Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Brostrom to Carol Rasco re Meeting (partial) (1 page)	12/15/1995	P6/b(6)
002. note	phone numbers and names (partial) (1 page)	nd	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Molly Brostrom
OA/Box Number: 8396

FOLDER TITLE:
National Association for Community Services Programs

2012-0326-S
kc774

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

Meeting file
cc Molly

National Association for State Community Services Programs

January 29, 1996

JAN 31 1996

Ms. Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy
White House
West Wing - Second Floor
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Ms. Rasco:

On behalf of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSP) I thank you for the access you provided our members to decision makers in the Administration.

The December 18, meeting with you and representatives from CEQ, OMB, HHS and DOE provided an exchange of ideas and principles that will move the agenda for the CSBG and the Weatherization Assistance Program forward. We understand that neither you, nor anyone else at the table, could give us any assurances about the level of commitment of future resources that the administration would support for either of these programs; however, you did provide a forum for us to elucidate the value we feel is inherent in the CSBG and the DOE/WAP to this Administration and to its long range goals of economic independence for poor Americans.

We feel confident, as the administration reviews all of the programs administered by the federal government and answers the question that seems to be uppermost in the new Congress, "Why should the federal government be engaged in this activity?" that both the CSBG and the DOE/WAP will pass muster. The answer in each case is that the programs are essentially grass roots ones that use the federal dollars to secure additional ones to address some of the most entrenched poverty problems in this country.

In the case of the weatherization program it is a true investment program. It has been tested and proven to payback in real dollars every penny that comes from the federal treasury. In recent years, it has doubled that return and in some states tripled it. Further, the weatherization program contributes to freeing us from foreign imports and reduces carbon dioxide emissions into the air.

Ms. Carol Rasco
January 29, 1996
page 2

As you know Congress reduced FY 1996 funds for weatherization by 47%. The other programs in energy efficiency were only cut 12%. Research and development have been rewarded at a cost to programs for the poor. We hope that the Administration will consider the people aspect of weatherization when additional funds are made available for energy efficiency projects in the FY 1996 appropriations and as the President finalizes his FY 1997 budget.

The CSBG, through extensive case management, has reduced dependency on the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program. It is also a unique grass-roots program that can be used for many of the initiatives envisaged and proposed by the Administration.

quoi?

Again, I thank you for your gracious help in securing an audience for the states and local programs to discuss our concerns with the persons who will play significant roles in determining the fate of these programs.

Sincerely yours,

Marjorie J. Witherspoon
Executive Director

12/18 Meeting with NASCSP

Administration Participants:

Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

Molly Brostrom
Senior Policy Analyst, Domestic Policy Council

Randy Steer
Program Examiner, Energy Branch, OMB

Barry White
Deputy Associate Director, Human Resources Division, OMB

Christine Ellertson
Program Examiner, Income Maintenance Branch, OMB

Wesley Warren
Associate Director, Air, Energy and Transportation, Council on Environmental Quality

Donald Sykes and Ann Rosewater
Office of Children, Youth and Families, HHS

Mary Beth Zimmerman
Policy Office, Department of Energy

Dec. 11 → after Th'g, before Xmas

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Comm'ty Action Network

Input for
→ 97 budget, partly for DoE
Comm'ty Services BlGr
- wondering if support

= talk ab't these progs, how they are contrib to Pres' agenda
= want to tell the story

them:
= 8-9 people

Randy Steer

3 state
3 local

5-4561

1
1 lobby

Comm. Action Agencies
David Bradley

⇒ Kyle Simpson — Assoc Deputy Sec
→ Deputy Sec'y for Energy Programs
WH - Energy → Weatherization
- Comm Service Bl Grant
⇒ Mary Jo Bane's deputy
OMB →
- Paul Weinstein
Wesley Warren (energy issues @ WH-SE
DOE
HHS
OMB
WH Staff
→ Last Fri, TJ Glauthier met w/

OPL - let them know

Leg. affairs

E X E C U T I V E   O F F I C E   O F   T H E   P R E S I D E N T

21-Nov-1995 11:45am

TO: Carol H. Rasco

FROM: Molly Brostrom
Domestic Policy Council

CC: Patricia E. Romani

SUBJECT: Mtg w/Marjorie Witherspoon & Co.

Pat is holding Dec. 18, 3-4:30 pm, for a meeting with Marjorie and her folks. I spoke to Marjorie and she is going to line up her representatives -- she's thinking of 8-9 people (3 state; 3 local; herself; and a lobbyist for Community Action Agencies).

Her goal for the meeting is to talk about their programs, how they can contribute to the Pres' agenda, and give input for the '97 budget.

