

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Deaver, Michael
Folder Title: 50 States Project

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>

National Archives
Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 31, 1984

FD

*But
res stay on
top of this.
we need help
conventions*

MEMORANDUM FOR JAMES A. BAKER, III
MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG *fl from*
FRANK J. DONATELLI *see*

SUBJECT: 50 States -- Status Report

This memorandum reviews the activities of our two offices in preparing a report for the "50 States Project" on efforts to eliminate sex bias from state laws.

Research

Our detailee from the Department of Transportation has been working on the project for two weeks. He has reviewed all 50 state files, and initiated some independent legal research. Those efforts indicate:

- 1) The quality of the state files (i.e., the amount of information we have as to what a state has or has not done to date) varies considerable -- generally, according to the level of cooperation between a governor's office and this Administration. Thus, some of the files (e.g., California, Delaware, New Jersey) are reasonably complete, but many are not. Most require at least some additional research in one or more areas.
- 2) It appears that many states do have several positive developments to report. These developments include comprehensive reviews of state statutes for gender bias; enactment of corrective legislation; and passage of laws in other areas (such as sexual assault and spouse abuse) that help treat women more fairly than in the past. Many of those took place during the 1970's, but several new efforts (e.g., North Dakota, Iowa, and Wyoming) have been attributed to this Administration's focus on the issue.

The areas in which information is lacking have been compiled on a state-by-state basis. Our detailee is continuing his legal research, checking for recent enactments in each state.

Report

Our plans are to prepare a short (two-page) concise review of each state's efforts in the gender bias field, focusing on these general areas (to the extent applicable):

- Whether the state has conducted a survey of its statutory law for gender-biased terms, and to what extent corrective legislation has been enacted.
- What substantive legal changes a state has made in areas such as marital property, sexual assault, spouse abuse, child support, and pension bias, to improve equity for women.
- What types of ongoing monitoring mechanisms (e.g., a Commission on the Status of Women) the state has established to guard against sex bias in current law and new legislation.

While the report would emphasize new developments (e.g., Iowa's February 1984 report on recommended gender-neutral legislation), it would also point out efforts by other states over the past decade. The report would also disclaim endorsement of any specific legislative proposals, and avoid any "scoresheet" approach to grade or rank the respective efforts of the states. (Some states will, of course, appear to have done more than others.) These narratives would be supplemented with appropriate legal citations, thereby enhancing the value of the report as a general resource guide in the area.

In addition to the state-by-state reviews, we plan to include general overview of the various efforts undertaken by the states, including a brief discussion of some of the constitutional (i.e., 14th Amendment "equal protection") principles involved, and a reminder of the parallel efforts under way to eliminate gender bias from Federal law.

Timetable

While the time frame is tight, we still expect to have reasonably complete drafts of all 50 state profiles finished by June 15. We also hope to have most (if not all) of the overview prepared by that date.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 10, 1984

File

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

February 1, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG *lee*

SUBJECT: FIFTY STATES PROJECT *James H*

*1. Since item veto
2. Balanced Budget
3. Enterprise zones
4. 50-States project*

*Can handle all
- at some time -
- same legislators on all
issues
- James H*

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

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

Read file file

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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

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 BUDGET FOR
FEBRUARY 7, 1984 TO MARCH 31, 1984

<u>Round trip Airfare</u>	<u>Per diem</u> <u>(including lodging)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Virginia \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		
W.Virginia \$ <u>351.</u> Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		\$ <u>501.</u>
Ohio \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		
Michigan \$ <u>326.</u> Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		\$ <u>476.</u>
Texas \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____		
Louisiana \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		
Oklahoma \$ <u>691.</u> Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____		\$ <u>1066.</u>
N.Dakota \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		
S.Dakota \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		
Colorado \$ <u>1272.</u> Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____		\$ <u>1497.</u>
Washington \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____		
Oregon \$ _____ Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____		
California \$ <u>640.</u> Airfare \$ <u>225.</u> Per diem for <u>3</u> day(s) _____		\$ <u>1165.</u>
	(\$3280)	Subtotal \$ <u>4705.</u>
Misc. (Gasoline in states where car rented, public transportation, tips, tolls, incidentals)		\$ <u>500.</u>
	Grand total	\$ <u>5205.</u>

