

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 - June 1994 #1 [7]

Staff Office-Individual:

Defense Policy-Bell, Robert

Original OA/ID Number:

265

Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:	Stack:
31	3	4	3	V

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. memo	For Samuel Berger from Steven Andreasen. Subject: Deputies Committee Meeting on Hydronuclear Experiments...July 22, 1994. Record ID: 9420857. (6 pages)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)
001b. agenda	Deputies Committee Meeting, July 22, 1994. Record ID: 9420816. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)
001c. talking points	Points to be Made for Deputies Committee Meeting on Hydronuclear Experiments. (3 pages)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)
001d. briefing paper	Duplicate of vz4590_001b. (6 pages)	06/24/1994	P1/b(1)
001e. briefing paper	Proposed Compromise. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)
002a. memo	For Lynn Davis, Walter Slocombe, et al from Robert Bell. Subject: Draft PRD-34 Assessment Section. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)
002b. draft	Presidential Review Thirty Four. (7 pages)	07/22/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F

vz4599

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]

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]

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.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

5920

July 21, 1994

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

THROUGH: ROBERT G. BELL *RGB*
FROM: STEVEN R. JONES *J*
SUBJECT: National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP)
Media Day

On Friday, July 29, the Joint Staff will for the first time conduct an open house orientation on the NEACP for the media. Two significant announcements will be made:

- (1) the name of the NEACP will be changed to the National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC) to better reflect its post Cold War "dual-use" status; and
- (2) a new agreement between the Joint Staff and FEMA will be announced to use the NAOC to support FEMA during major disasters or emergencies.

BGen Thomas Twomey will represent the Joint Staff during the orientation and Director James Lee Witt will represent FEMA. We have been very involved in the planning for this event and Bob Bell plans to attend as an observer.

BACKGROUND:

The NEACP (now NAOC) provides, along with the USSTRATCOM Command Center, a round-the-clock back-up to the National Military Command Center (NMCC) and supports the National Command Authorities with a survivable, mobile command center. Although NAOC's wartime responsibilities are classified, its new name reflects today's emphasis on its "dual-use" peacetime mission to support FEMA in responding to major disasters or emergencies.

The media has in past articles portrayed the NEACP as the "doomsday machine," i.e., a flying White House in the midst of a nuclear holocaust. The NAOC still plays its important deterrent role in assuring NCA command and control, but the NAOC's robust communications capabilities and mobility will also enable FEMA and other officials to respond to a domestic emergency or disaster within hours and have a unique command and control platform from which to direct emergency relief efforts.

With the exception of one visit in 1980, media requests to visit NEACP have been disapproved for security reasons and sensitivity regarding the "doomsday" portrayal. This orientation will attempt to refocus the media and public on NAOC's broader capabilities and evolving "dual-use" capabilities.

MEDIA DAY:

The Joint Staff is conducting this event, and media participation is hosted by OSD and JCS Public Affairs. It has been opened to Pentagon correspondents and other media who have requested information on NEACP. This is the first time cameras will be allowed on board the aircraft. National media attention is a possibility.

BGen Thomas Twomey from the Joint Staff, Director Witt and the NAOC Chief, Col Sauter, will provide unclassified briefings of NAOC's mission and "dual-use" capabilities and the JCS/FEMA agreement will be announced. Any questions about White House/NAOC missions will be answered by General Twomey to the extent possible in a general fashion and in the context of support to the National Command Authorities. Bob will purposefully play no role in the presentation or the Q&A, so as to avoid questions about the President's views as to the likelihood of "doomsday" scenarios.

A draft Q&A that will be provided to NSC public affairs and the Press Office is included at Tab A. A more detailed information paper is at Tab B. A brief DoD press release announcing the NEACP media day will be released on Monday, July 25.

DoD and FEMA have discussed potential use of the NAOC should it be needed to direct any federal emergency efforts in Hawaii due to Hurricane Emilia. At the present time, however, it appears that the main force of the hurricane will miss the islands.

If the July 19 NAOC media day is successful and the "dual-use" aspects receive favorable press, we will propose a visit by the President to Andrews AFB to tour the NAOC and further publicize how we are adapting "Cold War" DoD assets to new purposes.

Concurrence by: ^{JS} Johnathan Spalter

Attachments

Tab A Draft Press Q&A
Tab B NEACP Media Event Information Paper

NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)

Q: Are you aware of the tour of the NEACP command post being provided for the press on July 29? Why is its name being changed?

