

ARMS Email SystemRECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sharolyn A. Rosier (CN=Sharolyn A. Rosier/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-APR-1998 14:55:25.00

SUBJECT: 1997-07-24 CLIMATE CHANGE BRIEFING

TO: Sarah S. Knight (CN=Sarah S. Knight/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98

02:55 PM -----

Catherine T. Kitchen

07/24/97 02:40:18 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1997-07-24 CLIMATE CHANGE BRIEFING

----- Forwarded by Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP on

07/24/97 02:40 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1

07/24/97 02:20:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1997-07-24 CLIMATE CHANGE BRIEFING

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 24, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY

KATIE MCGINTY,

CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY;

DAN ALBRITTON,
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION;
AND JERRY MELILLO,
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

The Briefing Room

12:40 P.M. EDT

MR. LOCKHART: Good afternoon. Before Mike comes down for the regular daily briefing, we've asked some of our colleagues here to come in. As you know, the President begins a series of events today on the issue of global climate change which will lead up to the Kyoto meeting in December. He'll be meeting with some eminent scientists today including some Nobel laureates.

I've asked Katie McGinty, the Chair of the Council of Environmental Quality, to come down , along with Dan Albritton, the Director of the Aeronomy Lab at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and Jerry Melillo, the Associate Director for Environment of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

MS. MCGINTY: Thanks, Joe.

Q How are those Redwoods?

MS. MCGINTY: Good afternoon. Not to change the topic. As Joe has indicated, today the President launches his campaign to engage the American people on the important issue of climate change. Today we will hear from some of the most distinguished scientists in our country, and indeed, in the world, on these issues.

These scientists will tell us in clear and certain terms why it is that we can't stick our hand in the sand on this issue. Infectious diseases -- already we're seeing diseases like malaria and dengue fever at our borders; indeed, Russia has seen an incidence of malaria return. These diseases will only spread as the climate warms.

Rapid increases in deaths from heat stroke -- just two years ago we saw 400 people die in Chicago from a record-breaking heat wave. Increasingly severe storm systems -- and in just the last century, we've seen a 20-percent increase in the severity of storm systems here in the United States. Now, insurance companies will tell you that has meant billions of dollars in losses here in the U.S.

Rapid sea level rise -- we stand to see thousands of

square miles of our coastal states -- Florida, Louisiana -- lost to inundation from sea level rise. Indeed, we may lose a third of the Everglades from sea level rise. Severe droughts also can be expected like the ones we saw in 1988 that cut U.S. agricultural production and productivity by a third.

As I've said, these things are not just theoretical. Some things are happening now. The heat waves that have killed people, 1993 outbreak of the Hanta virus in the southwest U.S. followed on the heels of severe droughts and then heavy rains.

What the scientists want to say today is that these kinds of things are exactly in line with the predictions that they would make -- could happen as a consequence of climate change. And these are the kinds of things that can become increasingly severe, common and widespread if, again, we stick our heads in the sand on this issue and just allow ourselves to continue with business as usual.

The President has identified this issue of one of extremely seriously moment for the United States from an environmental perspective, from an economic perspective as we've already seen -- damaging storm systems, for example -- and from a national security perspective because of the global disruption that could come from climate change. Having identified this as a serious issue for the United States and one that is important to our security, the President has also determined that the United States will show leadership here to join all of the countries in the world to taking responsible steps to meet this challenge.

Now, having said that, the President has also said you can do these things dumb and you can do them smart. He is determined that we will pursue this issue as we have all of the environmental challenges we have addressed, and that is in a way that shows the interlinkages between environmental progress and economic progress. There's a \$400-billion market for environmental technologies and services to, in part, address this issue and it will be part of the President's effort that U.S. companies are seizing those opportunities as we take on the climate challenge.

The President will articulate and pursue policies that are flexible, that are market-oriented, and again, that enable us to take this challenge and turn it into economic opportunity. This launches our effort in the coming months. We will continue the effort to engage the American people in general, but also to bring in the business community; leadership from Capitol Hill, from the environmental groups, from state and local government to find and tease out those ideas that will help us again to change this challenge into a very significant opportunity for the United States.

Today is a very important first step in this campaign and I think it will open all of our eyes to the reality of this

challenge and to the very serious consequences that would follow if we were to pursue a course of no action on this issue.

To flesh some of that out, let me turn it over to Dan Albritton, one of our leading experts in this issue.

Q Why did you wait so long when this has been an issue now for several years?

MS. MCGINTY: Not to duck it, but why don't we continue with the presentations and come back for questions.

MR. ALBRITTON: Thanks. Katie's outlined the activities that are occurring today and why. From a scientific perspective, the reason that we are here today is basically that the Earth's climate system and humankind are co-involved. By that I mean, our activities, along with natural changes on the planet have the capability of changing the planet on which we live. It also implies that, as inhabitants of the planet, if the climate system were to change to unfavorable states, then we would be impactees.

And so, the issue before decision-makers in governments and industry is, on the one hand, our activities and lifestyle have the potential of changing the planet, and on the other hand, as impactees we would be involved in receiving the impacts of that change.

The complexity of that balance of cost and benefits approaches led governments to ask the expert communities around the world to prepare their very best understanding of the climate system and our role in it and their understanding of the impacts to humankind of the climate system were to change.

Very large reports were prepared and delivered to governments last year. What we will be summarizing today for you in the way of context are the major points associated with our involvement with the climate system both on the front end and on the receiving end.

The scientific community, in addressing the question of how well do we understand the climate system and our role in it, have come up with perhaps five take-away messages. I'll summarize those five for you and my colleague, Jerry Melillo, will comment on the take-away messages associated with the impacts of climate change on humans.

I'll arrange those five points in the order of things that scientists are absolutely confident in down to things that we wish we had more information about. And I'll try to explain why the certainty and the uncertainty are both relevant to those wrestling with approaches and decisions on this.

The first point. There is a natural greenhouse effect on the planet, and we understand its basic principles very, very

well, namely, we know that there are trace gases in the atmosphere that absorb part of the heat that would be radiated to space, and thereby have the potential for raising the temperature on the planet. In fact, those greenhouse gases have been part of our atmosphere as long as we've had an atmosphere. In fact, if it weren't for those greenhouse gases that are already naturally in the atmosphere, our planet would have an average temperature of six degrees Fahrenheit, not 60 degrees that we enjoy today. And so, the principles of trapped heat by a small set of gases is the rationale for us having the life on planet as we know.

Well, why is greenhouse then often deemed an issue? The issue arises is that in the last 100 years -- and this is point number two -- we've begun to change the composition of the atmosphere through our activities. That is we've been adding to, during the industrial area, the natural amount of greenhouse gases that were on the planet.

For example, CO₂ has increased 30 percent since the industrial era. And we know that it's because of the use of fossil fuel to generate energy and thereby develop the lifestyle that we enjoy. Other greenhouse gases are increasing as well. Scientists have impeccable measurements that demonstrate this steady increase of the amount of greenhouse gases since we gained the capability of altering the amount of greenhouse gases.

Third point, and this now is a forecast -- what I've mentioned up until now is what has happened in the past and at the present. The forecast is that, if greenhouse gases were to continue to increase as they have been doing, our best understanding of how the planet is going to respond to that is that the average temperature of the planet will increase perhaps 3.5 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the next century.

Associated with that would be an increase in sea level, because a warmer ocean and melted glaciers mean more water, more space occupied by the ocean. There will be an increase in sea level of perhaps 20 inches, which would add, of course, to storm surges and other things.

If the planet were to choose to change its temperature about 3.5 degrees, it would be larger than any natural change that's occurred since the last Ice Ages. This puts a scale on the nature of the change, and it would be more rapid than any change that we've seen since the last Ice Age.

The point that perhaps is the most policy-relevant about this is that the CO₂ that we use to get here today is going to be in the atmosphere long after we're gone; namely the resonance time of CO₂ in the atmosphere is longer than the human lifetimes, and therefore, if the planet starts changing climate, the long resonance time of these greenhouse gases means that it will be a very slow process to reverse.

Point number four, have we seen anything yet? Global temperatures have warmed over the last century, and the balance of evidence suggests that part of that warming is due to our activities. For example, we've been taking the temperature of the planet for about 125 years, beginning with seaboard thermometers, and now having the very sophisticated weather thermometers that we have, that data shows that the planet's warmer now. It's warmer by about a half to one degree Fahrenheit, compared to the middle of the last century. And, naturally, as weather and climate do, that warming has been up and down and up and down, but steadily upward over that long period.

Associated with that is an increase in sea level of about four inches to 10 inches, so there is a consistent picture. Associated with that warming is a retreat of mountain glaciers -- very obvious -- three aspects of the fact that we now live in a warmer world.

The key question is not whether we have a warmer world right now or not; the key is what caused the change. That half to one degree is about the size of what the natural changes have been since the last ice age. And so scientists have had the challenging job of looking for a half a degree needle inside of a half a degree haystack.

In this most recent statement by the World Science Community, they believe now that they see reasons that not all of that change has been natural, and they make that by looking at the pattern of the change compared to the pattern that you would expect from natural behavior or from CO2 behavior. So the world is warmer. We believe, at least in part, it's due to our having added greenhouse gases to the planet.

Fifth point -- and this states more about our level of knowledge -- fifth point is that it's a very complex planet and we do have imperfect knowledge of some of the details. That implies that we can't predict what the climate change will be in a given city or a given state or what the climate will be or a particular summer will be in any particular place.

The understanding of the smaller details of the climate system and the size of computers and our lack of observations in many areas means that our predictions are at the current time either globally or regionally. Now, regionally, though, can be important. For example, scientists are saying that large land masses will warm and dry out faster than smaller land masses or the oceans. And, obviously, that has implications to countries involved in large continents.

Secondly, higher latitudes will warm more than lower latitudes. This has implications for effects and things about farming and where that might shift. It's also fairly clear that the warming will occur largely at night. And this increase in that regime has to do a lot with impacts on animal populations and crops.

The question frequently comes up, what can you say about extremes? Extremes are probably the more difficult things for scientists to predict, but they can say some things. And it's this: that in a warmer world, there's more evaporation; more water in the atmosphere; more variable, in a sense, more tropical, and hence the hydrological cycle -- storms, clouds and so on -- will be a much more active system. It's summer in Washington compared to other times in Washington. This means that the rainfalls are likely in warmer world to be heavier rainfalls. There would be more frequency of hot, dry periods.

The question comes up frequently about hurricanes. The jury is still out scientifically. It's not clear whether hurricanes will be more intense or more frequent in a warmer world -- a very difficult call.

Finally, what about surprises? Scientists answer, yes, to that. We're entering a warmer regime of climate than we've had experience for. And as nature is inclined to do, it's going to reveal a process to us that we probably don't know now. And so, the probability of either rude or happy surprises in the century ahead are very high. And you only have to remember that we didn't predict the Antarctic ozone hole. It was a regime of chlorine in the atmosphere that we had never experienced. It triggered a process that we didn't know as scientists and we were rudely surprised by that. The climate system has such non-linearities for sure. And there will be surprises, both rude and happy surprises.

In summary, from an understanding of how well scientists understand the climate system and our role in it, there are five points that I've tried to make. Number one -- this is a real issue; it's worth your time in explaining it, the government's time in debating it, industry's time in engaging -- it's a real issue. Secondly, some degree of human-influenced climate change now appears to be inevitable. Third, discernible signs that we are changing the climate are at hand at present. However, exactly what will happen in particular places at particular times will remain difficult to predict. And the fifth point, and probably one of the more important scientific points, is that any human-induced climate change that were to occur would be very, very long and slow in reversing it because of the lifetimes.

Let me quickly add -- and this will underscore what Jerry can summarize for you, too -- this is not the view of one scientist, this is the view of thousands of scientists who were asked to give their current statement of scientific understanding. I believe that those statements made by the entire scientific community are of high value to decision-makers in government and industry and those who acquaint the public with such complex things.

Number one, it's prepared by the expert communities. It is their vast, vast majority viewpoint, and it represents, since it goes from forcings to changes to impacts to options, it represents one-stop shopping on a complex, complex issue. Because of the large

impacts associated with climate change, because of large impacts of doing anything to avoid it, a key element, we think, in this process is what we're doing here today, both at the White House and here, and that's dialogue. And that's why both Jerry and I really do appreciate the opportunity to lay out the scientists' viewpoint for these, and there is plenty of time afterwards; if I've hurried through any of these points, please do bring them up again. Thanks.

MR. MELILLO: Good afternoon. I'm going to try to be very brief so that we can get to questions. As Dan outlined, more than 2,500 scientists have come together to produce the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report that includes one large component on impacts.

The impacts range across issues of human health, water resources, agriculture and food supply, coastal zone integrity and management, forests and forestry, fisheries and natural areas. And we don't want to minimize the importance of natural areas, because they provide a whole suite of services to us that are absolutely critical for society's maintenance.

Now, very briefly, I want to indicate and underline some of the things that Katie said. The human health issue has been one that has been tremendously interesting to all of us. The prospect of climate change brings with it the prospect of a shift in the distribution of vector-borne diseases, such as malaria. There are model estimates that would suggest that with a doubling of CO₂ and the associated change in climate, we might see in the range of 50 million to 80 million more cases of malaria in a year.

With respect to water resources, water is a critical asset for all nations of the world, and -- disputed one in many regions. General circulation models would suggest significant changes in water availability and soil moisture in particular, which is essential for growing crops, and one model, the general fluid dynamics model at Princeton, would suggest that at four times current levels -- or pre-industrial levels of CO₂, the soil moisture levels in the heartland of the United States could drop by as much as 30 to 50 percent, which would make agriculture in that area very difficult.

For natural systems, there will be many surprises, I'm sure. One of the concerns that ecologists have is that as climate zones shift, so, too, will vegetation distribution shift. However, it will not shift in an orderly fashion. Species will move at varying rates, and there could be long periods of reorganization in the world's vegetation. That could be very difficult for us to deal with and affect adversely some of those services that we count on natural ecosystems providing us, such as the cleansing of water, the stabilizing of landscapes against erosion, and the stabilizing of coastal zones against storm surges.

So I think there are an array of impacts that we can talk about, but as Dan mentioned, there's probably going to be a tremendous amount of regional and temporal texture in the degree of

those impacts.

To begin to understand the regional consequences of climate change and to give some vision to what kinds of regional changes we might expect, the administration through the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the U.S. Global Change Research Program, has begun a series of 17 regional workshops on the climate change issue. And in these workshops we attempt to do four things. The first thing that we do is try to get an understanding outside of the climate change issue, either climate variability or climate change, what the current stresses are that regions are facing for their environment, their economics and their social structure.

The second question is, how would climate variability, if it were to increase, or climate change if it were directional, either amplify or dampen these current stresses. The third question is, what kind of information, in addition to the information that the people in these regions already have, what kind of additional information would they need to begin to think more clearly about the climate change issue. And that helps us to set a research agenda, by the way. And finally, what kinds of coping strategies could they think of that would be useful to deal with their current stresses and also have a positive effect on ameliorating the climate change issue.

And I must say we've had four of these 17 workshops, and each one of them has been truly fascinating, with some surprising stresses surfacing to the top of the various lists. For example, in Alaska, one of the greatest concerns is the melting of permafrost with global warming. This has tremendous implications for infrastructure in the state of Alaska. Approximately -- I think it's about 80 percent of the state of Alaska -- is under land by frozen soil. As this soil melts out, you can imagine what it does to building structures and the roads and airports. And we've been told that already, the permafrost in Alaska is warming; in some places in Central Alaska it's actually melting out. This could result in a slumping in those areas of anywhere between five and 10 meters, and present an array of problems, such as difficulty keeping rural airports functioning -- which is the link to civilization for many of these isolated places -- and tremendous difficulty in keeping roads flat so that you can move around this state.

I could go on with examples, but I think I'm going to stop and open it to questions.

Q You want the public to realize that there is a problem. What can the public do? Does the administration want the public to do things such as stop cutting their lawn with a combustion engine, stop barbecuing, eliminate the combustion engine? What do you want people to do?

MS. MCGINTY: Part of this dialogue will be to identify what the best solutions are. But in our mind, it won't involve the

kinds of things you've just suggested, it will involve things like energy efficiency. Currently, if you think of energy, for every three units of energy we produce, we basically throw out two of them just through wasteful practices. That's money we're throwing out. It's also the leading contributor to this challenge.

So the idea is, what are the technologies we can employ that will reduce the pollution, and in that instance especially, save us money, improve our efficiency. Those are the kinds of things we know are out there that we want to identify and through this effort put into place.

Q You must have some examples. Can you give us any besides turning our thermostat down?

MS. MCGINTY: Sure. All of this week we have had the leading vice presidents for research of the three automobile companies in Washington. We have launched with them what we call a Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. Through this partnership, by the early years of the next century, we will produce a vehicle that achieves 300 percent the fuel efficiency of current vehicles -- 80 miles to the gallon. And we are on our way through that partnership with the Big Three to produce that kind of vehicle.

Q Have you come any closer to setting macro-goals for emissions of greenhouse gases? Because the U.S. has already rejected the European proposal to stabilize at 1990 levels. Where are we moving in terms of that?

MS. MCGINTY: We have outlined the framework for what the next steps on climate should look like. One, the United States has said the current voluntary approach hasn't fully worked. The world community needs to come together around binding emissions limits. We have put that forward.

The United States has also put forward the notion that, again, there are smart ways to do this and dumb ways. The smart way is that we use flexible approaches, we harness market forces, we use market mechanisms to achieve those emissions reductions.

Third, that all countries in the world, not just the developed countries -- and clearly, we in the United States have a responsibility here as do other industrial countries -- but developed and developing countries have to be part of the solution.

Now, what we have not put forward as yet is the exact -- what's called target and timetable -- emissions level and year for achieving that emissions level. We have not yet put forward those numbers in the international arena. This process is designed to enable us to do that by the mid, late fall when these negotiations internationally will reach that point and have to come to terms with that issue.

Q You described -- these two gentlemen described part of their presentation as a forecast of the bad things that would happen. Can you explain to us or can they explain to us how hypothetical this situation is or how concrete it is? And a second part to the question, you presented a very good sort of sky is falling scenario; it would seem that there would have to be some positive aspects of global climate change and I know that some countries think that their agriculture might work out better with climate change. Can you address any of those issues?

MS. MCGINTY: Dan, do you want to take that on?

MR. ALBRITTON: As I've mentioned, representing how the planet will respond is a very challenging scientific job. What the scientists have tried to do is evaluate the effect of their ignorance. The 3.5 degree warming for a doubling of CO₂, which could occur some time in the next century, is in the middle of an uncertainty range which could be as high as six degrees warming, could be as low as 2 degrees warming. And so, with high confidence, the current scientific community is saying that for a doubling of CO₂, which could occur sometime in the next century, the planet will warm somewhere between two degrees Fahrenheit and six degrees Fahrenheit.

They got those two ranges by pushing all of their known ignorance in one direction and pushing all of their known ignorance in the other direction. They are very confident that the planet will respond in that range for a doubling of CO₂.

In terms of the pluses and minuses of that, Jerry can expand upon those points.

MR. MELILLO: When I talked about the fact that there would be texture or place to place variation in response, that was part of what I was alluding to. Indeed, let's take the example of agriculture. The analyses would suggest that indeed, globally, there may be some winners and there may be some losers. As it turns out, the winners are most likely to be in the developed countries, and that is also the place, of course, where there is capital available to be able to respond and to adapt to changes in climate.

Those places where the climate currently is semi-arid, the agriculture is largely dry-land agriculture without the benefit of any kind of irrigation, and those places that are subject to periodic droughts -- and there is a large portion of the tropics that would fall into this category -- might well be the places where there would be real losses in agricultural productivity.

In fact, when the modelers do their analyses, the predictions about agricultural productivity changes under a two-times CO₂ world -- that's both the climate and the fact that the carbon dioxide concentration of the atmosphere has doubled -- would be plus or minus 40 percent, depending upon where you were on the face of the

Earth and what your conditions were.

A lot of the minus numbers fall into the tropics where, over the next 100 years, we expect at least a doubling of population. So indeed, there are winners and losers. To predict exactly where they'll be, as Dan pointed out, is currently beyond us, but what we can do is paint a picture of vulnerabilities, and this is clearly a vulnerability.

Q President Clinton made political points against George Bush because Bush denied global warming. And yet, this is the second term of President Clinton and there is no national theme for fuel conservation, miles per gallon and other things we could be doing. Why is that? Why is it only now?

MS. MCGINTY: We have been at this job since the beginning of the President's first term. The President reversed the policy of the previous administration and signed up to trying to achieve 1990 levels of emissions by the year 2000. We put together a very ambitious program of investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. We will fall short of that goal not because the President did not articulate it and not because we did not put together a thorough program of action, but because, for example, the Congress has cut by -- on the order of 50 percent the nation's investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy technology.

I just mentioned this Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. We've also been at that work for about two years or maybe even a little bit more. We have been moving forward on this agenda consistently since 1993.

Now, there are certain things, however, that now catalyze this work. First is, as Dr. Albritton noted, the science itself has gelled in a significant respect in just the last year and a half or so as the scientists, for the first time, have determined that there is -- to quote them -- "a discernable human impact" on the climate. That's only in the last year or year and a half that that determination has been made, and that has quickened the discussion.

Second, we do now face an international negotiation which will culminate at the end of this year, in December in Kyoto, Japan, 150-plus countries, nations in the world will come together to conclude a treaty on this issue. So we've been at it, but there are certainly things that have quickened the discussion in the last year, year and a half.

Q Is Senator Byrd's resolution consistent with your negotiating position in these talks?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, certainly, the notion that developing countries need to be part of the solution is something

that we absolutely agree with. In fact, as I articulated, this has been an essential part of the U.S. position in these negotiations internationally. We are not supported on this point by, for example, many in the European Union and certainly not by many in the developing countries themselves -- the point being that as developed countries take the lead here, as we must, we need developing countries also to pick up the baton and help become part of the solution to this problem.

