the need for local empowerment and a seat at the table when making decisions regarding public lands issues affecting their future.

The group boiled these ideas down to three community questions, which were to be followed by broad-based wild lands futures deliberations in a focused geographic area. The community questions were: What do we have?, What do we want?, and What can we do?. In short, the hypotheses proved correct. Asking citizens what they valued, how they wanted the future to look, and exploring options to achieve this vision on the front side of a county-wide general planning initiative, led to outcomes such as: 1. the formation of a public lands council, 2. county agreement to enter wild lands futures deliberations with a broad range of interests and affected parties from within and without the county, 3. a county proposal for the protection of over 500,000 acres of BLM land (including 184,000 acres of wilderness), and 4. the conceptualization of a public lands institute involving cooperative partnerships with the BLM and other agencies for the preservation and management of the San Rafael Swell.

COMMUNITY AND WILD LANDS FUTURES PILOT PROJECT (CWFP)

In the summer of 1993, the broad-based group of stakeholder volunteers known as the Process Advisory Group, including decision-makers and resource representatives, gave birth to the Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project. As described in the opening of this paper, when challenged to consider how a wilderness bill passed Congress by working backwards from 1999, the Process Advisory Group agreed that the first step should be community-based. Out of the discussions came the following project goals:

1. Address community and wild lands futures in a rational and scientific manner.
2. Create a grass roots process for comprehensive local community planning and sustainability.
3. Identify resources to enrich the process and generate useful information to share.
4. Connect the local visioning/planning process with the issue of public wild land futures and with state and national processes and players.
5. Develop a broad based recommendation for the classification of public wild lands in the pilot region.
6. Educate the broader general public about rural planning and community self-determination, and ecosystem management of natural systems and wild lands issues.
7. Create a replicable model.

A concept paper was circulated among approximately 300 interested parties at national, regional, state and local levels requesting constructive feedback. The reviews were favorable, which meant the next task was to select from one of several receptive pilot communities. In October of 1993, Emery County became the chosen community for the pilot project, and the newly formed Canyon County Partnership (CCP) received CUF funding to initiate staff support.

Today, the seed is germinating and concepts are maturing. County initiated deliberations include ideas to 1. develop a resource area partnership among Emery County, the BLM, the Forest Service, and other public land users, 2. become a nationally supported pilot program, and 3. conceptualize a non-profit San Rafael Swell Institute. Today, Emery County is proposing and exploring a planning/management partnership arrangement with the BLM. The purpose would be to:

Incorporate direct local involvement in land management agency planning processes.

Incorporate direct local involvement in land management agency decision-making processes.

Reconcile differences between the Emery County Master Plan and the planning goals and objective of the land management agencies.

Develop consistency between the ordinances and regulations of the federal and county entities.

Cooperate in law enforcement activities.

Cooperate in the provision of emergency services.

Cooperate in the permitting, design, placement, construction, and costs of public facilities (roads, buildings, etc.).

Cooperate in the facilitation of allowable uses.

Cooperate in the mitigation of impacts from various uses.

Cooperatively work to resolve local conflicts between uses, users, and stakeholders.

Leverage the limited resources of the local and Federal entities through coordinated efforts.

Share in a joint stewardship over the public lands within Emery County.

CUF believes it is a major accomplishment that Emery County is now adopting cooperative, problem-solving principles in newly conceived public lands initiatives within the County.

APPLICATION OF THE MODEL

In conclusion, the Community and Wild Lands Futures Pilot Project did advance environmental decision-making through inclusive community and interest group participation. Outcomes are evolving and project participant evaluations were overwhelmingly favorable. OPB's Brad Barber writes, ''It [the project] taught us that this type of thing may work in the future. Once a wilderness bill is done in Utah—we should talk about moving into cooperative management.'' CUF board member and Moab Times Editor, Sam Taylor says, ''In the event the [Utah delegation] bill does not become law, CUF has laid the ground work that will still lead to piece-meal resolution for the BLM wilderness issue. We have given them a roadmap,'' he concludes.

