[ms-0398.027.010.024]

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 23, 1976

TO: Don Benninghoven
Ken Emanuels

FROM: Bill Morgan

SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL/CITY CONFERENCE ARRANGEMENTS

Here are some clarifications and suggestions:

1. GRS: Our overall effectiveness will depend on the individual delegates preparation and sense of objectives and strategy. Since the materials you send out will go a long way to establishing the tone for the delegates, I'm including some thoughts you might want to work in as appropriate, based on a good deal of conversation with a lot of people here.

a. Overall approach: The Delegates need to feel that, more than ever before, the Conference is targeted and organized for results. Each delegate should be focussing on what his or her group needs to accomplish, and what they will be prepared to report back in terms of information and recommended follow-up action.

b. Delegate Preparation - GRS must "go public": Our effectiveness with all members will be increased if the delegates can convince them that the GRS issue is gaining broader public attention. City officials can build this directly through press conferences, or by working through citizens groups, unions, non-profit agencies, and other present, past, and potential beneficiaries. For example, city figures on the consequences (tax increases, service cuts) of non-reenactment are essential; the figures will have much more punch if accompanied by newspaper clippings showing that press conferences have been conducted to explain the issue. Similarly, while a letter of support from the President of a Senior Citizens group will help, a resolution from his board and clippings on the issue from the group's newsletter will greatly strengthen the case. Cities which haven't gathered a file of such material should do so now - its likely to be far more eloquent than words in most cases. Delegates must understand that their effectiveness may be substantially determined by the quality of such preparation before they board the plane to Washington. Delegates should of course also be aware of basic GRS issues through issue papers sent out by the League and supplemented by briefings at the Conference.

c. Strategy - In all cases, the delegates will need to reconfirm the reports on their member's position, since even recent reports maybe incorrect or out of date. Regardless of whether the delegate's own Congressman supports or opposes GRS, the delegate can contribute meaningfully.

(1) GRS supporters - GRS continues to stagnate, and

there are numerous highly devisive or damaging issues which could derail an acceptable bill, Delegates whose Members support GRS should (1) explain current GRS developments and secure support or opposition on key issues, and (2) where appropriate persuade the Member to help with other Members waivering or opposed, to intercede with key Committee Members where appropriate, etc. The latter arrangements should be specific, with provisions for feedback to the delegates. These discussions with supporters will require every bit as much skill and discretion as those with GRS opponents.

(2) GRS Waiverers and Opponents: Delegates with Members in these categories will have to convince them that substantial numbers of constituents will be angered by the consequences of non-reenactment, and that Congress and the Member himself will be held responsible.

(3) District Coordinators: The Delegates chairing the meetings with the individual members should be prepared to develop a consensus with the other delegates attending on the meeting's objectives; guide the discussion with the right mix of issue awareness, aggressiveness, and tact; and report back accomplishments, comments, and recommendations for follow-up. We are too late in the game for either ineffectual social calls or counterproductive shouting matches.

d. Other GRS items: I will be meeting with the California Washington representatives group Friday, February 27, and will forward any updates on Members' positions which may emerge there. I'll also check again to see if we can't send you a list of registered delegates this week, so that you can see how well the various Districts are covered.

2. Other Conference Arrangements:

a. Special meetings: Your list of topics looks excellent- it has good focus as is, and I hope we don't have to add to it. My understanding is that you will formally invite the Members listed on the attached program this week. When we receive copies of the invitations here, we will follow up with phone calls, appropriate staff invitations, and room arrangements. It would be good if you could send us the Meeting Chairman list soon, so that we can make contact there as needed. Finally, we will get back to you with confirmed rooms, times and attendees by March 5, so that you can send a general letter of invitation to all California Congressmen.

b. California Report - back Session: (Tuesday, 1:30 - 2:00): When NLC-USCM secures a room for the general feedback session on the Hill, I'll try to get one near it for our use, prior to our joining the general meeting at 2:00

c. Reception (Monday, 5:00): We're not doing anything on this from this end - John Wells can call on us if anything further is needed.

Please let me know is this has left any loose ends or unanswered questions.

CALIFORNIA DELEGATES' PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

CONGRESSIONAL-CITY CONFERENCE
March 14-16, 1976 Washington Hilton Hotel
Washington, D. C.