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 BUDGET FOR
APRIL 1, 1984 to MAY 27, 1984

<u>Round trip Airfare</u>	<u>Per diem (including lodging)</u>	<u>Total</u>
Alabama\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Georgia\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Florida\$ <u>595.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$895.</u>
Kentucky\$ <u>198.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$273.</u>
Montana\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Idaho\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Nevada\$ <u>1143.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>150.</u> Per diem for <u>2</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$1443.</u>
Kansas\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Nebraska\$ <u>548.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$698.</u>
Maine\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Massachusetts\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Rhode Island\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Connecticut\$ <u>338.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$638.</u>
S. Carolina\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
N. Carolina\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Mississippi\$ _____	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	
Arkansas\$ <u>782.</u>	Airfare \$ <u>75.</u> Per diem for <u>1</u> day(s) _____	<u>\$1082.</u>
		Subtotal\$ <u>5029.</u>
	(\$3604.)	
Misc.	(Gasoline in states where car rented, public transportation, tips, tolls incidentals)	\$ <u>500.</u>
	Grand total	\$ <u>5529.</u>

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 23, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEEVER

FROM: LEE L. VERSTANDIG *lee*

SUBJECT: **The Current Status of the Balanced Budget
Amendment in Key States**

*Bill
Final out
if an appearance
by RR could
make the
difference in
any states.*

This is an update to you of the status of the Balanced Budget Amendment in those eighteen states which have not yet passed it. I have been assured by legislative leaders in those chambers in session this year that such a resolution will be introduced in each of those legislative chambers. As we move into this new legislative year, there are no states in which the resolution can be considered to have passed one chamber since a state must pass a resolution in both houses in the same session in order to petition Congress. Also it should be noted that there is a recession movement under way in several states. Maryland has already passed such a resolution in one chamber.

Those states which have the best chance of passing this resolution this year are:

1. Kentucky -- There is better than a fifty - fifty chance in this state. While the key sponsors are all Democrats, GOP members are solid. Kentucky legislature will go into session in March.
2. Vermont -- There is a fifty-fifty chance here. However, as I have reported previously, Governor Snelling is against it and may well be able to sway some GOP members of the legislature. However, he has just announced that he is not seeking re-election.

The National Tax Payers Union is attempting to get a convention call on a ballot initiative as well as introduce a resolution in the following states:

1. California -- State Senator Pete Wilson is chairman of the initiative committee, and State Senator Bill Campbell is actively involved. As you may be aware, if the initiative passed, it would force the legislature to adopt a resolution within twenty legislative days, or have their pay and benefits suspended. The deadline to get the signatures is February 21, and it would go on the ballot in November.

2. Ohio -- With the GOP as chief sponsors, a resolution passed the Senate in a previous session. However, control of Senate has now changed and there is no chance of passing it in the legislature. Thus, an initiative will be filed.
3. Washington -- There will be a renewed effort to get an initiative on the ballot in November, 1984, and they are now working on petitions.
4. Montana -- The legislature is out of session this year, so they are working on an initiative.
5. Massachusetts -- The issue is now just at the discussion stage.

The following states are those where there is "hope" for the passage of a balanced budget resolution in 1984:

1. Maine -- In the past, the Senate has come within a few votes. However, the GOP was not strong on it. There is a U.S. Senatorial race in 1984 which may focus on this (Cohen).
2. Michigan -- Given the fact that two Democratic senators were recently recalled, there could be some momentum here.
3. Minnesota -- Republicans are sponsoring such a resolution but given the composition of the legislature this is doubtful. Again, there is a U.S. Senatorial race in 1984 (Boschwitz -- on Finance Committee).
4. Rhode Island -- A resolution had previously passed the House. You may recall GOP has come within 3 seats on control of the Senate. Thus, there may be a renewed effort. In the past, the chief sponsor in the Senate was a Democrat. However, both Senator Chafee and Representative Schneider are against the amendment.
5. West Virginia -- A resolution has passed the Senate twice. However, we have few GOP legislators in this state.
6. Wisconsin -- The chief sponsor in the Assembly is Assistant Minority Floor Leader Robert Travis (R). However, support is limited.