A: Yes, we are aware of the NEACP orientation briefing and tour at Andrews Air Force Base on Friday. The Department of Defense can provide you with more details on this. The name was changed from NEACP (pronounced "knee-cap") to the NAOC (pronounced "nay-oc"), or National Airborne Operations Center, to reflect the aircraft's expanded role in supporting other federal agencies during natural disasters or emergencies and to better reflect its post Cold War "dual-use" status.

Q: What expanded role?

A: Defense can provide additional detail, but the NAOC's mobility and robust communications capability make it not only an excellent emergency command post in a hypothetical nuclear crisis but also extremely useful as a command, control and communications center in responding to peacetime emergencies and disasters. The Joint Staff and FEMA have just concluded an agreement to initiate such a "dual-use" role for NAOC.

Only if asked/pressed:

Q: Has the President visited NEACP?

A: The President has not yet visited NEACP, now the NAOC, although he is aware of its mission and capabilities. Other high-level Administration officials have visited the plane, and have been briefed on its new utility in supporting relief efforts during natural disasters.

**OFFICIAL US
ONLY**

July 21, 1994

INFORMATION PAPER

NATIONAL EMERGENCY AIRBORNE COMMAND POST (NEACP) MEDIA EVENT

Purpose. To provide information and recommendations on an upcoming media event involving the Joint Staff, the National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Background. The Joint Staff will conduct an open house orientation on the National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP) aircraft for the media on July 29, 1994 at Andrews AFB, MD. Two significant announcements will be made during this event. The first is an announcement of the name change of the NEACP to the National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC). The second is of a new agreement between the Joint Staff and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) dealing with use of the NAOC in support of FEMA during major disasters and emergencies. This event will accomodate long standing media interest in the NEACP, in an effort to begin to dispel the "Doomsday" perception associated with the aircraft.

Discussion. By changing the NEACP aircraft's name to National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC), and announcing this change with a media event, the Joint Staff intends to begin to dispel the exclusive "Doomsday" perception associated with the aircraft, and to collaterally initiate refocussing on the aircraft's full range of capabilities and potential uses, both in peacetime and wartime. This change is designed to be consistent with ongoing, post-Cold War US military nuclear de-emphasis, and is being effected in concert with a new agreement between the Joint Staff and FEMA which extends the roles and missions of the aircraft.

The new arrangement between the Joint Staff and FEMA involves a formal Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) governing the use of the NAOC in support of FEMA during major disasters and emergencies "pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act PL 93-288, as amended". "The concept of operation of this MOA is for the NAOC to provide initial support to the FEMA national Emergency Response Team (ERT) and other passengers specified by FEMA during major disasters and emergencies. This support will be provided for a period of up to 48 hours or as directed by the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS)". The day-to-day alert posture of the NAOC in its primary mission as a recognized national asset and component of the National Military Command System supporting the National Command Authorities and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff will not be affected.

This media event has been opened to Pentagon correspondents and to an additional select group of media who have consistently

**OFFICIAL USE
ONLY**

**OFF CAL SE
ONLY**

requested information on NEACP over the past years. To date the only media ever authorized aboard the NEACP aircraft was Aviation Week & Space Technology, in 1980. All other requests from the media have been disapproved for security reasons and sensitivity concerns over the aircraft's "Doomsday" perception. Media interest and speculation remains great, with CBS "60 Minutes" recently referring to NEACP as the "flying White House" which follows the President (12 Dec 93). A recent feature article in Popular Mechanics also expanded on these exact sentiments. Despite continuing media speculation, there are no current plans which call for NEACP to serve as an alternate "White House". NEACP does not follow the President during domestic travel, and during foreign travel the aircraft may relocate to the general theater in which the President is located, but this is purely at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense in support of the National Command Authorities.

The Joint Staff is conducting this event. Media participation is being hosted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) and the Office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (Public Affairs). National media coverage is a possibility; for the first time, the media will be allowed to use camera equipment aboard the aircraft. An exact list of participating media will not be available until the week of the event. Interest by White House correspondents is also a possibility, considering the history of media speculation on affiliation between the White House and NEACP. The announcement involving FEMA (and participation in the event by the Director, FEMA) especially increases the possibility of recognition by national media and White House correspondents due to recent, highly publicized disaster relief efforts and associated Presidential attention.

