

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

July 25, 1984

TO: MIKE MCMANUS

The attached is an attempt to combine the various drafts into a single, agreed introduction to the 50 States Project Report. I think it is a good document that approaches the subject in the manner we all felt best.

Please let me know what you think. You may also want to show it to MKD for his reaction.

Thanks.


Jim Cicconi

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 25, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM CICCONI

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG 

SUBJECT: FIFTY STATES PROJECT

Attached are my comments and suggested corrections to the latest draft introductory materials to the Fifty States Project Report.

As you can see, I have concurred with most of the draft and have noted the few changes. In addition, I have attached a title page which I would recommend include the names of Faith and Trudy as indicated. The acknowledgment page that I have attached gives the appropriate and agreed upon acknowledgment to Jeff Miller.

Per your comments earlier today, Eliza's draft has apparently been incorporated in the attached introductory materials. You may recall that we rewrote the letter going out from the White House from her proposal. We recommend that the letter go to the Fifty State Representatives and be signed by Trudy. The other substantial differences between our draft and Eliza's were in the history section and some editorial corrections similar to the ones which I have made in the attached.

Please let me know how we proceed from here.

Attachments
cc: Donatelli

THE FIFTY STATES PROJECT

1984 Report

Faith Ryan Whittlesey
Assistant to the President
for Public Liaison

Trudi Michelle Morrison
Project Director

Acknowledgements

The Fifty States Projects acknowledges with special thanks the work of Jeffrey R. Miller for directing the preparation of this report and Eliza Paschall for assisting. The Project is also grateful for help provided by Lee L. Verstandig, Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs, and his staff.

[DRAFT LETTER TO THE 50 GOVERNORS]

State Representatives

Dear Governor

On behalf of the President,

We are

~~I am~~ pleased to present you with the 1984 Report on the FIFTY STATES PROJECT, a reference ~~book~~ ^{guide to} changes made in state laws to eliminate sex discrimination. One of ~~my~~ *President Reagan's* earliest pledges ~~as President~~ was to establish liaison with the fifty Governors to assist them in identifying and changing state laws that provide unequal treatment between the sexes.

This Report supplements the 1982 Year-End Report which provided a state-by-state summary of activities then in progress. This year's report presents the results of a systematic survey of changes made in state law. ^{over the past} It ^{fifteen years} reflects the variety of legislative devices used by the states to achieve their unique objectives.

This Report confirms once again the wisdom of our Founding Fathers in establishing a federal system, whereby the sovereign states are free to act as laboratories to identify their particular needs and to experiment with and develop individual solutions.

(NEXT PAGE)

DRAFT

(LETTER CONTINUED)

[OPTIONAL SENTENCE, DEPENDING UPON STATE -- ^{We} ~~I~~ would like to express ^{our} ~~my~~ appreciation for your ^{cooperation in} ~~support~~ of this effort. [STATE] has taken many significant actions to eliminate sex discrimination under state law.] ^{We} ~~I~~ hope that the FIFTY STATES PROJECT may be of continuing assistance to you.

Sincerely,

~~Ronald Reagan~~

~~Faith Michelle Morrison~~

Faith Whittesey
Lee Verstandig

HISTORY

Within weeks after taking office, President Reagan established the "Fifty States Project" to serve as an informational clearinghouse and to provide technical assistance to the states in reviewing their legal codes ^{with regard to} ~~for~~ sex discrimination. ~~As the~~ President ^{wrote} ~~explained in a letter~~ to the fifty Governors ^{inviting} ~~participation in this Project.~~

~~BLOCK QUOTE~~

By the Fall, 1981, every Governor had appointed a representative to serve as state liaison with ^{this} the Project. ^{This} ~~The entire group was~~ ^{participated in} ~~invited to~~ a White House meeting ^{October 7, 1981} at which ~~the~~ President Reagan ^{reaffirmed} ~~emphasized~~ his support for ^{this} the Project, saying that: "It's my hope that through the Fifty States Project we can alter or eliminate those State laws that continue to deny equality to women . . . (B)y inviting you here today, I want to reaffirm my commitment to the equality of all of our citizens and my commitment to this project."

that
 At ~~the~~ initial White House meeting, ^{*the*} Project Director ~~Judy Peaches~~ explained the goals of the Project to the Governors' representatives and ^{*solicited*} sought their advice on how the White House could be of most assistance to the states. She emphasized that the Administration would not urge any particular course of action. Rather, the White House wished to facilitate communications among the states and to provide support services so that the states could achieve their individual objectives in eliminating unfair sex discrimination.

