UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY

NOVEMBER 15, 2002

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

+ + + + +

. + + + + +

The Commission convened at 8:35 a.m., in the Coast Ballroom, Holiday Inn by the Bay, 1355 North Harbor Drive, San Diego, California, Chairperson Mary Frances Berry, presiding.

Present:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, COMMISSIONER CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., COMMISSIONER ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER

LESLIE R. JIN, STAFF DIRECTOR

Present by telephone:

PETER N. KIRSANOW, COMMISSIONER RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, COMMISSIONER ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, COMMISSIONER

LILLIAN ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Staff Present:

KIMBERLY ALTON DEBRA CARR, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL IVY DAVIS TERRI DICKERSON PAMELA DUNSTON JOYCE SMITH ALEX SUN

Staff from the Western Regional Office Present:

GRACE HERNANDEZ PHIL MONTEZ ART PALACIO ANGIE TREVINO

State Advisory Committee Members Present:

FERNANDO HERNANDEZ, Chair, California SAC GIL ALSTON, Retired Judge, Member California SAC JUNE WEBB-VIGNERY, Chair, Arizona SAC

Commissioner Assistants Present:

LAURA BATIE PATRICK DUFFY ' JOY FREEMAN KIMBERLY SCHULD KRISHNA TOOLSIE

Also present:

(202) 234-4433

PENNY EDGERT

I-N-D-E-X

Approval of Agenda	. 4
Approval of Minutes of July 19 Meeting and	
Acknowledgement of September 13 and	
October 11, 2002 Meetings	6
Announcements	8
Staff Director's Report	19
SAC Appointments	36
SAC Report	39
FY-2004 Budge Estimate to OMB	40
Discussion of Status of Commission	
Projects	120
Discussion of Letter to the DOJ regarding	
Border-Crossing Deaths	46
Western Regional SAC Presentations	52
Presentations and Discussion Relating to	
Challenges of Equal Opportunity in Higher	
Education	88
Future Agenda Items	121
Adjournment	129

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(8:35 o'clock a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The meeting will come
4	to order. Online. I think who's online, could you
5	please identify yourselves?
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Commissioner
7	Redenbaugh.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And, Commissioner
9	Thernstrom, are you there?
10	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Commissioner
11	Thernstrom is online.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Thank you.
13	The meeting will come to order.
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Commissioner
15	Kirsanow should be online.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm on.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you on,
18	Commissioner Kirsanow?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
20	Kirsanow's on.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Hello. Good morning.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Good morning.
23	I. Approval of the Agenda
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I guess it's still
25	morning.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1	The first item on the agenda is the
2	approval of the agenda. I wanted to say to the
3	Commissioners that our SAC Chairs are here. And our
4	SAC Chair from Arizona will have to leave early today.
5	And so I am going to ask the Commissioners'
6	indulgence, that we could have the presentation of
7	projects after the SAC presentations.
8	There are two SAC members who will
9	Chairs who will present to us, from Arizona and
10	California, so that we can indulge and appreciate her
11	schedule since she came here all the way from Arizona
12	and has to go back, it turns out, in order to give a
13	presentation.
14	So if there is no objection to that, I
15	would ask for the approval of the agenda with that
16	understanding. Could I get a motion to
17	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'll move.
18	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
20	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there anybody who
22	has any other discussion of the agenda?
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes. I wonder,
24	Madam Chair, whether we could if there are items to
25	be voted on, whether we could push them towards the

1	front as well as so that those of us who cannot stay
2	for the entire time will miss no vote.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I couldn't understand
4	what you said, Commissioner.
5	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Are there items
6	that we need that will be voted on today? Because
7	I have a preference, if possible, for voting, bringing
8	those items up earlier rather than later because I
9	have some time constraints myself.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. That's good,
11	because the items that we understand that we need to
12	vote on will all be brought up before the SAC Chair
13	gives her presentation.
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Good. Thank
15	you.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Unless
17	something happens that I don't know about, and I can't
18	tell that.
19	All those in favor of approving the agenda
20	with those understandings indicate by saying "Aye."
21	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
23	So ordered.
24	II. Approval of the Minutes
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is to

1	approve the minutes of the July 19th meeting. We
2	simply do not ask the approval of any minutes for
3	September 13th and October 11th because the Commission
4	did not have an official meeting on that date, but we
5	are asking the item is to approve the minutes of the
6	July 19 meeting.
7	Could I get a motion?
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: So moved.
9	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those anybody
11	have any changes in the minutes for July 19th?
12	All those in favor indicate by saying,
13	"Aye."
14	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
16	So ordered.
17	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Madam Chair,
18	just one question. I'm sorry, I should have brought
19	this up before. Someplace in this agenda shouldn't
20	there be approval of the calendar for 2003?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That will be under the
22	Staff Director's Report.
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. Thank
24	you. I'm sorry.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's all right.

III. Announcements

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: On the announcements, there are many announcements to make about events associated with civil rights. I will mention a few of them.

November 16th, this month, we recognize that in 1990 on that date the Native American Graves Protection and Family Abuse Prevention Act was passed, which provides protection of American Indian gravesites and the repatriation of Indian remains and cultural artifacts to tribes, which was a very important issue for them and for the country.

November 10th, Fred Korematsu and Minoru Yasui and Gordon Hirabayashi filed their petitions to overturn their World War II convictions for violating the curfew and evacuation orders. They did that in 1983 and later on there was of course the law passed for recompense and they received apologies. So that day is marked.

There are the Individuals with Disabilities and Education Act, was enacted on November 29th, 1975.

I also point out that since the last time we had an official meeting, of course, Democratic

Congresswoman Patsy Mink, who was a great champion of 1 civil rights and women's rights, education, died at 2 3 the age of 74 in Honolulu of viral pneumonia. She was very instrumental in the passage of Title IX of the 4 5 education amendments. I also would like to point out that since 6 7 our last meeting, Senator Paul Wellstone, of Minnesota 8 of course, who was a champion in the cause of civil 9 rights and human rights, among other things, and I 10 remember getting up at four o'clock in the morning in 11 Alabama to catch a plane to fly to -- a little plane 12 to fly to Minnesota during his first campaign to go to 13 breakfast, that he called up and begged me to come to. 14 That great champion of course died along with members 15 of his family and staff on this airplane. 16 This also is National American Indian and 17 Alaska Native Heritage Month, in November. 18 So I wanted to point out these. There are 19 other items, legislation and the like, that have taken 20 place that we could acknowledge, but I thought that 21 these were important. 22 Does anyone else have any announcements 23 that they would like to make? 24 I do, Madam Chair. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As some of you may know, this year the Navy has revived its scholarship program for students attending historically black colleges. The ROTC program has 10 full scholarships at each of 12 major historically black colleges or universities. The restoration οf these 120 African American students scholarships for is wonderful outreach program to help achieve diversity in our armed forces.

And I'd like to congratulate this administration for reviving that program which was dormant under the previous administration.

My second announcement has to do with Bush's Commission President the Educational on Excellence for Hispanic Americans. And I just wanted to announce that that commission has released an interim report, the final report being due out in March of the coming year. The report basically studies the issue of Hispanic education in this country. It does not make specific recommendations at this time, but I believe the final report plans to do that.

And I would recommend that anybody who's interested take a look at it on the website, which is www.yesican.gov.

And in conjunction with that, one of the 1 interim things they talk about is the need to do more 2 outreach to Hispanic parents, particularly immigrant 3 parents, about education and the importance of their 4 5 kids getting an education and staying in school. 6 And I know that this Commission, one of 7 the things we're charged with doing is issuing public 8 service announcements. That's part of our statute and our charter. So I'd like everybody to at least think 9 10 some public service might do about whether we 11 announcement in Spanish for Spanish-language 12 television, just encouraging -- you know, in line with 13 our recommendation -- encouraging immigrant children 14 to stay in school and get a good education. 15 I think that might be something that would 16 be worth us looking into, so I wanted to announce the 17 report and suggést people take a look at it and ask 18 that we consider maybe doing a PSA on the topic. 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we ask the 20 Staff Director to look into the possibility of doing 21 this PSA. 22 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay? All right. 24 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: And I have one 25 announcement.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
2	Thernstrom. Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I don't know if
4	all Commissioners know, but Hugh Price is stepping
5	down as President of the National Urban League. And I
6	just would like to personally note that Price has been
7	an enormously effective leader. That he will be hard
8	in fact to replace. I am very sorry to see him go. I
9	understand the need to move on in his own life, but
10	I'd like personally to commend Price for the work he
11	has done at the National Urban League and particularly
12	with respect to education.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I think that
14	that's thank you for reminding us of Hugh's leaving
15	
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chair?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: the Urban League.
18	Do you want to say something about that?
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yeah. I think that
20	I agree whole-heartedly. I think that might
21	warrant sort of a formal letter or something like that
22	from the Commission as a body. I think Commissioner
23	Thernstrom put it very well.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we can do that.
25	When I became aware that he was leaving, I sent Hugh

1	a note telling him that before he became President of
2	the Urban League I had said publicly, and it was
3	various articles, that the Urban League was missing in
4	action in many of the great policy debates of the
5	period and that since he had been there the Urban
6	League was in the midst of a very important policy
7	debate about issues such as education and the like.
8	So you're all right, he's done a great
9	job. If there's no objection to doing so, we may
10	draft a note to him saying that the Commission
11	commends him for his service, in particular his work
12	on education issues, wish him well and know that he
13	will be hard to replace. How's that?
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: That's great.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, okay. Any other
16	announcements? Commissioner Meeks?
17	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes, I do. It could
18	fall under the Staff Director's Report, but it's
19	related to the 20.00 South Dakota SAC study that came
20	out of the forum that the Commissioners attended in
21	South Dakota.
22	After the SAC report was released the
23	Governor of South Dakota commissioned a study to
24	determine whether Native Americans were treated
25	differently than nonIndians. And I think we had some

concerns about how can that be -- the methodology of the report. But I think in the end the report was a pretty balanced report, but it did find that there were some disparities.

The researchers are now extending their study to attempt to determine why that is. And those findings are supposed to be released next summer.

And one of the recommendations that came out of the report too was on the federal sentencing guidelines, which affects Native Americans, you know, more than it does just about any other race. They have formed an advisory committee of which I am a member. And we're researching to see if Native Americans are disproportionally affected by the federal sentencing guidelines because of the federal criminal jurisdiction over typical local law offenses.

And so we are also looking at comparing the federal sentences to the state sentences for similar cases. State by state where there's a large population of Native Americans. We're going to try to get an interim report out in March.

And one other recommendation that came out of that report was for a treatment center at Pine Ridge, South Dakota. And the Oglala Sioux Tribe received a \$12.4 million DOJ grant to build a

correctional facility that also includes space for 1 inmates to receive career counseling, substance abuse 2 3 treatment, and medical services. The Lower Burrell Tribe has also been 4 5 approved a grant to build a similar facility. 6 And, lastly and relative to the Indian 7 2000 South Dakota SAC report the vote, in 8 recommendation was made that Indians get involved with 9 state and federal elections and vote. And the 2002 10 election I'm happy to say had an unprecedented Indian 11 voter turnout in South Dakota. 12 On Pine Ridge, the typical turnout 13 usually about 17 percent. This year it was 43 14 And, you know, it can get better, but I 15 really believe that Native Americans can see now that 16 they can make a difference and stay involved in 17 elections. And it was -- I just attended the National 18 Congress of American Indians' conference and that was 19 really big news and got talked about a lot, and will 20 inspire I hope reservations across the country. 21 Thank you, Elsie. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 22 I think it's really important that our 23 South Dakota SAC report, which made all 24 recommendations, in the forum that we held out there

has been responded to in the way that you point out.

And that it seems to, by all accounts from South 1 Dakota, made a tremendous difference. 2 I want to commend our South Dakota SAC for 3 the work that they did. And maybe the Staff Director 4 ought to send them a note and tell them that 5 They will see the transcript, 6 acknowledge that here. 7 but their work has had so many reverberations since 8 that time and it just keeps going. 9 Yes, Commissioner Edley. Just a different 10 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 11 matter. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 13 The Civil Rights COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Project at Harvard put out a report a couple of weeks 14 15 ago on just a simple analysis looking at state by 16 state and county by county disparities in spoiled ballot rates using the 2000 election data. 17 18 got some press attention. Ι And it 19 commend it to everyone's attention. I'll see that 20 everybody gets a copy of it complete with the very 21 pretty color maps. 22 And I think we're all generally familiar 23 already from the work that we did on Florida with the 24 This is only county-level data, phenomenon. 25 And the central finding of precinct level data.

course is that there are very wide disparities from 1 state to state in the residual ballot rates. And that 2 even in many of the relatively well performing states 3 there are tremendous disparities county to county 4 5 within a state. 6 Controlling for COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: 7 demographic? 8 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No, not controlling 9 for anything. Just looking at the residual, --10 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I see. 11 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: the at error 12 rates. 13 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. 14 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: And the reason I 15 raise is that -- the reason I raise it is for two 16 One is that the recently -- the recently-17 enacted federal election reform legislation, in my 18 view, frankly doesn't do very much to directly get at 19 jurisdiction this disparities issue of from to 20 jurisdiction in residual ballot rates, which is 21 Certainly some of the things that they unfortunate. 22 do in terms of the new technology and some money for 23 voter education will indirectly have an impact on 24 residual error rates over time, but one could have

some questions about whether the legislation goes as

far as it should.