The sequence of events consists of welcoming remarks aboard the NEACP aircraft by Brigadier General Thomas Twomey, USAF, Deputy Director for Operations, National Military Command System and Mr. James Lee Witt, Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency. During these remarks, the NEACP name change and Joint Staff/FEMA agreement will be announced. An unclassified overview of the NEACP mission and capabilities will be presented, followed by a brief "question and answer" session with Col Sauter, USAF, Chief, NEACP. The event will conclude with a 30 minute tour of the aircraft.

During the "question and answer" session, inquiries about White House/NEACP affiliation will be answered only within the context of NEACP support to the National Command Authorities (and therefore the President/White House).

Recommendations.

- 1) This highly unique media opportunity, combined with the FEMA announcement and participation by the Director, FEMA, is likely to result in (national-level) media attention. Recommend advance

**OFFICIAL USE
ONLY**

**OFFICIAL USE
ONLY**

notice of this event be provided to the White House Press Office;
White House participation at this media event is not necessary.

**OFFICIAL USE
ONLY**

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

5903

July 21, 1994

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY LAKE

FROM:

ROBERT G. BELL *Rhb*

SUBJECT:

Meyer Report on Readiness

On Friday, July 22, at 10:00 a.m., Defense will release the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Readiness report (also known as the "Meyer Report"). A background briefing will be conducted by Lou Finch (Deputy Undersecretary for Readiness), Brigadier General Thomas Twomey (NMCC Deputy Director for Operations) and DSB Task Force member General Larry Welch (USAF-ret.)

The memorandum at Tab I summarizes the principal findings and recommendations of the report and outlines the various initiatives directed by Secretary Perry to ensure readiness continues to receive DoD's highest priority.

RECOMMENDATION

That you forward the memorandum at Tab I to the President

Attachments

Tab I Memorandum to the President
Tab A Executive Summary of Report
Tab B Additional DoD Readiness Initiatives

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ANTHONY LAKE

SUBJECT: Meyer Report on Readiness

The final report of the Readiness Task Force, chaired by former Army Chief of Staff "Shy" Meyer, will be released by DoD on Friday morning. The Executive Summary of the report is at Tab A. The Task Force was commissioned by then-Secretary of Defense Les Aspin in May, 1993, to assist the SecDef in evaluating DoD's ability to keep our forces ready during the drawdown.

The Report gives more than 70 detailed recommendations to preserve and improve readiness. Its major findings include:

- The current readiness of our forces is acceptable in most measurable areas.
- DoD has recognized potential threats to readiness and has taken early steps to meet them.
- DoD has an extensive system to monitor the current readiness of units within each of the military services, but no effective system to evaluate the readiness of today's force to carry out joint, multi-service operations.
- DoD has no effective system to project future readiness.
- DoD and Congress need formal publication by the White House of the National Security Strategy Report (NSSR) in order to determine the adequacy of the readiness of certain forces. You approved the NSSR on Monday and it was submitted to Congress today.

Secretary Perry will endorse the Report's recommendations. In anticipation of them, Secretary Perry's Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) issued in May directed the military services to provide sufficient funds in their programs and budgets to ensure readiness. The DPG also included specific directions to follow up on 40 of anticipated Readiness Task Force recommendations, with subsequent actions taking care of most of the rest. Additional readiness initiatives undertaken by Defense are listed at Tab B.

In testimony to the Senate Appropriations Committee last week, Secretary Perry characterized readiness as follows: "My assessment at this point is that our current readiness is at a high level, and that is good news. The bad news is I see many trends which make me worry about readiness in the future." To

counteract these trends, your FY 1995 defense budget request includes a 5.6% increase in funding for O&M (a key readiness determinant) even though the force structure is declining next year by 7%. A major thrust of DoD's on-going review of FY 1996 programs and budgets is geared toward ensuring they are sufficient to maintain readiness.

Attachments

Tab A Executive Summary of Report
Tab B Additional DoD Readiness Initiatives

DEFENSE SCIENCE BOARD TASK FORCE ON READINESS

FINAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the late 1970's and early 1980's we had "hollow" forces. Compared with today's troops, the service member who served during that period was, on average:

- less well educated;
- more involved with drugs;
- less well trained;
- less well equipped;
- less well sustained;
- less strategically mobile;
- and, less highly regarded by the population.

