+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

UNEDITED

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

Present by telephone:

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

LESLIE R. JIN, STAFF DIRECTOR

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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 JANE WEBB-VIGNERY, Chair, Arizona SAC

Commissioner Assistants Present:

LAURA BATIE
PATRICK DUFFY
JOY FREEMAN
KIMBERLY SCHOLD
KRISHNA TOOLSIE

Also present:

PENNY EDGERT

NEAL R. GROSS

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 35,	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

NEAL R. GROSS

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.

1	5
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
13	this 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
1.1	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.

1.0

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

NEAL R. GROSS

Congresswoman Patsy Mink, who was a great champion of 1 civil rights and women's rights, education, died at 2 the age of 74 in Honolulu of viral pneumonia. 3 very instrumental in the passage of Title IX of the 4 education amendments. 5 I also would like to point out that since 6 our last meeting, Senator Paul Wellstone, of Minnesota 7 of course, who was a champion in the cause of civil 8 rights and human rights, among other things, and I 9 remember getting up at four o'clock in the morning in 10 Alabama to catch a plane to fly to -- a little plane 11 to fly to Minnesota during his first campaign to go to 12 breakfast, that he called up and begged me to come to. 13 That great champion of course died along with members 14 15 of his family and staff on this airplane. This also is National American Indian and 16 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. Does anyone else have any announcements 22 23 that they would like to make?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I do, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

24

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 of these 120 scholarships for African American students is a wonderful outreach program to help achieve diversity in our armed forces.

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

My second announcement has to do with President Bush's Commission on the Educational 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 kids getting an education and staying in school. 5 And I know that this Commission, one of 6 the things we're charged with doing is issuing public 7 service announcements. That's part of our statute and 8 our charter. So I'd like everybody to at least think 9 might do some public service 10 whether we announcement in Spanish for Spanish-language 11 television, just encouraging -- you know, in line with 12 13 our recommendation -- encouraging immigrant children to stay in school and get a good education. 14 I think that might be something that would 15 16 be worth us looking into, so I wanted to announce the 17 report and suggest 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 this PSA. 21 22 MR. JIN: Okay. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay? All right. 24 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: And I have one 25 announcement.

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

a note telling him that before he became President of 1 the Urban League I had said publicly, and it was 2 various articles, that the Urban League was missing in 3 action in many of the great policy debates of the 4 period and that since he had been there the Urban 5 League was in the midst of a very important policy 6 debate about issues such as education and the like. 7 So you're all right, he's done a great 8 If there's no objection to doing so, we may 9 iob. draft a note to him saying that the Commission 10 commends him for his service, in particular his work 11 on education issues, wish him well and know that he 12 13 will be hard to replace. How's that? COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: That's great. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, okay. Any other 16 announcements? Commissioner Meeks? COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes, I do. 17 It could fall under the Staff Director's Report, 18 but it's 19 related to the 2000 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

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

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 after Native Americans, you know, more than it does just about any other race. Thev have formed an advisory committee of which I am a And we're researching to see if Native member. Americans are disproportionally affected by federal sentencing guidelines because of the federal criminal jurisdiction over typical local law offenses.

And so we are also looking at comparing federal sentences to the state sentences for the 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 \$12.4 million DOJ grant to build

correctional facility that also includes space for 1 inmates to receive career counseling, substance abuse 2 treatment, and medical services. 3 The Lower Burrell Tribe has also been 4 approved a grant to build a similar facility. 5 lastly and relative to the Indian 6 2000 South Dakota SAC report 7 the vote, recommendation was made that Indians get involved with 8 state and federal elections and vote. And the 2002 9 election I'm happy to say had an unprecedented Indian 10 voter turnout in South Dakota. 11 On Pine Ridge, the typical turnout is 12 usually about 17 percent. This year it was 13 And, you know, it can get better, but I 14 really believe that Native Americans can see now that 15 they can make a difference and stay involved in 16 elections. And it was -- I just attended the National 17 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 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you, Elsie. 22 think it's really important that our 23 SAC report, which made all South Dakota 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 we 5 They will see the transcript, acknowledge that here. 6 but their work has had so many reverberations since 7 that time and it just keeps going. 8 Yes, Commissioner Edley. 9 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Just a different 10 11 matter. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 12 The Civil Rights COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 13 Project at Harvard put out a report a couple of weeks 14 ago on just a simple analysis looking at state by 15 state and county by county disparities in spoiled 16 ballot rates using the 2000 election data. 17 And it got some press attention. Ι 18 commend it to everyone's attention. I'll see that 19 everybody gets a copy of it complete with the very 20 21 pretty color maps. 22 And I think we're all generally familiar already from the work that we did on Florida with the 23 This is only county-level data, not 24 phenomenon. precedent level data. And the central finding of 25

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 within a state. 5 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Controlling for 6 7 demographic? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No, not controlling 8 for anything. Just looking at the residual, --9 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I see. 10 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: -- at the error 11 12 rates. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okav. 13 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: And the reason I 14 15 raise is that -- the reason I raise it is for two One is that the recently -- the recently-16 things. enacted federal election reform legislation, in my 17 18 view, frankly doesn't do very much to directly get at 19 issue of disparities from jurisdiction 20 in residual ballot rates, jurisdiction which is 21 unfortunate. Certainly some of the things that they 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 fullness of time and other work 2 that in the 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 recommendations for them to focus on. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Is there an 7 appropriation for that, or do you know? Does anybody 8 know? Is it being appropriated now or what? 9 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: It is, Madam Chair. 10 There's a -- yeah, a lot more than we will. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's not too Oh. 12 13 hard. IV. Staff Director's Report 14 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The next item on the agenda is the Staff Director's Report. And, 16 Commissioner Thernstrom pointed out, we need to vote 17 on the Commission schedule for next year. 18 19 I think you were sent a schedule take a 20 look at to see if those days were -- the point was to look to see if those were days on your calendar that 21 you thought you might be able to -- or would be able 22 23 to meet and to see if you agreed to that. And if you 24 had any suggestions to change these, that you would

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

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

to

get there in Delaware

impossible for me

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	MR. JIN: Well, Madam Chair, I

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It wouldn't be for the
2	meeting in December because we already decided that.
3	So we're not asking you to
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just starting in
5	the next calendar year.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What would be your
7	so that would be that you would have to let us know
8	about, let's see practically speaking, what would be
9	the next thing you'd have to do? We'd have to know
10	MR. JIN: Well, I certainly would ask if
1.1	we were to adopt this policy that we have a certain
12	grace period so we wouldn't have to like at this
13	moment come up with whatever's needed for January. I
14	mean we
15	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, January is
16	the planning meeting. Wouldn't that naturally be in
17	Washington?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we don't know
19	yet. But the why don't we say that you will why
20	don't we agree to the motion with the understanding
21	that no later than the notification for the March
22	meeting,
23	MR. JIN: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: which gives you
25	since it's going to be two months, that you

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

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

I'm

able

to

and

know

in

advance

25

those

make

arrangements. So I realize that others have planning 1 difficulties all the time, but if we could all have 2 3 our lives made a little bit easier, I think that would be to the benefit of everybody. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let us be clear about what we're moving. We are moving, and the motion 6 7 would be, that the Staff Director will tell me, so I can notice, I'm the one who's supposed to decide it, 8 9 and he will notify you at least 60 days in advance 10 where the location of the next Commission meeting. And that this policy will get into effect with respect 11 12 to the February meeting. That's the motion. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, and 14 Commissioner Edley said --15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And -- and that the 16 Staff Director will information you at that time 17 whether or not there are activities on the day before 18 the meeting, okay? 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Great. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's all that we are 21 In terms of letting you know exactly what moving. 22 activities, that's all worked out with SACs. And the 23 SACs, as you know, are volunteers. So they get together and the Staff Director and the Regional 24 25 Coordinator gets together with them as they can and

work this out. And everybody tries to work cooperatively, but the timing on it may not always be exactly what they would like and what we would like, given the constraints of resources and their volunteering and their other activities and the like.