But for the future, I hope at some point over the next year or two the Commission will have a chance to revisit this issue to look at the -- to look at the '02 data to see what happens, what the trends are with respect to these disparities. I'm not talking about race now. I'm just talking about disparities from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. The basic principle is the one person-one vote principle. And that we understand very well in law that when election districts are redrawn, the courts insist, under the equal protection clause, are really quite close match in populations from district to district so as not to have vote dilution.

But the reality of course is if elections are administered in a way that then results in effective vote dilution because of disparities in spoilage rates, then it just strikes me we're back in the same ballgame of worrying that one community with a poor election infrastructure or inadequate investments in worker training or voter education may end up having the votes from that jurisdiction not count as much as votes in other jurisdictions.

So I simply wanted to -- I'll circulate that report to -- to the Commission as a whole for

your interest, and I wanted to flag it as something 1 other 2 time and fullness of the that permitting, we may want to take a look at this issue 3 of voter dilution as this new election commission gets 4 established under the statute. We may have some 5 6 recommendations for them to focus on. 7 Okav. Is there an CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 8 appropriation for that, or do you know? Does anybody 9 Is it being appropriated now or what? 10 It is, Madam Chair. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 11 There's a -- yeah, a lot more than we will. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh. That's not too 13 hard. 14 IV. Staff Director's Report 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item on the 16 the Staff Director's Report. agenda is And, 17 Commissioner Thernstrom pointed out, we need to vote 18 on the Commission schedule for next year. 19 I think you were sent a schedule to take a 20 look at to see if those days were -- the point was to 21 look to see if those were days on your calendar that 22 you thought you might be able to -- or would be able 23 to meet and to see if you agreed to that. And if you 24 had any suggestions to change these, that you would 25

make those suggestions.

1	So if people brought their calendars or
2	are aware already of what their calendars are, could
3	we get a motion to approve this for purposes of
4.	discussion?
5	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'll move.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And a second from
7	somebody.
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'll second it.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Any
10	discussion?
11	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: If it was
12	possible for the other Commissioners, I would prefer
13	rather than March 14th a week later, March 21.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: March 21? Everyone
15	should look at March.
16	Anybody else, anybody have a problem with
17	that?
18	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I don't.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, then why
20	don't we change it to the 21st.
21	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thank you very
22	much.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. If there
24	are no other changes could we have agreement that this
25	schedule will be the dates of the meetings for the
	II

1 next calendar year? 2 All those in favor indicate by saying, 3 "Aye." 4 COMMISSIONERS: Aye. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? 6 So ordered. 7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May be I heard 8 just a moment, Madam Chair? 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just wondering 11 whether it might be possible to have a little bit more 12 advanced notice from the staff on the location of the 13 meetings and the agenda. And I say this because I 14 realize that we voted in May to hold our meetings 15 outside the beltway wherever possible so that we could 16 hear from our State Advisory Committees, but 17 planning purposes it would certainly be helpful to me 18 and I know to other Commissioners to be able to plan a 19 little bit farther in advance. 20 Ι was not able to attend either the 21 September meeting or the October meeting and may have 22 been able to juggle some things and do so at least in 23 September if I had known sooner that we would not be 24 meeting in Washington. And it was just logistically

get

there

in

impossible

for

me

to

25

Delaware

1	September, and I regret that I was unable to do so.
2	But I think that if we were able to have a
3	little bit more notice, it might facilitate all of the
4	Commissioners being able to attend, so.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Why don't we
6	agree yes, Commissioner Edley.
7	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: And if I can add.
8	Also I think if we're going to be if we're going to
9	have some activities the day before, that we also
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: get notification
12	of that as early as we can as well.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So I mean
14	I guess if I were going to put it in the form of a
15	motion well, why don't I just move to amend our
16	policy of 30-day notice to 60-day notice.
17	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, why don't
18	you include Commissioner Edley's suggestion. And also
19	in order to properly prepare for subjects that are
20	being discussed at the meetings, it would be at the
21	same time very good to know what the topic will be, so
22	that we don't come to meetings unprepared.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director, what
24	do you think?
25	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Well, Madam Chair, I
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN:

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

Okay.

23

24

25

meeting, --

-- which gives you --

ı	
1	since it's going to be two months, that you
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, how about
3	February?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: let us know. You
5	would have to let us know about February in December,
6	
7	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We can do that.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: if we passed that.
9	Can you do that?
10	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We can do that.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The Staff
12	Director says he can do that.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yeah. Madam Chair,
14	notice provision we can do. The other things, I
15	understand the sense of the Commission, and we will do
16	the absolute best we can. Some of the activities that
17	are less formal, they get developed as we
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Work with the SACs.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes,
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think we
21	need to know what the activities are. We just need to
2 2	know if there's going to be a day of activities on the
23	Thursday, then we can, you know, adjust our schedules
24	accordingly to be there, whatever those activities may

end up being.

Well, and I'd COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: 1 I have a great 2 like to know the general subject. preference for arriving at meetings having done my 3 4 homework. 5 Well, I think that --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: just a second, and I'll respond, but Commissioner 6 7 Meeks. 8 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I mean I have no objection to being notified as early as possible, or 9 10 But you know, for instance, Cruz and I, we whatever. 11 know we have to reserve time to go either to D. C. or 12 somewhere. And it's never -- if I have to come to San 13 Diego, that's just no different. It's easier in some 14 ways. 15 So, you know, to make it 60 days, to me, 16 puts the staff at some disadvantage, I'm not sure. 17 But I'm not arguing the case necessarily, but I just 18 think that for those that have a short trip to D. C., 19 there are some of us that have a long trip to D. C. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yeah. No, and I 21 certainly respect that. It's just that, for example, 22 a trip to New York, you know, would not require a 23 large amount of planning for daycare purposes in my 24 case, but a trip to California requires a huge amount

of daycare planning.

25

And so it's just easier if I

able make those I'm to 1 advance and know in So I realize that others have planning 2 arrangements. difficulties all the time, but if we could all have 3 our lives made a little bit easier, I think that would 4 5 be to the benefit of everybody. Let us be clear about CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 6 7 what we're moving. We are moving, and the motion would be, that the Staff Director will tell me, so I 8 9 can notice, I'm the one who's supposed to decide it, and he will notify you at least 60 days in advance 10 where the location of the next Commission meeting. 11 And that this policy will go into effect with respect 12 13 to the February meeting. That's the motion. 14 I'm sorry, COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: and 15 Commissioner Edley said --16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And -- and that the 17 Staff Director will inform you at that time whether or 18 not there are activities on the day before the 19 meeting, okay? 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Great. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's all that we are 22 In terms of letting you know exactly what moving. 23 activities, that's all worked out with SACs. And the 24 as you know, are volunteers. So they get SACs,

Director and the

and the Staff

25

Regional

Coordinator gets together with them as they can and work everybody tries to And work this out. cooperatively, but the timing on it may not always be exactly what they would like and what we would like, of resources their constraints and given the volunteering and their other activities and the like. So you will do the best we can, right? STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: That's correct, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let us know. motion is 60-days notice starting with the February meeting and letting people know at that time when the notice issued whether there are activities on the day before. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, is it possible, Madam Chair, to include the topic, the general topic as part of this motion? Because certainly if we decide we're going to x city, we must have some idea of what the general topic is. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I would rather not do that because for what reasons the Staff Director gave already. There are many topics that the SAC may be considering, and they may be trying to finalize ' whether they want to do one or the other. And giving

them as much time as possible is really important, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I would rather opt on the side of giving them latitude and letting him work with them, rather than boxing them in that far ahead.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: That's right, Madam Chair. I mean sometimes the SAC has one specific idea and they are planning way ahead. Other times the SAC has an idea as to what they want to do, but it's really not firm. And so we're not really ready to say that we're probably going to do this because it may not happen and it could create confusion. There are other times where what we try to put together is a combination of things, and those things tend to get done, you know, much more closely to the time when the event is supposed to take place.

The one thing to remember is that, and again we try to provide you accurate information as early as possible, but we'd rather not give you stuff that could eventually be incorrect.

I think one thing to remember is when the Commission has voted on this, one of the key reasons for doing it was to go and just talk to the SAC members and other people in the civil rights community there to find out what's going on. So that's really I think — I always thought that was the key part of going there, not necessarily, you know, all the

1	different topics.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. I call for
3	the question, or somebody has to call for the
4	question.
5	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Can I just one
6	ask question on this still? So, in other words, when
7	the staff is picking a location it is not necessarily
8	because there are issues that have arisen, let's say
9	border control, in that location that is fruitful for
10	the Commission to address. It's really you know,
11	we are simply going to places where there will be SAC
12	committees that may or may not be addressing something
13	that is central to our concerns. Is that I'm just
14	a little confused on that.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It is clear that we go
16	in part. And we need to close off this part of the
17	discussion because it's taking too long
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and people are
20	waiting.
21	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes. I'm sorry.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's it is clear
23	that we go to places for a combination of reasons, and
24	the Staff Director and I discuss it. Sometimes
25	there's a hot issue there. Other times there's
ł	

several issues. And the SAC may be in need of reinforcement or wish to have us urgently come to meet with them in terms of reinforcing what they're doing in their local communities.

There may be a combination of reasons or they may have two or three issues that they want to tell us about or people in the community who they think need to meet with us. And so we try to assess all of those factors and to figure out the logistics of it to try figure out where we would get the maximum response and bang for our buck.

Yes, Commissioner Edley.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we -- I don't think this ought to be that hard. Can we just have it be part of the legislative record, or whatever, that when the -- when the Staff Director and the Chair notify us at the 60 days, that they tell us as best they can what they think the topics might be and so we'll accept any comments or input that commissioners may have about things that ought to be addressed if we're going to Las Vegas?

But that it -- but that we -- it just be understood that that's not any sort of -- that that's not binding, that that's not definitive, that there's got to be some fluidity built into it. And the Staff

1	Director and the Chair will do their best to keep us
2	informed as things change, as things develop.
3	But I think just a good faith, let us know
4	as early as convenient, as early as possible what the
5	possibilities are and what the staff is thinking
6	about.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Call for the
8	question.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
10	the motion indicate by saying, "Aye."
11	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
13	So ordered.
14	Is there anything under the Staff
15	Director's Report that people would like to ask, under
16	this particular topic, the Staff Director about or not
17	beyond what we've just been discussing?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, this
19	is Commissioner
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We have a
22	question, and actually a motion. When we originally
23	discussed on May 17th the issue of flying to various
24	locations, possibly in conjunction with the SAC, it
25	was done the understanding that it would be that that
	T. Control of the con

1	traveling would be done absent a specific vote to the
2	contrary.
3	And I would like to move that, in fact,
4	whenever we are going to be holding meetings outside
5	of Washington, D.C. that perhaps within that 60-day
6	notice, a full vote be conducted by the staff, the
7	Staff Director of all Commissioners as to their
8	preference going to a particular city or going out of
9	Washington for that particular day.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You heard the motion.
11	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I second it.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All those in
13	favor of the motion indicate by saying, "Aye."
1	
14	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
14 15	COMMISSIONERS: Aye. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
15 16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay.
15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay.
15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nay. You oppose?
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nay. You oppose? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we get maybe a
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nay. You oppose? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we get maybe a roll call?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nay. You oppose? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we get maybe a roll call? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I add to your no.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Nay. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Nay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Or nay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nay. You oppose? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can we get maybe a roll call? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I add to your no. All right. Someone has requested a roll

1	33
1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
2	Thernstrom?
3	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Aye.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Reynoso?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
7	Redenbaugh?
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks?
10	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: No.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley?
12	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioners
14	Braceras?
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Berry,
17	no.
18	The motion fails.
19	All right. Anything else under the Staff
20	Director's Report?
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a few
22	things. I'm sorry. Just one of them relating to the
23	dates and the logistics of traveling. As most of you
24	can tell, I am going to be having a baby in December.
25	So I just wanted to put you all on notice that
ľ	NEAL D. CDOCC

unfortunately I will not be able to be in New York in 1 December, but would very much like to participate by 2 telephone hook-up and would like my assistant Kimberly 3 Schold to be able to do so as well. 4 I'm not yet sure about January. That will 5 depend on where we go and my doctor's order and how 6 the delivery goes and so forth. So I will certainly 7 keep you posted about that, but I just -- I wanted it 8 that I will 9 the record clear on participating, you know, via telephone hook-up for 10 those two meetings due to the circumstances. 11 hope that all accommodations can be made so that my 12 assistant and I can participate in that fashion. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Fine. No objection 15 and we already have a policy, so it's fine. And good 16 luck to you. 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you. 18 Let us know when you CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 19 have the twins. 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah, there's .21 only one condition. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I will. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: There's only 24 one condition. You should bring the baby as you can 25 so we can meet it.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The only the
2	more substantive things I wanted to ask about are the
3	Educational Accountability Project. I know the
4	written Staff Director's Report says that we'll be
5	having a briefing probably some time in the first part
6	of 2003. And I'm wondering if the staff has any idea
7	of how that briefing will be structured or if we know
8	more clearly what month it will take place. Because
9	that's an issue that I'm very interested in, so I'd
10	just like some clarification from the staff on where
11	we think that project's going and how it's shaping up.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you want to
13	discuss it now or under commission projects?
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, well, it was
15	under the Staff Director's Report in this area, so
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
17	Well, that's fine. We can do it now.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: it doesn't
19	matter to me. I'd just like a more detailed briefing
20	on what's happening with that project.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Could we wait
22	until would you mind waiting?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, not at all.
24	That's fine.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Since some of the
į	