To that end, the 1982 Year-End Report reflected activity ^{*is*} in every state and ^{*identified*} ~~noted~~ areas of the law ^{*which were*} undergoing the most rapid change.

The Project staff employed a wide range of techniques for establishing and maintaining formal and informal contact with those working on this effort in the states. Recognizing that the success of the Project depended upon the voluntary cooperation of each state, the Director~~s~~ endeavored to provide individual assistance to the states, ~~in the form which would be most useful.~~

Among the functions carried out by the Project were:

- ^{Extended} Offer research and other technical assistance in identifying gender-specific statutes.

- Serve^d as a clearinghouse of information on the activities of the various states, as well as report^{ed} to the state representatives on relevant Federal action.^s

- ^{helped to create and stimulate} Create a dialogue with national and local, public and private sector individuals and groups with an interest in the ~~Fifty States Project~~. *eliminating sex discrimination.*

DRAFT

As a result of these efforts, the Project staff developed a resource bank of information about actions taken over the past fifteen years which ^{might} ~~may~~ be drawn upon by the states and the general public.

^{While}
↑ It was not the goal of the Project to pass judgment upon the wisdom of any state actions, or to evaluate the progress of state governments in eradicating invidious sex discrimination, ^{clearly,} Emphasis was placed on developing an ^a ~~accurate, up-to-date~~ file on each state as it has reported new activity. ^{is} The completeness of each file ^{did} ~~will~~, to a large extent, depend upon the degree of state activity and the amount of relevant information reported to the Project staff by the state.

DRAFT

OVERVIEW

The fulfillment of
The FIFTY STATES PROJECT represents ^{an} a commitment ^{of} the Reagan Administration to ^{enable} make the Federal Government ^{to become} a constructive partner with the several states ^{in order to encourage} to obtain equal rights for women. In recent years, virtually all of the states have carried out substantial revisions of their state codes to eliminate improper discrimination. ^{However, there has not been} This has been achieved without any institutional means ^{by which} for the states ^{could this useful} to share information about their individual efforts.

Through the FIFTY STATES PROJECT, the Federal Government has established ~~a formal liaison system~~ between the national and state governments, and among the states, to facilitate *and maintain* communications so that the states can learn from each other how best to promote equal treatment under the law for men and women.

philosophy
The ~~notion~~ of Federalism is central to the American political culture. The ^National Government was established to discharge certain powers enumerated in the Constitution, while the states retained critical aspects of sovereignty. Diversity among the states has been a hallmark of our democracy. Although state laws must conform to the Constitution of the United States, Governors and state legislatures do not report to the Federal government, nor do they need approval before moving ahead with creative new solutions to problems within the purview of state and local governments.

In recent years, our society has become increasingly aware of the many gender-based distinctions contained in state law.^S State statutes sometimes have embodied archaic discriminatory notions.

Great national debate has ensued over the need to change many of these laws. It has been a healthy debate, and one which is expected to continue. Americans agree that no man or woman should be discriminated against on ~~account~~^{because} of gender, but ^{that} there is a wide variety of opinion about what precisely constitutes improper distinctions made between sexes.

Over the past two decades, state Governments -- on their own initiative -- have taken major steps to ferret out and correct gender-based distinctions in their state codes. This has been accomplished, to a large degree, free from Federal interference. Different states identified different kinds of statutes in need of reform. Many laws that had been on the books for scores of years were amended, and a variety of new statutes were enacted. The states have truly functioned as social laboratories experimenting with solutions to pressing social needs.

