriate."

The House version of the bill contained no similar provision, and the Conference report and final Act compromised by requiring only a report on the possible options for allowing some form of concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation. This requirement is contained in section 641, Public Law 102-484, October 23, 1992.

CURRENT PROVISIONS OF LAW

The current provisions of law requiring the offset are set forth in sections 5304 and 5305, title 38, United States Code. These two sections of law prevent the duplication of benefits by prohibiting more than one award of "pension, compensation,..., regular, or reserve retirement pay, ...concurrently to any person based upon such person's own service...." In practice, multiple awards may be made, but the person receiving benefits must waive an equal amount of retired pay as is to be paid in disability compensation. The interaction of VA disability compensation and various forms of separation and severance pays are established in sections 1212, 1174, 1174a, and 1175 of title 10, United States Code.

Thus, all payments compensating the discontinuance of military service require an offset of VA disability compensation, or vice versa. Disability severance pay, involuntary separation pay, and the special separation benefit (SSB) are offset from VA compensation while VA disability compensation is offset from military retired pay and the Voluntary Separation Incentive (VSI).

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO CONCURRENT RECEIPT

Several options have been postulated by members of Congress and by various interested organizations. We postulate a few additional approaches here. Options are presented generically. The costs (savings) are on an estimated FY93 basis if the option had been in effect this fiscal year. One option would result in a savings. All other options could lead to increased costs beyond that shown as more people apply for VA benefits or seek to have their benefits increased.

1. **Full Concurrent Receipt** - Under this option all members entitled would receive both entitlements in full without reduction. This is the only option which will truly satisfy claims of inequity because any group not allowed full concurrent receipt, while others are, will contend that they are receiving inequitable treatment and paying for a portion of their

disability entitlement. The current approximate annual cost of this option would be $2.085 Billion for 496,000 members.

2. Sliding Scale of Offsets, Allowing Increased Duplication for Increased Disability - Under the most frequently proposed alternative of this type, those with higher disabilities would receive a higher percentage of concurrent receipt. The formula would be such that the percentage of disability would be the percentage of concurrent receipt; i.e., a person with a 40 percent disability would be allowed to receive 40 percent of his/her VA disability compensation without offset; only 60 percent of such compensation would be subtracted dollar-for-dollar from military retired pay. The estimated annual cost of this plan is $1.227 Billion to $1.395 Billion for 494,000 members.

3. Concurrent Receipt for the Most Severely Disabled (100%, >90%, etc.) - Under this option, a cutoff point would be established which would pay full concurrent receipt to persons at or above a certain percentage of disability, such as those with 70 percent or more disability, the costs for which are shown below. Those just below the established cutoff would consider this very inequitable. The current approximate annual cost of this option is:

DISABILITY THRESHOLD	NUMBER RECEIVING (000S)	COST ($M)
100%	43.1	449.7M
90	50.7	527.0
80	65.3	672.4
70	86.5	867.6
60	119.3	1,129.3
50	146.9	1,294.2
40	201.1	1,541.8
30	272.8	1,776.8
20	353.8	1,934.7
10	494.4	2,078.9
0	496.4	2,084.8

4. Concurrent Receipt for Those with Over 20 Years of Service - Under this option, concurrent receipt would be allowed only for those who had attained eligibility for longevity retirement, 20 years of active duty service. The current approximate annual cost of this option is a minimum of $1.125 Billion for 342,000 members if limited to those who retired under non-disability provisions. Costs would be substantially higher if those with 20 years or more who retired with disability were included.

5. **Phase-In Concurrent Receipt** - Under this option, concurrent receipt would be phased-in by compensating those with 100 percent disability in FY 1994, those with 90 percent or greater in FY 1995, and so forth until the objective level percentage and greater were being compensated. The current approximate annual cost of this option would follow the cumulative cost column under option 3 above with added cost due to any increase in the levels of compensation from year to year.

6. **50 percent offset** - This would be a compromise offset of the two competing philosophies for either a 100 percent offset or no offset. Such a formula is found, at least in part, in the dual compensation offset of military retired pay of retired regular officers where 50 percent of an amount in excess of a certain threshold is offset, and in the Variable Housing Allowance compensation when a member spends less than the full amount of compensation permitted. The annual cost of this option is in the range of $1.042 to $1.468 Billion for 496,000 members.