(*Denotes Special California Events)

SUNDAY, MARCH 14, 1976

11:00 A.M.	Registration opens
6:00 P.M.	WELCOME RECEPTION FOR DELEGATES (HILTON)
	Evening Free

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1976

9:00 A.M.	OPENING GENERAL SESSION (HILTON)
9:30 A.M.	Presidential Adresses: Mayor Hans Tanzler, Jacksonville, Fla. President, National League of Cities Mayor Moon Landrieu, New Orleans, La. President, U. S. Conference of Mayors Addresses: "Two Views on Revenue Sharing"
12:00 Noon	GENERAL LUNCHEON SESSION Address: "The Cities' Role in Reenactment of Revenue Sharing"
2:00 - 3:15 P.M.	REGIONAL MEETINGS (HILTON) California Delegates will meet as part of the Western Region, which also includes Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Arizona, and New Mexico. Agenda items will include: (1) Strategy and issues briefing (2) Regional "headcount" (3) Press strategy briefing

MONDAY, MARCH 15, cont'd

*3:30 - 4:30 P.M.

CALIFORNIA CAUCUS (HILTON)

(1) Issues discussion: "Urban Economic Recovery- A Must for California Cities"

(a) Revenue Sharing Reenactment-California strategy
(b) Unemployment-private sector stimulation and continuation of public service employment
(c) Federally-Mandated Personnel Costs- Unemployment Insurance (H.R. 10200) and FLSA update.
(d) Collective Bargaining- status and strategy discussion

(2) Organization for Tuesday A. M. Meetings with California Legislative Committee Members: Delegates grouped according to personal interest around Chairpeople, who conduct short discussion on arrangements and content of meetings.

*5:00 - 6:30 P.M.

CALIFORNIA RECEPTION FOR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (House Office Building, to be specified)

-Evening Free-

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1976

8:00 A.M.

REVENUE SHARING STRATEGY BREAKFAST (HILTON)

Speaker

9:15 A.M.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCES

Buses begin leaving Hilton for Capital Hill

9:45 A.M.- 1:30 P.M.

City Officials confer with members of their own Congressional Delegations

*10:00 - 11:00 A.M.

Concurrent California Delegate Meetings with key Legislative Committee Members and staff. (Senate or House Office Buildings).

(1) General Revenue Sharing:
House Government Operations Committee: Congressmen Moss, Ryan, John Burton, McCloskey (This meeting may be pre-empted by a national meeting with the entire committee.)

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, cont'd

(2) Public Service Employment and Employee Relations:
Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee: Senator Cranston; House Education and Labor Committee: Congressmen Hawkins, Phil Burton, Miller and Bell.

(3) Public Works:
House Public Works and Transportation Committee: Congressmen Johnson, Anderson, Mineta, Clausen and Goldwater.

(4) Unemployment Insurance:
House Ways and Means Committee: Congressmen Corman, Stark, and Ketchum.

(Members to be invited; attendance not confirmed)

12:00 - 3:00 P.M. "Feedback Center" Open for Reporting in on Revenue Sharing Discussions with Congressmen (House Office Building).

*1:30 - 2:00 P.M. California Feedback Session on Special State Meetings (House Office Building room near conference "Feedback Center")

2:00 - 3:00 P.M. Conference Wrap-Up meeting in "Feedback Center".

(Note: scheduled Greyhound limosine service for Dulles Airport leaves the Washington Hilton at 3:40 P.M. in time for 5:30 flights)

CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION
POSITIONS ON GENERAL REVENUE SHARING REENACTMENT

The attached chart represents the best information available to Washington representatives of California counties, cities and the State as of February 6. Overall delegation standing on GRS was as follows:

Strongly support	26
Leaning towards	9
Undecided	3
Strongly against	5
Position unknown	2
	45

Key to Attached Revenue Sharing Tally Chart

There were two votes on revenue sharing in the House and two in the Senate in 1972. Votes favoring our position are indicated by +; votes opposing our position are indicated by -; not voting but present is indicated by ?.

Column A -- House Vote on H.R. 14370

The first key House vote on revenue sharing prohibited amendments from the floor. In effect, this vote prevented Members from later offering an amendment to change the program to an annual appropriations process. The closed rule was approved 223-185.

Senate Vote on McClellan Amendment

This amendment would have required annual Congressional approval of appropriations for revenue sharing. It was voted down. (Rejected 49-34; Republicans 23 No - 11 Yes; Democrats 26 No - 23 Yes)

Column B -- Final House Vote on Passage of H.R. 14370

The vote approving final passage of revenue sharing was 275-122. (Republicans 122 Yes - 42 No; Democrats 158 Yes - 80 No)

Senate Vote on Passage of S. 3651

Passed 64-20. (Republicans 32 Yes - 5 No; Democrats 32 Yes - 15 No)

Column C -- Information Obtained Regarding Present Position Towards Reenactment

1-Strongly Supports
2-Leaning Towards
3-Undecided
4-Leaning Against
5-Strongly Against

Numbers in parentheses are assessments by Washington representatives of California state, counties, and cities.

CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

POSITIONS ON GRS REENACTMENT

UNDATE AS OF 2/6/76

		A	B	C	COMMENTS
Senate					
*John V. Tunney	D	+	+	1	O. K.
Alan Cranston	D	+	+	1	Likely to support stronger civil rights provisions
House					
1. H. T. Johnson	D	+	+	3 (2)	Probably favorable; moderate enthusiasm
2. *D. H. Clausen	R	+	+	1	O.K.
3. J.E. Moss	D	-	-	(3)	No firm position, needs work
4. R. L. Leggett	D	+	+	1	Probably O.K.
5. J. L. Burton	D			(2)	Probably won't vote against, finally
6. Phillip Burton	D	-	-	(3)	Agonizing
7. **George Miller, III	D			1	O. K.
8. R. V. Dellums	D	-	+	(7)	May have problems on formula; concerned about civil rights, citizen participation
9. **F. H. Stark	D			1,2	"
10. Don Edwards	D	-	+	2	"
11. **L. J. Ryan	D			1	O.K.
12. *P.N. McCloskey, Jr.	R	+	+	1	O.K.
13. **N.Y. Mineta	D			1	
14. J.J. McFall	D	-	-	(2)	Would support formula change, but not initiate; probably ultimately would support GRS
15. B. F. Sisk	D	-	-	1	"

		A	B	C	COMMENTS
House cont'd					
16. B. L. Talcott	R	-	+	1	O. K.
17. ***John Krebs	D			1	O. K.
18. W. H. Katchum	R			(2)	Probably O.K., finally, but needs attention
19. *R.J. Lagomarsino	R			1	O.K.
20. B.M. Goldwater, Jr.	R	+	-	(2)	Probably O.K., finally, but needs attention. Basically against, but hearing from district
21. J. C. Corman	D	-	-	(5)	Opposed
22. C. J. Moorhead	R			(1)	O.K.
23. T. M. Rees	D	-	-	(2)	Probably O. K., finally; needs work
24. H. A. Waxman	D			(2)	" not formally committed
25. E. R. Roybal	D	-	-	5	Firmly opposed
26. J. E. Rousselot	R	-	-	(5)	"
27. Alphonzo Bell	R	+	+	(?)	Position not clear
28. **Y. B. Burke	D			1 (2)	Probably O.K.; signed "Dear Colleague" reluctantly
29. A. P. Hawkins	D	+	+	(5)	Opposed on fiscal grounds and prefers categoricals
30. G. E. Danielson	D	+	+	(3)	Needs more selling. Basically against, but hearing from district
31. C. H. Wilson	D	+	+	1	O. K.
32. **G. H. Anderson	D	+	+	1	O. K.
33. Del Clawson	R	-	-	(5)	Firmly opposed on fiscal grounds
34. **M. W. Hannaford	D			1	O. K.
35. **Jim Lloyd	D			1	O. K.
36. **G. E. Brown	D			1	O. K.

		A	B	C	COMMENTS
House cont'd					
37. Shirley M. Pettis	R			2	Leaning towards, but needs work
38.*** J. M. Patterson	D			1	O. K.
39. C. E. Wiggins	R	+	+	(1)	In support, but would oppose substantial funding increases
40. A. J. Hinshaw	R			1	
41. *Bob Wilson	R	+	+	1	O. K.
42. Lionel Van Deerlin	D	-	-	1	O. K., although formal public stand still in opposition
43. C. W. Burgener	R			(1)	O. K.

*Cosponsor of Administration's Bill

**Signed Democratic Letter 12/19

***Both of the above

D-Democrat

R-Republican