The FIFTY STATES PROJECT is one of the first systematic attempts to encourage state officials to review their laws and regulations, to identify those which need to be changed in order to eliminate sex discrimination, and to take the action most suitable to correct a particular problem in that particular state.

Since no two state codes are exactly alike, different states have amended different areas of the law. Some states may have found no need to tamper with their domestic relations law. Instead, the focus of activity may have been on passing tougher laws against rape. Conversely, ^{another} ~~a sister~~ state may be satisfied with its sexual abuse laws, and instead have combatted sex discrimination by amending ^{its} ~~their~~ domestic relations law.

Each state Report consists of three sections. First, there is discussion as to whether statutes and regulations have been revised to ensure gender neutrality. The second section summarizes the substantive changes in state laws that purported to treat men and women differently. While obviously ^{a great} ~~an infinite~~ number of issues could be discussed, the REPORT sought ~~as best as possible~~ to concentrate on the major changes. In the third section, the availability of machinery in the state to monitor developments and propose ideas for future reforms is discussed.

This REPORT contains no definition of a "woman's issue." In the broadest sense, all issues are women's issues, ranging from a healthy national economy to anti-pornography laws. And all issues are men's issues, ranging from weighty matters of war and peace to the thorny problems associated with awarding child custody. The concern here is with those state laws and regulations which treat persons similarly situated differently on account of gender.

~~It is not the intent of the authors of the REPORT that the Administration take credit for all of the ^p progress ^{has been} made toward achieving equal treatment for the sexes over the past several years. Many states began taking corrective action in the 1970's. Credit for these changes is thus difficult to assign in any case.~~

However, ^T to the extent that the added attention generated by the PROJECT has contributed to implementation of reforms being pursued by each of the states, all who have been a part of the PROJECT can take satisfaction. Comments from many state officials involved in the PROJECT indicate this has already happened.

Furthermore, the publication and distribution of this REPORT should accelerate the pace of these reforms over the next several years as states take note of the many different strategies available to them.

Finally, this REPORT is a compilation of the major changes in state law and regulations that treat men and women differently. It does not constitute an endorsement of any or all of the changes that are catalogued herein. It is provided as a resource tool for the individual states as they continue to examine their laws in light of the changing roles of men and women in our society. The goal is to promote the cause of sexual equality through the two century old American tradition of Federalism.

Although the authors of this REPORT make no claim that it is an exhaustive compendium of relevant state enactments, the REPORT does represent a substantial resource document that will be of value to researchers, legislators, and those interested in obtaining an overview of recent state action^s to eliminate sex discrimination. ~~To a large extent, the completeness of the REPORT is dependent upon the amount of information made available by the fifty state representatives who served as liaison between their Governors and the Federal Government.~~

The FIFTY STATES PROJECT staff ^{will} ~~stands ready to~~ continue to ~~provide information and technical help through~~ the on-going system of consultation with representatives appointed by the Governors of each state. The staff appreciates the efforts of the many state officials and private citizens throughout the country who cooperated in this PROJECT. ~~Their continued advice on how the Administration may be of maximum assistance is always welcome.~~ *The Administration looks forward to assisting to further insure elimination of discrimination.*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 7, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR FRANK DONATELLI

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG *lee*

SUBJECT: 50 States Project

As I had promised Faith in January and reported to you in a memorandum on April 9, IGA has provided staff assistance to the 50 States Project as follows:

- o Verified the coordinators of this project in approximately half of the 50 States. This was done either by direct contact with the Governor or his Chief of Staff to insure that we had the name of the appropriate person in each state.
- o Identified state legislators and staffers willing to assist in this project especially where there might have been a Governor reluctant to cooperate on the completion of the project. My staff contacted legislators in some 35 states to get status information and enlist assistance. Materials have already been received by IGA from state legislators from Wisconsin, Vermont, Georgia and Delaware. Commitments have been made by legislators from Alaska, Rhode Island and Virginia. Offers to assist were made by legislators from Arizona, Nevada, Florida, New Jersey.
- o When key intergovernmental groups were in D.C. in recent months, I stressed at every opportunity the importance of the project and urged participation in the project.
- o Since January, in individual meeting with Governors I personally received 50 States Status accomplishment reports or commitments to do special reports or provide documentation from Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Hampshire, Delaware, Louisiana, Oregon, Missouri, Indiana, New Jersey, North Dakota.
- o My staff has recommended action or follow-up needed in 35 states. My memorandum to Trudi Morrison of April 5 set forth those recommended actions or follow-up. Before IGA can assist further, this follow-up must be completed.

On April 30, you asked that IGA provide a status report on State responses to the questionnaire due back on May 1. Upon learning that there was a substantial backlog of those materials not yet opened, I advised my staff to refrain from making those calls until we had determined which states had responded and whether the requested materials were in fact adequate.

Thus, we are presently awaiting (1) a response on the follow-up and actions of those states listed in my April 5th memorandum; (2) a report on those states which have complied with the May 1 deadline to submit questionnaires and whether or not that information is complete. Below are the states which have provided or promised to provide a report on their respective participation in the 50 States project:

Connecticut	New Hampshire
Delaware	New Jersey
Illinois	Oregon
Iowa	Pennsylvania
Louisiana	

Recommendations:

At this stage it would be my recommendation that there needs to be:

- (1) a thorough review of the completed project materials which have been received from the states and;
- (2) an evaluation of each State questionnaire by a project officer with legal expertise and background in the relevant issues. This would determine what remains to be required from specific states. We may need to urge those states which have provided complete materials to pull those materials together in the form of a 50 States Project report as several other states have done.

✓
2/10
JC:
I agree w/ this. I'd
like to make the switch
as soon as the switch
change of OPL - but
not unless it may be a
I'd want to see Trudi
fully utilized. JAB

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
February 10, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: JAMES W. CICCONI *JW*

SUBJECT: 50 States Project

Per your request, the following is a brief overview of the 50 States Project, along with recommendations:

Purpose

The 50 States Project was publicized as the Administration's alternative to ERA. The President committed, via this project, to bring about the identification and removal of laws and regulations which are discriminatory, or which use gender-based terminology.

Immediate Objective

In the short run, the Project must be able to demonstrate an impact on state laws and regulations. The President must be able to cite examples of states which have accomplishments under the Project.

This immediate objective can be met by focusing efforts on obtaining reports from each participating state. These reports would list their progress in meeting the goals of the Project via changes in their state's laws and regulations. This can, for the most part, be done from the White House with a minimum of travel. White House meetings should be scheduled to exchange information and generally encourage provision of the reports. Events could also be scheduled to highlight progress. For example, a photo op could be held in which the President is given copies of 50 States Project reports by a group of state directors.

Management and Coordination

Currently the Project is directed by Trudi Morrison, and is within the Office of Public Liaison. This is an unnatural arrangement, which is largely a result of Judy Peachee's departure and Rich Williamson's subsequent decision to move the Project out of IGA.

The Project's function is closely related to the normal business of IGA, and could be reincorporated into that office with little difficulty. This would also be the most efficient set-up from a management standpoint, since the immediate objective will be achieved only through state governmental contacts--the main business of IGA.

If it is decided that the Project should remain within OPL, its director will have to work in close conjunction with Lee Verstandig's office and would, in fact, have to coordinate most contacts and activities through IGA. This can be done, and is being done now with Faith and Lee consulting more closely as a result of past difficulties. However, such an arrangement will blur management responsibility to a degree, and will involve a duplication of effort.

Travel Needs

If the above objectives are adopted for the Project, travel needs will be minimal. The Phase I and II trips proposed in Faith's memo will, for example, be largely unnecessary.