7. **No Concurrent Receipt For Those With Civil Service Retirement** This option would deal with the problem which many retired members focus on in claiming inequitable treatment, that of allowing persons who retire as Federal civilians to receive that retired pay without reduction. The current approximate annual savings of this option is about $56.1 Million for 13,380 members who have VA benefits and have waived their military retired pay in favor of a civil service annuity. However, we have no data on the number who have VA compensation and civil service retirement but no military retired status.

8. **Income Offsets, Combat Casualty Compensation, Distinct systems for VA vice military compensation**

There are clearly other actions which could be taken to provide some form of concurrent receipt. One such option would focus on whether or not the veteran had any other income. It could be done on either a threshold basis, either fixed or increasing with the disability percentage. For example, the income threshold could be set at $30,000. A retired member with income of $36,000 would have up to $6,000 offset from retired pay. Any annual disability compensation exceeding $6,000 could be received concurrently, without offset. An example of basing an offset on the percentage of disability would be to establish the income threshold as $30,000 and offset income in excess of this threshold from retired pay in an amount computed as (Income - Threshold * Disability Percentage). A specific example would be a retired member with a 70 percent disability and an annual income of $45,000. The maximum offset from this member's retired pay would be

($45,000 - $30,000)/(.1 * 70) = $15,000/7 = $2,142.86

Another approach would be to allow some portion of concurrent receipt, according to any of the options described above, only if the disability compensated by the VA was a disability from injuries sustained while on duty, perhaps only while in combat or in training for combat. This would limit the concurrent receipt to those instances in which there was truly pain and suffering unequivocally resulting from conditions of service which is the most legitimate claim to such entitlement.

The final alternative would be to simply make the two systems totally exclusive. If a person wanted to forsake the military retirement system and receive compensation as a veteran, they could do so, but would forgo their military retired status. This would make the systems pure and distinct and discourage the concept of additive systems.

CLOSING COMMENT

All of these alternatives, except those with potential savings (number 7 and parts of number 8), require added funding in the budget. First, they require added accrual costs in the DoD budget to fund the added benefits for members now in service. Second, they require increased outlays from the income security accounts to pay for the added benefits for those already receiving compensation. Third, they will result in substantial increased unfunded liabilities which we are in the process of estimating. The present value of added unfunded liabilitites for each alternative may be as much as 20 times the annual cost shown above. Any of these changes could be implemented rapidly.

6869

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON. D.C. 20506

September 16, 1993

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR WILLIAM H. ITOH

THROUGH: ROBERT G. BELL

FROM: STEVEN R. JONES

SUBJECT: OMB Request for Views on Revised NASA Draft Bill
RE: NASA Authorization

OMB has requested NSC views on the revised draft authorization bill submitted by NASA. The bill has been revised to reflect the more recent decisions regarding the Space Station.

Although the House has already taken action on the FY 94 NASA authorization, NASA is submitting this modified draft bill for Senate consideration.

The modified bill includes $2.1 billion for the Space Station. The Senate will debate next week the NASA authorization and the proposed Space Station Alfa, redesigned to accommodate potential Russian participation. We should defer to OSTP and the OMB analysts for a detailed review of the budget numbers proposed.

Concurrence by: Jeremy Rosner

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memo at Tab I.

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: OMB Request for Views on Revised NASA Draft Bill RE: NASA Authorization

The NSC raises no objection to the revised NASA draft authorization bill on the basis of our national security policy. The NSC defers comment on the specific funds to be authorized for specific programs to NASA, OSTP and OMB program analysts.

 6869

20 pages

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

September 9, 1993

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

LRM #D-376
DRAFT #191

TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -

COMMERCE - Michael A. Levitt - (202)482-3086 - 324
DEFENSE - Samuel T. Brick, Jr. - (703)697-1305 - 325
JUSTICE - Sheila F. Anthony - (202)514-2141 - 217
TRANSPORTATION - Tom Herlihy - (202)366-4687 - 226
TREASURY - Richard S. Carro - (202)622-1146 - 228
NSC - William H. Itoh - (202)395-3723 - 249
GSA - William R. Ratchford - (202)501-0563 - 237
NEC - Sonia Mathews - (202)456-6722 - 429
NSF - Lawrence Rudolph - (202)357-9435 - 248
OSTP - Chris Clary - (202)456-7116 - 288
ENERGY - Bob Rabben - (202)586-6718 - 209