On this end, from talking to Marjorie, I was going to invite:

Dan Reichert X
Deputy CoS

*A White House person who works on energy (Marjorie mentioned a Wesley Warren -- I don't know him, but can call and see if he's appropriate) -- anyone you would suggest?
CEQ → Weatherization 6-5143, Rm. 360

*OMB representative(s) -- I was going to call Ken's office and ask whom, unless you have suggestions.
Rick Kwan 586-6210 = Nicolo 586-9168

*Dept of Energy Rep. -- Marjorie suggested Kyle Simpson, Assoc. Deputy Secretary for Energy Programs
new →

*HHS Rep. -- S.o. from Mary Jo Bane's office
- Ms. Rose Water
Mary Beth 690-6133

Anyone else or instead?

thanks.

part of DoE Conservation Program → includes climate change
→ has taken 50% cut in Repub budget → Admin trying to get back up —

• DoE W'zation in Interior Approps - recommitted back to House
→ NE + MW states disprop'ly
→ has gotten attention internally

→ has worked w/ OSTP, OMB, Heather Foley, VP
T.J. Glauthier
Natural Resources PAD

• LIHEAP

Support soft in Congress
1 - no gasoline crisis
2 - poor people not in fashion
3 - fragmentation, squeezed, no 1 champion

→ need to engage so they understand & give us credit

National Association for State
Community Services Programs

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES NETWORK

General Information

Based on data provided by the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, we know that:

- The Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) provides funding to over 1,144 local non-profit agencies in over 98% of America's counties.

- For every CSBG dollar expended, an additional $2 of non-federal resources are leveraged.

- Over 15.6 million hours of service were contributed by volunteers, the equivalent of over 7,500 full-time employees.

Services Provided

The states also reported local agency CSBG expenditures in FY 1993 of:

- $30.3 million on Employment programs
- $37.9 million on Education programs
- $14.9 million on Income Management programs
- $30.4 million on Housing programs
- $77.4 million on Emergency Services programs
- $42.7 million on Nutrition programs
- $73.3 million on Linkage programs
- $15.2 million on Self-Sufficiency programs
- $ 8.6 million on Health programs

Client Characteristics

Based on data provided by 36 states and 670 community action agencies describing over 5 million people served, we know that:

- CSBG continues to serve the very poorest of the poor. Of those served, 47% have incomes at or below 75% of poverty and 70% have incomes at or below 100% of poverty.

- CSBG also serves the most vulnerable of the poor. Children represent 35% and older Americans 15% of those served.

- CSBG also provides needed support to working families. Twenty-four percent of families report wages as a part of their income, with an additional 4% receiving unemployment compensation. Further, 29% of the families served are former and/or disabled workers reporting Social Security or Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

- Lack of education is a major barrier to self-sufficiency for many CSBG clients. Over 38% of those served with less than a high school education are adults.

National Association for State
Community Services Programs

COMMUNITY ACTION AND ITS CLIENTS:
Who is in need? Who is being served?

OVERVIEW OF THE NEW COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (CSBG) 1993 DATA

In 1993 the annual Community Services Block Grant Information System (CSBG/IS) survey conducted by the National Association for State Community Services Program asked that demographic data describing persons served by the community services network be collected locally in a uniform manner as a voluntary activity of the local agencies and states.

Thirty-six CSBG grantees, including 34 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico (hereafter referred to as "states"), established information systems and submitted data for at least some of those persons and families served by CSBG programs in 1993.

These data were submitted to the states by 670 eligible entities, the vast majority of which are community action agencies. They describe some characteristics of over 5 million individuals who received services from the Community Services Network. The recipient information includes only those who voluntarily provided information. Providing demographic information is not a requirement to receive services and was not provided by all those who were served. Further, not everyone who provided some information, provided information for all the characteristics described below.

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REPORTED BY:	
STATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and PUERTO RICO	36
ELIGIBLE ENTITIES	670
RECIPIENTS	5,351,548

Data for future years will probably reflect a larger proportion of grantees and subgrantees as they develop more efficient and comprehensive systems to improve their capacity for ensuring information is accurate and is fully unduplicated when one client uses multiple services.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS 1993 (Number Responding to Item)

GENDER (5.01 m)	
FEMALES	61%
MALES	39%

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

AGE (5.35 m)	
0-5 YEARS	15%
6-11 YEARS	8%
12-17 YEARS	12%
18-23 YEARS	10%
24-44 YEARS	29%
45-54 YEARS	11%
55-69 YEARS	9%
70 AND OVER	6%

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

ETHNICITY/RACE AS % OF CLIENTS (5.10 m)				
Ethnicity/Race	**1993 CSBG/IS**	**1993 AFDC**	**1990 Census < 125% of poverty**	**1990 Census All Persons**
Black, non-Hispanic	24%	36.6%	22.3%	12.3%
White, non-Hispanic	51%	38.3%	50.6%	75.7%
Hispanic	19%	18.5%	15.2%	9.0%
Native American	3%	1.4%	1.6%	3.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	2.9%	2.8%	.8%
Other	1%	2.2%	7.5%	

CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENTS (Number Responding to Item) CONT'D

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

CLIENT EDUCATION LEVELS (3.39 m)	
LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 8th GRADE*	30%
9th THROUGH 12th GRADES*	29%
HIGH SCHOOL/GED	30%
BEYOND 12th GRADE, NON-GRADUATE	8%
COLLEGE GRADUATE	3%

* Thirty-five percent of clients are 17 or under and would be reported in these 2 groups. In addition, 65% are over 17. Of the individuals with education levels in these two groups, 38.4% are older than seventeen and completed less than a high school diploma. This is computed by multiplying 66% of clients by 59%, the sum of the percent of clients completing "less than or equal to 8th grade" and the percent of clients completing "9th through 12th grades."

Health Insurance, Disability and Veterans Status
(Many clients were not asked or did not answer these items.)