So we absolutely agree with the resolution in that respect.

Q Can you tell us what you're talking about when you say -- you refer to those who have their heads in the sand -- are you talking about members of Congress, people in industry, other scientists? Who are you talking about?

MS. MCGINTY: The point was that we can't -- it was a general point that the evidence is such that we take a very high risk if we decide to put our hands in the sand on this issue. Now, having said that, on this issue, like any other serious issue, there are the extremes. There are those who will say that this is nonsense, that we should do nothing, that we should let the dice roll here, it's okay that we currently have levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that are higher than any we've seen in the last 200,000 years. What's the big deal? Let's roll the dice, let's see what happens. There are some who will say that.

There are some that will say the sky is falling or the sea level is rising and we have to all run for the hills, and let's take drastic action, 15 percent cuts by tomorrow in our emissions. That would drastically hurt our economy.

The President is saying this is a serious issue; it's an issue on which we will not stick our head in the sand, but it is an issue on which we will take responsible action and action that can very well provide us economic opportunity if we do it right.

Yes, sir.

Q If I can take advantage of you being here to ask a quick question on Saturday's environment summit. Is the President going to go to Tahoe with the commitment that's been requested by the Governors of Nevada and California for the \$300 million? And, secondly, is he going to have an answer for them on the low-intensity burn?

MS. MCGINTY: The President will -- and I don't want to -- I mean, these announcements are for him to make -- however, we have participated in and organized in the region a series of intensive discussions with local and state leaders to say Lake Tahoe is a priceless national jewel; what are the threats to it and what needs to be done to help it. Whether it's water quality, transportation or forest health issues, very real ideas came out of

that dialogue. The President will have very real and concrete measures he will announce and to which the federal government will contribute when he is out there.

Q But if I can follow, Governor Miller and Governor Wilson this week said that they didn't want the President coming out there empty-handed, is the word that Governor Wilson used.

MS. MCGINTY: And he will not.

Q He will have some commitment on --

MS. MCGINTY: I will not announce what they are, but let me just say again, we have heard some very real and concrete suggestions as to what we need to do around Lake Tahoe, and the President will have some very real and concrete initiatives that the federal government will undertake to be a positive partner with others in the region in saving and restoring Lake Tahoe.

Q Related to that, Babbitt has endorsed the low-intensity burn in previous conferences earlier in July. Can you give any assurances that that will work and that it will be safe to the residents there?

MS. MCGINTY: Let me just say our forest policy will be dictated by the best science. What the science has told us is that in some respects, the Smokey Bear campaign has been overly successful, and the consequence of stamping out every fire, including naturally-occurring fires has been that we now have a tinderbox in many places of the country.

About a year ago, in the face of that, we made what might be considered a bold determination, but a determination driven by the science that we would increase the use of what's called prescribed burns to begin to thin out some of that tinderbox kindling that has built up over the decades. That will certainly be part of our approach to enhancing and trying to improve forest health in the Lake Tahoe region. The degree of it, the intensity of it will be driven by the science.

Q Doesn't that clash in any way with your endorsement of this Quincy Library Group plan to take trees out before you burn?

MS. MCGINTY: Not at all, and to say that there will be use of some prescribed burn is not to preclude the possibility that there also will be thinning of some trees, taking them out before you do the prescribed burn. You can, and should, do both.

Q What would the administration like to see coming out of Kyoto related to the developing countries? What kind of language should be in that agreement?

MS. MCGINTY: We very much want to see an agreement that shows real participation on the part of developing countries in

becoming part of the solution to this challenge. We have suggested ideas along the following lines: It's our position that a new category of countries should be created under the treaty, that instead of just developed and developing countries, maybe we should recognize that Bangladesh, for example, is in a very different place and situation than Singapore is, for example, and that maybe there should be a third category of countries recognizing the economic development that has occurred in some developing countries.

Related to that, that those countries would take on binding obligations probably not equivalent to the obligations of developed countries, but more than the obligations of developing countries.

Also related to that, that we would think about an automatic graduation process, so that as a country reaches a certain level of economic growth and development, they automatically would flip into the developed country category and take on legally binding obligations.

Q Do you envision specific targets and timetables for that category -- countries at that point?

MS. MCGINTY: For that third category of countries, at that point, yes, absolutely, right.

Q Do you think it's feasible to do a cost benefit analysis -- domestically, the United States -- of putting in limits on carbon or fossil fuel emissions? And will you attempt to do that before setting the targets for the December treaty?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, certainly what we will do and will be essential in figuring out the best approach to this is to do a cost-benefit analysis, if you will, of the various policy approaches we might take. So, for example, if there is a suggestion that comes out of these dialogues that says, one-third of our emissions are due to inefficient buildings. And if we would just invest in X, Y or Z-building technology, we can improve the situation. We will have to do a cost-benefit analysis of how much we want to invest, and if we invest, what's the benefit? Emissions reductions. How close does it get us to meeting an overall objective? We will do that we might pursue a policy initiative.

Q But will you have to analyze the cost of global warming to the U.S. economy or to some other standards here in the United States?

MS. MCGINTY: Whether we'll do it independently or just look at the plethora of literature and scientific information, economic information that is out there -- there are many different people around the country that have models that are analyzing those kinds of things. And I very much expect we will engage some of those

folks in looking at that, yes.

Q Could I ask about a scientists comment on the question of the temperature change since the last Ice Age? You mentioned in the last 100 years or so, there had been a one or half degree increase, which is equal to what had changed since the last Ice Age. What was the change then in that period, that previous period since the last Ice Age, as far as you know? Up or down or around or what?

MR. ALBRITTON: The temperature record that we have going back, say, 15,000 years, back to the last Ice Age times is based on, first of all, tree rings -- other proxy indicators, but they are accurate to show that over that period the Earth, itself, has changed its temperature over long, slow undulations of about one-half to one degree. And so, in looking backwards on what the size of natural variation can be, we can confidently say, it's in the range of part of a degree Fahrenheit, up to a degree Fahrenheit.

Now, since the industrial period, we have very carefully, of course, measured the temperature change. And since the preindustrial times, that one degree warming can be stated also with high confidence.

The third thing I mentioned was, of course, a forecast that when CO2 doubles, what will be the added temperature from that is the 3.5 degrees Fahrenheit. So there's the scale factor. The planet changes its own temperature on the range of a half a degree to a degree or so. A change of that size we have seen in the last 150 years. We believe part of that is due to greenhouse gases.

Q The original change from the Ice Age to the last century, you don't know whether that was up or down, or does it just sort of vary --

MR. ALBRITTON: It varies. For example, about 600 years ago, the so-called "Little Ice Age," that's when grapes and wine-producing in England ended and the Greenland colonies stopped for the Nordics -- it was a half to three-quarter of a degree below the average. So the natural range the planet swings its own temperature is plus or minus a degree.

Q Twice, you mentioned during your discussions that you were looking for binding agreements. How would you enforce binding agreements, and how realistic are they considering we can't control nuclear weapons, we can't control drugs -- how are we going to enforce any binding agreement?

MS. MCGINTY: Just take the example of other environmental treaties we've had. The Montreal Protocol on the chemicals that deplete the ozone layer, chlorofluorocarbons -- how you make that binding is when countries sign up to it, as the United States signed up to the Montreal Protocol. You come back home and you go to your respective legislature, parliament or diet, and you

proscribe legislation that is legally binding and that will enable you to meet that target. So that in the United States, we came back and, under the Clean Air Act, then implemented a set of requirements that basically phased out and ended the production and use of

chlorofluorocarbons in the country. And you would have to do a similar thing here. You would have to come back and whatever the goal was that was agreed to, come back and implement legislation of one kind or another that would get you there.

Q I don't mean to argue, but a lot of countries in the world don't have legislative processes. There are dictatorships or whatever form of government. And we also do have a problem of the smuggling of CFCs right now, even though that's supposed to be a legally-binding treaty.

MS. MCGINTY: No, I absolutely agree. In every kind of international exercise that you undertake there is always the problem of ensuring that you will have 100 percent compliance. It's always a difficult challenge. We have no reason to expect that this will be any less of a challenge to ensure 100 percent cooperation and compliance. Having said that, though, we do know what the mechanisms are that you put in place, and the President's commitment will be that this country, giving its word, will live up to its word.

Okay, thank you all very much.

END

1:28 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Julie E. Mason
April Mellody
Darby E. Stott
Julia R. Green
Lorraine L. Wytkind
Laura D. Schwartz
Lori E. Abrams
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie
Robin J. Bachman
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Lanny A. Breuer
Robin J. Bachman
Laura Capps

Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
Steven A. Cohen
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Marilyn DiGiacobbe
James A. Dorskind
Jennifer D. Dudley
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen E. Finney
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Michael A. Gill @ OVP@EOP
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Ricardo M. Gonzales
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Thomas D. Janenda
Brian J. Johnson
david t. johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Angus S. King
Joshua A. King
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn
Catherine T. Kitchen
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
steven j. naplan
Elizabeth R. Newman

Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Jonathan P. Robell
Charles F. Ruff
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
G. Timothy Saunders
Stuart Schear
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Todd Stern
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Jodie R. Torkelson
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Teresa Wildman
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LN GTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LN GTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
GILLESPIE_C @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LN GTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LN GTWY

LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
glynnm @ panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

Message Sent

To:

Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Catherine T. Kitchen
07/24/97 03:45:25 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1997-07/24 REMARKS BY PRESIDENT AT CLIMATE CHANGE EVENT

----- Forwarded by Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP on
07/24/97 03:45 PM -----

SUNTUM M @ A1
07/24/97 03:17:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:
Subject: 1997-07/24 REMARKS BY PRESIDENT AT CLIMATE CHANGE EVENT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release July 24, 1997

OPENING REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND THE VICE PRESIDENT
AT DISCUSSION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The East Room

1:57 P.M. EDT

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Please be seated ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the President and the First Lady, it is my pleasure and honor to welcome all of you to the White House. I'm going to present the President in just a moment.

Before doing so, on his behalf, I would like to acknowledge the distinguished guests who are present. I will formally introduce our panel of Nobel laureates and university scientists in just a moment. I want to acknowledge members of the President's Cabinet who are here -- Administrator of the EPA Carol Browner; Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley; Secretary of Labor Alexis

Herman;
Secretary of Energy Federico Pena; Under Secretary of the Treasury Larry Summers;
Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency James Lee Witt; Chair of the
Council on Environmental Quality Katie McGinty; the President's Science Advisor,
Dr. Jack Gibbons, and other distinguished guests who are present. We meet today to
discuss the future of our planet and the realities of global climate disruption.

I want to acknowledge one other person who is in the room somewhere
and I haven't had a chance to see him yet, but Charles David Keeling is here. And,
Dr. Keeling, thank you very much for joining us. And he was responsible, along
with one other, in measuring carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for the very first
time back in the last 1950s. And my own introduction to this issue came about as a
direct result of the measurements which showed the annual cycle of carbon dioxide
and the steadily increasing peaks of concentrations of carbon dioxide, and now, of
course, we know other greenhouse gases, as well, that resulted from those measurements.

Later, when I came to the Congress quite a few years after that, in
holding hearings I saw that those concentrations had increased dramatically and, of
course, all around the world scientists were studying it intensively. And now we
will soon hear from these scientists about what the world's scientific conclusion
is about what this means for increased droughts and floods, dramatic changes in the
distribution of forests and croplands. And all of this gives rise to great concern
that we are committing future generations to a planet that is altered in profound
ways that can cause great harm to future generations.

This administration has always worked on a simple principle when
addressing problems of a scientific and technical nature, and that principle is:
Science must inform policy decisions. Scientists are by nature a cautious group,
but the world's
scientific community is telling us in many ways that they believe that we as a civilization are disrupting the balance of the world's

climate. In the words of the 2,000 scientists who participated in the intergovernmental panel on climate change -- and I quote -- "there is a discernable human influence on global climate."

More than 2,600 scientists have signed a letter about global climatic disruption, which we'll be hearing more about in just a few minutes. Today, we hear about the concerns of scientists. They speak as eminent experts and as U.S. citizens who care about the future of this planet. Each has a resume far too long to recount, but let me briefly introduce those who are with us today.

Dr. Sherry Rowland won the 1995 Nobel Prize for Chemistry for his pioneering research in atmospheric chemistry, explaining the destruction of the stratospheric ozone layer. He is also a professor at the University of California at Irvine and an official with the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Mario Molina shares the 1995 Nobel Prize with Sherry Rowland. He is the Lee and Geraldine Martin Professor of Environmental Science at MIT.

Dr. Jane Lubchenco is an eminent ecologist, past President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, very active with the AAAS, and also past President of the Ecological Society of America. She is currently the Wayne and Gladys Valley Professor of Marine Biology and a distinguished Professor of Zoology at Oregon State University.

Dr. Stephen Schneider is a climate scientist and professor at Stanford University, recipient of a MacArthur Fellowship and winner of the American Association for the Advancement of Science's Westinghouse Award for Public Understanding of Science and Technology.

Dr. Bob Shope has devoted his professional life to the study of viruses carried by biting insects. He is currently a professor in the Departments of Pathology and Microbiology and Immunology at the University of Texas.

Dr. Henry Kendall won the Nobel Prize for physics in 1990. He is Chairman of the Board of the Union of Concerned Scientists and the J.A. Stratton Professor of Physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

And John Holdren is an expert on energy and environmental science and delivered the Nobel Peace Prize acceptance lecture on behalf of the Pugwash Conferences. He is currently the Director of the Program on Science, Technology and Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Professor of Environmental Science and Public Policy in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard.

And now I would like to introduce the person who is leading our country and the world toward a recognition of what must be done to deal with this issue. It is my honor, ladies and gentlemen, to present the President of the United States, President Bill Clinton. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, first let me thank you for being here -- members of the administration and concerned members of the public, the scientists and other experts that are here.

I would also like to say a special word of thanks to the Vice President. In one of our earliest meetings together -- we meet once a week and have lunch -- he went over the whole history of greenhouse gas emissions and climatic change. And I became convinced first that he was convinced that something was wrong. (Laughter.) Then I became convinced something was wrong. And it's been a great help to me, and I believe, to the people of the United States to have him in the position that he's in not only with the convictions that he has, but with the knowledge that he has. And I'm very grateful to him for what he has done to help me come to grips with this issue.

To me, we have to see this whole issue of climate change in terms of our deepest obligations to future generations. I have spent most of my time in the last four and a half years trying to prepare the American people for a new century and a new millennium. It is also very important that we protect the Earth for that new millennium, to make sure that people will be able to take advantage of all the things we are trying to do, the opportunities we are trying to create, the problems we are trying to solve.

It is obvious that we cannot fulfill our responsibilities to future generations unless we deal responsibly with the challenge of climate change. Whenever the security of our country has been threatened, we have led the world to a better resolution. That is what is at stake here. And the scientists have come here to explain why.

As the Vice President said, the overwhelming balance of evidence and scientific opinion is that it is no longer a theory, but now a fact that global warming is for real. The world scientists believe that if we don't cut our emissions of greenhouse gases, we will disrupt the global climate. In fact, there is ample evidence that human activities are already disrupting the global climate, and that if we stay on our current course, the average global temperatures may rise 2 to 6 degrees Fahrenheit during the next century.

To put that in some context, the difference in average temperature between the last Ice Age, which was 10,000 to 12,000 years ago -- 10,000 to 12,000 years ago -- and today, is about 9 degrees Fahrenheit. So we could have two-thirds of that change in 100 years unless we do something.

If we fail to act, scientists expect that our seas will rise one to three feet, and thousands of square miles here in the United States, in Florida, Louisiana and other coastal areas will be flooded. Infectious diseases will spread to new regions. Severe heat waves will claim lives. Agriculture will suffer. Severe droughts and floods will be more common. These are the things that are reasonably predictable.

In the face of this, the United States must confront a challenge that in some ways is the most difficult of all democracy's challenges to face. That is, we have evidence, we see the train coming, but most ordinary Americans in their day-to-day lives can't hear the whistle blowing. They have no -- unless they have lived in a place where they have experienced severe and unusual and completely atypical weather disruptions in the last five years or so, the degree of the challenge is inconsistent with the actual perceived experience of most ordinary Americans. And this is true, indeed, throughout the world. And that presents us our challenge.

A democracy is premised on the proposition that if the American people, or any people in any democracy, know what the facts are and believe them, way more than half the time they will do the right thing. And so what we are doing today is beginning a process in which we ask the American people to listen to the evidence, to measure it against their own experience, but not to discount the weight of scientific authority if their own experience does not yet confirm what the overwhelming percentage of scientists believe to be fact today. This is a great exercise and a great test for our democracy.

I do want to say that I am convinced that when the nations of world meet in Kyoto, Japan, in December on this issue, the United States has got to be committed to realistic and binding limits

on our emissions of greenhouse gases. Between now and then, we have to work with the American people to get them to share that commitment. We have to emphasize flexible market-based approaches. We have to embrace research and development efforts in technology that will help us to improve the economy -- improve the environment while permitting our economy to grow. We have to ask all nations, both industrial and developing, to participate in this process.

But if we do this together, we can defuse this threat. And we can make the 21st century what it ought to be, not only for our children, but for all the children of the world. I believe the science demands that we face this challenge now. I'm positive that we owe it to our children. And I hope that we can find the wisdom and the skill to do democracy's work in the next few months, to build the consensus necessary to actually make action, as opposed to rhetoric, possible.

And for all of you for your commitment to that, I thank

you.

And now I'd like to ask Dr. Rowland to be the first of our distinguished scientists to lead off. (Applause.)

* * * * *

THE PRESIDENT: I wish every American could hear what we've heard today. But thanks to our friends in the media, a good number of them will hear at least a portion of what we have heard today. And this is the beginning of a consistent long-term effort that we all have to make to involve the people of this country in this decision. And I thank you all for the points you've made because, in different ways each of them will resonate with citizens of this country in a way that I believe will give us the support we need to take the action that has to be taken.

In the weeks and months ahead, the Vice President, the Cabinet, other members of the administration and I will be out in the country discussing this. We'll be working with the American people; we'll be talking about solutions as well as problems. The truth is, it's like anything else -- the quicker you get -- another answer Dr. Holdren might have given is that the quicker you get after this the less extreme the remedy you have to embrace to have a measurable effect to avoid an undesirable outcome. And the longer you wait, the more disruptive the ultimate resolution will be. So that's another thing that I'd like to emphasize.

Before we close I hope you will permit me to make a brief statement. Just before I came in here to this meeting I learned that today, and not very long ago, retired Supreme Court Justice William Brennan passed away. He was a remarkable human being, one of the finest and most influential jurists in our nation's history. He served on the Supreme Court for 34 years. He was perhaps during that period the staunchest, most effective defender of individual freedom against government intrusion.

His devotion to the Bill of Rights inspired millions of Americans and countless young law students, including myself. And one of the great honors I have had as President was to be able to award him the Presidential Medal of Freedom in my first year in office.

He once said, the role of the Constitution is the protection of the dignity of every human being and the recognition that every individual has fundamental rights which government cannot deny. He spent a lifetime upholding those rights, and he authored some of the most enduring constitutional decisions of this century, including *Baker v. Carr* on one person, one vote; *The New York Times v. Sullivan*, which brought the free speech doctrine into the latter half of the 20th century. The force of his ideas, the strength of his leadership and his character have safeguarded freedom and widened the circle of quality for every single one of us.

We will miss him greatly. And I know you join me in sending our best wishes and our prayers to his family and friends, and our gratitude for his life.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

3:05 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Julie E. Mason
April Mellody
Darby E. Stott
Julia R. Green
Lorraine L. Wytkind
Laura D. Schwartz
Lori E. Abrams
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie
Robin J. Bachman
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Lanny A. Breuer
Robin J. Bachman
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
Steven A. Cohen
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Marilyn DiGiacobbe
James A. Dorskind
Jennifer D. Dudley
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen E. Finney
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Michael A. Gill @ OVP@EOP
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Ricardo M. Gonzales
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes

Russell W. Horwitz
Thomas D. Janenda
Brian J. Johnson
david t. johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Angus S. King
Joshua A. King
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn
Catherine T. Kitchen
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
steven j. naplan
Elizabeth R. Newman
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Jonathan P. Robell
Charles F. Ruff
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
G. Timothy Saunders
Stuart Schear
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith

Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Todd Stern
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Jodie R. Torkelson
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Teresa Wildman
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GILLESPIE_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
glynnm @ panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

Message Sent

To: _____

Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Catherine T. Kitchen
07/28/97 01:44:42 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-7-26 opening remarks of Tahoe Forum

----- Forwarded by Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP on
07/28/97 01:44 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
07/28/97 01:38:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-7-26 opening remarks of Tahoe Forum

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Incline Village, Nevada)

For Immediate Release
1997

July 26,

OPENING REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND THE VICE PRESIDENT
AT LAKE TAHOE FORUM

Hyatt Hotel
Incline Village,

Nevada

11:55 A.M. PDT

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Please be seated, ladies and gentlemen.
Thank you very much. It's a great honor to be here. And as you can imagine, it's a wonderful pleasure for the President and me to be able to come to this beautiful place and to take part in this important process.

A couple people, just as we were coming in to this room, said, why don't we have this down by the lake site this morning? And you want to know the answer? The answer is, there was no way to do that without closing down a public beach on a Saturday and we thought it would be better to let people continue enjoying this lake while we all go about the work of trying to preserve it for the future. (Applause.)

On behalf of the President, I want to acknowledge some of the distinguished guests who are here. Then I'll make some brief remarks and present the President. After the President's remarks, I'll call on some presenters to start us off, and then we'll have a series of five short panel discussions on topics that are critical to the future of Lake Tahoe.