The director should travel to individual states only when it is necessary to further the objective of obtaining that state's accomplishment report, and when it is impossible to do so from Washington or via a White House meeting. If travel to individual states is necessary, it should be consolidated into regional trips where possible, and should be "advanced" by IGA through contacts with appropriate state officials. There is no valid objective served by the director visiting all 50 states. Thus, it should again be emphasized that any travel needs would be minimal under this approach.

I would suggest that John Rogers review the immediate objectives of the Project as set forth here, and budget an appropriate sum for travel needs through the remainder of the fiscal year. The director should then determine travel priorities as they arise in consultation with Faith and Lee. Since travel would be on an "as needed" basis per the above criteria, there should be no need for a travel plan as such.

cc: John F. W. Rogers

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Auth for Ryan

February 1, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III
MICHAEL DEEVER

FROM: FAITH RYAN WHITTLESEY *FRW*
SUBJECT: 50 State Project Travel Request

In order to complete the 50 States Project, an expanded travel budget for OPL is necessary. The following is a proposal involving two phases of travel.

PHASE I includes a travel budget for visits to states designated as "priority" states by Lee Verstandig and me. This assessment is based on interest in the project found in previous trips and level of support to continue the work. Our goal would be to permit Trudi Morrison our Project Director to visit these "13" priority states as soon as possible.

PHASE II of the project would involve additional travel funds to allow visits to the remaining states not yet visited by Trudi.

The optimum result is to allow the Project Director, Trudi Morrison, to visit all 50 states by June 1, 1984.

I urgently request approval of Phase I as soon as possible so that travel arrangements and plans with local supporters can be made. I also urge approval at a later date of Phase II. However, we can reevaluate the Phase II plans as Phase I is underway.

Trudi Morrison has already visited 20 states on an exploratory basis.

PHASE I

- Approval of additional travel funds for Phase I
- Disapproval of additional travel funds for Phase I

PHASE II

- Approval of additional travel funds for Phase II
- Disapproval of additional travel funds for Phase II
- No Action on Phase II until Phase I completed

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

(B)

PHASE I

50 STATES PROJECT TRAVEL SCHEDULE
for FEBRUARY 7, 1984 to MARCH 31, 1984

February

7-8	Virginia
8-9	West Virginia
13-14	Ohio
15-16	Michigan
20-22	Texas
23-24	Louisiana
27-28	Oklahoma

March

5-6	North Dakota
6-7	South Dakota
8-9	Colorado
22-24	Washington
25-27	Oregon
28-31	California

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

(C)

PHASE II

50 STATES PROJECT TRAVEL SCHEDULE
for APRIL 1, 1984 to MAY 27, 1984

April

2-3	Alabama
3-4	Georgia
5-6	Florida
9-10	Kentucky
16-17	Montana
17-18	Idaho
19-20	Nevada
24-25	Kansas
26-27	Nebraska

May

7	Maine
8-9	Massachusetts
10	Rhode Island
11	Connecticut
21	South Carolina
22	North Carolina
23-24	Mississippi
24-25	Arkansas

June

Unscheduled	Alaska
Unscheduled	Hawaii

February 1, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG *lee*

SUBJECT: FIFTY STATES PROJECT

Below are my proposals on how the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs should continue to assist on the Fifty States Project.

1. Presently, we are confirming the project status, evaluating receptiveness to the project and reassessing potential for project results in each state. To date, I have discussed this project with six Governors (Atiyeh, Olson, Thompson, du Pont, Sununu, and Orr) and several state legislators (Delaware, New Jersey, Maryland, Florida, Arizona, Michigan, Alaska, and Missouri). My office will continue to intensify these contacts and coordinate state efforts. When the NCSL legislative leaders are in Washington on February 8-10th, I plan to set up meetings with those appropriate legislators. I will discuss this project further with the Governors attending NGA on February 25-28th.

2. Based on the current information and analysis, the goal of the Fifty States Project can best be achieved by two methods: 1) visiting appropriate states, and 2) communicating with appropriate state leadership in states where a visit is not needed -- such as in Louisiana where achievements will be arranged by phone calls to Governor Treen. In our opinion, success can best be achieved or demonstrated by visits to 17 states in the coming months.

