U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission convened via

Video/Teleconference at 10:00 a.m. EDT, Rochelle Garza, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

ROCHELLE GARZA, Chair

VICTORIA NOURSE, Vice Chair

STEPHEN GILCHRIST, Commissioner

J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

GLENN D. MAGPANTAY, Commissioner

MONDAIRE JONES, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

DAVID GANZ, General Counsel & Parliamentarian

"NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

STAFF PRESENT:

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

JULIAN NELSON, ASCD

MICHELE YORKMAN-RAMEY, ASCD

DAVID MUSSATT, Director, RPCU

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director, OM

ANGELIA RORISON, Director, PAU

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

JOHN K. MASHBURN

THOMAS SIMUEL

ALEXIS FRAGOSA

CARISSA MULDER

NATHALIE DEMIRDJAIN-RIVEST

YVESNER ZAMAR

STEPHANIE WONG

IRENA VIDULOVIC

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

3

UNEDITE

A G E N D A

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
BUSINESS MEETING A. Presentations by State Advisory Committee Chairs on Released Reports and Memorandum Maine
B. Discussion and Vote on Updated Report Timeline: The Federal Role in Enforcing Religious Freedoms in Prison
C. Discussion and Vote on Report: Federal Efforts in Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities Among Victims of Violent Crime
D. Discussion and Vote on State Advisory Committee Appointments Alabama
E. Management and Operations Staff Director S Report
ADJOJIPN MEETING 53

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(10:00 a.m.)
3	MR. BATES: Good day and welcome to the
4	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' monthly business
5	meeting. Today's conference is being recorded. At
6	this time, I would like to turn the conference over
7	to Chair Garza. Please go ahead.
8	CHAIR GARZA: Good morning, everyone.
9	Let's go ahead and get started. This business
10	meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
11	comes to order at 10:00 a.m. Eastern time on
12	Friday, June 7th, 2024. This meeting is taking
13	place via telephone conference. I'm the Chair of
14	the Commission, Rochelle Garza, and since we're all
15	attending by phone, I'd like to start with a roll
16	call. So please confirm your presence when I say
17	your name. Vice Chair Nourse?
18	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Present.
19	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?
20	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Here.
21	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
22	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: I'm present.
23	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm here.
25	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones.

1	COMMISSIONER JONES: Present.
2	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here.
4	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
5	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: I'm here.
6	CHAIR GARZA: Wonderful. Thank you all.
7	Based on that roll call, we have all Commissioners
8	present. Is the court reporter present?
9	COURT REPORTER: Thank you, ma'am. I'm
10	here.
11	CHAIR GARZA: Wonderful. Is the Staff
12	Director present?
13	MR. MORALES: I am present.
14	CHAIR GARZA: Is the Parliamentarian
15	present?
16	MR. GANZ: I'm present. Yes.
17	. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
18	CHAIR GARZA: Good morning, David.
19	Great. Well, now we are going to go ahead and
20	proceed with today's agenda as posted on the
21	federal register. We are going to consider the
22	following items. I have presentations by the
23	Maine, North Carolina, and South Carolina State
24	Advisory Committee Chairs on released reports. And
25	then, those presentations will be followed by

1	discussion and vote on updated timeline for our
2	Commission's report on the federal role in
3	enforcing religious freedoms in prison. And we
4	will also have a discussion and vote on our
5	briefing report entitled Federal Efforts in
6	Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities Among
7	Victims of Violent Crime. And that will be
8	followed by a discussion and vote on the
9	appointment of members to the advisory committee
10	for the State of Alabama. And finally we're going
11	to conclude with the Staff Director's report. Are
12	there any motions to amend the current agenda?
13	Okay. Hearing none, we're going to go ahead and
14	move to consider the first agenda item,
15	presentation by our Advisory Committee Chairs.
16	A. PRESENTATIONS BY STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRS
17	ON RELEASED REPORTS AND MEMORANDUM
18	So in today's meeting we're going to be
19	hearing from the three Advisory Committees that I
20	mentioned. Advisory Committees serve as the eyes
21	and ears on the ground to identify and elevate
22	civil rights concerns from the local to the
23	national level. And their dedication to uncovering
24	inequality and recommending actual solutions is
25	crucial for promoting justice and equality across

1	our nation. Advisory Committee reports provide our
2	Commission an understanding of emerging and
3	pressing civil rights issues experienced at the
4	state level. We are very grateful to have the
5	Chairs of these Committees as our guests to present
6	upon the text of their reports that have been voted
7	upon by a majority of their committees. And
8	through their rigorous investigations, public
9	hearings, and comprehensive reports, we ensure that
10	civil rights remain at the forefront of policy
11	discussions. Your work is invaluable. The SAC
12	work is completely invaluable in offering a
13	foundation for meaningful change and safeguarding
14	the civil rights of all citizens.
15	And so before we start with our before
16	we hear from our advisory committee chairs today,
17	I'd like to make a disclaimer just to set the stage
18	for our discussion. Again, these presentations are
19	based on the report that the Advisory Committees
20	have put together They voted upon it by a
21	majority of their committee. It is important to
22	note that statements and dissents from individual
23	committee members reflect their personal opinions
24	and may not necessarily be accurate or these
25	opinions are not vetted or reviewed by others. So

1	we should not consider those equivalent to the
2	official report that had been voted on. The
3	purpose, again, of these presentations is to hear
4	from the Advisory Committee representatives about
5	what was voted upon and recommended as the
6	committee based on the testimony they gathered.
7	We deeply appreciate your presence and
8	your ability to represent your Committee's findings
9	and recommendations. Additionally, I want to
10	emphasize that while some statements made today may
11	be controversial, it is crucial that we all respect
12	our colleagues by refraining from defaming or
13	degrading any person. And as Chair, I do reserve
14	the right to cut short any statements that defame,
15	degrade, or do not pertain to the issue at hand.
16	So thank you all for being here. Thank you for
17	sharing your insights with us today. And we're
18	going to go ahead and proceed with our first
19	presentation from our Maine Advisory Committee
20	Chair Samantha Le on the Committee's report, the
21	right to criminal legal defense in Maine. Thank
22	you, Chair Lee. The floor is yours.
23	MAINE
24	MS. LE: Thank you, Chair Garza,
25	Commissioners, fellow State Chairs, and staff for