Of those answering these items, 1.19 million individuals reported that they were without health insurance, either private, Medicaid, or Medicare. Similarly, 436,568 individuals reported having a disability and 119,514 reported being a veteran of military service.

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

CATEGORY	# OF RECIPIENTS
DO NOT HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE	1,191,083
HAVE A DISABILITY	436,568
ARE A VETERAN	119,514

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS:

For each of the characteristics below, states and agencies could ask either questions to the individual client about their family, or about themselves individually. These answers cannot be well integrated nationally if the two groups differ widely; however, these data showed little variation. We have reported the responses for those that responded with characteristics of their family and noted any significant differences.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES (Number Responding to Item) CONT'D

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

FAMILY STRUCTURE (.94 m)	
Family Structure	**% by Family**
FEMALE, SINGLE PARENT	31%
MALE SINGLE PARENT	9%
TWO PARENTS	23%
SINGLE PERSON	25%
TWO ADULTS, NO CHILDREN	8%
OTHER	4%

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

FAMILY SIZE (.97 m)	
# of Family Members	**% by Family**
ONE	27%
TWO	19%
THREE	19%
FOUR	17%
FIVE	10%
SIX	4%
SEVEN	2%
EIGHT OR MORE	1%
AVERAGE SIZE	2.86 members

These data were collected using two different survey forms, Section G and Section Alternate G. Both forms collect individual characteristics in the same manner describing the gender, age, ethnicity/race, education, availability of health insurance, disability status and veteran status. Then Section G goes on to ask about information about the families served. This information includes family type, family size, source of family income, level of family income, housing, food stamp receipt, and farmworker status. Section Alternate G asks these same questions but of individuals rather than families. The difference in practical terms is that those states that reported "families" reported each family one time, but in the states that reported individuals, it is possible that these questions were answered by several members of a family that received assistance and therefore these data may be duplicative if viewed as "family" responses. Twenty-one states submitted data in terms of families (Section G), thirteen states submitted data in terms of individuals (Section Alternate G), and two states submitted some data on each form.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES (Number Responding to Item) CONT'D

Poverty

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

FAMILY INCOME BY PERCENT OF POVERTY (1.19 m)	
Level of Income	**% by Family**
LESS THAN OR EQUAL TO 75% OF POVERTY	47%
76%-100% OF POVERTY	23%
101%-125% OF POVERTY	21%
126%-150% OF POVERTY*	6%
151% OR MORE OF POVERTY*	3%

* These individuals were served by agencies using funds not restricted to providing services for only those at or below 125% of poverty.

Source of Income

CSBG clients who answered the question on "source of income" were asked to select all of the categories from which they receive income.

Twenty-four percent of all families reported wages as part of their income. When added to the 4% receiving unemployment compensation, these figures dramatize the participation of the "working poor" in the programs of the Community Service Network.

Twenty-one percent of all client families received AFDC and some of these were undoubtedly among those with some earnings.

Twenty-nine percent received Social Security and or SSI benefits. Nearly all are former or disabled workers.

Although it is startling that 8% reported no income, the data on the FY 1993 numbers of homeless persons or persons in emergency situations (like exhausted unemployment benefits or abandonment) served by the Community Services Network provide a possible explanation. For instance over 57,473 homeless families were served by agencies in 18 states.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES (Number Responding to Item) CONT'D

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

FAMILY SOURCE OF INCOME (1.00 m)	
Source	**% by Family**
NO INCOME	8%
AFDC	21%
SSI	11%
SOCIAL SEC.	18%
PENSION	4%
GENERAL ASSISTANCE	4%
UNEMPLOYMENT	4%
EMPLOYMENT, PLUS	7%
EMPLOYMENT	17%
OTHER	5%

Housing Status

CSBG LOCAL AGENCY CLIENTS: 1993

TYPE OF HOUSING (.94 m)	
Type	**% by Family**
OWN	31%
RENT	60%
HOMELESS	6%
OTHER*	3%

* "Other" may reflect those living with friends and family or similar situations.

References

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1993. Current Population Reports, Series P23-185. "Population Profile of the United States: 1993." Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1993. Current Population Reports, Series P60-185. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1993. 1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics, United States. 1990 CP-2-1. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance. 1995. "Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of AFDC Recipients: FY 1993." Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Brostrom to Carol Rasco re Meeting (partial) (1 page)	12/15/1995	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Molly Brostrom
OA/Box Number: 8396

FOLDER TITLE:
National Association for Community Services Programs

2012-0326-S
kc774

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

[001]

December 15, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR CAROL H. RASCO

FROM: Molly Brostrom mb

RE: Meeting with National Association for State Community Services Programs

On Monday, December 18, from 3:00–4:30 pm, Room 180 OEOB, you are meeting with representatives of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCP).

Attached is a list of the representatives from NASCP who will participate, and following are the Administration representatives:

- **T.J. Glauthier**, OMB Associate Director, Natural Resources, Energy and Science
- **Ann Rosewater**, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Children, Youth and Families, HHS
- **Wesley Warren**, Associate Director, Air, Energy and Transportation, Council on Environmental Quality
- **Mary Beth Zimmerman**, Policy Office, Department of Energy

From my conversations with Marjorie, I have understood the purpose of the meeting to be an opportunity for NASCP to discuss their programs, how they can contribute to the President's agenda, and to provide input for our FY 97 budget. The programs they are particularly interested in discussing are Weatherization and the Community Services Block Grant.