First, let me acknowledge Governor Miller. We appreciate your hospitality, Governor, and thank you very much. And representing Governor Wilson, Doug Wheeler is present. We appreciate his presence. Of course, we're delighted to have the senators from the two states who are here -- Senator Harry Reid, who suggested this forum; Senator Richard Bryan, both from Nevada. And Senator Dianne Feinstein and Senator Barbara Boxer, both from

California. Congressman Jim Gibbons and Congressman John Ensign, both from Nevada; and Congressman Dick Fazio, Congressman John Doolittle, Congressman George Miller, who was here yesterday -- all from California.

Members of the President's Cabinet who are here and who have been here, working hard on this issue include Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Carol Browner. Also, the Chair of the Council of Environmental Quality Katie McGinty. And all the members of the Tahoe Basin Steering Committee who are here -- we want to say a special word of thanks to you.

And there are two statewide elected officials, constitutional officers here -- the Attorney General of Nevada, Frankie Sue Del Papa, who was, incidentally, a former member of the TRPA, and Lt. Governor Gray Davis of California.

And, Mr. President, in addition to the Cabinet members, I want to note that the Secretary of Transportation, Rodney Slater, played a major role in the lead-up to today's conference, and his Deputy, Secretary Mort Downey, is here. And two other Deputy Secretaries are here -- both of them happen to

be Californians -- Rich Ruminger, Deputy Secretary of Agriculture; and John Garamendi, Deputy Secretary of the Interior; and John Zhirsky, from the Department of the Army for Civil Works.

Mr. President, yesterday was my kind of day. I've had a chance to tell the President about this, but I got the better end of this deal. (Applause.) Right after I arrived in Lake Tahoe, a park ranger guided me on a hike near the Desolation Wilderness. The trail finished at a summit with a breathtaking view of the Fallen Leaf Lake where Tipper and I stayed last night, and a backdrop of the majestic Mount Tallac.

And then after the hike, I went to the Forest Service Visitors Center to take part in the conference on Lake Tahoe's future. And I want to emphasize that that discussion yesterday, which was very lengthy and very detailed, was actually a wrap-up session following a much lengthier and much more detailed series of intensive issue workshops, five of them led by members of the President's Cabinet and others, and all of them based on the premise that throughout the world, but especially

here in Lake Tahoe, the environment and the economy go hand and hand.

Lake Tahoe demonstrates clearly that the economy is the environment, and the environment is the economy. That's the fundamental foundation of all of our conversations. And that's where we will start in the first of our five panels today.

But yesterday we talked in depth about Tahoe's stunning water clarity and how we can work together to keep Tahoe blue. We discussed the importance of forest health and what we must do to prevent wildfires and reduce erosion into the lake. And we spoke about transportation and its critical role, and recreation and tourism -- how we can balance the demands of development and traffic with the constant need to protect the air and the water.

The discussions yesterday yielded a lot of information and insights. The discussion on water clarity emphasized the fact that this lake is unique throughout the world, and the bright, cobalt blue quality just has to be preserved. Everybody agrees on that.

And there was a discussion of the critical role of nitrogen and phosphorus in feeding the algae growth, which is, of course, the main reason why the clarity is slowly disappearing. And the scientists make the point that the phosphorus is critical as a limiting factor, and that's why soil erosion must be controlled. And nitrogen, the other critical element, comes predominantly, it seems, from the emissions from cars and trucks and buses, both directly through the air and indirectly after being deposited on the land and then washed in with the soil erosion.

On the panel dealing with forest health, we had an extensive discussion about the history of the forest and what can be done in practical terms to restore forest health. We had an extremely interesting conversation about the planning that's under way to deal with the transportation issue. And I was extremely impressed with what the business community talked about for the future of recreation and tourism here to emphasize the quality of the recreation experience here at Lake Tahoe, the creation of partnerships and how in the future the economy and the environment will go hand in hand as well.

We heard, Mr. President, from a lot of people -- Democrats and Republicans, Nevadans and Californians, environmentalists and business owners, public officials, private citizens, and tribal leaders. There were a lot of different viewpoints, but there was one thing that everybody agreed on:

this place is amazing. It's a national treasure that must be protected and preserved.

Lake Tahoe sits on the edge of two states, but it's smack-dab in the middle of paradise. And all who benefit from the Lake Tahoe Basin bear responsibility for keeping it that way. In fact, it's our moral obligation to be faithful stewards of our heritage and protect this area for future generations. So that's why we're here today -- to make sure that this special place is protected, as the President's doing with Yellowstone and the Everglades and the Grand Canyon. This is one of crown jewels, unique among them all.

We'll succeed if we remain committed and especially if we recognize the overriding importance of the other great asset here in Lake Tahoe, in addition to the natural beauty, the unique partnership and consensus that has emerged here.

Now, it is my pleasure to present the individual who has made possible and led the growing national consensus on protecting the environment and growing the economy at the same time; someone whose commitment to our national heritage is unparalleled, who understands that environmental protection and economic growth are one in the same, not only here, but all over our nation; someone who knows that we need to come together and find common ground if we're to preserve America's sacred ground.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of United States, Bill Clinton. (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. First of all, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all of you who have had anything to do with these efforts in working with us over the last several months. The members of the Cabinet and the deputy secretaries have been acknowledged. The members of the Congress have been acknowledged. The other distinguished state officials from California and Nevada have been acknowledged. But there are a lot of people who work for these federal agencies at other levels who have just been out here killing themselves for the last few months to try to make this a good, successful two days. And to all the citizens who worked with them, and to all the federal employees who are here, I want to thank all of you for what you did to help these last two days be successful. (Applause.)

In addition, there are four people who worked with us to help make these workshops and in this forum a success -- Katie McGinty, Jim Lyons, Tom Tuckman, Phil Bayles -- I can't count; six -- Jeff Bailey and Dave Van Note. And I want to thank them.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to the members of Congress from these two states who have proved that this is a bipartisan, perhaps even a nonpartisan endeavor, that we all have a stake, not just as Westerners, but as Americans, in not only preserving Lake Tahoe, but, if possible, reversing some

of the difficulties of the last two years.

But I would be remiss if I did not say a special word of thanks to the person who thought this idea up and got my commitment months ago -- months ago -- to show up, if you'll forgive me, come hell or high water. And here we are in the middle of the budget negotiations we're trying to finish today back in Washington, but I am here because I promised Harry Reid months ago I would be here. (Applause.) Thank you.

I also want to thank the people who took us out on the boat today and who do all this wonderful research here, and everybody who took the Vice President around yesterday. When I got up at 5:00 a.m. in the morning my time, 2:00 a.m. your time, to come here today -- and I ought to be tired but I'm

exhilarated, partly because of the beauty of the surroundings. And I always -- on the few times in my life I've been privileged to be at this great site, I've always been exhilarated by it.

The other reason I am pumped up is that when I saw the Vice President this morning he was virtually glowing, and I knew he had been here in his element. (Laughter). And the minute we got on the boat, I got my Marine Biology 101 lecture -- (laughter) -- about, phosphorous, nitrogen, what does what, what does the other. I looked at the plankton. I mean, I could pass anybody's test now. (Laughter.)

And you have made Al Gore a happy man. (Laughter and applause.) He thinks that he is a -- this may be one of the deepest lakes in the world, but he's just about 6 inches below heaven right now. (Laughter.)

Let me say that the first stewards of this land, of course, were the Washoe People. They tell us that Lake Tahoe was the product of the Good Spirit's benevolent hand. They've also treated it that way. Perhaps now more and more Americans and more and more citizens of the world are tending to look at our environment that way. I certainly hope so.

When Washoe families came to the lake each spring, they blessed the water and shared its bounty. And when they left their campsites each winter, they hardly left a track behind. Today, it appears to me that all those who are involved in this great endeavor revere this region and have worked hard to keep it safe from harm.

Your cooperation to protect Lake Tahoe is, frankly, as the Vice President said, an outstanding model for the work we have to do to protect all kinds of national treasures and deal with all kinds of environmental challenges in the new century. And if I could be quite candid here, one of the reasons that I wanted to come here was not only to highlight to the nation the

importance of Lake Tahoe, but also to show the nation that there is a place where environmentalists and business people and ordinary citizens, where Republicans and Democrats, where tribal leaders and governmental people, where everybody is working together in common cause recognizing that there cannot be an artificial dividing line between preserving our natural heritage and growing our economy.

That is the fundamental lesson as Americans we have to absorb if we hope to be able to have our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren 100 years from now celebrating the kind of country we're celebrating on the edge of this new century. So you are doing something important for the country. (Applause.)

As all of you know, the Vice President and I got to go out on the UC Davis research vessel this morning to see how the scientists monitor the lake's clarity and quality, and we also learned just how not only pristine Lake Tahoe still is, but how much it has degraded over the last 40 years or so. We could see from measurable evidence and the charts that are tacked up inside the vessel what we have to do to reverse the decline.

We also have gotten the message in the workshops the Vice President has described. Over the last two months, I think it's astonishing that more than 1,000 people have participated in these workshops. I believe this is the seventh such meeting -- I think that's accurate. And for all of those 1,000 people plus, I want to thank you because the announcements that will be made today and the work that will be done in the months and years ahead is in no small measure the direct result of your willingness to give your time to participate in this process.

We learned that all of us have to find even better ways to work together. And I think you know that just a few moments ago, I signed an executive order to ensure greater cooperation among all the governments, agencies and businesses working here. It's not a top-down federal mandate, but a pledge to collaborate and share resources more than ever. We will work with you, we will support you, but you -- the states, the tribes, the local citizens -- you will lead the way. The executive order simply embodies the ratification of our obligation to help and to support.

The workshops also convinced us that the federal government must take new actions now to help protect Lake Tahoe's environment and, with it, the area's economy and quality of life. Today, with real projects based on listening to local people, we commit to take more than 25 specific actions and more than double the federal government's investment in the basin in each of the next two years to well over \$50 million. (Applause.)

Among the things that we intend to do are, first, to expand our efforts to restore the forest and reduce the risk of catastrophic fires. The Forest Service will use prescribed fire and other means to clean out the dry brush and wood on more than 3,500 federally owned lots and 3,000 acres of open forest each year.

Second, we'll take steps to protect and restore the lake's fabled water quality. We will work with UC Davis to develop computer tools that can predict how various watershed improvements will contribute to water quality. Every federal agency here will work to increase efforts to restore natural habitat, reduce erosion, and keep the water clean.

One crucial measure we'll work hard to deliver is a new pipeline to carry waste water out of the Tahoe Basin. (Applause.) And I thank all the members who have supported that, but I particularly want to recognize the efforts of Senator Boxer and Congressmen Fazio and Doolittle.

Third, we will help to cut down on traffic congestion and auto pollution by joining with you to improve mass transit throughout the region. I'm pleased to report that the U.S. Postal Service will help by switching to cleaner natural gas trucks and expanding home mail delivery to people on the west side of the lake. The Sierra Nevada's legendary 19th century mail carrier, Snowshoe Thompson, would probably be proud of that. (Laughter.)

And let me say, if I might do a little home cooking here, there are natural gas buses manufactured in Chattanooga, Tennessee -- (laughter) -- now being sold all over the world, now in use in the rainforest in Costa Rica, that would be very good for reducing air pollution around the lake. (Laughter.) And I know someone who would be helpful in getting you in touch with the appropriate people. (Applause.)

Finally, the Vice President met with Washoe elders yesterday and announced that we will assist the tribe in their efforts to protect sacred areas and preserve their culture. (Applause.) The Forest Service intends to provide approximately 350 acres to the Washoe for use in growing traditional plants, and another section of land where the Washoe will establish a cultural center. As part of this action, the Forest Service intends to provide tribal members access to the water's edge for the first time in a century. (Applause.)

I learned today from their leader that the Washoe first wrote to the President of the United States asking help on these matters in 1877. It just took 120 years, but I can tell you, from now on, the mail will run more rapidly between Lake Tahoe and Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

We hope to do more beyond today's announcement as we work with leaders from California and Nevada and Lake Tahoe's many friends in Congress. I also want to recognize the efforts

of Governor Miller, Governor Wilson earlier this week in recommending their states' resources to the lake -- recommitting their states' resources to the lake.

I'm convinced we can succeed in this endeavor. And, as I said before, I'm convinced, as we do, the model of cooperation you have established will be a model that we'll want to follow throughout the country.

We have a lot of work to do today to preserve the pristine Head Water's Forest in northern California, something of great concern I know to Senator Feinstein and many others; to restore the Florida Everglades; to protect the endangered Sterling Forest in the Northeast; to save Yellowstone from gold mining. We have an awful lot of work to do I think in perhaps our biggest challenge of all in confronting the challenge of global climate change as we move into a new century.

President Theodore Roosevelt said, standing not far from here, "We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages." Well, as we approach the 21st century and deal with these huge mega-challenges like climate change, you have given us a way to meet the challenge of the ages -- by working together and understanding what our forebears knew centuries ago. We cannot divide our quest for prosperity from our obligation to hand nature, God's great gift to us, on down to the generations.

We can do that. You have shown us the way. And we are determined to do our part. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

12:16 P.M. PDT

Message Sent

To:

Julie E. Mason
April Mellody
Darby E. Stott
Julia R. Green
Lorraine L. Wytkind
Laura D. Schwartz
Lori E. Abrams
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie
Robin J. Bachman

Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Lanny A. Breuer
Robin J. Bachman
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
Steven A. Cohen
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Marilyn DiGiacobbe
James A. Dorskind
Jennifer D. Dudley
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen E. Finney
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Michael A. Gill @ OVP@EOP
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Ricardo M. Gonzales
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Thomas D. Janenda
Brian J. Johnson
david t. johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Angus S. King
Joshua A. King
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn
Catherine T. Kitchen
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Doris O. Matsui

Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
steven j. naplan
Elizabeth R. Newman
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Jonathan P. Robell
Charles F. Ruff
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
G. Timothy Saunders
Stuart Schear
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Todd Stern
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Jodie R. Torkelson
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Teresa Wildman
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY

BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GILLESPIE_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
glynm @ panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

Message Sent

To:

Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Catherine T. Kitchen
08/04/97 11:45:14 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-8-4

----- Forwarded by Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP on
08/04/97 11:45 AM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
08/04/97 11:11:00 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-8-4

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

August 4, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The Cabinet Room

10:25 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Before we start, I think it's only fair to note that we are observing another anniversary of Helen's 50th birthday. (Laughter.) We wanted to give you a birthday cake with a tell-tale number of -- ("Happy Birthday" song is sung.) (Laughter and applause.)

MS. THOMAS: Now, may I have a press conference?
(Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: I'm going to make a statement and you get the questions. (Laughter.)

MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Take it to the press room and cut it up.
(Laughter).

MS. THOMAS: Thank you. This is painful. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: You don't make it look that way. It's painful for me, too. (Laughter.)

I'm glad to be joined today by the CEOs of 10 Fortune 500 companies who have come here to meet with me on climate change. These companies represent electric utilities, the oil and gas industry, finance, high technology, and heavy industry. They are all intimately interested in this issue and will be affected by whatever happens on it in our country and throughout the world.

We want a responsible approach to climate change. We believe that the science makes it clear that the climate is changing. I want to proceed based on some fairly straightforward and simple principles. First of all, as we get ready for the Kyoto conference, I believe there should be realistic but binding limits to emissions of greenhouse gases. I believe that we have to do it in a way that keeps our economy growing. And I believe that we ought to embrace flexible, market-based policies. I believe we should reemphasize and reenergize our efforts in research and development to find as many technological solutions to this as possible, and to keep our nation in the forefront of what is now a \$400 billion market for environmental technologies.

And finally, I believe the agreement has to be a global one. I think all nations, developed and developing, should be a part of this. So this is part of an ongoing process that I and our administration have undertaken to try to make sure we're working together with all the people who would be affected by this issue and try to reach, hopefully, a common position.

We're going to have a good meeting today, and I'm looking forward to it. And, again, I want to thank all the executives for coming here and giving vent to their views.

Q What do you think of the opposition, who says there is no such thing as global warming and that they don't agree with the scientists -- some of the scientists?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think that the real question is -- I don't think that very many people disagree with the fact that there is climate change now, I think there's some disagreement about what the impact of it is and what the appropriate response is. There's still some debate there. But I think the scientific evidence

for the fact of climate change is pretty compelling.

We had that panel of scientists, including the Nobel Prize winners here the other day, and I received a letter from -- I don't know -- over 2,500 of them, from scientists about it. So I think that there's pretty clear evidence that the climate is changing and could be changing substantially. There is still some difference about what the consequences of that will be and what we ought to do about it.

But I think if we follow these principles, we'll be staking out a responsible position, which will permit us to continue to grow economically and do our part in the world. After all, we have only four percent of the world's population, but we account for 20 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions, which you would expect since we have slightly over 20 percent of the world's output.

Q Mr. President, how seriously are you considering using a line-item veto to kill some provisions of the budget you'll sign into law tomorrow?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I asked Mr. Bowles to -- once we got a budget agreement and it passed -- to institute an intensive process to review both the spending and the tax bills to see if there were any items that would be appropriate for the line-item veto. And I have not yet received the results of that review.

I support the line-item veto; I did all along. And I think if we have it, it ought to be used -- I believe that it ought to be used somewhat sparingly. And my experience as Governor was that once I used it a few times I didn't have to -- I didn't need to use it very much anymore. And that's what I would hope would happen. We'll just see -- you probably know more about the likely targets for it than I do at this point. I was interested in the big-picture items in the budget. We got virtually 100 percent of what I sought and I'm elated with the budget. I think it's good for America. I think it will keep the economy growing, and I think it's a responsible thing to do. So whatever I do on that shouldn't be in any way detracting from the terrific job that the Congress did on it.

Q Mr. President, one question on UPS -- the standards for presidential intervention are relatively high. Are you considering doing anything else to intervene to bring an end to the strike?

THE PRESIDENT: On UPS?

Q Yes, UPS.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, first we urged the federal mediator, and we got that. And we got -- obviously, it didn't work. I still think the parties ought to go back to the table. UPS is a very important company to our country and there are a lot of employees there, and I hope they go back to the table. But at this

time I don't think any further action by me is appropriate.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

10:32 A.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Julie E. Mason
April Mellody
Darby E. Stott
Julia R. Green
Lorraine L. Wytkind
Laura D. Schwartz
Lori E. Abrams
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie
Robin J. Bachman
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Lanny A. Breuer
Robin J. Bachman
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
Steven A. Cohen
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Marilyn DiGiacobbe
James A. Dorskind
Jennifer D. Dudley
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen E. Finney
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Christopher J. Gillespie
Michael A. Gill @ OVP@EOP
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Ricardo M. Gonzales
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Thomas D. Janenda

Brian J. Johnson
david t. johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Angus S. King
Joshua A. King
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn
Catherine T. Kitchen
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
steven j. naplan
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Victoria Radd
Jonathan P. Robell
Charles F. Ruff
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
G. Timothy Saunders
Stuart Schear
Brooks Scoville
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
June Shih
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman

Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Todd Stern
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Jodie R. Torkelson
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Lowell A. Weiss
Teresa Wildman
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
glynnm @ panet.us-state.gov@INET@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

Message Sent

To:

Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
R. Scott Michaud/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman
09/11/97 12:31:16 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Executive Order: American Heritage Rivers

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 11, 1997

EXECUTIVE ORDER

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY EFFORTS ALONG
AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and

the laws of the United States of America, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), and in order to protect and restore rivers and their adjacent communities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Policies.

(a) The American Heritage Rivers initiative has three objectives: natural resource and environmental protection, economic revitalization, and historic and cultural preservation.

(b) Executive agencies ("agencies"), to the extent permitted by law and consistent with their missions and resources, shall coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to preserve, protect, and restore rivers and their associated resources important to our history, culture, and natural heritage.

(c) Agencies shall develop plans to bring increased efficiencies to existing and authorized programs with goals that are supportive of protection and restoration of communities along rivers.

(d) In accordance with Executive Order 12630, agencies shall act with due regard for the protection of private property provided for by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. No new regulatory authority is created as a result of the American Heritage Rivers initiative. This initiative will not interfere with matters of State, local, and tribal government jurisdiction.

(e) In furtherance of these policies, the President will designate rivers that meet certain criteria as "American Heritage Rivers."

(f) It is the policy of the Federal Government that communities shall nominate rivers as American Heritage Rivers and the Federal role will be solely to support community-based efforts to preserve, protect, and restore these rivers and their communities.

(g) Agencies should, to the extent practicable, help identify resources in the private and nonprofit sectors to aid revitalization efforts.

(h) Agencies are encouraged, to the extent permitted by law, to develop partnerships with State, local, and tribal governments and community and nongovernmental organizations. Agencies will be responsive to the diverse needs of different kinds of communities from the core of our cities to remote rural more

(OVER)

areas and shall seek to ensure that the role played by the Federal Government is complementary to the plans and work being carried out by State, local, and tribal governments. To the extent possible, Federal

resources will be strategically directed to complement resources being spent by these governments.

(i) Agencies shall establish a method for field offices to assess the success of the American Heritage River initiative and provide a means to recommend changes that will improve the delivery and accessibility of Federal services and programs. Agencies are directed, where appropriate, to reduce and make more flexible procedural requirements and paperwork related to providing assistance to communities along designated rivers.

(j) Agencies shall commit to a policy under which they will seek to ensure that their actions have a positive effect on the natural, historic, economic, and cultural resources of American Heritage River communities. The policy will require agencies to consult with American Heritage River communities early in the planning stages of Federal actions, take into account the communities' goals and objectives and ensure that actions are compatible with the overall character of these communities. Agencies shall seek to ensure that their help for one community does not adversely affect neighboring communities. Additionally, agencies are encouraged to develop formal and informal partnerships to assist communities. Local Federal facilities, to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the agencies' missions and resources, should provide public access, physical space, technical assistance, and other support for American Heritage River communities.

(k) In addition to providing support to designated rivers, agencies will work together to provide information and services to all communities seeking support.