1	allowing me to speak today. I'm Samantha Le, Chair
2	of the Maine Advisory Committee. For the last two
3	years, the Maine Advisory Committee studied whether
4	Maine, the public criminal defender office impacts
5	the civil rights of indigent criminal defendants.
6	Our report was submitted in November 2023.
7	So a little history. Until recently,
8	Maine was the only state that relied solely on
9	private contracted attorneys to provide indigent
10	public defense, instead of having public defender's
11	offices. It was slowly it has slowly worked to
12	establish a public defender system working
13	alongside private attorneys to alleviate the
14	shortage of representation for indigent criminal
15	defendants. A few years ago, the Maine legislature
16	established the Maine Commission on Indigent Legal
17	Services, or MCILS, with the mandate to quote,
18	"Provide high quality representation to indigent
19	criminal defendants, juvenile defendants, and
20	children, and parents in child protective cases."
21	Our report focused on just indigent criminal
22	defendants. So there's public concern that MCILS
23	is not meeting its Constitutional obligations. A
24	report by the 6th Amendment Center found that MCILS
25	is not meeting the standards of the 6th Amendment

1	The American Civil Liberties Union of Maine is
2	suing MCILS because quote, "The current system has
3	failed low-income people accused of a crime."
4	Unquote. Maine's government oversight committee
5	also found issues with MCILS. Thus, the Maine
6	Advisory Committee set out to discover more on this
7	issue. We heard from impacted individuals,
8	academics, advocates, and law makers at three
9	public hearings in 2022. I will highlight some of
10	what we found.
11	So the first thing was Maine's nascent
12	public defense system is under-funded and unable to
13	meet the state's current legal needs of indigent
14	clients. A lack of sufficient funding, structure,
15	and administrative support negatively impacts
16	individuals in need of public defense. The current
17	demand for indigent legal services far outweighs
18	the capacity of available attorneys leading to long
19	delays. This creates an imbalance in speed of
20	obtaining counsel between those who can afford
21	their own lawyers versus those who can't.
22	Number two. People of color, individuals
23	with disabilities, and non-English speakers are
24	disproportionately impacted by Maine's current
25	system. Individuals in the federally protected

1	classes are most likely to be negatively impacted
2	by the lack of quality and capacity of indigent
3	legal services. Mentally ill defendants'
4	disability will manifest in the extreme without
5	counsel being promptly appointed.
6	Finding three. Attorneys assigned as
7	public defenders meed the same resources as
8	prosecutors to effectively and meaningfully
9	represent their clients. There's a lack of parity
10	between the resources available for public defense
11	and those available for prosecution. Public
12	defense attorneys are not provided with mentorship,
13	technical knowledge, or resources such as health
14	insurance, disability insurance, or overhead costs
15	in the same manner as prosecutors are, putting
16	their client's risk at subpar representation.
17	Parity is not just mere money the
18	Committee learned, it is about having a defense
19	perspective at the decision making tables. At
20	every table, a prosecutor or the attorney general
21	is welcomed. Overall, it is about standing and
22	respect for the defense function. There are more
23	findings in the full report. However, I'm now
24	going do highlight some of our recommendations.
25	So the first one is we urge this

1	Commission body to have the U.S. Department of
2	Justice investigate whether Maine is providing
3	effective and meamingful representation to indigent
4	clients facing actual incarceration. For the state
5	level recommendations, we would like for them to go
6	to the Maine legislature, Governor Mills' office,
7	the Chief Justice for the Maine Supreme Judicial
8	Court, and MCILS. The first one is, they should
9	provide adequate funding to indigent legal services
10	for criminal defendants at the minimum recommended
11	by MCILS to promote parity between defense counsel
12	and prosecutors. Until the Maine legislature and
13	the Governor adequately funds Maine's indigent
14	defense system, this issue will not be resolved.
15	So again, until the Maine legislature and the
16	Governor adequate y funds Maine's indigent defense
17	system this issue will not be resolved.
18	Recommendation number two, developing
19	robust and well-structured public defender system
20	one that includes state input public defenders, as
21	well as private attorneys, and one that
22	incentivizes attorneys to provide quality legal
23	defense.
24	Number three. Increase the number of
25	criminal defense attorneys in order to reduce

1	workloads of those still accepting cases. This
2	will hopefully reduce the pressure on defendants
3	who may feel pressured into taking plea deals when
4	they have genuine defenses and want to be heard in
5	court. Workload and caseload standards should be
6	updated accordingly.
7	Recommendation number four. Appoint a
8	task force to create a system of public defense
9	that has the capacity to provide effective and
10	meaningful defense and that ensures the members of
11	the federally protected classes are not receiving
12	delayed or subpar services. Ensure the task force
13	includes the public defense prospective.
14	So a year after taking the last
15	testimony, the Advisory Committee voted to revisit
16	the topic. We want laser focus this time and ask
17	the question, what are the barriers to fully
18	funding a public defense system in Maine? So in
19	December 2023, we heard from two people. Anne
20	Carney is a state legislator and Chair of Judiciary
21	Committee. Jim Billings is the new Executive
22	Director of MCILS The first thing we learned was
23	that there was a lack of consensus on how to
24	address the barriers. Director Billings said that
25	despite the Constitutional mandate of right to

1	counsel, indigent legal services are often funded
2	by leftover or supplemental budget allocations.
3	Senator Carney added that the legislature must
4	uphold its Constitutional mandate to provide right
5	to counsel while at the same time maintaining a
6	balanced budget.
7	So Director Billings explained that
8	moving to a new public defense system for the State
9	of Maine will require sustained funding and time to
10	build up the capacity. Meaning things will be
11	worse until they get better. But he believes the
12	long-term benefits will outweigh the initial high
13	costs. So our recommendation is to the Maine
14	legislature, Governor's office, and the Chief
15	Justice to not fund public defense with
16	supplemental budget, but to fund it in a
17	sustainable manner with the goal of building up the
18	capacity. We need to prioritize our parity between
19	public defense and prosecution.
20	Something else we learned was that
21	Director Billings stated how transitioning to a
22	public defense system will attract new attorneys
23	who can take advantage of the student loan
24	forgiveness programs, mentorship programs, and
25	partnership with law schools. The current system