Commissioners want us to get things out of the way 1 2 that have to be voted on. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we'll defer that 4 5 question, okay. 6 V. SAC Appointments 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item on the agenda is the SAC appointments for Arkansas, Georgia, 8 9 Illinois, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, 10 and Tennessee. 11 Could I get a motion to approve those? 12 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So move. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second? 14 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second. 15 Is CHAIRPERSON BERRY: there any 16 discussion? 17 Yes, Vice Chair. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, 19 we've agreed that in the past that I would vote in 20 favor of it with the understanding that the staff 21 would take a second look at some of the concerns I 22 And I have on this occasion three concerns. 23 In Illinois there's only one Latino on the 24 SAC even though the population is something like 12 25 percent, so I suggest that the staff take a look to

see if one or two others can be added for balance 1 2 purposes. And in all others there's only one Native 3 American in -- in the SAC. And, again, I suggest that 4 5 maybe there ought to be more than one Native American 6 one in the SAC. The SAC is composed of 12. 7 And in Texas four of the 17 are Latinos 8 even though in Texas Latinos represent a third of the 9 So I suggest that we take a second look 10 at that. 11 I've been told in the past that normally 12 we'd have flexibility and that folk can be added to 13 If that's true, then I would vote with the the SAC. 14 others to approve these reports. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Does anybody 16 else have any comment? Yes, --17 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Madam Chair and Vice 18 Chair, we'll definitely do that. We'll look into 19 that. 20 The only thing I would like to add is that 21 we would also ask that the Commission vote to endorse 22 the chairs of those eight states except for Arkansas, 23 New Hampshire, and Texas. Those we still need some 24 leadership statements from, and we'll provide those to 25 you at a later time.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I didn't I meant to
2	say that I needed the motion to include of course the
3	chairs of these SACs, which are in the appointment
4	packagės.
5	So could we
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait. Can I just
7	have some clarification? Is it that you can add
8	additional members to the SACs after we vote
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: They have to bring
10	them back
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So is there a
12	limit on how many numbers there are?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: SACs have a limit of
14	21. The range is 11 to 21.
15	MS. DAVIS: No, no, no.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ivy's trying to answer
17	the question.
18	MS. DAVIS: Thank you. There's a floor of
19	you have to at least have 11 as a minimum, but I
20	will remind you, California has 26 members right now.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So these
22	aren't full, and the Vice Chair's recommendations can
23	be
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Considered.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Gotcha.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now I forget what I
2	was oh, the Chairs of the SACs are included in the
3	appointment packages, so when you vote for the motion
4	you are voting for the entire package, which includes
5	the chairs, which is what the Staff Director was
6	pointing out.
7	Did the maker of the motion accept that?
8	I forgot who made the motion?
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I made it. I
10	accept.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And does the seconder
12	accept that? And I don't remember who seconded it,
13	but whoever
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think I do.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. So the
16	motion is then to approve these appointments with the
17	Chairs and with the understanding that you'll go back
18	and look and see if you want to recommend some more
19	people to us to respond to these concerns.
20	All those in favor of the motion indicate
21	by saying, "Aye."
22	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
24	So ordered.
25	VI. SAC Report

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next items is the
2	State Advisory Committee Report on Civil Rights Issues
3	in West Virginia. Could I get a motion to approve the
4	SAC report?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So move.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
9	approval the Civil Rights Issues in West Virginia
10	Report from our SAC indicate by saying, "Aye."
11	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
13	So ordered.
14	VII. FY-2004 Budget Estimate
14 15	VII. FY-2004 Budget Estimate CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the
15 16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of
15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve?
15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second?
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item is the FY 2004 budget estimate to OMB for purposes of discussion. Could I get a motion to approve? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a second? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of the COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Madam Chair?

1	Redenbaugh.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
3	Redenbaugh.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: A point of
5	clarification and then I think I do want to have a
6	discussion.
7	Could you just review with me, this has
8	been submitted already to OMB or I'm not sure where
9	we are.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The Staff Director, as
11	I understand from him, has the staff has had staff-
12	to-staff discussions at OMB about what the
13	recommendation is from the staff to the Commission,
14	with the understanding that it is the staff
15	recommendation, and the Commission has not yet
16	endorsed a budget. Is that right?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: That's correct, Madam
18	Chair. We sent over the staff draft and made it very,
19	very clear that the Commissioners have not voted on
20	it.
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And this was due
22	to OMB in
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The schedule.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: September,
25	presumably, or

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Right. Based on our 1 2 budget officer's with OMB, our conversations communications with them, we felt that it was prudent 3 to get them over a copy even if it hadn't been voted 4 5 on. All 6 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: right. 7 Well, then I do want to have some discussion. And I 8 admit that I'm significantly underprepared for this, having seen this document -- having not spent enough 9 10 time with it. 11 But as I've over expressed in the past, you know, generically all budget documents are a set 12 13 of promises between the parties. And I'm not prepared to support this particular submission without a review 14 15 of how we performed on the current budget and project, 16 which I think as a manager we ought to be doing 17 periodic anyway. So that's the general concern that I 18 have with this particular submission. 19 Okay. Any other CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 20 comments? 21 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I could 22 add a word on that, that it is confusing to some of us 23 to have a budget and a list of projects for the year 24 and then a complete alteration of our priorities,

what these trips have involved.

which is

25

do

personally feel a fiduciary responsibility here that 1 -- and, you know, it's troubling to me when I can't 2 3 come through on it, in effect. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anybody else have a 5 comment? 6 Yes. 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I 8 think we discussed this last meeting where we've gone 9 over the scheduling, where we're required by OMB and 10 the budgetary process to agree like two years ahead of 11 time what the projects are going to be. But it's 12 understood by OMB and the budgetary apparatus that in 13 change those projects and fact we're free t.o 14 priorities as we go along and as the matters require. 15 it seems that there's no danger So to me 16 normally in the federal proceeding is done as 17 government. 18 The other thing is of course that we're 19 duty-bound to include a budget that explains what our 20 resources are and what we need to actually do the job. 21 And I think that's what we've tried to do with the 22 budget, so it seems to me we're proceeding in the 23 normal federal way. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Anybody else 25 have any further discussion on the subject of this

budget proposal?

Yes.

from my time working in OMB.

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, I just want to
make clear at least in my experience -- my experience
over the years on these matters and, in particular,

|| For

For what it's worth, I want to assure my colleagues that in the minds of OMB officials but also in the minds of appropriators, the budget decisions that the White House and the appropriation decisions of the Congress are not contingent in any way upon some specific list of programmatic activities. That's not what the appropriation line items contain. It's in the appropriations bill report not what the in the the narrative It's not what contains. President's budget submission contains.

So our responsibility -- our fiduciary, if you will, responsibilities or even our quasi contractual obligations to OMB and the Congress don't include that level of detail as to what topics we're going to be taking up or even where we're going to be going.

So that's not -- I think the question of what kind of role or what kind of oversight. the Commission takes of the decisions made by the staff is

1	a separate matter from the budget submissions to the
2	White House and the Congress. And I think we have a
3	planning meeting scheduled for January and it's at
4	that planning process internally where I think the
5	issue of topics and travel and so forth is much more
6	relevant.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further discussion
8	of this matter?
9	If there is no further discussion, then
10	someone call for the question.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I call for the
12	question.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
14	item number 7, which is the FY 2004 Budget Estimate
15	indicate by saying, "Aye."
16	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No.
19	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No. I'm going
20	to oppose it, too.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. I hear
22	hearing only two opponents of it, the motion passes,
23	and so the budget is approved.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
25	Kirsanow also opposed.
- 1	

	46
1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I couldn't hear you.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
3	Kirsanow also opposed.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then the budget is
5	still approved.
6	The we are aware, I will say after we
7	have approved it, that this is just what we think the
8	Commission needs. It doesn't mean we'll get it. It'd
9	be nice if we get it, but we won't.
10	VIII. Discussion of Letter to the DOJ
11	The next item on the agenda is to hear
12	from our oh, let me do this first because there may
13	be necessity for a vote on it.
14	Commissioner Braceras yesterday suggested,
15	if I recall correctly, and she's here and can speak
16	for herself obviously, that we might consider sending
17	a letter to Justice about the allegations that there
18	were some vigilante incidents along the border in
19	Arizona.
20	Am I recalling correctly? ,
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. We talked
22	about maybe sending a letter asking them just to look
23	into it. I don't think we have enough information to
24	ask them to take specific action,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.

1	. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: but we can ask
2	them to look into it and see whether anyone's civil
3	rights may have been violated.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And report back to
6	us or take whatever action is necessary.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you off the top
8	of your head, Commissioner Braceras, repeat what you've
9	just said so the staff can write it down in addition
10	to looking at the transcript and draft a letter so it
11	would be comport with what you have in mind?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just to send a
13	letter to the Justice Department indicating that we
14	heard testimony on this issue and we're concerned
15	about it. And, you know, could they look into it and
16	either report back or take whatever action is
17	necessary.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: See if the allegations
19	if there is any validity to any of the allegations
20	and report back. If there is any action, let us know,
21	or something like that.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That sounds fine.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner.
24	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, we also heard
25	then

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you going to help
2	Commissioner Braceras?
3	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, we also
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't want to
5	draft the letter off the top of my head. I'm sure the
6	staff is perfectly capable of doing that.
7	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: As I understand it,
8	the Arizona SAC has looked into this somewhat, so
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And they're going to
10	tell us about that.
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Right. So I think it
12	would make sense in the letter to at least reference
13	the fact that our SAC in Arizona has looked into it
14	and without without framing the letter as though
15	we're endorsing any factfindings by the Arizona SAC, I
16	think it would be good to at least
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
18	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: acknowledge that
19	the Arizona SAC has been working on it, mentioned
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean I guess we
21	could even you know, if there's any I haven't
22	had a chance to read this fully, but if there's any
23	specific report or document from the Arizona SAC on
24	it, we could include it, and then they could take it
0.5	

from there.

That would be Right. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So after we hear from the Arizona SAC we'll 2 3 know better, but is there anyone who has an objection to sending the letter of inquiry to the Justice 4 5 Department that we are discussing? 6 Hearing no objection, the staff will send 7 such a letter and see what we get back. And we will 8 then -- now we go onto the presentations from the SAC 9 members. 10 And we have with us the SAC Chairs from 11 California and Arizona and a member to give reports on 12 their states. We're happy to have them come. 13 so grateful for their service to the Commission. 14 The Arizona SAC, as was just pointed out, 15 recently looked into the issue of federal border and 16 immigration policy in that state, including with the 17 migrant deaths along the border. And so it will be 18 interesting to hear from them. And they're now just 19 giving us a package of what looks like news articles 20 concerning this subject. 21 And from the -- so let me introduce the 22 two SAC Chairs and the member. From the California 23 SAC we have with us Fernando Hernandez, Dr. Fernando 24 Hernandez, who is Chair of the State Advisory

Committee and was recently reappointed to a second

1 Is that right? term. 2 DR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, ma'am. Thank you very much 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 4 for your service. Dr. Fernandez is from Long Beach and is 5 Chairman of the Foundations Department in the College 6 of Education at California State University at Los 7 8 strong advocate for Не is a Angeles. 9 for everyone. He is the educational opportunity former chairman of the board of directors for 10 11 He is active in Community Youth Gang Services. 12 service to his university and his community, and he will be discussing the activities of the California 13 14 SAC 15 Also with us from the California SAC is Gilbert C. Alston of Pasadena who is a retired 16 17 Superior Court Judge, a retired U.S. Air Force Pilot, 18 a past Military Affairs Committee Chairman of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce, and he has experience as 19 20 a peace officer and as a prosecutor. He's also a life 21 member of the NAACP and a member of the Pasadena 22 Chapter of the Red Cross Advisory Council. 23 He served on the boards and committees of 24 many church groups and community-based organizations. 25 He attended the briefing in Arizona on migrant deaths

along the border, but he will be discussing 1 2 perspective other California or any the from 3 perspective he feels like discussing. 4 And, finally, all the way from Tucson is 5 June Webb-Vignery, who is Chair of the Arizona SAC. 6 And we are grateful for your service, and who was also 7 recently reappointed by the Commission to a second 8 term. 9 Dr. Vignery is executive director of the 10 Metropolitan Education Commission. She served as a 11 member of -- the Arizona Civil Rights Advisory Board, 12 the Arizona Women's Committee. She's been a member of 13 the University of Arizona Latin American Resource 14 Board and served on the Executive Board of the NAACP 15 Tucson Chapter. 16 Her extensive community involvement also 17 includes service on the Arizona Womens Political 18 Caucus, the Tucson Civil Rights Coalition, the Tucson 19 Womens Discrimination Task Force, the League of the 20 United Latin American Citizens otherwise known 21 LULAC. 22 Dr. Vignery is a historian by training and 23 has published several books and articles. And we want 24 to mention that we don't list books and articles --25 I'm teasing you -- many of which concern equal rights

and employment issues. And she will be discussing 1 border control issues in our state. 2 But before I -- we continue with the SACs, 3 I think Phil Montez, who is our Director for the 4 Western Regional Office and has been at the Commission 5 since I think 1967 -- is that right, Phil? 6 7 MR. MONTEZ: I forgot the year. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll say a few words. 9 He started as a Consultant in the Field Services 10 Division and was promoted to Civil Rights Community 11 Service Specialist, a job that no longer exists, the 12 title at least, in July 1968. He's been a Supervisor 13 Equal Opportunity Specialist, and then the Regional 14 Director of the Western Regional Office since 1982. 15 And has continued to serve admirably and well in that 16 position ever since. 17 So, Phil, will you please proceed, and 18 then we will hear from our SAC members. 19 IX. Western Regional SAC Presentations 20 MR. MONTEZ: All I wanted to say was Dr. 21 Hernandez will introduce our illustrious guest and 22 make their presentations to the Commission. 23 you're here. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Okay.