Sec. 2. Process for Nominating an American Heritage River.

(a) Nomination. Communities, in coordination with their State, local, or tribal governments, can nominate their river, river stretch, or river confluence for designation as an American Heritage River. When several communities are involved in the nomination of the same river, nominations will detail the coordination among the interested communities and the role each will play in the process. Individuals living outside the community may not nominate a river.

(b) Selection Criteria. Nominations will be judged based on the following:

(1) the characteristics of the natural, economic, agricultural, scenic, historic, cultural, or recreational resources of the river that render it distinctive or unique;

(2) the effectiveness with which the community has defined its plan of action and the extent to which the plan addresses, either through planned actions or past accomplishments, all three American Heritage Rivers objectives, which are set forth in section 1(a) of this order;

(3) the strength and diversity of community support for the

nomination as evidenced by letters from elected officials; landowners; private citizens; businesses; and especially State, local, and tribal governments. Broad community support is essential to receiving the American Heritage River designation; and

more

3

(4) willingness and capability of the community to forge partnerships and agreements to implement their plan to meet their goals and objectives.

(c) Recommendation Process.

The Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality ("CEQ") shall develop a fair and objective procedure to obtain the views of a diverse group of experts for the purpose of making recommendations to the President as to which rivers shall be designated. These experts shall reflect a variety of viewpoints, such as those representing natural, cultural, and historic resources; scenic, environmental, and recreation interests; tourism, transportation, and economic development interests; and industries such as agriculture, hydropower, manufacturing, mining, and forest management. The Chair of the CEQ will ensure that the rivers recommended represent a variety of stream sizes, diverse geographical locations, and a wide range of settings from urban to rural and ensure that relatively pristine, successful revitalization efforts are considered as well as degraded rivers in need of restoration.

(d) Designation.

(1) The President will designate certain rivers as American Heritage Rivers. Based on the receipt of a sufficient number of qualified nominations, ten rivers will be designated in the first phase of the initiative.

(2) The Interagency Committee provided for in section 3 of this order shall develop a process by which any community that nominates and has its river designated may have this designation terminated at its request.

(3) Upon a determination by the Chair of the CEQ that a community has failed to implement its plan, the Chair may recommend to the President that a designation be revoked. The Chair shall notify the community at least 30 days prior to making such a recommendation to the President. Based on that recommendation, the President may revoke the designation.

Sec. 3. Establishment of an Interagency Committee. There is hereby established the American Heritage Rivers Interagency Committee ("Committee"). The Committee shall have two co-chairs. The Chair of the CEQ shall be a permanent co-chair. The other co-chair will rotate among the heads of the agencies listed below.

(a) The Committee shall be composed of the following members or their designees at the Assistant Secretary level or equivalent:

- (1) The Secretary of Defense;
- (2) The Attorney General;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior;
- (4) The Secretary of Agriculture;
- (5) The Secretary of Commerce;
- (6) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

more

(OVER)

4

- (7) The Secretary of Transportation;
- (8) The Secretary of Energy;
- (9) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (10) The Chair of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation;
- (11) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts; and

(12) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Chair of the CEQ may invite to participate in meetings of the Committee, representatives of other agencies, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee shall:

- (1) establish formal guidelines for designation as an American Heritage River;
- (2) periodically review the actions of agencies in support of the American Heritage Rivers;
- (3) report to the President on the progress, accomplishments, and effectiveness of the American Heritage Rivers initiative; and
- (4) perform other duties as directed by the Chair of the CEQ.

Sec. 4. Responsibilities of the Federal Agencies. Consistent

with Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, agencies shall:

- (a) identify their existing programs and plans that give them the authority to offer assistance to communities involved in river conservation and community health and revitalization;
- (b) to the extent practicable and permitted by law and regulation, refocus programs, grants, and technical assistance to provide support for communities adjacent to American Heritage Rivers;
- (c) identify all technical tools, including those developed for purposes other than river conservation, that can be applied to river protection, restoration, and community revitalization;
- (d) provide access to existing scientific data and information to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the agencies mission and resources;
- (e) cooperate with State, local, and tribal governments and communities with respect to their activities that take place in, or affect the area around, an American Heritage River;
- (f) commit to a policy, as set forth in section 1(j) of this order, in making decisions affecting the quality of an American Heritage River;
- (g) provide, once a river is designated an American Heritage River and at the community's request, a single representative called a "River Navigator" with whom communities can communicate goals and needs and who will facilitate community-agency interchange;

more

5

- (h) allow public access to the river, for agencies with facilities along American Heritage Rivers, to the extent practicable and consistent with their mission; and
- (i) cooperate, as appropriate, with communities on projects that protect or preserve stretches of the river that are on Federal property or adjacent to a Federal facility.

Sec. 5. Responsibilities of the Committee and the Council on Environmental Quality. The CEQ shall serve as Executive agent for the Committee, and the CEQ and the Committee shall ensure the implementation of the policies and purposes of this initiative.

Sec. 6. Definition. For the purposes of this order, Executive agency means any agency on the Committee and such other agency as may be designated by the President.

Sec. 7. Judicial Review. This order does not create any right or

benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 11, 1997.

#

Message Sent

To:

Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP
Lori E. Abrams/WHO/EOP
Laura K. Capps/WHO/EOP
Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP
Ben A. Freeland/WHO/EOP
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP
Joshua A. King/WHO/EOP
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn/WHO/EOP
G N. Lattimore/WHO/EOP
Peter R. Orszag/OPD/EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP
Douglas S. Sheorn/WHO/EOP
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP

Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Christopher F. Walker/WHO/EOP
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP
David Shipley/WHO/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP
Michael W. Williams/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP
James A. Dorskind/WHO/EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP
Jennifer D. Dudley/WHO/EOP
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP
Tracy S. Olmstead/OSTP/EOP
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP
1=US @ 2=TELEMAIL @ 3=INTERNET @ *RFC-822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL @ MRX @
LNGTWY
1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 5=ATT.COM @ *ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP
INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
SULLIVAN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY

GRAY_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
ROBINSON_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
RONNEL_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
tnewell @ ostp.eop.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY
Roger V. Salazar/OVP @ OVP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP
HEMMIG_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Ashley L. Raines/OA/EOP
Peter A. Weissman/WHO/EOP
Mary A. Dixon/OVP @ OVP
Douglas J. Band/WHO/EOP
Edwin R. Thomas III/WHO/EOP
Sherman A. Williams/WHO/EOP
William W. McCathran/WHO/EOP
Jonathan P. Robell/WHO/EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Karen C. Fahle/WHO/EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP

Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
Denise L. Miller/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman
09/11/97 03:42:11 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: UPDATED: Executive Order: American Heritage Rivers

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

September 11, 1997

EXECUTIVE ORDER

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY EFFORTS ALONG AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), and in order to protect and restore rivers and their adjacent communities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Policies.

(a) The American Heritage Rivers initiative has three objectives: natural resource and environmental protection, economic revitalization, and historic and cultural preservation.

(b) Executive agencies ("agencies"), to the extent permitted by law and consistent with their missions and resources, shall coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to preserve, protect, and restore rivers and their associated resources important to our history, culture, and natural heritage.

(c) Agencies shall develop plans to bring increased efficiencies to existing and authorized programs with goals that are

supportive of protection and restoration of communities along rivers.

(d) In accordance with Executive Order 12630, agencies shall act with due regard for the protection of private property provided for by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution. No new regulatory authority is created as a result of the American Heritage Rivers initiative. This initiative will not interfere with matters of State, local, and tribal government jurisdiction.

(e) In furtherance of these policies, the President will designate rivers that meet certain criteria as "American Heritage Rivers."

(f) It is the policy of the Federal Government that communities shall nominate rivers as American Heritage Rivers and the Federal role will be solely to support community-based efforts to preserve, protect, and restore these rivers and their communities.

(g) Agencies should, to the extent practicable, help identify resources in the private and nonprofit sectors to aid revitalization efforts.

(h) Agencies are encouraged, to the extent permitted by law, to develop partnerships with State, local, and tribal governments and community and nongovernmental organizations. Agencies will be responsive to the diverse needs of different kinds of communities from the core of our cities to remote rural more

(OVER)

2

areas and shall seek to ensure that the role played by the Federal Government is complementary to the plans and work being carried out by State, local, and tribal governments. To the extent possible, Federal resources will be strategically directed to complement resources being spent by these governments.

(i) Agencies shall establish a method for field offices to assess the success of the American Heritage River initiative and provide a means to recommend changes that will improve the delivery and accessibility of Federal services and programs. Agencies are directed, where appropriate, to reduce and make more flexible procedural requirements and paperwork related to providing assistance to communities along designated rivers.

(j) Agencies shall commit to a policy under which they will seek to ensure that their actions have a positive effect on the natural, historic, economic, and cultural resources of American Heritage River communities. The policy will require agencies to consult with American Heritage River communities early in the planning stages of Federal actions, take into account the communities' goals and objectives and ensure that actions are compatible with the overall character of these communities. Agencies shall seek to ensure that their help for one

community does not adversely affect neighboring communities. Additionally, agencies are encouraged to develop formal and informal partnerships to assist communities. Local Federal facilities, to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the agencies' missions and resources, should provide public access, physical space, technical assistance, and other support for American Heritage River communities.

(k) In addition to providing support to designated rivers, agencies will work together to provide information and services to all communities seeking support.

Sec. 2. Process for Nominating an American Heritage River.

(a) Nomination. Communities, in coordination with their State, local, or tribal governments, can nominate their river, river stretch, or river confluence for designation as an American Heritage River. When several communities are involved in the nomination of the same river, nominations will detail the coordination among the interested communities and the role each will play in the process. Individuals living outside the community may not nominate a river.

(b) Selection Criteria. Nominations will be judged based on the following:

(1) the characteristics of the natural, economic, agricultural, scenic, historic, cultural, or recreational resources of the river that render it distinctive or unique;

(2) the effectiveness with which the community has defined its plan of action and the extent to which the plan addresses, either through planned actions or past accomplishments, all three American Heritage Rivers objectives, which are set forth in section 1(a) of this order;

(3) the strength and diversity of community support for the nomination as evidenced by letters from elected officials; landowners; private citizens; businesses; and especially State, local, and tribal governments. Broad community support is essential to receiving the American Heritage River designation; and

more

3

(4) willingness and capability of the community to forge partnerships and agreements to implement their plan to meet their goals and objectives.

(c) Recommendation Process.

The Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality ("CEQ") shall develop a fair and objective procedure to obtain the views of a diverse group of experts for the purpose of making recommendations to the President as to which rivers shall be designated. These experts shall

reflect a variety of viewpoints, such as those representing natural, cultural, and historic resources; scenic, environmental, and recreation interests; tourism, transportation, and economic development interests; and industries such as agriculture, hydropower, manufacturing, mining, and forest management. The Chair of the CEQ will ensure that the rivers recommended represent a variety of stream sizes, diverse geographical locations, and a wide range of settings from urban to rural and ensure that relatively pristine, successful revitalization efforts are considered as well as degraded rivers in need of restoration.

(d) Designation.

(1) The President will designate certain rivers as American Heritage Rivers. Based on the receipt of a sufficient number of qualified nominations, ten rivers will be designated in the first phase of the initiative.

(2) The Interagency Committee provided for in section 3 of this order shall develop a process by which any community that nominates and has its river designated may have this designation terminated at its request.

(3) Upon a determination by the Chair of the CEQ that a community has failed to implement its plan, the Chair may recommend to the President that a designation be revoked. The Chair shall notify the community at least 30 days prior to making such a recommendation to the President. Based on that recommendation, the President may revoke the designation.

Sec. 3. Establishment of an Interagency Committee. There is hereby established the American Heritage Rivers Interagency Committee ("Committee"). The Committee shall have two co-chairs. The Chair of the CEQ shall be a permanent co-chair. The other co-chair will rotate among the heads of the agencies listed below.

(a) The Committee shall be composed of the following members or their designees at the Assistant Secretary level or equivalent:

- (1) The Secretary of Defense;
- (2) The Attorney General;
- (3) The Secretary of the Interior;
- (4) The Secretary of Agriculture;
- (5) The Secretary of Commerce;
- (6) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

more

(OVER)

- (7) The Secretary of Transportation;
- (8) The Secretary of Energy;
- (9) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (10) The Chair of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation;
- (11) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts; and
- (12) The Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Chair of the CEQ may invite to participate in meetings of the Committee, representatives of other agencies, as appropriate.

- (b) The Committee shall:
 - (1) establish formal guidelines for designation as an American Heritage River;
 - (2) periodically review the actions of agencies in support of the American Heritage Rivers;
 - (3) report to the President on the progress, accomplishments, and effectiveness of the American Heritage Rivers initiative; and
 - (4) perform other duties as directed by the Chair of the CEQ.

Sec. 4. Responsibilities of the Federal Agencies. Consistent with Title I of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, agencies shall:

- (a) identify their existing programs and plans that give them the authority to offer assistance to communities involved in river conservation and community health and revitalization;
- (b) to the extent practicable and permitted by law and regulation, refocus programs, grants, and technical assistance to provide support for communities adjacent to American Heritage Rivers;
- (c) identify all technical tools, including those developed for purposes other than river conservation, that can be applied to river protection, restoration, and community revitalization;
- (d) provide access to existing scientific data and information to the extent permitted by law and consistent with the agencies mission and resources;

(e) cooperate with State, local, and tribal governments and communities with respect to their activities that take place in, or affect the area around, an American Heritage River;

(f) commit to a policy, as set forth in section 1(j) of this order, in making decisions affecting the quality of an American Heritage River;

(g) select from among all the agencies a single individual called the "River Navigator," for each river that is designated an American Heritage River, with whom the communities can communicate goals and needs and who will facilitate community-agency interchange;

more

5

(h) allow public access to the river, for agencies with facilities along American Heritage Rivers, to the extent practicable and consistent with their mission; and

(i) cooperate, as appropriate, with communities on projects that protect or preserve stretches of the river that are on Federal property or adjacent to a Federal facility.

Sec. 5. Responsibilities of the Committee and the Council on Environmental Quality. The CEQ shall serve as Executive agent for the Committee, and the CEQ and the Committee shall ensure the implementation of the policies and purposes of this initiative.

Sec. 6. Definition. For the purposes of this order, Executive agency means any agency on the Committee and such other agency as may be designated by the President.

Sec. 7. Judicial Review. This order does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 11, 1997.

#

Message Sent

To:

Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP
Lori E. Abrams/WHO/EOP
Laura K. Capps/WHO/EOP
Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP
Ben A. Freeland/WHO/EOP
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP
Joshua A. King/WHO/EOP
Nicholas B. Kirkhorn/WHO/EOP
G N. Lattimore/WHO/EOP
Peter R. Orszag/OPD/EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP
Douglas S. Sheorn/WHO/EOP
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Christopher F. Walker/WHO/EOP
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP
David Shipley/WHO/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP
Michael W. Williams/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP
James A. Dorskind/WHO/EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP

Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP
Jennifer D. Dudley/WHO/EOP
Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP
Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP
Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP
Tracy S. Olmstead/OSTP/EOP
Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP
1=US @ 2=TELEMAIL @ 3=INTERNET @ *RFC-822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL @ MRX @
LNGTWY
1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 5=ATT.COM @ *ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
73030.21 @ compuserve.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP
INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
SULLIVAN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
ROBINSON_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
RONNEL_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
tnewell @ ostp.eop.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY
Roger V. Salazar/OVP @ OVP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP
Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP
Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP
HEMMIG_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY
Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP
Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Ashley L. Raines/OA/EOP
Peter A. Weissman/WHO/EOP
Mary A. Dixon/OVP @ OVP

Douglas J. Band/WHO/EOP
Edwin R. Thomas III/WHO/EOP
Sherman A. Williams/WHO/EOP
William W. McCathran/WHO/EOP
Jonathan P. Robell/WHO/EOP
Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP
Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP
Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP
Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP
June Shih/WHO/EOP
Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP
Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Karen C. Fahle/WHO/EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
Denise L. Miller/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Kevin S. Moran
09/11/97 05:11:45 PM
Record Type: Record

To: All OPD Users, All WHO Users, All Staff
cc:
Subject: The White House at Work (9/11)

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Kevin S. Moran
10/01/97 05:51:56 PM
Record Type: Record

To: All OPD Users, All WHO Users, All Staff
cc:
Subject: The White House at Work -- Weather Forecasters Event

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Kevin S. Moran
10/06/97 04:48:52 PM
Record Type: Record

To: All OPD Users, All WHO Users, All Staff
cc:
Subject: The White House at Work -- White House Conference on Climate Change

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Elizabeth R. Newman
10/09/97 05:41:10 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Statement by the President: National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am pleased to sign today H.R. 1420, the "National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997." This Act will strengthen and improve our National Wildlife Refuge System as we enter the 21st century. It embodies the principle that whether they cast a line, pitch a decoy, or click a shutter, the 30 million Americans who annually visit and enjoy our refuges have one common and enduring interest -- the conservation of fish, wildlife, and their habitat. That is what the National Wildlife Refuge System is about and that is what this Act will promote and ensure.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is the world's greatest system of lands dedicated to the conservation of fish and wildlife. It is a system founded in faith; a belief that in a country as bountiful and diverse as ours, there ought to be special places that are set aside exclusively for the conservation of fish and wildlife resources. These special places are National Wildlife Refuges where the conservation needs of wildlife are paramount.

Key provisions of H.R. 1420 mirror those of Executive Order 12996, Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System, which I signed in March 1996. These provisions include the mission statement for the Refuge System, the designation of priority public uses, and a requirement that the environmental health of the Refuge System be maintained.

The bill maintains the crucial distinction clearly set forth in my Executive order between wildlife conservation as the dominant refuge goal and compatible wildlife-dependent recreation as a priority public use. Wildlife conservation is the purpose of the refuges. The opportunity for compatible recreational uses are the important benefits that flow from this purpose. This bill recognizes that the use of refuge lands and waters, to the extent that such use can be allowed, shall be reserved first to those recreational activities that depend and thrive on abundant populations of fish and wildlife.

The bill also maintains the strict policy, first established by the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, that all refuge uses must be compatible with the primary purpose or purposes for which the refuge was established. It sets up a sensible, consistent, and public process for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's managers to follow in making compatibility determinations, and it adopts the Fish and Wildlife Service's longstanding regulatory standard for compatibility.

The bill reiterates the specific categories of wildlife-dependent recreation found in Executive Order 12996 that are to be considered as the "priority public uses" for the refuge system: hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. Where compatible, refuge managers are to provide increased opportunities for these uses and enhance the attention they receive in refuge management and planning.

more

(OVER)

2

Finally, H.R. 1420 maintains the historic Refuge System policy that refuges are "closed until open." That is, in order to ensure that wildlife needs come first, existing refuge lands and waters are closed to public uses until they are specifically opened for such uses. Also as provided in Executive Order 12996, the bill establishes a new process for identifying compatible wildlife-dependent recreational activities prior to the acquisition of new refuge areas, thereby avoiding the temporary closure of ongoing compatible recreational activities.

This bill is the result of extensive negotiations by my Administration, the Congress, and environmental and sportmen's groups. Starting from widely differing positions, they worked intensively to reach the compromise reflected in this legislation. The bill is proof that when there is a shared commitment to do what is right for our natural resources, partisan and ideological differences can be set aside and compromises can be negotiated for the benefit of the common good. It is clearly the most significant conservation legislation to emerge from this Congress to date. I hope and trust the process by which this bill was enacted will serve as a model for future congressional action on other environmental measures.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 9, 1997.