So you will do the best we can, right?

MR. JIN: That's correct, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let us know. But the 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 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.

б

MR. 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 different topics.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. I call for

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

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

1	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Aye.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Reynoso?
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
5	Redenbaugh?
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks?
8	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: No.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley?
10	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioners
12	Braceras?
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Berry,
15	no.
16	The motion fails.
17	All right. Anything else under the Staff
18	Director's Report?
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a few
20	things. I'm sorry. Just one of them relating to the
21	dates and the logistics of traveling. As most of you
22	can tell, I am going to be having a baby in December.
23	So I just wanted to put you all on notice that
24	unfortunately I will not be able to be in New York in
25	December, but would very much like to participate by

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

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

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

And in all others there's only one Native 1 American in -- in the SAC. And, again, I suggest that 2 maybe there ought to be more than one Native American 3 one in the SAC. The SAC is composed of 12. 4 And in Texas four of the 17 are Latinos 5 even though in Texas Latinos represent a third of the 6 population. So I suggest that we take a second look 7 8 at that. I've been told in the past that normally 9 we'd have flexibility and that folk can be added to 10 If that's true, then I would vote with the 11 the SAC. 12 others to approve these reports. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Does anybody 13 14 else have any comment? Yes, --Madam Chair and Vice Chair, 15 MR. JIN: we'll differently do that. We'll look into that. 16 17 The only thing I would like to add is that we would also ask that the Commission vote to endorse 18 19 the chairs of those eight states except for Arkansas, 20 New Hampshire, and Texas. Those we still need some leadership statements from, and we'll provide those to 21 22 you at a later time. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I didn't -- I meant to 24 say that I needed the motion to include of course the 25 chairs of these SACs, which are in the appointment

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

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

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

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

on.

2.5

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: All right.

Well, then I do want to have some discussion. And I admit that I'm significantly underprepared for this, having seen this document -- having not spent enough time with it.

But as I've over expressed in the past, you know, generically all budget documents are a set of promises between the parties. And I'm not prepared to support this particular submission without a review of how we performed on the current budget and project, which I think as a managerial we're not to be doing periodic anyway. So that's the general concern that I have with this particular submission.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I could add a word on that, that it is confusing to some of us to have a budget and a list of projects for the year and then a complete alteration of our priorities, which is what these trips have involved. I do personally feel a fiduciary responsibility here that — and, you know, it's troubling to me when I can't come through on it, in effect.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anybody else have a

comment?

2 ||

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I think we discussed this last meeting where we've gone over the scheduling, where we're required by OMB and the budgetary process to agree like two years ahead of time with the projects are going to be. But it's understood by OMB and the budgetary apparatus that in change those projects we're free to priorities as we go along and as the matters require. there's it that no danger So seems to me proceeding is normally done in the federal as government.

The other thing is of course that we're duty-bound to include a budget that explains what our resources are and what we need to actually do the job.

And I think that's what we've tried to do with the budget, so it seems to me we're proceeding in the normal federal way.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Anybody else have any further discussion on the subject of this budget proposal?

Yes.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, I just want to make clear at least in my experience -- my experience

over the years in these members and, in particular, from my time working in OMB.

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 the appropriations what the report in It's not what the narrative in contains. the 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 a separate matter from the budget submissions to the White House and the Congress. And I think we have a planning meetings scheduled for January and it's that planning process internal where I think the issue of

NEAL R. GROSS

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	topics and travel and so forth is much more relevant.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further discussion
3	of this matter?
4	If there is no further discussion, then
5	someone call for the question.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I call for the
7	question.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All those in favor of
9	item number 7, which is the FY 2004 Budget Estimate
10	indicate by saying, "Aye."
11	COMMISSIONERS: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No.
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No. I'm going
15	to oppose it, too.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. I hear
17	hearing only two opponents of it, the motion passes,
18	and so the budget is approved.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
20	Kirsanow also opposed.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I couldn't hear you.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner
23	Kirsanow also opposed.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then the budget is
25	still approved.

The -- we are aware, I will say after we 1 have approved it, that this is just what we think the 2 Commission needs. It doesn't mean we'll get it. It'd 3 be nice if we get it, but we won't. 4 VIII. Discussion of Letter to the DOJ 5 The next item on the agenda is to hear 6 from our -- oh, let me do this first because there may 7 be necessity for a vote on it. 8 Commissioner Braceras yesterday suggested, 9 if I recall correctly, and she's here and can speak 10 for herself obviously, that we might consider sending 11 a letter to Justice about the allegations that there 12 were some vigilante incidents along the border in 13 14 Arizona. Am I recalling correctly? 15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. We talked 16 1.7 about maybe sending a letter asking them just to look into it. I don't think we have enough information to 18 ask them to take specific action, --19 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: -- but we can ask 21 them to look into it and see whether anyone's civil 22 rights may have been violated. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And report back to 25

1	us or take whatever action is necessary.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you off the top
3	of your head, Commissioner Braceras, what you've just
4	said so the staff can write it down in addition to
5	looking at the transcript and draft a letter so it
6	would be comport with what you have in mind?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just to send a
8	letter to the Justice Department indicating that we
9	heard testimony on this issue and we're concerned
LO	about it. And, you know, could they look into it and
l1	either report back or take whatever action is
L2	necessary.
L3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: See if the allegations
L4	if there is any validity to any of the allegations
L5	and report back. If there is any action, let us know,
L6 .	or something like that.
Ŀ7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That sounds fine.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner.
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, we also heard
20	then
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you going to Help
22	Commissioner Braceras?
23	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, we also
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't want to
25	draft the letter off the top of my head. I'm sure the

staff is perfectly capable of doing that. 1 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: As I understand it, 2 the Arizona SAC has looked into this somewhat, so --3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And they're going to 4 tell us about that. 5 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Right. So I think it 6 would make sense in the letter to at least reference 7 the fact that our SAC in Arizona has looked into it 8 9 and without -- without framing the letter as though we're endorsing any factfindings by the Arizona SAC, I 10 11 think it would be good to at least --12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: -- acknowledge that 13 the Arizona SAC has been working on it, mentioned --14 15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean I quess we 16 could even -- you know, if there's any -- I haven't 17 had a chance to read this fully, but if there's any specific report or document from the Arizona SAC on 18 19 it, we could include it, and then they could take it 20 from there. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. That would be 21 22 So after we hear from the Arizona SAC we'll 23 know better, but is there anyone who has an objection 24 to sending the letter of inquiry to the Justice 25 Department that we are discussing?

