

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual
collections.

Collection: Baker, James A.: Files
Folder Title: White House
Intergovernmental Affairs (Friedersdorf)
Box: 3

To see more digitized collections
visit: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories
visit: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

CS 10/5/00

Collection: BAKER, JAMES A. III: Files

Archivist: mjd/srj

File Folder: Legislative Affairs (Friedersdorf) *Box 3*
~~OA 9107~~

Date: 1/15/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. note	Richard Darman to JAB III re: parking fees. 1p.	n.d.	P5
2. memo	Bill Gribbin to Max re: Baker request for bill information. 1p.	4/13/81	P5
3. memo	Gribbin to Max re: duplicate see item 2. 1p.	4/13/81	P5

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
 - P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
 - P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
 - P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
 - P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
 - P-6 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.

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

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection: BAKER, JAMES A. III: Files

Archivist: mjd/srj

File Folder: Legislative Affairs (Friedersdorf) OA 9107

Date: 1/15/98

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. note	Richard Darman to JAB III re: parking fees. 1p.	n.d.	P5
2. memo	Bill Gribbin to Max re: Baker request for bill information. 1p.	4/13/81	P5
3. memo	Gribbin to Max re: duplicate see item 2. 1p.	4/13/81	P5

RESTRICTION CODES

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

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 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.

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

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

file

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

BRK.
REC: DO AWAY WITH
PER JAB -

December 16, 1981

MEMORANDUM TO: Jim Baker
FROM: Max Friedersdorf
SUBJECT: Parking fees

m.f.

Per your request this morning, I am sending along the attached memo from Nancy Risque and B. Oglesby concerning the attitude on the Hill on parking fees for Federal workers.

I would add that if the decision is to reimpose parking fees for Federal workers, it should be coupled with a strong recommendation that this also apply to Congress.

The last time when Carter applied these parking fees, it was applicable to Federal workers, and Congress indicated it would study the situation and impose the fees on itself. Of course, this never happened, and if we are going to do this to the Federal workers, the equity insofar as the public is concerned, would be more apparent if Congress were included.

Attachment

Nancy's office called & agreed -

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 16, 1981

FOR: MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF
THRU: KENNETH M. DUBERSTEIN *Ken D.*
FROM: NANCY RISQUE *Nancy*
M.B. OGLESBY *MB*
SUBJECT: PARKING FEES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Frank Wolf and Stan Parris have called to register their opposition to:

1. Reimposition of parking fees for federal employees, and,
2. If fees are imposed, for retroactive collection.

Trent concurs with these two Republican freshmen. They are both in extremely marginal districts that contain heavy populations of federal workers. Both have been consistent supporters of the Administration's proposals.

UPDATE

J.L. and Nancy Risque just called from Lott's Whip Office to say the Members are up in arms about this proposed reimposition of parking fees. Says the Members don't want to pay the fees, and they don't want the Federal employees to have to pay the fees. Herb Harris, who defeated Stan Parris, and Parris then in turn defeated, and who is running against Stan again, has been hired by the American Federation of Government Employees to lobby AGAINST the imposition of fees. He is attempting, as I type, to gain an audience with the President TODAY. If he succeeds, and we DON'T impose parking fees, he'll use that in his campaign for Stan's seat.

JL & Nancy request, that if we don't impose fees, that Holt/Parris/Wolf, be allowed to make the announcement.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TO: Edwin Meese
✓ James Baker
✓ Michael Deaver
Richard Darman

FROM: Lyn Nofziger

DATE: December 16, 1981

RE: White House Staffing Memorandum
Subject: Parking

Somewhere along the line, we have to begin to show that we care a little bit about people. We should even appreciate the bureaucrats who make this government, regardless of how badly, function.

It seems to me, to hit them with parking fees now is just the wrong thing to do. We could make a lot of hay and show them that we care by announcing, at least for now, we are not going to reinstitute parking fees.

Why not do something for the federal employees' morale just once? After all, we are cutting a lot of employees and this would be an easy way to show that we appreciate the ones that are still working. You could always institute it 6 months from now, if you really thought it was necessary. Although, I do not think it is.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 13, 1981

TO: Max

FROM: Bill Gribbin

RE: Jim Baker request for bill information (see attached)

The bill Darman's memo mentions is S. 808, a Mathias bill, with a House counterpart by William Clay (Dem-Mo).

We are doing nothing about it because it is, basically, dead legislation: a PR gesture by two members who want to please their air-traffic controller constituents.

The bill, as Mathias' office admits, is simply the codification of the labor demands of the Air Traffic Controllers organization. It's all the things they would like to get from the government in their negotiations, the benefits -- hours, wages, promotion, etc. -- they would be demanding if they were permitted to unionize and strike.

So this legislation is a stunt by two sympathetic members of Congress to get public attention -- and considerable respectability -- for the position of one side in the air traffic dispute.

Even though both sponsors of the legislation are on the Civil Service subcommittees of House and Senate, it is unlikely that we will hear any more about the bills.

For details of the bills, it would be best to refer people to the attached copy from the Record.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 15, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR CRAIG FULLER

FROM: JAMES A. BAKER, III



SUBJECT: Legislative Affairs Support

Attached is a memorandum from Ed Harper to me suggesting we request detailees from Commerce, Transportation, HUD, Agriculture and Interior, to help us with the mark-ups.

I have discussed this with Max Friedersdorf. He thinks it's a good idea, but that the details should be to OMB on a temporary basis (not to the White House staff).

Based on Max's views, and subject to Ed Meese's views, I recommend you request such details, effective immediately.

Thanks for your help.

ATTACHMENT

CC: Ed Meese

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 11, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM BAKER
FROM: ED HARPER *EH*
SUBJECT: Legislative Affairs Support

The work load on the OMB and White House Legislative Affairs unit with mark-ups going on in 150 committees has become overwhelming. Unfortunately, I'm not in a position to reallocate another individual within the Office of Management and Budget to Legislative Affairs, even if we had a person with the appropriate expertise. Even with moving OMB's personnel to 610 slots, that's approximately 40 less than the estimated number required to implement the Executive Order on Regulatory Clearance. We are doing our best to make due on a tight resources budget, but we've come to the end of the line.

Prior Administration's have supplemented their Congressional Liaison staff with detailees from the agencies. The purpose of this memorandum is to ask that this practice be reinstated in a specific manner.

Max Friedersdorf and I have reviewed the work load and activities of each of the Cabinet departments and are asking you to request detailees to help the Office of Management and Budget and the White House staff from the Departments of Commerce, Transportation, HUD, Agriculture and Interior. We'd like to have one detailee from each department. One of the detailees should be Fred Upton. The others would be subject to negotiation.

If you approve, I would appreciate Craig Fuller's implementing this at the earliest possible moment as we are in desperate need of help.

I intend to discuss with Nicky —