###

Message Sent

To:

Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP

Lori E. Abrams/WHO/EOP

Laura K. Capps/WHO/EOP

Steven A. Cohen/WHO/EOP
Anne M. Edwards/WHO/EOP
Rahm I. Emanuel/WHO/EOP
Karen E. Finney/WHO/EOP
Ben A. Freeland/WHO/EOP
Jeremy M. Gaines/WHO/EOP
Jason S. Goldberg/WHO/EOP
Julia R. Green/WHO/EOP
James T. Heimbach/WHO/EOP
Russell W. Horwitz/OPD/EOP
David E. Kalbaugh/WHO/EOP
Joshua A. King/WHO/EOP
G N. Lattimore/WHO/EOP
Peter R. Orszag/OPD/EOP
Gordon Li/WHO/EOP
Julie E. Mason/WHO/EOP
Doris O. Matsui/WHO/EOP
Elisa Millsap/WHO/EOP
Cheryl D. Mills/WHO/EOP
G. Timothy Saunders/WHO/EOP
Laura D. Schwartz/WHO/EOP
Douglas S. Sheorn/WHO/EOP
Joshua Silverman/WHO/EOP
Douglas B. Sosnik/WHO/EOP
Todd Stern/WHO/EOP
Barry J. Toiv/WHO/EOP
Michael Waldman/WHO/EOP
Christopher F. Walker/WHO/EOP
Dorian V. Weaver/WHO/EOP
Catherine T. Kitchen/WHO/EOP
James T. Edmonds/WHO/EOP
David Shipley/WHO/EOP
Lori L. Anderson/WHO/EOP
Brenda M. Anders/WHO/EOP
Michael W. Williams/WHO/EOP
Suzanne Dale/WHO/EOP
Richard Socarides/WHO/EOP
Dag Vega/WHO/EOP
James A. Dorskind/WHO/EOP
Barbara D. Woolley/WHO/EOP
Darby E. Stott/WHO/EOP
Jake Siewert/OPD/EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP
Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP
Carole A. Parmelee/WHO/EOP
Andrew J. Mayock/WHO/EOP
Beverly J. Barnes/WHO/EOP
Megan C. Moloney/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Murchinson/WHO/EOP
Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP
Laura S. Marcus/WHO/EOP
Virginia N. Rustique/WHO/EOP
Thomas D. Janenda/WHO/EOP
Terri J. Tingen/WHO/EOP

Jennifer D. Dudley/WHO/EOP

Brian D. Smith/WHO/EOP

Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP

Stacey L. Rubin/WHO/EOP

Tracy S. Olmstead/OSTP/EOP

Kim B. Widdess/WHO/EOP

1=US @ 2=TELEMAIL @ 3=INTERNET @ *RFC-822\MWOLFE(A)MH1.JS.MIL @ MRX @
LNGTWY

1=US @ 2=WESTERN UNION @ 5=ATT.COM @ *ELN\62955104 @ MRX @ LNGTWY

62955104 @ eln.attmail.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

73030.21 @ compuserve.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

CAPLAN_P @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

COGDELL_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP

INFOMGT @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

JOHNSON_WC @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

LIZIK_C @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

SULLIVAN_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

SUNTUM_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

WOZNIAK_N @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY

newsdesk @ usnewswire.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

usia01 @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

usnwire @ access.digex.com @ INET @ LNGTWY

wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu @ INET @ LNGTWY

GRAY_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

NAPLAN_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

WEINER_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

GRIBBEN_J @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

RILEY_R @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

RONNEL_S @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

tnewell @ ostp.eop.gov @ INET @ LNGTWY

Roger V. Salazar/OVP @ OVP

Joseph P. Lockhart/WHO/EOP

Elizabeth R. Newman/WHO/EOP

Carolyn Curiel/WHO/EOP

Jordan Tamagni/WHO/EOP

HEMMIG_M @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

Serena C. Torrey/WHO/EOP

Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP

Ashley L. Raines/OA/EOP

Peter A. Weissman/WHO/EOP

Douglas J. Band/WHO/EOP

Edwin R. Thomas III/WHO/EOP

Sherman A. Williams/WHO/EOP

William W. McCathran/WHO/EOP

Julia M. Payne/WHO/EOP

Robin J. Bachman/WHO/EOP

Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP

Katherine Hubbard/WHO/EOP

Nicole R. Rabner/WHO/EOP

June Shih/WHO/EOP

Elisabeth Steele/WHO/EOP

Brooks E. Scoville/WHO/EOP
Estela Mendoza/WHO/EOP
Neera Tanden/WHO/EOP
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr./WHO/EOP
Kyle M. Baker/WHO/EOP
Anna E. Cushing/WHO/EOP
Diane Ikemiyashiro/WHO/EOP
Leanne I. Johnson/WHO/EOP
Sarah S. Knight/WHO/EOP
Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP
Tracy F. Sisser/WHO/EOP
Woyneab M. Wondwossen/WHO/EOP
Jeannetta P. Allen/WHO/EOP
Judithanne V. Scourfield/WHO/EOP
Karen C. Fahle/WHO/EOP
Patrick E. Briggs/WHO/EOP
Debra S. Wood/WHO/EOP
Daniel W. Burkhardt/WHO/EOP
Maureen A. Hudson/WHO/EOP
Lana Dickey/WHO/EOP
Carmen B. Fowler/WHO/EOP
Jonathan Orszag/OPD/EOP
Lynn G. Cutler/WHO/EOP
Nelson Reyneri/WHO/EOP
Denise L. Miller/WHO/EOP
Julianne B. Corbett/WHO/EOP
Eleanor S. Parker/WHO/EOP
Whitney S. Staley/WHO/EOP
Sheelah A. Feinberg/WHO/EOP
Walker F. Bass/WHO/EOP
Virginia Apuzzo/WHO/EOP
Glen M. Weiner/WHO/EOP
Michael V. Terrell/CEQ/EOP
Elliot J. Diringier/CEQ/EOP
Kara Gerhardt/WHO/EOP

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
10/22/97 03:50:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-10/22 briefing on climate change

THE WHITE HOUSE

For Immediate Release

October 22, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING

BY

CHAIR OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL GENE SPERLING,
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY
DAN TARULLO,
DEPUTY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR JIM
STEINBERG,

STAFF SECRETARY TODD STERN,
CHAIR OF COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENT QUALITY KATIE MCGINTY,
AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TREASURY LARRY SUMMERS

The Briefing Room

1:15 P.M. EDT

MR. MCCURRY: We are bringing before you a parade of administration officials, harmoniously and vigorously united together -- brown and green alike, they march out, and all colors in between.

The President's global climate change team is here with you, including all of the following and more: Gene Sperling, Assistant to the President for Economic Policy, Chair of the National Economic Council; Dan Tarullo, Assistant to the President for International Economic Policy; Jim Steinberg, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; Todd Stern, Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary and really the shepherd of all of our global climate folks at the White House; Katie McGinty, the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality; and Larry Summers, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

They are here at your disposal, but we are going to do the following. We'll start with Gene giving a little overview of the policy directions the President has now put in place as we head to Kyoto. Katie will tell you a little bit, expand a little bit on the specifics of the policy. And I guess Jim and Todd can talk about the negotiating process that we foresee looking ahead to Kyoto.

Mr. Sperling.

MR. SPERLING: The President, the Vice President and everyone in the administration who has worked on this issue feels very strongly that this is perhaps the major environmental challenge of our generation. All of us believe strongly that the science compels action; that the science, based on the scientists that came together from over 150 countries, makes clear that there has been a

discernable human influence on the climate with potentially disruptive effects for our future; and that the United States must play a leadership role in addressing this environmental challenge.

The President today puts forward an ambitious, but sensible and sound approach for addressing this. He sets timetable and targets of reaching 1990 levels by the period of 2008 to 2012. Our policies will be based on five fundamental principles, that we be, one, guided by the science; two, that our approach be market-based and common sense; three, that we should first look for the win-win, positive solutions that exist before us; fourth, that there must be global participation, that this is a global problem that requires a global solution; and, fifth, recognizing the uncertainty in engaging on a long-term we need to have common sense, economic and scientific review periodically.

The President puts forward a proposal today that one can see in three stages. The first stage is where the President says, here are the things America can do without waiting, without, we think, conflict in addressing this problem. And if you look on the materials we've handed out, on the third page, it runs through the specific items from the tax incentives to the industry action to the early credit. These are the things this President is committed to doing as soon as possible. This is what we can do without waiting. This is what we can do right now to utilize the opportunities that are before us. And it very much fits the principle that to the degree there are under-utilized energy efficiencies that exist right now, it would be irresponsible for us to not first do everything within our power to make sure that our industries and our people utilize those efficiencies and get the gains that are before us.

The second period would be, in having a five-year review, would be to look at 2004, to evaluate what has worked; to do more of what is being effective; to take account of what new things we have learned on the science, the environment and the economics; and to go forward and to start planning for the third stage, the binding stage, between 2008 and 2012. It is at this stage we would call for a broad-based emissions trading system, both domestically and internationally, that we believe would ensure that we hit the binding targets that the President has set out.

I should stress that by the time a President and the Congress would have to implement this, we would have under our belt a decade of experience, a decade of innovation, a decade of technology, a decade of science and economic review. So this is a strong approach, but it is handled in a sound and sensible way that recognizes both the uncertainties we face, but both -- that we have an imperative to reach the binding target that the President is setting forward.

If you look in the materials we have, we try to give

some examples as you go through on some of the places where the President feels very strongly in the area of electricity, in the area of cogeneration, others where there is, we think, significant waste and, therefore, significant opportunities using existing technologies and energy efficiency, and our hopes for where there can be innovation and breakthroughs, the type that you heard Secretary Pena talk about yesterday, that can put us on a path.

There will be many people who will suggest that down the road, in 2008, that this would be difficult to implement. But as with so many other issues -- entitlement reform and others -- the thing we know for sure is that if we act early we make it easier to deal with a long-term problem. It is only when we wait too long and too late that the choices become too difficult. We have before us the opportunity to deal with these things in a way that this country is best at -- through innovation, through technology, through mobilizing this country, through using the powers of the market. And this President is committed, that without waiting, he is going to try to mobilize those forces to go forward and do our part in dealing with our generational responsibility in addressing this environmental issue.

MS. MCGINTY: Thanks to my partner, Gene. Good afternoon. I just want to underscore a few of the points that Gene made, maybe elaborate briefly.

First of all, today President Clinton is exercising strong leadership in putting forth a bold plan to take on the challenge of global climate change. Four points that I think are worth underscoring and emphasizing: The President's exercise of leadership today will, first and foremost, get this country moving today to begin to secure the opportunities we have before us to reduce emissions, to improve the environment and to seize economic opportunity in doing that.

How? One, through a very innovative new initiative on tax incentives to encourage investments in energy-efficiency, renewable energy, in encouraging the turnover of older, less efficient capital stock -- things like that. Second, through a program of designing and affording credit to industries who are willing to step up to the plate and take action early -- earlier than any of the periods that are being discussed in the international arena. The President will want to work in partnership with industry, affording them credit for taking early action to reduce emissions, through new investments in the important technologies that the United States can develop and has the opportunity to lead the world in developing.

And, fourth, and importantly, by unleashing the forces of competition in the electricity markets. Today, electricity generation and transmission is governed by rules that in some instances are 70 years old. That antiquated system has stifled some of the most efficient and effective technologies we have that can dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity

sector. The President is putting that forward today, something we can begin to move forward on that can help us to reduce emissions and seize tremendous economic opportunity.

The President has underscored in previous statements on this issue that today we throw out two-thirds of the energy we generate. These policies are about capturing those inefficiencies, enhancing the economy and the environment at the same time. So the first principle, through the President's leadership, we are getting to work today.

Second, the President's leadership increases our ability to bring the entire world to a binding, but realistic and achievable set of goals in reducing greenhouse gas emission -- binding first. Why? Because our experience since 1992, the Rio Earth Summit, shows us that simply voluntary actions aren't sufficient to meeting this challenge. The voluntary actions have achieved some reductions, but not enough, and we have continued to see emissions grow.

So the President is saying it's time to give the issue the seriousness it merits; binding reductions are very important. But those reductions should be realistic and achievable. What the issue really demands is action, not the pie in the sky kind of rhetoric we've heard, nor the doomsday scenarios we've heard, either -- 1990 levels by the year 2008 to 2012 is significant, first; it represents a reduction in U.S. emissions on the order of 28 percent from where we would otherwise be in the year 2010. But it's realistic and achievable. As Gene underscored, the President is seizing on this decade of opportunity we have from 1998 to 2008 to find those ways to harness market forces to help us get this job done.

That leads to the third principle. The President's leadership here is about harnessing market forces to help us to achieve environmental objectives in a cost-effective way and in a way that helps us build new industries. We have great experience in this country in using market forces to reduce the costs of achieving environmental goals.

The Clean Air Act has provided us with a wonderful example. We've reduced the emissions that cause acid rain by more than 40 percent of what was required under the law for less than a tenth of the price that was predicted. How? Because we used innovative means, a marketable permit scheme, where firms can trade among themselves the right and the obligations to reduce emissions. We've reached targets that way, but in a much more cost-effective manner. So the President is exerting leadership here by saying we will put those market forces to work to help us take on this objective.

Fourth and finally, the President's leadership is also about recognizing that climate change is a global challenge and it, therefore, requires a global solution. The United States has put proposals on the table that can help encourage the participation of

developing countries -- our initiative on joint implementation, for example, where U.S. businesses can act in partnership with developing countries jointly to reduce emissions.

And today the President will emphasize this important principle again and underscore that for the U.S. to undertake binding obligations, we will secure the participation of developing countries in this effort as well. And as you saw last week, the President has made this a priority as he has spoken to leaders around the world, and was joined last weekend by President Menem as President Menem recognized also that developing countries have to be part of the solution as well.

So with these four principles, the President is putting us on the road today to take on this challenge in a way that will significantly reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, that offers us the promise of seeking and achieving a global agreement on this issue, and that will unleash market forces so that we can secure new and important economic opportunities as we pursue our goals.

Thank you.

MR. STERN: Let me say just a couple of things briefly on the international context. Gene and Katie have already alluded to a number of the more salient factors involved in the negotiation. As you know, international attention to climate change did not begin last month, and it won't end at Kyoto. As important as Kyoto is, this is part of an ongoing process that the world community is going to have to engage in over the course of the coming decades.

I think what has changed in the relatively recent past is the attention that the leaders of the world themselves are paying to this issue. It has, over the course of the last six months, been a topic of conversation in numerous presidential meetings, of our President with his counterparts from around the world. As Katie alluded, in just the last few days, the President has been on the phone with a number of his colleagues from other industrialized countries talking about Kyoto, about the approach that we are all taking. He has also, I might add, been consulting in follow-ups to the climate change conference with industry leaders, environmentalists, and others to discuss how we move forward in a realistic fashion.

The second point I would make is factual. As you probably are aware, our negotiators are in Bonn this week and will be there next week in the final set of formal discussions before the Kyoto Conference itself. The positions that the President announces this afternoon will be tabled by our negotiators and they will pursue those positions over the course of the next week and a half.

Third, I just wanted to re-emphasize some of the key negotiating instructions, position, what we have laid out as our position this afternoon, which are relevant for the international negotiations.

First, Gene mentioned the target and timetable itself, the 2008 to 2012 period returning to 1990 levels of emissions.

Secondly, as I think Katie mentioned, flexibility is of key importance. It is an essential component of the President's domestic agenda on climate change; it must be an essential component of the international agenda on climate change. That means international emissions trading; it means international joint implementation proposals and mechanisms so that the most cost-effective means of reducing emissions are available to all the countries of the world to seize.

Third, the President will say this afternoon, as I think both my colleagues have mentioned, that the United States cannot assume binding obligations in this area without developing country participation. The developing countries of the world will, over the course of the next couple of decades, become the most significant, in quantitative terms, emitters of greenhouse gases. That is notwithstanding the fact that, to date, the developed countries have been. Thus, as a matter of science as well as policy, we simply cannot solve this problem without the participation of developing countries.

Now, in pursuit of that, we have made quite clear, Katie alluded to the President's discussions with President Menem -- this has been the subject of numerous consultations at a staff and ministerial level as well, and this will be an important component of our negotiators' positions taken in Bonn and all the way to Kyoto.

I think I'll stop there. Who is running the questions here?

Q The word "bold" isn't very -- the environmentalists don't think this is very bold. You haven't mentioned -- emissions. It's a real retreat, is it not?

MS. MCGINTY: Let me say, first of all, that many in the environmental community have spoken very favorably, especially to the President's insistence that we are going to get to work now. The President's idea that we will offer incentives to industry to step up to the plate and take early actions to reduce emissions is a proposal that is very important to the environmental groups and that they support wholeheartedly.

Would they like to see additional reductions, reductions on the order of what the European countries and others have been talking about? Certainly. Would some in the business community like to have seen less reductions? Certainly. But what the President has put together here is an ambitious plan that will reduce U.S. emissions by 28 percent in the year 2010. It's an aggressive plan to move us forward.

Q -- on developing countries -- you talk in terms of

assuring that developing countries must participate in whatever regime results. But I don't hear you saying that there would have to be some point at which they accept binding obligations. Would there be, perhaps at a later date, perhaps on a case-by-case basis different standards, but are you going to propose in Kyoto that there be binding totals and limits on the developing nations?

MR. STERN: As I said a moment ago, our position is one of the indispensability of participation. The nature of that participation is to be defined obviously in the course of negotiations. I think it is useful, however, to refer to President Menem's own observations on the subject last week where he did make reference to the need for developing countries to take on obligations on emissions as well.

Q How is this package tailored to meet the requirements on the Hill and to win the ratification you'll need for anything coming out of Kyoto?

MR. STERN: That's the next briefing. (Laughter.)

MR. SPERLING: Well, I think that there is no question that, despite what some, for honorable reasons in the environmental community might have preferred, I think in what was considered the range of potential options the President did pick will probably be perceived on the Hill as the most ambitious within that range.

But the President is also I think providing people assurance that what he is going to be presenting to Congress -- what we will present in our budget in detail further -- is the type of things that we think the country should be able to rally behind, which is the focus on R&D and technology, tax incentives to encourage more use of renewable energy sources. I think that this is the type of mobilization that I think many people would consider win-win, market-based solutions. And the fact that there is review in different stages I think reflects the concern that people would have that we would, in the year 1997, seek to say that we knew exactly how a decade from now exactly what would be the right -- what energy prices would be, where the technology would have been. I mean, most people, if we were to look back 13 years wouldn't look very good at predicting the Internet and other things.

So I think when you're trying to deal with something like this and have binding targets, it is a sensible approach to assure people that you are going to try to do all of the positive things that people can rally around first, and see how far you can get there and assure people that you are going to be reviewing the science and the economics periodically, so that when the time comes that you do put forward an emissions trading program you do have a decade of experience and review behind us.

And, ultimately, Congress and the President, at a later

time, will ultimately have to pass things and have that judgement. So I think the President has put a sensible path that I think should also be reassuring to people on the Hill that we are taking a sensible path. I don't know what the specifics the President has put forward, people should find particularly objectionable.

Q Gene, you make it sound as if this plan, 30 percent reductions, is almost entirely painless.

MR. SPERLING: Well, let me go back five years on our budget. There were people who said at that point that if we did not do something dramatic -- dramatic reduction on Medicaid or Medicare, dramatic increase on discretionary budget -- if we didn't do those things we would never get near balance.

Now, we put forward what we thought at the time was a prudent plan to go forward, under the notion that it would not make sense to rush to do things that may not be necessary, that you should try to do things in a prudent, sensible, market-based way. As it's turned out, that plan and the subsequent growth of the economy has led us to arrive at a goal. Looking back five years, having done more controversial, more painful things would not have made sense when we were able to reach that goal.

The President takes the approach here that there is tremendous -- as Katie described, tremendous inefficiencies out there. There is tremendous potential to alert the American public and to work with industry to capitalize on the inefficiencies that are out there. And by alerting the public and making the public more conscious, you do start to create the market for more people to think that there is profit to be made and reason to research and to do more. And to give you a chance to have a positive cycles.

Now, in the years 2008-2012, when you're in that binding period and you have emissions trading, that is the period where there could be arguments as to what the possible impacts would be on energy. But the truth is, it's pretty hard for any of us to know. And so I think the President, in providing a sensible path, in going forward and making sure that we are doing all of the win-win, positive things first, that down the road Congress and the President will have to evaluate whether those have been enough and whether we have to take more strenuous steps.

Q So no increase in energy prices?

MR. SPERLING: The plan that we have as you look forward does not include increased energy prices. I think that one has to acknowledge that one you enter the emissions trading period in 2008, that there will probably be costs, those emissions. But how much and what the price of energy will be and what kind of success we've had at having other efficiencies by then is, again, very hard to predict. I doubt people would have predicted the tremendous real decrease in gasoline oil prices we've had.

Q Do you have a target for the five-year period after 2012 for those reductions?

MS. MCGINTY: The President will indicate that the United States proposal includes both a binding target of reaching 1990 levels emissions between the year 2008 and 2012; and that then in the next five-year period of years, that emissions should be reduced below 1990 levels. And the extent to which they should be reduced is an issue that we will take up in the international arena and have discussions there.

MR. SPERLING: I'm just going to let Larry follow up on mine, and then we'll take the next question.

DEPUTY SECRETARY SUMMERS: Thank you, Gene.

If I could just add, this is a helping-hand approach, rather than a heavy-handed approach to working to reduce energy consumption. It doesn't provide for mandated increases in prices on energy over the next decade. And it does contain a number of provisions that are likely to work to reduce energy costs.

Those provisions include measures that will support the introduction of technologies that will increase fuel efficiency, such as vehicles that have more miles per gallon. Those provisions include measures that by encouraging energy conservation will reduce demand for energy, which will tend to reduce its price worldwide. And those provisions include electricity restructuring, which by harnessing competition in an important network industry has the potential to bring down the costs of energy to consumers, just as we've seen in telecommunications and in airlines, and that on fairly conservative estimates could mean as much as \$20 billion to households.

So this is an approach that is, as Gene has emphasized, one that is very much focused on doing all we can over the next decade to exploit win-win solutions that can come from harnessing market forces to do things that are both good for the economy and good for the environment.

Q Can I stay on this question of cost for a second? What you guys are saying is we're kind of hazy in this 2008 to 2012 period, we can't know for sure. But I seriously doubt that the administration's economic team would have signed off on these 1990 levels without doing a hard analysis that said, based upon our knowledge now we predict that this scheme would mean energy cost of X by the year 2008 or 2010 or 2012. Are you saying you don't and haven't done that? Or if you have, what are the numbers?

MR. SPERLING: First of all, I think we were pretty clear that, as Larry said, there is not a mandated energy price increase between the year 1998 and 2008. We're acknowledging that in the binding -- in the emissions trading period that it can't be ruled out that there could be some effect on energy prices. We're saying

that part of that is going to depend on what the success of the variety of different efforts, many of the nine steps that the President has had there.

Q Well, what I'm saying is, haven't you guys done an analysis that say best case scenario it's X, worst case scenario it's Y. And if you have, won't you share that with us?

MR. SPERLING: I think I'll let Larry speak. First of all, there is -- you know, I've been around here five years. If you want an econometric model to show you something 13 years out, you can do anything you want. You can show anything that you want. What we're trying to do is --

Q We'll keep that in mind the next time you --
(laughter.)

MR. SPERLING: What's that? The next time that we predict what a particular policy right now will be 13 from now with an econometric model, you can be free to show that to me, and I would say you'd have a hard time showing a time in the past that we've tried to predict 13 years out in that sense. But we have certainly been locked in doing a tremendous amount of economic analysis. When you look at the things there, you will see, for example in the five-lab study, that there is, from the Energy Department, there is very careful analysis on what the potential is for reducing metric million tons of carbon through the efficiencies in the three main sectors --the building, the transportation, and the industrial sectors.

As Larry said, and this really is the first time today that the President will be and is announcing that he will be supporting an electricity restructuring proposal, there is certainly in that area a tremendous amount of waste because there is not incentives to capture the full amount of energy that is used.