The armed forces then were not ready to meet most of the major contingencies called for by the National Security Strategy without a considerable period of warning time to permit our conventional forces to mobilize and equip themselves. Absent ready conventional forces, greater reliance was placed on nuclear deterrence; and, our nuclear forces were maintained at a higher state of readiness than most of our conventional forces.

The Readiness Task Force concludes that the readiness of today's conventional and unconventional forces by contrast is acceptable in most measurable areas. However, our group was asked to do more than merely assess the readiness of today's armed forces compared with those of two decades ago. We were charged with providing advice on how to avoid future unreadiness - future "hollow armed forces."

When we state that the readiness of today's forces is acceptable, that does not mean that we did not find "pockets" of unreadiness. Most of these "pockets" are a result of changes taking place in the armed forces and the turbulence created by these changes. However, we observed enough concerns that we are convinced that unless the Department of Defense and the Congress focus on readiness, the armed forces could slip back into a "hollow" status.

To prevent such back-sliding we believe that the following actions, some ongoing and planned, need to be supported:

1. Resources to access, train, educate, retain high quality personnel. Maintaining the quality of our people should continue to be the Department's top priority.
2. A system that adequately funds contingency operations. The Department should work with Congress in developing and institutionalizing a contingency funding system which adequately funds contingencies and does not divert, delay or disrupt the flow of funds needed to maintain readiness of forces not engaged in such operations.
3. Development of measurement systems that better equate readiness to resources - present and future. The Department should take actions to develop and improve the set of analytical models and other means that can be used to help better understand the relationship between funding allocation decisions and future force readiness.
4. Sustainment readiness addressed with efforts equal to those involved in assessing unit combat readiness. The Department should develop and implement procedures and practices to address sustainment readiness issues at the same level of detail and with the same emphasis normally used when addressing combat readiness. (To include rationalization of the role of Reserve Components and the criticality of strategic mobility.)
5. Increased emphasis on Joint and Combined readiness and requirements, including development of joint mission essential task lists. This is one of the actions the Department should pursue to provide greater emphasis on the joint forces perspective of readiness.
6. Development of an OSD C4I architecture and greater involvement by theater CINCs in the readiness of space assets that influence their combat capabilities. There is a need for rapid development and implementation of a joint C4I architecture and doctrine. It should include readiness of satellite components of the C4I system to ensure it can support joint contingency operations. The theater CINCs should be involved throughout the process.
7. Enhanced use of modeling and simulation. Modeling and simulation technology should be exploited to enhance joint and combined training and doctrine. It offers a tremendous opportunity to leverage our existing training at all levels through enhancement or even replacement where appropriate after thorough review.

8. Emphasize offensive and defensive measures relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction. Nuclear readiness requirements should be based on evolving nuclear policy guidance. The Department must ensure that U.S. forces are prepared to conduct operations (offensive and defensive) in a nuclear, biological, and/or chemical environment. That includes the conduct of national-level command and control exercises involving joint military and civilian leadership and their staffs to ensure the ability of military and civilian leadership to carry out their roles and provide confidence in the continued effectiveness of nuclear control and security means. Of the triad, the area that requires greatest attention is biological.

9. Continued refinement of the roles of SECDEF/CJCS/SVCS/CINCS in readiness matters. The environment and processes are changing. The Department should re-examine the readiness oversight and management roles of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Services, and the CINCs. In many areas of readiness, responsibilities are clear. However, in the case of resource allocations to support joint readiness, and planning for readiness to conduct joint operations, these responsibilities are less clear.

10. A system to ensure that BRAC 95 has top down guidance regarding ultimate basing, depots, etc., as well as a funding system to permit rapid write-off by the Defense Department of selected bases. Guidance should be applicable to all Services with a focus on expediting elimination of excess infrastructure.

11. Implementation of ongoing Defense Science Board proposals that have an impact on readiness - Acquisition, Depot Maintenance, Defense Manufacturing, and the special Study for the USD (P&R) on Training Readiness. These specific reports address issues and provide recommendations which directly impacts on readiness today and in the future.

12. We have a special concern about future readiness. The reduction of resources for acquisition raises serious questions about the capabilities of our forces to respond to the challenges of the 21st Century.

The above list does not include all of our recommendations. However, it highlights the areas that we believe will pay significant dividends in future readiness, and particularly in future joint and combined readiness.