1	disincentivizes new public defense attorneys from
2	working in Maine. So our recommendation again is
3	to the Maine legislature, the Governor's office,
4	and MCILS to pursue initiatives that will attract
5	and support new attorneys through student loan
6	forgiveness programs, mentorship programs, and
7	partnerships with law schools. I want to take this
8	opportunity to thank the Maine Advisory Committee.
9	We are a small but dedicated group. And also to
10	thank the staff and interns for their help.
11	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Thank you so
12	much, Chair Le, for that presentation. We now have
13	time for Commissioner questions. Are there any
14	questions from Commissioners that would like to be
15	recognized? Hearing no initial questions, I would
16	like to jump in and ask a question, if that's okay.
17	Chair Le, first of all, thank you so much
18	for the work that was done with regards to this
19	investigation. Just as a matter the personal
20	background, I've done some indigent criminal
21	defense work in Texas on essentially on a wheel in
22	my county, and I'm just curious, what does the
23	compensation look like? I'm not sure if you've
24	heard testimony around this particular issue, but
25	for the public defender, or for those that are

1	private attorneys that are providing legal support,
2	what does that system look like in terms of I
3	mean do you have these are they paid by county?
4	Is there a state fund that pays them? Do you have
5	any details on that?
6	MS. LE: As best I could understand it,
7	the legislature has raised the hourly pay for
8	public defense to \$150 an hour just most recently.
9	But still that's not we're still losing
10	attorneys that way. So, I mean, \$150 the
11	prosecution has a lot of support in terms of all
12	the benefits that are listed. So at \$150, that has
13	to be shared with the other overhead costs, the
14	defense counsel has to take into consideration. A
15	lot attorneys in Maine are solo practitioners, so
16	they have to cover all their costs, rental fee,
17	heating fee, overhead costs, and staff fee. So
18	even with the high increase it's \$150, we're still
19	losing attorneys.
20	CHAIR GARZA: How much was it previously?
21	MS. LE: I believe it was when I
22	studied this issue it was like \$60, went to \$80,
23	\$120, and now \$150, yeah.
24	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for that
25	information. It's important to understand.

1	Because it's very similar situation with private
2	attorneys that take cases in Texas, you know
3	they're typically solo practitioners. It's kind of
4	extra. And a lot of times I think there are
5	attorneys that take those cases just to learn. But
6	I appreciate some of those findings with regards to
7	extra support that you all have identified that
8	their needs to be parity in that regard when it
9	comes to being prepared and handling these types of
10	cases and providing robust representation. I
11	understand that Vice Chair Nourse has a question.
12	So I'm going to call on her.
13	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Chairman Le?
14	MS. LE: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Thank you so much
16	for your service. I love the state of Maine. It's
17	gorgeous. I grew up around the bend. So I just
18	want to ask you - you know, it's a national
19	problem I just not just a Maine problem. And a lot
20	of people frame this as, you know, why are we
21	spending our scarce tax dollars on defending people
22	who are alleged to have committed a crime. And I
23	think what we need to recognize in this battle is
24	that it's really a battle for the rule of law and
25	it's a battle for innocence. So we know that bad

1	lawyers don't investigate. They make, you know,
2	perfunctory motions the Southern Poverty Law Center
3	has proved this over and over again. And so I
4	wondered if you could comment a little bit about
5	what the resistance is to this kind of parity. Is
6	it just a monetary tax resistance? And have you
7	tried appealing to the sense that, you know, we're
8	going to spend a lot more money putting people in
9	jail who are innocent if we don't achieve some kind
10	of parity.
11	MS. LE: So I don't know the answer to
12	that question. But I get the sense that it's a lot
13	about political will. States like Maine, like many
14	states, deal with a lot of budget shortfalls, so a
15	lot of times the governor will say, "We have
16	supplemental budget. So let's look at heating
17	costs, let's say, for those who can't afford it."
18	But we're not prioritizing people's liberty, which
19	very important. So we need to have the political
20	will in the legislature to fund a robust public
21	defense system.
22	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Well, thank you very
23	much for your service and keep fighting.
24	MS. LE: Thank you.
25	CHAIR GARZA: Are there any or questions
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	or Chair Le? Well, thank you, Chair Le, for your
2	presentation. We re going to go ahead
3	appreciate your time. I don't know if you wanted
4	to make any last minute comments.
5	MS. LE: I just wanted to add for your
6	question, the atterneys don't get paid until the
7	cases are closed.
8	CHAIR GARZA: Okay. That's helpful.
9	MS. LE: So this is the reason for
10	pushing to take plea deals, plea bargains, and
11	things like that.
12	CHAIR GARZA: It's all these nuances that
13	really kind of undermine the representation model.
14	But I appreciate you highlighting that as well.
15	And very much appreciate the work that you all are
16	doing and have raised to us as something to keep an
17	eye on and how we can consider it and provide
18	support into the future. So thank you so much,
19	Chair Le, for your service and your leadership on
20	the Maine Advisory Committee and for taking time to
21	speak with us today. Wonderful.
22	Well, we're going to go ahead and move on
23	to our next presentation. We're going to hear from
24	the North Carolina Advisory Committee Chair Olga
25	Moran Wright on the Committee's report. The Civil

1	Rights and Equity of Legal Financial Obligations in
2	North Carolina. Thank you, Chair Wright, for
3	joining us. The floor is yours.
4	NORTH CAROLINA
5	MS. WRIGHT: Good morning, ma'am. I am
6	Olga Morgan Wright, Chair of the North Carolina
7	Advisory Committee. I would like to thank Chair
8	Garza and all members of the Commission for the
9	invitation to share relevant points of our report.
10	I would also like that thank all North Carolina
11	Advisory Committee members, panelists, and members
12	of the public who made this report possible.
13	Our report, Civil Rights and Equity of
14	Legal Financial Obligations, focuses on civil
15	rights concerns specific to post-conviction legal
16	financial obligations. The 8th Amendment to the
17	United States Constitution states that excessive
18	bail should not be required, nor excessive fines
19	imposed, nor crue and unusual punishments
20	inflicted. We, as a Committee, examined state
21	practices governing legal financial obligations,
22	where the LFOs have a disparate impact on the
23	minority and indigent groups and the impact on the
24	basis of race color and income. LFOs include
25	fines, fees, and charges attached to criminal

