

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Americorps

Series/Staff Member: General Files

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24221

FolderID:

Folder Title:

USDA [Department of Agriculture]/AmeriCorps - Clinton Library Copies - Internal Management
Memos - 1993 [2]

Stack:
S

Row:
66

Section:
1

Shelf:
6

Position:
1

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	re:1992 campaign (2 pages)	06/24/1992	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
AmeriCorps
General Files
OA/Box Number: 24221

FOLDER TITLE:

USDA [Department of Agriculture]/AmeriCorps - Clinton Library Copies - Internal
Management Memos - 1993 [2]

2013-0661-F
rc3049

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]

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

June

Divider Title: _____

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	re:1992 campaign (2 pages)	06/24/1992	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
AmeriCorps
General Files
OA/Box Number: 24221

FOLDER TITLE:

USDA [Department of Agriculture]/AmeriCorps - Clinton Library Copies - Internal
Management Memos - 1993 [2]

2013-0661-F
rc3049

RESTRICTION CODES

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

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

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

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

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



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250-1300

MEMORANDUM

TO: PETER EDELMAN
COUNSEL TO THE SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (HHS)

FROM: JOEL BERG
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (USDA)

DATE: JUNE 23, 1993

RE: USDA SECRETARY MIKE ESPY'S SENATE TESTIMONY ON NATIONAL SERVICE

In preparation for our first interagency national service meeting, I thought it might be helpful for you to have an update on USDA activities. On June 8, Secretary Espy testified on the National Service Trust Act of 1993 before the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources and outlined both the civic philosophy behind the President's program and the concrete ways in which the Department of Agriculture will participate. A copy of his testimony is enclosed.

As you can see, Secretary Espy has directed the Department to develop three specific proposals: a rural development corps, an anti-hunger and empowerment corps, and an environmental corps.

I Look forward to working with you to develop these ideas.

DRAFT

From: Joel Berg, Director of Public Liaison, USDA

Date: June 16, 1993

Re: Saving the Core Philosophy of National Service

Imagine if we asked someone in the military to work for free... Or if we allowed soldiers to pass on their G.I. Bill benefits to their kids... Or if we paid infantry based on their family's income....

The Republicans would surely howl with derision. Yet now the G.O.P. wants to trick us into accepting each of those very same concepts for national service.

The bill's legislative language is already dangerously slanted in the direction of making the initiative a targeted jobs program for the disadvantaged. The other changes we are negotiating could result in all the pilot programs being comprised of only the rich or only the poor. These additional changes could cut out "the forgotten middle class" entirely.

Eli is absolutely right in saying that "Socioeconomic diversity is the core of what we are trying to achieve." We all know that national service was such a winning issue for the President during the campaign because it promised equal benefits for equal rewards. The Republicans want us to throw away this basic principle NOT because they sincerely think they will improve the bill, but because they want to deny the President a major, uncompromised, achievement on which he can campaign.

If we have the votes, why not force a fight? In general, our Administration has spent so much time lately on fights we can't win and, in some cases, shouldn't win. But this is a fight we would win and should win! Many of us are prepared to back you up. Just last week in Senate testimony, Secretary Espy made an impassioned plea for diversity and AGAINST needs-testing in national service.

Let's dare Congressman Goodling to go back to his rural, middle class, white district in Pennsylvania and tell his constituents that he thinks national service funds should go only to the urban poor and not to their own struggling families. He would never do it -- because he knows its a losing issue.

I plea to you -- don't trade away the philosophical guts of President Clinton's most captivating proposal. Please call me at 720-4623 if we can help.

TO: MYRON JOHNSRUD
ADMINISTRATOR, EXTENSION SERVICE

FROM: JOEL BERG
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PUBLIC LIAISON

DATE: JUNE 14, 1993

RE: PARTICIPATION OF DR. EDITH THOMAS OF THE EXTENSION SERVICE ON
USDA NATIONAL SERVICE WORKING GROUP

As you may know, Secretary Espy is committed to creating National Service pilot programs at USDA that will serve as models for how other Departments and Federal agencies can incorporate into the President's initiative. At the Secretary's direction, I have been chairing a USDA/National Service Working Group. Dr. Edith Thomas of the Extension Service has been serving as facilitator of the Working Group, whose task is to create the Department's program in anticipation of the passage of the National Service Trust Fund Act of 1993.

On May 4-5, Dr. Thomas facilitated a two-day meeting of the Working Group at the 4-H Center in Chevy Chase. The meeting included team-building workshops and informational sessions on the National Service Trust Act of 1993, which would fund National Service Programs. Discussions were held on the role of the Department of Agriculture and the various agencies in this new Presidential initiative. Participants developed three draft concept proposals in the areas of the environment, rural development, and empowerment/hunger.

Since the workshop, members of the Working Group have developed three concept proposals for a National Environment Corps, a National Rural Development Corps, and a National Anti-Hunger/Empowerment Corps. In testimony before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on June 8, Secretary Espy announced the plans for creation of these three corps. Dr. Thomas is currently assisting the development of an agenda for the next meeting of the Working Group.

The National Service Act, which will authorize funding, is currently winding its way through Congress. I anticipate its passage by fall. The Working Group will continue its efforts as we prepare for USDA's involvement when the bill becomes law. I want to take this opportunity to let you know of Dr. Thomas' continuing contribution to the establishment of National Service Programs at the USDA. I am deeply appreciative of her efforts.

cc: John Bottum, Deputy Administrator
Planning, Development, and Evaluation

Dear fellow RPCVs at ^{the} Ag Dep

My name is Kate Gilt and I was a
volunteer in Senegal. I have been at
Ag Dep for 2 years & was recently detai-
led to the Department of

To: Secretary Espy

From: Joel Berg

Date: June 7, 1993

Re: Potential Questions from Senators at National Service Hearing

Background on the Senators Likely to Attend

Democrats:

The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee is chaired by Edward Kennedy, who is not expected to attend the hearing. Kennedy was responsible for brokering the compromise between Sam Nunn, himself, and the White House that led to the passage of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, which you co-sponsored in the House. Kennedy's prime area of interest is service-learning, also known as experiential learning, in which students from kindergarten through college perform community service as part of their regular school curriculum.

The hearing will be chaired by Harris Wofford, who helped President Kennedy found the Peace Corps. Immediately before entering the Senate, Wofford served as Commissioner of Commerce in Pennsylvania under Governor Casey; under his direction, the Commerce Department pioneered ground-breaking volunteer and youth service programs. A staunch supporter of national service, Wofford entered the Senate **after** the passage of the 1990 act.

Barbara Mikulski is the member of the Committee whose position on national service most closely resembles the original proposal of the DLC. She was an original co-sponsor of the Nunn-McCurdy bill. She also proposed her own bill that would promote national service, modeled on the ROTC, which would allow part-time service on weekends and during summers; parts of this proposal were incorporated into the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

Claiborne Pell sponsored one of the earliest bills to create a type of national service. He is also the creator of the Pell Grant and may be hesitant to support major changes in the current system which would downplay needs-based grants.

Paul Simon is the leading advocate of a direct lending system which would cut both banks and Sallie Mae out of the student loan system. While those changes are contained in a separate administration bill, on which you will NOT be testifying, Simon is supportive of national service to a large degree because he sees it as a vehicle to cut banks out of student aid funds.

Howard Metzenbaum, Christopher Dodd (a former Peace Corps volunteer), Tom Harkin, Jeff Bingaman, and Paul Wellstone are also on the Committee.

Republicans:

James Jeffords of Vermont and Dave Durenberger of Minnesota are the two Republicans on the Committee that have co-sponsored the bill. Their support will likely mean that the President's bill -- in some version -- will pass the House.

Orrin Hatch of Utah, who is personally lukewarm about national service, played a key role in getting the Bush White House to agree to a compromise on the 1990 national service bill.

Nancy Kassebaum of Kansas is one of the Committee's strongest opponents of national service. She believes the government should not pay people to volunteer and that any government initiative will duplicate and harm existing private volunteer efforts.

Dan Coats of Indiana, Judd Gregg of New Hampshire, and Strom Thurmond of South Carolina are also on the Committee.

Possible Questions and Suggested Answers:

I AM CURRENTLY ATTEMPTING TO OBTAIN FROM WOFFORD'S STAFF AND THE COMMITTEE STAFF THE EXACT QUESTIONS THAT THE DEMOCRATS ON THE COMMITTEE PLAN TO ASK YOU. IF I CAN OBTAIN THEM, I WILL IMMEDIATELY PROVIDE THEM TO YOU, ALONG WITH SUGGESTED ANSWERS. IN THE MEANTIME, HERE ARE SOME QUESTIONS THAT I BELIEVE YOU MAY BE ASKED:

Question #1: Isn't it really an oxymoron to have "paid volunteers?" Why should our government pay people to do work they are already volunteering to do for free.

Answer #1: Volunteer work is critical to this nation. One of President Bush's greatest contributions was to use his high office to continually promote volunteerism with his "Points of Light Awards." This Administration will continue to promote volunteerism. In fact, I have directed my own Department to seek ways to expand its own employee volunteer programs. But volunteerism is NOT national service -- they are two different things. National service is a targeted, systematic approach to

fill unmet social needs. National service is mostly full-time, year-round work. Without compensating servers, it is unlikely that many people other than the rich would be able to donate a full year of their time to work for free. If Cabinet Secretaries and Senators and career civil servants get paid for full-time service to their nation, it is only fitting to compensate youth service with a minimal subsistence wage. Moreover, there is a greater point to be made; national service is not a giveaway, but a civic compact made between participants and their society. The G.I. Bill did not dilute the meaning of citizenship -- it enhanced it. National service will enhance citizenship. So we need both volunteerism and national service.

Question #2: Isn't national service really just a cover for yet another traditional liberal big-spending, big-government, big-bureaucracy program?

Answer #2: Absolutely not. National service represents an entirely new approach to reinventing government that is neither right nor left, neither liberal nor conservative. It combines the traditionally liberal concern with opportunity with the traditionally conservative concern for responsibility. It is a way of moving beyond established student aid programs, which do not work very well. It will create virtually no Washington bureaucracy. Almost all the national service projects will likely be managed by existing youth service groups, state and local governments, community groups, entrepreneurs, and non-profit agencies. Any program run by my agency will be entrepreneurial. We will try to obtain matching funds from private sources. We will measure performance based on actual outcomes, not on how well program managers fill out forms. Our bottom line will be that any service program must be providing valuable service to communities.

Question #3: This program would give large college scholarships to young people who might be from rich families. Wouldn't our scarce resources be better spent on targeting aid to students who couldn't get to college without it?

Answer #3: This Administration is maintaining current aid programs, such as the Pell Grant program, which are intended to help low-income students. National service educational benefits can be utilized by low-income students in addition to existing aid programs. Therefore, such youths will benefit even more through national service. Yet, national service also works towards another ideal, that of equal benefits for equal contribution to our society. Programs based on this principle, such as Social Security, receive wide-spread support from the American people beyond the span of individual Administrations.

Question #4: Won't national service discriminate against low-income students by creating a two-tiered society in which poor students work to perform service to pay for college but rich students do not?

Answer #4: Nothing discriminates against low-income students more than the failing status quo. Low-income and middle-class students **already** have to work for college, and many are still saddled with a huge debt after graduating. Under a program of national service, these students could teach reading instead of flipping burgers, and their subsequent debt would be greatly reduced. In addition, low-income citizens would be the beneficiaries of much of the work performed by the participants of national service.

Question #5: How will the President meet his pledge of making national service available for all Americans?

Answer #5: The President's plan calls for placing 25,000 participants in the field in the Fall of 1994 and moving up to 150,000 by the end of his first four years in office. It would be almost impossible to move faster and create a program that meets all our quality objectives. Not only is the budget deficit a major concern, but we simply do not want to move so fast that we displace the work of the wonderful service programs in all fifty states. We want to move as quickly as possible to build upon the successes of the current system. Our ultimate goal is to make our program so effective and popular that it continues to expand no matter who is in office five, ten, or twenty years down the road.

Question #6: What is your position on Congressional Amendments that would add to this bill provisions that would require the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to run youth corps of public lands?

Answer #6: My Department is already making very serious plans to run corps on National Forests on public lands. I have no position on such an amendment that would require me to do what I am already planning to do.

Question #7: Will the programs run by your department be targeted just for college students.

Answer #7: No, our programs will be open to all Americans who either have a high school degree or agree to receive a G.E.D. We do hope, however, that our programs will inspire, and help pay for, young people to attend college, trade schools, or apprenticeship programs, even if they had not previously planned to do so. We will allow service to be performed before, after, or during post-secondary education.

Question #8: Won't the President's proposal wipe out the ACTION agency?

Answer #8: Not at all. By merging ACTION with the new Corporation for National Service, similar to the existing Commission on National and Community Service, we will be able to utilize the best of both models. The Administration's plan will, in fact, greatly expand upon the original mission of ACTION.

To: Susan Stroud

From: Joel Berg

6 pages, including this cover

A few items:

1) I just learned that the disaster relief money administered by the Commission can only go to **Corps**. To my knowledge, out of the states affected by the flooding, only Iowa has a corps -- we have contacted them about applying. In addition, I asked Steve Mullen of our Extension Service to develop a 4-H "corps-type" proposal for immediate flood relief for Missouri. A draft is attached. If you think this proposal might legally qualify for the funds, could your office help push it?

2) We are increasingly concerned about continuing rumors that Senator Boren might get the public lands corps amendment squashed. We don't particularly care about that exact amendment per se, so much as we want to retain the flexibility that some of the language in the amendment would have given us. Could you please relate to Jack Lew our very strong concern that our legislation contain specific language that:

A) Allows the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to run public lands corps for people above the age of 18 -- our current YCC authority allows us to run programs for only youths under 18

B) Allows Forest Service employees to engage in certain activities OFF public land, such as giving community development training to young people in a town near a national forest

3) Steve Mullen has expressed interest in serving on your Interagency Task Force on Human Needs. As you know, he is highly respected by the Commission and has done remarkable youth service work for our Department. If you have any openings, I would highly recommend him.

DRAFT

Draft 1

Flood Relief - Community Service Proposal

July 1993

Missouri 4-H Youth Development Program
210 Whitten Hall - UMC
Columbia, MO
314-882-4012

Compiled by

Barry Link, 4-H Natural Resource Spec.
Barb Brown, 4-H SACC Coordinator

DRAFT

Situation-

In 49 Missouri counties, communities have been inundated with flood waters from the Missouri, Mississippi and many local rivers. These floods have caused physical loss to homes, personal belongings, agricultural crops and many businesses. In addition to the physical loss, the mental stress of being displaced from ones home, and the total devastation caused by the flood will continue to affect many individuals long after the flood waters have receded.

Many communities will be faced with reallocation of local resources, and possibly the complete elimination of local summer youth oriented programs available through parks and recreation departments, local churches or school systems.

Why 4-H and University Extension

Within University Extension and Missouri 4-H Youth Development Programs there exists a capacity to help both communities and familys' begin to cope with the problems at hand, and to help them rebuild their lives, homes and their communities. University Extension has both the people skills as evidenced by the work done in the early and mid 1980's in dealing with the rural crisis and the technical expertise to assist both individuals and communities help restore their lives, homes and businesses.

Proposal -

Creation of a state wide Youth Service Corp, utilizing the many existing community linkages and the organizational structure, and educational expertise that currently exists within the local extension and 4-H system. Local units will be formed consisting of single or multiple "action teams", headed by a county coordinator.

Each action team will consist of 2 adults and 12 teen stipend volunteers. This configuration provides for an easily transportable unit (van), with proper adult supervision and the manpower capacity to accomplish a given task. The program will function for an initial period to begin August 15th through December 31, 1993. Fifty (50) teams (600 youth and 100 adults) providing a minimum of 120 hours of service per team will be available for work in local communities. A review of impacts and additional needs during December 1993 will take place to determine future directions for 1994.

Multiple benefits will occur with this model:

- * communities and elderly individuals will gain direct benefits from the youthful manpower available to assist with flood clean-up activities.

- * youth who have experienced a loss as a result of this disaster will have an avenue to vent frustrations, and find a supportive structure in the team.

DRAFT

* the model provides constructive alternative activities for older youth along with an opportunity for income (stipend) which can be used to replace lost or damaged personal items.

* Youth will develop an increased sense of community ownership and pride in helping to restore their community.

* Youth will gain valuable job skills, work place ethic and organizational skills and sense of achievement as various tasks are accomplished.

* Adults team coordinators will receive compensation for their services. This will provide an alternative means of income for adults displaced from work or spouses needing to generate additional income needed for the family.

PLACEMENT OF TEAMS -

Communities may apply through the local Extension Center for funding to put teams in place within their communities. Communities may apply for funding of multiple teams depending on their needs and availability of interested youth. Teams will be assembled at the local level, with training coordinated and provided by appropriate state and local extension staff.

TRAINING-

All program participants will receive and orientation to their specific project and training relating to flood safety and safe handling of flood damaged materials. Training in dealing with stress and people under stress will also be included.

Adult team coordinators will receive additional training on working and organizing youth on their teams. Ages and stages of adolescents will be explored in order to provide a positive experience for the youth involved. Adults will also learn how to help place these teens into leadership roles within their teams, to allow for team decision making. Training on identifying and dealing with stress in individuals will be a final component.

PROPOSED TEAM PROJECTS -

While many projects exist the initial proposal is to involve the teams in areas that can be best supported by the extension and 4-H organization and place youth in low risk situations.