Well, we're glad we are.

Dr. Hernandez. 1 Thank you very much, 2 HERNANDEZ: DR. welcome 3 Berry. And I want to Commissioner California my Arizona -- the Arizona SAC Chair June 4 5 Vignery. 6 And I want to thank Judge Alston for 7 taking time to come. I think most importantly I want to thank 8 9 the Commission for accepting our invitation to come to 10 I know we've asked Phil to invite you California. 11 numerous times. And I'm glad that you were able --12 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Are you sure 13 he's done it. 14 DR. HERNANDEZ: And I'm glad you're able 15 to be here in San Diego, that has the best weather in 16 the entire world. 17 I also want to thank Commissioner Braceras 18 for mentioning the Navy scholarship program. 19 Captain in the United States Naval Reserve and very, 20 very much involved in recruiting minority officers 21 into the Navy. And so I want to thank you for that, 22 Commissioner. That's a real important activity and I 23 think we want to make sure that our armed forces and 24 are Navy reflects the diversity of our nation.

The California State Advisory Committee is

presently involved with several -- several projects. And we have completed a post-9/11 forum in San Diego and one in San Francisco. And on November the 20th we'll be holding a forum in Sacramento as a continuation of our 9/11 project.

The final city to be reviewed will be Los Angeles. And then upon completion of this project, the committee would like to issue one report focusing on what is happening post 9/11 in the four cities and how civil rights in each of these cities is being handled and the state of civil rights post-9/11.

Each one -- each city will be a separate chapter in the report.

Recently the Western Regional Office received complaints of discrimination against minority officers in the City of Huntington Park. And the regional staff and I discussed the situations and we agreed that these Huntington Park officers, the minority officers should be referred to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The staff communicated with the regional director of EEOC asking him to meet with these police officers. And this was due to the delicacy, as you might imagine, of the police officers challenging their own department.

director of EEOC spent dood 1 The afternoon discussing the ramifications of their filing 2 3 against the Huntington Park Police complaint 4 Department. And subsequently these minority officers filed a complaint against the Huntington Park Police 5 6 Department. 7 **EEOC** investigating The is now 8 complaints of discrimination and unequal treatment. 9 The Regional Director and I met with the 10 city attorney and the police chief to get a background 11 on these complaints. And we will be holding a forum 12 in Huntington Park in the very near future to look at 13 allegations of discrimination and unequal treatment 14 against minority police officers in Huntington Park. 15 We are also going to look at the grievance 16 procedure that the Police Department uses in -- and 17 their complaint process for aggrieved officers, so 18 we'll be holding that forum in the next few weeks. 19 In California there have been two consent 20 decrees filed against two police departments. 21 Department of Justice filed in federal court, asking 22 the court to set a consent decree against the Los 23 Angeles Police Department, and the request was 24 honored.

In Los Angeles City we have a new police

chief. And the committee has voted to analyze the consent decree and to hold a public forum in the first part of the year. The staff's been collecting data, and all the SAC members have received a copy of the consent decree.

I'd like to thank Judge Gil Alston, who is here, who did a great job in analyzing for the SAC the two consent decrees. And he's done a line-by-line analysis of the consent decree. And the fact that he's been a superior court judge helps him to -- helps the SAC to make sense out of some very, very difficult legal terminology. And he's done a great job helping us to understand exactly what the decrees say and what they're asking. So he'll talk a little bit more about that in a bit.

The other police department that we'll be analyzing with respect to the second consent decree is the Riverside Police Department, where the state Attorney General has filed against the department.

The committee has voted to hold a briefing in Riverside and to analyze the progress of the consent decree.

Now the committee feels strongly that these two consent decrees have to be looked over by a committee to make sure that they're progressing and

~ 8

. 16

that all the powers that be are carrying out the mandate of the courts.

Judge Alston's analysis I think is going to help us to ask the right questions and try to get to the bottom of exactly what it is that's going on with these consent decrees.

We also intend to collaborate with four other SACs, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, to explore some of the issues that you explored earlier with respect to border problems.

In our San Francisco meeting we recently had a rather spirited discussion surrounding the whole issue of border violence and the associated problems of people coming across the border trying to get into the United States and the deaths and the way that some of the authorities have been handling these unfortunate people that are crossing the border into the United States.

I'm real pleased that my fellow chair from Arizona is here. It's going to give me an opportunity to pursue a little further exactly how we want to do this, but we are intent on working with the other SACs on this problems because it's a huge problem and it's a problem that cannot be addressed by just one SAC. We think we really need to take on a regional

approach.

And I'm gratified that the Commission looked at the issue here. And it may well be that we can work very, very closely with you as you begin to look at these issues and we're of course going to be transmitting all that we find along to you.

Finally, I'd like to say that we have another concern and it's a concern that we're going to be looking at down the line once we finish these projects, and that's the state of minorities in higher education here in California.

Given the impact of affirmative action, one of the things that we've been concerned about and that we've received a lot of complaints about is access to higher education on the part of minorities.

And, in addition to access, we're also concerned about the number of minorities represented on the faculties and the administration of both the California State University and the University of California.

These are areas where we're getting a lot of complaints and where there's an awful lot of concern being raised.

daresay probably in the world. It's a fine system, but we're beginning to get really concerned about whether minorities are going to be participating in representative numbers in these two very, very fine systems.

Finally I'd like to say that the United States Commission on Civil Rights is a very, very important commission. We're gratified that you're reconnecting with the SACs again. You are the conscience, the moral conscience of the United States of America.

You play a very, very important role in our communities. When you come to San Diego or California, or whatever state you're in, you represent the best of what this nation has to offer.

And we are very gratified that you're here in California. And we support the work of the Commission. We're think you're very, very important and we feel that the United States needs the Commission on Civil Rights. And we are — and as the Chair of the SAC, I know — the California SAC, I know I speak on behalf of the State Advisory Committee of California in saying that we will do everything we possibly can to support your work and to partner with you to make sure that the moral conscience of America

stays alive and well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you again. And I want to just -finish my remarks thank, in particular, before I who's resident of Commissioner Cruz Reynoso, a California and who has been great for the State He attends our committee meetings Advisory Committee. from time to time. He's attended our forums. And I just want to say on behalf of the entire SAC of California, Commissioner, thank you very much for all of the fine work that you've done with us and for being a partner in helping the Commission and the State Advisory Committee do its work.

Thank you very much. And I'd now like to introduce my colleague from Arizona, June Vignery.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.

DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: I too would like to express the Arizona SAC's appreciation for your coming to this region of the country.

This opportunity for us to share with you the issues and concerns of this locality is valuable not only for the civil rights health of this region, but actually the United States. And I know it takes some work on our part to get to different regions of our country. It's a big country, but what you are doing is invaluable and thank you for being here to

listen to us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Arizona SAC has engaged in several activities, and I'll just briefly mention. We have held two hearings to date on the education of minority children and also the Justice system in Arizona and it's treatment of minorities. Those hearings have been held in Tucson and in Flagstaff.

A third one has been put on hold, but will be -- I gather from talking with our Regional Director, we'll be able to hold this shortly in the Phoenix area so that we can complete that series of hearings.

At the same time we have met or I have met with the state Attorney General after 9/11 to discuss profiling of Muslims in our state. And that was with our Regional Director.

But the most important thing that we have done this year has -- and that's not to say that those hearings are not extremely important and at the top of our list, but we have had 320 deaths on the border in Arizona this summer. And it is extremely at the top of the list not only of the political community -- if you could have heard the gubernatorial candidates talk about also this in Arizona, but the economic development community.

What is happening there is just crucial that we deal with it. So on August 23rd, 2002, the Arizona SAC held a factfinding hearing to gather information about Mexican nationals -- and at that time we learned there are many other nationals crossing the border -- and attempting to cross into southern Arizona from Mexico.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We held the hearing because this issue of the deaths was the primary problem that we saw at that time. We're concerned about the deaths. And Arizona — and it's very salient in Arizona and a top priority issue for our religious leaders as well.

Media coverage of the issue has been and continues to be extensive, as your packet of media materials demonstrates. And that continues, and I just recently -- I brought one article over with me that I'll be quoting from that was just in the newspaper just recently.

Representatives from both public agencies private organizations and approved before the committee to address the situation along the border. We heard testimony from Henry Ramon, who is the Vice Chair, of the Tohono O'odham Nation. We heard Robin Hoover, Humane Borders; Katie Hudak, BorderLinks; David Aguilar, U.S. Border Patrol; Andy

Silverman, University of Arizona, College of Law; Aljania Cabrerra, who is Deputy Counsel General from the consulate of Mexico; the Reverend John Fife, Samaritan Patrol; and many others.

Much of what was presented by the speakers yesterday addressed what we heard. Operation Safeguard in Arizona does channel border crossers to rural Arizona, where they enter into one of the driest and harshest desert environments in the world.

Vice Chair Ramon of the Tohono O'odham Nation emphasized an issue which was not addressed The Tohono O'odham Nation yesterday concerning this. occupies a large portion of this rural area. people live on both sides of the border, and about O'odham 1400 the Tohono People, and they registered, live on the Mexican side. Seven thousand on the United States side are U.S. citizens, but they can't produce documentation because, as Ramon stated, historically the Native People did not document on paper. And the elders were primarily born at home. Thus no birth -- no birth certificates are there, and this is a problem.

These people are harassed by the Border Patrol incessantly. He stated, "Our people are no longer free to travel. They are intimidated, their

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Border Patrol agents, 1 by the vehicles tailgated looking into their cars, shining bright lights in 2 their faces, running them off the road, asking them to 3 produce documents they don't have." 4 "Now our people," to quote Ramon, 5 afraid to go out in the open to gather native plants 6 7 and fruits because they're warned if they stop you and you don't have papers, 'We will deport you.'" And the 8 people who are born here on the reservation would be 9 10 at a loss if they're deported to the other side. 11 So most of the elders who don't have birth 12 certificates hide from the Border Patrol. Further, he 13 said, the Border Patrol has not sought agreement or permission to operate on the reservation. 14 15 Reverend Fife, of the Samaritan Patrol, 16 described the need for change in Border Patrol and 17 Immigration Officials' policy so we do not 18 another summer of record deaths. 19 He warned that the attempt now to seal the 20 border is impossible. There are 2,500 miles of desert 21 and mountains out there. And what it takes to control 22 a border we learned from the example of the migration 23 between east and west Berlin during the Cold War. 24 That wasn't a remote desert wilderness 25 It was an urban area of about 37 miles. area.

border officials tried to control and seal that border 1 with everything you've heard about going down on this 2 3 border and more. number the of border 4 increased Thev agents; that didn't do it. They built a wall -- that 5 They militarized the border with 6 it. didn't do 7 military units; that didn't do it. They tried 8 helicopters and dogs; that didn't do it. 9 They built two walls, that didn't do it. it did was to mine the area with landmines 10 11 between these two walls, put a machine gun nest every 12 50 yards and issue shoot-to-kill orders. And that's 13 what it took and in urban area of just 37 miles to 14 seal off the border. 15 You can imagine the cost to do that over 16 2,500 miles, let alone the human and moral cost of 17 putting machine gun nests and landmines along that 18 border and issuing shoot-to-kill orders. 19 your press packets are suggested In 20 matters for solving the border problem and saving 21 lives from both Reverend Fife and Vice Chairman Ramon, 22 as well as U.S. Congressman Jim Colby and U.S. Border 23 Patrol Chief David Aguilar. 24 The Arizona SAC also made recommendations 25 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights after the hearing was over. They voted to send a letter to you which was sent on September 6th, 2002 requesting the One, a call for formal congressional following: hearings on the issue of deaths of people crossing into the U.S. from Mexico. We are concerned that if something isn't done quickly we will have deaths again next year, and it will rest on our conscience. And, number two, the Commission support HR 2348, which has been introduced to address the Tohono O'odham People and their U.S. citizenship. In conclusion, recently the Tucson Citizen ran an editorial from Ricard Pimentel, an Arizona Republic columnist. It stated that, quote: should be outraged at the deaths of 320 border crossers last fiscal year. It is a national tragedy. Three hundred and twenty is 152 more than died in the Oklahoma City bombing. They are dying to come to work in the United States. Our business interests are desperate Immigration reform, that they continue to do so. visas allowed Mexicans. expanding the number of Helping Mexico narrow the gap between its economy and These, more than militarizing the

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

ours.