1	convictions and citations. Fines are imposed as
2	punishment, forfetures take basic gains acquired
3	illegally, restitution compensates the victim, and
4	fees pay for court services and general
5	governmental expenses. In North Carolina, the
6	payment of economic sanctions is a standard
7	condition of probation and parole. Out the
8	categories defined, fees that pay for court
9	services and excuse me?
10	CHAIR GARZA: Someone had unmuted
11	themselves. Please continue.
12	MS. WRIGHT: Oh. I'm sorry. Okay.
13	Fines are imposed as punishment, forfeitures take
14	basic gains acquired illegally, restitution
15	compensates the victims, and fees pay for court
16	services and general governmental expenses. Out
17	the categories detailed, fees pay for court
18	services and general governmental expenses have
19	increased the most, by 400 percent over the past 20
20	years. In fiscal year 2018 to 2019, the North
21	Carolina General Assembly allocated \$323 million
22	dollars' worth of fees collected by the courts to
23	the state's general fund. Our Committee believes
24	that the North Carolina state government should
25	consider the court system as a public good.

1	Wherein, it would have a responsibility to pay for
2	operations of the court system. The state
3	currently covers only \$5 million dollars of the \$7
4	hundred million dollars required.
5	CHAIR GARZA: Chair Wright was muted.
6	MS. WRIGHT: Thank you. Legal financial
7	obligations have detrimental long lasting impacts
8	of defendant's lives such as potential
9	reincarceration, loss of public benefits, or
10	inability to access public housing. People of
11	color are over-represented in the court system and
12	are disproportionately impacted by legal financial
13	obligations. For example, 80 percent of those
14	charged with failure to pay or failure to comply
15	are people of color, while 54 percent of the North
16	Carolina prison population incarcerated due to
17	failure to pay were people of color.
18	People who struggle to pay back an LFO
19	may forego necessities such as food, rent, medical
20	care, or child support. LFO debt can also have
21	harmful impacts on the defendant's credit, limiting
22	their access to housing or employment.
23	Driver's license can be suspended
24	indefinitely due to LFO debt. Such a suspension
25	often makes paying the debt difficult or impossible

1	and intensifies the debt as personal and financial
2	strains.
3	LFOs cam also create a cycle of debt.
4	When the debt amount continues to increase as
5	interest accrues, it is more difficult for the
6	defendant to pay off even the principle of their
7	debt. In some cases, the courts will issue
8	warrants for arrest in cases on non-payment.
9	LFOs have legal repercussions for
10	defendants. The defendant does not have access to
11	legal representation during the proceeding due to a
12	reclassification of punishments under Class 3
13	misdemeanors. The 6th Amendment to the United
14	States Constitution's right to counsel does not
15	apply if the sentence involves an economic sanction
16	but no jail time. Since the punishment for Class 3
17	misdemeanor offenses was reclassified as fines
18	rather than jail time in North Carolina, the
19	defendant sentenced to LFOs are not provided legal
20	representation.
21	Statutory requirements are burdensome,
22	and judges need more training to assess if a
23	defendant has the ability to pay. Indigency
24	determination is only assessed if a defendant can
25	afford to hire an attorney, not if they can afford

1	to pay an LFO. Judicial waiver tracking is a
2	primary reason judges decline waivers to pay. It
3	is statutorily required that notice must be given
4	via First Class mail to all impacted government
5	entities, which is currently approximately 600.
6	The Committee developed two sets of
7	recommendation for the Commission's consideration.
8	The first is a list of recommendations that we
9	request be submitted to the North Carolina General
10	Assembly and governor. These include, the
11	appointment of a bipartisan legislative committee
12	to study and make recommendations to all interested
13	parties regarding the financial impact of fines,
14	fees, and costs. Fund training for judges and
15	court personnel that will ensure enforcement of
16	state statutes and procedures that require the
17	courts to consider a defendant's ability to pay
18	before imposing obligations. Repeal the
19	requirement found in the general statutes providing
20	notice to agencies before waiving fines and fees.
21	We also developed several recommendations
22	that are intended to ease the challenges faced by
23	judges in imposing LFOs and that attempt to ease
24	the cycle of debt for impacted individuals. The
25	Committee also recommends that the general statutes

1	be revised to eliminate driver's license
2	suspensions for unpaid court debt and automatically
3	reinstate licenses currently suspended for that
4	reason. We also request that our second set of
5	recommendations be submitted to the Supreme Court
6	of North Carolina, Chief District Court judges
7	throughout North Carolina, and the North Carolina
8	Administrative Office of the Court for their
9	consideration. These recommendations include,
10	require judges to conduct meaningful, rigorous
11	ability-to-pay hearings that include a mandatory
12	inquiry into defendant's ability to pay before
13	assessing costs. Prohibit the issuance of arrest
14	warrants solely for failure to pay criminal court
15	fines, fees, and penalties. Consider alternatives
16	to fines and fees such as community services and
17	provide notice of available resources for
18	individuals. We also recommend an analysis of the
19	cost incurred by the state and local jurisdictions
20	in imposing LFOs and in collecting outstanding
21	LFOs. Lastly, we recommend that North Carolina
22	General Statute Chapter 13-1 be amended to provide
23	that all persons convicted of a crime cover their
24	right recover their right to vote even if they
25	have not yet paid outstanding court fees, so long

1	as they have been released from prison and complied
2	with all other conditions of their release.
3	In closing, I want to again thank you,
4	the Commission, for the opportunity to share key
5	points and recommendations of our report, and I
6	look forward to your questions. Thank you.
7	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Chair
8	Wright. Thank you for your presentation. At this
9	point, we'll open up the floor to Commissioners for
10	questions. If someone would like to be recognized,
11	please let me know. Okay. Well, I will take the
12	cherished privileged and ask another question.
13	I noticed that there was a comment in
14	your report that one of the most common and paradox
15	goal, collateral consequences is having a driver's
16	license suspended indefinitely due to LFO debt.
17	I'm curious, what was the what are the options
18	for folks that are unable to pay these debts? How
19	are they supposed to get work and be able to pay
20	them off? I don't know if the Committee explored
21	the impact to the individuals directly, but if you
22	can speak to that I'd be curious to hear if you had
23	any information on that.
24	MS. WRIGHT: Thank you for your
25	question. The Committee as a whole did not