We recommend that these states be visited on a regional basis by the following trips:

1. Delaware*, New Jersey*
2. California*, Oregon, Washington, Colorado*, Utah*
3. Iowa*, North Dakota, South Dakota
4. Virginia, West Virginia
5. Illinois*, Missouri
6. Indiana*, Ohio, Michigan

* Re-visits.

Feb. 2

To-Turn

Fgi

lee

3. The Office of Intergovernmental Affairs will identify a contact person in advance of the Project Director visits to the above states. In addition, we will coordinate meetings with the Governors' and legislative leaders' office.

4. Upon the Project Director's return from state visits, the IGA Office will debrief her and will follow-up with appropriate state officials.

5. Several states, such as Iowa, are preparing a report on their Fifty States Project accomplishments. We plan to review such reports and consider them as models for recognition of state accomplishments.

6. We hope to be able to assist in the compilation of an overall report on the Fifty States Project.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 6, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III

FROM: FAITH RYAN WHITTLESEY

FRW

SUBJECT: 50 States Project

Hold till

Jan 16

Lee V. F. FW do

reach agreemt.

je 1/9

The immediate decisions which must be made with respect to the 50 States Project are:

1. The acceptance of a travel plan for the year. Continuing visits to the states are recommended in lieu of telephone and mail contacts, which were used prior to the summer of 1983.
2. If travel, as opposed to mail and telephone contacts, is approved, a budget must be established for traveling. The states having top priority in the travel plan must be determined.

Authorized OPL travel funds are not adequate for an extensive 1984 50 States travel schedule. Because the 50 States Project is an effort to generate support for changes at the state and local levels, I recommend that the Project Director visit every state as soon as possible so that the President's committment (which was made in his convention acceptance speech and subsequently at a Rose Garden ceremony in Oct. of 1981) be fulfilled.

The list of the 20 states to which the Project Director has traveled since the summer of 1983 are as follows:

Arizona	Maryland	Pennsylvania
Colorado	Minnesota	Tennessee
Delaware	Missouri	Utah
Illinois	New Hampshire	Vermont
Indiana	New Jersey	Wisconsin
Iowa	New Mexico	Wyoming
Louisiana	New York	

The states which have made requests for the Project Director to visit during the first quarter of 1984 are as follows:

California
Hawaii
Nevada
North Dakota
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Dakota
Texas
Washington

The states which have been contacted and have indicated some interest in the project and would welcome a visit by the Project Director if such a visit were initiated by the White House are as follows:

Alaska	Maine	West Virginia
Arkansas	Michigan	
Connecticut	Montana	
Idaho	Nebraska	
Kansas	Ohio	
Nebraska	Virginia	

The state governments which have demonstrated a hostile reaction to the project and have specified a lack of interest in having the Project Director visit are as follows:

Alabama
Florida
Georgia
Rhode Island
Kentucky
Massachusetts
Mississippi
North Carolina
South Carolina

When the Project Director visits the states, she meets with both private and public sector representatives such as various women's organizations, including Chamber of Commerce women, University women, business women, industry representatives, Commissions appointed by the Governors on the Status of women, Governors, State legislators, Attorneys General, women's advocates, insurance commissioners, and numerous community constituents groups. While in a state, the Project Director also appears on radio talk shows, accepts radio call-ins, gives television interviews, conducts press conferences, speaks to local editorial boards, and gives speeches to interested groups of all kinds.

The Project Director in all of these contacts speaks generally about the Reagan record, emphasizing the President's record on women's issues. Some of the press reports are attached.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Jan Cicconi - 1/24/84

Here is my memo to
Faith outlining our role,
an instance + suggestions
on 50 State Projects.

