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TO: Michael Lance
FROM: Patty Sullivan
DATE: 11/16/89
RE: House offer to Senate on LSCA

1) The House bill, but not the Senate bill, broadened the definition of a "network" to specifically include networks that include "international" entities.

Recommendation: Senate recede

2) The House bill, but not the Senate bill, contains a provision that prohibits the contracting out of the Department's Research Library through 9/30/90 requires a S&O study of the contracting out issue.

Recommendation: Senate recede

3) The House bill, but not the Senate bill, contains a provision that permits libraries to participate in drug abuse prevention programs under Title I.

Recommendation: Senate recede

4) The bills differ with respect to Title V, the Foreign Language Materials Acquisition. The Senate provision maintains the maximum award size at $15,000 and sets aside 30 percent of the funds under this program for Major Urban Resource Libraries (MURLS)…with no limit on the size of the grant for awards made from the 30 percent set-aside.

Under the House bill, we increased the grant size from $15,000 to $50,000 because the cost of purchasing foreign materials has increased significantly since the program was first authorized. In addition, our Members questioned whether it was even worth applying for a $15,000 grant.

Recommendation: House recede with an amendment that would raise the grant size from $15,000 to $35,000 and would reserve 30 percent of the funds for grants of $125,000. In addition, no library could be awarded under both programs. This compromise addresses the concern that larger libraries need access to larger grants, while also increasing the grant size for small libraries.

5) The House bill, but not the Senate, contains a provision that recognizes that school libraries can be reimbursed with LSCA funds for providing access to the public during periods when school is not in session.

Recommendation: Senate recede
6) The House bill, but not the Senate bill, clarifies the intention of the maintenance of effort reporting requirements.

Recommendation: The Senate recede with an amendment.

7) The House bill, but not the Senate bill, contains a new Title VIII, Family Learning Centers. In its offer, the Senate has added a provision for Library Literacy Centers to this Title. Title VIII could not be funded until Titles I, II, and III were funded at the FY89 appropriations levels, plus inflation.

Recommendation: House recede to Senate with amendment that reflects the Cochran/Simon/Owens amendments and the funding trigger proposed above.

8) The Senate bill, but not the House, contains a provision that requires libraries not to discriminate in providing equal access to library services to civic meetings.

Recommendation: House recede with amendment to include only the access to civic meetings.

9) The Senate bill, but not the House bill, clarifies provisions regarding the determination of child-care centers.

Recommendation: The Senate recede to the Senate.