Many participants believe that the pilot has application value for comprehensive planning efforts in rural areas, and some can see it being applied to growth management, transportation, education and topical problems in urban areas. It clearly is recognized as being superior to the conventional approach of deriving local input from a couple of perfunctory public hearings. Jane Brass suggests that the need for disseminating information regarding the pilot model ''is pervasive as states struggle with public lands issues.'' She cautions that communities should not have consultants dictate a quick way out. Rather, she recommends working through a process to ''find answers that will be more acceptable to your community''. Another participant echoed the concern that it could be dangerous to create a ''cook book approach''. The emphasis from a model should be on need and a few questions to ask in the beginning, he cautioned. Chairman Petersen advises other rural county leaders, who might be considering a similar planning model, ''1. Put together a good steering group, 2. Listen to their input, and 3. Listen to people from other areas and take advantage of their successes and failures.''

COMMUNITY VISIONS: A CATALYST FOR CREATING POSITIVE FUTURES

CWFP demonstrated that engaging local citizens in discussions about their values and visions of the future enabled them to develop solid plans for economic development and empowered them to approach the highly polarized issue of wilderness as an issue which could be resolved with their traditional adversaries, not as a battle to be won.

The constructive progress made by the county in the relatively short time will continue to bear fruit for the county on public lands issues and other matters of county interest. In reference to ''Discovering Common Ground'' by Marvin Weisbord, project consultant, Susan Carpenter, summarizes her perspective. She writes, ''Weisbord makes the point that creating the tension between what we have and what we really want is a much more effective way to get what we want than the more traditional methods of problem-solving and conflict management (identify the problem and then develop options to solve it). My experience bear this out. I see the Coalition's Emery County Community/Wild Lands Futures Project as a powerful, effective model which can be applied to a wide range of issues at the county and state level across the West.'' Currently, CUF is moving forward with an initiative focused on quality growth in Utah. History will reveal whether we, as a whole and increasingly diverse community in Utah and the West, are able to build on the lessons learned from the Emery County experience.●

TRIBUTE TO AN INDISPENSABLE AMERICAN

● 1Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last month I was proud to learn that a member of my staff received an extraordinary accolade that is as fitting as it is complimentary. U.S. News & World Report named Stanley Israelite, my friend, counsel, and senior adviser in my State office in Connecticut, as 1 of 12 ''indispensable Americans.'' It was an honor and a tribute, but not a surprise. Stanley's friends, his colleagues—and most certainly the people of Connecticut—have known that for years.

The best decision I ever made was hiring Stanley Israelite. He has been a dedicated public servant in every sense of the term, and I have trusted his counsel and treasured his companionship throughout my 21 years as a Member of Congress. Mr. President, it is with pride, admiration, and deference that I ask that this article from the November 27, 1995 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HOUNDING THE BUREAUCRATS

(By James Popkin)

Lots of people's problems with their government aren't ideological, they're logistical. That's why many rely on the congressional aides like Stanley Israelite to help them fight their battles with government agencies.

At age 70, Stanley Israelite is fighting a crusade to prove the cynics wrong. Since 1975, when the gravelly voiced former Brooklynite first went to work for then Rep. Christopher Dodd (now a senator), Israelite has helped thousands of Connecticut citizens replace lost passports, track down late tax refunds, ship dearly departeds to grieving families overseas and even bail the occasional misbehaving Connecticut teenager out of Mexican jails.

All successful members of Congress have staffers like Israelite who can goose reluctant bureaucrats into action. Although Dodd happens to be a Democrat, effective constituent service is a congressional specialty that cuts across political lines. It's first and foremost a matter of good politics: Good service results in happy voters. But what distinguishes Israelite is his gusto for the job. And his not-so-artful technique: ''When I call

an agency because somebody is waiting for her Social Security check or a guy is waiting for an FHA loan and the agency gives me some song and dance, I try to let them know I'm not gonna take any of their crap,'' he says. ''At times, I tell them I've discussed this problem with the senator. Sometimes, it isn't true.''