Faith will probably
not like the idea of not
doing all 50 states, but
I believe these
recommendations can do
the job + satisfactorily.
Let me know if you need
more. hcc

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

January 23, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR FAITH WHITTLESEY

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG 

SUBJECT: FIFTY STATES PROJECT

As you know, I am most eager to assist your office on the 50 States Project given its importance to the President. Since our meeting, my staff has had several working meetings with Trudi Morrison. After reviewing their work, I would suggest the following:

- The Office of Intergovernmental Affairs will assist in determining the status, receptiveness, and potential for the Project in each state. Based on that analysis, we will help establish the scorecard of accomplishments. This should be completed June 1, 1984 - after most legislative sessions are adjourned.
- Based on our analysis of the information provided by Trudi, the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs recommends the attached list of states to be visited, keeping in mind the best utilization of travel time and funds. The attached travel proposal may need to be updated as more specific information is gained through our intergovernmental contacts. This plan takes into account states on a regional basis allowing emphasis on states that are exemplary.
- In an effort to assist the Project Director, the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs will initiate contacts to elected officials, particularly Governors and State Legislators for commitments, assistance, and arrangements prior to visits. While at the same time, my office will assist in working with elected officials in those states to achieve project results and thus some state visits may not be necessary. Additionally my office will assist in monitoring state by state progress and make recommendations for additional Administration opportunities.

I am looking forward to the opportunity to continue to work together.

50 STATES PROJECT

RECOMMENDED FORTHCOMING STATE VISITS TO BE MADE BY TRUDI MORRISON

These visits will supplement those already made to twenty states. They are listed below according to priority and feasible regional travel.

1. Louisiana (before March), Texas, Oklahoma
2. *Delaware, *New Jersey
3. *California, *Oregon, *Washington, Colorado, *Utah
4. *Iowa (after 2/27), North Dakota, South Dakota
5. Virginia, West Virginia
6. *Illinois (after 3/20), *Missouri
7. Indiana, Ohio, Michigan

* indicates potential exemplary state

NOTE: This list of recommended visits may be changed depending on results of contacts by the Intergovernmental Affairs Office.