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

OMB CONTACT: Jeffrey WEINBERG (395-3457)
Secretary's line (for simple responses): 395-3454

SUBJECT: Revised NASA Draft Bill NASA Authorizations, FY 1994

DEADLINE: NOON September 16, 1993

COMMENTS: This is a revised version of the draft bill that was circulated on April 16, 1993. The bill has been revised to conform to the budget amendment that was transmitted by the President on June 21st. The Senate subcommittee is expected to markup the bill later this month.

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	Ed Rea
Kathy Peroff	Roz Rettman
Jack Fellows	Jee Rhee
Bruce Campbell	Cyndi Vallina
Steve Isakowitz	David Haun
Memphis Norman	

LRM #D-376

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: Jeffrey WEINBERG
Office of Management and Budget
Fax Number: (202) 395-3109
Analyst/Attorney's Direct Number: (202) 395-3457
Branch-Wide Line (to reach secretary): (202) 395-3454

FROM: ______________________ (Date)

______________________ (Name)

______________________ (Agency)

______________________ (Telephone)

SUBJECT: NASA Draft Bill NASA Authorizations, FY 1994

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

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Office of the Administrator
Washington, DC 20546-0001

The Honorable Leon E. Panetta
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20503

August 27, 1993

Dear Mr. Panetta:

On April 15, 1993, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) submitted a proposed bill for FY 1994 "To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; research and program management; and Inspector General; and for other purposes" to the Office of Management and Budget for coordination and advice.

As you know, at the direction of the President, NASA recently completed a redesign of the Space Station program. As a result of that effort, the President on June 17 called for NASA to proceed with development of a reduced-cost, scaled-down version of the original Space Station Freedom program and, on June 21, transmitted to the Congress amendments to the FY 1994 appropriations request for NASA allocating $2.3 billion requested in the FY 1994 budget for research and development among the Space Station, New Technology Investments, and other needed programs.

Consistent with the President's June 21 budget amendment, NASA has prepared modifications to its proposed bill authorizing appropriations for FY 1994. Although the House has already taken action relative to the FY 1994 authorization bill, we believe it is appropriate to submit this modified draft bill to the Senate for its consideration.

Therefore, in accordance with Circular No. A-19, I am forwarding for Office of Management and Budget coordination and advice 25 copies of the modified bill requesting authorization for NASA programs consistent with the budget amendment. I have also enclosed a draft letter of transmittal to the Congress which discusses the proposed budget amendment and identifies differences between the budget amendment and the bill as proposed.

If we may be of assistance to you during your coordination of this package, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. Goldin

Daniel S. Goldin
Administrator

3 Enclosures
(25 copies)

A BILL

To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and Inspector General, and for other purposes.

TITLE I--FISCAL YEAR 1994 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

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

SEC. 101. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to become available October 1, 1993:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

(1) Space Station, ~~$2,300,000,000~~ $1,946,000,000;

(2) Space transportation capability development, ~~$649,200,000~~ $705,000,000;

(3) Physics and astronomy, $1,074,700,000;

(4) Planetary exploration, ~~$557,200,000~~ $625,300,000;

(5) Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, ~~$351,000,000~~ $470,000,000;

(6) Mission to Planet Earth, ~~$1,074,900,000~~ $1,112,900,000;

(7) Space research and technology, ~~$298,200,000~~ $348,200,000;

(8) Technology Transfer, $28,100,000;

(9) Commercial use of space, ~~$145,100,000~~ $145,100,000;

(10) Aeronautical research and technology, $1,020,700,000;

(11) Transatmospheric research and technology, $80,000,000;

(12) Safety, reliability and quality assurance, $35,300,000;

(13) Academic Programs, $74,500,000;

(14) Tracking and data advanced systems, $24,600,000;

of which $2,095,000,000 is for the Space Station, $163,900,000 is for the New Technology Investments, and $19,200,000 is for other needed programs. In addition, for the Space Station, $2,075,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1995 and to remain available until September 30, 1996; $2,085,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 and to remain available until September 30, 1997; $2,100,000,000 is authorized to appropriated for fiscal year 1997 and to remain available until September 30, 1998; and $2,100,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1998 and to remain available until September 30, 1999.