Attached is information from OMB on the status of the Weatherization program.

Christine Ellerton → 5-7762

LIHEAP

- H proposed to eliminate
- S comm → $900M
- Pres made $810M avail to states (advance appropriated in FY95) $1B

U43558 →

Barry White - + Chris Ellerton

→ Emergency Welfare Mtg → Donald Sykes

P6/(b)(6)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 15, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR **T.J. Glauthier, OMB**
Ann Rosewater, HHS
Wesley Warren, CEQ
Mary Beth Zimmerman, DOE

FROM: Carol H. Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

RE: Meeting with National Association for State Community Services Programs

Thank you for agreeing to join me on Monday, December 18, 3:00-4:30 pm, for a meeting with representatives of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCP). The meeting will be held in Room 180 of the OEOB. If you have not already done so, please provide your date of birth to Pat Romani of my staff (456-2249).

As you are aware, the purpose of the meeting is to provide the NASCP an opportunity to discuss their programs, how they can contribute to the President's agenda, and to provide input for our FY 97 budget. The programs they are particularly interested in discussing are Weatherization and the Community Services Block Grant.

Attached is a list of the NASCP meeting participants. If you have any questions about the meeting, please call Molly Brostrom at 456-5561.

cc: Mary Beth Donahue
Alice Shuffield

Marjorie J. Witherspoon, Executive Director
National Association for State Community Services Programs
Washington, DC

Evelyn Harris, Director
Community Services Block Grant
Division of Economic Opportunity
Department of State
Albany, New York

Ms. Harris is also the Chairperson of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSP). She has served on many national boards and has extensive experience with the Community Services Block Grant, Homeless programs and Head Start.

Rick Gerardi, Director
Weatherization Program
Division of Economic Opportunity
Department of State
Albany, New York

change U43558

MB
Ann Rosewater

Mr. Gerardi has been responsible for the development of a sophisticated audit protocol for New York's weatherization program which has been a model for other states. He has also been instrumental in leveraging significant private investments into New York's weatherization program. The funds have come from landlords, agreements with utilities and housing programs.

Thomas E. Green, Deputy Director
Office of Community Services
Little Rock, Arkansas

Mr. Green is responsible for the administration of the CSBG, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and the Weatherization Assistance Program. In addition Mr. Green administers a number of homeless programs.

David Bradley, Executive Director
National Community Action Foundation
Washington, DC

Mr. Bradley is a fulltime lobbyist for Community Action Agencies. He has been involved on their behalf since the early eighties, and was instrumental in the creation of the Community Services Block Grant Act. He is also a partner with the government relations firm of Moss, McGee, Bradley and Foley.

Charles Braithwait, Executive Director
West Central Community Action Agency
Appleton City, Missouri

Mr. Braithwait is the President of the Board of Directors of the National Community Action Foundation. He has worked on behalf of the community action network since 1966, and has been a leader in the development of new strategies dealing with the needs of low-income Americans and the agencies which serve them.

Fuel Aid Runs Low in Freezing Fall

Budget Impasse Hampering Federal Heat Assistance Program

By Barbara Vobejda and Edward Walsh
Washington Post Staff Writers

Judy Murray, who lives alone in an old, leaky farmhouse in rural Vermont, has about a week's worth of fuel in her propane tank and no money to refill it. So she keeps the temperature set as low as she can bear it, wears four sweaters at a time and worries about how she'll keep warm next week.

Last year at this time, she was receiving $130 a month in federal energy assistance. But Murray, who is 60 and takes home $83 a week from a part-time job, has gotten no help on her fuel bills this winter.

For Murray and many of the other 5.6 million households that received help last year under the program for low-income Americans, the budget standoff in Washington has been brought home with chilling reality. Their assistance hasn't arrived because Congress has yet to pass the Health and Human Services appropriations bill that would fund the energy program. And the temporary measures, called continuing resolutions, that have kept the government running permitted just a fraction of the funding the program received last year. But the last continuing resolution expired Friday and a new one has not been passed.

So, freed from the restrictions imposed by the continuing resolutions, President Clinton yesterday ordered that $578 million in funds—available because they were appropriated in advance by Congress last year—be released to states to help poor people with their fuel bills.

But the future of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) remains in serious doubt. The House has voted to eliminate it and the Senate has yet to vote on an appropriations bill covering it.

Most of the families who were aided last year and other applicants have received no help, or much less than before, under the program. And with temperatures across much of the Northeast and Midwest below normal this season, some families have run out of fuel and others are turning to churches and charities for help.

"Probably, I'll have to go on welfare," Murray said. "And that's no fun at all."

In Vermont, the funding shortage has driven up the demand at food banks as families save their money for heat, state officials said. In Chicago, families applying for energy help were turned away beginning in mid-November because of the funding problem. In Minnesota, state officials say they have as many as 15,000 households that have applied with no prospect of receiving help. At a Chippewa Indian reservation in North Dakota, where the temperature has stayed below zero every day for a two-week spell, officials are warning families to conserve heat and try to come up with money elsewhere.