1	research the impact. I did speak on those
2	impactful and consequences of not being able to
3	gain employment. A lot of times, and this is my
4	personal opinion, people would drive without their
5	license to get to work, to pay whatever bills that
6	they are choosing to pay. It may not be the fees
7	and fines. It may be rent and food, or medical
8	care. But we do not have any data on specific
9	impacts. But from the research that we received
10	from our panelists, they did inform us of those
11	circumstances that occur, and the decisions that
12	have to be made by those impacted, driving without
13	a license. And that is one of the reasons we did
14	place this as a recommendation and, in fact, do
15	have a few North Carolina General Assembly embers
16	that are looking into creating a bill for that
17	reason.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Yeah. I could imagine.
19	And I could also imagine it would be difficult to
20	gain employment so that you can turn around and not
21	only pay for your living expenses but pay these
22	fees.
23	MS. WRIGHT: And we believe that I
24	believe that you drive without your license to
25	provide for yourself and your family, which could

1	be another ticket in and of itself to start that
2	cycle over again.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Absolutely. Thank you for
4	answering my question. Are there any other
5	questions from Commissioners? Okay. Well, hearing
6	no further questions, we're going to go ahead and
7	move on. But thank you so much Chair Wright for
8	your service and your leadership on the North
9	Carolina Advisory Committee and for taking the
10	time, not just for speak with us today, but for
11	doing the hard work and the investigation and
12	publishing of this report as a Committee. I'll
13	give you a chance to give any last words before we
14	move on. But I just want to express on behalf the
15	entire Commission our appreciation for your
16	presence here today.
17	MS. WRICHT: My final words, thank you
18	for the opportunity. And we do hope that those
19	suggested entities will receive our recommendations
20	and that they intern will act upon those. Thank
21	you.
22	CHAIR GARZA: Appreciate it. Well,
23	we're going to now hear from our South Carolina
24	Advisory Committee Chair, Theodore Mauro, on the
25	Committee's report, the Seizing Property Civil

1	Asset Forfeiture in South Carolina. Thank you,
2	Chair Mauro, for joining us. The floor is yours.
3	SOUTH CAROLINA
4	DR. MAURO: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
5	My name is Doctor Ted Mauro. I am a Ph.D. and
6	instructor at an academy for law, business and
7	finance. But before I was these things, I was a
8	member of law enforcement. So this topic is
9	particularly a sensitive one for me and one that I
10	think really needs to be explored deeper. The
11	South Carolina Advisory Committee on the U.S.
12	Commission on Civil Rights report really focused on
13	the idea that, how do we monitor these types of
14	seizures. In our state, restitution is provided in
15	civil penalties. I originally found out about this
16	issue reading an article in the beautiful Post and
17	Courier, one of our favorite state papers. A
18	fantastic paper in the beautiful city of
19	Charleston, which is also beautiful state and city,
20	like Maine, that encourage you I'd like thank
21	you all for giving us an opportunity to talk about
22	our state and our unique needs. Our civil rights
23	history is such that when accusations of law
24	enforcement inappropriateness comes across, it
25	immediately becomes a situation where we want to

1	see about monitoring. And one of the biggest
2	challenges we faced in this was the question of
3	what exactly what do we know? What can I
4	verify? I'm a Ph.D., I'm a researcher, I'm a
5	scientist, and I immediately want to go to the
6	data. And that, to me, was the most blaring issue.
7	We found that generally we could not find out
8	information other than the information provided by
9	newspaper reporters. So when we immediately
10	approached the subject, we didn't know what we're
11	looking at, and it was almost impossible for us to
12	follow up this research that was done by the Post
13	and Courier, our state paper. And we are
14	probably the most important thing I wanted to point
15	out was that we suggested or requiring the
16	statewide annual reporting process. We looked at
17	the federal system, we looked at the reporting
18	requirements, and we really found that we needed
19	some sort of searchable public database. That the
20	details of which entities and which agency is
21	seizing which assets made it so we couldn't even
22	follow up situations like a bus being pulled over
23	on our interstate with an historically traditional
24	black college and university on board, students
25	being taken off the bus and searched by drug dogs.

1	And I couldn't even answer the question of how
2	often this has happened? Have other agencies in
3	the states done this sort of thing? Is this
4	standard procedure? Or is this a targeted thing
5	for African Americans? So really the question is,
6	is the circumstances that lead to the assets being
7	seized information about the people whose assets
8	are being seized their age, their race, their
9	gender. And the reports we couldn't actually find
10	out any state reporting requirements to tell us
11	what the money has been used for. We read in the
12	newspaper reports about them being used to buy
13	trips for members of law enforcement, for the
14	purchasing of one was a margarita machine. And
15	it seems to us that this Sheriff of Nottingham
16	system of seizing assets from individuals and then
17	forcing them to justify why they want them back
18	after criminal charges were brought and they were
19	dropped against them, just really puts us into the
20	situation where we see a system that could be
21	really abused. As a person in law enforcement I
22	continually make the person make to every person
23	I talk to the point that, look is it fair to ask
24	members of law enforcement to go out like we had
25	a ticket quota system that was removed in the state

1	when the funding was taken away to have law
2	enforcement go out and seize assets in a quota
3	system to somehow justify the financing of this
4	important public service. It's seems to be
5	derogatory and damaging to law enforcement to ask
6	them to go out and do these sorts of things. So
7	that's really been the approach I had.
8	And this proportionality question was
9	also one that was discussed. We couldn't even see,
10	you know, is the underlying crime that they were
11	charged with equal to the amount of assets that
12	were seized? Or the simple marijuana possession
13	lead to the seizure of a gentleman's only pick-up
14	truck that he runs his business out of for a metal
15	shop? I mean, it really was a situation where we
16	felt our ability to answer the most basic questions
17	of its impact on the civil rights was really
18	hampered because we don't gather the data we needed
19	to find.
20	Thank you so much for your time. I
21	particularly want to thank David and Barbara de La
22	Viez and everyone at the U.S. Commission on Civil
23	Rights. And they have been invaluable in the
24	movement towards addressing civil rights issues in
25	our state. And I can't tell you how much I admire