(b) For "Space flight, control and data communications," for the following programs:

(1) Space Shuttle production and operational capability, $1,189,600,000;

(2) Space Shuttle operations, $3,006,500,000;

(3) Launch Services, ~~$300,300,000~~ $316,900,000;

(4) Space and ground networks, communications and data systems, ~~$820,500,000~~ $820,800,000;

of which $16,900,000 is for the New Technology Investments;

(c) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisition, as follows:

(1) Replace Mission Control Center Air Handlers, Johnson Space Center, $8,000,000;

(2) Replace Thermal Vacuum Helium Refrigeration System, Johnson Space Center, $6,900,000;

(3) Modify Launch Complex 39 Exterior Utility Piping, Kennedy Space Center, $1,200,000;

(4) Refurbish Launch Complex 39 Cooling System, Kennedy Space Center, $4,000,000;

(5) Refurbish Launch Complex 39 Secondary Circuit Breakers, Kennedy Space Center, $3,300,000;

(6) Refurbish Vehicle Assembly Building/Pad Water Storage Tanks, Kennedy Space Center, $3,000,000;

(7) Rehabilitate Industrial Area Fire Alarm Reporting System, Kennedy Space Center, $4,900,000;

(8) Restore C-5 Substation, Launch Complex 39 Area, Kennedy Space Center, $5,000,000;

(9) Restoration of High Pressure Air Compressor System, Marshall Space Flight Center, $8,500,000;

(11) Repair Decking and Roof, X-Ray and Staging Facility, Michoud Assembly Facility, $1,500,000;

(12) Replace Cooling Tower and Boiler, Michoud Assembly Facility $4,000,000;

(13) Restore High Pressure Gas Storage Capacity, Stennis Space Center, $2,300,000;

(14) Restore SSME Test Complex High Pressure Industrial Water System, Stennis Space Center, $2,300,000;

(15) Construction of Advanced Solid Rocket Motor facilities (various locations), $32,600,000;

(16) Rehabilitate Electrical Distribution System, Project Management Building, Johnson Space Center, $2,200,000;

(17) Restore Class III Landfill, Kennedy Space Center, $1,900,000;

(18) Restoration of Electrical Power System, Marshall Space Flight Center, $2,600,000;

(19) Restoration of Underground Communication Distribution System, Stennis Space Center, $3,800,000;

(20) Construction of Earth Systems Science Building, Goddard Space Flight Center, $12,000,000;

(21) Replacement of Central Plant Steam and Electrical Generation Equipment, Goddard Space Flight Center, $8,600,000;

(22) Restoration and Modernization of Chilled Water System, Goddard Space Flight Center, $5,000,000;

(23) Replace Chillers and Modify Related Systems, Various Buildings, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, $2,900,000;

(24) Restoration of Airfield, Wallops Flight Facility, $5,200,000;

(25) Rehabilitation of Control Systems, National Full-Scale Aerodynamics Complex, Ames Research Center, $2,100,000;

(26) Upgrade of Outdoor Aerodynamic Research Facility, Ames Research Center, $3,900,000;

(27) Modernization of the Unitary Plan Wind Tunnel Complex, Ames Research Center, $25,000,000;

(28) Construction of EOSDIS Distributed Active Archive Center, Langley Research Center, $8,000,000;

(29) Rehabilitation of Rocket Engine Test Facility, Lewis Research Center, $12,500,000;

(30) Construction of 34-Meter Multifrequency Antenna, Goldstone, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, $17,600,000;

(31) Repair of Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,000,000 per project, $36,000,000;

(32) Rehabilitation and Modification of Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $1,000,000 per project, $36,000,000;

(33) Minor Construction of New Facilities and Additions to Existing Facilities at Various Locations, not in excess of $750,000 per project, $14,000,000;

(34) Environmental Compliance and Restoration including land acquisition, $50,000,000;

(35) Facility Planning and Design, $27,000,000;

(36) For Space Station, $5,000,000. In addition, for the Space Station, $25,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1995 and to remain available until September 30, 1998; and $15,000,000 is authorized to be

appropriated for fiscal year 1996 and to remain available until September 30, 1999;

(d) For "Research and program management," $1,675,000,000;

(e) For "Inspector General," $15,500,000.