There are several policy areas that will affect future readiness which need immediate clarification. The Department of Defense and the Congress need formal publication of a National Security Strategy from the White House that defines the administration's security policies in this changed world. We found it difficult to evaluate the adequacy of the readiness of certain forces when no specific National Security Policy

has been provided. The effect of this void is the inability to answer the question "to do what?" about certain elements of the armed forces. We used the defense strategy that served as a basis for the Defense Department's Bottom-Up Review to evaluate conventional force readiness. We did not attempt to evaluate the adequacy of those forces. Such evaluation needs to be done in conjunction with future simulated and real war games.

In addition, we concluded that the key indicators that measure readiness and provide early warning of potential readiness problems are strongest as they relate to a unit's current readiness within its Service and weakest as they address future and joint readiness.

It's well to remind those interested in military readiness that this matter has always been the near exclusive responsibility of the uniformed military - with the Services playing the dominant role. This process is changing. Now, the SECDEF, CJCS, and CINCs are all more involved in not only evaluating, but resourcing, joint and combined readiness. This Task Force has had unprecedented freedom to review readiness matters. Secretaries Aspin and Perry, General Shalikasvili, and the leadership of the individual Services have been most supportive in this area.

The nation celebrated the 50th Anniversary of D-Day during the preparation of this report. It is well to remember that five years before D-Day the United States had very hollow forces. Many servicemen died as a result of our unreadiness. Readiness can not be taken for granted. History has shown how "pockets" of unreadiness rapidly grow and create "hollow" forces. We believe that attention to the issues raised in this report, and the continued support of Congress for a ready responsive force will give us a chance to prevent the shortcomings of the past from happening again as the military force evolves in response to the demands of our unsettled world.

Additional DoD Readiness Initiatives

In addition to creating the Meyer Task Force, increasing O&M budgets and including readiness reporting requirements in the DPG, the Department has undertaken other initiatives to ensure readiness remains the top priority in DoD, including:

- Created the Senior Readiness Oversight Council (SROC). This council, chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and co-chaired by the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is the senior-level DoD forum for readiness policy and oversight.
- Created the Readiness Working Group. This group, co-chaired by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness and the Joint Staff Director for Operations (J-3), provides the primary support for the Senior Readiness Oversight Council.
- Established the position of Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management and Personnel was reorganized and renamed, and then elevated to Under Secretary status.
- Established the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness. This new position in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness is the focal point on the OSD staff for readiness issues and, as previously noted, co-chairman of the Readiness Working Group.
- Increased Service focus on unit readiness monitoring capabilities.
- Conducted readiness off-site meetings (three days of meetings chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense), which resulted in plans to develop analytical tools that relate resources to readiness.
- The Chairman, JCS, has taken the initiative and responsibility for assessing readiness of U.S. forces to execute assigned missions.
- The Vice Chairman, JCS, has expanded the focus of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) beyond its normal acquisition review function to include readiness issues. The JROC is comprised of the Vice Chairman and Service Vice Chiefs.
- The Vice Chairman, JCS, also initiated the Joint Warfighting Capability Assessment (JWCA) process, which will assess readiness operationally and programmatically, current and future, with a focus on mission accomplishment.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001a. memo	For Samuel Berger from Steven Andreasen. Subject: Deputies Committee Meeting on Hydronuclear Experiments...July 22, 1994. Record ID: 9420857. (6 pages)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F
vz4599

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001b. agenda	Deputies Committee Meeting, July 22, 1994. Record ID: 9420816. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F
vz4599

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001c. talking points	Points to be Made for Deputies Committee Meeting on Hydronuclear Experiments. (3 pages)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F
vz4599

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]

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
(TO BE PROVIDED)**

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001d. briefing paper	Duplicate of vz4590_001b. (6 pages)	06/24/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F
vz4599

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001e. briefing paper	Proposed Compromise. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F

vz4599

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002a. memo	For Lynn Davis, Walter Slocombe, et al from Robert Bell. Subject: Draft PRD-34 Assessment Section. (1 page)	07/21/1994	P1/b(1)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F

vz4599

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]

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

002b. draft	Presidential Review Thirty Four. (7 pages)	07/22/1994	P1/b(1)
-------------	--	------------	---------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
National Security Council
Defense Policy and Arms Control (Robert Bell)
OA/Box Number: 265

FOLDER TITLE:

Chron File - July 1994 #1 [7]

2016-0152-F
vz4599

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]

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]

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.