"It's going to be very, very tough," said Rosemary Peltier, the local administrator who distributes the funds for the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians.

Like many other social welfare programs, LIHEAP has been targeted for funding reductions under the Republican-led Congress. The Senate bill contains $900 million in funding, $400 million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1995. But there is no way of knowing whether the Senate figure will prevail on the floor or in a House-Senate conference, especially because of the House vote to end the program.

In the meantime, the program had operated under the continuing resolutions, which allowed the federal government to spend 75 percent of last year's figure. But the measures forced the funds to be parceled out in 12 monthly increments, which providers said releases far too little during the cold winter months and would leave unspent funds in June.

White House officials said the amount released yesterday was based on the funding formula contained in the pending Senate bill. Because 90 percent of the funds are normally spent in the first six months of the year, the White House was anxious to seize whatever chance it had to get the money out the door in the cold season, officials said.

Sen. Paul D. Wellstone (D-Minn.) urged Clinton in a meeting Saturday to release the funds. "This was a huge step forward," Wellstone said. "We still have to worry about the appropriations bill."

Wellstone has led the fight to keep the program from being eliminated in the appropriations bills.

But some Republicans, led by Rep. John Edward Porter (R-Ill.), have contended that the program has grown dramatically since it was created in 1981, even as fuel prices have dropped.

"There is a demonstrable segment of the American public that needs assistance in meeting energy bills, but we don't need a separate $1 billion program in meeting that cost," said Dave Kohn, press secretary to Porter.

Porter has argued that the need could be met through a federal community service block grant, in combination with utilities and community groups.

Around the country, the community organizations that distribute the fuel assistance funds have been scrambling to find other sources of aid but say they have been turning many families away.

"We're hearing a lot of panic," said Nancy Cashman, who works with the Community Action Program in Duluth. "Every day the calls are increasing, 'Are we going to get any money? It's getting colder,' " she said late last week.

In Illinois, officials said the delay in appropriating funds and the uncertainty about how much money eventually will be provided from Washington have forced them to guess how many homes they can help.

Last year, Illinois had received $44.8 million under the program by Nov. 15 and an additional $18.6 million by Dec. 19—virtually all the funds it used to assist about 200,000 households.

So far this year, according to Becky Enrietto, spokeswoman for the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, only $13 million in federal funds has been provided. She said local agencies have been told to use the limited funds for emergency situations and curb the number of applications they accept.

"We're trying not to make promises we can't deliver on," she said.

While the budget talks drag on in Washington, the winter has begun with brutal harshness in much of the country. According to the National Climatic Data Center in Asheville, N.C., November temperatures were the sixth lowest in recorded history in Illinois, the third lowest in Wisconsin and the fifth lowest in Minnesota.

Bob Vondrasek, who runs a community action organization on Chicago's West Side, said the local gas company estimates that at least 10,000 households in Chicago have been shut off from their gas supply because of overdue bills, but that "we have nothing to work with."

In many small towns, the budget fight in Washington has come to rest on small fuel companies, which are being asked by longtime customers to supply fuel on credit.

"It's really hard. I've had to turn some people down," said Kent Hanson, owner of Hanson Oil Co. in Karlstad, Minn. He said one family with four children went through the night with no heat and the air in their house near freezing. The next day, he said, they came up with $25 and he delivered a small amount of fuel, enough to last less than a week.

"They're asking for credit, which we can't afford to give," he said.

Living in a mobile home in Crow Wing County, Minn., 61-year-old Edythe Nelson said the program "got me through the season" last year, when she received $403 in aid. This year, she applied and was told she would receive the same amount.

But Nelson, who is disabled and lives on $708 a month in Social Security benefits, was later informed by letter that her assistance this year would be cut by more than half.

"I'd already used that up" when the letter arrived, she said. "I don't usually go this far complaining," she said, but added: "The politicians are just playing games with each other . . . while our citizens and poor people are at the mercy of our government."

Nelson has surveyed all her choices. Turn the heat down even lower. Stop by the local fuel company and ask for credit. Or close up her mobile home and do what she has tried hard to avoid—moving in with one of her children.

Walsh reported from Chicago. Special correspondent Jennifer Ordonez in Chicago contributed to this report.

THE WASHINGTON POST
MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1995

THE WASHINGTON POST
MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1995

J.S. Helium Reserve Finds a Champion

Physicists Warn of Possible National Catastrophe if Stockpile Program Is Privatized

By Curt Suplee
Washington Post Staff Writer

The venerable National Helium Reserve—32 billion cubic feet of the stuff, stored beneath the Texas Panhandle—has become the federal government equivalent of laughing gas. Marked for extinction in the Republican budget plan, the 70-year-old stockpile program has been travestied on Capitol Hill and in the news media as "a symbol for obsolete federal ventures," "the government-waste poster child" and "amazingly stupid even by government standards."

But to many scientists, it's no laughing matter. Earth's tiny supply of helium is "finite and irreplaceable," the American Physical Society (APS) warns in a strongly worded new statement, and doing away with it could prompt a national catastrophe. When present reserves are exhausted, the world's leading organization of physicists argues, there will be no economically feasible way to replace them.