(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 101(i), appropriations hereby authorized for "Research and development" and "Space flight, control and data communications" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to ensure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" and "Space flight, control and data communications" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $750,000, unless the Administrator or the Administrator's designee has notified the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(g) When so specified and to the extent provided in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development," for "Space flight, control and data communications" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) contracts may be entered into under "Inspector General" and "Research and program management" for training, investigations, and costs associated with personnel relocation and for other services to be provided, during the next fiscal year.

(h) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 101(a) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for official reception and representation expenses.

(i)(1) Funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 101(a) and (b) may be used for the construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for repair, rehabilitation, or modification of facilities, provided the cost of each such project, including collateral equipment, does not exceed $200,000.

(2) Funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 101(a) and (b) may be used for unforeseen programmatic facility project needs, provided the cost of each such project, including collateral equipment, does not exceed $750,000.

(3) Funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 101(a) and (b) may be used for repair, rehabilitation or modification of facilities controlled by the General Services Administration, provided the cost of each project, including collateral equipment, does not exceed $500,000.

Administrator's Reprogramming Authority

SEC. 102. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through ~~(35)~~, (36), inclusive, of subsection 101(c) --

(a) at the discretion of the Administrator or the Administrator's designee, may be varied upward 10 percent, or

(b) following a report by the Administrator or the Administrator's designee to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, on the circumstances of such action, may be varied upward 25 percent, to meet unusual cost variations.

The total cost of all work authorized under paragraphs (a) and (b) shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in Section 101(c).

Special Reprogramming Authority for

Construction of Facilities

SEC. 103. Where the Administrator determines that new developments or scientific or engineering changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities have occurred; and that such changes require the use of additional funds for the purposes of construction, expansion, or modification of facilities at any location; and that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities; the Administrator may transfer not to exceed 1/2 of 1 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to Section 101(a) and 101(b) to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation for such purposes. The Administrator may also use up to $10,000,000 of the amounts authorized under Section 101(c) for such purposes. The funds so made available pursuant to this section may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No such funds may be obligated until a period of 30 days has passed after the Administrator or the Administrator's designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate a written report describing the nature of the construction, its cost and the reasons therefor.

Limitations on Authority

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act-

(a) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology or the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation,

(b) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by subsections 101(a), 101(b) and 101(d),

(c) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to either such committee,

unless a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by each such committee, of notice given by the Administrator or the Administrator's designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action.

SEC. 105. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1994."

TITLE II--AMENDMENT TO THE SPACE ACT ON REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 201. Section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, is amended by changing the words "January" to "May," and "calendar" to "fiscal."

DRAFT
For coordination and advice

Honorable Albert Gore
President of the Senate
Washington, DC 20510

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

Dear Mr. President:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

On May 13, 1993, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration submitted a draft bill "To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; research and program management; and Inspector General; and for other purposes." As noted in our letter which transmitted the draft bill, NASA was in the process of conducting a redesign effort for the Space Station program. That effort is now complete. On June 17, the President called for NASA to proceed with development of a reduced-cost, scaled-down version of the original Space Station Freedom program and, on June 21, transmitted to the Congress amendments to the FY 1994 appropriations request for NASA allocating $2.3 billion requested in the FY 1994 budget for research and development among the Space Station, New Technology Investments, and other needed programs.

Accordingly, consistent with the President's budget amendment, submitted herewith is a modification of our earlier proposed bill requesting authorization for NASA programs.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that such amendments would be in accord with the program of the President. I have also enclosed material which provides a more detailed analysis of the proposed amendment.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. Goldin
Administrator

2 Enclosures

DRAFT
For coordination
and advice

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you know, on May 13, 1993, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration submitted a draft bill "To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development; space flight, control and data communications; construction of facilities; research and program management; and Inspector General; and for other purposes." In our letter transmitting the draft bill to you, we noted that NASA was in the process of conducting a redesign effort for the Space Station program and that it was our intent to submit a budget amendment at a later date reallocating funds included in the "Space Station and New Technology Investments" item.