1	and respect them both. Thank you.
2	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you so much, Chair
3	Mauro. And I appreciate your words here. Before I
4	open up questions to other Commissioners I, you
5	know, I just was really struck by what I saw in
6	your report about how disproportionate this impact
7	is. The report said, "Although African Americans
8	only makeup 27 percent of the overall population of
9	the state, they comprise 71 percent of all
10	instances of asset forfeiture seizures in South
11	Carolina." That's particularly shocking to me.
12	And I think just as a point of clarity, is there a
13	public defender system or is there any sort of
14	access for to an attorney to gain back these
15	items or things or money or whatever it may be that
16	had been seized, is there a system in place so that
17	people if they are indigent or if they're unable to
18	pay for a private attorney, is there a process for
19	them? Is there something that they can access?
20	DR. MAURO: There is not a state
21	provided system. Public defender's office does not
22	handle civil issues. There are non-profits, South
23	Carolina Legal Aid, the South Carolina Bar
24	Association has connections to various non-profit
25	groups. One of our members actually is

1	Appleseed is another group of volunteer attorneys
2	who take cases like this. But to be honest with
3	you, no. And that's why I felt this idea that
4	restitution is a part of our criminal justice
5	system in this state which takes out that civil
6	requirement in mamy instances. And it would seem
7	only appropriate that that would be the platform.
8	Because there is public defender involved in that
9	side of the equation. You know, if someone is
10	convicted of and again, the issue you mentioned
11	of the civil rights, you know, that was based on
12	data that we received from the Greenville News and
13	other reporting in the newspapers, but I can't
14	independently verify that information because I
15	don't have any baseline. I don't I can't tell
16	you if that number has gone up or gone down because
17	there are no reporting requirements. And to me,
18	that's seems the most basic level of coverage. I
19	would stress the committee just focus on the need
20	for transparency in government to help us
21	understand why these people's assets are being
22	seized, under what circumstance, and what the
23	results were.
24	CHAIR GARZA: And what the money is
25	being spent on.

1	DR. MAURO: And in who? I couldn't even
2	tell you who these people are.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Yeah. Well, I appreciate
4	you bringing this to light. Your committee has
5	done this report in bringing this important issue,
6	but I think a lot of folks are unaware this is
7	actually occurring. So I commend you and the State
8	Advisory Committee for investigating this. I'm
9	going to open it up to others for questions. So if
10	there are other commissioners that have questions
11	for Chair Mauro, Chair Doctor Mauro, please let me
12	know so I can recognize you.
13	COMMISSIONER GILCHIRST: Madam Chair?
14	Gilchrist, here.
15	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist.
16	Go ahead.
17	DR. MAURO: Hello Commissioner.
18	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Thank you,
19	Madam Chair. Doctor Mauro, it's great to hear your
20	voice and thank you so much, and to the South
21	Carolina Advisory Committee for doing such an
22	informative report. I to a wanted to echo what the
23	Chair highlighted regarding the 71 percent of
24	forfeitures coming from African Americans in the
25	state, having the state being made up of about 28

1	percent of Affican Americans.
2	My question to you, when the Committee
3	did their report, was there any data that
4	highlighted whether or not any of the forfeitures
5	came from out-of-state, from folks traveling
6	through South Carolina?
7	DR. MAURO: No, sir. We did not focus
8	on specifically that issue. And it's a very good
9	question. As I mentioned, there was also this
10	system in South Carolina where law enforcement
11	would receive a percentage of all parking tickets,
12	all particularly speeding tickets was a big
13	issue where speed traps were set throughout the
14	state. Once the state legislatures concreted a
15	general \$25 dollar fee that was received by the
16	municipality and counties, that lowered the number
17	of these out-of-state stoppages and the speed
18	traps. We were not able to find that information.
19	I do know of several different counties in our
20	state who do set up dragnets, basically, on the
21	interstate and pull over random cars and vehicles
22	and using legal means which, you know, taking the
23	group of vehicles. But again, that points again to
24	this data problem. I just can't tell you because
25	there's no way to know other than to go through

1	every newspaper, every court report, and to do some
2	sort of data grab and it's just such a daunting
3	issue. It is certainly a concern, sir. And I
4	appreciate you advocating for the people of our
5	state as well. I m very happy to see that this is
6	the topic that you all chose to look at. It is
7	something that makes us all shutter in some ways.
8	Thank you.
9	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Well, no. I
10	want to thank you all for certainly doing yeoman's
11	work regarding the report. I also read that my
12	good friend Sheriff Leon Lott in South Carolina
13	gave some testimony to the Committee on his
14	assertion that some police departments were
15	annexing parts of interstate in order to seize
16	money. Are you familiar with that testimony
17	DR. MAURO: Yeah.
18	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: that the
19	sheriff gave on that?
20	DR. MAURO: Well, Sheriff Lott is a
21	leader in law enforcement in the state, as you
22	know. And he really it was very good and brave
23	of him to come forward and to talk about this
24	issue. And unfortunately, I believe he's correct.
25	I don't feel comfortable being able to, you know,

1	talk specifically. But in a general sense, because
2	the revenues we're talking about here, because of
3	their unencumbered nature, the ability to take the
4	funding and use it in whatever discretion the
5	sheriff has and some issues we've had in the
6	state with sheriffs in the past makes this a
7	topic that Sheriff Lott was right to point out.
8	COMMISSIONER GILCHIRST: Thank you for
9	that information. And again, I certainly
10	appreciate you bringing this before the Commission.
11	And we certainly look forward to continuing to stay
12	abreast of what's happening here. Madam Chair,
13	that's all I have Thank you so much, again, for
14	the time.
15	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Commissioner
16	Gilchrist. Are there other questions from
17	Commissioners? Okay. Hearing none. Again, thank
18	you, Doctor Mauro, Chair Mauro, for your service
19	and your leadership on the South Carolina Advisory
20	Committee and all the work that you are doing
21	there. I really genuinely appreciate the
22	enthusiasm behind your words today and appreciate
23	your presence. So on behalf of all of my fellow
24	Commissioners, I want to thank each of Chairs for
25	presenting today and sharing your important work.