We have gone through all of this analysis, but I think that what we have tried to do, and I think what the economic team has worked to stress, was to recognize where there is really is uncertainty, that rather than to try to pretend that you can draw a road map from here to Los Angeles with every street and turn in it over the next 13 years, is to try to have a process where we have the ability to incorporate what we are learning, what we are seeing, what works. That is, I think, the soundest and most realistic approach for us going forward.

We clearly think that if things -- if this country mobilizes the right way, that we can get there without having a significant price increase, even after the year 2008. One of the things that will be a key element, and I can let Larry speak to that, is the success of having a truly international system with international trading. Where you allow for the most market efficiencies, where people have the ability to seek out the places where there is the greatest capacity to reduce carbon greenhouse gas

emissions at the lowest price, that will be one of the most key elements in determining how much we can do this in a cost-effective way.

And that's one of the points one has to understand in climate change. When you reduce a million metric tons of carbon, when you reduce carbon emissions anywhere in the globe, it has the same impact. And so having a system develop over time that allows that to happen will be absolutely critical and vital to what the costs are. If you assume that that will work very well, extremely well, then you can have very, very, very, very low cost impacts. If you assume that it won't, then it would be more difficult.

And I think, again, what we've tried to do is incorporate a process where we can constantly review that and where the country can make adjustments accordingly.

Q I just want to get back to something you didn't finish. Do you have a targeted number, or any range --

MS. MCGINTY: We're not specifying a number at this time.

Q At what point would you get around to specifying a number?

MS. MCGINTY: To hearken back to what Gene has outlined, at this point the President is outlining a very clear plan that takes us, not from today to tomorrow, but a clear plan for the next decade, for the five years that follow that decade, in that five years to hit 1990 levels on average between 2008 and 2012, and beyond, to say we need then to move to reduce emissions below 1990 levels. We're not going to specify that specific target today.

Q When will the period come when you begin to specify?

MS. MCGINTY: It's still under discussion.

Q Is it within the next year or is it --

MR. STERN: The point I think that Katie just made is we're not going to start negotiating in public. That's why we have negotiators who go to Bonn and then to Kyoto.

Q How does the \$5 billion in tax cuts on R&D break down? And over what period of time would that be? And when you might get something like that before Congress?

MR. SPERLING: That will be in our fiscal year 1999 budget. We met, the team working on this, with the budget team, including Frank Raines, and we tried to almost do an early budget review so that we could make sure that we have room in our budget for a significant initiative. And so what we are comfortable doing this

time is announcing that there will be a \$5 billion, or at least a \$5 billion in R&D and tax incentives. What the exact composition is of those will be announced with the rest of our budget.

Q Over what period of time will that \$5 billion --

MR. SPERLING: That's \$5 billion over five years. So at least \$1 billion a year of additional funds beyond -- or tax incentives beyond what we have currently.

Q If I could follow up, Gene, you said that most of those ideas, or many of them, will come from this report from the President's committee on science and technology. So could you at least outline a few or highlight a few from that report that are likely to be in your package?

MR. SPERLING: We are announcing almost, as you see, almost every element we have now. It is not our intention to announce the specifics of every single thing we're going to do now, quite honestly. This is something the President cares very deeply about. He wants to return to this, and we will roll out the details of our plan periodically. But also, you have to understand, we do our budget review in the first two weeks of December, and so we will have time and opportunity to spell out in detail as we present our budget the exact specifics. Certainly, the -- recommendations will be highly considered and certainly many of those will make it into our budget.

Q How flexible, Gene, are you going to be in the negotiations this week, next week, up to Kyoto, with regard to your binding target proposal for the industrialized world? Is this a take it or leave it proposal from the United States, or are you flexible enough in these pending negotiations to perhaps strengthen the binding targets the President outlined today?

MR. SPERLING: This is our position; this is a position that the President has worked on himself. He has developed this plan himself. He took this from a variety of different recommendations, all of this, gave him -- he pulled different pieces and put together a strategy that he feels comfortable with. This is our position. And when I say that we're not seeing anymore, I'm not commenting one way or the other on what would happen in negotiations. This is our position and this is where we stand.

Q Gene, what has happened since the time the President set the year 2000 as the goal? What's changed since then?

MS. MCGINTY: I think this is an important point. We have a lot of attention to this issue now because Kyoto is on the horizon, but the fact is that the President has been hard at work on this issue since 1993. First, he reversed the position of the previous administration and signed the United States up to the goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000. He followed that immediately with a 50-point plan to help

us to achieve that goal.

Now, that plan has delivered very significant reductions in emissions from where they otherwise would have been. Did it get us or are we on track to get to the year 2000? As we articulated more than a year and a half ago, we are not on track to do that. Why? One, economic growth has been quite robust and more robust than even we had anticipated in the beginning of 1993. Two, oil prices have proven to be lower than were anticipated in early 1993. But, three, and most compellingly and importantly, is that the Congress had as part of its anti-environmental agenda, had not funded the President's initiatives in energy efficiency and renewable energy. Now, despite those three factors, the President's efforts have delivered significant emissions reductions from where we otherwise would have been, on the order of about -- for the jargon -- on the order of about 40 million metric tons of carbon emissions.

You will see today major utilities in the United States standing up and saying that the President has outlined today a very sensible and very strong policy to move forward on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Many of those utilities have been working in partnership with us since 1993, with the President's leadership. They have signed up voluntarily and have voluntarily reduced their emissions significantly.

So we have been at this consistently since 1993. Kyoto presents us an opportunity with taking this issue now to the next steps where we can join together with the world community, looking beyond the year 2000 and the steps that have to be taken then.

Q Are the utilities that began participating in '93 going to get credit for those reductions?

MS. MCGINTY: One of the points that the President wants to emphasize today is that we will build a program to provide credit for those who will take early action. As part of our effort to do this, to undertake this effort in partnership with industry, we will work with them, we will work with members of the environmental community to put the details of that initiative together.

But the idea is simple: We want to incentivize industry to take action now to reduce emissions -- not to wait until the year 2008 to begin. If we have a marketable permit scheme in the year 2008, for example, then what we would be talking about here is working with industries so that they could get credits to play in that tradeable permit scheme that would be set up in the year 2008 for the actions that they take to reduce emissions now. That's one of the ideas we would pursue.

Q Does that have budgetary impact, the provision of credits --

MS. MCGINTY: Budgetary in what sense?

Q Does it cost any money off the budget? Is it a tax incentive? I don't understand your credit.

MS. MCGINTY: No. The notion of a marketable permit system is that you provide permits to various actors in the economy and they have a choice: They can reduce their emissions to the level required, or if it's more cost effective for them, they can purchase permits from other players in the economy who have not only met their target, but gone over and above it. And the idea is simply that those who take actions now won't be penalized for having taken action early, and that those reductions in emissions that they achieve will be recognized when the binding period comes into play.

Q -- this document, it does indicate here, we reject the European proposal for more stringent early reductions. Would you remind us of the reasons for that rejection?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, I'll first of all remind you of what the European policy is. Overall, the European Union has called for a 15 percent reduction from 1990 levels by the year 2010. Now, the reasons that that approach is not appropriate for the United States, that we feel is not realistic or achievable, is also related to why we believe our plan is significant, but realistic and achievable.

The President's plan will reduce U.S. emissions by 30 percent from where they otherwise would be in the year 2010. That's an ambitious undertaking. To go further and add to it 10 or 15 percent additional reductions, we don't believe is realistic or achievable in the time period that we are looking at. It just underscores the fact that what we've tried to do here is a very significant and ambitious plan, but one that is built on the opportunities that we know that are out there, that can enable us to get started now and seize some economic opportunities; that's what the President's target represents.

Q What's the number now, from this point to back to 1990 levels? I've heard between 15 percent and 20 percent. What is it from today's date?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, in the year 2000, business as usual, it would be 13 percent. But do we know today -- I think it's about 7.5 percent -- 7.5 percent. Today I think we are on the order of about 7.5 percent above 1990 levels of emissions.

Q -- you expect emissions in the United States to start --

Q What's the point of having an economic review of how we're doing five years out if we're committing to binding targets? I mean, if you're saying we absolutely will meet these by this date, and your economic review says, geez, you know what, it's going to cost a lot more money than we thought it would? There's no

opt out, is there?

MS. MCGINTY: The notion of economic reviews as scientific reviews is just common sense. We are putting forward here some very ambitious ideas that we think can deliver both environmental and economic results. But we want to make sure we are seizing all the best opportunities that are out there, and the point of that review is to make sure that all the best ideas are ideas that we are implementing.

Q If you don't envision a clause that lets you out -- is what I'm asking, is there any clause that lets you out of this? If it says this is going to cost a lot more than we thought and we can opt out or not, is it really binding?

MS. MCGINTY: It is a binding treaty and it's very important to the President and a principle that he has consistently put forward is that we are now moving into a period where binding emissions reductions are absolutely required, certainly.

Q So there's no -- if five years from now we say it's going to cost a lot more money --

MS. MCGINTY: Look, there's no treaty in the world that would require a country to bankrupt itself. And this treaty is no different than any other treaty in the world in that respect.

Q When does the United States expect to stop increasing its greenhouse gas emissions and start decreasing them? How will we know if we're not performing, because the track record so far is one of saying you are going to meet targets and then missing them, saying you were going to review them and then postponing them. When are we going to actually turn the corner and start cutting down?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, let me just say that the whole point of the series of efforts that we have announced today is to enable us not to wait until the year 2008, but to move forward now. We are going to do our level best through providing the tax incentives we've spoken about, by designing a program that affords credit to industries for taking early action, by investing in new technologies to begin to turn those curves just as soon as we can. But we are moving as ambitiously and as aggressively as we can toward that target period.

Q When do you expect U.S. greenhouse gas emissions to start going down?

MS. MCGINTY: From where they would otherwise be, we would hope --

Q To stop going up. They're going up. It's a very simple question.

MS. MCGINTY: You may be on a level of technical detail that I can't provide.

Q Can anybody say when the emissions are going to start going down?

Q The EU has put forward a much stricter proposal and the developing countries in Bonn just signed a statement saying they support the EU proposals. So how good do you think the chances are of getting a treaty out of Kyoto?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, let me underscore, this is a very difficult undertaking, and the President is addressing it with tremendous seriousness of purpose, as was referred to here before. He has worked this issue very hard with leaders from around the world. Now, I just say and underscore that U.N. processes operate

often, and this one does, on the basis of consensus proposals and moving forward on a consensus basis.

What we are trying to do here is not only hear the voices who want to go much quicker, much further, much faster, but recall that there are many voices out there, too, many countries who are saying much less, much slower, if not, nothing at all. And what we are trying to do is provide that leadership that can hopefully take those two extremes of the debate and find that common ground that would enable the world to move forward in a reasonable and effective way in the years post-2000.

Q I don't understand the global thing. Could I just ask for clarification on what the President today envisages in the treaty with regard to global obligations from the developing countries? Would it necessarily be binding targets and timetables, or could it take another form?

MR. MCCURRY: That's been asked and answered.

Q That's not been answered.

MR. MCCURRY: It's been answered as well as it's going to be answered.

Q The previous proposals on developing countries, do they still stick? That is, some may -- that the large developing countries should graduate into commitment, into binding targets? What's been going on the last six months, does that still hold?

MR. STERN: Well, I'm not sure exactly what you're referring to, but what I think you are bringing up is the nature of the problem, which as I said earlier, there is general agreement that the problem of global warming, of global climate change, is not going to be resolved without the participation of developing countries.

What, when and exactly what participation will mean is obviously what our guys are going to be doing in Kyoto, and therefore, it is premature to indicate exactly what that means.

What we can say, and what the President will say this afternoon is we will not assume binding emission reduction obligations without the participation of the developing countries.

Q On the post-2012 role, you all are saying you are not taking a specific target. But yesterday environmental groups say that they were told there would be a five percent reduction as a goal and then that was abandoned last night. Can you say why that -- the President backed off that as a specific target?

MS. MCGINTY: That is a number that some of the environmental community have suggested. We just have not arrived at a number and are not prepared to discuss one right now.

Q They said the administration told them that. That's not true?

MS. MCGINTY: It's a number that I've heard them discuss.

Q But you all never told them that?

MS. MCGINTY: No.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END 2:04 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Sharolyn A. Rosier
Lori E. Abrams
Jeannetta P. Allen
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie @ OVP@EOP
Patrick Aylward
Robin J. Bachman
Kyle M. Baker
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Alexander L. Boyle
Lanny A. Breuer
Patrick E. Briggs

Katharine Button
Robin J. Bachman
Barbara D. Woolley
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
David K. Chai
Steven A. Cohen
Julianne B. Corbett
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Anna E. Cushing
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Elliot J. Diringier
Jennifer D. Dudley
Daniel W. Burkhardt
Diane Ikemiyashiro
Dorian V. Weaver
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen C. Fahle
Karen E. Finney
Carmen B. Fowler
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Jessica L. Gibson
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Peter D. Greenberger
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Maureen A. Hudson
Thomas D. Janenda
david t. johnson
Leanne I. Johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
Julie E. Mason
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Allison J. King
Joshua A. King
Catherine T. Kitchen
Sarah S. Freeman
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis

Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Tanya E. Martin
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Estela Mendoza
R. Scott Michaud
Elisa Millsap
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Tamara Monosoff
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.
Sean P. Maloney
Michael V. Terrell
Steven J. Naplan
Mark D. Neschis
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Michael A. O'Mary
Jonathan Orszag
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Victoria Radd
Nelson Reyneri
Charles F. Ruff
Peter Rundlet
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
Roger V. Salazar
G. Timothy Saunders
Judithanne V. Scourfield
Brooks Scoville
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
June Shih
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik

Maria E. Soto
Aviva Steinberg
Todd Stern
Darby E. Stott
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Tracy F. Sisser
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Glen M. Weiner
Lowell A. Weiss
Woyneab M. Wondwossen
Debra S. Wood
William H. White Jr.
meglynn @ usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BALDERSTON_A @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
DICKY_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOb@MRP@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY

newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
10/22/97 04:01:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-10-22 President's Remarks on Global Climate Change

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release October 22, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

National Geographic Society
Washington, D.C.

2:57 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Vice President, to all of you who are here. I thank especially the members of Congress who are here, the leaders of labor and business who are here, all the members of the administration, and especially the White House staff members that the Vice President mentioned and the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the EPA, and the others who have helped us to come to this moment.

On the way in here we were met by the leaders of the National Geographic, and I complimented them on their recent two-part series on the Roman Empire. It's a fascinating story of how the Empire rose, how it sustained itself for hundreds of years, why it fell, and speculations on what, if any, relevance it might have to the United States and, indeed, the West.

And one of the gentlemen said, well, you know, we got a lot of interesting comments on that, including a letter referencing a statue we had of the bust of Emperor Vespasian. And one of our readers said, why in the world did you put a statue of Gene Hackman in a piece on the Roman Empire? (Laughter.) And I say that basically to say, in some senses, the more things change, the more

they remain the same. (Laughter.)

For what sustains any civilization, and now what will sustain all of our civilizations, is the constant effort at renewal, the ability to avoid denial and to proceed into the future in a way that is realistic and humane, but resolute. Six years ago tomorrow, not long after I started running for President, I went back to my alma mater at Georgetown and began a series of three speeches outlining my vision for America in the 21st century -- how we could keep the American Dream alive for all of our people, how we could maintain America's leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity, and how we could come together across the lines that divide us as one America.

And together, we've made a lot of progress in the last nearly five years now that the Vice President and I have been privileged to work at this task. At the threshold of a new century, our economy is thriving, our social fabric is mending, we've helped to lead the world toward greater peace and cooperation.

I think this has happened, in no small measure, in part because we had a different philosophy about the role of government. Today, it is smaller and more focused and more oriented toward giving people the tools and the conditions they need to solve their own problems and toward working in partnership with our citizens. More important, I believe it's happened because we made tough choices but not false choices.

On the economy, we made the choice to balance the budget and to invest in our people and our future. On crime, we made the choice to be tough and smart about prevention and changing the conditions in which crime occurs. On welfare, we made the choice to require work, but also to support the children of people who have been on welfare. On families, we made the choice to help parents find more and better jobs and to have the necessary time and

resources for their children. And on the environment, we made the choice to clean our air, water, and land, to improve our food supply, and to grow the economy.

This kind of commonsense approach, rooted in our most basic values and our enduring optimism about the capacity of free people to meet the challenges of every age must be brought to bear on the work that remains to pave the way for our people and for the world toward a new century and a new millenium.

Today we have a clear responsibility and a golden opportunity to conquer one of the most important challenges of the 21st century -- the challenge of climate change -- with an environmentally sound and economically strong strategy, to achieve meaningful reductions in greenhouse gases in the United States and throughout the industrialized and the developing world. It is a strategy that, if properly implemented, will create a wealth of new

opportunities for entrepreneurs at home, uphold our leadership abroad, and harness the power of free markets to free our planet from an unacceptable risk; a strategy as consistent with our commitment to reject false choices.

America can stand up for our national interest and stand up for the common interest of the international community. America can build on prosperity today and ensure a healthy planet for our children tomorrow.

In so many ways the problem of climate change reflects the new realities of the new century. Many previous threats could be met within our own borders, but global warming requires an international solution. Many previous threats came from single enemies, but global warming derives from millions of sources. Many previous threats posed clear and present danger; global warming is far more subtle, warning us not with roaring tanks or burning rivers but with invisible gases, slow changes in our surroundings, increasingly severe climatic disruptions that, thank God, have not yet hit home for most Americans. But make no mistake, the problem is real. And if we do not change our course now, the consequences sooner or later will be destructive for America and for the world.

The vast majority of the world's climate scientists have concluded that if the countries of the world do not work together to cut the emission of greenhouse gases, then temperatures will rise and will disrupt the climate. In fact, most scientists say the process has already begun. Disruptive weather events are increasing. Disease-bearing insects are moving to areas that used to be too cold for them. Average temperatures are rising. Glacial formations are receding.

Scientists don't yet know what the precise consequences will be. But we do know enough now to know that the Industrial Age has dramatically increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, where they take a century or more to dissipate; and that the process must be slowed, then stopped, then reduced if we want to continue our economic progress and preserve the quality of life in the United States and throughout our planet. We know what we have to do.

Greenhouse gas emissions are caused mostly by the inefficient burning of coal or oil for energy. Roughly a third of these emissions come from industry, a third from transportation, a third from residential and commercial buildings. In each case, the conversion of fuel to energy use is extremely inefficient and could be made much cleaner with existing technologies or those already on the horizon, in ways that will not weaken the economy but in fact will add to our strength in new businesses and new jobs. If we do this properly, we will not jeopardize our prosperity -- we will increase it.

With that principle in mind, I'm announcing the

instruction I'm giving to our negotiators as they pursue a realistic and effective international climate change treaty. And I'm announcing a far-reaching proposal that provides flexible market-based and cost-effective ways to achieve meaningful reductions here in America. I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the treaty is negotiated and ratified to act. The United States has less than 5 percent of the world's people, enjoys 22 percent of the world's wealth, but emits more than 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases. We must begin now to take out our insurance policy on the future.

In the international climate negotiations, the United States will pursue a comprehensive framework that includes three elements, which, taken together, will enable us to build a strong and robust global agreement. First, the United States proposes at Kyoto that we commit to the binding and realistic target of returning to emissions of 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. And we should not stop there. We should commit to reduce emissions below 1990 levels in the five-year period thereafter, and we must work toward further reductions in the years ahead.

The industrialized nations tried to reduce emissions to 1990 levels once before with a voluntary approach, but regrettably, most of us -- including especially the United States -- fell short. We must find new resolve to achieve these reductions, and to do that we simply must commit to binding limits.

Second, we will embrace flexible mechanisms for meeting these limits. We propose an innovative, joint implementation system that allows a firm in one country to invest in a project that reduces emissions in another country and receive credit for those reductions at home. And we propose an international system of emissions trading. These innovations will cut worldwide pollution, keep costs low, and help developing countries protect their environment, too, without sacrificing their economic growth.

Third, both industrialized and developing countries must participate in meeting the challenge of climate change. The industrialized world must lead, but developing countries also must be engaged. The United States will not assume binding obligations unless key developing nations meaningfully participate in this effort.

As President Carlos Menem stated forcefully last week when I visited him in Argentina, a global problem such as climate change requires a global answer. If the entire industrialized world reduces emissions over the next several decades, but emissions from the developing world continue to grow at their current pace, concentrations of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere will continue to climb. Developing countries have an opportunity to chart a different energy future consistent with their growth potential and their legitimate economic aspirations.

What Argentina, with dramatic projected economic growth,

recognizes is true for other countries as well: We can and we must work together on this problem in a way that benefits us all. Here at home, we must move forward by unleashing the full power of free markets and technological innovations to meet the challenge of climate change. I propose a sweeping plan to provide incentives and lift road blocks to help our companies and our citizens find new and creative ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

First, we must enact tax cuts and make research and development investments worth up to \$5 billion over the next five years -- targeted incentives to encourage energy efficiency and the use of cleaner energy sources.

Second, we must urge companies to take early actions to reduce emissions by ensuring that they receive appropriate credit for showing the way.

Third, we must create a market system for reducing emissions wherever they can be achieved most inexpensively, here or abroad; a system that will draw on our successful experience with acid rain permit trading.

Fourth, we must reinvent how the federal government, the nation's largest energy consumer, buys and uses energy. Through new technology, renewable energy resources, innovative partnerships with private firms and assessments of greenhouse gas emissions from major federal projects, the federal government will play an important role in helping our nation to meet its goal. Today, as a down payment on our million solar roof initiative, I commit the federal government to have 20,000 systems on federal buildings by 2010.

Fifth, we must unleash competition in the electricity industry, to remove outdated regulations and save Americans billions of dollars. We must do it in a way that leads to even greater progress in cleaning our air and delivers a significant down payment in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Today, two-thirds of the energy used to provide electricity is squandered in waste heat. We can do much, much better.