Hearing no objection, the staff will send 1 such a letter and see what we get back. And we will 12 then -- now we go onto the presentations from the SAC 13 14 members. And we have with us the SAC Chairs from 5 California and Arizona and a member to give reports on 6 7 their states. We're happy to have them come. so grateful for their service to the Commission. 18 9 The Arizona SAC, as was just pointed out, 10 recently looked into the issue of federal border and 11 immigration policy in that state, including with the 12 migrant deaths along the border. And so it will be 13 interesting to hear from them. And they're now just giving us a package of what looks like news articles 14 15 concerning this subject. 16 And from the -- so let me introduce the 17 two SAC Chairs and the member. From the California 18 SAC we have with us Fernando Hernandez, Dr. Fernando 19 who is Chair of the State Hernandez. Advisory 20 Committee and was recently reappointed to the second 21 term. Is that right? 22 DR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, ma'am. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you very much 24 for your service. 25

Dr. Fernandez is from Long Beach and is

• 1

Chairman of the Foundations Department in the College of Education at California State University at Los Angeles. He is a strong advocate for equal educational opportunity for everyone. Is the former chairman of the board of directors for the Community Youth Gang Services. He is active in service to his university and his community, and he will be discussing the activities of the California SAC.

Also with us from the California SAC is Gilbert C. Alston of Pasadena who is a retired Superior Court Judge, a retired U.S. Air Force Pilot, a past Military Affairs Committee Chairman of the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce, and he has experience as a peace officer and as a prosecutor. He's also a life member of the NAACP and a member of the Pasadena Chapter of the Red Cross Advisory Council.

He served on the boards and committees of many church groups and community-based organizations. He attended the briefing in Arizona on migrant deaths along the border, but he will be discussing issues from the California perspective or any other perspective he feels like discussing this on.

And, finally, all the way from Tucson is June Webb-Vignery, who is Chair of the Arizona SAC. And we are grateful for your service, and who was also

2.5

recently reappointed by the Commission to a second term.

Dr. Vignery is executive director of the Metropolitan Education Commission. She served as a member of -- the Arizona Civil Rights Advisory Board, the Arizona Women's Committee. She's been a member of the University of Arizona Latin American Resource Board and served on the Executive Board of the NAACP Tucson Chapter.

Her extensive community involvement also includes service on the Arizona Womens Political Caucus, the Tucson Civil Rights Coalition, the Tucson Womens Discrimination Task Force, the League of the United Latin American Citizens otherwise known as ULAC.

Dr. Vignery is a historian by training and has published several books and articles. And we want to mention that we don't list books and articles -- I'm teasing you -- many of which concern equal rights and employment issues. And she will be discussing border control issues in our state.

But before I -- we continue with the SACs,
I think Phil Montez, who is our Director for the
Western Regional Office and has been at the Commission
since I think 1967 -- is that right, Phil?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. MONTEZ: I forgot the year.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll say a few words.
3	He started as a Consultant in the Field Services
4	Division and was promoted to Civil Rights Community
5	Service Specialist, a job that no longer exists, the
6	title at least, in July 1968. He's been a Supervisor
7	Equal Opportunity Specialist, and then the Regional
8	Director of the Western Regional Office since 1982.
9	And has continued to serve admirably and well in that
10	position ever since.
11	So, Phil, will you please proceed, and
12	then we will hear from our SAC members.
13	IX. Western Regional SAC Presentations
14	MR. MONTEZ: All I wanted to say was Dr.
15	Hernandez will introduce our illustrious guest and
16	make their presentations to the Commission. I'm glad
17	you're here.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Okay.
19	Well, we're glad we are.
20	Dr. Hernandez.
21	DR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much,
22	Commissioner Berry. And I want to welcome to
23	California my Arizona the Arizona SAC Chair June
24	Vignery.
25	And I want to thank Judge Alston for

taking time to come. 1 I think most importantly I want to thank 2 the Commission for accepting our invitation to come to 3 I know we've asked Phil to invite you California. 4 numerous times. And I'm glad that you were able --5 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Are you sure 6 7 he's done it. DR. HERNANDEZ: And I'm glad you're able 8 to be here in San Diego, that has the best weather in 9 10 the entire world. I also want to thank Commissioner Braceras 11 for mentioning the Navy scholarship program. 12 Captain in the United States Naval Reserve and very, 13 very much involved in recruiting minority officers 14 15 into the Navy. And so I want to thank you for that, That's a real important activity and I 16 Commissioner. 17 think we want to make sure that our armed forces and are Navy reflects the diversity of our nation. 18 19 The California State Advisory Committee is 20 presently involved with several -- several projects. 21 And we have completed a post-9/11 forum in San Diego 22 and one in San Francisco. And on November the 20th 23 holding a forum in Sacramento be 24 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 ease 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.

The director of EEOC spent a good afternoon discussing the ramifications of their filing a complaint against the Huntington Park Police Department. And subsequently these minority officers filed a complaint against the Huntington Park Police Department.

55 investigating their is now 1 The EEOC complaints of discrimination and unequal treatment. 2 The Regional Director and I met with the 3 city attorney and the police chief to get a background 4 on these complaints. And we will be holding a forum 5

in Huntington Park in the very near future to look at allegations of discrimination and unequal treatment against minority police officers in Huntington Park.

We are also going to look at the grievance procedure that the Police Department uses in -- and their complaint process for aggrieved officers, so we'll be holding that forum in the next few weeks.

In California there have been two consent decrees filed against two police departments. And the Department of Justice filed in federal court, asking the court to set a consent decree against the Los Angeles Police Department, and the request was 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

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

(;[']

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 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.

NEAL R. GROSS

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.

The State of California has one of the finest higher education systems in the nation and I 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.

Thank you again. And I want to just -before I finish my remarks thank, in particular,
Commissioner Cruz Reynoso, who's a resident of
California and who has been just for the State
Advisory Committee. He attends our committee meetings

NEAL R. GROSS

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 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.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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 at the time 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 this in Arizona, but also 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 incurred 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 medium 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 organizations and private 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 Humane Borders; Katie Hudak, BorderLinks; David Aguilar, U.S. Border Patrol; Andy Silverman, University of Arizona, College of 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 Tohono O'odham People, and they are the 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 my 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 vehicles tailgated by the Border Patrol agents, looking into their cars, shining bright lights in their faces, running them off the road, asking them to produce documents they don't have."

"Now our people," to quote Ramon, "are afraid to go out in the open to gather native plants

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and fruits because they're warned if they stop you and 1 you don't have papers, 'We will deport you.'" And the 2 people who are born here on the reservation would be 3 at a loss if they're deported to the other side. 4 So most of the elders who don't have birth 5 certificates hide from the Border Patrol. Further, he 6 said, the Border Patrol has not sought agreement or 7 permission to operate on the reservation. 8 Reverend Fife, of the Samaritan Patrol, 9 described the need for change in Border Patrol and 10 Immigration Officials' policy so we do not have 11 another summer of record deaths. 12 He warned that the attempt now to seal the 13 border is impossible. There are 2,500 miles of desert 14 15 and mountains out there. And what it takes to control a border we learned from the example of the migration 16 between east and west Berlin during the Cold War. 17 That wasn't a remote desert wilderness 18 19 It was an urban area of about 37 miles. border officials tried to control and seal that border 20 with everything you've heard about going down on this 21 border and more. 22 increased the 23 They number of border 24 agents; that didn't do it. They built a wall -- that 25 They militarized the border with didn't do it.

military units; that didn't do it. They tried 1 helicopters and dogs; that didn't do it. 2 They built two walls, that didn't do it. 3 with a did it was to mine the area with landmines 4 between these two walls, put a machine gun nest every 5 50 yards and issue shoot-to-kill orders. And that's 6 what it took and in urban area of just 37 miles to 7 seal off the border. 8 You can imagine the cost to do that over 9 2,500 miles, let alone the hum and moral cost of put 10 machine gun nests and landmines along that border and 11 issuing shoot-to-kill orders. 12 1.3 press packets are suggested your matters for solving the border problem and saving 14 1.5 lives from both Reverend Fife and Vice Chairman Ramon, as well as U.S. Congressman Jim Colby and U.S. Border 1.6 17 Patrol Chief David Aguilar. The Arizona SAC also made recommendations 18 19 to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights after the 20 hearing was over. They voted to send a letter to you 21 which was sent on September 6th, 2002 requesting the 22 a call for formal congressional following: One, 23 hearings on the issue of deaths of people crossing

We are concerned that if something isn't

into the U.S. from Mexico.