A former jewelry store owner and Chamber of Commerce honcho from Norwich, Conn., Israelite is Dodd's pipeline to many of the state's small-business owners. Harry Jackson, a lifelong Republican who is the City Council president in Norwich, recalls how difficult it was to get a meeting with officials from the Environmental Protection Agency when the city wanted to build a new firehouse on federal land. ''Stan got us in there after just one phone call,'' says Jackson, who ultimately built the firehouse.

THINGS HAPPENED.

Don Daren says Israelite was a lifesaver in 1981, when a state-based paper distributor was trying to secure a $900,000 umbrella loan from the Connecticut Development Authority. Daren, who owns the Arrow Paper Supply and Food Co., says it was going to take forever for the CDA to process his loan papers so he could buy a new warehouse. ''Stanley told them [CDA officials] my problem, and things happened right away,'' says Daren, whose business has grown from 36 workers then to nearly 200 today. ''He has his own constituency. People like Stanley.''

Ideally, says veteran Hartford Courant political columnist Don Noel, senators like Dodd would use their clout on Capitol Hill to fix bureaucracies and make them more consumer friendly—eliminating the need for taxpayer-financed ombudsmen like Israelite. But since that goal seems unattainable, Noel figures that Israelite plays a vital role. ''If you have something you need the senator to do for you, if anyone can do it, Stanley can,'' he says.

Israelite admits that he is motivated by a desire to help re-elect Dodd. But he adds: ''Part of what drives me is knowing that there's someplace where somebody can go when they are not getting anyplace.''

GENERIC ZANTAC

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, during the debate on an amendment offered by my colleague from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, with regard to GATT patent extensions, there were representations made about the availability of a generic form of Zantac. The Senate has expressed its support for Judiciary Committee hearings on this important issue. The chairman of that committee has committed to hold a hearing on February 27, 1996.

Some supporters of the generic drug companies claim that the hearings will delay marketing of generic Zantac. This is not true. In fact, due to other outstanding patent issues with regard to Zantac, it is unclear when a generic form of Zantac will be available, but it will be at least several months and likely to be after September 1996. Therefore, hearings held in early 1996 will permit more than sufficient time to resolve this question well before September 1996.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a detailed background paper on the patent issues relating to Zantac.

The material follows:

BACKGROUND ON THE IMPACT OF GATT PATENT EXTENSIONS ON POTENTIAL AVAILABILITY OF GENERIC ZANTAC® (RANITIDINE HYDROCHLORIDE)

Even if the U.S. had not implemented the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), based on the generic applications submitted to date, no generic form of Zantac could have been legally marketed on December 5, when the basic patent was scheduled to expire prior to the implementation of GATT. Because of other outstanding patent issues with regard to Zantac, it is unclear when a generic form of Zantac will be available, but it will be at least several months and is likely to be after September 1996.

Glaxo Wellcome has two product patents with respect to ranitidine hydrochloride, which exists in two form:, referred to as form 1 and Form 2. All of the Zantac sold by Glaxo Wellcome worldwide has been Form 2. The Form 2 product patent expires on June 4, 2002. It bars the marketing of generic versions of Form 2 or any product that contains Form 2. In September 1993, the validity of the Form 2 patent was upheld in federal district court against a challenge by a generic company. That decision was affirmed on appeal.

The basic patent was scheduled to expire on December 5, 1995, but was changed by the GATT implementing law to July 25, 1997. The basic patent bars the marketing of generic versions of both Form 1 and Form 2. For various reasons it may be more difficult to manufacture Form 1 ranitidine in a pure form in commercial quantities over time. Even when the basic patent expires, before a company can market a generic form 1 ranitidine, they must demonstrate that their Form 1 product is bioequivalent to Zantac and does not violate the remaining Form 2 patent.

The Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (Hatch/Waxman Act) provides expedited procedures for generic drugs to enter the market and for the resolution of outstanding patent issues. Under these procedures, a company seeking approval for a generic drug may file an Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) with the FDA. The ANDA must contain one of the following certifications with respect to each relevant patent on the pioneer drug: (I) patent information has not been filed with the FDA, (II) the patent has expired, (III) the patent will expire on a date specified, or (IV) the patent is invalid or won't be infringed.

If the ANDA contains a paragraph III certification listing the patent expiration date, the FDA is precluded from making the ANDA effective prior to that date. If the generic company seeks to market a drug before the expiration of any relevant patents, the ANDA must contain a paragraph IV certification that the patents are invalid or won't be infringed, and the generic company must notify the patent owner. Unless the patent owner sues for infringement within 45 days of being notified, the FDA can approve the ANDA.

If the patent owner does sue within 45 days, FDA cannot make the ANDA effective immediately. To protect generics from undue delay during litigation, the Act provides that the FDA can make the ANDA effective after 30 months from the date the patent holder is notified of the ANDA filing or when there is a final court ruling that the patent is invalid or not infringed, whichever is earlier.

All ANDA applicants seeking to market generic ranitidine hydrochloride prior to 2002 have lawsuits pending against them asserting violations of one or more patents. Because of the 30 month provision, the pending litigation affects the earliest date that generic ranitidine hydrochloride could be marketed by any of these companies.

Even if the FDA were not precluded by the Hatch/Waxman Act from making ANDAs effective prior to the expiration of the full patent term for brand name drugs, September 1996 is the earliest date under the Hatch/Waxman Act procedures that Form 1 generic ranitidine hydrochloride could be marketed by any of these companies unless there is a final court ruling earlier that the basic patent is invalid or that the generic product does not infringe any Glaxo Wellcome patents.

Because a trial court decision is not considered final if an appeal is taken, it is unlikely that a final court ruling will occur prior to September 1996. In a prior patent infringement case against Novopharm with respect to the validity of the Form 2 patent, the trial court ruled in Glaxo Wellcome's favor in September 1993. Novopharm appealed the same month, but the appeal was not decided for 19 months, in April 1995. The appeals court upheld the earlier decision in favor of Glaxo Wellcome.•

WELFARE 2015

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, since the publication of Michael Young's ''The Rise of Meritocracy'' in 1957, a book written from the perspective of Great Britian in the year 2034, there has not been so brilliant an exercise in this format than Jason DeParle's ''Welfare, End of'' in yesterday's New York Times Magazine, looking back from the year 2015. It foresees a social disaster that will follow the repeal of title IV–A of the Social Security Act, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, in this the 104th Congress. Mr. DeParle speculates that President Clinton will look back upon this as one of the greatest regrets of his Presidency.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Dec. 17, 1995]

WELFARE, END OF—THE EVENTS THAT LED TO ITS DEMISE IN 1995, AND THE STRIKING CONSEQUENCES IN THE YEARS SINCE.

(By Jason DeParle)

The following interactive encyclopedia entry looks back from the year 2015. References to events before December 1995 are real; subsequent developments may become so all too quickly.

SUMMARY

For 60 years, until 1995, the United States Government ran a social program technically called Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and commonly known as welfare. The program, which provided cash grants to indigent families, was abolished as part of a bipartisan deal that reduced Federal spending and transferred power to state governments. At the time of its demise, welfare was a thoroughly discredited program—often accused of causing long-term poverty rather than helping people survive it.

A handful of critics accurately predicted that ending welfare would bring rising numbers of ''street families,'' just as the closing of mental hospitals had produced ''street people'' in the 1970's and 80's. But most welfare abolitionists argued that the poor would be better off without the program. They would have been astonished to learn that today, in 2015, the program they reviled as ''welfare'' is often described nostalgically as