Sixth, we must continue to encourage key industry sectors to prepare their own greenhouse gas reduction plans. And we must, along with state and local government, remove the barriers to the most energy efficient usage possible. There are ways the federal government can help industry to achieve meaningful reductions voluntarily, and we will redouble our efforts to do so.

This plan is sensible and sound. Since it's a long-term problem requiring a long-term solution, it will be phased in over time. But we want to get moving now. We will start with our package of strong market incentives, tax cuts, and cooperative efforts with industry. We want to stimulate early action and encourage leadership. And as we reduce our emissions over the next decade with

these efforts, we will perform regular reviews to see what works best for the environment, the economy, and our national security.

After we have accumulated a decade of experience, a decade of data, a decade of technological innovation, we will launch a broad emissions trading initiative to ensure that we hit our binding targets. At that time, if there are dislocations caused by the changing patterns of energy use in America, we have a moral obligation to respond to those to help the workers and the enterprises affected -- no less than we do today by any change in our economy which affects people through no fault of their own.

This plan plays to our strengths -- innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship. Our companies already are showing the way by developing tremendous environmental technologies and implementing commonsense conservation solutions.

Just yesterday, Secretary Pena announced a dramatic breakthrough in fuel cell technology, funded by the Department of Energy research -- a breakthrough that will clear the way toward developing cars that are twice as efficient as today's models and reduce pollution by 90 percent. The breakthrough was made possible by our path-breaking partnership with the auto industry to create a new generation of vehicles. A different design, producing similar results, has been developed by a project funded by the Defense Advanced Research Products Agency and the Commerce Department's National Institute of Science and Technology.

The Energy Department discovery is amazing in what it does. Today, gasoline is used very inefficiently in internal combustion engines -- about 80 percent of its energy capacity is lost. The DOE project announced yesterday by A.D. Little and Company uses 84 percent of the gasoline directly going into the fuel cell. That's increased efficiency of more than four times traditional engine usage.

And I might add, from the point of view of all the people that are involved in the present system, continuing to use gasoline means that you don't have to change any of the distribution systems that are out there. It's a very important, but by no means the only, discovery that's been made that points the way toward the future we have to embrace.

I also want to emphasize, however, that most of the technologies available for meeting this goal through market mechanisms are already out there -- we simply have to take advantage of them. For example, in the town of West Branch, Iowa, a science teacher named Hector Ibarra challenged his 6th graders to apply their classroom experiments to making their school more energy efficient. The class got a \$14,000 loan from a local bank and put in place easily available solutions. The students cut the energy use in their school by 70 percent. Their savings were so impressive that the bank decided to upgrade its own energy efficiency. (Laughter.)

Following the lead of these 6th graders -- (laughter) -- other major companies in America have shown similar results. You have only to look at the proven results achieved by companies like Southwire, Dow Chemical, Dupont, Kraft, Interface Carpetmakers, and any number of others in every sector of our economy to see what can be done.

Our industries have produced a large group of efficient new refrigerators, computers, washer/dryers, and other appliances that use far less energy, save money, and cut pollution. The revolution in lighting alone is truly amazing. One compact fluorescent lamp, used by one person over its lifetime, can save nearly a ton of carbon dioxide emissions from the atmosphere, and save the consumer money.

If over the next 15 years everyone were to buy only those energy-efficient products marked in stores with EPA's distinctive "Energy Star" label, we could shrink our energy bills by a total of about \$100 billion over the next 15 years and dramatically cut greenhouse gas emissions.

Despite these win-win innovations and commitments that are emerging literally every day, I know full well that some will criticize our targets and timetables as too ambitious. And, of course, others will say we haven't gone far enough. But before the debate begins in earnest, let's remember that over the past generation, we've produced tremendous environmental progress, including in the area of energy efficiency, at far less expense than anyone could have imagined. And in the process, whole new industries have been built.

In the past three decades, while our economy has grown, we have raised, not lowered, the standards for the water our children drink. While our factories have been expanding, we have required them to clean up their toxic waste. While we've had record numbers of new homes, our refrigerators save more energy and more money for our consumers.

In 1970, when smog was choking our cities, the federal government proposed new standards for tailpipe emissions. Many environmental leaders claim the standards would do little to head off catastrophe. Industry experts predicted the cost of compliance would

devastate the industry. It turned out both sides were wrong. Both underestimated the ingenuity of the American people. Auto makers comply with today's much stricter emissions standards for far less than half the cost predicted, and new cars emit on average only 5 percent of the pollutants of the cars built in 1970.

We've seen this pattern over and over and over again. We saw it when we joined together in the '70s to restrict the use of the carcinogen, vinyl chloride. Some in the plastics industry

predicted massive bankruptcies, but chemists discovered more cost-effective substitutes and the industries thrived. We saw this when we phased out lead and gasoline. And we see it in our acid rain trading program -- now 40 percent ahead of schedule -- at costs less than 50 percent of even the most optimistic cost projections. We see it as the chlorofluorocarbons are being taken out of the atmosphere at virtually no cost in ways that apparently are beginning finally to show some thickening of the ozone layer again.

The lesson here is simple: Environmental initiatives, if sensibly designed, flexibly implemented, cost less than expected and provide unforeseen economic opportunities. So while we recognize that the challenge we take on today is larger than any environmental mission we have accepted in the past, climate change can bring us together around what America does best -- we innovate, we compete, we find solutions to problems, and we do it in a way that promotes entrepreneurship and strengthens the American economy.

If we do it right, protecting the climate will yield not costs, but profits; not burdens, but benefits; not sacrifice, but a higher standard of living. There is a huge body of business evidence now showing that energy savings give better service at lower cost with higher profit. We have to tear down barriers to successful markets and we have to create incentives to enter them. I call on American business to lead the way, but I call upon government at every level -- federal, state, and local -- to give business the tools they need to get the job done, and also to set an example in all our operations.

And let us remember that the challenge we face today is not simply about targets and timetables. It's about our most fundamental values and our deepest obligations.

Later today, I'm going to have the honor of meeting with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, the spiritual leader of 300,000,000 Orthodox Christians -- a man who has always stressed the deep obligations inherent in God's gift to the natural world. He reminds us that the first part of the word "ecology" derives from the Greek word for house. In his words, in order to change the behavior toward the house we all share, we must rediscover spiritual linkages that may have been lost and reassert human values. Of course, he is right. It is our solemn obligation to move forward with courage and foresight to pass our home on to our children and future generations.

I hope you believe with me that this is just another challenge in America's long history, one that we can meet in the way we have met all past challenges. I hope that you believe with me that the evidence is clear that we can do it in a way that grows the economy, not with denial, but with a firm and glad embrace of yet another challenge of renewal. We should be glad that we are alive today to embrace this challenge, and we should do it secure in the knowledge that our children and grandchildren will thank us for the endeavor.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

3:24 P.M. EDT

Message Sent

To:

Sharolyn A. Rosier
Lori E. Abrams
Jeannetta P. Allen
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie @ OVP@EOP
Patrick Aylward
Robin J. Bachman
Kyle M. Baker
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Alexander L. Boyle
Lanny A. Breuer
Patrick E. Briggs
Katharine Button
Robin J. Bachman
Barbara D. Woolley
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
David K. Chai
Steven A. Cohen
Julianne B. Corbett
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Anna E. Cushing
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Elliot J. Diringer
Jennifer D. Dudley
Daniel W. Burkhardt
Diane Ikemiyashiro
Dorian V. Weaver
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen C. Fahle
Karen E. Finney
Carmen B. Fowler
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines

Jessica L. Gibson
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Peter D. Greenberger
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Maureen A. Hudson
Thomas D. Janenda
david t. johnson
Leanne I. Johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julia R. Green
Julie E. Mason
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Allison J. King
Joshua A. King
Catherine T. Kitchen
Sarah S. Freeman
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
G N. Lattimore
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Tanya E. Martin
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Estela Mendoza
R. Scott Michaud
Elisa Millsap
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Tamara Monosoff
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.
Sean P. Maloney
Michael V. Terrell
Steven J. Naplan
Mark D. Neschis
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Michael A. O'Mary
Jonathan Orszag
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali

Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Jonathan Prince
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Victoria Radd
Nelson Reyneri
Charles F. Ruff
Peter Rundlet
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
Roger V. Salazar
G. Timothy Saunders
Judithanne V. Scourfield
Brooks Scoville
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
June Shih
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith
Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Maria E. Soto
Aviva Steinberg
Todd Stern
Darby E. Stott
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur/OVP @ OVP
Tracy F. Sisser
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Barry J. Toiv
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Glen M. Weiner
Lowell A. Weiss
Woyneab M. Wondwossen
Debra S. Wood
William H. White Jr.
meglynn @ usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ AI@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ AI@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ AI@CD@LNGTWY

backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BALDERSTON_A @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
DICKEY_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOB@MRP@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAK_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

Kevin S. Moran
10/22/97 05:34:33 PM
Record Type: Record

To: All OPD Users, All WHO Users, All Staff
cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
Subject: White House at Work -- Global Climate Change Policies

Message Copied

To: _____

Lawrence J. Haas/OMB/EOP

SAMBURG_T @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

HAYMES_W @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

FAYER_L @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY

SKOLODA_K @ A1 @ CD @ LNGTWY----- Forwarded by Sharolyn

A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98 02:55 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
11/15/97 03:14:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: 1997-11-15 wetlands remarks

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Sacramento, California)

For Immediate Release
1997

November 15,

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO BUILDERS AND SUPPORTERS OF
THE YOLO BASIN WETLANDS

Yolo Basin Wetlands
Davis,

California

11:45 A.M. PST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. You can't imagine how much I wanted to get out of cold, wet, rainy, windy Washington, D.C. to come to California. (Laughter.) But, after all, this is a wetlands event.

I want to, first of all, thank Sara for her introduction. Didn't she speak well? She was terrific I thought. (Applause.) And listening to her account of the experiences the last several years of her life I think was as good a statement as any as could be made about so many of you who are here and the work you have done to make this day come to pass. I want to thank all of you very much.

I'd like to say a special word of appreciation to your Secretary of Natural Resources Dough Wheeler, and two people who came from Washington with me, our Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Rich Rominger (phonetic), who is from Yolo County. (Applause.) And he's already been mentioned, but our Deputy Secretary of the Interior, John Garamendi, who grew up not far from here. And they've both done a terrific job for you right there. (Applause.)

I thank John Walker for his statement. We were dedicating a wetland in Arkansas once, a few years ago, on a much warmer day. And I was the governor and he was the president, but after all, I'm term-limited and he can go on forever. (Laughter.)

I'm very glad to be here with all of you. I want to thank Robin and Greg for showing me around the area and giving me a chance to look at some of the birds and just see what you've done here. I asked him how many ducks and geese there were going to be here and whether you had any eagles or ospreys or egrets, and I got a pretty good rundown on it.

And I have to say that I have been, as you have heard already, a big supporter of these kinds of endeavors. I thank the people from the California Water Fowl Association, and I do want to say a special word of thanks to two groups with which I have been associated -- first, the folks from the Corps of Engineers. They have not only changed their image, they've changed their reality. They're working hard not only to give us water projects, but to give us the kind of environmental conservation that we need for the long run. And I thank you very much, Colonel, and I thank all the people from the Corps for what you've done. (Applause.)

And let me just echo what was said earlier. I'm very proud of my very long association with Ducks Unlimited. They've done a wonderful job in helping us to bring water fowl back to our state and they do a great job in this country. (Applause.)

Finally, I'd like to say a word of appreciation to Vic Fazio, who is clearly one of the most outstanding members of the United States Congress in either party. If we had a hundred more people like him, America would have no problem. He is a

very good man. (Applause.)

I want to thank Vic not only for his work here, but for the general efforts he's made, along with Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and John Garamendi, for our efforts in the Bay Delta area, and the work that we are doing to try to guarantee the long-term needs of California for water supply, as well as water quality, habitat preservation and environmental progress. And that's very, very good.

Let me say, I wanted to be here today because to me this project is the embodiment of not only what we should be doing as Americans on the edge of a new century, but how we should be doing it. We worked very hard to create a country where things were working for ordinary Americans, where we were coming together across the lines that divide us and where we can be strong enough to continue to lead the world in the right direction. And that bridge that I talked about all the time I'm trying to build to the 21st century is going pretty well. We've got the strongest economy in a generation, crime and welfare are dropping. And our water quality, our air quality, our food safety, they're all improving. We are moving in the right direction.

One of the biggest challenges we will have to continue to face during the entire lifetime of all the children that are here is the challenge of trying to grow our economy and lift our standard of living while improving, not diminishing our environment. That is critical. (Applause.) A great deal of the history of 20th century California is a story of this battle. And the truth is, for most of the 20th century, not only in California but throughout America, whenever people thought about this they either thought, I'm going to develop the economy, the environment will take care of itself, or they felt for a long time, it's unfortunate that we have to give up so much of our environment, but it's a necessary price we have to pay to continue to raise our living standards.

Now we know that is a false choice. And, indeed, we understand that over the long run if we want to preserve our ability to increase our standard of living we have to preserve our national environment and all the things that go with it. (Applause.)

Just for example, Greg Smith and I were talking about this project and how the more you do these projects, the more you're going not only to have what you came here for today, but what you cannot see -- you will lose less water in rain runoff, and you will over time rebuild the aquifers that are below the land, that no one sees and most people don't think about. But that will enable you to sustain your population and to sustain your economic activity.

So again I say, I wanted to come here today because

this is a huge success. You're doing the right thing and you're doing it in the right way. And that's the second point I want to make. If we haven't learned anything in our country in the last few years, I hope we have learned we do not get very far when we just stand off and shout at each other and fight and argue all the time. But we can do anything if roll up or sleeves and get down to work and honestly listen to people who have different experiences, different perspectives, and different genuine interests. That's what you've done here. You've been able to bring everybody together, and I really feel good about that.

Here we are in the shadow of Sacramento. We see the farmlands here, and I promise you, when I crossed that levee

today, I thought I was back home in eastern Arkansas, and I kept

waiting for somebody to give me my waders and a gun to go duck hunting. (Laughter.)

What you have done today was based on the cooperation of state, federal, and local governments, based on public --(inaudible.) That's how we ought to be dealing with all America's problems. You can't name a single problem we've got in this country that we could not make the kind of progress on we're celebrating today, if we didn't approach it the way you have approached this.

And I would implore you to think about what you can do and what you can say to people in this state, and your friends and family members and neighbors all around America, to take this attitude and this approach, not only to our environmental problems, but to all others.

You've been working on this since the late '80s. You ought to be very proud of it. But you ought to also draw confidence from this that there is no challenge facing this country that we cannot meet if we will just do what you have done here.

I am so proud of you -- I know that you believe in it or you wouldn't be standing out here in the cold and rain listening to me talk. (Applause.)

I've just got to make one other point that I think is very important to you here in California. Three years ago we helped to launch the historic Cal-Fed partnership to try to end the water wars and restore the environment and ensure clean and reliable water for generations to come. I just signed legislation, as Vic Fazio said, that makes \$85 million in down payments to match funds that the California voters approved to restore their rivers and marshes in the valleys. In two months the Cal-Fed program will recommend a blueprint for moving forward

with all of our partners in the way I said. We'll be working on habitat restoration, flood protection, integrated from the beginning into all projects designed to meet the other needs of the area. We're going to do it right.

And again I say I'm very grateful to Vic Fazio and to Senator Boxer, Senator Feinstein, and of course, to John Garamendi for their work in this whole process.

And let me also say that -- I want to say a word of thanks to the Corps of Engineers and others who have done all the work in rebuilding after last year's floods. Within the next few weeks, the Corps will finish all remaining repairs. It's the most extensive flood reparation ever done in this short of time, and another reason we should thank the Corps of Engineers for what they've done here. (Applause.)

We're working hard across America on projects like this. We're making progress in reclaiming Florida Everglades, in restoring Lake Tahoe, in saving Yellowstone. We have funds in this latest bill, in our balanced budget plan, to continue this work. But I now can go around the country and talk to other people about what you've done here and tell them you believe in it so much you all showed up and stayed in the wind and the rain in Southern California. (Laughter.)

Well, I've seen the wetlands here today, and some of you may have seen more than you wanted to see. But I'll tell you what else I've seen -- I've seen a glimpse of America's future, and I like it.

Thank you, and God bless you. (Applause.)

END

11:55 A.M. PST

Message Sent

To:

Sharolyn A. Rosier
Lori E. Abrams
Jeannetta P. Allen
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie @ OVP@EOP
Patrick Aylward
Robin J. Bachman
Kyle M. Baker
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Alexander L. Boyle

Lanny A. Breuer
Patrick E. Briggs
Katharine Button
Robin J. Bachman
Allison Balderston
Barbara D. Woolley
Bradley M. Campbell
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
David K. Chai
Nanda Chitre
Steven A. Cohen
Julianne B. Corbett
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Anna E. Cushing
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Elliot J. Diringier
Jennifer D. Dudley
Daniel W. Burkhardt
Diane Ikemiyashiro
Dorian V. Weaver
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen C. Fahle
Julie A. Fernandes
Karen E. Finney
Carmen B. Fowler
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Jessica L. Gibson
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Peter D. Greenberger
Donald Goldberg
Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Maureen A. Hudson
Thomas D. Janenda
david t. johnson
Leanne I. Johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julie E. Mason
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Allison J. King
Joshua A. King
Catherine T. Kitchen
Sarah S. Freeman
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP

Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Tanya E. Martin
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Estela Mendoza
R. Scott Michaud
Elisa Millsap
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Tamara Monosoff
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.
Sean P. Maloney
Michael V. Terrell
Steven J. Naplan
Mark D. Neschis
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Michael A. O'Mary
Jonathan Orszag
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerali
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner
Victoria Radd
Nelson Reyneri
Charles F. Ruff
Peter Rundlet
Virginia N. Rustique
Evan Ryan
Roger V. Salazar
G. Timothy Saunders
Judithanne V. Scourfield
Brooks Scoville
Ruby Shamir
Douglas S. Sheorn
June Shih
David Shipley
Robert M. Shireman
Jake Siewert
Joshua Silverman
Brian D. Smith

Craig T. Smith
Richard Socarides
Douglas B. Sosnik
Maria E. Soto
Aviva Steinberg
Todd Stern
Darby E. Stott
Michael J. Sullivan
Jonathan H. Schnur @ OVP@EOP
Tracy F. Sisser
Sylvia M. Mathews
Lisa Tamagni
Virginia M. Terzano @ ovp@eop
terri tingen
Amy W. Tobe
Barry J. Toiv
Serena C. Torrey
June G. Turner
Dag Vega
Lorraine A. Voles @ ovp@eop
Michael Waldman
Angelina Walker @ ovp@eop
Glen M. Weiner
Lowell A. Weiss
Woyneab M. Wondwossen
Debra S. Wood
William H. White Jr.
meglynn @ usia.gov@INET@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SUNTUM_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
COGDELL_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
backup @ wilson.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
wh-outbox-distr @ clinton.ai.mit.edu@INET@LNGTWY
BARBUSCHAK_K @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOME_M @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
BARTHOLOW_T @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CAPLAN_P @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
CUTLER_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
DICKY_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRAY_W @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
GRIBBEN_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
HAAS_L @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
JOHNSON_WC @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
LIZIK_C @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
MOFFETT_J @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
PR_U=TDIXON@PR_L=AVUOEOb@MRP@LNGTWY
RILEY_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
NAPLAN_S @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
SMITH_BD @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
STUMPF_D @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
TCSmith @ dol.gov@INET@LNGTWY
WEINER_R @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
WOZNIAC_N @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
julie_green @ ed.gov@INET@LNGTWY

usia01 @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY
1=US@2=WESTERN UNION@3=@5=ATT.COM@*ELN\62955104@MRX@LNGTWY
62955104 @ eln.attmail.com@INET@LNGTWY
INFOMGT @ A1@CD@LNGTWY
newsdesk @ usnewswire.com@INET@LNGTWY
usnwire @ access.digex.com@INET@LNGTWY

----- Forwarded by Sharolyn A. Rosier/WHO/EOP on 04/29/98
02:55 PM -----

SUNTUM_M @ A1
12/04/97 06:19:00 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: 1997-12-04 Press Briefing on the VP's Kyoto trip

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 4, 1997

PRESS BRIEFING BY
DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL GENE SPERLING
CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY KATIE MCGINTY
THE VICE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR LEON FUERTH

The Briefing Room

3:03 P.M. EST

MR. SPALTER: Good afternoon. This afternoon, Leon Fuerth, who is Vice President Gore's National Security Advisor, and Katie McGinty, who is chairperson of the Council on Environmental Quality, will provide a briefing on the Vice President's trip this weekend to Kyoto. He is leaving on Saturday. He will be in Kyoto on Monday.

I will turn the floor over to Leon Fuerth, who will have to be leaving in a few minutes to go to another meeting, but you will

have some time with him. Please, Leon.

MR. FUERTH: Katie and I have been working a long time with the Vice President and we remember the early days of his engagement with this issue. So it is with great satisfaction that, as old-timers on his staff, we see him representing the United States and heading off to this conference in Kyoto. The mere fact that this conference is being held is a testament to how far the issue of the relationship between industrial civilization and the environment has gone and how high it has risen in the consciousness, not just of governments, but of people around the world.

That didn't happen by accident, and I think we are each proud of any role that we played in helping along the way, and especially proud of the role that the Clinton administration has played in truly recognizing that this issue takes its place as part of a normal set of issues that affect the security of nations.

I really don't have too much to say, except that opening comment. I will be going in just a few minutes and Katie will be carrying the brunt of the Q & A session. So let me turn this over to you and, if I'm still here when the questions begin, I'll pitch in.

MS. MCGINTY: Thanks, Leon. I would just add my own sense that as headlines have appeared on this issue trumpeting the fact that consensus emerges on climate change, that is a proud moment for an issue that is really coming into its own and the understanding of which has increased enormously in the last five years, 10 years at the most, that it has emerged on the radar screen.