1	B. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON UPDATED REPORT TIMELINE:
2	THE FEDERAL ROLE IN ENFORCING RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS
3	IN PRISON
4	So we're going to go ahead and move on to
5	our next agenda item. It is a vote to amend the
6	timeline for a briefing report on the federal role
7	in enforcing religious freedoms in prison due to
8	staffing shortages that we've experienced in the
9	Office of Civil Rights Evaluation. The revised
10	timeline that we have has been shared by
11	Commissioner Kirsanow's special assistant. I'm
12	going to go ahead and move to adopt that we move to
13	adopt the revised timeline for the federal role in
14	enforcing religious freedoms in prison report. Do
15	I have a second?
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow,
17	second.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Commissioner
19	Kirsanow. So a motion has been made and properly
20	seconded. Is there any discussion on this? Okay.
21	Hearing none, we can proceed to a roll call vote.
22	So please respond with "yes" if you are in favor,
23	"no" if you are opposed, or "present" if you are
24	abstaining. Vice Chair Nourse?
25	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

1	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?
2	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yes.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
4	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes.
5	CHAIR GARZA: I believe that was a
6	"yes"; is that correct?
7	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes. I can
8	barely hear everyone. For some reason, my volume
9	has gone down, and I can barely hear. I hope you
10	can hear me okay.
11	CHAIR GARZA: I can hear you very
12	clearly. Okay. Commissioner Jones?
13	COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.
14	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
15	COMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
16	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay.
17	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes.
18	CHAIR GARZA: And I vote yes. Motion
19	passes unanimously.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You skipped me.
21	You skipped me.
22	CHAIR GARZA: Oh, I'm so sorry.
23	Commissioner Heriot.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote yes.
25	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for that. I
	II NEALD ADACA

1	apologize.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No problem.
3	CHAIR GARZA: So motion passes
4	unanimously. All Commissioners have voted yea.
5	Thank you for that. We're going to have a new
6	schedule that we'll adhere to for that report.
7	C. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON REPORT: FEDERAL EFFORTS
8	IN EXAMINING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES AMONG
9	VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIME
10	The next item on our agenda is a
11	discussion and vote on the Commission's report
12	entitled Federal Efforts in Examining Racial and
13	Ethnic Disparities Among Victims of Violate Crime.
14	We're going to hold two votes. First we're going
15	to consider the report itself, and second we will
16	consider findings and recommendations. So I'm
17	going to move that we approve the report as
18	circulated to all Commissioners on May 20th by the
19	Director of the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation
20	with the mutually agreed upon technical final
21	revisions that were made and recirculated on June
22	6th by Commissioner Kirsanow's special assistant.
23	So we've adopted those. Is there a second to this
24	motion?
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1716 14TH ST., N.W., STE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009-4309

1

second.

2	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Commissioner
3	Kirsanow. A motion has been made and properly
4	seconded. Is there any discussion?
5	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: This is Vice Chair
6	Nourse. I just would like to say that I thank
7	Commissioner Adams and our colleagues for dealing
8	with this report on an equitable and fair basis.
9	It could have been politicized and about the nature
10	after crime which, of course, went up during the
11	pandemic, and now has gone down once we are out of
12	the pandemic. But I think they taught me something
13	about the deep problem of young black men has, and
14	they're extraordinary homicide rate which has
15	fueled some of this as a civil rights issue. So
16	I've learned from them. I'd also like to say that
17	OCRE did an extraordinary work on something that
18	I've worked on for a long time, which is victims of
19	crime, and how that system, which is worth a
20	billion dollars, works. And it turns out that the
21	way in which these funds are distributed needs a
22	second look. So I want to thank Commissioners and
23	the Chair for pursuing this with a spirit of fair
24	play and listening to all sides and the
25	professional staff. Thank you.

1	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you very much, Chair
2	Nourse.
3	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Chair Garza?
4	Adams.
5	CHAIR GARZA: Yes, Commissioner Adams.
6	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: The point of
7	parliamentary inquiry, are we voting is this
8	is the question before us the report or something
9	else?
10	CHAIR GARZA: It's the report,
11	Commissioner Adams. It was
12	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Okay.
13	CHAIR GARZA: Yeah. And we're voting on
14	the report that was recirculated on June 6th with
15	the technical revisions to the report that was
16	circulated to us on the 20th of May.
17	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Okay. I'd like to
18	be recognized on that issue, please.
19	CHAIR GARZA: Yes. Go ahead,
20	Commissioner Adams.
21	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Forgive me. I'm a
22	little below the weather, I guess. So I'd have
23	more to say otherwise. But this report started
24	years ago and former Chair Cantu and I had a lot of
25	talks about what it should be about. And the core

1	that we wanted or at least I wanted it to be about,
2	was the impact on minority communities of the
3	rising crime, which I don't think is deniable
4	and the impact on minority communities, the ability
5	to run a business, the ability to walk down the
6	street, the ability to, you know I saw pictures
7	of businesses in the Bronx that were being
8	regularly looted. The fact that Wal-Mart and
9	target are leaving minority communities because of
10	disproportionate levels of crime, that's what this
11	report was originally intend to be. And I'm sorry
12	that it's seemed to take a detour. I would
13	disagree with the statement that all sides are
14	misrepresented, because, for example, we wanted to
15	have a panel of a number of police chiefs who were
16	the chiefs of police in major cities when the crime
17	went up, not somebody like, we had one witness,
18	one police chief, who came late to the game. So I
19	think there was some real stories here about the
20	direction this report took that I think have over-
21	arching messages both for the public and Congress
22	regarding the procedures of how we do reports. And
23	I'll be getting more into that you know, I've
24	supported a lot of reports that I didn't
25	necessarily agree with everything, but this one