24

done quickly we will have deaths again next year, and 1 it will rest on our conscience. 2 And, number two, the Commission support HR 3 2348, which has been introduced to address the Tohono 4 O'odham People and their U.S. citizenship. 5 In conclusion, recently the Tucson Citizen 6 ran an editorial from Ricard Pimentel, an Arizona 7 Republic columnist. It stated that, quote: The U.S. 8 should be outraged at the deaths of 320 border 9 crossers last fiscal year. It is a national tragedy. 10 Three hundred and twenty is 152 more than died in the 11 Oklahoma City bombing. 12 They are dying to come to work in the 13 United States. Our business interests are desperate 14 that they continue to do so. Immigrating reform, 15 expanding the number of visas allowed Mexicans. 16 Helping Mexico narrow the gap between its economy and 17 Amnesty. These, more than militarizing the 18 border, will save lives. 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. Thank you 20 21 very much. DR. HERNANDEZ: I'd now like to introduce 22 Judge Gilbert Alston, a member of the California SAC. 23 Welcome to California, 24 JUDGE ALSTON:

Commissioners. I will keep my remarks to a time limit

in order to conserve time. I would like to comment on the last issue that the Arizona SAC Chairman mentioned to you, and that is the selective policing of the border which is causing the deaths in the desert.

This is something which could be changed by a simple policy change on the part of the Border Patrol to channel the border crossers away from the most difficult routes across the border and into the United States, into those that are the easier. It would make their job a little easier because if apprehension is their goal, certainly the border crossers would take the easy routes and eschew the difficult ones. That can be done with the stroke of a pen.

The gentleman who did testify in Arizona, the chairman -- or the Director, David Aguilar, the Chief of the Border Patrol, did not seem to realize that his agency's method of enforcing the immigration 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 thinking of the consent decrees of 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.

б

69 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 8 behind schedule, and to offer our assistance 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 12 you wish to go through the decree. The one on the 13

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 there too to make an inquiry of the chief there.

The chief there is also new, incidentally, and has come aboard since the decree was entered into.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which chief?

JUDGE ALSTON: Riverside.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Riverside.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JUDGE ALSTON: Yes. 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The suggestion you 2 made about the meeting with Mr. Bratton, --3 JUDGE ALSTON: Yes. 4 -- the Chief. I CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 5 really hadn't thought about that. The Commission is 6 already on record and has a policy concerning the LAPD 7 and the County, because we did a report on it and we 8 made recommendations. And that was a report that Cruz 9 Reynoso may recall, and you may too, Fernando, and the 10 rest of you, that we --11 DR. HERNANDEZ: Could you speak up, Mary? 12 -- we found a number CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 13 of serious problem with the -- which had been in 14 time and made some for long 15 existence а recommendations and highlighted them. And the L.A.16 Times, I think it was, wrote an article --17 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Editorial. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- an editorial saying 19 20 we shouldn't have done that because everything was 21 fine and dandy in the L.A. Police Department. a month or two after that that all the information 22 23 came out that everything we said was exactly right in

the paper, so the reporter who had done a little story

on it called me and said he was shocked to find out

24

that this was the case.

But, in any case, I think, Phil, in terms of follow up, maybe what we ought to do is you -- and we can just do this, we don't need because we already have a policy, to set up a meeting, I'd be happy to come out and go with you guys to meet with Bratton, and to go over this. And I'd like to take a look at the consent decree.

If you will just share with the information with us, we can distribute it to anyone who's interested, any Commissioners, and just go over some of these items and talk about their responses.

And we might do it with the Riverside one, too, but on L.A. we clearly have a record of recommendations and analyzes and all the rest of that that I think we could act on, and see where we get.

JUDGE ALSTON: We have something here in California called the three strikes law.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, we heard of it.

JUDGE ALSTON: And we're on the third strike with respect to the Police Department. We had Willy Williams, we've had Chief Parks. Neither one of them could do anything with the Police Department. We now have Bratton and I think that he is our third strike. And I think we have to get behind him.

1	The Los Angeles Police Department, by
2	virtue of being here in Hollywood, and getting all the
3	publicity they get, they kind of set the stage. They
4	the set the standard for police departments all over
5	the country.
6	If we can't tame the L.A. Police
7	Department, we can't tame any of them. And Bratton
8	needs every bit of help that he can get in order to do
9	that. And if we can come in in an advisory kind of
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
11	JUDGE ALSTON: helping role, he might
12	be able to do it.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. Because of my
14	impression of him is that he, from the experience in
15	New York and other experiences, is that he would be
16	receptive.
17	And the comments that you that he made
18	that you referred to probably were comments made in
19	ignorance of what was actually going on. And I'm sure
2.0	he's got a whole load of problems to deal with, but we
21	might do that. If you want to follow up on that, I'd
22	be perfectly happy to do so.
23	MR. MONTEZ: We'll get copies of the
24	consent decree to the Staff Director alone with the
25	analysis of Dr

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, the analysis.
2	MR. MONTEZ: Judge Alston.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I wanted to say to
4	Chairperson Vignery from Arizona. The Staff Director
5	said that there is in preparation some kind of summary
6	of what they recommended. I don't know whether there
7	are any time sensitive issues in your recommendations.
8	I myself I don't know about the other
9	Commissioners. I didn't know anything about the issue
10	of the Native Indian population and the border issues
11	as related to that community being divided and the
12	elders not having documentation. It's like my mother
13	not being able to get on the airplane because she
14	doesn't have a driver's license, and she's 87.
15	But, anyway, yes.
16	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: What's the name of
17	that bill again?
18	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: It's HR
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 2348.
20	JUDGE ALSTON: 2348.
21	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: 2348.
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And what's your sense
23	as far as support for that in Arizona?
24	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Well, the support in
25	Arizona is strong for that. The they've been on

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

So we want to take a multistate look at 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.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we -- as you 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 getting the problem out of sight. It's going to be out of mind because they're going to go die. They were just thinking out of sight, out of mind, and maybe they'll stop coming and not making those connections.