Enclosed, for your information, is a copy of a letter of this date to the Speaker of the House of Representatives recommending modifications to our original draft bill which are in accordance with amendments made on June 21 by the President to the fiscal year 1994 budget of the United States resulting from the Space Station redesign review. I have also enclosed a copy of the proposed bill as modified. By letter dated July 12, 1993, the Associate Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Jeff Lawrence, provided detailed justification material to you in support of the President's budget amendment.

Copies of the enclosed letter and proposed bill as amended are being provided to each member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

Sincerely,

Daniel S. Goldin

2 Enclosures

6902 Chron

Document No. 035750SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 11, 1993 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 9/16

SUBJECT: Army General Officer Nomination - Major General Johnnie E. Wilson

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	PASTER	☐	☐
McLARTY	☐	☐	RASCO	☐	☐
NEEL	☐	☐	RUBIN	☐	☐
PANETTA	☐	☐	SEGAL	☐	☐
BAGGETT	☐	☐	SEIDMAN	☐	☐
EMANUEL	☐	☐	STEPHANOPOULOS	☐	☐
GEARAN	☐	☐	TYSON	☐	☐
GERGEN	☐	☐	VARNEY	☐	☐
GIBBONS	☐	☐	WATKINS	☐	☐
HALE	☐	☐	WILLIAMS	☐	☐
HERMAN	☐	☐	Clerk	☐	☑
LAKE	☐	☐	Bob Bell	☑	☐
LINDSEY	☐	☐		☐	☐
McGINTY	☐	☐		☐	☐
MONTOYA	☐	☐		☐	☐
NUSSBAUM	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

RESPONSE:

The National Security Council staff concurs in the attached military nomination.

Anthony Lake

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 7, 1993

'93 SEP 8 P1:25

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOHN A. GAUGHAN
DIRECTOR, WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE

SUBJECT: Army General Officer Nomination

Forwarded for your approval and signature is the nomination of Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general and a recommendation for his assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army.

This nomination was staffed by the Acting Secretary of the Army and approved by the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Recommendation

That you approve and sign the attached.

Attachment

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1000

31 AUG 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Army General Officer Nomination

On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I recommend the assignment of Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army, a position previously designated to carry the grade of lieutenant general, and his nomination for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general. General Wilson, age 49, is currently assigned as Chief of Staff, United States Army Materiel Command. He will succeed Lieutenant General Leon E. Salomon, who is being nominated for another position.

In order to carry out the duties of the proposed assignment, a general officer must have demonstrated highly effective performance in a number of senior leadership positions. He must possess a thorough and detailed understanding of the logistics field including Active and Reserve Component logistics and security assistance matters. General Wilson meets these requirements.

This action will not result in the Army exceeding the number of officers authorized to be serving in the grade of lieutenant general. General Wilson has not served a joint duty assignment. The requirement for joint duty was waived because his selection as a general officer was based primarily on his scientific and technical qualifications.

William J. Perry
William J. Perry

Attachment

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002a. letter	Duplicate of 001a. (1 page)	08/13/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:
Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

The White House

Washington

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate:

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under Title 10, United States Code, Section 601(a):

To be Lieutenant General

Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, (b)(6), United States Army [002a]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002b. resume	Duplicate of 001b. (2 pages)	01/19/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:
Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

No.
(703) 697-5131 (info)
(703) 697-3189 (copies)
IMMEDIATE RELEASE
(703) 697-5737 (public/industry)

GENERAL OFFICER ANNOUNCEMENT

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin announced today that the President has nominated Major General Johnnie E. Wilson, United States Army, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general and assignment as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, United States Army, Washington, DC. Since July 1992, he has served as the Chief of Staff, United States Army Materiel Command, Alexandria, Virginia.

Major General Wilson was born on February 4, 1944, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

-END-

6903 Chron

Document No. 035751 SS

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 11, 1993 **ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:** 9/16

SUBJECT: Air Force General Officer Nomination - Major General Marcus A. Anderson.