That might not matter much if helium were used only for levitating blimps or filling birthday balloons. But it has become one of the most important materials in modern science. The physicists are worried that if it's left up to private industry to extract it from natural gas (the main source), much of the nation's helium simply will go up in smoke.

Liquid helium has the lowest boiling point of any substance and is essential to the production of practical superconductors—materials that have no resistance to electricity—and devices that rely on them. That includes a wide range of cutting-edge technologies such as medical MRI scanners, ultra-sensitive diagnostic detectors, weapon-guidance and astronomical systems, particle accelerators, magnetically levitated trains and resistance-free power lines.

Moreover, helium is as close to chemically inert as elements get and thus is crucial to operations in which chemical reactions could be destructive, including pressurizing space shuttle tanks (NASA is NHR's biggest customer), welding such reactive metals as aluminum and forming delicate silicon crystals.

Yet there is strong bipartisan support for selling off the federal reserves—housed in underground facilities near Amarillo, Tex.—on the private market over the next 20 years to raise an estimated $1 billion or more for the treasury.

In his last State of the Union address, President Clinton cited the National Helium Reserve as one of "over 100 programs we do not need." The Republican budget reconciliation bill vetoed by Clinton earlier this month called for a shutdown of the NHR's helium-extraction activities (which make up about 10 percent of U.S. production) and gradual sale of its inventory between 2005 and 2015. The revised balanced-budget plan Republicans are proposing contains the same provisions.

THE BUDGET BATTLE
WINNERS AND LOSERS

That leaves the program, which originated in 1925 to ensure ample gas supplies for "national security" uses such as dirigible inflation, with no visible means of support: Except for the physicists, who have taken their case to the Office of Science and Technology Policy in hopes of emphasizing that helium is not a renewable resource.

The only commercially viable source is natural gas, some deposits of which contain as much as 0.3 percent helium. Such "helium-rich" fields exist only in the United States and, to a minor extent, in Canada. If helium is not extracted from the fuel before the gas is burned, it disappears irretrievably into the atmosphere. Some 3.2 billion cubic feet per year—approximately the same amount that is commercially extracted—is lost this way, the APS estimates.

(Theoretically, helium could be recaptured from the air, where it makes up about five ten-thousandths of 1 percent by volume. But the cost would be astronomical. Recovering even 3.2 billion cubic feet—about one year's domestic production—would require 5 percent of the annual U.S. energy consumption, according to an APS analysis.)

There are only a couple of deposits in the United States that are particularly rich in helium, said Charlotte LeGates, a spokesman for the Natural Gas Supply Association, who estimates that those resources probably will be exhausted "60 or 70 years from now." But that situation, she said, has nothing to do with whether the federal government remains in the helium business or not. She said the current budget legislation simply aims "to turn government stockpiling—which is sort of nonsense—into an orderly private market."

A spokesman for Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Calif.), who introduced the National Helium Privatization Act of 1995 that both houses of Congress incorporated into the budget bill, agreed. "The private sector is well situated to fill the need," said Vincent Sollitto. "We are extremely confident that there's going to be plenty of helium in this country."

This is plausible in view of the fact that demand for U.S.-produced helium has nearly doubled since 1985, according to the Department of Interior.

But the APS is skeptical. The physicists are not opposed to privatization of the NHR. "It will little matter to future generations whether the helium they use was extracted and stored by the government or by private industry," said APS spokesman Robert Park of the University of Maryland. "But it cannot be assumed that private industry, motivated by short-term profits, will decide to extract more helium than there is an immediate market for. Any helium that is not extracted will be lost forever as the natural gas is burned. Some incentive or requirement to store it must be in place."

For years, that incentive was the Helium Act of 1960, in which Congress authorized the NHR—operated by the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines—to make purchases of the gas and store it. The government is uniquely positioned to do so, because 64.2 percent of "helium-rich" gas resources are on federal land, according to the Bureau of Mines. The purchases were halted in 1973, and the size of the reserve has changed little since then.

The program's financial situation, however, has changed drastically. Because it was launched with a congressionally mandated $252 million loan from the Treasury and has paid back little of its debt, the National Helium Reserve "owes" the federal government about $1.4 billion, most of which is compound interest accrued in the past 35 years. It is this obligation that the sale of the reserves is intended to pay off. And it is this ostensible debt that Cox spoke of in October when he said that the NHR is "continuing to lose tens of millions of dollars a year."

The APS disputes the logic of such reasoning. "From the viewpoint of the U.S. government's net worth," the group's statement says, "regarding this $1.4 billion as a 'debt' . . . is purely illusory. . . . Any transfer of funds from one government agency to another neither reduces the Treasury's national debt nor increases the budget deficit by a single penny."

Besides, said Park of the APS, if money is the principal issue, helium is likely to appreciate in value at least as much as any other government-held asset over the next few decades. "It's a good investment over the long term," he said. "It makes far more sense than storing gold at Fort Knox."

Staff writer Guy Gugliotta contributed to this report.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 15, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR **T.J. Glauthier, OMB**
Ann Rosewater, HHS
Wesley Warren, CEQ
Mary Beth Zimmerman, DOE

FROM: Carol H. Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

RE: Meeting with National Association for State Community Services Programs

Thank you for agreeing to join me on Monday, December 18, 3:00-4:30 pm, for a meeting with representatives of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCP). The meeting will be held in Room 180 of the OEOB. If you have not already done so, please provide your date of birth to Pat Romani of my staff (456-2249).