But your idea of channeling them to the 1 2 easy areas, they were already coming to the easy 3 areas, and they decided to do the opposite, right? DR. HERNANDEZ: Well, Madam Chair, the 4 other thing is that, I think that needs to be pointed 5 6 out here, and I think Chairman -- Chairwoman Vignery 7 pointed it out, is why do they keep coming. They keep coming because there's a need. 8 9 It's '90 just that they're coming to 10 someplace and they don't have any place to go. They come and they get employed. They actually find 11 12 employment. And I think if you look around the San 13 Diego area and you look at who's washing the dishes, 14 who's washing the cars, who's serving your food, who's 15 parking your cars, --16 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Who's cooking 17 Chinese food. Exactly. -- what you're 18 DR. HERNANDEZ: 19 going to find is they look a lot like the people that 20 are crossing the border. And there's an awful lot of 21 people making an awful lot of money off of people that 22 cross the border. 23 And so the other part of the issue is not just funneling people so that they can be arrested, 24 25 but the other part of the issue is that those that do

across, 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 It goes both ways. And the other half is people. never talked about. All we focus on is these poor people trying to get across the border, being arrested, the Border Patrol racking up numbers. what happens to the people that get past the Border Patrol, where do they go and what do they contribute to this country. That story hasn't been told. think that's one of the things we want to focus on as

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	we get together with our other colleagues to see what
2	is going on, what is the business side of the
3	immigration question.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Um-hum. Right.
5	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: An excellent issue.
6	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: The question of
7	militias was raised before we took our seats here.
8	And the militia question was addressed in the
9	transcript, which I gather you're going to receive a
10	synopsis of?
11	MR. JIN: We're going to work up a
12	synopsis where
13	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Well, there are
14	there are. And we have, one of the members of our SAC
15	has been threatened by the militia. She is an
16	advocate for changing what's happening on the border.
17	And we've had disappearances in Arizona of people
18	coming across. And I think there's article in your
19	news packet which refers to that, where the militia
20	has probably been involved.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: These are vigilante
22	groups?
23	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Yeah.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
25	JUDGE ALSTON: I would like to make one

comment about House Resolution 2348. The Tohono 1 O'odham Nation is an Indian Tribe that was here in 2 How does it look for us to be passing a 3 resolution declaring them to be citizens? Isn't that 4 a little bit ridiculous. 5 Their reservation or their Native lands 6 were cut in half by the -- was it the Treaty of 7 Guadalupe Hildago with Mexico? 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 9 JUDGE ALSTON: And this is the difficulty: 10 They live on both sides of the border. We did it to 11 They didn't do it to us. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Shouldn't those 13 folks have dual citizenship? It's not the only tribe 14 15 that was cut in this fashion. And until certain years, they certainly not until the late '30s or '40s 16 17 did we start sort of looking strictly at restricting 18 folk going both ways. So until rather recently, 19 historically speaking, these folk were able to go to 20 Mexico and come back without being harassed. 21 And it seems to me that we might go beyond 22 suggest that these folks are perfect and 23 candidates for dual citizenship. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Isn't it true --

JUDGE ALSTON: As a law professor, sir,

1	you know that the Constitution says that if you're
2	born of American parents in another country you're a
3	citizen.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Right.
5	JUDGE ALSTON: So that automatically makes
6	them citizens.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, no, but
8	presumably there are some who just live I assume
9	there are some who just live on the Mexico side whose
LO	children are born there. But they still belong to the
11	same tribe.
L2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Isn't it true on the
13	northern border too that isn't it true on the
L4	northern border
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Sure. Sure.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: that there are
17	tribes are there tribes that are on both sides of
18	the Canadian-U.S. border?
19	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yeah. Some of the
20	Mohawk Tribes.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There are?
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes, um-hum.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So among all the
24	things that we have on our list, we need to get
25	somebody to look into that whole general topic.

1	Let me does anyone else have anything
2	else that they would like to either say or ask our SAC
3	representatives before we thank them for their
4	wonderful service and say that we will follow up on
5	the recommendations and we'll read with interest the
6	materials that you give us?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
8	just I assume that the staff will send a copy of
9	the material that we received to the Commissioners who
10	are not here present?
11	MR. JIN: Yes, of course.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
14	Well, thank you very, very much.
15	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Thank you.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who's the governor.
17	You mentioned the governor of Arizona? I know who the
18	governor of California is.
19	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Oh, it's Janet
20	Napolitano, who was our attorney general.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you've got a new
22	governor?
23	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Yes.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Pretty tight
25	election, huh?

1	DR. WEBB-VIGNERY: Very tight.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. Okay. Thank
3	you.
4	Now we have a presentation. We want to
5	discuss the where am I the presentation on
6	education?
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
9	Terri, let's do your presentation.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
11	I'd just like to recognize the presence of Penny
12	Edgert, who's here today, who's very involved with
13	higher education in California. And so she was
14	interested in hearing this report.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, all right.
16	Welcome.
17	Thank you, Terri.
18	MS. DICKERSON: Good morning.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Good morning.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good morning to you.
21	MS. DICKERSON: This is a review that the
22	Office of Civil Rights Evaluation conducted.
23	I'll move over to here because there's
24	some feedback for some reason. I guess, as usual, I'm
25	the only thing standing between you and lunch. And I

1 have --(Laughter.) 2 MS. DICKERSON: And, as usual, I have 3 4 data, --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, good. 5 MS. DICKERSON: -- which I hope you find 6 7 fascinating. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I enjoyed reading your 8 9 draft very much. MS. DICKERSON: Thank you. 10 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. I'm 11 looking forward to looking at it on the screen. 12 X. Equal Opportunity in Higher Education 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. This is a 14 staff report and the staff authors who worked on this 15 16 were Sock-Foon MacDougall, she was the Team Leader; and the people who served on the Team were Wanda 17 Margaret Butler, Monique Dennis-Elmore; 18 Johnson: 19 Manuel Alba; and Mireille Zieseniss -- basically our 20 whole office conducted this analysis. at percentage plans, 21 We looked the 22 challenge of equal opportunity in higher education. 23 And the purpose was to update and expand on the 2000 24 report that was issued by the Commission Toward an

Understanding of Percentage Plans in Higher Education:

They Effective Substitutes for Affirmative 1 2 Action. also wanted to review admissions We 3 policies, national enrollment trends, to give some 4 context to the percentage plans and to examine what 5 the federal role is, since that is our interest. 6 this we obtained 7 to do order application admission enrollment data from the States 8 of California, Texas, and Florida. And we also got 9 national enrollment data from the internet that we 10 reviewed and analyzed and made part of this 11 examination. 12 We also looked at literature from a number 13 We did a pretty extensive of other sources. 14 literature review and we conducted some interviews 15 with federal, state, and university officials. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So the data you got 17 from the states is their official data? 18 MS. DICKERSON: Yes, it is. 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right. 20 MS. DICKERSON: We got it directly from 21 22 the schools. And we evaluated all of that. In 23 addition, we'll go -- the report went into some detail 24 about the schools we reviewed and why we looked at the 25

ones that were affected by percentage plans. In some states it's across the board, in others it's not. But 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 of new admissions policies on minority enrollment in particular.

Okay. Well, let's talk about affirmative action. Traditional affirmative action programs were already significantly improving diversity on college campuses. I guess affirmative action really came 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.

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 continue. The Supreme Court, looks like there are 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 done so in the states of California, Texas, and Florida.

Okay. Let's talk just about the percentage plans. And then, as you know from looking at the paper, we looked at a number of other things. For example, national enrollment trends and the impact of the SAT and other success predictors.

