

ARMS Email SystemRECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lotus Pager Gateway (Lotus Pager Gateway [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-JAN-1998 10:11:11.00

SUBJECT: Re: Living Wage language (Sent to: LAEL BRAINARD [Pager])

TO: Anne H. Lewis (CN=Anne H. Lewis/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To: LAEL (Pager) #BRAINARD

cc:

From: Anne H. Lewis

Date: 1/7/1998

Time: 10:09:56

Subject: Living Wage language

Body:

Priority:

Message history for recipient LAEL BRAINARD [Pager]

Wednesday 07 Jan 1998 10:10:20 Eastern Standard Time - Message received
by Pager Gateway

Wednesday 07 Jan 1998 10:10:56 Eastern Standard Time - Message received
by Paging Service

ARMS Email System RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: BOB WILLIAMS (BOB WILLIAMS <bwilliam@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 10-JUN-1998 17:49:31.00

SUBJECT: Kennedy Jeffords, etc.,

TO: christopher c.jennings ("christopher c.jennings/opd/eop"@eop.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: jeanne lambrew ("jeanne lambrew/opd/eop"@eop.eop.gov [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Diana Fortuna (CN=Diana Fortuna/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: gclaxton (gclaxton@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV [UNKNOWN])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I want to run the following hopefully not altogether random thoughts by you and have you react:

It seems to me we are looking at 2 possible scenarios here. The first is that Kennedy through the Senate Rule 14 process manages to offer a substitution/combination of the House and Senate bills. The second is that nothing happens on the employment front this year and the disability community increasingly looks to us to do something more on this in the FY2000 Budget. Either way I think we are on the hook to develop some incremental policy options.

Here are some of the things we are more or less in agreement around:

Any thing more we do in this area should build on and encourage more States to take up the BBA working disabled provision.

We have also supported lifting the 250% of poverty cap on income in the past and presumably could do so around (this is something we should do on principle but substantively it'd get us little).

We also supported the Medicare extension in Bunning and there might be ways, I believe, to recraft it and use it as a carrot for some States to take the BBA option.

I think that is the extent of our areas of agreement thus far. Though if others have things they think should be added or subtracted from this let me know.

Now I want to lay out the components of the problem I think we are being asked to solve:

- o Many feel that without an enhanced match of some kind few States will take up the BBA option or any similar provide we or Congress might dream up. Whether it's too early to tell or not is of course a debatable point but I am not sure it is worth debating since the perception is there.

- o Many likewise strongly believe that those on SSDI face unique health care coverage issues when turning to work and that they require some remedies over and beyond what BBA does. Again this is debatable but the perception is pervasive and I believe probably has some truth to it.

Moreover, if we could support a 5 year period during which time

individuals with disabilities on SSDI returned to work at or above some living wage could keep Medicare, I think we could then say to States that take up the BBA provision the chance to wrap their Medicaid package around Medicare for up to 5 years. This should lower their Medicaid coverage costs for these individuals during the initial 5 years of employment.

The problem then becomes what happens after the 5 years are up. Obviously we would want these individuals to keep their Medicaid coverage as long as they work. States could use the 5 year extended Medicare eligibility period to arrange alternative primary coverage for a person (employer group health or both group health). We might also consider paying States a bonus award for arranging such coverage and we could pay more the earlier they do so.

I'd welcome your thoughts both on this and next steps. Thanks.

ARMS Email SystemRECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: BOB WILLIAMS (BOB WILLIAMS <bwilliam@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV> [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:30-JUL-1998 20:46:46.00

SUBJECT: comments on 7/29 Jeffords Kennedy draft -Forwarded

TO: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Re: the attached comments about defining what work means in terms of

this legislation. I feel quite strongly that if we do not provide some

benchmark of what we mean by work in this context that we will

obscure the real intent of this proposal which is to support an increase

number of individuals with disabilities to engage in productive work at or

above the minimum wage and hopefully at some type of living wage.

We, of course, need to be sensitive to the fact that some individuals

with disabilities will in fact only be able to work part time as well as

that

we should be flexible in allowing individuals with disabilities who are in

job training or internship programs to get Medicaid coverage to need

under this option. That said, however, I think crafting something along

these lines would improve the proposal and I think generally would be

seen as a plus by the community.

Let me know what you think. Thanks!

Date: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 16:22:17 -0400

From: RUTH KATZ <rkatz@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV>

To: jeanne_lambrew@opd.eop.gov

Cc: CProvost@HCFA.GOV,LCarpenter@HCFA.GOV, lbuchele@OS.DHHS.GOV,

bwilliam@OSASPE.DHHS.GOV

Subject: comments on 7/29 Jeffords Kennedy draft

we (Bob and Ruth) have two comments and a plan:

comments:

1. defining employment: i know this came up while bob and i were out of the room on tuesday, but how about some kind of definition of employment -- either modeled on commonhealth (40 hours per month); or 40 hours per month at minimum wage; or language that the secretary will review the definition of employment in these plan amendments, to prevent gaming by states. (i.e., calling something employment that is not really employment: sheltered workshops, other types of day activity programs, etc.)

2. ms. medicaid eligibility (letty) has helped us puzzle this out. we think the bill is intended to offer states the choice of taking the 250% or offering the services with no cap on income. bob supports that choice for states.

the language on page 6, line 3 RETAINS the 250% and on line 8, adds the new uncapped income group. GOOD

down at (v)(1), still on page 6, they define working ind. with a disability, and it appears that the definition includes only the uncapped income

group.

SO, on page 14, where they talk about what states have to do to be eligible for infrastructure/outreach and performance grants, they say they have to have an amendment that offers services to people described in (v)(1). THUS, it does not include the staets that opt in to serve only those up to 250%. page 14, the requirements should be modified to say states that either serve the 250% group or the uncapped group.

along the same lines, we might on page 15, last line, offer a higher grant to states that do uncapped versus 250%.

our plan: we have been analyzing this bill mostly with an eye toward people with incomes HIGHER than SSI. we want to take some time to focus on those with lower incomes, and the implications of the bill for them, particularly those with mental illness or mental retardation. we would like to have one or two one day meetings with state mr and mh people, and a few dc types to discuss the jeffords kennedy bill and how it affects these two populations. this can't happen in august, with vacation schedules being what they are, but regardless of whether this bill passes soon or not, we need to think these issues thru.

ARMS Email SystemRECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (TRP NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Trooper Sanders (CN=Trooper Sanders/O=OVP [OVP])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-NOV-1999 12:05:24.00

SUBJECT: Living Wage

TO: Jason Furman (CN=Jason Furman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Thanks for your message. 4 or 5pm is fine. Thanks.