As you are aware, the purpose of the meeting is to provide the NASCP an opportunity to discuss their programs, how they can contribute to the President's agenda, and to provide input for our FY 97 budget. The programs they are particularly interested in discussing are Weatherization and the Community Services Block Grant.

Attached is a list of the NASCP meeting participants. If you have any questions about the meeting, please call Molly Brostrom at 456-5561.

cc: Mary Beth Donahue
Alice Shuffield

Marjorie J. Witherspoon, Executive Director
National Association for State Community Services Programs
Washington, DC

Evelyn Harris, Director
Community Services Block Grant
Division of Economic Opportunity
Department of State
Albany, New York

Ms. Harris is also the Chairperson of the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSP). She has served on many national boards and has extensive experience with the Community Services Block Grant, Homeless programs and Head Start.

Rick Gerardi, Director
Weatherization Program
Division of Economic Opportunity
Department of State
Albany, New York

Mr. Gerardi has been responsible for the development of a sophisticated audit protocol for New York's weatherization program which has been a model for other states. He has also been instrumental in leveraging significant private investments into New York's weatherization program. The funds have come from landlords, agreements with utilities and housing programs.

Thomas E. Green, Deputy Director
Office of Community Services
Little Rock, Arkansas

Mr. Green is responsible for the administration of the CSBG, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and the Weatherization Assistance Program. In addition Mr. Green administers a number of homeless programs.

David Bradley, Executive Director
National Community Action Foundation
Washington, DC

Mr. Bradley is a fulltime lobbyist for Community Action Agencies. He has been involved on their behalf since the early eighties, and was instrumental in the creation of the Community Services Block Grant Act. He is also a partner with the government relations firm of Moss, McGee, Bradley and Foley.

Charles Braithwait, Executive Director
West Central Community Action Agency
Appleton City, Missouri

Mr. Braithwait is the President of the Board of Directors of the National Community Action Foundation. He has worked on behalf of the community action network since 1966, and has been a leader in the development of new strategies dealing with the needs of low-income Americans and the agencies which serve them.

OCT 2 3 1995

National Association for State
Community Services Programs

October 18, 1995

Ms. Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
White House
West Wing - Second Floor
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Carol:

It was a pleasure and honor to have some time to talk with you about the issues that are troubling state CSBG and Weatherization directors. As always your comments cut to the heart of their concerns. I am working with our members and local Community Action Agency directors to put together a group that could meet to provide a White House briefing. What date would you suggest as an appropriate time, i.e., one that would find the most relevant persons available? I realize that no time is perfect, but I would appreciate your guidance on this matter.

I am most appreciative of your offer and thank you for providing this significant opportunity to our members. I look forward to your response and to the possibility of meeting with you again soon.

Sincerely yours,

Marjorie J. Witherspoon

= Dec. 18, 3-4:30, Rm. 180
= 8-9 people from NASCSP (3 state, 3 local, 2 D.C.)
= Administration: DPC, OMB, CEQ
HHS, DoE

444 North Capitol Street, NW Suite 221 Washington, DC 20001 (202) 624-5866 Fax (202) 624-8472

12/18 NASCSP

Focus - energy

Randy: outside leveraging key
NY: $87.5M (documented) primarily from owners of props that were w'ized (lge m-f hsg, 7+)

? study
? formula in S. States

Randy/
OMB: not all states as effective as NY
balanced agst other initiatives
conservation as a whole being attacked
DoE having to streamline

didn't take into acct qual of life ... biased agst S states
'88 unit

John Henderson?

- Southerners pay just as much as income as N's on energy (poorer)
- ltr from 70 members in House

1. You could ask if OMB or HHS has anything to add on LIHEAP

2. Follow up to discuss here: quick mtg
- you could follow-up w/ CEQ (Wes Warren) + OMB (T.J. / Randy) to get the low down from them on Weatherization

Dave Eykels, HHS

- you might mention that we'll follow up internally on Weatherization / these programs?

• support restructuring / reinvention

• network

CSBG

• discretionary progs in Office of Community Services → not sufficient support

- McKinney piece → "Admin not supportive"

Demonstration p'ship program - $8M

Mikulski + Inouye

Hatfield (S) } supporters - Community Action Programs

- much gov's support

need to be thought of / included in Admin's initiatives

network has been under utilized

- believe in this Admin

Obey - considers himself "Father" of LIHEAP

- not nec'ly $,

- John Porter loves this program - bl grant w/ 5% adm. limit

Community Action Agencies run Head Start

- tensions

• Admin / Reg'l offices need to secure position in bringing the 2 together

working w/ Reich on E+T

e.g. worked w/ Mtgy Cty CAP on EITC

- Consol of # of anti-pov progs into CSBG

OCT 23 1995

National Association for State
Community Services Programs

October 18, 1995

Ms. Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
White House
West Wing - Second Floor
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Carol:

It was a pleasure and honor to have some time to talk with you about the issues that are troubling state CSBG and Weatherization directors. As always your comments cut to the heart of their concerns. I am working with our members and local Community Action Agency directors to put together a group that could meet to provide a White House briefing. What date would you suggest as an appropriate time, i.e., one that would find the most relevant persons available? I realize that no time is perfect, but I would appreciate your guidance on this matter.