But just talking about percentage plans alone, first the University of California. The 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 so it's interesting to look at California because you can look at the effect of percentage plans both with and without affirmative 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 as that target minority students.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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 in undergraduate and professional increases applications and admissions from underrepresented minorities, compared to when the 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 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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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.

far as affirmative action and 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 Programs and programs that -workshops. School 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 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

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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 graders in the past year, we won't know for four years when those students start applying for college what the effect of these programs are.

So, in conclusion, for California, the race ban has resulted in admitting and enrolling

NEAL R. GROSS

smaller proportions of African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans than it did with affirmative and modifications to action programs; existing percentage plan and extended outreach have yet to overcome the detrimental effects of the ban. Now we're in Texas. We looked at the Hopwood ruling which abolishes the use of race or ethnicity as college recruitment, admission, financial aid, and student retention criteria in the is that. The plan was initiated in '88 -- I mean in And the percentage plan was -- came about as a '98. This guaranties high school result of $^{
m HB}$ 588. graduates in the top ten percent of their classes admission to Texas public schools or university of their choice. Now the non-10 percent students are not Whether or not thev

quaranteed admission. admitted depending we seats that are left over after the 10 percent have made their decisions about whether or not they're going to accept the offers from the Texas schools.

Admissions guidelines and apply 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

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

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.

95 The primary beneficiaries have been Asian 1 Asian 2 Pacific Americans. American enrollment increased initially. It was a very perceptible jump 3 eventually, but it's leveled off since. So that's 4 something that really the state universities should 5 continue to examine and track to see if it has leveled 6 off, if it's going to increase or decrease or stay the 7 8 same. still struggle to recruit, 9 Thev especially, African American students. They are 12 10 percent of the state's population but, as I said, only 11 12 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 has declined at the University of Texas. The percentage of applicants admitted has declined and the number of those admitted, who actually enroll has declined since the 1996 --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So the applications

NEAL R. GROSS

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 are up, but the applicants admitted and the admittees 2 who enroll have declined? 3 MS. DICKERSON: Correct. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 4 MS. DICKERSON: In '96 UT Austin admitted 5 But by 2001 black 6 57 percent of black applicants. 7 applicants had increased by 24 percent, but admittees decreased by 19 percentage points. 8 Only 38 percent applicants were admitted 9 in 2001 and of those only 266 total enrolled. 10 So prerace ban 1996: 2,496 Hispanics applied. 11 65 percent were admitted. And by 2001, fewer Hispanics were 12 13 admitted in 2001 than in 1996. The number of Hispanics applied had increased by 20 percent, but the 14 15 percentage who were admitted decreased by 15 percent. So we can really see there's been a profound effect 16 17 enrollment African Hispanic and American on18 enrollment. The University of Texas at Austin was 19 20 concerned about declined minority enrollment, and they 21 have started to take action. And one action that they 22 have attempted to draw students, they created the 23

"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.

24

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to see the relationship We're between financial need and minority enrollment a 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 enrollment at the University of Texas Medical School shows that five and a half percent fewer enrolled students are students, when compared to the 1997-1998 year.

The only grouped to have experienced a

steady increase at the University of Texas Medical
Branch was Asian Pacific Americans. And, again, time
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

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 -- academic year 2000-2001. And it does not apply to graduate, law, and medical admissions.

This program similarly guarantees admission to one Florida's 11 public institution. Who's eligible? Any Florida resident who graduated in

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

ĺ	99
1	the top 20 percent of his or her public class. And
2	students also must have completed a prescribed 19-unit
3	academic high school curriculum. The number of units
4	is spelled out in the report, the Florida section of
5	the report.
6	The Talented 20 Program is one of three
7	pathways to enrollment in the state University system.
8	The second is through traditional criteria, reviewing
9	SAT, ACT, and GPA. And the third is the profile
10	assessment which examines nonacademic factors for
11	students who may have a weak high school record, then
12	schools can start out look at their background.
13	That's in a nutshell the talented 20
14	program.
15	The use of class ranks in admissions
16	decisions particularly hurts blacks, is what we found,
17	in their access to higher education. Specifically,
18	because of their weaker high school performance
19	relative to other groups, blacks have the smallest
20	percentage of high school graduates qualifying for the
21	Talented 20 students.
22	You look at black high school graduates,
23	blacks have the smallest percentage applying to
24	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.

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. As for 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 groups didn't change because enrollment on that changed. So even -- there are even more white students. So the percentages of minority groups 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.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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 lowest rate at all. The first minority medical students grew minimally at the -- in the University system and the two medical schools that we studied. Again, the black and Hispanic were the lowest of all.

So we concluded about the Florida is that

NEAL R. GROSS

and

So

the

the Talent 20 Program does not enhance action to higher education for blacks, nor does it help improve 2 the presence of blacks and Hispanics at the two selective flagship universities. And I'm going to get into why that is a concern in the next set of slides. The overall proportion of minorities in stayed the same University system the of minority first-time in the number increases So the proportions did not change. students. Graduate admission rates for blacks are almost lower than for those in the other groups. and medical school admission rates for blacks Hispanics are lower than those for other groups. you can see a common pattern here. Just to summarize and compare percentage plan programs and how we focused this And if you look at the middle column, report. 18 California had a percentage plan in place before the race been and after the race ban. And that's what we looked at.

In Texas and Florida we looked at the effect of admission, the effect of the percentage plan on admission before and after the plan implemented.

And for the University of California we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

only looked at the U.C. system because the 12-and-a-1 half percent plan only applies to the University of 2 California. There's a 33-and-a-half percent plan 3 which applies to Cal State. And community colleges in 4 that state don't have a presence plan at all. 5 U.C. has the strictest percentage plan, and that's 6 what we looked at. 7 And in Texas and in Florida, the percent 8 plan applies to all of the colleges and universities 9 in the system. 10 In terms of eligible students, a student 11 can be -- statewide in California, a student can 12 qualify by being in the top 12 and a half percent, as 13 I said before. Or the top four percent of their high 14 15 school. And in Florida, the plan only applies to high school academic record in their students' 16 17 particular high school. I'm sort of tempted to kind of fast 18 forward through --19 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go right ahead and do it because we will remember those. We just had them, 21 22 so that's okay. You can go to the next session. MS. DICKERSON: Go to the next set. 23 going to go -- well, basically what we found when we 24 25 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.

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 percent of college students in 1976 and they are 33 percent today. Blacks are 12 percent of college students, Hispanics 11 percent, and Asian Pacific Americans are five percent. But there still are problems.

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

MS. DICKERSON: The disparities that still 1 exist is there is enrollment and variation within 2 groups and among subgroups so there's a tendency to 3 lump all Hispanic students all together when you 4 really shouldn't look at the subgroups as well as The 5 Asian Pacific Americans because some groups are well 6 7 ahead of others. And as well there's a disparity, white 8

And as well there's a disparity, white students are more likely to attend college at a traditional age and minority students tend to be older. Whites and Asian Americans are more likely to attend four-year colleges and blacks Hispanics are more likely to attend the two-year colleges.

And the trends are similar in graduate and professional schools.

Let's see what some of the main disparities are. Hispanics are five percent, blacks are nine percent of graduate students. And minorities are 21 percent of law schools and 31 percent of medical school students.