Amnesty.

border, will save lives.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. Thank you 2 very much. DR. HERNANDEZ: I'd now like to introduce 3 4 Judge Gilbert Alston, a member of the California SAC. 5 JUDGE ALSTON: Welcome to California, 6 I will keep my remarks to a time limit Commissioners. 7 I would like to comment on in order to conserve time. 8 the last issue that the Arizona SAC Chairman mentioned 9 to you, and that is the selective policing of the 10 border which is causing the deaths in the desert. 11 This is something which could be changed 12 by a simple policy change on the part of the Border 13 Patrol to channel the border crossers away from the 14 most difficult routes across the border and into the 15 United States, into those that are the easiest. Ιt 16 would make their job a little easier because if 17 apprehension is their goal, certainly the border 18 crossers would take the easy routes and eschew the 19 difficult ones. That can be done with the stroke of a 20 pen. 21 The gentleman who did testify in Arizona, 22 the chairman -- or the Director, David Aquilar, the 23 Chief of the Border Patrol, did not seem to realize 24 that his agency's method of enforcing the immigration 25 laws was the basic cause of the deaths of the desert.

He was concentrating primarily on the *coyotes*, who are the people who smuggle -- the smuggler who smuggle the aliens in. His focus was on apprehending them.

He did have some sympathy for the workers, but did not seem to realize that his enforcement methods were a primary cause of the deaths. The coyotes were taking the routes and losing the people because the other routes were heavily patrolled by his agency.

Turning from that to the consent decrees that we have in Riverside and in Los Angeles. We do have a new Chief of Police now in Los Angeles. You've probably all read about Mr. Bratton. He comes to us from New York, and has an excellent reputation of reform.

I saw Mr. Bratton being interviewed on a news broadcast just last week. And he made mention of the consent decrees in the same sentence as other obstacles like changing officers' attitudes and other things that were -- I don't know exactly how to put it, but he put us in a category of thinking of the consent decrees as one of those things that somehow he was going to have to get around or, quote, get rid of.

He speaks -- he talks a good game. He says he's for the kind of reformation of the Police

Department that the consent decrees is directing. This is an excellent chance for the Commission to get together with Mr. Bratton to analyze what has been done prior to his coming onboard and to assist him in getting the balance of the consent decree up and running and enforced.

All of the consent decrees -- both of the consent decrees contain paragraphs which specify time limits by which certain things must be done and reports must be made. We do not have the information as to whether or not those reports have been filed and whether those things have been done. It would be very simple and nonconfrontational simply to establish which things have not been done, which things are behind schedule, and to offer our assistance in helping him get those things taken care of.

Any questions you might have, I prepared an analysis of each decree which might be helpful if you wish to go through the decree. The one on the L.A. consent decree should be on your left knee while the consent degree is on your right knee as you're going through it. The one on the Riverside decree is more general. I listed the things, the basic elements of the decree and the time limitations that were placed on those things, and it would be rather simple

1	there too to make an inquiry of the chief there.
2	The chief there is also new, incidentally,
3	and has come aboard since the decree was entered into.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which chief?
5	JUDGE ALSTON: Riverside.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Riverside.
7	JUDGE ALSTON: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The suggestion you
9	made about the meeting with Mr. Bratton,
10	JUDGE ALSTON: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: the Chief. I
12	really hadn't thought about that. The Commission is
13	already on record and has a policy concerning the LAPD
14	and the County, because we did a report on it and we
15	made recommendations. And that was a report that Cruz
16	Reynoso may recall, and you may too, Fernando, and the
17	rest of you, that we
18	DR. HERNANDEZ: Could you speak up, Mary?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: we found a number
20	of serious problem with the which had been in
21	existence for a long time and made some
22	recommendations and highlighted them. And the $L.A.$
23	Times, I think it was, wrote an article
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Editorial.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: an editorial saying

we shouldn't have done that because everything was 1 fine and dandy in the L.A. Police Department. 2 a month or two after that that all the information 3 4 came out that everything we said was exactly right in 5 the paper, so the reporter who had done a little story on it called me and said he was shocked to find out 6 7 that this was the case. 8 But, in any case, I think, Phil, in terms 9 of follow up, maybe what we ought to do is you -- and 10 we can just do this, we don't need because we already 11 have a policy, to set up a meeting, I'd be happy to 12 come out and go with you guys to meet with Bratton, 13 and to go over this. And I'd like to take a look at 14 the consent decree. 15 If you will just share with the 16 information with us, we can distribute it to anyone 17 who's interested, any Commissioners, and just go over 18 some of these items and talk about their responses. 19 And we might do it with the Riverside one, 20 but on L.A. we clearly have a record of 21 recommendations and analyzes and all the rest of that 22 that I think we could act on, and see where we get. 23 JUDGE ALSTON: We have something here in 24 California called the three strikes law.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

25

Right, we heard of it.

1	JUDGE ALSTON: And we're on the third
2	strike with respect to the Police Department. We had
.3	Willy Williams, we've had Chief Parks. Neither one of
4	them could do anything with the Police Department. We
5	now have Bratton and I think that he is our third
6	strike. And I think we have to get behind him.
7	The Los Angeles Police Department, by
8	virtue of being here in Hollywood, and getting all the
9	publicity they get, they kind of set the stage. They
10	the set the standard for police departments all over
11	the country.
12	If we can't tame the L.A. Police
13	Department, we can't tame any of them. And Bratton
14	needs every bit of help that he can get in order to do
15	that. And if we can come in in an advisory kind of
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
17	JUDGE ALSTON: helping role, he might
18	be able to do it.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. Because of my
20	impression of him is that he, from the experience in
21	New York and other experiences, is that he would be
22	receptive.
23	And the comments that you that he made
24	that you referred to probably were comments made in

ignorance of what was actually going on.

25

And I'm sure

	'
1	he's got a whole load of problems to deal with, but we
2	might do that. If you want to follow up on that, I'd
3	be perfectly happy to do so.
4	MR. MONTEZ: We'll get copies of the
5	consent decree to the Staff Director along with the
6	analysis of Dr
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, the analysis.
8	MR. MONTEZ: Judge Alston.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I wanted to say to
10	Chairperson Vignery from Arizona. The Staff Director
11	said that there is in preparation some kind of summary
12	of what they recommended. I don't know whether there
13	are any time sensitive issues in your recommendations.
14	I myself I don't know about the other
15	Commissioners. I didn't know anything about the issue
16	of the Native Indian population and the border issues
17	as related to that community being divided and the
18	elders not having documentation. It's like my mother
19	not being able to get on the airplane because she
20	doesn't have a driver's license, and she's 87.
21	But, anyway, yes.
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: What's the name of
23	that bill again?
24	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: It's HR
25	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 2348.

1	JUDGE ALSTON: 2348.
2	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: 2348.
3	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And what's your sense
4	as far as support for that in Arizona?
5	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Well, the support in
6	Arizona is strong for that. The they've been on
7	the Tribal Rolls since 1938 in the Indian
8	Reorganization Act.
9	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Right.
10	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: And many live this
11	is not only on the United States side of the border,
12	but it's on the Mexican side. And they've always had
13	the opportunity to travel back and forth. And it's
14	only been since 9/11 that that's been cut off.
15	And at the same time the citizenship
16	status of those in Mexico is in question. But the
17	ones, as I said, on the United States side, they have
18	no birth certificates, so it's a very deep problem for
19	them.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So this bill would
21	regularize their status?
22	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Yes, uh-huh.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We need to know more
24	about that to see if we want to I mean I don't know
25	what the status of it is or where it is. Congress of

course is not --

DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Well, I know there's been visitations from delegations from Arizona to the congressional offices in Washington on this. And we understood it was on the right track for passage. And then 9/11 happened and everything got...

DR. HERNANDEZ: But that's also the other reason why I think we have out have a multistate approach to this and a multistate project. As we started looking at this issue. And if you remember a few years ago, the committee did a multistate project on border violence.

And I think we did some really good work there. It was picked up widely be the press and I think forwarded to the Commission. And the Commission also helped us in terms of calming the situation and improving the border violence problem.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.

DR. HERNANDEZ: But what we're looking at now is with these deaths and all the associated problems, it's not going to be enough to look at it just in an isolated situation just in Arizona, because we're experiencing similar problems in some of the desert areas in California that are less patrolled and certain the same can be said of Texas and New Mexico.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

this. And I think one of the things that we found very, very positive the last time we did this, is when you get four SACs together, pieces of the puzzle start coming together in a very interesting fashion. And I think this is something that the four SACs could collaborate with the entire Commission on and I think really move on agenda and begin to help the nation figure out what it's going to do with its border.

And there are a lot of issues associated with those people crossing the border. And I think the nation has to face those issues. And certainly you can provide the moral leadership to take the country in the right direction with respect to the human lives that are at stake here because we're talking about large numbers of people dying because they want to come to the United States to have a better life.

These are not bad people. It's a real problem. And it's something that ends up being very inhumane in the long run. So we want to take a look at this. And we think that a four-state approach, multistate approach to this is going to have much more impact than if just California did or just Texas or just Arizona.

1.3

know, we went out yesterday and had good meetings with people from the Border Patrol and we heard from people here. And it just seemed that, you know, the Border Patrol, these folks are trying to do their jobs. And there's so many inconsistencies in the policy and so many things that are detrimental.

and I hadn't thought about that either. I guess that's why we have meetings and stuff, so we can think about things we never thought about before. But, anyway, that the funneling of migrants, that they might funnel them into an easy-to-cross area and then arrest them, from the Border Patrol's standpoint, which would make their job easier because they could funnel them there and arrest them, as opposed to funneling them to someplace where they're likely to go out and die, where the terrain is rough.

But of course they're more visible if you funnel them someplace that is heavily populated. That's one of the political issues. And it's one reason why they were diverted from the San Diego area, for example, because it had become a hot political issue.

And so the diversion, which I think when

it was done, well-meaning people didn't think about in 1 getting the problem out of sight. It's going to be 2 out of mind because they're going to go die. They 3 were just thinking out of sight, out of mind, and 4 5 maybe they'll stop coming and not making those 6 connections. 7 But your idea of channeling them to the easy areas, they were already coming to the easy 8 9 areas, and they decided to do the opposite, right? 10 Well, Madam Chair, the DR. HERNANDEZ: 11 other thing is that, I think that needs to be pointed 12 out here, and I think Chairman -- Chairwoman Vignery pointed it out, is why do they keep coming. They keep 13 14 coming because there's a need. 15 It's '90 just that they're coming to someplace and they don't have any place to go. 16 They 17 come and they get employed. They actually 18 And I think if you look around the San employment. 19 Diego area and you look at who's washing the dishes, 2.0 who's washing the cars, who's serving your food, who's 21 parking your cars, --22 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Who's cooking 23 Chinese food. 24 DR. HERNANDEZ: Exactly. -- what you're 25

going to find is they look a lot like the people that

are crossing the border. And there's an awful lot of people making an awful lot of money off of people that cross the border.

And so the other part of the issue is not just funneling people so that they can be arrested, but the other part of the issue is that those that do cross, find a place. And why. So it's not — it's not just that these people are breaking the law, they're getting across.

I think the thing that people miss is that there's also people that are breaking the law on the other side of the border, employing these people. And I think that we've got to begin to face up to the issue. And certainly this is true in California and this would — this is true in terms of the California economy.

If you took all those illegal immigrants and put them back in Mexico tomorrow, the California economy would be devastated, would be devastated. And daresay the same is probably true for Arizona, Texas, and New Mexico.