Community Services [illegible]

I am most appreciative of your offer and thank you for providing this significant opportunity to our members. I look forward to your response and to the possibility of meeting with you again soon.

Sincerely yours,

Marjorie J. Witherspoon

= Dec. 18, 3-4:30, Rm. 180
= ~~8-9~~ 6-7 people from NASCSP (3 state, 3 local, 2 D.C.)
= Administration: DPC, OMB, CEQ
HHS, DoE

444 North Capitol Street, NW Suite 221 Washington, DC 20001 (202) 624-5866 Fax (202) 624-8472

National Association For State
Community Services Programs

444 North Capitol Street, N W • Suite 221
Washington, D C 20001

U.S. POSTAGE
$0.32

Ms. Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy
White House
West Wing - Second Floor
Washington, DC 20500

National Association for State
Community Services Programs

HIGHLIGHTS OF WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

QUESTION: What are weatherization services?

Weatherization services address the health, safety, comfort and energy efficiency of low-income Americans' homes. Through a network of community-based professionals, sophisticated and technologically sound building performance assesments identify areas of waste and danger relating to a home's energy systems. The necessary health and safety work and the most cost-effective energy efficient measures are then installed in each home. The kinds of measures used include: wall, ceiling, attic and floor insulation; the replacement of highly inefficient or deadly furnaces; caulking; duct repair; weather-stripping; window and door replacement.

Weatherization services are provided primarily through Community Action Agencies and other Community-based organiztions who have built a specific capacity and expertise to deliver a high quaility product. Homes with small children, elderly and handicapped, those most vulnerable to extremes in temperature, are prioritized for service.

QUESTION: What are the benefits of weatherization to the American taxpayer?

The weatherization program is an investment of taxpayer dollars that has a proven return in energy savings. For every dollar invested there is an energy savings of THREE dollars. These are dollars which remain in each community as dicretionary income.

The weatherization program increases the health and safety of the occupants in the residences that are weatherized. By identifying the presence of carbon monoxide and eliminating it, the program saves lives as well as preventing longterm effects from the presence of undetected carbon monoxide. Although hard to quantify, this certainly avoids health costs in the medicaid and medicare programs.

The program keeps low-income housing from falling into disrepair and from becoming eligible for costly rehabilitation and repair dollars.

This program maintains people in their homes. A 1989 study by Oak Ridge National Laboratories (ORNL) indicated low-income persons whose homes were weatherized did not move as often as those in a control group whose homes were not weatherized. This creates a level of stability for the children in these homes that has a significant social payback.

The weatherization program does not give a low-income household a check. It increases the household's disposable income by reducing its energy bills thus allowing it to pay more toward its own energy costs. Weatherization may be the difference in whether or not an elderly couple maintains their independence and are able to stay in their own home.

The economic efficacy of residential energy efficiency has been proven and financing is being made available on a large scale for conservation measures in non-low-income households (Home Energy Rating System, Energy Efficient Mortgages and Energy Efficient Loans). Low-income residences do not have access to this capital and therefore will not otherwise receive energy conservation treatments.

We continue to be increasingly dependent on foreign oil imports. In its evaluation of the program, ORNL found that weatherization investments in 1989 will save the Btu equivalent of 12 million barrels over the lifetime of the measures installed. These are savings that are increased each year of the program.

To sum it up, this is a one time investment in low-income residences that continues its payback over the lifetime of the measures installed in:

- energy savings
- health and comfort of the low-income residents
- stability of the housing stock
- stability of low-income families
- decreased dependency on energy both at the household level and the national one
- decreased dependency on energy payment assistance

QUESTION: Why should the federal government support the weatherization assistance program?

The benefits set forth above are the primary reasons for a federal presence. To insure that our country's most vulnerable populations are not exposed needlessly to extreme weather conditions in their residences, to conserve energy and reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to enhance the energy affordability for low-income households with a long-term solution to their energy dependence.

The weatherization program has been diligent in forming public private partnerships and leveraging additional dollars into the program. As with other public/private partnerships, there needs to be a constant and consistent partner. The Department of Energy's Weatherization program has proven itself to be the core program for leveraging other federal, state, utility and other private dollars. Without the presence of the federal dollar, the other funds that are used for this program will evaporate and the energy savings that the nation now experiences will no longer be achievable.

As mentioned above, these are residences that otherwise would not be addressed. The savings in avoided health care costs, reduced fuel assistance payments and other housing costs that are avoided cannot be realized without an adequate appropriation of federal funds for this program.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. note	phone numbers and names (partial) (1 page)	nd	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Molly Brostrom
OA/Box Number: 8396

FOLDER TITLE:

National Association for Community Services Programs

2012-0326-S
kc774

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

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

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

[002]

6-5743 fax: 6-2710
Wesley Warren (faxes)
TJ. Glauthier fax: 5-4639
5-4561 Alice Shaffield fax: 690-7755
fax: 401-4678
Ann Rosewater - 690-6133
401-5180 Sec'y → Mojnet
(Kyle Simpson - 586-5500)
MBeth Zimmerman (P6/(b)(6))
586-7249 (tel)
586-4447 (fax)