Asian Pacific Americans, though, account for 17 -- I'm not sure that -- I think what that's supposed to say is even though minorities are highly represented in medical schools, 17 percent of that Is Asian Americans. And the rest are all other

NEAL R. GROSS

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

minorities combined. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. I remember that from reading it. 3 MS. DICKERSON: Yeah. That's what that's 4 5 supposed to say. I don't think I'm going to go over 6 all the information about financial access in the TRIO 7 Essentially some of the problems that we 8 programs. 9 discussed were that there are repeaters. These are programs that are targeted to counselors, school 10 11 districts, et cetera. And it's very difficult to expand beyond 12 13 14 15

the schools that have always participated in TRIO programs, because now there are new immigrant groups that may be situated in suburbs and rural areas and people who will have different language requirements. And TRIO is not able to expand beyond that because there's just not enough money to reach all the It only reaches about seven percent of the eligible population, which is a very, very small So it creates a real disconnect with percentage. people who need access to financial aid.

The other thing we find with financial aid is now that it's starting to rely more on academic record than it used to rely on need, a lot

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	109
1	scholarships that used to go to people based on
2	academic need, are going on
3	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: You mean based on
4	financial need.
5	MS. DICKERSON: based on financial need
6	thank you are going to people, other people who
7	may not who may otherwise who would otherwise be
8	able to afford college.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Like the people in the
10	New York Times editorial who will take the Hope
11	Scholarships and buy cars with them.
12	MS. DICKERSON: Okay. So it really
13	creates a crisis for students who but for the
14	financial means, they might be they are excluded
15	from being able to go to college.
16	Okay. Let's get to some of the overall
17	conclusions. Let's skip through the financial aid.
18	Overall, I guess what the picture ends up being is,
19	you know, we're saying to black, Hispanic, Native
20	American students that: Compared to others, you
21	probably won't be admitted to college. If you are
22	it's going to be a lower tier university, possibly a
23	two-year degree and not a four-year degree.
24	If you get in, you may not have the
25	financial aid to be able to accept, or it's going to

take you longer to graduate because we find that there are a lot of students that because of part-time work, they are taking longer to get that degree or taking longer to even enter college.

So -- and some of the financial aid that used to go to them is going to students who might be able to have afforded it without assistance.

Percentage plans, we found weren't a viable substitute for affirmative action. 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 minority enrollment. The plans have 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, 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

111 such as the comprehensive review that allows 1 look at other factors, like to 2 administrators demonstrated leadership or motivation or use work 3 experience in evaluating a candidate. And they also 4 have to perform regular examinations of percentage 5 6 plans. We found that there was not very -- that 7 there aren't a lot of studies at all done by the 8 states on these percentage plan programs. In fact, we 9 were asking for data and they were collecting it for 10

need to look at what the impact of these programs has

13 been. They need to study them regularly and they need

14 | to do a comprehensive review of all the schools in

their system that with five analysts we weren't able

the first time to send it to us. So states really

16 | to do.

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think it's -- yes.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Terri, I just have one question. Why -- I mean were the Native American numbers so small that you couldn't pick them up or they did not just counted them?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. DICKERSON: Yeah, they're in the
2	report. I guess generally the trends are the
3	numbers that you start with were so small that it was
4	hard to make the big conclusions. I think the state
5	university systems probably could if they were, you
6	know, picking up on the data and looking at it across
7	the board for a number of years. But in relation to
8	the data that we got we were able to make the broad,
9	the sweeping conclusions.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the numbers are in
11	the report?
12	MS. DICKERSON: They are in the report,
13	yes.
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have a
15	procedural question
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
17	Thernstrom.
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I just want to
1'9	know as we go forward here on this report what is the
20	process. I haven't had a chance to read it, frankly,
21	but I will do so very carefully. Are there going to
22	be can Commissioners write, you know, separate
23	statements of some sort and react in response to it?
24	Is it going to be published, what is the time table
25	and so forth?

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's a draft staff
2	report. And for staff reports the Commission does not
3	have to approve them. They're just put out for the
4	informational purposes. And it was presented to us
5	and give to us. And if we have any comments that the
6	staff might use, since it says "Draft," as they
7	finalize they would very much appreciate having those
8	in terms of any questions we have or points we'd like
9	to make or things that we think that they missed.
10	And the overall purpose of it was simply
11	to update the situation on the percentage plans and to
12	provide data that other researchers might be able to
13	use because the data is not out there, as Terri
14	pointed out, until they asked for it. The states
15	hadn't even collected it, so one of the benefits of
16	this exercise is to get the data and get it out there
17	so that people can look at it and reach their own
18	conclusions.
19	So that was the general idea. Although if
20	the Commission wants to do something else with it, it
21	can, but that was the idea.
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, so as it
23	stands now, we don't vote on this at any point?
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Not unless we wish to

decide that we wish to --

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. 1 Now I just -- it's just a point of clarification. 2 I just 3 didn't know. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And if there are any 4 5 comments that you have, I'm sure that the staff would love to have a good read and some feedback would be 6 7 great as they work on this. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Good. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley. 9 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think I'd like, 10 11 like Commissioner Thernstrom, I'd like to give some comments to the staff on the draft report, which I'll 12 13 tried to do in the next ten days or so. 14 strikes me that we might consider at the next meeting 15 whether there are some policy recommendations we want to make to Congress arising from the staff report to 16 17 try to inform Congress' , consideration 18 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. 19 My understanding is that the staff, the 20 bipartisan staff on the Hill have asked the public to 21 provide recommendations for the reauthorization by the 22 end of December so that they can be putting together 23 their legislative language early in the calendar year. 24 So actually if we had two, three, four

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

particular ideas building off of what the staff has

in

those

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

discovered or otherwise, December -- it would really timely if we could talk about

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 people who website SO that read it, who are researchers or who are interested who may want to ask questions about it or add something or check it out, and I'm not going to do this, but I was going to ask Penny whether the data seemed to her to fit with what

was going on in California, but it won't go on the 1 2 record. MS. EDGERT: Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But, in any case, so 4 it's perfectly -- it's a perfectly open public process 5 and we'll see how it works in terms of it. But so far 6 I think we've made a great contribution in just 7 getting the data and putting together and putting it 8 out there so people can have it. 9 10 And, Terri, I want to commend you for the work of your staff and for --11 MS. DICKERSON: Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- your usual good 13 14 work. 15 Does anybody else have anything else on this? 16 17 Okay. The -- yes. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can I -- just one 18 If it's not to burdensome there's an 19 other thing. 20 aspect of this that I'd be very interested in. I know the Civil Rights Project we did some work relating to 21 the merit versus financial need scholarships and the 22 23 disparate impact of those state level policy changes. But if you could -- if you can find out anything 24 easily generally about what's going on in the country 25

with regard to cut-backs in state financial aid programs as a result of to the recession? You know with all the state budget pressure.

I've heard generally that they've been raising tuitions, cutting down on financial aid programs. If there's any way to get a handle on just 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. I think that would be interesting and might affect 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. I'm not 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 some places like in California where they're talking about a 20-percent across-the-board cut -- the governor's talking about a 20-percent across-the-board cut, it might be interesting to at least call them.