So the other half of this is the issue of economic justice. And who's making money off of these people. It goes both ways. And the other half is never talked about. All we focus on is these poor

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	people trying to get across the border, being
2	arrested, the Border Patrol racking up numbers. But
3	what happens to the people that get past the Border
4	Patrol, where do they go and what do they contribute
<i>-</i> 5	to this country. That story hasn't been told. And I
6	think that's one of the things we want to focus on as
7	we get together with our other colleagues to see what
8	is going on, what is the business side of the
9	immigration question.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Um-hum. Right.
11	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: An excellent issue.
12	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: The question of
13	militias was raised before we took our seats here.
14	And the militia question was addressed in the
15	transcript, which I gather you're going to receive a
16	synopsis of?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We're going to work
18	up a synopsis where
19	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Well, there are
20	there are. And we have, one of the members of our SAC
21	has been threatened by the militia. She is an
22	advocate for changing what's happening on the border.
23	And we've had disappearances in Arizona of people
24	coming across. And I think there's article in your
25	news packet which refers to that, where the militia

1	has probably been involved.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: These are vigilante
3	groups?
4	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Yeah.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
6	JUDGE ALSTON: I would like to make one
7	comment about House Resolution 2348. The Tohono
8	O'odham Nation is an Indian Tribe that was here in
9	1492. How does it look for us to be passing a
10	resolution declaring them to be citizens? Isn't that
11	a little bit ridiculous.
12	Their reservation or their Native lands
13	were cut in half by the was it the Treaty of
14	Guadalupe Hildago with Mexico?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
16	JUDGE ALSTON: And this is the difficulty:
17	They live on both sides of the border. We did it to
18	them. They didn't do it to us.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Shouldn't those
20	folks have dual citizenship? It's not the only tribe
21	that was cut in this fashion. And until certain
22	years, they certainly not until the late '30s or '40s
23	did we start sort of looking strictly at restricting
24	folk going both ways. So until rather recently,
25	historically speaking, these folk were able to go to

1	Mexico and come back without being harassed.
2	And it seems to me that we might go beyond
3	2348 and suggest that these folks are perfect
4	candidates for dual citizenship.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Isn't it true
6	JUDGE ALSTON: As a law professor, sir,
7	you know that the Constitution says that if you're
8	born of American parents in another country you're a
9	citizen.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Right.
11	JUDGE ALSTON: So that automatically makes
12	them citizens.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, no, but
14	presumably there are some who just live I assume
15	there are some who just live on the Mexico side whose
16	children are born there. But they still belong to the
17	same tribe.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Isn't it true on the
19	northern border too that isn't it true on the
20	northern border
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Sure. Sure.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: that there are
23	tribes are there tribes that are on both sides of
24	the Canadian-U.S. border?
25	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yeah. Some of the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1	Mohawk Tribes.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There are?
3	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes, um-hum.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So among all the
5	things that we have on our list, we need to get
6	somebody to look into that whole general topic.
7	Let me does anyone else have anything
8	else that they would like to either say or ask our SAC
9	representatives before we thank them for their
10	wonderful service and say that we will follow up on
11	the recommendations and we'll read with interest the
12	materials that you give us?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
14	just I assume that the staff will send a copy of
15	the material that we received to the Commissioners who
16	are not here present?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, of course.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
20	Well, thank you very, very much.
21	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who's the governor.
23	You mentioned the governor of Arizona? I know who the
24	governor of California is.
25	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Oh, it's Janet

1	Napolitano, who was our attorney general.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you've got a new
3	governor?
4	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Yes.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Pretty tight
6	election, huh?
7	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Very tight.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. Okay. Thank
9	you.
10	Now we have a presentation. We want to
11	discuss the where am I the presentation on
12	education?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
15	Terri, let's do your presentation.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
17	I'd just like to recognize the presence of Penny
18	Edgert, who's here today, who's very involved with
19	higher education in California. And so she was
20	interested in hearing this report.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, all right.
22	Welcome.
23	Thank you, Terri.
24	MS. DICKERSON: Good morning.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Good morning.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good morning to you.
2	MS. DICKERSON: This is a review that the
3	Office of Civil Rights Evaluation conducted.
4	I'll move over to here because there's
5	some feedback for some reason. I guess, as usual, I'm
6	the only thing standing between you and lunch. And I
7	have
8	(Laughter.)
9	MS. DICKERSON: And, as usual, I have
10	data,
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, good.
12	MS. DICKERSON: which I hope you find
13	fascinating.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I enjoyed reading your
15	draft very much.
16	MS. DICKERSON: Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. I'm
18	looking forward to looking at it on the screen.
19	X. Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. This is a
21	staff report and the staff authors who worked on this
22	were Sock-Foon MacDougall, she was the Team Leader;
23	and the people who served on the Team were Wanda
24	Johnson; Margaret Butler, Monique Dennis-Elmore;
25	Manuel Alba; and Mireille Zieseniss basically our

whole office conducted this analysis. 1 percentage plans, the 2 looked at Wе challenge of equal opportunity in higher education. 3 And the purpose was to update and expand on the 2000 4 report that was issued by the Commission Toward an 5 Understanding of Percentage Plans in Higher Education: 6 Are They Effective Substitutes for Affirmative Action. 7 review admissions 8 wanted to We also policies, national enrollment trends, to give 9 context to the percentage plans and to examine what 10 the federal role is, since that is our interest. 11 do this we obtained 12 order to In application admission enrollment data from the States .13 of California, Texas, and Florida. And we also got 14 national enrollment data from the internet that we 15 this 16 analyzed and made part reviewed and 17 examination. We also looked at literature from a number 18 19 did a pretty extensive We of other sources. literature review and we conducted some interviews 20 21 with federal, state, and university officials. 22 So the data you got CHAIRPERSON BERRY: from the states is their official data? 23 24 MS. DICKERSON: Yes, it is. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right.

MS. DICKERSON: We got it directly from the schools.

evaluated of In all that. we addition, we'll go -- the report went into some detail about the schools we reviewed and why we looked at the ones that were affected by percentage plans. states it's across the board, in others it's not. primarily looked at those that had flagship status or those that were involved in the percentage plan programs, to just begin to develop a picture of the effects admissions policies on minority of new enrollment in particular.

Okav. Well, let's talk about affirmative action. Traditional affirmative action programs were already significantly improving diversity on college I guess affirmative action really came campuses. about in the 1960s and visible progress was really evident by the 1980s, though some disparities still existed in higher education. And some of the admissions policies started to be challenged in the 1990s.

There were a lot of legal and legislative challenges in recent years, including the consideration of race in admissions, financial aid, recruitment and outreach programs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

នន Kind of setting the stage for this review and for talking about percentage plans. In the report we noted that challenges seem as if they are going to The Supreme Court, looks like there are continue. some cases that are moving through the system, and the Supreme Court may have an opportunity to speak on this again, sometime soon, in fact. And the challenges that we know have resulted in percentage plans have in the states of California, Texas, and Florida. the Let's talk just about Okay. 12 percentage plans. at the paper, we looked at a number of other things.

And then, as you know from looking For example, national enrollment trends and the impact of the SAT and other success predictors.

But just talking about percentage plans first the University of California. The alone, University of California had a 12.5-percent plan for admissions since 1960. So that was before the race ban in the state as well as after. This is the only state in which there was a percentage plan in place even before the race ban.

And it's interesting to at so California because you can look at the effect percentage plans both with and without affirmative

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

action. And by affirmative action, I guess I'm generally talking about consideration of race in admissions decisions, but also if you talk about affirmative action you can talk about outreach programs as well that target minority students.

Since the race bans came into effect the plan has undergone modifications. Some of the modifications, the modifications were made to increase the diversity of the students. One of the modifications was the Four Percent Plan and the other was the comprehensive review. These are just in California.

The Four Percent Plan admits California students who graduate in the top four percent of their high schools. And this expands the eligible pool to includes students who rank near the top in their school but not the top 12 percent graduates statewide. So what I mean by that is say statewide the 12 percent of students had a GPA of 3.5. I have a GPA of 3.4, but I'm still in the top four percent of my high school, even though I didn't meet the statewide cutoff, then the plan was modified to include students like me, like that would be in that example.

And the whole idea is to drill a little deeper and get students who didn't qualify statewide,

but they are very good students. And, you know, maybe it sort of evens out the inequalities in the infrastructure that might be across the state and the differences between school districts.

The other is the comprehensive review. That was the other modification that came about after the affirmative action ban. And it expanded the existing 10, that purely academic selection criteria, to include four nonacademic factors: Motivation, leadership, initiative. There's another one that I don't have listed right here. I can't recall right now.

What were the effects of the race ban and the policy changes? The race ban further reduced the already small portions of African American, Hispanic, and Native American students in the U.C. system's undergraduate and professional schools. The recent changes in policies have been accompanied by small professional increases in undergraduate and applications and admissions from underrepresented the minorities, compared to when race ban was initially imposed.

Further effects. For both undergraduate and professional schools, the proportions of the groups remain lower than they were before the race

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

ban. In particular, the chances of undergraduate admission for African American, Hispanic, and Native American applicants to the L.A., Berkeley, and San Diego campuses dropped.

This is what we found when we reviewed the data. For the U.C. system as a whole, higher rates of underrepresented minorities didn't always result in higher enrollment rates in the undergraduate and professional schools.

as affirmative action far Now as Prior to the race ban, the University of outreach. California had an array of affirmative action programs that were intended to increase minority students' eligibility rates for college. These are like Stay in and programs that -- workshops. School Programs Things that help students sometimes in the lower grades, but also in high school, mentoring programs, things of that nature that are targeted specifically to black, Hispanic, Native American students based on race and their families.

Because of the ban, the University of California wasn't allowed to target outreach in that way. So they've changed those programs. They when —the programs became more targeted to disadvantaged students and high schools with low numbers of students

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

attending the university -- attending the University of California.

They extended efforts deeper into the middle and elementary schools, especially to beef up and math since preparation. And they also tried to double in size the number and results of the previous outreach program. So they doubled the amount of money they were putting into it. They tried to include twice as many students and they tried to admit twice as many students.

The University of California outreach programs currently include programs for enrichment, mentoring, and scholarships for disadvantaged students, but these aren't based on race.

Making the process of transferring from community colleges was another part of it. Making that easier, because a lot of the -- if you read the report, a lot of minority students tend to be in the community colleges. Improving the teaching skills in low performing schools, so better preparing -- so that they can better prepare students for college admission and facilitating teacher recruitment and retention.

The full effects of these programs is really not going to be known for years to come. For example, the ones that were put in place for eighth

1.3

graders in the past year, we won't know for four years 1 when those students start applying for college what 2 3 the effect of these programs are. in conclusion, for California, 4 5 race ban has resulted in admitting and enrolling 6 smaller proportions of African Americans, Hispanics, 7 and Native Americans than it did with affirmative 8 modifications to the long action programs; and 9 existing percentage plan and extended outreach have 10 yet to overcome the detrimental effects of the ban. 11 Now we're in Texas. Okay. We looked at 12 the Hopwood ruling which abolishes the use of race or 13 ethnicity as college recruitment, admission, financial 14 aid, and student retention criteria in the is that. 15 The plan was initiated in '88 -- I mean in 16 '98. And the percentage plan was -- came about as a 17 588. result of HB This quaranties high school 18 graduates in the top ten percent of their classes 19 admission to Texas public schools or university of 20 their choice. 21 Now the non-10 percent students are not 22 guaranteed admission. Whether ornot they are 23 admitted depending we seats that are left over after 24 the 10 percent have made their decisions about whether

or not they're going to accept the offers from the

Texas schools.

Admissions and guidelines apply to students not ranked in the top 10 percent. And at the point that that determination is made and if a student is not in the top 10 percent, the university can consider a student's academic performance and other factors. They can look at socioeconomic background and standardized test scores in order to make that determination.

December 2001, the Texas A&M system regents tentatively approved a plan that would pursue the top 20 percent of students at approximately 250 low-performing or disadvantage high schools. These are schools that are perennially underrepresented or are never represented in the top 10 percent. They've never had a student to qualify in the top 10 percent.

So legal concerns prompted the University to table this proposal, though. The concerns were associated with how many schools, what number of schools, is it 250, how — at what level does it go too far to not comply with Hopwood. So there were so many concerns about that, that this was tabled.

In 1994 during affirmative action admission policies, the racial and ethnic breakdown at the University of Texas at Austin was white, 65

percent; blacks, 5 percent; Hispanics 15 percent. All minorities 36 percent. And Hopwood has had a profound effect on minority enrollment. Blacks are now less three percent and Hispanics are less than 13 percent, whereas they used to be 15.

The primary beneficiaries have been Asian

The primary beneficiaries have been Asian Pacific Americans. Asian American enrollment increased initially. It was a very perceptible jump eventually, but it's leveled off since. So that's something that really the state universities should continue to examine and track to see if it has leveled off, if it's going to increase or decrease or stay the same.

They still struggle to recruit, especially, African American students. They are 12 percent of the state's population but, as I said, only three percent of the school system.

The Texas Universities are continuing to look for methods to admit more minorities within the legal boundaries of *Hopwood*. For example, they have started the "Keep Texans in Texas Program" in that they have matched scholarship offers from out-of-state schools to try to keep the Texas students in the Texas schools.

Overall the number of minority students

declined at the University of The 1 has percentage of applicants admitted has declined and the 2 number of those admitted, who actually enroll has 3 declined since the 1996 --4 5 So the applications CHAIRPERSON BERRY: are up, but the applicants admitted and the admittees 6 7 who enroll have declined? 8 MS. DICKERSON: Correct. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. In '96 UT Austin admitted 10 MS. DICKERSON: 11 57 percent of black applicants. But by 2001 black 12 applicants had increased by 24 percent, but admittees decreased by 19 percentage points. 13 14 Only 38 percent applicants were admitted 15 in 2001 and of those only 266 total enrolled. So pre-16 race ban 1996: 2,496 Hispanics applied. 65 percent 17 were admitted. And by 2001, fewer Hispanics were 18 admitted in 2001 than in 1996. The number of 19 Hispanics applied had increased by 20 percent, but the 20 percentage who were admitted decreased by 15 percent. 21 So we can really see there's been a profound effect 22 enrollment African American Hispanic and 23 enrollment. 24 The University of Texas at Austin was 25 concerned about declined minority enrollment, and they

have started to take action. And one action that they have attempted to draw students, they created the "Long Horn Scholarship Program." It's aimed at low income high schools. And they awarded 64 four-year, need-based scholarships in the first year.

the relationship going to see We're financial need and minority enrollment between little bit earlier, as it was expressed in the paper. As for graduate and professional schools, the number of minorities in graduate and professional schools is declining since Hopwood as well. Even though the 10 percent plan doesn't apply to professional schools, it really can't because the source of that is high schools in the state. But minority enrollment rose at both law school, 17 percent in 2000 -- the year 2000-2001, the academic year. This was only a one percent increase from the previous academic year and overall a seven-and-a-half percent decline from when the plan began in 1996.