CRITERIA:	ID of				5 Proposed Legislation	6 Bills passed	7 Confinity, Monitoring, Comprehensiveness	8 Public/Private Cooperation	REMARKS:	RECOMMENDATION BY TREDI MICHELLE MORRISON
	1 Support Project Goals	2 Terminology	3 Preference	4 Impact						
Letter	A = full achievement of criterion									
Designations	D = full failure of criterion achievement									
										? = Unknown
ALABAMA	?	(Has not participated)								Should not visit
ALASKA 1, 2	?	(Has not participated)							Recognizes it need help	Should not visit
ARKANSAS	?	A	A	A	C	C	D	D	Governor established Ad Hoc Task Force of volunteers to review legislation	Good Model state; Should not revisit
ARIZONA 1, 2	B	A	A	A	C	C	C	C	Has requested assistance	Exemplary state; <u>MUST</u> visit
CALIFORNIA	A	A	A	A	B	D	D	B	Governor contacted Project Director (1/84) directly and expressed interest in participating; has requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
COLORADO 1, 2	B	(Has not participated)								Should not visit
CONNECTICUT	?	A	A	A	A	B	C	C		
DELAWARE	A	A	A	A	B	C	A	A	Governor extremely supportive	Exemplary state; should revisit
FLORIDA	D	(Has not participated)							Has requested that we do not visit them	Should not visit
GEORGIA	A	A	D	D	D	D	D	D	State needs strong lobbying to finish job	Should not visit
HAWAII	?	A	A	A	B	A	D	C	Requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
IDAHO 1, 2	?	(Has not participated)								
ILLINOIS	A	A	A	A	B	B	A	A	Governor formed the "Cannon-Proctor Commission", a panel to study and eliminate sex discrimination; State offered to host Human Rights/50 States Conference	Exemplary state; Has state ERA; Should revisit
INDIANA 1, 2	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	Governor and staff expressed no interest or support for project	Has state ERA; should not revisit
IONA	A	A	A	A	C	C	A	A	Governor Report based on 50 States Commission findings	Exemplary state; should revisit or receive info thru mail/phone
KANSAS 1, 2	?	(Has not participated)							Would welcome White House visit; needs help	Consider a visit
KENTUCKY	?	A	?	?	A	D	?	?	Hostile state	Should not visit
LOUISIANA	A	A	A	A	D	D	B	B	Has requested assistance to establish review commission before March 1984	Re-visit conditional
MAINE	?	A	A	A	B	B	B	A	State Human Rights Act applies to private and public sector	No need to visit
MARYLAND	D	A	A	A	C	B	A	A	Extremely hostile state	Has state ERA; should not revisit
MASSACHUSETTS	?	A	A	A	B	B	B	B		Should not visit
MICHIGAN	?	A	A	A	A	B	B	?		Should visit
MINNESOTA	B	A	A	A	C	B	A	A		Good model state; should consider revisit
MISSISSIPPI	?	(Has not participated)								Should not visit
MISSOURI	?	A	A	A	D	B	A	A	Governor very supportive	Exemplary state; should revisit
MONTANA 1	?	A	A	A	D	D	D	D		Should not visit
NEBRASKA	?	A	A	A	C	C	B	?		Should not visit
NEVADA	?	A	D	D	C	C	D	D	Would welcome White House initiated visit	Consider a visit
NEW HAMPSHIRE	C	A	A	A	D	D	D	D	Governor has yet to appoint a new project representative	Has state ERA; should not revisit
NEW JERSEY	?	A	A	A	B	B	B	B	Feb. 1982 Public Hearing on Sex Discrimination; March 1983 Report on Wage Discrimination	Exemplary state; did not meet Gov.; should revisit
NEW MEXICO	B	A	A	A	C	C	A	C		Good model state; Has state ERA; should consider revisit
NEW YORK 1	D	A	A	A	B	C	C	C		Should not revisit
NORTH CAROLINA	?	A	D	D	B	D	?	?		Consider a visit
NORTH DAKOTA	A	A	D	D	A	?	D	?	Has requested assistance	Should visit
OHIO	?	A	A	A	B	B	A	A		Should visit
OKLAHOMA	?	A	D	D	B	C	C	B	Has requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
OREGON	?	A	A	A	B	B	C	B	Has requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
PENNSYLVANIA	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	B	Project goals accomplished prior to 1980	Good model state; "Double ERA" state; should consider revisit
RHODE ISLAND	A	A	D	D	B	C	B	B	State needs encouragement	Should not visit
SOUTH CAROLINA	?	A	A	A	A	D	D	D		Should visit
SOUTH DAKOTA 1, 2	?	(Has not participated)							Wants to get involved; needs help	Should visit
TENNESSEE	D	B	B	B	D	D	D	D	Governor has priorities which do not include project; not committive	Should not revisit
TEXAS	?	A	A	A	D		D	D	Has requested assistance; needs help	Should visit
UTAH 1, 2	A	A	C	C	A	A	B	B	Governor established seven-member panel to pursue project goals and objectives; Governor considering forming a 50 States Commission; will request assistant of Project Director	Good model state; has state ERA; should consider revisit
VERMONT 1, 2	D	B	B	B	D	D	D	D	Hostile State; Project representative is leading ERA proponent and Governor supports her	Should not revisit
VIRGINIA	?	A	D	D	D	D	D	D	Has requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
WASHINGTON	?	A	A	A	C	C	B	?	Has requested assistance from Project Director	Should visit
WEST VIRGINIA	?	A	D	D	D	D	D	D	Recognizes it needs help to finish job	Should visit
WISCONSIN	D	B	C	C	B	B	D	C	Governor's representative does not feel project has been of assistance to the state	Should not revisit
WYOMING 1, 2	A	A	B	B	B	B	A	A	Governor discussed project in 1983 State-of-the-State message; Governor has requested Project Director to return during February, 1984 when the legislature is in session	Good model; state ERA; should revisit