The Vice President's attendance at the conference on Monday is a sign of the United States' commitment to this issue, to the process of negotiations that are under way there. We have an extraordinary team of people committed to help work through the complex issues that are presented there. Negotiations led for us by Stu Eizenstat, who is a long-term negotiator on this issue, has been involved with us on this issue but on many other issues as well, a very skilled negotiator.

It is an issue that is of the utmost importance to us, and we are going to do our best, both throughout this week and then as we get into the ministerial level sessions of this meeting in the early days of next week, to try to bring some consensus among the more than 160 nations that are participating in Kyoto.

I think it is important for us to keep in mind that the job here is not one of just reconciling the differences, for example, between the United States and the European Community or the United States and Japan. There are 160 nations. Their opinions range from those of the Netherlands to those of Saudi Arabia. The leadership the United States is called to show here is neither to be extremist to the left, extremist to the right, but to try to provide that

common ground on which these many and quite diverse nations can stand.

Second, I think it is important to keep in mind that Kyoto won't be the final answer in any circumstances to the issue of climate change, and the critical thing is that Kyoto be an important step along a much longer path where the nations of the world seriously and responsibly will come to grips with this issue, and, post-Kyoto, continue to make progress on it. The Vice President is committed to being there to try to help further that cause, and we have the job of traveling with him on what is going to be an arduous journey.

Q He is really there to hold the flag, isn't he? I mean, he's not going to be negotiating. What is he really going to be doing except representing --

MS. MCGINTY: Well, let me say a couple things. Leon, you may want to add to it, too. First and foremost, we want to underscore the seriousness and importance that we attach to these negotiations. We have worked very hard. The Vice President personally has worked very hard not just on the issue in general but, in the last several years, to bring the nations of the world to the point where we are actually talking about a legally binding treaty.

It was the United States three years ago that said, first, the treaty that was negotiated in Rio is not adequate to the challenge of climate change and we won the agreement of the nations of the world to that principle. It was the United States a year and a half to two years ago that said to the nations of the world, a voluntary agreement has not proven effective enough on this issue; we need to move into a legally binding regime.

This process we are now in is the culmination of those efforts and that work we have done over the last several years and, frankly, that the Vice President has led the way for us in accomplishing. So he is there to help move us now through this next set.

Q Wasn't the Vice President supposed to make calls this week to European leaders, and could you tell us who he called?

MR. FUERTH: Let me respond to that. First of all, you are right. He is not going there to negotiate. Our negotiator is Stu Eizenstat. But the Vice President's willingness to be there and his presence there are helpful to Stu in his effort to underscore the seriousness of intent of the United States and the general process and in the United States position that we have announced previously.

The Vice President has been making a number of phone calls to some leaders who are involved in the conference on his way there, and he will probably continue to make calls on his way back. So, for him, it is a continuous effort and not just a one-shot trip to Kyoto and back.

Q Leon, could you talk about how the Vice President is going to try and get the developing countries, especially China, on board -- what you may have planned, what your expectations are? And if all of this can't be done in a day, would he consider staying on through the end of the conference?

MR. FUERTH: I can answer the second question, which is I don't think he has any plans to extend his stay. There are ongoing commitments.

As for the first part of the question, I am interested in it, as I think you know, because of matters such as the development of the U.S.-China energy environment initiative. But that is a matter which is separate from the question you ask, and so I turn to Katie to deal with it.

MS. MCGINTY: We are working very hard to encourage the support of developing countries on things like joint implementation, which will both bring emissions down in developing countries and provide sources of new economic investment into developing countries. We are also working with them on an article in the proposed treaty that would invite the voluntary assumption by developing countries of binding targets and timetables, and then would allow those countries to participate in the international emissions trading regime that the United States has proposed.

Again, an initiative that we believe, first, is critical in terms of an environmentally effective treaty, but also an initiative that would provide economic opportunity, both domestically and for developing countries.

Q Will this satisfy the Senate, the voluntary assumption of responsibilities?

MS. MCGINTY: We will see what comes out of Kyoto. We are working hard on these fronts and there are other delegations who have other ideas, so we will see what the product is.

Q Katie, there are some reports in Kyoto, mostly from European sources, that the United States is more or less moving toward agreeing to some additional reductions beyond stabilization.

MS. MCGINTY: No, that is not -- those are inaccurate reports.

Q The reports are that the U.S. is about to announce that it is ready to cut emissions by up to 5 percent. You are ruling out such a gesture?

MS. MCGINTY: Those are inaccurate reports.

Q Is the figure 5 percent inaccurate or the --

MS. MCGINTY: It is inaccurate that we are moving at all from the target and timetable that the President proposed.

Q What is the purpose of the phone calls to the world leaders?

MS. MCGINTY: Let me underscore too that we will be losing Leon sooner than Gene and I, but we are joined also by the President's Economic Policy Advisor, Gene Sperling.

Q Just before we lose Leon, can I ask, you know, five years ago I remember Gore going to Rio and complaining that the United States should be more aggressive and commit more and the administration then was kind of holding the line. I mean, it now seems as through the critics are saying the same thing about the current U.S. position, that it should be much further.

MR. FUERTH: You ask me the question. I will anticipate, in part, my colleagues' answers, and that is that the United States position involves some pretty substantial things. We are not pitching softballs here. This is a serious proposal. It is one the United States is prepared to carry out. And when you talk about making changes in the way an economy of our size does business, you are talking about some fairly substantial things. The President has said nothing that he isn't prepared to follow through on, and that is a serious matter.

I've got to scram.

Q What is the purpose of the calls to world leaders?

MS. MCGINTY: For the world leaders, first, better to understand what the important elements are of the United States position; to understand things like joint implementation, that these are ways, yes, we can achieve our environmental goal but that it provides economic opportunity for developing countries, which many of them have not heard that message; and, frankly, for us to hear firsthand from those world leaders too their perspective on these negotiations and what their view is as to how we can best establish some common ground.

Q Could you give us some names?

MS. MCGINTY: Yes, the Vice President spoke today to the Presidents of Mexico, Chile, and I believe Costa Rica, although we were at one point having some trouble making the connection there. But that was on the schedule.

MR. SPALTER: He also will be meeting later this afternoon with the foreign minister of Japan.

Q Katie, the President of the European Union is in

town and meeting with Madeleine Albright and I think with the Vice President and the President. Will they be telling him what you just said, that the United States won't budge from its targets and timetables?

MS. MCGINTY: I actually don't know exactly what will be on the agenda, but it has been at the top of the President's agenda both in APEC and in all of the various bilateral, multilateral discussions we have been involved in to put this issue at the fore of what our present concerns are as we face Kyoto.

Q That is the position of the -- I mean, if that's the position at this instant, presumably that is the position that Madeleine Albright would be taking this afternoon.

MS. MCGINTY: Yes, yes. And there are other matters for us to -- as I said, part of the reason for these calls is to help leaders better understand the U.S. position. One example of that is that while the United States proposal has been considered less environmentally ambitious than the proposals of some other countries, as we have pointed out, the United States is the only country that has a comprehensive proposal on the totality of the greenhouse gasses.

Leaders are only now beginning to understand that, in fact, the European proposal has a big loophole in it which makes it less ambitious than they have presented. And, in fact, the Japanese proposal, also containing this loophole, would allow emissions to grow above 1990 levels, so it is less ambitious than the U.S. proposal. But it's that kind of dialogue that we have been having in helping various delegations better understand our proposals.

Q What kind of loophole is that? What kind of a loophole are you talking about now?

MS. MCGINTY: The United States proposal is comprehensive. It is based not only on three gasses, but the full six gasses which are the major greenhouse gasses. The European Union and Japan focus only on carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxides. The U.S. proposal adds other gasses -- sulphur hexafluoride, HFCs, and PFCs -- which gasses are smaller in quantity than CO₂ but that are on the order of 25,000 times more polluting than CO₂.

Now, this is a huge detriment to the environment that the European proposal and the Japanese proposal do not include these pollutants, and that the Europeans and the Japanese so far have refused to include those pollutants in their proposal.

Q But whatever consensus seems to be emerging so far in Kyoto, it is not around the U.S. proposal for stabilization. Is the Vice President going to Kyoto with some flexibility in the U.S. position?

MS. MCGINTY: Gene, I'll ask you to join on this, too.

The Vice President is going there to articulate and help to explain and to present to the countries of the world the U.S. position that the President articulated. Already, again, as we have pushed forward a more full description of what it is that the United States has proposed, it has become clear that ours is the only comprehensive proposal on the table, one; that we are the only country that has proposed a mechanism that allows developing countries to pursue a more sustainable, cleaner energy path, three; and that we are the only country that has proposed mechanisms to insure that countries actually will enforce and take seriously their obligations. And it is those things that we will articulate and try to impress upon our colleagues.

You've got the next one.

Q Will the Vice President be looking to bridge differences with Japan in his meeting with the foreign minister? What do you expect to come out of this afternoon's meeting?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, similarly to the phone conversations that we have had this morning, the Vice President will look to more fully articulate and explain the various elements of the U.S. position to try to encourage the Japanese, for example, to see the wisdom of including all of the greenhouse gasses in the targets and timetables that are proposed, and to understand the huge loophole that there exists in both the Japanese and the European proposal in not having those elements there.

We also want to ask the Japanese as the hosts of this conference, and thank them for their leadership in hosting this conference, how it is that they see the discussions going, where they think that we can be most helpful in shepherding the countries of the world towards some common ground.

Q There are people that I have talked to in Kyoto --although I am not there myself so I'm not sure about this -- who say that in the plenary sessions the developing countries have been refusing even to open for discussion the subject of their participation; that they say what we are here to discuss is the developed nations, the industrial nations.

Is that the state of play at the moment? Are you discouraged by that?

MS. MCGINTY: I don't want to say that we have had -- that there have been major breakthroughs of any kind yet in these discussions. I think that there is work under way that is increasing the understanding of the various parties of the points of view that have been expressed. But, no, I would not say that there have been major breakthroughs yet of any kind on the various elements that are being discussed.

Q Am I accurate in saying they are refusing even to have discussion about that? In the plenary sessions the topic is now allowed to be brought up?

MS. MCGINTY: I would certainly say that I'm not aware of any formally expressed position by any country or group of developing countries to the contrary. I am not aware of any. But I do believe that there are some countries within that mix who are more inclined to favorably consider some of the elements of these proposals.

Just to take an example, Costa Rica, for example, has been a proponent of joint implementation and has joined with the United States, for example, in launching various joint implementation projects. So there are individual countries that have been more favorably inclined, but I am not aware of any formal statements by the G-77 as a whole that would break with what has traditionally been their position.

The last thing I would say on this, I want to be clear and underscore again that there is nothing in our proposal which is about saying that the developed countries, the industrialized countries, should not take the lead here. We believe firmly -- the President, the Vice President believes firmly that the United States and the other industrialized countries of the world do need to lead the way. We have been the major contributors to this greenhouse gas pollution, and we need to lead the way in reducing greenhouse gas pollution. So I don't want to confuse that in the emphasis on the point that developing countries nonetheless need to become part of the solution as we work together on the issue.

Q Gene, I wonder if you would be willing to respond to critics who say that the U.S. policy essentially amounts to caving to the interests of the auto industry and big business.

MR. SPERLING: I think too few people have judged -- on both sides, have judged our proposal by actually looking at the merits and the degree of ambition in there. Our proposal would require over 30 percent reduction off the projected baseline by the year 2010. That is a highly ambitious target, and I think that it is not by any means the position that was recommended to us by the auto industry, not even close.

But what we did was we tried to come through with what we felt was a three-stage process of, number one, having a period over these next few years that, regardless of what happens in Kyoto, that we will come forward, as we are working on in our budget right now, with a series of initiatives that will include R&D and technology initiatives as well as tax cuts that will be aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and that in this period we should be focusing on the type of what we have called win-win opportunities that are out there; and that over the next five years, to review that and then to get ready for a period where we would allow a period of emissions trading.

So I think what we tried to do was come up with an approach that hit the right balance, that was ambitious in its target and timetable but was market-sensitive in that it relies on market mechanisms and that it allows for a period of up to a decade where our overall focus would be on the type of win-win opportunities that come from using existing technologies, developing -- giving people incentives to use things that are more efficient.

And so I don't think that our -- I think our proposal was one that the President chose by listening to different people in his administration, by listening both to people who more represented the environmentalists, but also listening to what the right means to achieving this were economically from his economic team and from economic interest.

And I think that when you have a very controversial and difficult and challenging environmental issue and you are trying to hit a good balance, you may find people on both sides feeling that you have either not gone far enough or gone too far.

But I think the American people would think that we have hit exactly the right balance, which is an ambitious aspiration for this country in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but doing it in a way that is thoughtful and that relies on common sense market mechanisms, and that says let's first look at everything we can do through technology and R&D and incentives, but let's make clear that when we get to the period of the binding agreement, 2008-2012, that we do have a system that ensures that we will ultimately reach the target. But let's the give the country and the market and the economy the best opportunity to adjust and prepare and to take advantages of all the possibilities that are out there now.

Q Why does this need to be done now? There is one, by no means, radical school of thought that says if you wait 10 years we will better understand the science, we will better understand the interplay between greenhouse gasses and climate change, and it will be a hell of a lot cheaper to implement the emissions.

MR. SPERLING: Well, let me respond to that. I think that the President and Vice President's view was that the science is compelling enough as to the fact that there is a discernible human influence on climate to compel action at this moment, and that the failure to act now would be irresponsible; that it would allow what is clearly the major environmental challenge of our generation to go on untreated for another decade.

On the other hand, we have put forward a plan that allows us to learn and experiment as to what is the best means of doing that so that by having a period of five-year reviews we are always looking at what is working best, what is being most effective, what we can do in terms of incentives, in terms of technology. So we are not saying that we have all the answers as to the exact means; we are giving ourselves a period of review to see what works and improve

upon that.

But at some point, with any major problem, whether it's Social Security, whether -- you know, anything, you can say that things could work out differently. But as policymakers, you have to judge whether the evidence you have at the time is compelling enough to compel action. And this administration, which had a lot of different views on the means and the methods and the targets and timetables, was rock-solid unanimous that the science was strong enough to compel action at this moment.

Q But at the same time, just to play devil's advocate, in Social Security's case you know the demographics so you know what is going to happen. In this case, over the past five years, according to the economists, the computer models upon which these predictions are based have reduced by half the estimation of long-term increase in greenhouse gasses. At that rate, how can you depend on the models now?

MR. SPERLING: Well, first of all, we saw over the last year that our level of greenhouse gas emissions was 5 percent worse than we had projected in the year, which would suggest that we have had evidence over the last year that this problem requires even more action than would have been projected.

And, again, we are not saying that there is -- what we precisely did not do is say, next year we are implementing a mandatory system of A or B that we are going to use for the next 15 years. We precisely put in a period of strong policy action to be reviewed after five years in light of the science, in light of the effectiveness, and that we would give ourselves up to 10 full years of action, of experimentation, of voluntary efforts, of technology, before our period, the binding period and the trading period, would go in in the year 2008.

So, I mean, anybody who cares about compelling governmental -- compelling public policy issues has to always weigh action in the face of uncertainty. And I think one has to distinguish between the uncertainty as to the magnitude or the speed or the means for dealing with it, with what we feel is strong certainty that the problem is significant, compelling, and getting worse without action. And that requires us to act for it.

And that is -- and I should point out that is a place of which I think you have international agreement, among scientists and among the countries at Kyoto. Again, the differences are more on the exact areas of the mechanisms and the timetables. There really, I believe, is strong international agreement and strong agreement in our administration that the science is compelling enough to warrant action. And really with what we saw was the worst report on emissions over the last year, I think that conviction is held even stronger.

Q Katie, you said the Vice President is not going to

negotiate there, but in addition to giving the speech Monday morning he is meeting extensively during the day. Can you tell us a little but about who he is meeting with and what his intentions are in those meetings?

MS. MCGINTY: Well, the meetings will be at the -- in part, at the suggestion of our lead negotiator, Stu Eizenstat, who he believes it would be most helpful and effective for the Vice President to meet with. So we will have to see. We have not, I don't think, finalized a list of countries that we would meet with there.

And I guess the point to be made is that whether he is here or whether he is there, the President and Vice President, of course, are at the top of the policy chain in this government and they singularly and exclusively have their finger on the trigger in terms of the policies we articulate and the decisions we ultimately will make. The meetings that Stu Eizenstat will recommend for the Vice President and participate in with the Vice President are ones which, in his judgment, will help to inform the President and Vice President's decision-making.

MR. SPALTER: Thank you very much, unless there is one last question.

Q When the \$5 billion energy tax cut package was announced in October, Gene, you said the details would be coming forth in December when the budget process is under way. It's December. Do you have any details yet on it?

MR. SPERLING: I said we would make the decisions on it in December when we make our budget. As always, we generally announce our budget and the policies in it around the State of the Union, with a few sprinkles before for interest.

But what we said is that we would have a combination of \$5 billion, at least \$5 billion over five years. That would be a combination of tax incentives and R&D. We have had at least one full-level principles' meeting at NEC and a meeting on the tax incentives. We met with the President's Science and Technology advisors yesterday. One of the things we talked about was what the exact package would be.

But it is like everything else. The next two weeks -- not this week but really the next two weeks are the weeks where, for the fifth year in a row, is the period where we really get to crunch time and make the decisions as to how much we can afford in different areas.

But the one thing we have laid out a commitment on is

that there will at least be five years above what is the -- \$5 billion above the current baseline, in combination of tax incentives and R&D. And we are getting recommendations from Treasury Department on the tax incentives and we are looking very heavily at the PCAST recommendations on the R&D and they will be part of our budget.

Q Well, other than the energy cuts and child care credits the President has indicated would be in the '99 budget, is the administration considering any form of broad-based tax reductions that would simplify the tax code and make it fairer?

MR. SPERLING: I think that we all understand that the issue of how to improve the tax system at IRS is an important issue. It is an issue we are working on, have worked on, have made progress on, and expect to be a significant policy debate over the next few years.

We will be pressing very hard for the passage of the IRS reform bill that came out of the House that had strong bipartisan support that was an honest and good faith compromise between Democrats and Republicans. We will be hoping to pass that soon.

In terms of tax cuts and tax simplifications, we are certainly studying a variety of things. But the tests we hold things up to are three: Is it good for the economy, is it fair for working families, and is it fiscally responsible? I think the things we have done, the EITC and the HOPE Scholarship tax credit, child tax credit and IRA have all met that proposal, that test.

I think anybody who puts forward a proposal, whether it's us or Republicans or Democrats, has to be able to hold their proposal against that test and make sure it passes that test before they try to sell it to the American people. And we will be holding any proposal we have internally up to that test as well as external proposals.

I think you have to have a bit of the Hippocratic middle class family test here. You have to make sure any reforms you are doing do no harm to working families, and many of the proposals we have seen in the past would, in fact, have done harm by either raising the tax rates of working families or turning back the progress we have had on deficit reduction.

But we certainly are engaged in a process to see what further steps we can take to complement what we have done in the past that would meet that test.

MR. SPALTER: Thank you very much.

END

3:38 P.M. EST

Message Sent

To:

Sharolyn A. Kosier
Lori E. Abrams
Jeannetta P. Allen
Lori Anderson
Brenda M. Anders
Eli G. Attie @ OVP@EOP
Patrick Aylward
Robin J. Bachman
Kyle M. Baker
Kris M Balderston
Beverly J. Barnes
David S. Beaubaire
Marsha E. Berry
antony j. blinken
Alexander L. Boyle
Lanny A. Breuer
Patrick E. Briggs
Katharine Button
Robin J. Bachman
Allison Balderston
Barbara D. Woolley
Bradley M. Campbell
Laura Capps
Joseph W. Cerrell @ OVP@EOP
David K. Chai
Nanda Chitre
Steven A. Cohen
Julianne B. Corbett
Michelle Crisci
Carolyn Curiel
Anna E. Cushing
Suzanne Dale
Lanny J. Davis
Elliot J. Diringer
Daniel W. Burkhardt
Diane Ikemiyashiro
Dorian V. Weaver
Dorinda A. Salcido
James T. Edmonds
Anne M. Edwards
Rahm Emanuel
Karen C. Fahle
Julie A. Fernandes
Karen E. Finney
Carmen B. Fowler
Ben A. Freeland
Jeremy M. Gaines
Jessica L. Gibson
Adam W. Goldberg
Jason S. Goldberg
Peter D. Greenberger
Donald Goldberg

Richard Hayes
Russell W. Horwitz
Maureen A. Hudson
Thomas D. Janenda
david t. johnson
Leanne I. Johnson
Michele Jolin
James M. Teague
Julie E. Mason
David E. Kalbaugh
William R. Kincaid
Allison J. King
Joshua A. King
Catherine T. Kitchen
Sarah S. Freeman
Jim Kohlenberger @ OVP@EOP
Heidi Kukis @ OVP@EOP
Sara M. Latham
Christopher J. Lavery
Anne H. Lewis
Joseph P. Lockhart
Laura D. Schwartz
Lisa J. Levin
Michael D. Malone
Laura S. Marcus
Tanya E. Martin
Doris O. Matsui
Andrew J. Mayock
Anne E. McGuire
Estela Mendoza
R. Scott Michaud
Elisa Millsap
Cheryl D. Mills
Megan C. Moloney
Tamara Monosoff
Kevin Moran
Jonathan Murchinson
Melissa M. Murray
Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.
Sean P. Maloney
Michael V. Terrell
Steven J. Naplan
Mark D. Neschis
Elizabeth R. Newman
Neera Tanden
Michael A. O'Mary
Jonathan Orszag
Peter R. Orszag
Kristen E. Panerai
Carole A. Parmelee
Sally P. Paxton
Julia M. Payne
Peter O'Keefe
Nicole R. Rabner