1	sort of got off the rails. And that's all I have
2	on this.
3	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you for your
4	comments, Commissioner Adams. Is there any further
5	discussion? Okay Hearing none, we're going to go
6	ahead and proceed to roll call vote. Please
7	respond with "yes" if you are in favor, "no" if you
8	are opposed, or "present" if you are abstaining.
9	We're going to start with Vice Chair Nourse.
10	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes.
11	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?
12	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: No.
13	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
14	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes.
15	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm not a fan of
17	this report. I'm going to abstain. I guess that
18	means you want me to say "present." So present.
19	CHAIR GARZA: Okay. Commissioner Jones?
20	COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.
21	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
23	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
24	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes.
25	CHAIR GARZA: And I vote yes. So the
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	motion passes with six yeses, and we had one
2	opposed, and one abstention.
3	We're going to now move on to the second
4	vote. We're going to consider findings and
5	recommendations for the report that was circulated
6	to all Commissioners on June 5th by Vice Chair
7	Nourse's interim special assistant, and I'm going
8	to go ahead and read them into the record. They
9	are as follows.
10	Findings. The substantial and
11	enduring racial disparity in homicide
12	victimization is driven by the high risk
13	of homicide for young black men. Crime
14	rates are associated with hot spots or
15	particular places typically where the
16	disadvantaged are disproportionately
17	represented. Although the crime rate
18	peaked during the COVID-19 pandemic, it
19	has receded. Gun violence, including gun
20	homicides, increased during the pandemic,
21	and disproportionately impacted persons of
22	color residing in racially segregated
23	neighborhoods. There are racial
24	disparities in victims' access to and
25	benefits from existing victim services.

1	including the Federal Victims of Crime Act
2	Fund. Some victims, including black
3	victims, may receive less compensation
4	because of racial or ethnic or gender
5	stereotypes questioning whether they are
6	deserving crime victims.
7	Recommendations. Crime reduction
8	efforts are often hampered in the very
9	spots in which crime spikes because of low
10	trust in police by those in over-policed
11	neighborhoods. Best practices support
12	efforts by police to increase trust in the
13	community that they are policing as an
14	effective crime reduction strategy.
15	Number two, victim service providers
16	should provide trauma informed culturally
17	and linguistically specific services.
18	Number three, non-fatal shootings need a
19	standardized method of measurements for
20	the FBI's data and police departments,
21	should handle these shootings like
22	homicides to prevent further violence.
23	Number four, data collection on crime
24	victimization could be improved by
25	requiring police officers to capture more

1	granular data about race, ethnicity,
2	sexuality, and gender for the uniform
3	crime reporting system. Number five, in
4	devising the state programs and services,
5	state victim service providers, example
6	VOCA Grant grantees should encourage
7	applicants for all walks of life without
8	regard to race, ethnicity, or gender. And
9	number six, victims' compensation programs
10	should aim to reduce disparities in victim
11	compensation, and consider removing rules
12	that bar compensation when the victim has
13	not reported the event to police or
14	consider whether reporting to the
15	Commission if it is made to a reliable
16	third-party, non-governmental agency, or
17	crisis center.
18	Is there a second to adopting these
19	findings and recommendations?
20	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Second.
21	CHAIR GARZA: So a motion has been made
22	and properly seconded. Is there any discussion on
23	this? Okay. Hearing no discussion on this issue,
24	we can go ahead and proceed to a roll call vote.
25	Please respond with "yes" if you are in favor, "no

1	if you are opposed, or "present" if you are
2	abstaining. Vice Chair Nourse?
3	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Present. Wait.
4	Yes, is my vote. Sorry. I apologize.
5	CHAIR GARZA: Okay.
6	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes, is my vote.
7	CHAIR GARZA: Yes. Thank you.
8	Commissioner Adams?
9	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: No.
10	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
11	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: No.
12	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
14	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
15	COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes.
16	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
19	COMMISS ONER MAGPANTAY: Yes.
20	CHAIR GARZA: The Chair votes yes.
21	Thank you all. The motion fails with four votes in
22	favor, four opposed, zero abstentions.
23	
24	
25	D. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1	APPOINTMENTS: ALABAMA
2	And our next agenda is a discussion and
3	vote on the members of the Alabama Advisory
4	Committee. And begin our discussion, I am going to
5	move to appoint the following people to serve as
6	members of the Alabama Advisory Committee. Jenny
7	Carol as Chair along with the following appointees:
8	Akiesha Anderson, Mark Ayers, Meridith Blackburn,
9	Craig Lenoips, Michael Innis-Jimenez, Jason Jewel,
10	Angela Lewis-Maddox, Tim McCullen, Daiquiri Steele.
11	All of these members with serve as an uncompensated
12	government employee. If the motion passes, the
13	Commission will authorize the Staff Director or his
14	designee to execute the appropriate paperwork for
15	the appointments. Do I have a second for this
16	motion.
17	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Second.
18	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you. Is there any
19	discussion? Okay Hearing no discussion, we'll go
20	ahead and proceed to roll call vote. Please say
21	"yes" if you are in favor, "no" if you are opposed,
22	"present" if you are abstaining. Vice Chair
23	Nourse?
24	VICE CHAIR NOURSE: Yes.
25	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Adams?

1	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yes.
2	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Gilchrist?
3	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes.
4	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Heriot?
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote yes.
6	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Jones?
7	COMMISSIONER JONES: No.
8	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Kirsanow?
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
10	CHAIR GARZA: Commissioner Magpantay?
11	COMMISSIONER MAGPANTAY: Yes.
12	CHAIR GARZA: And I vote yes. So the
13	motion passes with seven yeses. Seven in favor,
14	one opposed, and no abstentions. Congratulations
15	to all the new members and returning members of the
16	Alabama Advisory Committee. Okay.
17	We're going to go ahead and move on.
18	Staff Director Morales, it's going to be now your
19	turn to present the Staff Director's report. The
20	floor is yours.
21	E. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS:
22	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
23	MR. MORALES: Thank you, Madam Chair.
24	Appreciate the opportunity. In the interest of
25	time, I have nothing further to add than what's

1	already contained in the report. Of course, if any
2	Commissioner has any specific question about
3	anything contained in the report, feel free to
4	contact me and I'l respond. So with that Madam
5	Chair, I have nothing further. Thank you very
6	much.
7	CHAIR GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Staff
8	Director. Well, think we've reached the end of
9	our agenda. It concludes all of the business that
10	we have for today
11	III. ADJOURN MEETING
12	And if there is nothing further, I'm
13	going to go ahead and adjourn this meeting at 11:05
14	a.m. Eastern time Thank you. Thank you so much
15	everyone and I hope you all have a wonderful
16	weekend.
17	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
18	went off the record at 11:05 a.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	