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☐	PASTER	☐	☐
McLARTY	☐	☐	RASCO	☐	☐
NEEL	☐	☐	RUBIN	☐	☐
PANETTA	☐	☐	SEGAL	☐	☐
BAGGETT	☐	☐	SEIDMAN	☐	☐
EMANUEL	☐	☐	STEPHANOPOULOS	☐	☐
GEARAN	☐	☐	TYSON	☐	☐
GERGEN	☐	☐	VARNEY	☐	☐
GIBBONS	☐	☐	WATKINS	☐	☐
HALE	☐	☐	WILLIAMS	☐	☐
HERMAN	☐	☐	Clerk	☐	☑
LAKE	☐	☐	Bob Bell	☑	☐
LINDSEY	☐	☐		☐	☐
McGINTY	☐	☐		☐	☐
MONTOYA	☐	☐		☐	☐
NUSSBAUM	☐	☐		☐	☐

REMARKS:

RESPONSE:

The National Security Council staff concurs in the attached military nomination.

Anthony Lake

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President
and Staff Secretary
Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 7, 1993

93 SEP 8 P1:25

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JOHN A. GAUGHAN
DIRECTOR, WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE

SUBJECT: Air Force General Officer Nomination

Forwarded for your approval and signature is the nomination of Major General Marcus A. Anderson, United States Air Force, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general and a recommendation for his assignment as Inspector General of the Air Force.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense has attached an evaluation of General Anderson's performance in a joint duty assignment from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This nomination was staffed by the Secretary of the Air Force and approved by the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Recommendation

That you approve and sign the attached.

Attachment

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-1000

30 AUG 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Air Force General Officer Nomination

On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I recommend the assignment of Major General Marcus A. Anderson, United States Air Force, as Inspector General of the Air Force, a position previously designated to carry the grade of lieutenant general, and his nomination to the grade of lieutenant general. General Anderson, age 54, is currently assigned as Commander, Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center. He will succeed Lieutenant General Eugene H. Fischer, who is retiring.

In order to carry out the duties of the proposed assignment, a general officer must have demonstrated highly effective performance in a number of senior leadership positions responsible for ensuring optimum effectiveness and mission readiness of operational units. He must possess a broad base of experience and a high level of expertise in each of the wide-ranging programs under the purview of the Air Force Inspector General, including: inspection, nuclear safety, investigation, fraud, waste and abuse, and complaints programs. General Anderson meets these requirements.

This action will not result in the Air Force exceeding the number of officers authorized to be serving in the grade of lieutenant general. As required by title 10, United States Code, section 601(d)(1), I have attached an evaluation of General Anderson's performance while assigned to a joint duty assignment from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

William J. Perry

William J. Perry

Attachment

CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20318-0001

CN-236-93
2 Aug 93

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Through: Deputy Secretary of Defense

Subject: General Officer Nomination

1. In accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, and DOD Instruction 1320.4, the Acting Secretary of the Air Force has recommended Major General Marcus A. Anderson for assignment as Inspector General of the Air Force, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and appointment to the grade of lieutenant general.

2. I have reviewed Major General Anderson's performance in one joint assignment as Chief, Programs and Requirements Branch, Plans and Policy Division, Headquarters, Allied Air Forces Southern Europe. In this position, Major General Anderson worked closely with national air staffs and ministries of defense of NATO Southern Region nations regarding force programming and external reinforcements. He improved USAFE force allocation to the Southern Region by working issues of aircraft basing, improving aircraft reinforcements, and deciphering the details of a NATO Aircrew Training Complex. He also managed AIRSOUTH's input to a major SHAPE study that justified multiple improvements to the Southern Region's force posture. I am confident he is well qualified for this assignment and advancement.

3. I concur in the Acting Secretary's nomination of Major General Anderson for this assignment and appointment to the grade of lieutenant general. Accordingly, I recommend you forward the enclosed nomination to the President approving these actions.

COLIN L. POWELL
Chairman
of the
Joint Chiefs of Staff

Enclosure

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. resume	[Resume of Service Career] Marcus Antone Anderson. (3 pages)	06/07/1993	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 47

FOLDER TITLE:
Chron File - September 1993 #2 [2]

2016-0152-F
vz4470

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]

No.
(703) 697-5131 (media)
(703) 697-3189 (copies)
(703) 697-5737 (public/industry)

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

GENERAL OFFICER ANNOUNCEMENT

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin announced today that the President has nominated Major General Marcus A. Anderson, United States Air Force, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general with assignment as The Inspector General of the Air Force, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington DC. Major General Anderson is currently serving as Commander, Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico.

Major General Anderson was born April 12, 1939, in Everett, Washington.

-END-