Maybe the way to frame the question again

1	would be what, if anything, do we know
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yeah. No,
3	that's fine. Yeah.
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: about the cyclical
5	about the cyclical impact of of the economy on
6	state budgets for higher ed. financial assistance.
7	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Right. I think
8	it's a good question. I would like to know the answer
9	myself.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So if you can find out
11	anything, Terri, and in particular for this you're
12	only interested in three states, but just in general
13	if you could find out for us, that would be
14	MS. DICKERSON: Okay.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything you can find
16	out we'd love to know.
17	MS. DICKERSON: We'll look and see what's
18	out there.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Maybe when you
20	ask the question, maybe they'll go find out the
21	question.
22	MS. DICKERSON: Yeah, like they would on
23	this. What do we have to ask 50 states, though?
24	We'll see what's out there.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, actually 1 you know the states that are really financially 2 strapped. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe the DuPont 4 Circle has some answers, you know, ACE and all those 5 folks, Dazzle Group and the rest of them. 6 Madam 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes, a related issue in California and I know 8 Chair, elsewhere is the increased cost of education in public 9 institutions of higher education, so that in law 10 schools for example, institutions that I'm associated 11 It's go up more than twice in the last few 12 with. 13 And it's happened also at the community years. college level and at the undergraduate level. So 14 the cost goes up, for those who are 15 16 financially needy, presumably the help should go up, 17 and it hasn't. 18 MS. DICKERSON: That's true. One of the 19 points we make in the paper is how education -- people 20 are being priced out of education now. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yeah. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I wanted to point out 23 that of course California, which has made some very --24 according to what you have given us -- some positive 25 responses to this whole problem than in the -- I guess

the president of the U.S. system is retiring, Dr. Atkinson, who has shown marvelous leadership on this issue. I can say myself having been a chancellor of a 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 public policy. They mostly keep their heads down or raise a whole lot of money, or something, and are on their way.

So he has been remarkable in his 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 picked good people. To come up with something that 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 opportunity and excellence at the same time. And so I just wanted to take note of this.

I knew had he to retire sometime, but I didn't know it was going to be this year.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I

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

1	Just wanted to comment that I was teaching at othe haw
2	School both before and after affirmative action. And
3	it was of interest to me that the law school was
4	commended for its ability to increase all of the
5	indices of excellence during the time that affirmative
6	action was in place. So there's in my view no
7	conflict between the notion of affirmative action and
8	excellence, as I've seen it operate.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Well, I won't
10	tell other stories. I could sit here and tell other
11	stories about that, but I won't do it.
12	Any other comments on what well, okay,
13	hearing none, we have unless I forgot something and
14	no one reminded me, gotten through the items on the
15	agenda.
16	Have I missed something?
17	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I think Future
18	Projects.
19	XI. Future Agenda Items
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I missed the
21	projects. I'm sorry. Let's do the projects and
22	answer first Commissioner Braceras' question, which
23	question was about the education accountability
24	report.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just a little more

1	detailed information on
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: where we stand
4	with the educational account
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And thank you, Terri,
6	again.
7	MS. CARR: Did we do the Staff Report?
8	MR. JIN: Thank you, Terri.
9	Well, along with myself of Terri
10	Dickerson is here from the Office of Civil Rights
11	Evaluation and Debra Carr, the Deputy General Counsel
12	of General Counsel's Office is here, so hopefully with
13	the three of us we can answer all the questions that
14	you might have.
15	In terms of the Educational Accountability
16	Project, I think we're looking at the briefing in
17	January or February, somewhere around there. And
18	again Debra could
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would love it if
20	it could be in February so that I could definitely
21	attend. I don't want I mean obviously don't do it
22	around me, but I'd just like to put in that word.
23	MR. JIN: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because I'm not
25	sure about January. I mean I'll participate by phone,

I	123
1	but I'd love to be at such a briefing if I can, so.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. We'll keep that
3	in mind.
4	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Um,
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Go ahead.
6	Continue.
7	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. If
8	we were off the education, I wanted to ask about the
9	environmental
LO	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no.
11	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: test report,
L2	but
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Excuse Me,
L4	Commissioner. Excuse me. I think Mr. Jin is going to
L5	give more some answers to Commissioner Braceras'
16	question.
L7	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, I'm sorry.
18	Okay.
19	MR. JIN: I was just going to add also
20	that, you know, this is we had subpoenaed a lot of
21	documents related to this, the Educational
22	Accountability Project. And staff is going through it
23	quite nicely, but it's taking quite a bit of time. So
24	that's kind of where the status is.
25	The General Counsel's Office, over the

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

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is it in the
2	MR. JIN: Debra, do you want to just
3	elaborate on that since
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If you turn to the MIS
5	you will find and Debra will
6	MS. CARR: I'm sorry. Commissioner
7	Thernstrom, could you repeat your question for me?
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: well, if it's
9	in the information, that's fine. I actually we can
10	just move on. I don't want to take people's time. I
11	somehow missed that.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just looking
13	at it right now. It looks like in the documents that
14	circulated, it says the target date for completion is
15	May 2003.
16	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Fine.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And now you will have
18	enough of a package each time, Commissioner
19	Thernstrom, to tell you exactly where each project is
20	
21	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. That's
22	great.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Didn't what it's
24	doing. And then
25	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Sounds good.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's a two-day 1 training session available from the staff on how to 2 interpret these endless reports. 3 (Laughter.) 4 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think the next 5 training sessions is scheduled for June --6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let the record show 7 that Commissioner Edley is teasing. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a question 9 10 on this. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's number 18 on 12 the list as a staff director review. Is there a 13 window in here in which Commissioners have a chance to 14 review and comment on the report? And then do we vote 15 on the report, or how does that work. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It says --17 JIN: Yes, Commissioner Braceras. 18 MR. This is -- it's like any other report. Once the staff 19 is finished with it, including the Staff Director's 20 Review, then it comes to the Commissioners. And of 21 course at that point you can either approve it or 22 reject and make comments and us to, you know, we work 23 in light of your comments. 24

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And what this means is

that these office reports are telling us where the office is finished. 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So --3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When they get their, 4 the OJC is through, it's going to go to the staff 5 Director. 6 Right. And it COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 7 looks like the timeline for Staff Director review is 8 that that office would finish reviewing it at the 9 beginning of April 2003 which should hypothetically 10 give us almost two full months, the Commissioners, a 11 chance to review it. And then I guess it would be 12 probably on the agenda for the June meeting. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If this all works out, 14 15 yes. Right. 16 MR. JIN: COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have just been 17 reminded by my husband that we are due at a memorial 18 19 service for David Riesman, the great Harvard 20 physiologist, in less than an hour. I better get off 21 and I thank everybody. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're just about 23 finished anyway, Abigail. We're just going over this. 24 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. Very 25 good.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thanks. Bye.
3	COMMISSIONERS: Bye.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So it looks
5	like if this works out, that you're extrapolation from
6	the dates is correct.
7	MR. JIN: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If it all goes
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So we should be
11	expecting barring other circumstances,
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Somewhere in that one
13	
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: we'd basically
15	be approving it in June and
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, basically.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: hopefully
18	having, you know, a month or so to look it over.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: But we can't
20	help but add a footnote that sometimes things don't
21	work out quite the way we want.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is true.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the MIS does give
24	us the staff's best guesstimate
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
	1

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and only for us as
2	to where these things are.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's what
4	we're looking for.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Anything else,
8	gang?
9	All right. Hearing nothing else, thank
10	you very much for coming and the meeting is adjourned.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Thank you very
12	much.
13	(The meeting was adjourned for the day at
14	11:08 o'clock a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	