As well, although minority admissions data from the three law schools varied to some extent, the U. T. Austin school of law has admitted fewer minorities in each of the post *Hopwood* years that we looked at.

The most recent data on minority

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

98 enrollment at the University of Texas Medical School 1 shows that five and a half percent fewer enrolled 2 students are students, when compared to the 1997-1998 3 4 year. The only grouped to have experienced a 5 steady increase at the University of Texas Medical 6 7 Branch was Asian Pacific Americans. And, again, time is going to tell if that trend continues. 8

is going to tell if that trend continues. But, generally, the trend foretells a further reduction of minority enrollments in the coming years, if they continue the direction they are now.

Outlawing race, conscience affirmative action programs and higher education in Texas has had a negative impact on minority enrollment at the University of Texas, Austin. And I'm talking about overall minority.

And also increasing at some schools, minority admission rates have mostly declined at the premier Texas law and medical schools. Some of the main conclusions, after we looked at taxes.

And let's go to Florida now. The Florida percentage program has its roots in the order, an 1999 order which banned the use of race or ethnicity in University of admissions and replaced it with the Talent 20 Program. That took effect in the year 2000

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

quarantees

-- academic year 2000-2001. And it does not apply to graduate, law, and medical admissions. similarly This program admission to one Florida's 11 public institution. Who's eligible? Any Florida resident who graduated in the top 20 percent of his or her public class. students also must have completed a prescribed 19-unit academic high school curriculum. The number of units is spelled out in the report, the Florida section of the report. The Talented 20 Program is one of three pathways to enrollment in the state University system. The second is through traditional criteria, reviewing SAT, ACT, and GPA. And the third is the profile assessment which examines nonacademic factors for students who may have a weak high school record, then schools can start out look at their background. That's in a nutshell the talented 20 program. The use of class ranks in admissions decisions particularly hurts blacks, is what we found, in their access to higher education. Specifically, of their weaker high school performance because relative to other groups, blacks have the smallest

percentage of high school graduates qualifying for the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Talented 20 students.

2.5

You look at black high school graduates, blacks have the smallest percentage applying to college.

We looked at three classes in our review. And what we found is the percentage of blacks identified as Talented 20 students changed minimally for the three classes that we examined. And so what we have determined is that African American students in the state of Florida are disadvantaged from the very beginning of the admissions process because of the low high school record.

In the University system enrolled black Talented 20, first-time students, as the percentage of all enrolled black first-time students is lower than the comparable figures for other groups.

Civil rights advocates are concerned in the state that minorities are being shut out and that they're saying that that really needs to be examined. Hispanic, Native American and especially black Talented 20 students are underrepresented at the selective University of Florida relative to their presence in the entire state university system and in comparison with the group's presence among high school graduates.

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So in Florida, let's see, we analyzed the enrollment in two ways, both as a part of the school and as a part of the state university system. enrollment outcome of the three pathways to enrollment in Florida, enrollment increased overall so that the number of minority and nonminority first-time students enrolled in the university system increased, as one might have expected. But the percentages of minority change because enrollment on groups didn't changed. So even -- there are even more white the percentages of minority groups students. So didn't change.

The data show that blacks are admitted to the University system at rates almost always lower than those of other groups. White admission rates are always substantially higher than the overall minority rates. And as a group minority admittees enroll Hispanic and blacks at a lower rate than whites.

Within the University system, the University of Florida and Florida State University, the percentage of black first-time students who are consistently lower than the 1999 -- the percentage is consistently lower than that of the 1999 high school class. Hispanics are similarly underrepresented at the selective University of Florida and Florida State

University.

1.3

We looked at graduate and professional schools as well as in the state of Florida and we found the same pattern. First time black graduate admission rates are almost always lower than other groups. And white admission rates are -- a whole lot higher than overall graduate minority rates. Substantively.

Graduate and professional students, to continue, the first time minority graduate enrollment grew substantively in the University system in 2001 and 2002, the second year of the race ban, however Hispanics and especially blacks remain underrepresented in the University of Florida relative to their presence in the whole University system.

Minority rates of admission are lower than for other groups. First-time black and Hispanic law school students were admitted at lower rates than other groups. Minority law enrollment fluctuated, while those at the other law school, the University of Florida Law School, College of Law, it fell steadily.

Admission rates for first-time minority medical students improved after the race ban. Still, overall minority admission rates are lower than those for whites. While blacks and Hispanics have the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lowest rate at all. The first minority medical 2 students grew minimally at the -- in the University 3 system and the two medical schools that we studied. 4 Again, the black and Hispanic were the lowest of all. 5 So we concluded about the Florida is that 6 the Talent 20 Program does not enhance action to 7 higher education for blacks, nor does it help improve 8 the presence of blacks and Hispanics at the two 9 selective flagship universities. And I'm going to get 10 into why that is a concern in the next set of slides, 11 The overall proportion of minorities in 12 University system stayed the the same despite 13 the number οf minority first-time increases in 14 students. So the proportions did not change. 15 Graduate admission rates for blacks are 16 almost lower than for those in the other groups. Law 17 and medical school admission rates for blacks and 18 Hispanics are lower than those for other groups. So 19 you can see a common pattern here. 20 Just to summarize and compare the 21 percentage plan programs and how we focused this 22 report. And if you look at the middle column, .23 California had a percentage plan in place before the 24 race been and after the race ban. And that's what we 25

looked at.

In Texas and Florida we looked at the 1 effect of admission, the effect of the percentage plan 2 the plan was 3 after before and admission 4 implemented. And for the University of California we 5 6 only looked at the U.C. system because the 12-and-a-7 half percent plan only applies to the University of There's a 33-and-a-half percent plan 8 California. which applies to Cal State. And community colleges in 9 that state don't have a presence plan at all. 10 But U.C. has the strictest percentage plan, and that's 11 12 what we looked at. And in Texas and in Florida, the percent 13 plan applies to all of the colleges and universities 14 15 in the system. 16 In terms of eligible students, a student 17 can be -- statewide in California, a student can 18 qualify by being in the top 12 and a half percent, as 19 I said before. Or the top four percent of their high 20 And in Florida, the plan only applies to school. 21 high school academic record in their students' 22 particular high school. 23 I'm sort of tempted to kind of fast 24 forward through --25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go right ahead and do

it because we will remember those. We just had them, so that's okay. You can go to the next session.

MS. DICKERSON: Go to the next set. I'm going to go -- well, basically what we found when we looked at admission standards and success predictors, like the ACT and the SAT, that there really has been an over reliance on those tests and they've become widely disputed, largely due to disparities in the test scores and the racial and ethnic groups.

The gaps in the scores between white and nonwhite students has really widened. There is a lot of evidence that shows that and several studies that show the disparity -- the gap may be more due to the number of times that people take the SAT tests. Those who take it multiple times tend to progressively better. Those who have access to preparation, SAT preparation classes tend to do a whole lot better. And so there is a widening, there is a gap that is growing between students that can be connected to race in terms of SAT and ACT scores.

As for national trends in college enrollment, I'll just summarize that as well. What we found is that -- I'll pick a few of them. Affirmative action increased minority participation in higher education. Over the last 25 years, minorities were 20

1	percent of college students in 1976 and they are 33
2	percent today. Blacks are 12 percent of college
3	students, Hispanics 11 percent, and Asian Pacific
4	Americans are five percent. But there still are
5	problems.
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Is that all I read?
7	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Or just four year
9	schools or does that include is that only four-year
10	schools?
11	MS. DICKERSON: I would have to look it up
12	because I don't know, but I believe it's all schools.
13	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Okay. Two-year and
14	four-year.
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Excuse me, Madam
16	Chair?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. Commission
19	Redenbaugh. This has been a very informative and
20	productive meeting. I regret I have to leave to go to
21	an appointment, but I wanted to I wanted to commend
22	the presenters from the various SACs and the current
23	presentation on the education report. This is all
24	well done.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Thank you

1	very much.
2	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Take care, Russell.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Take care, Russell.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay. Thank
5	you.
6	MS. DICKERSON: The disparities that still
7	exist is there is enrollment and variation within
8	groups and among subgroups so there's a tendency to
9	lump all Hispanic students all together when you
10	really shouldn't look at the subgroups as well as The
11	Asian Pacific Americans because some groups are well
12	ahead of others.
13	And as well there's a disparity, white
14	students are more likely to attend college at a
15	traditional age and minority students tend to be
16	older. Whites and Asian Americans are more likely to
17	attend four-year colleges and blacks Hispanics are
18	more likely to attend the two-year colleges.
19	And the trends are similar in graduate and
20	professional schools.
21	Let's see what some of the main
22	disparities are. Hispanics are five percent, blacks
23	are nine percent of graduate students. And minorities
24	are 21 percent of law schools and 31 percent of

medical school students.

1	Asian Pacific Americans, though, account
2	for 17 I'm not sure that I think what that's
3	supposed to say is even though minorities are highly
4	represented in medical schools, 17 percent of that Is
5	Asian Americans. And the rest are all other
6	minorities combined.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. I remember
8	that from reading it.
9	MS. DICKERSON: Yeah. That's what that's
10	supposed to say.
11	Okay. I don't think I'm going to go over
12	all the information about financial access in the TRIO
13	programs. Essentially some of the problems that we
14	discussed were that there are repeaters. These are
15	programs that are targeted to counselors, school
16	districts, et cetera.
17	And it's very difficult to expand beyond
18	the schools that have always participated in TRIO
19	programs, because now there are new immigrant groups
20	that may be situated in suburbs and rural areas and
21	people who will have different language requirements.
22	And TRIO is not able to expand beyond that because
2 3	there's just not enough money to reach all the
24	students. It only reaches about seven percent of the
25	eligible population, which is a very, very small

So it creates a real disconnect with 1 percentage. 2 people who need access to financial aid. 3 The other thing we find with financial aid 4 is now that it's starting to rely more on academic 5 record than it used to rely on need, a lot of 6 scholarships that used to go to people based on 7 academic need, are going on --8 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: You mean based on 9 financial need. 10 MS. DICKERSON: -- based on financial need 11 -- thank you -- are going to people, other people who 12 may not -- who may otherwise -- who would otherwise be 13 able to afford college. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Like the people in the 15 New York Times editorial who will take the Hope 16 Scholarships and buy cars with them. 17 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. So it reallv 18 crisis for students who creates a but for the 19 financial means, they might be -- they are excluded 20 from being able to go to college. 21 Let's get to some of the overall 22 conclusions. Let's skip through the financial aid. 23 Overall, I guess what the picture ends up being is, 24 you know, we're saying to black, Hispanic, Native 25 American students that: Compared to others, you

110 probably won't be admitted to college. If you are 1 it's going to be a lower tier university, possibly a 2 two-year degree and not a four-year degree. 3 If you get in, you may not have the 4 financial aid to be able to accept, or it's going to 5 take you longer to graduate because we find that there 6 7 are a lot of students that because of part-time work, 8 they are taking longer to get that degree or taking 9 longer to even enter college. 10 So -- and some of the financial aid that 11 used to go to them is going to students who might be 12 able to have afforded it without assistance. 13 found weren't Percentage plans, we 14 viable substitute for affirmative action. 15 16 17 18 plans enrollment. The have to minority

That in each percentage plan statement, minority students are faring the same or worse. And of course we're looking at this evaluation in terms of what it's done to be supplemented with proactive recruitment, outreach, and academic support programs. And the earlier that they start, the better.

A model percentage plan did find very good features and best practices in all of them. The extensive outreach that is part of the California percentage plan program, the focus on improving,

19

20

21

22

23

24

reaching students early and getting them to stay in school and recognize the value of education, which is done in Florida, and the school choice which is built into the Texas program.

States have to broaden the use of things as such as the comprehensive review that allows administrators to look at other factors, like demonstrated leadership or motivation or use work experience in evaluating a candidate. And they also have to perform regular examinations of percentage plans.

We found that there was not very -- that there aren't a lot of studies at all done by the states on these percentage plan programs. In fact, we were asking for data and they were collecting it for the first time to send it to us. So states really need to look at what the impact of these programs has been. They need to study them regularly and they need to do a comprehensive review of all the schools in their system that with five analysts we weren't able to do.

And the federal government has to make TRIO and financial aid programs accessible to all who are eligible.