YOUTH WORKING WITH SENIOR CITIZENS

A team of youth will be partnered with local senior citizens whose homes were affected by the flood waters. Youths will provide assistance in house and yard clean-up, while also being supportive to the older person as they begin the stressful job of putting their home back together. Youth involved in this effort will

DRAFT

receive training in understanding/sensitivity to an elderly person in need of attention and support, safety issues associated with flood water clean-up and how-tos on yard and home clean up.

SAFE, NURTURING ENVIRONMENT FOR SCHOOL-AGERS

When the waters recede, and families begin to either clean-up their homes, or make decisions to start over, school-age children (youth ages 5-12) will be greatly affected. The stress caused by the unknown, decisions made quickly and multiple changes will create confusion in families. School-agers will need an environment where they can receive support and understanding for the emotions they are feeling.

A team of youths will participate in training that will help them understand the developmental needs and the signs of stress among school-agers. The team using existing curriculum will design a program that will help provide school-agers, whose homes were hurt by the flood, with a supportive, nurturing environment. A program where school-agers can come to find friends who understand the confusion at home, and where they can have fun and get away from the clean-up for awhile.

REMOVAL OF FLOOD RESTRAINING SUPPLIES

Many Missourians volunteered their time to strengthen levies and protect buildings with sand bags and other structures. These will have served their purpose, when the waters recede and will need to be removed, to eliminate a public nuisance. Teams of youths will assist with the disposal and clean up the thousands of sand bags and other flood retaining structures, disposing of them properly. Teams will receive safety training and instruction on proper disposal techniques.

PUBLIC USE AREAS

When the flood waters recede many recreational areas, that were build on flood plains will be in bad shape. Cities and counties that built the facilities will have neither the money or manpower to rebuild these quickly, and in fact they will probably not be the first priority in the clean-up. However, these facilities are often used by the young people in these small communities as one of the few sources of recreation and entertainment. Teams of youth will be trained on clean-up techniques, and provided the equipment and supplies so that these public use areas can be cleared and made safe for public use.

OPTIONAL TEAM PLANING

Because the needs of communities will vary greatly the option for these teams to work with local officials and to develop alternative projects is a viable option. Assistance will be provided to the teams in order to for them to gain the necessary expertise needed for their task. Coordination of this assistance will be through the University Extension Flood Emergency Task Force.

DRAFT

EVALUATION

The teams will provide daily work logs to the county coordinator with tasks accomplished and time spent. These will be reviewed in order to help balance the work variety for local teams and to help determine where additional assistance is needed for the teams.

A monthly evaluation of the local project will be conducted with the coordinator and the local clean-up management committee to determine the needs and future direction of the project.

BUDGET - Draft 7/13/93

Team Budget - 1 Unit - 120 hours per unit

Adult Team Leaders (2 adults)	\$1440
----------------------------------	--------

Youth Stipend 12x \$100	\$1200
-------------------------	--------

Insurance	\$250
-----------	-------

Transportation .50 x 300 miles	\$150
--------------------------------	-------

ID Safety Vests	\$150
-----------------	-------

Work Gloves	\$45
-------------	------

Safety Caps	\$150
-------------	-------

Total Cost per team	\$3385
---------------------	--------

Project Coordinator .5FTE for 6 Mo.	\$8,000
-------------------------------------	---------

Clerical/Payroll	\$3000
------------------	--------

Total Project 50 Teams w/state coordinator	\$180,250.00
---	--------------

Cost per manhour \$2.14

University Extension match will be through training of 50 teams at 8 hours per team total 400 hours. Value \$40,000

To: Secretary Espy

From: Joel Berg

Date: June 4, 1993

Re: Background on Tuesday's Hearing on National Service

By the start of business on Monday, I will provide you with draft testimony for Tuesday's national service hearing of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, as well as a set of likely questions from the Senators and suggested answers. Later in the day, I will orally brief you.

Secretary Babbitt testified before the same committee on May 11 and outlined the details of the President's proposal, therefore it may not be necessary for your testimony to dwell on the specifics of the bill. Instead, I suggest that your prepared remarks focus on the general philosophy behind the President's proposal and the specific ways in which USDA is preparing to participate in the program.

This memo outlines three ways that USDA can incorporate into the President's national service initiative. If you approve of them, I would like to highlight them in your testimony.

The Administration's bill, which should pass Congress in the next few months, would place the participants in the field starting in the Fall of 1994. Under the proposed legislation, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations. Through Extension Service and other USDA agencies, **we can play a vital role in providing technical assistance to organizations and institutions that want to apply for national service grants** from the new Corporation for National Service. For instance, we could work very closely with the Council of 1890's Presidents/Chancellors to help them in developing their proposed "Rural Community Service Program."

The legislation will also give USDA and other government agencies additional funds to allow us to design and manage our own youth service programs. In recent testimony on the Hill, Secretary Babbitt pledged that his Department would submit a service proposal the day after the President signs the bill. I have convened a working group with USDA employees from Extension Service, SCS, Forest Service, RDA, and FNS to develop specific proposals for corps we can run.

At your direction, I have worked with the task force to develop two very specific proposals: an Anti-Hunger and Empowerment Corps and a Environmental Corps. The working group also developed another idea, a Rural Development Corps, which I have discussed with Bob Nash.

Common Characteristics of All the Proposed USDA Service Programs

All the USDA national service programs should:

- * Reinvent government by promoting opportunity, responsibility, and community.
- * Reunite the interests of the middle class and the poor by allowing young people from all types of families to earn their way through college.
- * Provide models for how the federal government can run national service programs.
- * Expand dramatically as the President phases-in a full-scale national program.
- * Recruit groups of participants that are geographically, racially, religiously, and socioeconomically diverse.
- * Provide valuable service to the community by systematically filling unmet social needs.
- * Allow young people to perform service either before or after attending post-secondary education.
- * Forge links to youth apprenticeship programs run by USDA and other Cabinet agencies.
- * Give the participants at least a minimum wage living expense, as well as adequate supervision and training.
- * Limit the work performed to tasks that fulfill significant missions of USDA and are supported by our major constituency groups (farming, consumer, commodity, environmental, etc.).
- * Encourage the leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.
- * Build a new form of entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic government.
- * Create its staff out of existing USDA personnel.
- * Be managed across traditional USDA agency lines.

Proposal for National Empowerment Corps

I. SUMMARY:

Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help-low income families and individuals move towards self-sufficiency. The main focus of the Corps would be fighting domestic hunger; it would be similar to EFNEP but would have a greatly expanded mission. Corps members would help individuals apply for food stamps, WIC, and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets; learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credits, microenterprise loans, and help from community development banks. In short, this Corps would help put into effect the entire empowerment agenda promoted by you and President Clinton. A full-scale program could eventually provide a big boost to your efforts to eradicate domestic hunger.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED ON THE PROPOSAL:

John Webster of FNS; Katherine Gibney of FSIS; Alma Hobbs, Jon Irby and Edith Thomas of Extension Service

III. HOW PROGRAM WOULD WORK:

Participants would provide outreach and access services, build the anti-hunger and anti-poverty infrastructures, and run innovative new empowerment programs:

A) Provide outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible)

- o Outreach Workers Inform target populations about program availability (all programs)
- o Drivers Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP)

- o Delivery Aides
Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly, physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Aides
Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs)
- o Service Facilitator
Conduct telephone follow-up with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP)

B) Bolster the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent):

- o Food Handlers
Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR)
- o Day Care Workers
Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Case Assistants
Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)

- o Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance, monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)
- o Nutrition Assistants Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o CACFC Assistant Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

C) Boost innovative new empowerment programs

- o EITC Help families obtain the newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit
- o Microenterprise Teach people how to start small businesses
- o Community Develop. Banks Inform families on how to apply for loans from community development banks
- o Assets Building Work with families to develop savings plans
- o Tenant management Help public housing tenants to develop organizations for self-management
- o Apprenticeship Work with local schools and businesses to develop new school-to-work transition programs

Proposal for a National Environmental Youth Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with Interior and EPA, would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The urban component would be mostly non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The rural component would be both residential and non-residential and would perform conservation-related work projects on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Brian McGuire and Katherine Allen of the Forest Service; Jim Fuller of SCS; Andy Fisher of the National Forest Foundation

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree-planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to give youth sense of community and self-discipline
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;

Approach:

Urban: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas.

The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, building or improving recreation areas, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

Corps members could also focus on teaching sustainable agriculture, helping small farmers stay on the land, building rural housing, and engaging in rural development projects.

Participants and Clientele:

The participants would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

Anticipated Results:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, Americans are losing the ability to learn first hand about natural resources. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future while also providing for food and shelter.

Potential Partners:

I am meeting next week with representatives from Interior and EPA to discuss how we can plan together.

Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army Corps of Engineers
Land Grant universities
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America

Proposal for Rural Community Self Development Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture would establish a Corps of "professional" and "paraprofessional" members who could assist communities in identifying needs and resources necessary for economic well being. This group of individuals would be able to assist communities of all sizes facing economic recovery and local leadership development issues to plan and prioritize efforts combining formal and non formal education to work locally. The Corps will then assist the community to locate financial resources, prepare proposals, design educational programs, and implement strategies necessary for revitalization. The entire focus would be on the community generating its own vision for the future and the USDA corps assisting the community in creating and attaining that vision. **This Corps, consisting of participants older and more highly educated than the other two Corps, could be funded by a special section of the Administration's proposed bill that would fund special professional corps such as "Teachers Corps" or "Police Corps."**

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Bob Nash; Ruth McWilliams and Brian McGuire of the Forest Service; Norm Reed of RDA; Carl Bouchard of SCS; Steve Mullen and Randy Williams of Extension Service; and Joe Binder of REA

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

This program could give a significant boost to our overall rural development efforts.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o accomplish much needed community planning activities necessary to assure the economic vitality and productivity of our rural and mid-sized communities
- o teach specific skills in community building, coalition building, strategic planning and visioning, and leadership development
- o develop skills in working with units of local government encountered by community members in everyday living

Approach:

Most states have local Planning and Development Districts which provide for the overall strategic and project planning efforts for a multi-jurisdictional area. Some of these cover several counties, and some cover multiple communities within a county or township. They are staffed by local citizens and all have one thing in common. They are understaffed.

Bob Nash has suggested strongly that our Corps participants be physically located within the offices of local districts, so that they work with the districts and do not pose the threat of competition over turf.

Many rural communities now pay high-priced consultants to advise them on development; right now the Forest Service even gives grants to some communities to hire such consultants. With proper training, our Corps members could take the place of these consultants and help communities develop their tourism, high-tech industries, recreation sites, etc. The Corps members would work with each community to create an economic development action plan that makes sense for that particular community.

This Corps would also provide trained people with community involvement skills to begin to go into the communities and build from the bottom up the kind of plans that will be able to assure local support for the needed economic changes to occur through development of local leadership, especially among older youth, and the multiplier effect where teams work with preadolescent. These youth would explore with local governments possible avenues to serve as entrepreneurs within local government.

The participants would training before being assigned to the local districts. They would then live and work in the communities for which they are providing the assistance.

To support these Corps members, there already exists an information data base at the National Agriculture Library called the National Rural Information Center. This information center maintains a data base of organizations which provide financial support to communities on a national, regional, and local basis. This data base is available to the Corps members for assisting the community in developing its own action plan and applying for funding. Curriculum for teaching leadership and volunteer development and program management would be necessary along with basic life skills and understanding of basic business principles.

Participants and Clientele:

Participants of this program would hold either bachelor's degrees or graduate degrees and use the benefits to pay back student loans. Unfortunately, only two graduate schools in the country now specifically teach rural development; perhaps we could form partnerships with others to do so. Participants could also be trained in public administration, civil engineering, or agricultural science.

The communities themselves would be clients. As active participants in the revitalization of their community, they will have an increased commitment to maintaining the new economic path they have chosen. There will be considerable economic incentives for them to participate.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Thirty-two states currently have economic development councils or rural development councils so early pilot programs would be easy. Pilot programs could quickly be established in five areas of our country:

Oregon and Washington

Four Corners: Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona

Tennessee and Kentucky

East Texas and Louisiana

North Carolina, Texas, Missouri

The Mississippi Delta

These areas already have an existing multi-agency coordination group functioning well and communities that are in dire need of assistance.

Anticipated results:

There would be multiple outcomes and benefits derived from this program. The outcomes would be local and national at the same time. First, there would be the learning while earning of the Corps members themselves and those with whom they work. While the objectives of that learning have been chronicled elsewhere, it

is necessary here to again emphasize its critical importance to our country and to the communities that will come to benefit from these skilled citizens.

The increased economic viability of our rural communities and small towns would be another major benefit. With the assistance of the Corps, communities will be better able to develop a sound economic base that will take them into the next century. Results such as increased agricultural production, a viable pollution-free light industry, increased local tourism, and many other benefits are possible through planning and implementation of long range strategies as well as developing a community leadership core for the future.

Through a mentoring program with current community leaders new leaders would be developed. These practical skills would assist in passing on not only the usual skills, but allow for the passing on of the vital local cultural nuances as community spirit. The older leadership in the community would feel a greater sense of pride in being able to pass on its legacy to a new generation.

Potential Partners:

Monday Management Group (17 federal agencies involved in rural development)
 National Association of Counties
 National Association of Development Organizations
 National Governors Organization
 National Association of Towns and Townships
 National League of Cities
 State Rural Development Councils
 State Economic Development Councils or Agencies
 Local Planning and Development entities both private and public
 National Association of State Foresters
 Department of Defense Agencies such as Corps of Engineers, Air Force. etc/
 1890's Institutions

Issues to be Resolved for All Three Proposals:

1. How are Corps applicants selected, matched with suitable assignments, and trained? Will there be any age range set for the participants?
2. Would applicants be assigned anywhere they are needed, or only within their communities of origin? The former requires a higher degree of national organization; the latter would reduce re-location costs and might enhance cultural acceptance of the applicant.
3. Who supervises the Corps member? There will be a need to judge performance, initiate additional training when needed, and even perhaps to terminate or initiate re-assignment when necessary. Would workers be evaluated by NEC on quality as well as quantity (for quantity, productivity as well as hours contributed)?
4. What is a suitable assignment? Should local or county government agencies or community organizations have free rein in assigning Corps members wherever they wish, or should the assignments be limited to augmenting the functional capability of the agency - for example, providing tutoring services where none existed before. Would assignment as a file clerk, for example, be acceptable on the grounds that it frees up a staff member who can provide higher-level services to recipients, or would that assignment be viewed as supplanting efforts already underway and of no particular value to the Corps member?
5. How would this initiative relate to existing volunteer organizations?
6. What kind of structure will the initiative have? How will it interact with state and local governments?
7. How many USDA personnel will be required to manage the program?
8. How much will the program cost in total and per server?
9. What states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations can help fund this program?
10. How will locations be selected and the sizes of the pilot program be determined?
11. How many participants can we place in workable pilot programs? What will be the ultimate capacity of these programs?

Timeline for Suggested Action:

If you agree with the basic outlines of these three proposals, I recommend we take the following steps:

By June 10, 1993: Brief the Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretaries, the Assistant Secretaries, and Agency Administrators on the National Service plan and enlist their full cooperation in helping us develop the Empowerment Corps, the Environmental Corps, and the Rural Development Corps.

By July 1, 1993: Detail from appropriate agencies staff to serve on a USDA working group to hammer out specific details of each proposal.

By August 1, 1993: Identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships.

By September 1, 1993: Sign a memorandum of understanding with Interior, EPA, and other agencies with whom we will jointly make proposals.

By October 1, 1993: Complete preliminary proposal for submission to Corporation for National Service.

By March 1994: Finalize start-up plans for projects approved by the Corporation for National Service.

By July 1994: Interview and place project personnel.

By September 1, 1994: Begin pilot project.

I sincerely thank you for your continuing commitment to making national service a reality. Please let me know how you would like me to proceed.

TO: MIKE SWEENEY
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

FROM: JOEL BERG, USDA
DIRECTOR, PUBLIC LIAISON

RE: NATIONAL SERVICE

DATE: JUNE 3, 1993

Here are all the references to Federal agencies in the National Service Trust Act of 1993 (Senate 919) that I told you I would send. Thanks for attending the June 2 meeting and I will be in touch.

"PART I--INVESTMENT IN NATIONAL SERVICE, SECTION 121. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE AND APPROVED NATIONAL SERVICE POSITIONS. (b) Agreements With Federal Agencies -- The Corporation may enter into a contract or cooperative agreement with another Federal agency to support a national service program carried out by the agency. The support provided by the Corporation pursuant to the contract or cooperative agreement may include the transfer to the Federal agency of funds available to the Corporation under this subtitle. A Federal agency receiving assistance under this subsection shall not be required to satisfy the matching funds requirements specified in subsection (e). However, the supplementation requirements specified in section 173 shall apply with respect to the Federal national service programs supported with such assistance. \ \

\ PART II -- APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS, SECTION 129. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE AND APPROVED NATIONAL SERVICE POSITIONS BY COMPETITIVE AND OTHER MEANS. (D)(2) Federal agencies and other applicants.--The Corporation shall distribute on a competitive basis to subdivisions of States, Indian tribes, public and private not-for-profit organizations (including labor organizations), institutions of higher education, and Federal agencies the remainder of the funds allocated by the Corporation for provision of assistance under section 121 for a fiscal year, after operation of paragraph (1) and subsections (a) and (c). \

\ SECTION 133. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS. "(2) Priorities--The Corporation may designate, under such criteria as may be established by the Corporation, certain national service programs or types of national service programs described in section 122 (a) for priority consideration in the competitive distribution of funds under section 129(d)(2). In designating national service programs to receive priority the Corporation may include ~~the following~~ \

(B) national service programs carried out by another Federal agency;

as you can see, the legislation not only allows federal agencies to run their own corps, but gives ~~the agencies~~ agency programs priority in the grant process.

Wednesday

Judy Hamilton
Domestic Effort
RPCU

Jamie
Stevens
World Agriculture
Project
from London
England
10 a.m.

Barbara
Bush
8
USDA

Tomorrow

Help
Butler
EPA

Chris Hedrick
Senegal
88-90
4471723-8570

Barbara
202 606-3970

Calls for
National
Leaders
Pool

1. form
PC. Vists
honorary
2. assume
special
roles in
diff
2. ~~un~~ten
Leaders

Anna
Callahan
private funds
acted as
Chris Hedrick
RPCU
1 deny
PC Dellow
proze
money
write program
Congressional
Jim Simons
78-80
official
two
operating fellows
coordinate

To: Ron Blackley

From: Joel Berg

Date: June 2, 1993

Re: USDA's Long-Term Role in the Clinton National Service Plan

PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING PROPOSAL AND THEN DISCUSS IT WITH ME BEFORE I PRESENT IT TO THE SECRETARY.

Background

Whether or not USDA helps funds youth service programs for **this** Summer, the Department will likely play a large role in the President's long-term initiative. The Administration's bill, which should pass Congress in the next few months, would place the participants in the field starting in the Fall of 1994.

Under the proposed legislation, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations. Through Extension Service and other USDA agencies, **we can play a vital role in providing technical assistance to organizations and institutions that want to apply for national service grants** from the new Corporation for National Service. For instance, we could work very closely with the Council of 1890's Presidents/Chancellors to help in developing its proposed "Rural Community Service Program.

The legislation will also give USDA and other government agencies additional funds to allow us to design and manage our own youth service programs. In recent testimony on the Hill, Secretary Babbitt pledged that his Department would submit a service proposal the day after the President signs the bill. I have convened a working group with USDA employees from Extension Service, SCS, Forest Service, RDA, and FNS to develop specific proposals for corps we can run. At your direction, I have worked with the task force to develop two very specific proposals:

1) Anti-Hunger and Empowerment Corps

2) Environmental Corps

The working group also developed another idea, which I have discussed with Bob Nash:

3) Rural Development Corps

Common Characteristics of All the Proposed USDA Service Programs

All the USDA national service programs should:

- * Reinvent government by promoting opportunity, responsibility, and community.
- * Reunite the interests of the middle class and the poor by allowing young people from all types of families to earn their way through college.
- * Provide models for how the federal government can run national service programs.
- * Expand dramatically as the President phases-in a full-scale national program.
- * Recruit groups of participants that are geographically, racially, religiously, and socioeconomically diverse.
- * Provide valuable service to the community by systematically filling unmet social needs.
- * Allow young people to perform service either before **or** after attending post-secondary education.
- * Forge links to youth apprenticeship programs run by USDA and other Cabinet agencies.
- * Give the participants at least a minimum wage living expense, as well as adequate supervision and training.
- * Limit the work performed to tasks that fulfill significant missions of USDA and are supported by our major constituency groups (farming, consumer, commodity, environmental, etc.).
- * Encourage the leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.
- * Build a new form of entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic government.
- * Create its staff out of existing USDA personnel.
- * Be managed across traditional USDA agency lines.

Proposal for National Empowerment Corps

I. SUMMARY:

Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help-low income families and individuals move towards self-sufficiency. The main focus of the Corps would be fighting domestic hunger; it would be similar to EFNEP but would have a greatly expanded mission. Corps members would help individuals apply for food stamps, WIC, and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets; learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credits, microenterprise loans, and help from community development banks. In short, this Corps would help put into effect the entire empowerment agenda promoted by you and President Clinton. A full-scale program could eventually provide a big boost to your efforts to eradicate domestic hunger.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED ON THE PROPOSAL:

John Webster of FNS; Katherine Gibney of FSIS; Alma Hobbs, Jon Irby and Edith Thomas of Extension Service

III. HOW PROGRAM WOULD WORK:

Participants would provide outreach and access services, build the anti-hunger and anti-poverty infrastructures, and run innovative new empowerment programs:

A) Provide outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible)

- o Outreach Workers Inform target populations about program availability (all programs)
- o Drivers Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP)

- o Delivery Aides
Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly, physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Aides
Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs)
- o Service Facilitator
Conduct telephone follow-up with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP)

B) Bolster the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent):

- o Food Handlers
Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR)
- o Day Care Workers
Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Case Assistants
Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)

- o Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance, monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)
- o Nutrition Assistants Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o CACFC Assistant Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

C) Boost innovative new empowerment programs

- o EITC Help families obtain the newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit
- o Microenterprise Teach people how to start small businesses
- o Community Develop. Banks Inform families on how to apply for loans from community development banks
- o Assets Building Work with families to develop savings plans
- o Tenant management Help public housing tenants to develop organizations for self-management
- o Apprenticeship Work with local schools and businesses to develop new school-to-work transition programs

Proposal for a National Environmental Youth Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with Interior and EPA, would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The urban component would be mostly non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The rural component would be both residential and non-residential and would perform conservation-related work projects on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Brian McGuire and Katherine Allen of the Forest Service; Jim Fuller of SCS; Andy Fisher of the National Forest Foundation

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree-planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to give youth sense of community and self-discipline
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;

Approach:

Urban: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas.

The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, building or improving recreation areas, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

Corps members could also focus on teaching sustainable agriculture, helping small farmers stay on the land, building rural housing, and engaging in rural development projects.

Participants and Clientele:

The participants would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

Anticipated Results:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, Americans are losing the ability to learn first hand about natural resources. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future while also providing for food and shelter.

Potential Partners:

I am meeting next week with representatives from Interior and EPA to discuss how we can plan together.

Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army Corps of Engineers
Land Grant universities
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America

Proposal for Rural Community Self Development Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture would establish a Corps of "professional" and "paraprofessional" members who could assist communities in identifying needs and resources necessary for economic well being. This group of individuals would be able to assist communities of all sizes facing economic recovery and local leadership development issues to plan and prioritize efforts combining formal and non formal education to work locally. The Corps will then assist the community to locate financial resources, prepare proposals, design educational programs, and implement strategies necessary for revitalization. The entire focus would be on the community generating its own vision for the future and the USDA corps assisting the community in creating and attaining that vision. **This Corps, consisting of participants older and more highly educated than the other two Corps, could be funded by a special section of the Administration's proposed bill that would fund special professional corps such as "Teachers Corps" or "Police Corps."**

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Bob Nash; Ruth McWilliams and Brian McGuire of the Forest Service; Norm Reed of RDA; Carl Bouchard of SCS; Steve Mullen and Randy Williams of Extension Service; and Joe Binder of REA

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

This program could give a significant boost to our overall rural development efforts.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o accomplish much needed community planning activities necessary to assure the economic vitality and productivity of our rural and mid-sized communities
- o teach specific skills in community building, coalition building, strategic planning and visioning, and leadership development
- o develop skills in working with units of local government encountered by community members in everyday living

Approach:

Most states have local Planning and Development Districts which provide for the overall strategic and project planning efforts for a multi-jurisdictional area. Some of these cover several counties, and some cover multiple communities within a county or township. They are staffed by local citizens and all have one thing in common. They are understaffed.

Bob Nash has suggested strongly that our Corps participants be physically located within the offices of local districts, so that they work with the districts and do not pose the threat of competition over turf.

Many rural communities now pay high-priced consultants to advise them on development; right now the Forest Service even gives grants to some communities to hire such consultants. With proper training, our Corps members could take the place of these consultants and help communities develop their tourism, high-tech industries, recreation sites, etc. The Corps members would work with each community to create an economic development action plan that makes sense for that particular community.

This Corps would also provide trained people with community involvement skills to begin to go into the communities and build from the bottom up the kind of plans that will be able to assure local support for the needed economic changes to occur through development of local leadership, especially among older youth, and the multiplier effect where teams work with preadolescent. These youth would explore with local governments possible avenues to serve as entrepreneurs within local government.

The participants would training before being assigned to the local districts. They would then live and work in the communities for which they are providing the assistance.

To support these Corps members, there already exists an information data base at the National Agriculture Library called the National Rural Information Center. This information center maintains a data base of organizations which provide financial support to communities on a national, regional, and local basis. This data base is available to the Corps members for assisting the community in developing its own action plan and applying for funding. Curriculum for teaching leadership and volunteer development and program management would be necessary along with basic life skills and understanding of basic business principles.

Participants and Clientele:

Participants of this program would hold either bachelor's degrees or graduate degrees and use the benefits to pay back student loans. Unfortunately, only two graduate schools in the country now specifically teach rural development; perhaps we could form partnerships with others to do so. Participants could also be trained in public administration, civil engineering, or agricultural science.

The communities themselves would be clients. As active participants in the revitalization of their community, they will have an increased commitment to maintaining the new economic path they have chosen. There will be considerable economic incentives for them to participate.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Thirty-two states currently have economic development councils or rural development councils so early pilot programs would be easy. Pilot programs could quickly be established in five areas of our country:

Oregon and Washington

Four Corners: Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona

Tennessee and Kentucky

East Texas and Louisiana

North Carolina, Texas, Missouri

The Mississippi Delta

These areas already have an existing multi-agency coordination group functioning well and communities that are in dire need of assistance.

Anticipated results:

There would be multiple outcomes and benefits derived from this program. The outcomes would be local and national at the same time. First, there would be the learning while earning of the Corps members themselves and those with whom they work. While the objectives of that learning have been chronicled elsewhere, it is necessary here to again emphasize its critical importance to our country and to the communities that will come to benefit from these skilled citizens.

The increased economic viability of our rural communities and small towns would be another major benefit. With the assistance of the Corps, communities will be better able to develop a sound economic base that will take them into the next century. Results such as increased agricultural production, a viable pollution-free light industry, increased local tourism, and many other benefits are possible through planning and implementation of long range strategies as well as developing a community leadership core for the future.

Through a mentoring program with current community leaders new leaders would be developed. These practical skills would assist in passing on not only the usual skills, but allow for the passing on of the vital local cultural nuances as community spirit. The older leadership in the community would feel a greater sense of pride in being able to pass on its legacy to a new generation.

Potential Partners:

Monday Management Group (17 federal agencies involved in rural development)
National Association of Counties
National Association of Development Organizations
National Governors Organization
National Association of Towns and Townships
National League of Cities
State Rural Development Councils
State Economic Development Councils or Agencies
Local Planning and Development entities both private and public
National Association of State Foresters
Department of Defense Agencies such as Corps of Engineers, Air Force. etc/
1890's Institutions

Issues to be Resolved for All Three Proposals:

1. How are Corps applicants selected, matched with suitable assignments, and trained? Will there be any age range set for the participants?
2. Would applicants be assigned anywhere they are needed, or only within their communities of origin? The former requires a higher degree of national organization; the latter would reduce re-location costs and might enhance cultural acceptance of the applicant.
3. Who supervises the Corps member? There will be a need to judge performance, initiate additional training when needed, and even perhaps to terminate or initiate re-assignment when necessary. Would workers be evaluated by NEC on quality as well as quantity (for quantity, productivity as well as hours contributed)?
4. What is a suitable assignment? Should local or county government agencies or community organizations have free rein in assigning Corps members wherever they wish, or should the assignments be limited to augmenting the functional capability of the agency - for example, providing tutoring services where none existed before. Would assignment as a file clerk, for example, be acceptable on the grounds that it frees up a staff member who can provide higher-level services to recipients, or would that assignment be viewed as supplanting efforts already underway and of no particular value to the Corps member?
5. How would this initiative relate to existing volunteer organizations?
6. What kind of structure will the initiative have? How will it interact with state and local governments?
7. How many USDA personnel will be required to manage the program?
8. How much will the program cost in total and per server?
9. What states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations can help fund this program?
10. How will locations be selected and the sizes of the pilot program be determined?
11. How many participants can we place in workable pilot programs? What will be the ultimate capacity of these programs?

Timeline for Suggested Action:

I recommend that the Secretary approve the following steps:

By June 10, 1993: Brief the Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretaries, the Assistant Secretaries, and Agency Administrators on the National Service plan and enlist their full cooperation in helping us develop the Empowerment Corps, the Environmental Corps, and the Rural Development Corps.

By July 1, 1993: Detail from appropriate agencies staff to serve on a USDA working group to hammer out specific details of each proposal.

By August 1, 1993: Identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships.

By September 1, 1993: Sign a memorandum of understanding with Interior, EPA, and other agencies with whom we will jointly makes proposals.

By October 1, 1993: Complete preliminary proposal for submission to Corporation for National Service.

By March 1994: Finalize start-up plans for projects approved by the Corporation for National Service.

By July 1994: Interview and place project personnel.

By September 1, 1994: Begin pilot project.

I sincerely thank you for your continuing commitment to making national service a reality. Please let me know how you would like me to proceed.

DRAFT

To: Members of USDA/National Service Working Group

From: Joel Berg JB

Date: June 1, 1993

Re: USDA's Long-Term Role in the Clinton National Service Plan

I WANT TO THANK EACH OF YOU FOR YOUR WORK, ESPECIALLY WITH REGARD TO PUTTING TOGETHER THESE CONCEPT PROPOSALS. HERE IS MY SYNTHESIS OF YOUR EFFORTS WHICH WILL BE SUBMITTED SOON TO SECRETARY ESPY.

Background

Whether or not USDA helps funds youth service programs for **this** Summer, the Department will likely play a large role in the President's long-term initiative. The Administration's bill, which should pass Congress in the next few months, would place the participants in the field starting in the Fall of 1994.

Under the proposed legislation, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations. Through Extension Service and other USDA agencies, **we can play a vital role in providing technical assistance to organizations and institutions that want to apply for national service grants** from the new Corporation for National Service. For instance, we could work very closely with the Council of 1890's Presidents/Chancellors to help in developing its proposed "Rural Community Service Program.

The legislation will also give USDA and other government agencies additional funds to allow us to design and manage our own youth service programs. In recent testimony on the Hill, Secretary Babbitt pledged that his Department would submit a service proposal the day after the President signs the bill. I have convened a working group with USDA employees from Extension Service, SCS, Forest Service, RDA, and FNS to develop specific proposals for corps we can run. At your direction, I have worked with the task force to develop two very specific proposals:

1) Anti-Hunger and Empowerment Corps

2) Environmental Corps

The working group also developed another idea, which I have discussed with Bob Nash:

3) Rural Development Corps

All the USDA national service programs should:

- * Reinvent government by promoting opportunity, responsibility, and community.
- * Reunite the interests of the middle class and the poor by allowing young people from all types of families to earn their way through college.
- * Provide models for how the federal government can run national service programs.
- * Expand dramatically as the President phases-in a full-scale national program.
- * Recruit groups of participants that are geographically, racially, religiously, and socioeconomically diverse.
- * Provide valuable service to the community by systematically filling unmet social needs.
- * Allow young people to perform service either before **or** after attending post-secondary education.
- * Forge links to youth apprenticeship programs run by USDA and other Cabinet agencies.
- * Give the participants at least a minimum wage living expense, as well as adequate supervision and training.
- * Limit the work performed to tasks that fulfill significant missions of USDA and are supported by our major constituency groups (farming, consumer, commodity, environmental, etc.).
- * Encourage the leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.
- * Build a new form of entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic government.
- * Create its staff out of existing USDA personnel.
- * Be managed across traditional USDA agency lines.

Proposal for National Empowerment Corps

I. SUMMARY:

Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help-low income families and individuals move towards self-sufficiency. The main focus of the Corps would be fighting domestic hunger; it would be similar to EFNEP but would have a greatly expanded mission. Corps members would help individuals apply for food stamps, WIC, and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets; learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credits, microenterprise loans, and help from community development banks. In short, this Corps would help put into effect the entire empowerment agenda promoted by you and President Clinton. A full-scale program could eventually provide a big boost to your efforts to eradicate domestic hunger.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED ON THE PROPOSAL:

John Webster of FNS; Katherine Gibney of FSIS; Alma Hobbs, Jon Irby and Edith Thomas of Extension Service

III. HOW PROGRAM WOULD WORK:

Participants would provide outreach and access services, build the anti-hunger and anti-poverty infrastructures, and run innovative new empowerment programs:

A) Provide outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible)

- o Outreach Workers Inform target populations about program availability (all programs)
- o Drivers Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP)
- o Delivery Aides Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly,

physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR)

- o Bilingual Aides
Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs)
- o Service Facilitator
Conduct telephone follow-up with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP)

B) Bolster the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent):

- o Food Handlers
Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR)
- o Day Care Workers
Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Case Assistants
Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)
- o Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides
Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance, monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)

- o Nutrition Assistants Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o CACFC Assistant Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

C) Boost innovative new empowerment programs

- o EITC Help families obtain the newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit
- o Microenterprise Teach people how to start small businesses
- o Community Develop. Banks Inform families on how to apply for loans from community development banks
- o Assets Building Work with families to develop savings plans
- o Tenant management Help public housing tenants to develop organizations for self-management
- o Apprenticeship Work with local schools and businesses to develop new school-to-work transition programs

Proposal for a National Environmental Youth Corps**I. SUMMARY:**

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with Interior and EPA, would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The urban component would be mostly non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The rural component would be both residential and non-residential and would perform conservation-related work projects on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Brian McGuire and Katherine Allen of the Forest Service; Jim Fuller of SCS; Andy Fisher of the National Forest Foundation

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree-planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to give youth sense of community and self-discipline
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;

Approach:

Urban: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas.

The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas

of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, building or improving recreation areas, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

Corps members could also focus on teaching sustainable agriculture, helping small farmers stay on the land, building rural housing, and engaging in rural development projects.

Participants and Clientele:

The participants would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring

urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

Anticipated Results:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, Americans are losing the ability to learn first hand about natural resources. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future while also providing for food and shelter.

Potential Partners:

I am meeting next week with representatives from Interior and EPA to discuss how we can plan together.

Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army Corps of Engineers
Land Grant universities
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America

Proposal for Rural Community Self Development Corps

DRAFT

To: Ron Blackley

From: Joel Berg

Date: June 2, 1993

Re: USDA's Long-Term Role in the Clinton National Service Plan

I WOULD LIKE YOU TO REVIEW THE FOLLOWING PROPOSAL AND THEN DISCUSS IT WITH ME BEFORE I PRESENT IT TO THE SECRETARY.

Background

Whether or not USDA helps funds youth service programs for **this** Summer, the Department will likely play a large role in the President's long-term initiative. The Administration's bill, which should pass Congress in the next few months, would place the participants in the field starting in the Fall of 1994.

Under the proposed legislation, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations. Through Extension Service and other USDA agencies, **we can play a vital role in providing technical assistance to organizations and institutions that want to apply for national service grants** from the new Corporation for National Service. For instance, we could work very closely with the Council of 1890's Presidents/Chancellors to help in developing its proposed "Rural Community Service Program.

The legislation will also give USDA and other government agencies additional funds to allow us to design and manage our own youth service programs. In recent testimony on the Hill, Secretary Babbitt pledged that his Department would submit a service proposal the day after the President signs the bill. I have convened a working group with USDA employees from Extension Service, SCS, Forest Service, RDA, and FNS to develop specific proposals for corps we can run. At your direction, I have worked with the task force to develop two very specific proposals:

1) Anti-Hunger and Empowerment Corps

2) Environmental Corps

The working group also developed another idea, which I have discussed with Bob Nash:

3) Rural Development Corps

Common Characteristics of All the Proposed USDA Service Programs

All the USDA national service programs should:

- * Reinvent government by promoting opportunity, responsibility, and community.
- * Reunite the interests of the middle class and the poor by allowing young people from all types of families to earn their way through college.
- * Provide models for how the federal government can run national service programs.
- * Expand dramatically as the President phases-in a full-scale national program.
- * Recruit groups of participants that are geographically, racially, religiously, and socioeconomically diverse.
- * Provide valuable service to the community by systematically filling unmet social needs.
- * Allow young people to perform service either before **or** after attending post-secondary education.
- * Forge links to youth apprenticeship programs run by USDA and other Cabinet agencies.
- * Give the participants at least a minimum wage living expense, as well as adequate supervision and training.
- * Limit the work performed to tasks that fulfill significant missions of USDA and are supported by our major constituency groups (farming, consumer, commodity, environmental, etc.).
- * Encourage the leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.
- * Build a new form of entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic government.
- * Create its staff out of existing USDA personnel.
- * Be managed across traditional USDA agency lines.

Proposal for National Empowerment Corps

I. SUMMARY:

I. SUMMARY:

Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help-low income families and individuals move towards self-sufficiency. The main focus of the Corps would be fighting domestic hunger; it would be similar to EFNEP but would have a greatly expanded mission. Corps members would help individuals apply for food stamps, WIC, and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets; learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credits, microenterprise loans, and help from community development banks. In short, this Corps would help put into effect the entire empowerment agenda promoted by you and President Clinton. A full-scale program could eventually provide a big boost to your efforts to eradicate domestic hunger.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED ON THE PROPOSAL:

John Webster of FNS; Katherine Gibney of FSIS; Alma Hobbs, Jon Irby and Edith Thomas of Extension Service

III. HOW PROGRAM WOULD WORK:

Participants would provide outreach and access services, build the anti-hunger and anti-poverty infrastructures, and run innovative new empowerment programs:

A) Provide outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible)

- o Outreach Workers Inform target populations about program availability (all programs)
- o Drivers Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP)

- o Delivery Aides
Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly, physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Aides
Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs)
- o Service Facilitator
Conduct telephone follow-up with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP)

B) Bolster the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent):

- o Food Handlers
Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR)
- o Day Care Workers
Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Case Assistants
Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)
- o Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides
Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance,

monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)

- o Nutrition Assistants Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o CACFC Assistant Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

C) Boost innovative new empowerment programs

- o EITC Help families obtain the newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit
- o Microenterprise Teach people how to start small businesses
- o Community Develop. Banks Inform families on how to apply for loans from community development banks
- o Assets Building Work with families to develop savings plans
- o Tenant management Help public housing tenants to develop organizations for self-management
- o Apprenticeship Work with local schools and businesses to develop new school-to-work transition programs

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with Interior and EPA, would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The urban component would be mostly non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The rural component would be both residential and non-residential and would perform conservation-related work projects on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Brian McGuire and Katherine Allen of the Forest Service; Jim Fuller of SCS; Andy Fisher of the National Forest Foundation

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree-planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to give youth sense of community and self-discipline
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;

Approach:

Urban: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas.

The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service

programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, building or improving recreation areas, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

Corps members could also focus on teaching sustainable agriculture, helping small farmers stay on the land, building rural housing, and engaging in rural development projects.

Participants and Clientele:

The participants would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

Anticipated Results:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, Americans are losing the ability to learn first hand about natural resources. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future while also providing for food and shelter.

Potential Partners:

I am meeting next week with representatives from Interior and EPA to discuss how we can plan together.

Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army Corps of Engineers
Land Grant universities
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America

Proposal for Rural Community Self Development Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture would establish a Corps of "professional" and "paraprofessional" members who could assist communities in identifying needs and resources necessary for economic well being. This group of individuals would be able to assist communities of all sizes facing economic recovery and local leadership development issues to plan and prioritize efforts combining formal and non formal education to work locally. The Corps will then assist the community to locate financial resources, prepare proposals, design educational programs, and implement strategies necessary for revitalization. The entire focus would be on the community generating its own vision for the future and the USDA corps assisting the community in creating and attaining that vision. **This Corps, consisting of participants older and more highly educated than the other two Corps, could be funded by a special section of the Administration's proposed bill that would fund special professional corps such as "Teachers Corps" or "Police Corps."**

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Bob Nash; Ruth McWilliams and Brian McGuire of the Forest Service; Norm Reed of RDA; Carl Bouchard of SCS; Steve Mullen and Randy Williams of Extension Service; and Joe Binder of REA

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

This program could give a significant boost to our overall rural development efforts.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o accomplish much needed community planning activities necessary to assure the economic vitality and productivity of our rural and mid-sized communities
- o teach specific skills in community building, coalition building, strategic planning and visioning, and leadership development
- o develop skills in working with units of local government encountered by community members in everyday living

Approach:

Most states have local Planning and Development Districts which provide for the overall strategic and project planning efforts for a multi-jurisdictional area. Some of these cover several counties, and some cover multiple communities within a county or township. They are staffed by local citizens and all have one thing in common. They are understaffed.

Bob Nash has suggested strongly that our Corps participants be physically located within the offices of local districts, so that they work with the districts and do not pose the threat of competition over turf.

Many rural communities now pay high-priced consultants to advise them on development; right now the Forest Service even gives grants to some communities to hire such consultants. With proper training, our Corps members could take the place of these consultants and help communities develop their tourism, high-tech industries, recreation sites, etc. The Corps members would work with each community to create an economic development action plan that makes sense for that particular community.

This Corps would also provide trained people with community involvement skills to begin to go into the communities and build from the bottom up the kind of plans that will be able to assure local support for the needed economic changes to occur through development of local leadership, especially among older youth, and the multiplier effect where teams work with preadolescent. These youth would explore with local governments possible avenues to serve as entrepreneurs within local government.

The participants would training before being assigned to the local districts. They would then live and work in the communities for which they are providing the assistance.

To support these Corps members, there already exists an information data base at the National Agriculture Library called the National Rural Information Center. This information center maintains a data base of organizations which provide financial support to communities on a national, regional, and local basis. This data base is available to the Corps members for assisting the community in developing its own action plan and applying for funding. Curriculum for teaching leadership and volunteer development and program management would be necessary along with basic life skills and understanding of basic business principles.

Participants and Clientele:

Participants of this program would hold either bachelor's degrees or graduate degrees and use the benefits to pay back student loans. Unfortunately, only two graduate schools in the country now specifically teach rural development; perhaps we could form partnerships with others to do so. Participants could also be trained in public administration, civil engineering, or agricultural science.

The communities themselves would be clients. As active participants in the revitalization of their community, they will have an increased commitment to maintaining the new economic path they have chosen. There will be considerable economic incentives for them to participate.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Thirty-two states currently have economic development councils or rural development councils so early pilot programs would be easy. Pilot programs could quickly be established in five areas of our country:

Oregon and Washington

Four Corners: Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona

Tennessee and Kentucky

East Texas and Louisiana

North Carolina, Texas, Missouri

The Mississippi Delta

These areas already have an existing multi-agency coordination group functioning well and communities that are in dire need of assistance.

Anticipated results:

There would be multiple outcomes and benefits derived from this program. The outcomes would be local and national at the same time. First, there would be the learning while earning of the Corps members themselves and those with whom they work. While the objectives of that learning have been chronicled elsewhere, it is necessary here to again emphasize its critical importance to our country and to the communities that will come to benefit from these skilled citizens.

The increased economic viability of our rural communities and small towns would be another major benefit. With the assistance of the Corps, communities will be better able to develop a sound economic base that will take them into the next century. Results such as increased agricultural production, a viable pollution-free light industry, increased local tourism, and many other benefits are possible through planning and implementation of long range strategies as well as developing a community leadership core for the future.

Through a mentoring program with current community leaders new leaders would be developed. These practical skills would assist in passing on not only the usual skills, but allow for the passing on of the vital local cultural nuances as community spirit. The older leadership in the community would feel a greater sense of pride in being able to pass on its legacy to a new generation.

Potential Partners:

Monday Management Group (17 federal agencies involved in rural development)
National Association of Counties
National Association of Development Organizations
National Governors Organization
National Association of Towns and Townships
National League of Cities
State Rural Development Councils
State Economic Development Councils or Agencies
Local Planning and Development entities both private and public
National Association of State Foresters
Department of Defense Agencies such as Corps of Engineers, Air Force. etc/
1890's Institutions

Issues to be Resolved for All Three Proposals:

1. How are Corps applicants selected, matched with suitable assignments, and trained? Will there be any age range set for the participants?
2. Would applicants be assigned anywhere they are needed, or only within their communities of origin? The former requires a higher degree of national organization; the latter would reduce re-location costs and might enhance cultural acceptance of the applicant.
3. Who supervises the Corps member? There will be a need to judge performance, initiate additional training when needed, and even perhaps to terminate or initiate re-assignment when necessary. Would workers be evaluated by NEC on quality as well as quantity (for quantity, productivity as well as hours contributed)?
4. What is a suitable assignment? Should local or county government agencies or community organizations have free rein in assigning Corps members wherever they wish, or should the assignments be limited to augmenting the functional capability of the agency - for example, providing tutoring services where none existed before. Would assignment as a file clerk, for example, be acceptable on the grounds that it frees up a staff member who can provide higher-level services to recipients, or would that assignment be viewed as supplanting efforts already underway and of no particular value to the Corps member?
5. How would this initiative relate to existing volunteer organizations?
6. What kind of structure will the initiative have? How will it interact with state and local governments?
7. How many USDA personnel will be required to manage the program?
8. How much will the program cost in total and per server?
9. What states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations can help fund this program?
10. How will locations be selected and the sizes of the pilot program be determined?
11. How many participants can we place in workable pilot programs? What will be the ultimate capacity of these programs?

Timeline for Suggested Action:

I recommend that the Secretary approve the following steps:

By June 10, 1993: Brief the Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretaries, the Assistant Secretaries, and Agency Administrators on the National Service plan and enlist their full cooperation in helping us develop the Empowerment Corps, the Environmental Corps, and the Rural Development Corps.

By July 1, 1993: Detail from appropriate agencies staff to serve on a USDA working group to hammer out specific details of each proposal.

By August 1, 1993: Identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships.

By September 1, 1993: Sign a memorandum of understanding with Interior, EPA, and other agencies with whom we will jointly make proposals.

By October 1, 1993: Complete preliminary proposal for submission to Corporation for National Service.

By March 1994: Finalize start-up plans for projects approved by the Corporation for National Service.

By July 1994: Interview and place project personnel.

By September 1, 1994: Begin pilot project.

I sincerely thank you for your continuing commitment to making national service a reality. Please let me know how you would like me to proceed.

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

May

Divider Title: _____

To: Secretary Espy

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 26, 1993

Re: USDA's Long-Term Role in the Clinton National Service Plan

Whether or not USDA helps fund youth service programs for **this** Summer, the Department will likely play a large role into the long-term initiative which will hopefully pass Congress in the next few months and place the first participants in the field in the Fall of 1994.

I have convened a working group with USDA employees

Under the legislation proposed by the Administration, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations.

At your earlier direction, I have convened a USDA

Common Characteristics of All USDA Service Programs:

Model for how the federal government can run programs.

Diverse group of young people providing service (While those served will not be diverse)

Focus will be on providing valuable service to the community, not making the participants feel good about themselves.

Leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.

Entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic.

Staff will be out of existing resources.

NATIONAL EMPOWERMENT CORPS

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help families and individuals to help poor families move towards self-sufficiency.: apply for food stamps, WIC and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets

(as taught by the EFNEP program); learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credit, microenterprise loans, and help from community development bankse Tax Credit, and community development banks. Somewhat similar to the EFNEP program described above, this corps could be run by the Cooperative Extension system and the two USDA agencies that deal directly with food stamps and nutrition programs.

NAME OF PROGRAM: Food Stamp Program

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: The Food Stamp Program is designed to aid low-income families by increasing their food purchasing power in order to obtain more nutritious diets. Households - those people who regularly prepare and eat food together - may receive food coupons for exchange at authorized grocery stores. The amount of coupons received depends primarily upon household income, assets, composition and size. Benefits are 100% federally-financed, but the Program is administered by state employees in county or local welfare offices. These "front-line" employees determine who is eligible for benefits and how much in benefits an applicant household may receive. They attempt to "police" the program so that incorrect benefits are not issued and so that fraud does not occur. They administer the Program's work provisions and may refer applicants to other sources of government or local community assistance. They operate under regulations issued by the federal Food and Nutrition Service and with guidance provided by the State welfare agency.

POTENTIAL PARAPROFESSIONAL TASKS/JOB/RESPONSIBILITIES: The following are possible assignments for members of the National Empowerment Corps. Many more suggestions might be obtained from State and local officials who are intimately familiar with the particular needs of localities and States. Further refinement and augmentation of these suggestions would be worthwhile.

ASSIGNMENT	DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL BARRIERS
Greeter/facilitator	Meets applicants as they enter the welfare office; determines their needs and guides them	Possible union opposition in some locations.

through the appropriate processes, including reference to other Federal, State, or local community resources.

Outreach worker

Operates from county/ local welfare office and potential danger and liability in or community-based high-crime areas. organization. Seeks Acceptance may out potential food dependent in part stamp recipients by upon ethnicity, door-to-door canvas language skills, or through being stationed in a local community building, office, church, or other facility frequented by the target group. Explains Program benefits and aids potential recipients in the application process. larity.

Tutor

Assists food stamp recipients in developing skills such as reading and math which will enable the recipient to get a G.E.D. or successfully compete for a job. May operate from a community-based organization or from the welfare office. Must be accepted by recipient and may need ability to motivate the learner.

Trainer

Operates specific training programs for recipients designed to increase their employment knowledge and training/motivation skills are Substantive

ment prospects. May imperative for
function as a staff success. Must
person for the food be accepted by
stamp employment and trainees. Pos-
training program or sible union
may be a part of a problems.

local organization
providing services to
low-income persons.

May train recipients

in such basics as work
attitudes, job search,
and ways to keep a
job and earn promotion.

May provide training

in such areas as nutri-
tion education, food
purchasing on a low
budget, money manage-
ment, and use of
community resources.

Translator

Works in a variety of Extensive
settings with non- knowledge of

English-speaking food stamp
applicants or recip- procedures and
ients to facilitate rules required

application for food in addition to
stamp benefits, parti- foreign language
cipation in employment proficiency.
and training efforts, Possible union
and referral to other problems.

government and commun-
ity resources. Serves
as a primary contact
for such persons with

the food stamp agency,
facilitating solution
of their problems.

Deals with the inter-

pretation needs of such groups as Native Americans or Hispanics.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

1. How are National Empowerment Corps applicants selected, matched with suitable assignments, and trained?
2. Would applicants be assigned anywhere they are needed in the Nation, or only within their State of origin? The former requires a higher degree of national organization; the latter would reduce re-location costs and might enhance cultural acceptance of the applicant.
3. Who supervises the Corps member? There will be a need to judge performance, initiate additional training when needed, and even perhaps to initiate re-assignment when necessary.
4. Who pays the Corps member? Are re-location costs compensated? Are basic protections such as medical care insurance provided? Liability insurance?
5. What is a suitable assignment? Should local or county welfare agencies or community organizations have free rein in assigning Corps members wherever they wish, or should the assignments be limited to augmenting the functional capability of the agency - for example, providing tutoring services where none existed before. Would assignment as a file clerk, for example, be acceptable on the grounds that it frees up a staff member who can provide higher-level services to recipients, or would that assignment be viewed as supplanting efforts already underway and of no particular value to the Corps member?
6. For what period of time will the Corps member be committed to serving with a cooperating agency? Two years? One year? Six months? Questions of value to the cooperating agency as well as to the Corps member are involved here.

**NATIONAL EMPOWERMENT CORPS
APPLICATIONS APPROPRIATE FOR THE SPECIAL NUTRITION
PROGRAMS**

Program Descriptions:

The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) provides supplemental foods, health care referrals and nutrition education at no cost to low-income pregnant and postpartum women, and to infants and children up to 5 years of age, who are at nutritional risk.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program provides commodity foods to supplement the diets of low-income infants; children up to age 6; pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding women; and persons 60 years of age and over.

The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) provides balanced, low-cost or free lunches to about 25 million children each school day.

The School Breakfast Program (SBP) provides cash assistance to States to initiate, maintain or expand non-profit breakfast programs in eligible schools and residential child care institutions.

The Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) provides Federal funds and USDA-donated foods to non-residential child care and adult day care facilities to serve nutritious meals and snacks.

The Nutrition Program for the Elderly (NPE), administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, receives USDA commodity foods and /or cash to provide meals for people age 60 or older and their spouses, regardless of age.

The Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) provides monthly food packages to Indians living on or near a reservation.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) gives needy

Americans, including low-income and unemployed persons, USDA-donated foods for household use. The foods are free, but recipients must meet eligibility criteria.

The Food Distribution Program for Charitable Institutions helps provide meals to needy people in eligible institutions such as community kitchens for homeless people, orphanages, homes for the elderly, meals-on-wheels programs, soup kitchens, correctional institutions offering rehabilitative activities, group homes for the mentally retarded, and hospitals that offer general and long-term health care.

If carried out in accordance with Congressional intent, these programs mitigate the effects of poverty and thus contribute to the NEC goal of moving people toward self-sufficiency and from poverty to middle class. Therefore, we are suggesting NEC jobs that would help fulfill current program goals rather than those that would provide new benefits/services. In addition, by providing NEC participants themselves with opportunities to earn or pay off college costs with community service, the programs can help prepare this generation for a poverty-free future.

POTENTIAL JOBS

NEC workers could help our programs more fully achieve their goals in two ways:

providing outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible), and

bolstering the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent).

Outreach/Access Jobs

- o Outreach

- | | | |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|
| | Workers | Inform target populations about program availability (all programs) |
| o | Drivers | Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP) |
| o | Delivery Aides | Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly, physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR) |
| o | Bilingual Aides | Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs) |
| o | Service Facilitators | Conduct telephone followup with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP) |

Infrastructure

- | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|---|
| o | Food Handlers | Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR) |
| o | Day Care Workers | Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR) |

- o **Bilingual Case Assistants** Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)
- o **Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides** Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance, monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)
- o **Nutrition Assistants** Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o **CACFC Assistant** Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

BARRIERS/PROBLEMS

- Program managers who have been making do with limited resources may have developed tunnel vision for what is possible. May need to raise managers' consciousness of possibilities to create a demand for NEC services.
- Additional responsibilities: training and supervising new workers, monitoring and evaluating their work, new reporting/accounting requirements. In addition to staff time required for these functions, who pays?
- Possible Federal/program liability: licensing requirements, health care concerns (i.e., are shots necessary for workers; if so, who pays?), insurance.
- Availability of space/facilities for additional workers.

- Union concerns: would NEC workers take jobs from others?

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

- Need to research existing program use of volunteers. Also, how would this initiative relate to existing volunteer organizations?
- How would NEC match volunteers and work? Would the work have to be related to workers' interests or educational goals?
- Would workers be evaluated by NEC on quality as well as quantity (for quantity, productivity as well as hours contributed?)?
- Will workers receive credit toward Social Security quarters? (This would contribute toward self sufficiency down the road.)
- How much of a commitment will be expected of workers? Will this service be in addition to or in lieu of a job? If in lieu, will workers receive a stipend for living expenses? Can workers perform this service while they attend school (rather than earning a loan in advance or paying it off afterward)?
- What kind of structure will NEC have? Federal/state/local? Establishment of a bureaucracy means cost.
- We assume NEC will match workers/agencies in same geographical area to avoid relocation expenses. True?

USDA NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

PROJECT PROPOSAL

I. TITLE: National Environmental Youth Corps

II. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:

The Department of Agriculture would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The Urban Environmental Youth Corps would be non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The Rural Environmental Youth Corps would be residential and conservation-related work projects would be on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be separate but linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The Corps would provide opportunities for America's youth to "earn and learn." While acquiring valuable skills, members would earn wages for the work performed and a stipend towards future education.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to teach youth self discipline-skills on coping with the world as adults;
- o to teach numerous physical skills applicable to conservation work;
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;
- o to teach skills in working with the various branches of local government which participants would encounter in performing their tasks;
- o to teach skills in career planning and create awareness of other

post-secondary education opportunities;

IV. APPROACH:

Urban/non-residential: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas. The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural/residential: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

V. AUDIENCE AND CLIENTELE:

The target population would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

A secondary targeted population could be those in the process of changing careers due to military and industrial cutbacks because of the changing economy. The Corps would provide for the acquisition of new skills and new career planning.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

VI. POTENTIAL PILOT LOCATIONS:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

VII. ANTICIPATED RESULTS:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, the experiential learning about our natural resources that occurred in the past for the majority of the population has been lost. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future

while also providing for food and shelter.

VIII. SCHEDULE OF MAJOR TASKS AND COMPLETION DATES:

- o July 1, 1993 - Agencies identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships;**
- o September 1, 1993 - Preliminary proposal completed for submission to Corporation for National Service;**
- o October 15, 1993 - Startup plans for projects completed for submission;**
- o December 30, 1993 - Begin final startup phase of projects;**
- o April 1, 1994 - Begin USDA Conservation Corps pilot projects selected by the Corporation for National Service;**

IX. POTENTIAL PARTNERS

**Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service
Department of Interior National Park Service
Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management
Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army
Corps of Engineers, Air Force, etc.
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America**

X. POTENTIAL CAPACITY

URBAN/NONRESIDENTIAL

- o Pilot year 1,000 enrollees (500 each FS & SCS)**
- o Peak capacity 10,000 enrollees (5,000 each FS & SCS)**

RURAL/RESIDENTIAL

- o Pilot year 1,000 enrollees (500 each FS & SCS)**
- o Peak capacity 10,000 enrollees (5,000 each FS & SCS)**

Assumes 3 to 5 years to reach peak capacity

XI. PROJECT LIAISON

During the start up phase, the project liaison with the Forest Service would be through the Deputy for Administration, Lamar Beasley. Current staff specialist is Brian McGuire.

During the startup phase, the project liaison with the Soil Conservation Service would be through the Community Assistance staff. Current staff specialists are Jim Fuller and Lloyd Wright.

USDA NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM

PROJECT PROPOSAL

I. TITLE: Community Self Development Assistance Corps

II. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:

The Department of Agriculture would establish a corps of "professional" and "paraprofessional" members who could assist communities to identify needs and resources necessary for economic well being. This group of

individuals would be able to assist communities of all sizes facing economic recovery and local leadership development issues to plan and prioritize efforts combining formal and non formal education to work locally. The corps will then assist the community to locate financial resources, prepare proposals, design educational programs, and implement strategies necessary for revitalization. The entire focus would be on the community generating their own vision for the future and the USDA corps assisting them in creating and attaining that vision.

III.PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES:

The purpose of the program would be to provide opportunities for America's youth to "earn and learn." Corps members would work with early and preadolescents in identifying areas for entrepreneurial efforts in conjunction with local governments and learn valuable interpersonal skills.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o accomplish much needed community planning activities necessary to assure the economic vitality and productivity of our rural and midsized communities
- o teach corpsmembers self discipline-skills on coping with the world as adults
- o teach specific skills in community building, coalition building, strategic planning and visioning, and leadership development
- o teach numerous skills in working with the "3rd Sector" the private nonprofit sector of the volunteer
- o develop skills in working with units of local government which they encounter in their everyday living

- o develop community specific cultural leadership skills
- o develop skills in career planning and other post-secondary education possibilities

IV. APPROACH:

Most states have local Planning and Development Districts which provide for the overall strategic and project planning efforts for a multijurisdictional area. Some of these cover several counties, and some cover multiple communities within a county or township. They are staffed by local citizens and all have one thing in common. They are understaffed.

This corps would provide trained people with community involvement skills to begin to go into the communities and build from the bottom up the kind of plans that will be able to assure local support for the needed economic changes to occur through development of local leadership, especially among older youth, and the multiplier effect where teams work with preadolescents. These youth would explore with local governments possible avenues to serve as entrepreneurs within local government. The participants would need to spend a period of training before being assigned to the local districts. They would then live and work in the communities for which they are providing the assistance.

To support these corps members there already exists an information data base at the National Agriculture Library called the National Agriculture Library called the National Rural Information Center. This information center maintains a data base of organizations who provide financial support to communities on a national, regional, and local basis. This data base is available to the Corps members for assisting the community in developing its

own action plant and apply for funding. Curriculum for teaching leadership and volunteer development and program management would be necessary along with basic life skills and understanding of basic business principles.

V. AUDIENCE AND CLIENTELE:

Target audiences for these programs would be secondary and post-secondary education youth. Because of the skill level needed for some of these activities many of the corps members would be already graduated students seeking to pay back their student loans or those seeking to strengthen their communities. Others could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

A second target group would be the currently unemployed. The corps would allow for new career planning and skill building to occur as well as for the participants to get back into the world of work. This would allow the utilization of people already residing in the affected community and would provide a level of realism and continuity to the program.

The communities themselves are also a client. As active participants in the revitalization of their community they will have an increased commitment to maintaining the new economic path they have chosen. There will be considerable economic incentives for them to participate.

(A NOTE FROM STEVE MULLEN ABOUT THIS PARAGRAPH: I disagree that this is a key audience right from the beginning. We are taking "rural flight" here!) Finally, as the program expands it could move to include high school youth. This is the age to begin to develop community leadership skills, good work habits, improve self image, and self discipline. This age group could be

developed to do the follow-up activities and studies needed to document the success of the efforts. This is also a key target group for working with early adolescent and pre-adolescent groups. There could also be a summer program where they are mentored by current community leaders or participate in studies on a short term basis.

VI. POTENTIAL PILOT LOCATIONS:

Thirty-two states currently have economic development councils or rural development councils so early pilot programs would be easy. Pilot programs could quickly be established in four areas of our country:

Oregon and Washington

Four Corners: Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona

Tennessee and Kentucky

East Texas and Louisiana

North Carolina, Texas, Missouri

These areas already have an existing multiagency coordination group functioning well and communities that are in dire need of assistance.

VII. ANTICIPATED RESULTS:

There would be multiple outcomes and benefits derived from this program. The outcomes would be local and national at the same time. First there would be the learning while earning of the corps persons themselves and those with whom they work. While the objectives of that learning have been chronicled elsewhere it is necessary here to again emphasize its critical importance to our country and to the communities that will come to benefit from these skilled citizens.

The opportunity to develop skills, to learn about a variety of career paths, and the opportunity to approach career options at a pace not currently available would be other outcomes of the program. With the current economic conditions in our country, it is difficult for youth or people needing to change careers to have the time to do that in a planned and organized way. They feel the pressure to quickly make career choices and begin to earn income. The corps would provide that space to explore options while also providing for food and shelter, as well as focus energies on the most pressing community issues. (ANOTHER NOTE FROM STEVE MULLEN: He wants to emphasize the multiplier effect about Corps helping adults who in turn help adolescents and each other.)

The increased economic viability of our rural communities and small towns is the next major outcome expected. With the assistance of the corps communities will be better able to develop a sound economic base that will take them into the next century. Results such as increased agricultural production, a viable pollution free light industry, increased local tourism, and many other outcomes are possible through planning and implementation of long range strategies as well as developing a community leadership core for the future.

Through a mentoring program with current community leaders new leaders would be developed. These practical skills would assist in passing on not only the usual skills, but allow for the passing on of the vital local cultural nuances as as community spirit. It would allow the older leadership to feel a greater sense of relief to be able to pass on their legacy to a new generation.

VIII. SCHEDULE OF MAJOR TASKS AND COMPLETION

DATES:

- o July 1, 1993, agencies identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships**
- o September 1, 1993, have preliminary proposal ready for Corporation for National Service.**
- o October 15, 1993, complete startup planning for projects submitted**
- o December 30, 1993, begin final startup phase of projects, begin development of skills training curriculum, begin development of financial opportunity data base nationally and for pilot states.**
- o April 1, 1994, begin first training of corps members with assignment to communities at completion of training.**

IX. POTENTIAL PARTNERS

- Monday Management Group (17 federal agencies involved in rural economic development)**
- National Association of Counties**
- National Association of Development Organizations**
- National Governors Organization**
- National Association of Towns and Townships**
- National League of Cities**
- o State Rural Development Councils**
- o State Economic Development Councils or Agencies**
- o Local Planning and Development entities both private and public**
- o National Association of State Foresters**
- o Department of Defense Agencies such as Corps**

X. POTENTIAL CAPACITY

At least 100 corps members could be utilized in each state at the peak of the program. During the pilot phase, a cadre of at least 50 would be necessary to provide an adequate network of both professional and paraprofessional skills necessary to reach a significant number of communities.

XI. PROJECT LIAISON

During the start up phase, the project liaison with the Forest Service would be through the Economic Development Staff of Cooperative Forestry. Staff specialist is Steve Yadoff.

During the startup phase, the project liaison with the Rural Development Administration would be through Norman Reid.

During the startup phase, the project liaison with Extension Service would be through Randy Williams and 4-H Development staff.

During the startup phase, the project liaison with the Soil Conservation Service would be provided by Ed Reichart.

To: Secretary Espy

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 26, 1993

DRAFT

Re: USDA's Long-Term Role in the Clinton National Service Plan

Background

Whether or not USDA helps funds youth service programs for **this** Summer, the Department will likely play a large role in the President's long-term initiative. The Administration's bill, which should pass Congress in the next few months, would place the participants in the field starting in the Fall of 1994.

Under the proposed legislation, most of the service participants will be managed by state and local governments and by local non-profit organizations. Through Extension Service and other USDA agencies, **we can play a vital role in providing technical assistance to organizations and institutions that want to apply for national service grants** from the new Corporation for National Service. For instance, we could work very closely with the Council of 1890's Presidents/Chancellors to help them develop its proposed "Rural Community Service Program."

The legislation will also give USDA and other government agencies additional funds to allow us to design and manage our own youth service programs. In recent testimony on the Hill, Secretary Babbitt pledged that his Department would submit a service proposal the day after the President signs the bill. I have convened a working group with USDA employees from Extension Service, SCS, Forest Service, RDA, and FNS to develop specific proposals for corps we can run. At your direction, I have worked with the task force to develop two very specific proposals:

1) Anti-Hunger and Empowerment Corps

2) Environmental Corps

The working group also developed another idea, which I have discussed with Bob Nash:

3) Rural Development Corps

USDA is currently ahead of the other Cabinet agencies in planning how to incorporate into the President's national service plan. By forging ahead quickly to further develop these proposals, we would reinforce your reputation as the Cabinet Secretary most willing to reinvent government.

Common Characteristics of All the Proposed USDA Service Programs

All the USDA national service programs should:

- * Reinvent government by promoting opportunity, responsibility, and community.
- * Reunite the interests of the middle class and the poor by allowing young people from all types of families to earn their way through college.
- * Provide models for how the federal government can run national service programs.
- * Expand dramatically as the President phases-in a full-scale national program.
- * Recruit groups of participants that are socio-economically diverse.
- * Provide valuable service to the community by systematically filling unmet social needs. Our programs will be very **different** than Bush's Points of Light, which supported diffuse and untargeted volunteer efforts that served mostly to make volunteers feel good about themselves.
- * Allow young people to perform service either before **or** after attending post-secondary education.
- * Forge links to youth apprenticeship programs run by USDA and other Cabinet agencies.
- * Give the participants at least a minimum wage living expense, as well as adequate supervision and training.
- * Limit the work performed to tasks that fulfill significant missions of USDA and are supported by our major constituency groups (farming, consumer, commodity, environmental, etc.).
- * Encourage the leveraging funds from states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations.
- * Build a new form of entrepreneurial and non-bureaucratic government.
- * Create its staff out of existing USDA personnel.
- * Be managed across traditional USDA agency lines.

Proposal for National Empowerment Corps

I. SUMMARY:

Corps members would work in urban and rural areas to help-low income families and individuals move towards self-sufficiency. The main focus of the Corps would be fighting domestic hunger; it would be similar to EFNEP but would have a greatly expanded mission. Corps members would help individuals apply for food stamps, WIC, and the school breakfast program; overhaul their diets; learn to prevent foodborne illnesses; obtain the expanded Earned Income Tax Credits, microenterprise loans, and help from community development banks. In short, this Corps would help put into effect the entire empowerment agenda promoted by you and President Clinton. A full-scale program could eventually provide a big boost to your efforts to eradicate domestic hunger.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED ON THE PROPOSAL:

John Webster of FNS; Katherine Gibney of FSIS; Alma Hobbs, Jon Irby and Edith Thomas of Extension Service

III. HOW PROGRAM WOULD WORK:

Participants would provide outreach and access services, build the anti-hunger and anti-poverty infrastructures, and run innovative new empowerment programs:

A) Provide outreach/access services (educating eligible people about program availability and helping make benefits accessible)

- o Outreach Workers Inform target populations about program availability (all programs)
- o Drivers Help eligible people apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, CACFP, TEFAP, NPE, CSFP)

- o Delivery Aides
Deliver program benefits to homebound elderly, physically disadvantaged, and homeless people (TEFAP, CSFP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Aides
Provide program information, help with applications, etc. to eligible non-English-speaking people (all programs)
- o Service Facilitator
Conduct telephone follow-up with people who don't keep appointments, direct people to related health and welfare services (WIC, CSFP)

B) Bolster the infrastructure (providing the human capital necessary to deliver the programs according to congressional intent):

- o Food Handlers
Stock, warehouse, manage, distribute food products (TEFAP, Charitable Institutions, NPE, CSFP, school programs, FDPIR)
- o Day Care Workers
Provide child/adult care services to allow eligible people to apply for and receive program benefits (WIC, TEFAP, FDPIR)
- o Bilingual Case Assistants
Assist case manager with non-English-speaking clients (WIC)

- o Kitchen/Cafeteria Aides Help with meal preparation and serving, maintenance, monitoring lunchrooms, and sanitation (school food, CACFP, and commodity programs)
- o Nutrition Assistants Help with nutrition education, cooking demonstrations (WIC, school food programs)
- o CACFC Assistant Improve supervision ratio of provider to participants in child care/meal preparation functions (CACFP)

C) Boost innovative new empowerment programs

- o EITC Help families obtain the newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit
- o Microenterprise Teach people how to start small businesses
- o Community Develop. Banks Inform families on how to apply for loans from community development banks
- o Assets Building Work with families to develop savings plans
- o Tenant management Help public housing tenants to develop organizations for self-management
- o Apprenticeship Work with local schools and businesses to develop new school-to-work transition programs

Proposal for a National Environmental Youth Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with Interior and EPA, would establish an Environmental Youth Corps with urban and rural components. The urban component would be mostly non-residential and members would work on conservation projects on public and private lands in cities of various sizes. The rural component would be both residential and non-residential and would perform conservation-related work projects on private and public lands in rural America. The programs would be linked, with Corps members having the option of transferring between the rural and urban settings. For example, a Corps member could work in a rural environment for six months and then in an urban environment for another six months.

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Brian McGuire and Katherine Allen of the Forest Service; Jim Fuller of SCS; Andy Fisher of the National Forest Foundation

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

There are currently an estimated 8 million tree-planting sites in communities across America with the current replacement rate being one tree planted for every four removed. Thousands of water quality projects nationwide are awaiting manpower in our communities and our rural areas, as are riparian area restoration, erosion control, stream improvement, road bank stabilization, and wildlife habitat projects.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o to accomplish needed conservation work on public and private lands;
- o to give youth sense of community and self-discipline
- o to teach the environmental/biological/ecological and educational skills necessary to accomplish the conservation work;

Approach:

Urban: More than 80 percent of the American population now lives in cities of varying size. Currently, the Forest Service, with 620 Ranger Districts across the country, and the Soil Conservation Service, with more than 2,000 offices nationwide, have existing local partnerships and delivery systems in many urban areas.

The program would take the Corps to where the people are, operating in any urban community with an existing network of Forest Service/Soil Conservation Service programs in partnerships with local governments or non-profit organizations.

The non-residential program would focus on urban conservation projects in the areas of water quality, waste disposal, erosion control, road bank and stream bank stabilization, the creation of urban buffers, rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating community infrastructure, urban forestry, and the recycling and reuse of resources. Corps members would live in the community or already be a community member.

While the Forest Service has authority over public lands or lands owned by non-profit organizations, the Soil Conservation Service has authority to perform work on private lands as well, allowing for a broad range of work projects.

Rural: Corps members would live in a residential setting in a rural area. The program would provide full-time logistical support for Corps members. As in the urban program, the Corps members would be expected to pay for living expenses from their wages.

Work projects could be in erosion control, fire prevention, fire suppression, building or improving recreation areas, restoration of infrastructure such as buildings and bridges, watershed protection, and other similar conservation projects. The land base of the National Forests would be available for projects as well as the privately held land in partnerships with the Soil Conservation Service.

Corps members could also focus on teaching sustainable agriculture, helping small farmers stay on the land, building rural housing, and engaging in rural development projects.

Participants and Clientele:

The participants would be post-secondary education youth. They could perform the work either before, after, or during their career development education.

The Corps could provide an opportunity for non-paid service for volunteers from the senior citizen community, non-profit conservation organizations, and the public in general.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Currently the Forest Service, in partnership with the National Forest Foundation, is operating three residential summer camps in Virginia, Oregon, and Washington. Through grants, Forest Service and National Forest Foundation also are sponsoring urban programs in the southern California area. These could serve as initial sites.

Anticipated Results:

The Corps would provide much needed manpower for nationwide conservation projects. The work of the Corps could reduce the backlog of conservation-related work across the country.

With the shift from a rural population to an urban one, Americans are losing the ability to learn first hand about natural resources. We currently have a relatively uneducated and uninformed citizenry with regard to natural resources and conservation issues. The Corps would provide an opportunity to learn about America's natural resources, their uses, and the need to protect them. The end result would be a citizenry better informed on national conservation issues.

Besides developing new skills, Corps members would have the opportunity to be exposed to a variety of career options in the conservation field through hands-on experience. The Corps would provide a broad span of time to explore options and plan for the future while also providing for food and shelter.

Potential Partners:

I am meeting next week with representatives from Interior and EPA to discuss how we can plan together.

Association of Conservation Districts
Department of Defense, including such agencies as the Army Corps of Engineers
Land Grant universities
National Recreation Coalition
National Association of State Foresters
National Parks Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
National Tree Trust
Telephone Pioneers of America

Proposal for Rural Community Self Development Corps

I. SUMMARY:

The Department of Agriculture would establish a Corps of "professional" and "paraprofessional" members who could assist communities in identifying needs and resources necessary for economic well being. This group of individuals would be able to assist communities of all sizes facing economic recovery and local leadership development issues to plan and prioritize efforts combining formal and non formal education to work locally. The Corps will then assist the community to locate financial resources, prepare proposals, design educational programs, and implement strategies necessary for revitalization. The entire focus would be on the community generating its own vision for the future and the USDA corps assisting the community in creating and attaining that vision. **This Corps, consisting of participants older and more highly educated than the other two Corps, could be funded by a special section of the Administration's proposed bill that would fund special professional corps such as "Teachers Corps" or "Police Corps."**

II. USDA EMPLOYEES CONSULTED:

Bob Nash; Ruth McWilliams and Brian McGuire of the Forest Service; Norm Reed of RDA; Carl Bouchard of SCS; Steve Mullen and Randy Williams of Extension Service; and Joe Binder of REA

III. HOW THE PROGRAM WILL WORK:

This program could give a significant boost to our overall rural development efforts.

The objectives of the program would be:

- o accomplish much needed community planning activities necessary to assure the economic vitality and productivity of our rural and mid-sized communities
- o teach specific skills in community building, coalition building, strategic planning and visioning, and leadership development
- o develop skills in working with units of local government encountered by community members in everyday living

Approach:

Most states have local Planning and Development Districts which provide for the overall strategic and project planning efforts for a multi-jurisdictional area. Some of these cover several counties, and some cover multiple communities within a county or township. They are staffed by local citizens and all have one thing in common. They are understaffed.

Bob Nash has suggested strongly that our Corps participants be physically located within the offices of local districts, so that they work with the districts and do not pose the threat of competition over turf.

Many rural communities now pay high-priced consultants to advise them on development; right now the Forest Service even gives grants to some communities to hire such consultants. With proper training, our Corps members could take the place of these consultants and help communities develop their tourism, high-tech industries, recreation sites, etc. The Corps members would work with each community to create an economic development action plan that makes sense for that particular community.

This Corps would also provide trained people with community involvement skills to begin to go into the communities and build from the bottom up the kind of plans that will be able to assure local support for the needed economic changes to occur through development of local leadership, especially among older youth, and the multiplier effect where teams work with preadolescent. These youth would explore with local governments possible avenues to serve as entrepreneurs within local government.

The participants would training before being assigned to the local districts. They would then live and work in the communities for which they are providing the assistance.

To support these Corps members, there already exists an information data base at the National Agriculture Library called the National Rural Information Center. This information center maintains a data base of organizations which provide financial support to communities on a national, regional, and local basis. This data base is available to the Corps members for assisting the community in developing its own action plan and applying for funding. Curriculum for teaching leadership and volunteer development and program management would be necessary along with basic life skills and understanding of basic business principles.

Participants and Clientele:

Participants of this program would hold either bachelor's degrees or graduate degrees and use the benefits to pay back student loans. Unfortunately, only two graduate schools in the country now specifically teach rural development; perhaps we could form partnerships with others to do so. Participants could also be trained in public administration, civil engineering, or agricultural science.

The communities themselves would be clients. As active participants in the revitalization of their community, they will have an increased commitment to maintaining the new economic path they have chosen. There will be considerable economic incentives for them to participate.

Potential Pilot Locations:

Thirty-two states currently have economic development councils or rural development councils so early pilot programs would be easy. Pilot programs could quickly be established in five areas of our country:

- Oregon and Washington
- Four Corners: Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona
- Tennessee and Kentucky
- East Texas and Louisiana
- North Carolina, Texas, Missouri
- The Mississippi Delta

These areas already have an existing multi-agency coordination group functioning well and communities that are in dire need of assistance.

Anticipated results:

There would be multiple outcomes and benefits derived from this program. The outcomes would be local and national at the same time. First, there would be the learning while earning of the Corps members themselves and those with whom they work. While the objectives of that learning have been chronicled elsewhere, it is necessary here to again emphasize its critical importance to our country and to the communities that will come to benefit from these skilled citizens.

The increased economic viability of our rural communities and small towns would be another major benefit. With the assistance of the Corps, communities will be better able to develop a sound economic base that will take them into the next century. Results such as increased agricultural production, a viable pollution-free light industry, increased local tourism, and many other benefits are possible through planning and implementation of long range strategies as well as developing a community leadership core for the future.

Through a mentoring program with current community leaders new leaders would be developed. These practical skills would assist in passing on not only the usual skills, but allow for the passing on of the vital local cultural nuances as community spirit. The older leadership in the community would feel a greater sense of pride in being able to pass on its legacy to a new generation.

Potential Partners:

Monday Management Group (17 federal agencies involved in rural development)
National Association of Counties
National Association of Development Organizations
National Governors Organization
National Association of Towns and Townships
National League of Cities
State Rural Development Councils
State Economic Development Councils or Agencies
Local Planning and Development entities both private and public
National Association of State Foresters
Department of Defense Agencies such as Corps of Engineers, Air Force. etc/
1890's Institutions

Issues to be Resolved for All Three Proposals:

1. How are Corps applicants selected, matched with suitable assignments, and trained? Will there be any age range set for the participants?
2. Would applicants be assigned anywhere they are needed, or only within their communities of origin? The former requires a higher degree of national organization; the latter would reduce re-location costs and might enhance cultural acceptance of the applicant.
3. Who supervises the Corps member? There will be a need to judge performance, initiate additional training when needed, and even perhaps to terminate or initiate re-assignment when necessary. Would workers be evaluated by NEC on quality as well as quantity (for quantity, productivity as well as hours contributed)?
4. What is a suitable assignment? Should local or county government agencies or community organizations have free rein in assigning Corps members wherever they wish, or should the assignments be limited to augmenting the functional capability of the agency - for example, providing tutoring services where none existed before. Would assignment as a file clerk, for example, be acceptable on the grounds that it frees up a staff member who can provide higher-level services to recipients, or would that assignment be viewed as supplanting efforts already underway and of no particular value to the Corps member?
5. How would this initiative relate to existing volunteer organizations?
6. What kind of structure will the initiative have? How will it interact with state and local governments?
7. How many USDA personnel will be required to manage the program?
8. How much will the program cost in total and per server?
9. What states, localities, non-profit organizations, and corporations can help fund this program?
10. How will locations be selected and the sizes of the pilot program be determined?
11. How many participants can we place in workable pilot programs? What will be the ultimate capacity of these programs?

Timeline for Suggested Action:

I recommend you approve the following steps:

By June 10, 1993: Notify the Deputy Secretary, the Undersecretaries, the Assistant Secretaries, and the Agencies heads -- both in writing and orally at regularly scheduled meetings -- that national service is a priority to you and you expect their agencies full cooperation in helping us develop the Empowerment Corps, the Environmental Corps, and the Rural Development Corps.

By June 17, 1993: Include in the agenda for our Hunger Summit a very brief discussion of how national service can be used to help alleviate hunger.

By July 1, 1993: Detail from appropriate agencies staff to serve on a USDA working group to hammer out specific details of each proposal.

By August 1, 1993: Identify possible pilot project locations and partnerships.

By September 1, 1993: Sign a memorandum of understanding with Interior, EPA, and other agencies with whom we will jointly makes proposals.

By October 1, 1993: Complete preliminary proposal for submission to Corporation for National Service.

By March 1994: Finalize start-up plans for projects approved by the Corporation for National Service.

By July 1994: Interview and place project personnel.

By September 1, 1994: Begin pilot project.

I sincerely thank you for your continuing commitment to making national service a reality. Please let me know how you would like me to proceed.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

INITIALS: JML DATE: 4/26/2023

2013-0661-F Segment 3

To: Secretary Espy, Ron Blackley

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 21, 1993

Re: Proposal to Fund Youth Service Programs

Unfortunately, none of the 33 USDA-related applicants received Summer of Service grants for this Summer from the Commission on National and Community Service.

It is disappointing that the Commission did not respond favorably to our work in helping solicit the proposals and to your strong letter of support. However, their job was extremely difficult given that they could only make awards to 17 of the over 400 applicants.

Yet we can still help run some of these programs this summer if we can find a way to fund them with USDA money. I, along with Katherine Gibney, a former Peace Corps volunteer whom I have detailed from FSIS, carefully reviewed all the USDA-affiliated Summer of Service proposals.

Following are descriptions of six proposals from around the country for you to consider funding. Each program I am recommending would provide excellent services to the surrounding community and benefit at-risk youth. Whether these programs can operate this Summer will depend upon two variables: our ability to provide money and their ability and willingness to start the programs on such an abbreviated timetable.

These suggested programs -- in Iowa, Mississippi, Alaska, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Texas -- would provide a good geographical balance for our first major service initiative. (I selected three different proposals from Mississippi from which you can choose one.) Part of the Texas program would be in Chairman De La Garza's district. The West Virginia project might interest Senator Byrd, as well as with Senator Rockefeller, who is a fervent supporter of national service.

It would cost USDA about \$8 million to fully fund all six of these projects. You could chose to fund all six or only some of them. The cheapest one is the \$554,000 program proposed by Iowa State University.

Jane McNeil informs me that money for these projects might now be available in the Extension Service, the Forest Service, or in FNS. If you decide to attempt to fund any or all of these projects, you would need to immediately order all relevant agencies to provide funding options from their current budgets.

The six suggested projects:

SPONSOR: UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: A total of 3,700 at-risk youth in villages that are 75-85 percent Eskimo or Native American will receive immunizations and health care, some will receive public safety training, and/or nutrition and health education, or will participate in educational programs in fish camps or summer programs and/or be involved in leadership training in existing community councils during the eight weeks of the program. Also, 20 playgrounds will be improved and recreational programs provided.

WHERE LOCATED: in three boroughs (counties) of Alaska

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk Native American and Eskimo youth

COST: \$826,393

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 100 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 100 other community volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: University of Alaska Fairbanks Cooperative Extension, six Native American Associations/School Districts/and a Health Corporation

OTHER COMMENTS: Participants would receive a \$1,000 post-service benefit to be used for education and training purposes only.

SPONSOR: WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will work in the areas of literacy (individualized reading instruction to 30 children at nutrition day camps and free summer lunch feeding sites), home fire prevention (door-to-door surveys of high-risk homes following training from the Fire Extension Service), health care (work in area clinics and join county health outreach workers to educate families about immunizations and regular health care), and recreation (renovate playgrounds, build two new parks, improve recreational facilities at state parks).

WHERE LOCATED: southern West Virginia in three counties

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk children and families

COST: \$924,506 (Recipients will receive a post-service benefit of \$1,000 that must be used within a year of service for educational purposes only.)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 130 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 200

PARTNERSHIPS: West Virginia Extension Service, Department of Health, and Citizens' Conservation Corps

OTHER COMMENTS: The program would identify five participants for an entrepreneurial award to continue with year-round projects.

SPONSOR: CLEMSON UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will provide services in the areas of health (home visitations with 6-12-year-olds to deal with health issues), environmental and academic enrichment (instruct 10 middle school student in non-formal educational setting through program developed by Clemson) to at-risk youth. Participants will also take part in the South Carolina Gleaning Project and learn harvesting techniques to salvage food that would otherwise be wasted, and then will distribute the food surplus to families in need.

WHERE LOCATED: Charleston Metropolitan Statistical Area (3 counties) and Jasper County (rural)

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$2,549,443

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 250 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 750

PARTNERSHIPS: Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service, county government, local human services agencies and civic groups, selected school systems in targeted areas.

OTHER COMMENTS: Participants will be encouraged to submit year-round community service proposals and five will be chosen in hopes of receiving funding to continue community service on a permanent basis.

SPONSOR: IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Improve basic literacy skills (reading, math, and writing), improve health-related behaviors in areas of nutrition, physical fitness, human sexuality, tobacco, alcohol and other drugs, and safety, and enhance self-concept, communication, and decision-making skills.

WHERE LOCATED: Des Moines, Iowa

TARGETED POPULATION: 600 at-risk youth (6-12 years of age)

COST: \$554,232 (Post-service benefit of \$1,000 for each participant for educational use.)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 84

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 24 youth volunteers, 30 adult volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: Des Moines Community Schools, Iowa Department of Economic Development, three schools of nursing, three community centers, the Bureau of Refugee Services, Iowa Comprehensive Human Services, First Lutheran Church, and *The Communicator*, an intercultural newspaper.

SPONSOR: TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will assist in teaching English as a Second Language to Hispanic children and parents, help with an educational media campaign on the prevention of teenage pregnancy, work with an urban reforestation project and plant trees in city parks, and assist elderly with home repairs (intergenerational interaction).

WHERE LOCATED: 4 project sites, one on U.S. Mexican border, others in Laredo, San Antonio, and Bryan, Texas.

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$1,466,266

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 205

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 187

PARTNERSHIPS: (None listed. This was a one-page abstract of the proposal.)

SPONSOR: MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Train participants to conduct educational programs for the existing summer feeding programs established for low-income, at-risk children. Education programs would include activities and hands-on experience in health and environmental education during the morning hours between breakfast and lunch and serve as mentors and coordinators of community projects in the afternoon.

WHERE LOCATED: in five, 3-county clusters which represent a cross section of the state of Mississippi

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk children

COST: (No figures given but available if needed)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 160 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: (Not listed)

PARTNERSHIPS: (Not listed)

OTHER COMMENTS: This proposal was a one-page very brief abstract listing the name of someone who could be contacted for additional information.

OR

SPONSOR: JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Provide service learning activities in the areas of public health and education.

WHERE LOCATED: Jackson, Mississippi (work will be in 3 counties)

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$1,237,364.19 + in-kind contributions \$311,685.45

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 250 + 3 project leaders + 20 supervisors

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 500 other community volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: Jackson-Hinds Comprehensive Health Center, Jackson State University, and the National Coalition of Community Researchers, Inc.

OR

SPONSOR: WEST JACKSON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Over a nine-and-one-half week period, 60 young people (17-25 years of age) will rehab two houses in an area with a focus on neighborhood revitalization and housing rehabilitation. Participants will form four teams of 15 persons each. The first two weeks will consist of classroom training at Jackson State University in blueprint reading, carpentry skills, basic construction skills, pre-employment training, working with young children, and remedial math and reading, if necessary. While rehabilitating the two houses, the participants will receive conflict mediation training, and learn how to teach crime prevention, fire safety, early childhood health prevention to younger children, and how to be role models. The final week, participants will sponsor a crime prevention block party for children in the neighborhood. Closing summit in Washington, D.C.

WHERE LOCATED: western section of the city of Jackson, Mississippi

TARGETED POPULATION: 2,700 at-risk youth (6-12 years of age)

COST: No figures given. (Each participant will receive \$1,000 for educational use.)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 60

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: (No numbers given but obviously would involve many volunteers)

PARTNERSHIPS: Jackson State University, University Medical Center's Children's Hospital, Jackson Police Department.

NOTE: THIS IS THE PROJECT YOU VISITED IN JACKSON THE DAY YOU SPOKE TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE ABOUT THE CLINTON ECONOMIC PLAN.

TO: ALI WEBB

FROM: KATHERINE GIBNEY
720-7033

DATE: MAY 20, 1993

RE: POSSIBILITY OF ESPY TESTIFYING AT SENATE NATIONAL SERVICE
HEARING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 8

The third and final congressional hearing on National Service is scheduled for June 8. I spoke Tuesday with the Forest Service legislative person who is concerned that USDA has had no representation at these hearings. (Bruce Babbitt is the White House-appointed representative and has testified at the first two hearings.) Joel and I discussed the possibility of Secretary Espy testifying on June 8. Would he be interested and would he be available?

Other considerations:

In researching the procedure, I spoke with Robin Rorapaugh who said the Secretary testifies at full committee hearings only. I understand from a friend who works for Ted Kennedy that it is unclear at this point if it will be the full Committee on Labor and Human Resources (Kennedy, chair) or the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism. My friend said he thought if we indicated Espy was interested, there would be a decision in favor of the full committee. Of course, this may not be accurate but if the Secretary is interested and available, do you think we should begin the process of getting him invited to testify if we can get some clarification that it will be full committee?

Also, if Espy is not interested or available, who would be a good alternative? My suggestions: Bob Nash, Richard Rominger, Jim Lyons, or Joel.

Incidentally, I attended the May 19 House Education and Labor hearing on National Service and my personal observation is that it would be a good idea for USDA to testify on the bill.

To: Secretary Espy

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 17, 1993

Re: Proposal to Fund Youth Service Programs

Unfortunately, none of the 33 USDA-related applicants received Summer of Service grants for this Summer from the Commission on National and Community Service.

It is disappointing that the Commission did not respond favorably to our work in helping solicit the proposals and to your strong letter of support. However, their job was extremely difficult given that they could only make awards to 17 of the over 400 applicants.

Yet we can still help run some of these programs this summer if we can find a way to fund them with USDA money. I, along with Katherine Gibney, a former Peace Corps volunteer whom I have detailed from FSIS, carefully reviewed all the USDA-affiliated Summer of service Proposals.

I have selected six proposals from around the country for you to consider funding. Each program I am recommending would provide excellent services to the surrounding community and benefit at-risk youth.

These suggested programs -- in Iowa, Mississippi, Alaska, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Texas -- would provide a good geographical balance for our first major service initiative. (The political benefits of funding all or some of these projects could be significant. Part of the Texas program would be in Chairman De La Garza's district. The West Virginia project could help us with Senator Byrd, as well as with Senator Rockefeller, who is a fervent supporter of national service.)

It would cost USDA about \$8 million to fully fund all six of these projects.

The six suggested projects:

SPONSOR: UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: A total of 3,700 at-risk youth in villages that are 75-85 percent Eskimo or Native American will receive immunizations and health care, some will receive public safety training, and/or nutrition and health education, or will participate in educational programs in fish camps or summer programs and/or be involved in leadership training in existing community councils during the eight weeks of the program. Also, 20 playgrounds will be improved and recreational programs provided.

WHERE LOCATED: in three boroughs (counties) of Alaska

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk Native American and Eskimo youth

COST: \$826,393

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 100 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 100 other community volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: University of Alaska Fairbanks Cooperative Extension, six Native American Associations/School Districts/and a Health Corporation

OTHER COMMENTS: Participants would receive a \$1,000 post-service benefit to be used for education and training purposes only.

SPONSOR: WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will work in the areas of literacy (individualized reading instruction to 30 children at nutrition day camps and free summer lunch feeding sites), home fire prevention (door-to-door surveys of high-risk homes following training from the Fire Extension Service), health care (work in area clinics and join county health outreach workers to educate families about immunizations and regular health care), and recreation (renovate playgrounds, build two new parks, improve recreational facilities at state parks).

WHERE LOCATED: southern West Virginia in three counties

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk children and families

COST: \$924,506 (Recipients will receive a post-service benefit of \$1,000 that must be used within a year of service for educational purposes only.)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 130 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 200

PARTNERSHIPS: West Virginia Extension Service, Department of Health, and Citizens' Conservation Corps

OTHER COMMENTS: The program would identify five participants for an entrepreneurial award to continue with year-round projects.

SPONSOR: CLEMSON UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will provide services in the areas of health (home visitations with 6-12-year-olds to deal with health issues), environmental and academic enrichment (instruct 10 middle school student in nonformal educational setting through program developed by Clemson) to at-risk youth. Participants will also take part in the South Carolina Gleaning Project and learn harvesting techniques to salvage food that would otherwise be wasted, and then will distribute the food surplus to families in need.

WHERE LOCATED: Charleston Metropolitan Statistical Area (3 counties) and Jasper County (rural)

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$2,549,443

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 250 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 750

PARTNERSHIPS: Clemson University Cooperative Extension Service, county government, local human services agencies and civic groups, selected school systems in targeted areas.

OTHER COMMENTS: Participants will be encouraged to submit year-round community service proposals and five will be chosen in hopes of receiving funding to continue community service on a permanent basis.

SPONSOR: IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Improve basic literacy skills (reading, math, and writing), improve health-related behaviors in areas of nutrition, physical fitness, human sexuality, tobacco, alcohol and other drugs, and safety, and enhance self-concept, communication, and decision-making skills.

WHERE LOCATED: Des Moines, Iowa

TARGETED POPULATION: 600 at-risk youth (6-12 years of age)

COST: \$554,232 (Post-service benefit of \$1,000 for each participant for educational use.)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 84

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 24 youth volunteers, 30 adult volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: Des Moines Community Schools, Iowa Department of Economic Development, three schools of nursing, three community centers, the Bureau of Refugee Services, Iowa Comprehensive Human Services, First Lutheran Church, and *The Communicator*, an intercultural newspaper.

SPONSOR: TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Participants will assist in teaching English as a Second Language to Hispanic children and parents, help with an educational media campaign on the prevention of teenage pregnancy, work with an urban reforestation project and plant trees in city parks, and assist elderly with home repairs (intergenerational interaction).

WHERE LOCATED: 4 project sites, one on U.S. Mexican border, others in Laredo, San Antonio, and Bryan, Texas.

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$1,466,266

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 205

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 187

PARTNERSHIPS: (None listed. This was a one-page abstract of the proposal.)

SPONSORS: MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Train participants to conduct educational programs for the existing summer feeding programs established for low-income, at-risk children. Education programs would include activities and hands-on experience in health and environmental education during the morning hours between breakfast and lunch and serve as mentors and coordinators of community projects in the afternoon.

WHERE LOCATED: in five, 3-county clusters which represent a cross section of the state of Mississippi

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk children

COST: (No figures given but available if needed)

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 160 (17-25 years of age)

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: (Not listed)

PARTNERSHIPS: (Not listed)

OTHER COMMENTS: This proposal was a one-page very brief abstract listing the name of someone who could be contacted for additional information.

SPONSORS: JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL DO: Provide service learning activities in the areas of public health and education.

WHERE LOCATED: Jackson, Mississippi (work will be in 3 counties)

TARGETED POPULATION: at-risk youth

COST: \$1,237,364.19 + in-kind contributions \$311,685.45

NUMBER OF PAID PARTICIPANTS: 250 + 3 project leaders + 20 supervisors

OTHER NON-PAID VOLUNTEERS: 500 other community volunteers

PARTNERSHIPS: Jackson-Hinds Comprehensive Health Center, Jackson State University, and the National Coalition of Community Researchers, Inc.

To: Will Marshall

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 11, 1993

Re: Saving The Message Of National Service

As we discussed on the phone, national service is in serious trouble. **The President's bill will have great difficulty passing Congress without amendments that disfigure it so much we can't even recognize it. Even if a fairly acceptable bill does become law, the message of reciprocal obligation will likely be lost.**

You, Al, and the entire DLC have made the rightful argument for close to a decade that a real program of national service could re-define our entire party and make us a majority again. The White House hopes that national service will kick off the "second 100 days" in which we finally get back on message.

Unfortunately, national service is now alternatively explained as either a traditional jobs program, a slightly augmented "points of light" volunteer program, or as simply a student aid program. Far from saving our party, this program could ironically negate all our years of work by reinforcing the negative message of traditional tax-and-spend-liberalism that gives something for nothing.

The problem is not in the policy. Galston and Reed have done an excellent job incorporating the original DLC proposal, as well as other reinventing government principles, into the bill. I am particularly excited by the provisions that will allow government agencies (such as the Department of Agriculture) to make competitive proposals to run our own programs. The only real policy mistake is making the benefit level so low that middle class young people will have less of an incentive to participate.

The White House's major national service problems are not of policy, but of politics and communications. Some examples:

Key Congressional Sponsors Will Not Sell Our Message

Per your request, I am sending you a copy of Ted Kennedy's floor statement announcing the national service bill. **Cathy O'Brien of Nunn's office brought it to my attention because the statement focuses almost entirely on volunteerism and service-learning. Kennedy's statement hardly even touches on the real national service program which is the centerpiece of the bill.**

Said Kennedy, "School-based and community based learning programs are the heart of any service program." Describing national service almost as if it were the latest new age fad, Kennedy says the bill would "Empower citizens to look within themselves." The statement only briefly touches upon stipended service as one of "five vital streams of service." In fact, only two of the twenty-four the paragraphs in his statement refer specifically to full-time national service.

If the bill's lead Senate sponsor won't sell our message, who will?

On the House side, our prospects are even worse, especially given the Clinton team's decision to give almost full control of the bill to William Ford, a bitter opponent of national service. You may recall that Ford wrote a vitriolic diatribe against national service in the Chronicle of Higher Education that literally called the Nunn-McCurdy Bill "Stalinist."

Do President Clinton and Eli Segal know that the lead House sponsor has publicly compared national service to programs advocated by a mass-murdering Communist dictator?

Critical Allies Have Been Alienated

In the last few weeks, McCurdy met privately on different occasions with Clinton, McLarty, Paster, and Segal. In each of those meetings, he requested that he be one of the lead sponsors of the bill. Each of the people -- including Clinton -- said that they were working on his concerns. McCurdy and his staff then worked their tails off to line up Republican and moderate Democratic co-sponsors for the bill. Segal reportedly promised certain moderate Republicans that McCurdy would be highly involved.

Yet the bill was sent up to the House with Ford as the sponsor -- the White House never even made a courtesy call to McCurdy to inform him. McCurdy found out about the decision when Alden obtained a copy of the bill. Understandably, McCurdy was livid with anger. I doubt President Clinton would be pleased if he understood how shabbily one of his strongest allies was treated.

I also understand that Nunn's office is not exactly thrilled with the way the issue has been handled.

The Veterans Issue Was Bungled

In memos to Galston that I wrote during the Transition, I clearly warned of possible opposition from veterans groups. A smoothly running political operation would have handled this issue long before it came time for Clinton to announce the bill.

The Summer Of Service Programs Will Reinforce The Wrong Message

All the Summer of Service proposals are targeted at serving at-risk youth, and many will have participants who are mostly low-income and minority. Very few of the 17 projects will actually test national service.

Some of the projects will repeat the political mistakes that led to the demise of VISTA. The Harlem Freedom School, for instance, will allow "Experienced African American and Latino Americans" organizers to teach "advocacy and organizing skills."

The National Service Office Is Not Coordinating Well With Cabinet Departments

When the White House Office of National Service wants something from Espy or from USDA, a few different staffers will contact me -- often without the knowledge that someone else has already made the request. They continually send us contradictory information about exactly how and when they want us to promote national service.

Clinton's Plans Have Received Limited Press Coverage

The DLC New Orleans hit was ok, but there was very little follow-up. The activities for both "National Volunteer Week" and the subsequent "National Youth Service Week" were almost invisible. William Ford didn't even hold a press conference to announce that he had introduced the bill in the House. Much of the coverage we have received has focused on diversionary controversies such as the \$1,500 retreat on the benefits.

The National Service Office Has Basically Rejected Serious Help from the DNC

A number of weeks ago, with the full support of David Wilhelm, a friend of mine Tom Lindenfeld, Deputy Political Director of the DNC, proposed to Eli Segal that the DNC set-up a technically independent organization to focus solely on promoting President Clinton's vision of national service.

Lindenfeld spent a few weeks sitting in on key meetings at Eli's office before Eli basically said that the Administration did not really need its own organization to promote the issue. Eli then suggested to Lindenfeld that the DNC work jointly with People for the American Way and Youth Service America, two groups that opposed the Nunn-McCurdy Bill and now clearly have independent agendas. Lindenfeld rejected that suggestion.

How Can We Save Our Message?

Some suggestions:

- 1) Immediately hold a strategy session with key DLC national service supporters. Cathy O'Brien told me she would advise Nunn to host such a meeting with McCurdy, Moskos, Robb, Galston, Reed, Al, and you. Out of this meeting you can devise a coordinated strategy for focusing the message back on reciprocal responsibility.
- 2) Broker a deal with Eli Segal to give moderate Democrats on the Hill a more prominent role in shepherding this legislation through Congress.
- 3) Author an op-ed explaining why national service is the best proof that Clinton is indeed a "New Democrat." Market the article nationally and also try to get interviewed in the electronic and print media.
- 4) Work with the DNC to develop a joint program to sell national service.
- 5) Immediately convince Eli Segal and/or President Clinton that they need more help from the DNC, the DLC, and other groups loyal to Bill Clinton.
- 6) If the bill does pass, make sure that DLC supporters are appointed to the new governing board of the Corporation for National Service.

cc: Al From

May 6, 1993

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

35585

(6) A list of the salaries and other compensation (including the present value of stock options) and benefits paid to the officers and board members of the GSE.

(7) A list of all GSE employees who have been employed by either the Congress or the Federal Government in the 5 years preceding the report, and such employees' salary prior to being hired by the GSE and their current salary.

(b) DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ENTERPRISE.—For the purposes of this section, the term "government-sponsored enterprise" means—

(1) the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, the Student Loan Marketing Association, and

(2) a guaranty agency, as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(j)).

SEC. 11. LIMITS ON ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS, MEALS AND TRAVEL.

It is the sense of the Senate that, as soon as possible during this year's session, the Senate should limit the acceptance of gifts, meals and travel by Members and staff in a manner substantially similar to the restrictions applicable to executive branch officials.

SEC. 12. DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the conferees on this Act should seek to draft and add to this Act a constitutionally acceptable provision requiring additional disclosure of the contributions of foreign entities to the lobbying activities of registrants, as defined in this Act.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of this Act shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—The provisions of sections 6 and 17 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPEALS AND AMENDMENTS.—The repeals and amendments made under sections 12, 13, and 14 of this Act shall take effect as provided under subsection (a), except that such repeals and amendments—

(1) shall not affect any proceeding or suit commenced before the effective date under subsection (a), and in all such proceedings or suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) shall not affect the requirements of Federal agencies to compile, publish, and retain information filed or received before the effective date of such repeals and amendments.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Proposed regulations required to implement this Act shall be published for public comment no later than 70 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. No later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, final regulations shall be published.

(e) PHASE-IN PERIOD.—No penalty shall be assessed by the Director for any noncompliance with this Act which occurs during the first semiannual reporting period after the effective date of this Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COHEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first I wish to thank Senator COHEN, the majority leader, the Republican leader, and all those who made possible the

passage of this bill. From my staff, Linda Gustitus and Peter Levine have been incredibly involved, and we could not have moved the bill this far without them. Senator COHEN's staff and the Governmental Affairs members, including the chairman, Senator GLENN, and Senator ROTH and others have all played a very important role.

If we could get this bill enacted, it would put to rest one of Washington's oldest problems and that is the patchwork of loopholes and exceptions that currently pass for lobbying laws. There are going to be some bumps on this road to passage. We have to get a bill passed in the House and probably to conference. But I am optimistic, because the country demands reform in the way we operate here in Washington, that we have at least of fighting chance to get a bill passed finally after four failed attempts since 1943.

Again, my thanks to my colleague, Senator COHEN, the majority leader, and others who worked hard so we could get to this point.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, let me take just a moment to offer my congratulations to the Senator from Michigan. Without his prodigious and, I must say, persistent effort, this bill would not have received passage today. While we labored several days, without his intelligent and guiding hand, ably assisted by the majority leader's big stick, I might say that we would still be here tonight and possibly tomorrow, or well into next week.

This measure is a major step on the road to reform. I am not persuaded that this bill in itself is going to restore the public's confidence in and the integrity of the political process, but it will be one small step toward that end.

I, too, wish to commend Linda Gustitus and Peter Levine of Senator LEVIN's staff and Kim Corthell of my staff for all the work they have put into this effort.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to Senators LEVIN and COHEN for a very successful, difficult, and vigorous effort on this important legislation.

They have worked at this for a number of years. It is significant reform. It would not have occurred but for their combined thoughtful and bipartisan leadership. And I thank them both in behalf of all Members of the Senate for the effective way in which they managed the bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business to extend until the hour of 5:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I thank the majority leader.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 917 are indicated in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST FUND ACT OF 1993 AND THE STUDENT LOAN REFORM ACT OF 1993

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to introduce two bills with bipartisan support that represent a new approach to community service and educational opportunity in this country: The National Service Trust Fund Act of 1993 and the Student Loan Reform Act of 1993. These measures, proposed by President Clinton, combine two types of Federal support to tap the energy and the ideals of our greatest resource, the young men and women of America.

Under the direct lending bill, student loans for education will be cheaper and simpler to obtain, and easier to repay. Because students will be able to repay loans as a percentage of their income, it will be possible for many of them to pursue careers and to take lower paying jobs they prefer, including careers in public service and community service.

Under the national service bill, individuals will be encouraged to direct their energy, ideals, and talents into their communities.

I am particularly pleased that service learning is a key element of the national service bill. Service learning is a genuine innovation in K-12 education. It enables teachers to take the classroom into the community. It makes their projects a laboratory for both learning and service.

The National Service Trust Act of 1993 builds on the fabric of national and community service programs that already exist and provides a range of service opportunities for young and old alike.

The fashion today is for too many Americans to blame the problems of their communities on others. We must empower citizens to look within themselves, and develop their individual and collective capacity to solve vexing local issues. Participation and involvement of citizens are the touchstones of democracy, and this legislation is designed to develop innovative ways to encourage such service and transform the life of the community.

S5586

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

May 6, 1993

The National Service Trust Act of 1993 supports five vital streams of service:

School-based and community-based service learning programs will give students in grades K-12 educational experiences while performing community service.

College-based programs will enable students to bring the concept of service into their academic courses and extra-curricular projects.

Full-time and part-time stipends will be available to individuals for service in their communities.

Older American Volunteer programs will involve senior citizens in full-time and part-time community service.

Innovative programs will test new approaches to such service.

School-based and community-based service learning programs are the heart of any service program. They make service a part of people's daily lives, and stimulate new dimensions of learning. Students who monitor the pollution of a streambed are motivated to learn more about science. Fourth graders reading to senior citizens or writing down their stories acquire new skills in speaking, writing, and communication.

Service learning experiments are also part of school reform. They draw schools closer to their communities and tap the energy of residents to revitalize their neighborhoods. They raise students' educational achievement. High schools undertaking service learning programs in Pennsylvania, for example, report fewer dropouts and more college applicants.

Funding for the first year of the program will enable over half a million young Americans ages 5-17 to engage to participate in service programs. By the fourth year, several million young persons will have opportunities to serve.

Higher education-based programs are an equally essential part of the bill. Service-based classes can test academic ideas in the surrounding community. Extra-curricular service projects can add a new dimension to college experience, and make students more employable when they graduate. The National Service Trust Act will enable 100,000 college students to have service experiences in the first year.

The third major component of the bill is the full-time and part-time program to establish a domestic Peace Corps. It will offer an opportunity to 25,000 Americans in the first year and up to 150,000 in the fourth year to help pay for college or job training. Participants will help communities deal with unmet needs in areas such as the environment, public safety, and providing social services. Safeguards are included to prevent displacing or duplicating the functions of existing workers.

This component of the bill will include proven Federal programs such as VISTA, newer experiments such as the revival of the CCC, and a wide range of worthwhile State and local initiatives, such as Youthbuild and City Year in

Massachusetts and the California Conservation Corps.

The component for senior citizens will build on the success of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, which reimburses senior citizens for out-of-pocket costs when they volunteer their talents and experience to their communities. The Foster Grandparents Program encourages low-income persons over 60 to care for children at risk. The Senior Companion Program involves senior citizens in helping one another.

The act builds in strict guidelines to increase quality. Programs will compete to be creative in employing the talents and time of participating. Requirements of matching local and State resources will stretch Federal dollars further.

The second major bill, the Student Loan Reform Act of 1993, will revise the current college student loan program. Its goal is to achieve a full direct student loan program by 1998. The shift from the present system will take place slowly and cautiously. A small number of schools will participate in the early years, to ensure that the new program is a success.

Under direct lending, schools will be permitted to originate their own loans or use an alternative source. Schools themselves will not service the loans. Instead, the loans will be serviced largely by the existing entities on a competitive basis.

The result will be to lower the interest rate charged to students by approximately half of 1 percent, saving students hundreds or even thousands of dollars over the life of a loan.

Government subsidies to banks and other private entities will be eliminated, saving taxpayers billions of dollars.

EXCEL accounts will allow borrowers to repay their loans as a percentage of their income, permitting them to pursue lower paying careers in public service or other areas.

A range of other repayment options will be available, including lower fixed payments and graduated repayment plans.

The act will also streamline the system, and make it easier to audit and monitor. One stop student loans will enable students to receive all their financial aid through the existing aid offices. Schools will have only one form to use and one entity to deal with. Colleges, alternative loan originators, loan servicers, and the Department of Education will share data and develop a well-coordinated data system.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the shift to direct loans will save the Government \$4 billion in the next 5 years. The current system is a wasteful and inefficient method of providing college aid, and it is long past time for it to be replaced.

Mr. President, I want to commend the efforts of our colleagues and friends, the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, Senator DURENBERGER from Minnesota, both who have been

strong supporters, as well as Senator BRADLEY. The direct loan program has been a bipartisan effort. We are enormously grateful for their efforts in the past, including when we were debating the higher education bill last year.

I also want to commend the other original cosponsors of the direct lending program: Senator RIEGLE, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator LIEBERMAN. In the National Service Trust Act there are a number of Republicans: Senator DURENBERGER, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator SPECTER, and Senator CHAFFEE.

We have an excellent, broad-based group of Members on our side, as well as on the Republican side, and we have made and will continue to make every effort to ensure that the concept and idea of service, which is so ingrained in the American value system, will be reflected in this legislation, through the informed wisdom of Republicans and Democrats alike. That is certainly our intention.

We are off to a good start, and I hope we will be able to build further support as the legislation proceeds in the committee and then on the floor.

Before concluding, I see my friend and colleague, Senator HARRIS WOFFORD, who has been a key figure in providing leadership in the service program. Testified as a Pennsylvania State official before our Human Resource Committee when we were looking at the community service program some 2 years ago. His testimony was indispensable in developing many of the features of the National and Community Service Act of 1990. He has had wide experience in this area, dating back to the original development of the Peace Corps. I think all of us in this body understand what an enormously important contribution he had made and continues to make in promoting national and community service. I welcome, and I think all of us welcome, his comments on these measures this afternoon.

Mr. President, before yielding the floor to Senator WOFFORD, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 919

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "National Service Trust Act of 1993".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings and purpose.

TITLE I—PROGRAMS AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Programs

Sec. 101. Federal investment in support of national service.

Sec. 102. National Service Trust and provision of national service educational awards.

To: Members of the National Service Working Group

From: Joel Berg

Date: May 2, 1993

Re: **BACKGROUND FOR NATIONAL SERVICE RETREAT**

What President Clinton Announced Friday

Last Friday in New Orleans, President Clinton announced details of the National service Trust Act of 1993, which he will send to Congress this week. The Act will promote many forms of service -- from our youngest elementary school students to our oldest citizens -- including opportunities ranging from part-time volunteer activities to a full-time service jobs.

The centerpiece of the initiative is a new program to offer educational awards, to Americans who make a substantial commitment to service -- a kind of domestic Peace Corps. The full-time servers will receive a small living allowance and then receive \$6,500 worth of college benefits for each year of service they perform. The participants will work in activities that directly benefit their own communities and address unmet educational, environmental, human, or public safety needs.

The plan will also phase-in student direct loans, thereby cutting Sallied Mae and private banks out of the student aid system.

How National Service Demonstrates Reinventing Government Principles

The plan is based on three reinventing government principles: community, opportunity, and responsibility. By bringing together Americans from all socio-economic backgrounds to perform service together, the plan promotes community. By allowing young people to perform difficult service to earn generous college scholarships or training benefits, the plan promotes opportunity. By asking Americans to give something concrete back to their country in return for government benefits, the plan promotes responsibility.

Than plan is based on the concept of reciprocal responsibility of the original G.I. bill -- one of the most successful government programs in U.S. history.

Than plan is as different from the traditional liberal "get everything for free approach" as it is from the traditional conservative "let the free market do everything" approach.

The Clinton plan will not create a large federal bureaucracy. Instead, it will make government a catalyst to spur activities by non-profit agencies, states, corporations, and localities. The plan will not be paid for just by American taxpayers; it requires significant matching funds from other sources.

Lastly, the plan shows that Clinton take on special interests in order to fight for the forgotten middle class. Last year, while millions of American parents struggled mightily just to be able to send their kids to state universities, the President of Sallie Mae -- the quasi-public corporation that grants student loans-- raked in \$1.7 million in personal income. President Clinton is taking on the bankers to make sure that student aid dollars go to families that really need them.

Why National Service is Good for America

National service will make college more affordable for middle class and poor families. By performing two years of service, any American would be able to afford to attend just about any public university in the nation.

National service will boost America's economic competitiveness by proving young people with critical work skills and allowing more young people to obtain post-secondary educations.

National service will bring together Americans of all races, religions, and incomes to work together for a common purpose, thereby helping heal many of the wounds that now divide America.

National service will provide America's young people with an exciting, productive alternative to using drugs or joining gangs.

National service will help America start filling its huge backlog of unmet social needs.

National service will utilize innovative methods to fight poverty in both cities and rural areas.

National service spark will spark a new ethic of citizenship in which all Americans understand that they should perform valuable service for our country.

National service will provide a living, breathing example about how we can reinvent government through public-private partnerships.

How USDA Will be Part of the Program

USDA will be a critical part of the program in at least three ways:

USDA's Extension Service, as well as other USDA agencies, will help rural non-profit agencies and governments learn about and apply for grants from the new Corporation for National Service. USDA agencies will also provide technical assistance to national service projects throughout the country.

USDA will explore creating a new Civilian Conservation Corps, based on the idealism of the 1930's but aimed at solving the problems of the 1990's. Possibly run with the help of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, this corps could be aimed at protecting or drinking water supplies, teaching environmentally sound practices to farmers, and conserving our national forests.

USDA will also explore creating a national Nutrition and Anti-Hunger Corps. Possibly run jointly by the Food and Nutrition Service, the Extension Service, and the Human Nutrition Service. Corps members could work in urban and rural areas to help families and individuals apply for food stamps and WIC, overhaul their diets, and prevent food poisoning; corps members could also help teach families about some of the new anti-poverty measures advocated by President Clinton such as microenterprise loans, the expanded Earned Income Tax Credit, and community development banks.

Our retreat is intended to explore these three options, as well as other ideas for how USDA can be part of this new program.

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a tabbed divider. Given our digitization capabilities, we are sometimes unable to adequately scan such dividers. The title from the original document is indicated below.

April

Divider Title: _____

To: Dr. Alma Hobbs

From: Joel Berg

Date: April 12, 1993

3 pages, including this cover

Please give me any comments, corrections, or additions for this letter ASAP. I want to fax it to the White House and the National Service Commission today.

Thanks.

DRAFT

April 12, 1993

Mr. Eli Siegal, Director
White House Office of National Service
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Ms. Catherine Milton, Executive Director
Commission on National and Community Service
National Press Building, Suite 452
529 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20045

Dear Eli/Catherine:

I am writing to encourage you to give full consideration to the over 30 Summer of Service applications submitted by Cooperative Extension programs throughout the nation.

It gives me great pride to know that programs run in partnership with the Department of Agriculture have shown such great interest in participating in President Clinton's national service program.

While I am aware that your office received close to 500 applications for the 11 Summer of Service grants you can actually make, I would like to point out that the Cooperative Extension applications share certain common advantages:

- * A salaried staff of professionals and paraprofessionals highly experienced in coordinating 3.8 million adult and youth volunteers in every county of the United States.

- * Demonstrated success in rapidly and effectively delivering services to at-risk youth.

- * A technologically advanced federal, state, and county partnership linked via the Internet computer network and by satellite.

- * Strong support from the vast resources of the entire United States Department of Agriculture. **Dr. Alma Hobbs of the Extension Service, as well as Joel Berg and Oleta Garret Fitzgerald of my office, will have my full backing in offering support and guidance to any Cooperative Extension Projects that receive Summer or Service grants.**

The grant proposals made by the Extension offices provide an exciting array of innovative ways to serve at-risk youth. They include a peer educators program in rural Southeast Colorado, a child care project in Hartford, Connecticut, a nutrition program state-wide in Mississippi, and a drug awareness project in Kansas City.

DRAFT

Cooperative Extension provides one highly useful vehicle to help get President Clinton's national program off the ground quickly and efficiently, without creating a large Washington bureaucracy. If you have any further questions about the Extension grant proposals, please contact our department's national service coordinator, Joel Berg, at 720-4623.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Mike Espy

To: White House Office of National Service

From: Joel Berg, Department of Agriculture

Date: April 11, 1993

RE: USDA Departmental Service Initiatives Report (Summary Memo)

A. Agency Sponsored Programs -- Highlights

While USDA runs many excellent youth service and adult volunteer programs, I have summarized four particularly outstanding ones below:

- * **The Expanded Food and Nutrition Program (EFNEP).** Managed by the Cooperative Extensive system, EFNEP operates in all fifty states and Puerto Rico. EFNEP volunteers assist low-income families in acquiring the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and changed behavior to dramatically improve their diets and nutritional well-being. In 1991, 54,163 EFNEP volunteers worked a total of 466,018 hours, providing an estimated \$2.3 million worth of service.
- * **Earth Team.** A conservation program run by the Soil Conservation Service, the Earth Team engaged 10,000 volunteers in 500,000 hours of service at 1,800 sites throughout the nation. The volunteers helped staff Soil Conservation Service offices, planted trees, surveyed land, designed and constructed grass waterways, developed environmental education materials, and created computer databases of local soils.
- * **American Indian Youth Practicum.** This program engages 25-50 youths for a week each summer in service and learning in national forests in Montana and the Dakotas. It brings together youths from still warring tribes and teaches community cooperation, environmental conservation principles, and the need for youths to stay in school. This program was created by a Girard, a ranger on the Custer Forrest in Montana. The program is paid for entirely out of normal Custer Forrest operating funds and is managed by Girard primarily on his personal time.
- * **Youth Forest Camps.** Run by the non-profit National Forest Foundation which has been chartered by Congress, the camps program will begin this summer at two sites in Washington State and one in Virginia. The camps will each operate an eight week and ten week session this summer for about 200 people. The participants will be paid the minimum wage and perform conservation work in national forests.

To: Secretary Espy, Ron Blackley

From: Joel Berg

Date: April 1, 1993

Re: **Engaging the Peace Corps in Agricultural Reform in the Former Soviet Union**

I met yesterday with Arlene Mitchell, Director of the Development Resources Division of OICD. Arlene is currently detailed to the Peace Corps, where she holds large responsibility for starting our new Peace Corps operations in the former Soviet Republics.

According to Arlene, **we now have about 200 Peace Corps volunteers in the former Soviet Republics -- about 100 of whom are in Russia itself -- but none of them are focusing on agriculture.** All of them are either advising businesses or teaching English as a Second Language.

It costs our government about \$15,000 per year to place a Peace Corps volunteer in the former Soviet Union. Thus for \$1.5 million we could add 100 Peace Corps volunteers and for \$3 million we could double the amount of Peace Corps volunteers in the former Soviet Union.

My proposal is simple: We find a way to transfer either \$1.5 million or \$3 million from USDA to the Peace Corps with the understanding the Peace Corps will send "x" number of new volunteers to Russia or the former Soviet Union to specifically give advice and assistance on implementing free market reforms in their agriculture systems. Arlene Mitchell thought this could be a very good idea.

You could potentially propose this to President Clinton for him to discuss with Yeltsin at the Summit. This idea could boost the struggling Russian democracy, help open up markets for American agricultural products, and promote national service.

Do you want me to pursue developing this idea with FAS and OICD?