That's the end of my presentation.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think it's yes.
2	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Terri, I just have
3	one question. Why I mean were the Native American
4	numbers so small that you couldn't pick them up or
5	they did not just counted them?
6	MS. DICKERSON: Yeah, they're in the
7	report. I guess generally the trends are the
8	numbers that you start with were so small that it was
9	hard to make the big conclusions. I think the state
LO	university systems probably could if they were, you
L1	know, picking up on the data and looking at it across
L2	the board for a number of years. But in relation to
L3	the data that we got we were able to make the broad,
L4	the sweeping conclusions.
L5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the numbers are in
L6	the report?
L7	MS. DICKERSON: They are in the report,
18	yes.
L9	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have a
20	procedural question
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
22	Thernstrom.
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I just want to
24	know as we go forward here on this report what is the
25	process. I haven't had a chance to read it, frankly,

but I will do so very carefully. Are there going to be -- can Commissioners write, you know, separate statements of some sort and react in response to it? Is it going to be published, what is the time table and so forth?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's a draft staff report. And for staff reports the Commission does not have to approve them. They're just put out for the informational purposes. And it was presented to us and given to us. And if we have any comments that the staff might use, since it says "Draft," as they finalize they would very much appreciate having those in terms of any questions we have or points we'd like to make or things that we think that they missed.

And the overall purpose of it was simply to update the situation on the percentage plans and to provide data that other researchers might be able to use because the data is not out there, as Terri pointed out, until they asked for it. The states hadn't even collected it, so one of the benefits of this exercise is to get the data and get it out there so that people can look at it and reach their own conclusions.

So that was the general idea. Although if the Commission wants to do something else with it, it

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	
1	can, but that was the idea.
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, so as it
3	stands now, we don't vote on this at any point?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Not unless we wish to
5	decide that we wish to
6	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. Now I
7	just it's just a point of clarification. I just
8	didn't know.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And if there are any
1,0,	comments that you have, I'm sure that the staff would
1.1	love to have a good read and some feedback would be
1.2	great as they work on this.
13	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Good.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley.
15	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think I'd like,
16	like Commissioner Thernstrom, I'd like to give some
17	comments to the staff on the draft report, which I'll
18	try to do in the next ten days or so. But it strikes
19	me that we might consider at the next meeting whether
20	there are some policy recommendations we want to make
21	to Congress arising from the staff report to try to
22	inform Congress' consideration of reauthorization of
23	the Higher Education Act.
24	My understanding is that the staff, the
2,5	bipartisan staff on the Hill have asked the public to

provide recommendations for the reauthorization by the end of December so that they can be putting together their legislative language early in the calendar year.

So actually if we had two, three, four particular ideas building off of what the staff has discovered or otherwise, December — it would be really timely if we could talk about those in December, see if we might actually have some things we could agree upon as a group.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I think that's a great idea and that after you read it, if you have any suggestions that you would like to make in terms of policy, that we could consider, why don't you get them to the Staff Director in time for him to circulate and put the item on the agenda. And then we can discuss it at the last meeting — next meeting and decide whether we want to agree to it. Anyone can — any commissioner is perfectly welcome to do that, and we would appreciate it.

Also, if you have any comments on the staff draft, if you could get them to the staff director within the next 10 days. And then as they finalize, they can look at your comments and see how they fit in and so on. That would be helpful too.

Also the document is in draft out on our

1	website so that people who read it, who are
2	researchers or who are interested who may want to ask
3	questions about it or add something or check it out,
4	and I'm not going to do this, but I was going to ask
5	Penny whether the data seemed to her to fit with what
6	was going on in California, but it won't go on the
7	record.
8	MS. EDGERT: Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But, in any case, so
10	it's perfectly it's a perfectly open public process
11	and we'll see how it works in terms of it. But so far
12	I think we've made a great contribution in just
13	getting the data and putting together and putting it
14	out there so people can have it.
15	And, Terri, I want to commend you for the
16	work of your staff and for
17	MS. DICKERSON: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: your usual good
19	work.
20	Does anybody else have anything else on
21	this?
22	Okay. The yes.
23	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can I just one
24	other thing. If it's not to burdensome there's an
25	aspect of this that I'd be very interested in. I know

You know

aid

the Civil Rights Project we did some work relating to the merit versus financial need scholarships and the disparate impact of those state level policy changes. But if you could -- if you can find out anything easily generally about what's going on in the country with regard to cut-backs in state financial programs as a result of to the recession? with all the state budget pressure. I've heard generally that they've been raising tuitions, cutting down on financial If there's any way to get a handle on just programs. what the magnitude of what that phenomenon is and -and some sense of whether that's having an impact on people's ability to go to postsecondary education. think that would be interesting and might affect

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

recommendations we could have to Congress. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I think, Chris, the budgetary process is just starting in a lot of the states that are feeling financially strapped. sure that information is yet in place.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah, that may be -- that may be so. My sense is, though, this is a trend that started last year. And then if the actual policy decisions haven't -- even if the actual policy decisions haven't been made, I know there's

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	places like in California where they're talking about
2	a 20-percent across-the-board cut the governor's
3	talking about a 20-percent across-the-board cut, it
4	might be interesting to at least call them.
5	Maybe the way to frame the question again
.6	would be what, if anything, do we know
7	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yeah. No,
8	that's fine. Yeah.
9	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: about the cyclical
10	about the cyclical impact of of the economy on
11	state budgets for higher ed. financial assistance.
12	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Right. I think
13	it's a good question. I would like to know the answer
14	myself.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So if you can find out
16	anything, Terri, and in particular for this you're
17	only interested in three states, but just in general
18	if you could find out for us, that would be
19	MS. DICKERSON: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything you can find
21	out we'd love to know.
22	MS. DICKERSON: We'll look and see what's
23	out there.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Maybe when you
25	ask the question, maybe they'll go find out the

1 | answer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DICKERSON: Yeah, like they would on this. What do we have to ask 50 states, though? We'll see what's out there.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, actually you know the states that are really financially strapped.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe the DuPont Circle has some answers, you know, ACE and all those folks, Dazzle Group and the rest of them.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, Madam a related issue in California and I Chair, elsewhere is the increased cost of education in public institutions of higher education, so that in schools for example, institutions that I'm associated It's go up more than twice in the last few And it's happened also at the community vears. college level and at the undergraduate level. So goes up, for those who obvious as the cost financially needy, presumably the help should go up, and it hasn't.

MS. DICKERSON: That's true. One of the points we make in the paper is how education -- people are being priced out of education now. Yeah.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah.

I wanted to point out CHAIRPERSON BERRY: that of course California, which has made some very -according to what you have given us -- some positive responses to this whole problem than in the -- I guess the president of the U.C. system is retiring, Atkinson, who has shown marvelous leadership on this I can say myself having been a chancellor of a issue. university, that in the late 20th century and the early 21st century it is not often that heads of universities show any great leadership on matters of They mostly keep their heads down or public policy. raise a whole lot of money, or something, and are on their way.

in his So has been remarkable he willingness to find ways, and I admire his ability to find ways through a sort of minefield on this issue and it's the people who work for him. It means he To come up with something that picked good people. would satisfy the desires of people to have access to higher education at the same time maintaining what the U.C. system stands for in terms of its quality.

And, you know, he is an epitome of the idea -- of the example of the idea in higher education, the positive idea, that you can have equal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	opportunity and excellence at the same time. And so I
2	just wanted to take note of this.
3	I knew had he to retire sometime, but I
4	didn't know it was going to be this year.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I
6	just wanted to comment that I was teaching at UCLA Law
7	School both before and after affirmative action. And
8	it was of interest to me that the law school was
9	commended for its ability to increase all of the
10	indices of excellence during the time that affirmative
11	action was in place. So there's in my view no
12	conflict between the notion of affirmative action and
13	excellence, as I've seen it operate.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Well, I won't
15	tell other stories. I could sit here and tell other
16	stories about that, but I won't do it.
17	Any other comments on what well, okay,
18	hearing none, we have unless I forgot something and
19	no one reminded me, gotten through the items on the
20	agenda.
21	Have I missed something?
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I think Future
23	Projects.
24	XI. Future Agenda Items
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I missed the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1	projects. I'm sorry. Let's do the projects and
2	answer first Commissioner Braceras' question, which
3	question was about the education accountability
4	report.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just a little more
6	detailed information on
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: where we stand
9	with the educational account
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And thank you, Terri,
11	again.
12	MS. CARR: Did we do the Staff Report?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Thank you, Terri.
14	Well, along with myself Terri Dickerson
15	is here from the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation and
16	Debra Carr, the Deputy General Counsel of General
17	Counsel's Office is here, so hopefully with the three
18	of us we can answer all the questions that you might
19	have.
20	In terms of the Educational Accountability
21	Project, I think we're looking at the briefing in
22	January or February, somewhere around there. And
23	again Debra could
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would love it if
25	it could be in February so that I could definitely
	NEAL D. GDOSS

1	attend. I don't want I mean obviously don't do it
2	around me, but I'd just like to put in that word.
3	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because I'm not
5	sure about January. I mean I'll participate by phone,
6	but I'd love to be at such a briefing if I can, so.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. We'll keep that
8	in mind.
9	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Um,
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Go ahead.
11	Continue.
12	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. If
13	we were off the education, I wanted to ask about the
14	environmental
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no.
16	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: test report,
17	but
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Excuse Me,
19	Commissioner. Excuse me. I think Staff Director Jin
20	is going to give more, some answers to Commissioner
21	Braceras' question.
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, I'm sorry.
	COMMISSIONER INERNSTROM. On, I'm Sorry.
23	Okay.
23 24	
	Okay.

1	a lot of documents related to this, the Educational
2	Accountability Project. And staff is going through it
3	quite nicely, but it's taking quite a bit of time. So
4	that's kind of where the status is.
5	The General Counsel's Office, over the
6	summer especially, lost a number of lawyers, and
7	they're rebuilding somewhat but, anyway, they're going
8	through it, are getting new people involved, and so I
9	think we're moving along pretty well in respect in
10	light of that.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is it one of my
12	questions is it going to be a staff briefing or are we
13	having a briefing from witnesses?
14	MS. CARR: Witnesses.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Witnesses, okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
17	Thernstrom, you had something.
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yeah. Hanging
19	out there is the Environmental Justice Report. I was
20	wondering what was happening with that.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did we get the
22	Management Information Systems report?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. All the
24	Commissioners should have gotten management
25	information statement timelines for the various

projects from the General Counsel's Office and from
OCRE. And so
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can look at the MIS
for environmental justice.
COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes. Somehow I
missed that in a
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is it in the
STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Debra, do you want to
just elaborate on that since
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If you turn to the MIS
you will find and Debra will
MS. CARR: I'm sorry. Commissioner
Thernstrom, could you repeat your question for me?
COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: well, if it's in
the information, that's fine. I actually we can
just move on. I don't want to take people's time. I
somehow missed that.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just looking
at it right now. It looks like in the documents that
circulated, it says the target date for completion is
circulated, it says the target date for completion is May 2003.
May 2003.
May 2003. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Fine.

1	
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. That's
3	great.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Isn't that what it's
5	doing. And then
6	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Sounds good.
7	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's a two-day
8	training session available from the staff on how to
9	interpret these endless reports.
10	(Laughter.)
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think the next
12	training sessions is scheduled for June
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let the record show
14	that Commissioner Edley is teasing.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a question
16	on this.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's number 18 on
19	the list as a staff director review. Is there a
20	window in here in which Commissioners have a chance to
21	review and comment on the report? And then do we vote
22	on the report, or how does that work.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It says
24	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, Commissioner
25	Braceras. This is it's like any other report.
	N=11 C =====

1	Once the staff is finished with it, including the
2	Staff Director's Review, then it comes to the
3	Commissioners. And of course at that point you can
4	either approve it or reject and make comments and us
5	to, you know, we work in light of your comments.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And what this means is
7	that these office reports are telling us where the
8	office is finished.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When they get their,
11	the OGC is through, it's going to go to the staff
12	Director.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And it
14	looks like the timeline for Staff Director review is
15	that that office would finish reviewing it at the
16	beginning of April 2003 which should hypothetically
17	give us almost two full months, the Commissioners, a
18	chance to review it. And then I guess it would be
19	probably on the agenda for the June meeting.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If this all works out,
21	yes.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Right.
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have just been
24	reminded by my husband that we are due at a memorial
25	service for David Riesman, the great Harvard

l	_ ,
1	physiologist, in less than an hour. I better get off
2	and I thank everybody.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're just about
4	finished anyway, Abigail. We're just going over this.
5	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. Very
6	good.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thanks. Bye.
9	COMMISSIONERS: Bye.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So it looks
11	like if this works out, that you're extrapolation from
12	the dates is correct.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Right.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If it all goes
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So we should be
17	expecting barring other circumstances,
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Somewhere in that one
19	
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: we'd basically
21	be approving it in June and
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, basically.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: hopefully
24	having, you know, a month or so to look it over.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But we can't
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	help but add a footnote that sometimes things don't
2	work out quite the way we want.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is true.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the MIS does give
5	us the staff's best guesstimate
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and only for us as
8	to where these things are.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's what
10	we're looking for.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Anything else,
14	gang?
15	All right. Hearing nothing else, thank
16	you very much for coming and the meeting is adjourned.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Thank you very
18	much.
19	(The meeting was adjourned for the day at
20	11:08 o'clock a.m.)
21	
22	
23	·
24	
25	

THE EDWINSSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS