U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JULY 18, 2003

+ + + + +

WASHINGTON, D.C.

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at 9:30 a.m. in Conference Room of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Room 540, 624 Ninth Street; N.W., Washington, D.C., Mary Frances Berry, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, CHAIRPERSON
CRUZ REYNOSO, VICE CHAIRPERSON
JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, COMMISSIONER (via
Telephone)
CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR., COMMISSIONER
PETER N. KIRSANOW, COMMISSIONER (via Telephone)
ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER
RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, COMMISSIONER
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, COMMISSIONER (via
Telephone)

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:

MANUEL ALBA

KIMBERLEY ALTON

JOHN BLAKLEY

MARGARET BUTLER

DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Deputy General Counsel

KI-TAEK CHUN

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director for

Civil Rights Evaluation

PAMELA DUNSTON

LATRICE FOSHEE

WANDA JOHNSON

SOCK FOON MACDOUGAL

TINALOUISE MARTIN

MARC PENTINO

KWANA ROYAL

EILEEN RUDERT

JOYCE SMITH, Parliamentarian

ALEXANDER SUN

DAWN SWEET

DEBORAH VAGINS

AUDREY WRIGHT

TIFFANY WRIGHT

MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

KRISTINA ARRIAGA

LAURA BATIE

JOY FREEMAN

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

KIMBERLY SCHULD

MELISSA SHARP

KRISHNA TOOLSIE

SUMMER INTERNS PRESENT:

HILLARY BROWNE

DIEGO CHOJKIER

ALINA NEVENTSEL

SANG YOON PARK

WINSTON SHAW

ALISHEVA YUN

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-2701

-25

I-N-D-E-X

AGENDA ITEMS PAGE		PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	4
II.	Announcements	5
III.	Staff Director's Report	9
IV.	Ten-Year Check-Up: Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil Rights Recommenda Volume III	
V.	A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs In Indian Country	61
VI.	Briefing on community Reinvestment: Challenges Credit 'Access and C Accumulation in Low Income and Mi Communities	66 apital nority

4 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 2 (9:39 a.m.)3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The meeting will come 4 to order. 5 I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The first item on the 6 7 agenda is the approval of the agenda. Could I get a 8 motion? 9 COMMISIONER EDLEY: So moved. 10 COMMISSIONER REYNOSO: Second. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor indicate 12 by saying aye--13 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Wait, wait, 14 wait, wait. Can we move the items on which we 15 are voting up, you know, front; that is? Would that 16 be possible? I am trying to get out of town. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Would you have a problem right after the announcements and before the 18 19 staff director's report? 20 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, after the 21 staff director's report. That's fine. I don't want 22 to be unreasonable.

right after the staff director's report. Okay.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: That's great.

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

NEAL R. GROSS

23

24

25

It will be

1	Thank you so much.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I forgot what I was
3	doing. Oh. All in favor of approving the agenda
4	indicate by saying aye.
5	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ordered. The
9	minutes of the June 20th meeting, next item. Could I
LO	get a motion to approve?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN REYNOSO: So moved.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Has anybody got any
L3	changes or anything to the minutes?
L3 L4	changes or anything to the minutes? (No response.)
L4	' (No response.)
L4 L5	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS
L4 L5 L6	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item
L4 L5 L6 L7	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item on the agenda is announcements. As usual, I can't
L4 L5 L6 L7	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item on the agenda is announcements. As usual, I can't find them. Here they are.
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item on the agenda is announcements. As usual, I can't find them. Here they are. First of all, I would like to acknowledge
1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8 1.9	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item on the agenda is announcements. As usual, I can't find them. Here they are. First of all, I would like to acknowledge the death of Ms. Sylvia Tracy Amalfitano, who was a
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(No response.) II. ANNOUNCEMENTS CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item on the agenda is announcements. As usual, I can't find them. Here they are. First of all, I would like to acknowledge the death of Ms. Sylvia Tracy Amalfitano, who was a great contributor to the cause of civil rights in the

She earned a reputation for bravery in the

violent, sometimes violent, desegregation years, all those years in Boston, Massachusetts, which has been well documented, between the opportunity to chair this Commission and the Commission spent a lot of resources.

She had her car vandalized, bricks thrown through her window and all sorts of stuff happened to her. And she served not only with the Civil Rights Commission, but with the Boston police in neighborhood crime watch programs. She was really present in the civil rights, civic action community in Boston. And we just wanted to note her contributions.

The other is Ms. Lucille Gunderson, who volunteered and worked as an administrative assistant in the cause of civil rights and was in all kinds of good causes to change society, whether it was health care or civil liberties or civil rights.

We have with the Commission some summer interns, some new ones. If they are here, they can stand up. Winston Shaw from the Phillips Academy — wave if you are anywhere in here so people can see who you are.

Diego Chojkier from Washington University in St. Louis. Alisheva Yun, did I mispronounce his name? Alisheva attends Montgomery High School.

NEAL R. GROSS

Hilary Brown from Howard University School of Law.

Welcome. Sonya Park from Korea University in Seoul.

Is there anybody I've missed?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, Alina.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Who? Alina Neventsel from University of Windsor Law School. Where are they, are they working, they must be working.

In case anybody didn't know it, there was a Supreme Court decision involving diversity and affirmative action on June 23rd. I'm sure everybody knows that. So I don't need to tell you what they said except that the powerful decisions were consistent with the commission's longstanding policy supporting diversity and equal educational opportunity on these issues.

The other landmark decision that happened was the Lawrence v. Texas case, where the court made a revolutionary -- I shouldn't say revolutionary because it wasn't a revolution -- a decision claiming unconstitutional Texas' law regarding private and consensual sex between adults of the same sex.

It is, of course, within the administration of justice jurisdiction of this committee that we consider such issues in this environment, police arresting some people. It is seen

according to the analysis by the pundits and the experts, since this case that it is a landmark in its broad constitutional rights to sexual privacy. And there are a lot of issues left over, but it seems to be everybody agrees it's a landmark decision.

There was a recently released report that

I hope you noted last week, and we should get a copy
of it and send it out to the commissioners, don't you
think, if we haven't already, by the Lewis Mumford
Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research at
SUNY Law on how race counts for Hispanic Americans.
And it is very informative about the within group
differences within the Latino community and what the
social and economic implications and the
discrimination implications are for those.

I would like to read it myself. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was, of course, signed into law July 2, 1964; one of the great landmarks in the struggle for civil rights in this country. And the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 was enacted by Congress on July 26. That was a landmark that we should note.

So those are the announcements that I have. Does anyone else have an announcement that they would like to make?

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

ואום פטוואבדרו או ה אחמהב פארו

9 (No response.) 1 2 III. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The staff director's 3 report. Are there any questions anyone would like to 4 5 ask concerning the staff director's report? 6 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: * one question 7 about the educational count going to April for * 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That is Commissioner 9 Thernstrom speaking. They asked me to remind 10 everybody to identify themselves when they speak. 11 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Sorry. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I forgot to do that. So it's my fault. 13 14 Yes, Commissioner Thernstrom? 15 DIRECTOR JIN: STAFF (Interposing.) 16 Commissioner, * something that you sent me * expect 17 that the report will come out the early part of next 18 year. 19 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I haven't sent 20 anything out, so I couldn't tell you * 21 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We're looking at the

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We're looking at the possibility of having somebody effective examining the Maryland and Virginia documents that the Commission members may remember we had subpoenaed earlier.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: You know, I --

NEAL R. GROSS

22

23

24

maybe nobody else is in agreement? I would be very 1 2 pleased if we were kept apprised of, you know, who is 3 working on a project. That would interest me a great 4 deal. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Thernstrom -- the Staff Director says he will do that 6 7 -- would you try to find some time in your schedule to come and meet with the staff director and the staff to 8 9 talk about the education project? 10 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I will be delighted to do that, and if the Staff Director is in 11 town next week, I will be in town. At the end of next 12 13 week, I can easily come on Thursday or Friday. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe you could just, 15 when you come, maybe you could just discuss with them 16 what you see as the issues and how you think they 17 should be addressed and then discuss it with them. That would be interesting. 18 19 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I would be really 20 happy to do that. If the staff director is available 21 when I come into town, that would be really great. 22 would appreciate that. 23 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: No problem. 24 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: All right. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Does anyone

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

have any other questions on the staff director's report?

(No response.)

IV. TEN-YEAR CHECK-UP: HAVE FEDERAL AGENCIES

IV. TEN-YEAR CHECK-UP: HAVE FEDERAL AGENCIES RESPONDED TO CIVIL RIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS?:

VOLUME III

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the ten-year check-up, "Have Federal Agencies Responded to Civil Rights Recommendations?": Volume III, which is the statutory report.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This is Commissioner Kirsanow. Before we move on to that, I did have one matter with respect to the staff director. I think this is probably a more appropriate place to put in a request or actually move that consistent with what I think we agreed upon last April that we have a hearing or briefing on the ramifications of the Michigan decision. And those ramifications can be either — the scope of the briefing could be either very narrow or very broad.

We can do further briefings or hearings. And I would like to have some type of a briefing in the very near future on the effects of the *Grutter* case.

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

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When you say that you would like it narrow, we can, of course, start with a briefing. We don't really need to vote to do it. Can you explain what you mean, for the staff's information?

commissioner kirsanow: There are a whole variety of issues that are raised, mainly by the Grutter case, that I still think need to be addressed, or at least examined carefully. Several of them *, some got raised back in April or March the effect of the Rowe (phonetic) decision on the determination of what is a critical mass and who gets included in that critical mass. Specifically, many colleges exclude from the critical mass calculation the Asian-American students and other minorities. That is just one issue, also what is the determination of the plus factor, how is that applied, and what, in fact, is the plus.

The other thing -- and I am not necessarily focused on one given issue, whatever the staff director decides he wants the briefing on, I would be very pleased to hear about it. But I think we do need a briefing on the ramifications of the Michigan decision.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And could you,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	if you think of any issues that you want to make sure
2	they ask somebody to address, could you just let
3	someone know, send an e-mail or do something with the
4	staff director so he will know what you want covered
5	so that he can, to the extent possible, and anybody
6	else can do that, too. So that once you have figured
7	it out, he can make sure that somebody covers whatever
8	that is.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would be happy
10	to do so.
L1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, what sort
13	of timing are we talking about?
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, it's not going
15	to be in September. I can tell you that, and we don't
16	meet in August. We've got at least two months to
17	think about what other issues you want to have
18	covered.
19	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. That's
20	good.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. We won't tie him
22	down any more than that, I mean the staff director.
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I just wanted to
24	know if he was trying to do it in September.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He can't do it that

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

fast. Can you?

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

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: No.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: September we are going to have a briefing on Native American health care.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now we will do the ten-year check-up. We will hear from the staff director.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, Madam Chair. the Commissioners know, one of the Commission's vital functions each year is to do a report effectively a federal agency is meeting its duty to enforce civil rights laws. We saw comments that said this is * responsibility, so we feel * mandated the Commission complete at least one staff report a year. This year our report examines the performance of four federal agencies, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Interior, the Small Business Administration and EPA. * has responded to the recommendation in our report on the agencies and departments and that was a project the Commissioners agreed to a number of years to talk about at subsequent planning meetings.

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

1	To introduce the report I would like to
2	introduce OCRE Director Terri Dickerson to provide one
3	of her famous Power Point presentations.
4	MS. DICKERSON: I don't know about that,
5	but * couple of times *
6	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Can I ask a
7	question? * Can I get a sense of who is there.?
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, everybody is
9	here.
10	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Everybody is
11	There. Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You are on the phone,
13	and the rest of us are here, yes.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Abbie I'm on the
15	phone. I'm not physically present.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow
17	is on the phone, too.
18	MS. DICKERSON: Thank you. I want to
19	especially acknowledge that this has all been a team
20	effort. The team has worked really hard. This is the
21	third of four reports coming out of OCRE this fiscal
22	year. The fourth is on the agenda today too, just a
23	bit of a commercial
24	·*• *
25	MS. DICKERSON: The team leader on this

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

project was Margaret Butler, a civil rights analyst. Everyone in OCRE pretty much had a hand, but the core team was really Manuel Alba, Monique Dennis-Elmore, Sock-Foon McDougall, Wanda Johnson, and Eileen Rudert. OGC, of course, reviewed the report for legal sufficiency. And I also want to thank Dawn Sweet, the agency's editor. She's a team member in every respect on every project.

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

This is the third in a series of reports that follow up on recommendations that the Commission made in 16 enforcement reports between 1992 and 2000.

Just to refresh your memory this is Volume III.

Volumes I and II were delivered last year.

summarized Wе the of ten years recommendations in Volume I. Out of this came kind of a blueprint of sorts for civil rights enforcement. picked out the elements we found to be effective for civil rights enforcement and practices such planning, prioritizing, and resource management that seemed to help agencies max out on those elements.

Volume II was more like this year's volume in that we looked at agencies themselves and how they have responded to recommendations. Last year's study reviewed the Departments of Justice, Labor, and Transportation and the recommendations that have been

directed at both agencies. This year we looked at the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Small Business Administration.

And just to kind of run a commercial here, of upcoming attractions, we are going to be looking at the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and the EEOC.

It's very important to hone in on how this

-- I'm sorry. This says "Do not touch the laptop,"

but I think that was not directed to me. I'm going to

use the laptop.

The purpose of this was really to assess the extent to which some of the departments and agencies implemented the recommendations contained in past Commission reports. It differs markedly from what we have done before because previously we looked comprehensively at enforcement systems. For this, we looked at the recommendations that we already made and determined if the agencies had addressed them at all and, if they had, with what success they addressed them.

The methodology that we used was what we normally do. We looked at policy planning and budget documents. We reviewed annual reports. We looked at

civil rights implementation plans. We prepared interrogatories, written interrogatories, on select initiatives. And we reviewed the written responses that we received from the agencies.

We conducted interviews with the necessary civil rights staff when things were not elaborated upon enough or where there weren't sufficient responses in the interrogatories especially. And we reviewed other reports and sources that we either got from the agencies or other public information offices, such as GAO reports, et cetera.

We, as I said, looked at the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, the EPA, and the Small Business Administration. All of the recommendations came out of this report. We looked at all of these agencies in this particular year because these are agencies that have Title VI responsibilities, all of which had recommendations directed to them in this report entitled "Title VI Enforcement." And this was with federally assisted programs, not federally conducted programs. So all of the recommendations would be within this scope.

Let's jump through some of the findings, of course there are many more in the report but I am going to focus on some of the main themes. In terms

of the Department of Justice, we found that it hasn't issued as final the joint Title VI regulations of all 22 agencies with Title VI responsibilities. The last movement on this was in December 2000 when the draft was published. This really affects all agencies in this report. So we thought that it was necessary to address this.

The Department of Justice, we said, should publish final regulations immediately or, we had recommended, by March 2004. There was some movement on that in the year 2000, but it seems like it's kind of lost momentum since. There hasn't been any movement on this since there was some action taken in the year 2000.

There are some agencies that are not required to submit civil rights implementation plans, but if they have civil rights responsibilities, we really think they should. We think that all agencies with civil rights responsibilities really should submit a plan. If you don't make plans, you have little chance of carrying them out.

The Department of Justice hasn't really followed up. DOJ requires some federal agencies with Title VI responsibilities to submit annual plans which DOJ uses to evaluate their enforcement. Yet, they

MASHINGTON D.C. 20005-2701

1 don't require it of all agencies. COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can you repeat that? 2 The DOJ requires 3 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. 4 some agencies that have Title VI responsibilities to 5 submit an annual civil rights implementation plan to 6 evaluate their enforcement, but they don't require all 7 agencies with title VI responsibility to submit one. 8 as well, they are not reviewing And, 9 evidently or commenting on all of the implementation 10 plans that the agencies submit to them. We found one instance in which they had provided feedback to an 11 12 agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, and it 13 seemed like the only reason that they provided the feedback was because EPA asked for it. 14 So it seems 15 like it's just kind of tacit approval: if they don't 16 say anything, the agencies are assuming "Okay. Well, our plans are just fine." 17 18 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Is this 19 longstanding practice or is this something new? 20 know it's been our MS. DICKERSON: Ι 21 observation in our last several enforcement reports. 22 I can't really determine when it started. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We have been pointing 24 this out, for your information, Terri, we have been

pointing this out, the Commission has, in reports ever

1	since I got on the Commission. And that's two hundred
2	years ago.
3	MS DICKERSON: This is not something that
4	is new.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
6	Thernstrom, they finally did the reg redraft, which
7	was amazing because that had been recommended for God
8	only knows how long, by successive administrations.
9	It was a bipartisan failure, if that's your question.
10	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes, that
11	answers it, there's been no change with this
12	administration.
13	MS. DICKERSON: Oh, no. This goes way
14	back. DOJ has the coordinating responsibilities for
15	all agencies relative to their civil rights
16	responsibilities. I mean, I could be wrong, but I'm
17	thinking it might have even come under the 1964 Civil
18	Rights Act and the first regulations that came out of
19	that act. And the civil rights implementation plans
20	were part of the regs and how they were going to
21	monitor agencies.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The 1970's were the
23	last time I recall that they did it.
24	MS. DICKERSON: And this was something
25	that we found last year, that none of the agencies had

received feedback from the Department of Justice on their civil rights implementation plans.

So we recommended that DOJ require all agencies that have civil rights responsibilities to submit annual plans and that they provide feedback on them about how they can improve the enforcement. Looking at the plans, the agencies tend to use them kind of as a planning tool, but I think they can get a little bit more out of them.

Now, another recommendation is that the commission needs to have more than 10 staff members monitoring federal civil rights enforcement. This was done on a more routine basis in terms of going over and meeting with these staffs and going over their civil rights implementation plans and finding out what was being done, what they were planning. And our office is now the one that does it.

Now, we have ten people in the office, but some have complaints responsibilities and other responsibilities. One is me. We are not able to perform that ongoing monitoring function. So this is why it seems like a worthwhile expenditure of time to be able to assess how agencies are doing, really, with respect to our recommendations.

In terms of the priority of civil rights,

we found a model program. In December of 1996, the Environmental Protection Agency established a Title VI task force. And one of their primary responsibilities was to implement the commission's recommendations that came out of this June 1996 report. So it really succeeded in raising the priority of civil rights within the agency.

And we recommended, therefore, that other agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Justice, Labor, and Transportation, as well as the Small Business Administration that we have already reviewed in this context, that they will look at establishing task forces to implement the recommendations.

It seems like the Environmental Protection Agency more than the others really got a lot of traction and a lot of momentum going and were very successful in implementing a lot of the recommendations and going even further.

Let's turn to the Department of Agriculture. We looked at several offices within the Department of Agriculture. We looked at the Office of Civil Rights; the Farm Service Agency; the Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services Agency -- I'm sorry -- Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Let's just jump in to OCR, Office of Civil
Rights. In 1994, USDA reorganized and streamlined
staffing throughout the main headquarters at USDA
agencies and field offices. The secretary established
the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement within the
Office of Administration.

Then in 1995, they disbanded OCRE and

Then in 1995, they disbanded OCRE and divided the civil rights responsibilities between what was the Office of Operations and the Policy Analysis and Coordination Center.

A couple of years later, they consolidated the civil rights functions under a new Office of Civil Rights with complaints units for employment and program delivery and increased the enforcement budget.

And then, coming out of 1997, in August of 1997, they established an office for outreach, which was under the assistant secretary for administration, and a Civil Rights Division within the Office of General Counsel. So coming out of 1997, we have had additional offices created with civil rights responsibilities.

Some other significant dates in terms of reorganizations: in 2002, Congress passed the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 and they designated the position of Assistant Secretary for

NEAL R. GROSS

Civil Rights.

And this year in April, as I'm sure everyone knows, they swore in a new Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. This action seems to be an expression that civil rights is going to be elevated within the agency.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Question?

MS. DICKERSON: Yes?

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: What is the significance of these changes in organizational structure that are important and what do you think about that.

MS. DICKERSON: Well, I think that it says something about -- what we have found is the inability to just kind of get going and keep momentum in some of their initiatives and programs because it seems like the civil rights function kept being changed. The reporting authority changed quite significantly in several instances.

In some cases, that really even changed how complaints were handled and investigated and by which offices. It did have quite an effect. And all of these changes, I think what we are seeing kind of diluted some of the initiatives that they were trying to get going at USDA.

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

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So you think 1 2 that these organizational changes are a bad thing. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes? 4 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I had a conversation, 5 during the Clinton Administration, both with Secretary Mike Espy and with Secretary Dan Glickman, 6 7 And Ι know from their successor. personal 8 perspectives, they were struggling, trying to figure 9 out how to graft civil rights sensibilities onto an 10 organization that was, shall we say, highly resistant 11 to thinking about this. I had the sense in the conversations with 12 13 each of them that they were really struggling to 14 figure out what's the right formula. Is there a right 15 formula for elevating this mission and making it more 16 effective within USDA, which is a vast bureaucracy and 17 in many respects a highly decentralized bureaucracy. 18 And all of this is taking place against 19 the backdrop of black farmers' litigation and other 20 So they have a sense of reeling under the issues. 21 weight of genuine civil rights problems with 22 organization that for decades has been resistant to 23 civil rights sensibilities. So what do we do? 24 I don't think that either of them -- well,

I know that neither of them was ever really satisfied

1 that they could come up with the right way to change 2 the culture of the vast bureaucracy. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair Reynoso? 3 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: T have а 5 In your judgement with the new assistant 6 secretary for civil rights, will the other changes be 7 effective in changing the culture because in different 8 capacities, I have been observing the Department of 9 Agriculture now for nearly half a century. I'm not 10 sure it's changed much in that time in terms of civil 11 rights. 12 MS. DICKERSON: Well, in our findings --13 we do have some findings associated with this. And we 14 did find that it has had a history of being complex 15 and very decentralized. The roles and duties of the civil rights offices have been delegated, but they're 16 17 not very effective. 18 And it is the hope that with this new 19 assistant secretary for civil rights, that there will be more focus and direction and I think basically an 20 21 elevation of civil rights within the agency so that it 22 is more coordinated. And that was part of our 23 findings. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In general, I agree 25 with all of Commissioner the in answer to

MACHINICTON DC 20005-3701

Redenbaugh's question, the Commission has over the years always recommended that symbolically it is important for the leadership of civil rights in an agency to have access to the highest levels in the agency as a matter of bureaucratic sensitivity since those who are in the civil service notice such things, like who reports to whom and who has got the window office or whatever and that that's always important as who gets to go to the Secretary's staff meetings. So we have an opportunity for access.

Now, we all know, the Commission has known, that title doesn't necessarily give you access because if the Secretary doesn't like you, or for some reason isn't interested in what you are doing, you can forget about access. But the understanding was that it signals to the organization that this is important, and it signals to the organization that this person is going to get access.

My understanding is -- I have worked with university administrations, but I have not been in for-profit organizations of the kind that Commissioner Redenbaugh is used to dealing with. But my understanding from people who do is that those things are considerations in the private sector, too, like who reports to whom and is this important or is that

.20

important. So I think that that probably is where this comes from.

What is the COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: in of filing reports; delinquency terms implementation of Title VI, for instance. You know, when I think of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I think over the years there has been a series of reports filed. Yes. reports are filed *.

And so that what we're really * anyway as even though we specifically delve into the law * that there be a reporting process. You're really talking about the culture of an agency. And it's a fairly minor point whether they actually have the report and stick it in a filing cabinet and cardboard boxes eventually when they finally read them and they're on paper.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know about that, Commissioner Thernstrom, having run several education programs in the Carter Administration and having had the staff be the recipient of all these reports you talk about needing filing cabinets. Whether they read them or not, the fact that you folks up in Massachusetts or wherever, the states where you had to submit the reports in the first place.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Somebody had to focus on submitting them. 1 2 And in some cases, the secretaries did 3 read them, and in some cases they didn't. That is 4 what these all are, are the types of reports that we 5 as an agency in this case education have to submit to 6 Congress -- and every agency does, all the people. 7 And realize that they just put them in a 8 file cabinet and the hell with it, but the fact is 9 that these are all staff accountability measures. 10 They are all attempts, as I understand it, in policy 11 terms to try to get some accountability built into the 12 system. 13 And it doesn't always work because people 14 are people. But at least you tried. And you can't 15 really hit people over the head like you can't really 16 * money. 17 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I understand 18 that, * It's just that I think the real issue is what 19 Cruz brought up, which is the culture of an agency. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. I think that's 21 And it's hard. Yes, Commissioner Redenbaugh, 22 you started all of this. 23 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I had nothing to 24 do with it. 25

(Laughter.)

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: The* difficulty
2	that we have with this * report, which is let me
3	back up for a minute. You can't * need to move away
4	from * those things that can be easily measured, like
5	head count and budget. People are better *
6	observation, even though we're not organizational
7	design experts, the point that you were making, Madam
8	Chair, about opportunities for access. I think it's
9	important for us to be able to work in terms of
10	operations. But I still think we haven't yet been
11	able to get to the since * state *which seems to me*
12	or at least * more difficult task which is to measure
13	outputs or at least methods that are quantifiable *
14	And I would just put a line in the report that *
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So if amending the
16	appointment of the Assistant Attorney General is a
17	signal of commitment, by the politicos, that they're
18	signaling at least that they're committed to trying to
19	change the culture?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
21	MS. DICKERSON: Within the report, there is
22	a very detailed discussion. This dates from October
23	13, 1994 on pages 7 and 8, and it goes to April 6,
24	2003. It gets into a whole lot more of the subtext of

a lot of these changes.

And within that, in 1996, the Commission suggested that in the light of all of these changes, Title VI enforcement may not receive adequate attention. The staff thought there were too many layers between our and the Secretary's office. And they felt that they were, as a result, not being as effective as they could be.

The Commission suggested that they rebuild their Title VI program and implement immediately several changes that would strengthen the program including that they equate the priority of civil rights in the agency. * Volume I of this series of reports, the very first recommendation really gets into the priority of civil rights within the agency as expressed by its positioning relative to the top.

There was a core recommendation that there seemed to be some connection between how effective an agency was and how they were structured, at least how they were perceived to be structured in terms of their situation within the agency itself.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think we've nailed that one. Let's move on.

MS. DICKERSON: Okay. Moving on to the other efforts to improve, the Office of Inspector General issued eight reports in 1997 to 2000 about the

NEAL R. GROSS

weak civil rights enforcement at the USDA Office of Civil Rights.

The Secretary formed work groups to recommend improvements. And there was a civil rights action team that was implemented at the time. They were assigned to guide the implementation of the recommendations. That team was in place between December 1996 and March of 1998.

Also, significantly, since the last time we reviewed the agency, they settled a class action suit with African American farmers for racial discrimination. That was in April of 1999.

Another significant event that occurred since we last looked at them is that they first issued a long-term improvement plan to increase staff, streamline complaints, and standardize their operating procedures. They began to implement the planned improvements in January of 2000, and they're still implementing those plans.

USDA. Here are just some of the findings. There are many more in the report. The first one is they have one of the most complex and decentralized civil rights programs in federal government. The roles, duties, and responsibilities are delegated but not effectively

coordinated.

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 recommended that USDA officials should consult past Commission reports and establish ongoing Commission with the concerning liaisons for improving civil rights recommendations In other words, there are resources enforcement. here. We certainly would be happy to confer with them or if they need some elaboration on what we were recommending at either then or now. And they should also establish liaisons with the Environmental Protection Agency to learn their best practices.

We also found that in its reorganizations, USDA has tried to consolidate civil rights functions into one office. All agencies civil rights legal assistants are still not under the assistant secretary for civil rights' supervision. So we are a bit concerned about that. They are going to have to kind of reach into another office to carry out outreach responsibilities. And outreach really is a massive part of Title VI.

USDA should study whether placing the Office of Outreach and other offices that have civil rights functions, right within the assistant secretary's office. We think that if they did, they could really enforce more effectively and quickly and

implement changes that we are suggesting.

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

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Excuse me. Т just want to comment that I think that is a very serious structural problem because I have found that if you have a recommendation for improving civil rights enforcement but didn't stop to * someone else at the agency * about whether this should be done, the process can fail anywhere along the line. I just very much think that your recommendation is the proper one think this is really faulty to make, I organizational structure.

MS. DICKERSON: Yes. In addition to that, the outreach is not necessarily done by people who have expertise in civil rights. I mean, they might have expertise in other things, but if they really understood Title VI, outreach could be enhanced.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: * on decisions made by local committees established by the Department of Agriculture that have little reporting processes to the department or the * extreme decentralization process, that I have to * of civil rights, it seems to me that is not as effective.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It might make the Assistant Secretary in a position where it's signaling that he is really important and his job is, really

1	important. And that's good for the administration to
2	do. But then they might be undermining what they are
3	trying to do. But setting it up that way, they ought
4	to give some thought to what they need to do to put
5	under that person's span of control so that they can
6	really be successful.
7	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Do you know if they
8	are making plans to align them?
9	MS. DICKERSON: Not at present.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: They might if we
11	recommend that.
12	. MS. DICKERSON: I hope I didn't
13	mischaracterize this at the beginning, so let me
14	clarify. This staff does put together their civil
15	rights implementation plans. What I am suggesting is
16	that after the plans go to the Department of Justice,
17	these agencies don't get feedback from the Department
18	of Justice. So I wasn't saying that they are
19	delinquent in submitting plans.
20	Another finding, USDA doesn't have a
21	budget line item for civil rights enforcement. OCR
22	cannot distinguish the budget for Title VI from that
23	for other civil rights statutes, for example,
24	expenditures associated with the internal employment

complaints and the Title VI expenditures. They all

come out of the same budget. And OCR couldn't tell us 1 2 how much of the budget went for one, as opposed to the 3 other. This was a carryover from a recommendation 4 5 in 1996. So we recommended again that USDA should 6 establish budget line items and account separately for 7 headquarters and agency resources for civil rights 8 It should track those resources and enforcement. 9 expenditures separately for Title VI and other civil 10 rights statutes. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: What is 12 particularly important is the Supreme Court opinion 13 that you can't have private lawsuits in Title VI. it is important for the agencies to announce exactly 14 15 what they are doing with the resources * (10:25:13) 16 In terms of resources and MS. DICKERSON: 17 funding and staffing, we found that also although OCR studied its staffing levels and justified its budget 18 19 requests for increases, Congress and the agency have 20 not honored many of those requests. 21 So we looked at the staffing scenarios

that they proposed and the justifications. And they seemed to have merit, but they haven't gotten the budget that they have requested as a result.

We recommended that Congress reconsider

22

23

24

these requests for additional money and resources so that OCR can be more effective, especially because they really have in our view succeeded in the demonstration of the inadequacy of their resources to carry out their work load.

In terms of planning, the OCR tracking systems don't separate Title VI resources and expenditures from those of other activities. The goals and time lines were unrealistic because expenditures weren't linked to accomplishments.

And what we recommended is that they should upgrade their Title VI tracking capabilities and strengthen the relationship between expenditures and accomplishments and use that information to plan reasonable goals and streamline procedures efficiently so that they can meet those goals.

The policy guidance, their compliance review guidance, we found to be very confusing about the different types of reviews they perform. There are different levels of reviews. There are internal, and external reviews.

Unless you are an insider, it is very difficult to navigate their guidance. And if you are a recipient, it is hard to know whether you are in compliance or out of compliance.

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

1	२०
1	So we recommended that they immediately
2	need to clarify the differences in enforcement for
3	federally conducted versus federally assisted
4	programs.
5	They need to distinguish the types of
6	oversight reviews and clarify the meaning of "program
7	reviews" because the term "program" is used in
. 8	different ways to mean different things but within the
9	same guidance.
10	We found that they had developed a new
11	enforcement tool, which was civil rights impact
12	analyses. They perform analyses of proposed agency
13	actions before their implementation so that they can
14	eliminate any harmful civil rights effects.
15	So what that means is if there is a new
16	policy or new initiative that is under consideration
17	by the USDA, then they will analyze that initiative
18	for civil rights impact. And we thought that that
19	was, good, yes?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Who is "they"?
21	MS. DICKERSON: The Office of Civil Rights.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: This is the new
23	assistant secretary?
24	MS. DICKERSON: The staff that reports to
25	him, yes.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.

MS. DICKERSON: Although USDA requires civil rights impact analyses before a program change we recommended they also, should conduct ongoing, cyclical analyses to identify any harmful effects evidenced after implementation.

So right now what they do is preceding any policy change, they analyze the initiative for civil rights impact, but they don't go back to see if there was something that they maybe overlooked in their initial analysis. And we thought they should do some ongoing and follow-up analyses in the same way. That was our recommendation.

In terms of technical assistance, they don't have the resources to assign each agency a desk officer to provide technical assistance. Nine desk officers are assigned to serve all USDA agencies. And some desk officers serve as many as five agencies.

We recommended that they should allocate additional staff so that each USDA agency has a full-time desk officer providing technical assistance.

Again, this resonates with our findings and recommendations out of 1996.

We found in terms of complaints processing that OCR can't determine the number of Title VI

NEAL R. GROSS

complaints that it processes. And, furthermore, the complaints aren't consistently processed, and the processing takes too long. There is a large backlog of open complaints. This finding resonates with other government reports, including GAO. We recommended that OCR should separately track Title VI complaints and establish procedures in order to give a quick, consistent, appropriate response so that backlogs don't reach unacceptable levels, or to eliminate the backlog.

The compliance reviews. Several years passed without OCR conducting any compliance reviews And we recommended that they should conduct at all. regular and systematic oversight overviews of USDA agencies and their civil rights compliance. They should select the components to review both strategically and systematically so they can ensure there is comprehensive coverage.

In terms of compliance reviews, we also found that USDA agencies don't systematically collect participation eligibility statistics for their programs. They don't really know who in the prospective population is qualified and eligible that isn't already participating in these programs.

So we recommended that they should collect

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 data and perform analyses and compare them with the rest of applicant pools and determine whether their outreach is reaching eligible populations.

Staff training. We found that the training addresses general topics like cultural diversity and program accessibility, but that it has little or no content in Title VI enforcement.

And we recommended specific topics that should be covered in a Title VI training program, like outreach, policy guidance, complaints processing, compliance reviews, data collection and analysis, and civil rights impact analysis. While it's good to have cultural diversity as part of the training material it should not be in place of, the nuts and bolts, meat and potatoes, Title VI enforcement material.

We found evidence of some coordination at OCR and a number of formal agreements which delineate responsibilities with other USDA agencies processing complaints but not enough. They should establish MOUs and other of more memoranda understanding, that is -- and make sure that they are making determinations on complaints that ensure a complete and comprehensive and consistent and really expedient complaint-processing result within the agency.

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	In terms of the Farm Services Agency, we
2	found that despite the Commissions's 1996
3	recommendations, each state at the time in 1996, we
4	said that each state should have a full-time civil
5	rights director, but now only one state has a
6	full-time civil rights director. We recommended that
7	FSA should require each of the 50 states have a
8	full-time civil rights specialist, based on our 1996
9	recommendations.
10	In terms of the staffing with regard to
11	the Farm Services Agency, we felt that they couldn't
12	provide information on staff training expenditures
13	because the Financial Management Division tracks, and
14	monitors its budget.
15	We recommended that they should have the
16	authority to submit and control their own budget for
17	enforcement programs so that they can track
18	expenditures, themselves, and not another office, not
19	the budget office.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How long do you think
21	your presentation will be?
22	MS. DICKERSON: I am going to run through -
23	_
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No. I'm only asking.
25	If you don't know, just say you don't know.

1	MS. DICKERSON: I definitely can shorten
2	it.if
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, I understand, but
4	how long do you think?
5	MS. DICKERSON: Possibly another ten
6	minutes.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, go ahead, then.
8	Go right ahead. I was going to take a 15, but
9	MS. DICKERSON: I think I will work faster
10	through some of the Farm Services Agency.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: They have similar
12	problems as to
13	MS. DICKERSON: I can possibly skip the
14	Department of Agriculture and maybe get into another
15	agency. Why don't I do that.
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Before you do
17	that, though, I had a question on the Department of
18	Agriculture, if I may.
19	MS. DICKERSON: Yes?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: At least to the
21	issue of the volume of complaints, which I understand
22	it's down, and your recommendation, the report has
23	about that or interpretation can have about that, I
24	wanted to ask about the department's rebuttal to that
25	interpretation.

MS. DICKERSON: Okay. 1 2 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Is it 3 sufficiently confusing? MS. DICKERSON: I'll put them up there, 4 5 the rebuttal of that, right now. We asked for 6 information and documents to verify what we have in 7 our report, and we accepting their affected agency review without having received any other sources or 8 9 really kind of in conflict with even a report another 10 government report. 11 We couldn't find anything that kind of 12 verifies what was in the affected agency review. 13 seemed to go against the other evidence that we had. 14 And generally we looked at a number of sources and, as 15 well, we would ask the agency to produce the report 16 that indicates there was -- in the letter. And we 17 weren't able to get that verification. So that's --18 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Was there a 19 decline or --20 MS. DICKERSON: Well, I don't think that I 21 would use the word "decline," but I think that they 22 may have considered this presenting something offered 23 in the letter that they sent us as their way of 24 providing the information of --

WASHINGTON DC 20005-3701

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What's the conflict?

1	What's the conflict?
2	MS. DICKERSON: We were really indicating
3	that there was a longer tracking time as well as a
4	more significant backlog than the affected agency
5	review letter indicated that they thought they had.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And your documentation
7	for that was another repot, a government report? They
8	made a report.
9	MS. DICKERSON: Well, we asked for it. In
LO	this process of review and in the interrogatories, we
L1	asked them to produce the reports which would indicate
L2	what their complaint backlog was. Working with that
L3	evidence that we got from the agency as well as what
L4	was in another government report, it really was
L5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Alex, please, you are
L <u>.</u> 6	disrupting us. Yes. Go ahead.
L7	MS. DICKERSON: We could not put those
L8	pieces of information together. And it was very
L9	different from what the agency was asking us to change
20	the numbers to in their letter.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And what was their
22	evidence to support changing the numbers?
23	MS. DICKERSON: It was just the person who
24	wrote the letter. He didn't cite a source.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It didn't claim
2	in the letter, which I have no problem with, but there
3	was a change in the concept from what the old
4	measurement was relevant given the new process.
5	MS. DICKERSON: Yes. They did not
6	elaborate on what that new process is. And if it is
7	to determine that a complaint is complete at an
8	earlier point, I don't know that we would necessarily
9	accept that number. They didn't really elaborate on
10	exactly how that processing time is reduced I could
11	read the reference in the letter I can't really find
12	it. It's a 14-page letter, but
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: * (10:38:45)
14	MS. DICKERSON: I am sorry. But, as I
15	recall, there was an indication that they changed the
16	way that they processed complaints but not an
17	elaboration on what the complaints process now
18	entails. We would have
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is it unusual for
20	agencies to object to the way you characterize what
21	they do as a criticism? Is that unusual?
22	MS. DICKERSON: Very often, trust me.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay.
24	MS. DICKERSON: As well, their letter that
25	you're referencing says that the GAO report, which is

one of the ones we relied on, cited as evidence that 1 processing times and actually reflect a difference of 2 opinion over how the agency defines processing time. 3 So, again, since it was really kind of in 4 5 that very gray area and not elaborated upon in terms 6 of what their processing time consists of. Whether 7 they cut steps off in determining whether a complaint 8 is backlogged or not, when it is in the mail, or when, 9 it's in their mind they've resolved it, (10:39:55) or 10 is it when the agency has sent it from point A to 11 point B? 12 There are a lot of things that could have 13 determined that, but since they weren't really 14 specific in that, we weren't inclined to accept that 15 the backlog was, therefore, reduced and the processing 16 time was shorter. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 18 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: So the methodology 19 you used is generally consistent with the 20 approach the GAO has taken? 21 MS. DICKERSON: I don't know that I would 22 say we used that as a model or anything, but I think 23 it probably would be more arrived at in terms of when 24 we felt like a complaint was completely answered. 25 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Okay.

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

MS. DICKERSON: And sometimes there may be 1 2 a tendency of an agency to think of it as complete at 3 a different point, an earlier point. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes? 4 5 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Madam Chair, since we're leaving the USDA I just wanted to ask her to 6 7 comment that I thought the recommendations regarding the Food and Nutrition Service, Food, Nutrition, and 8 Consumer Services, whatever it is called now. 9 The 10 impact is critical. I mean, this is a huge operation, 11 they've got food stamps, WIC and so forth, and the 12 notion that they have so little capacity to ensure that the way in which nutrition programs are run by 13 14 the states is affected, is kind of frightening. 15 So I just want to commend the staff for 16 highlighting the decision to revisit their strategy 17 for dealing with *. 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. This 19 is Jennifer Braceras. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes? 21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: * I'm wondering * 22 or if that's not convenient, I'm happy to give a proxy vote to another commissioner. 23 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't accept 25 proxies, but, Commissioner, Terri said she is going to

be finished in a little bit. * Okay?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: *

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

MS. DICKERSON: Turning to the Department of Interior, the office for EEO is part of the Office of Policy Management and Budget. However, OEO staff should oversee policy management and budget. Again, there is too much distance between the assistant secretary and the civil rights programs. So the status of civil rights ought to be elevated within that office by placing it on a par with other DOJ offices that report directly to the front office.

We also found * within DOI something that came up earlier. There just seems to be kind of a culture of lots of movement, lots of policy changes, lots of shifts and not very much enforcement. I don't mean to express this in such a nutshell, but in the interests of time, I will just say that.

One other observation in terms of Interior, because they don't allocate separate funds for OEO, the director has to justify every single office need. So we recommended that DOI needs to track Title VI and other civil rights resources and expenditures and allocate funds for civil rights separately.

1	I'm going to fast forward to the
2	Environmental Protection Agency. We found that within
3	the EPA, the OCR directly reports to the EPA
4	administrator. External and internal civil rights
5	functions are separated. And we recommended that the
6	Commission commend EPA for elevating the stature and
7	accountability of its civil rights office.
8	We also found that the external compliance
9	program doesn't have its own budget, but it will,
10	beginning in 2004. They lack an electronic database
11	for tracking expenditures. And these points are
12	reflected in of the recommendations.
13	- I guess that was it.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: That's it?
15	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Let me ask, are
17	there any questions, based not only on the
18	presentation, but on the new report?
19	No?
20	. I do want to comment again on the
21	Department of Agriculture, because they have such far-
22	flung programs very often administered by other
23	entities, that it seems to me that because * it
24	particularly needs more hands-on type of oversight to
25	make sure that the other federal agencies are

enforcing the civil rights obligations. Some have a 1 greater need than some of the other agencies, yet 2 continue to place a lesser importance on it. 3 So, again, I think the recommendations are 4 5 not new what the all good, but they are 6 recommendations are, because you are just responding 7 to past recommendations. But they are going to have a real job, I think, if they're going to truly implement 8 9 the type of policy established by Congress. 10 MS. DICKERSON: If we have a second, maybe 11 I could just get into the affected agency review just a little bit and what the comments were. 12 I'm just 13 going to summarize them here. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Let's take two 15 or three minutes to do that. 16 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Then the Chair 18 will join us. 19 All right. I didn't DICKERSON: 20 really say very much about the Small Business 21 Administration either. I will say that we found a 22 conformation problems we noted in earlier reports because they are not able to separate their Title VI 23 24 and VII expenditures. And that was one of the main 25 problems that we found with their program. As well,

they have requested and provided justification for*
and justified their additional staffing, but they have
not received the increases that they thought that they
needed in order to be effective.

effected agency the review. received -- there were a number of comments that we received from each agency. Sixty-eight comments from OCR, 11 from the Farm Services Agency, and 71 from the Nutrition Service and 17 from the Food and Conservation Service. And this tracked whether the nature of the comments made; whether they were editorial or whether they were classification and elaboration or collection and update. In many cases, they were printing act typos and things of that nature.

I also pointed out earlier we might not have made an agency's change. In large measure, we might not have accepted something that was a description of future plans. They might have given us descriptions of things that they had planned to do, but had not yet implemented, so we would not have changed the report based on what they are planning to do.

Additionally, in the case of one agency, there were additions that were just adding unnecessary

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	details that really weren't pertinent to the
2	discussion and didn't change the findings and
3	recommendations at all. So while it's a lot of
4	interesting, as it is extraneous, we would not add it
5	to the information. I know the Commission remembers
6	that when I first got here they told me to stop doing
7	the reports that are this thick, and to start doing
8	ones that are this thick. Also, if there were
9	comments that were unsupported or disputed by the
10	documents that we received, or exceeded the scope,
11	those would be other reasons why we didn't respond.
12	CHAIPERSON BERRY: Okay, in view of that,
13	we should try to get on with the vote so that those
14	commissioners who have time constraints will be able
15	to get to their meetings.
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I move the adoption
17	of the report.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Is there
20	any further discussion?
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I would say that
22	I am trying to understand Terri's presentation about
23	the recommendations with the Ag Department I found
24	instructive and useful and * I'm a little confused
25	about the report, but I think that can be dealt with

in an editorial or we might even have the staff director draft this. So I think this applicant would understand * serious, but as I said earlier, that I want us to move our reports that point to where we're managing outcomes rather * but I think that recommending the organizational design and process changes was a good start in that direction.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Could I just make a point that I am very sympathetic with Commissioner Redenbaugh's point about looking to outcomes and effects. For example, there are some very critical budget recommendations here that, but as a former budgeteer, I know how much is involved in terms of resources. I just wonder if they can handle this. I think it would be a good thing if, over time if possible, for this Commission to find help from outside, perhaps the National Academy of Sciences.

So to get back to this question of how do you measure outcomes in more effective ways, I am very sympathetic to an effort to do that. Without developing that kind of science of program evaluation in the civil rights arena, I think we are wasting the technology available to us.

So I am sympathetic with Commissioner

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

1	Redenbaugh. Perhaps we can design some long-term
2	agenda to get into some of these blind areas to which
3	he keeps referring us.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And Commissioner
5	Redenbaugh, as well as you, he has said that we are
6	willing to visit with the staff. In fact, he sent
7	some things to all of us about getting new outputs to
8	work to try to come up with some type of metric, or
9	whatever it is. So I think that's a great idea.
LO	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, I
L1	just want to understand what Chris and Commissioner
L2	Redenbaugh had just indicated. I think that Terri and
L3	whoever else was involved in the production of this
L4	report did a splendid job given the direction that
L5	they've been given.
16	I do have concerns with respect to the
L7	outputs also. I think that Commissioner Edley has
L8	proposed a way of looking at that that might be
19	useful.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Commissioner
21	Meeks?
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes.
23	Commissioner Thernstrom here
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Just a moment,
25	Commissioner Thernstrom. I had already recognized

1	Commissioner Meeks.
2	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: This goes along with
3	those same comments, but I would just want to hear
4	what your next review of USDA would be, since they
5	just confirmed the Assistant Secretary of Civil
6	Rights. And I just wondered if there's some way we
7	can continue follow-up with them because it seems like
8	a key time that they can align the Office of Civil
9	Rights.
10	MS. DICKERSON: It's not among our
11	assignments due 2005, but that always would be up to
12	you.
13	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: To me, that is one of
14	the key recommendations coming out of this report, is
15.	that opportunity.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Okay. Are
17	we ready for the vote
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: *
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
20	Thernstrom? I'm sorry. Commissioner Thernstrom, you
21	are recognized.
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: It brings me back
23	to the question. I mean, I think we ought to look
24	into issuing a * support. The reason is the staff *
25	reason that he left his job is * is expressly because

they helped * misquided candidate the * he got in in 1 1966, and he said, in effect, "Ask how well these kids 2 can read. Don't tell me how much money you can spend. 3 That would be an innovative question that was never 4 5 properly addressed in the follow-up report. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay --7 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Excuse me, Madame 8 Chair? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner 9 10 Braceras? COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I guess I want 11 12 to respond to some of the comments that were made, but I'd just like to state for the record that I agree 13 14 with the staff that it should be drafted * customers, 15 but again, but I don't see an add-in * And for that 16 reason, I'd like a short statement to be published 17 with the report, mainly for the purpose of getting my 18 concerns into the public domain consistent with what we did in the last one and consistent with my vote on 19 20 line two. So that * under line three, simply to 21 register my concern with the way the report has been 22 given. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 24 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: And after I -- as 25 I told you, I am going to propose * the same reason,

1	join Jennifer Braceras on this. And, again, at the
2	same time expressing my appreciation for the work that
3	was put in.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
5	Questions?
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. All of
7	those in favor indicate by saying aye.
8	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?
10	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "nays.")
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The vote was
12	what was it? Five to three.
13	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Five to three *
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would like to
15	write a dissent. What's the time frame for a
16	dissent?
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: *
18	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Madam Chair, I would
19	like to call for a fairly short amount of time because
20	the staff * and that will get it out to the printers
21	and get it on the street by September. So seven days,
22	or if it seems like now that's not sufficient, maybe
23	ten days.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Ten days would be
25	fine.

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

1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ten days? The 2 We really appreciate that because we do have a 3 time constraint on this one. Yes, Vice-Chair? 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I want to file 5 just a very quick response to these concerns, but I 6 can do it in 24 hours. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Twenty-four hours. Well ? 8 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What's 10 procedure for that? Do you do fax and then respond to the fax? Because if that's the case, there will be a 11 12 tit for tat case going on. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no. Well, you see, 14 * he might want to do a different statement, but if he 15 does, he'll have to do it within the time constraint. 16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. But here is 17 my concern: he is obviously free to write whatever he 18 wants, but it should be submitted contemporaneously. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anyone who submits 21 anything will submit it within the ten-day time 22 constraint, and will not be privy to the other 23 people's writings. We don't have time to go back and 24 forth forever writing exchanges on this stuff. We've

never done that. So we're not going to start now.

	61
1	Okay. Did everybody hear that? Good.
2	Thank you, Terri, and thank the staff. We
3	very much appreciate what you have done
4	VI: A QUIET CRISIS: FEDERAL FUNDING AND UNMET
5	NEEDS IN INDIAN COUNTRY
6	The next item on the agenda is A Quiet
7	Crisis: Federal Funding of Unmet Needs in Indian
8	Country
9	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have to get
10	off the phone now.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thank you, I
13	appreciate it; I do have to run.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're sorry you are.
15	Is someone else getting off?
16	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I believe
17	Commissioner Braceras is getting off.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
19	Thernstrom, thank you very much.
20	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I hope you catch your
22	plane.
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff director, do you
25	have anything to say here before Commissioner Meeks

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

makes her comment? Is that okay?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: That's okay. That's okay.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks, please.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes. I want to thank the staff for this report. I am just so impressed with the quality and the depth. I met with a party of American Indians. I told them it was going to be on the Web site yesterday. So they read it with great interest. And I just want to say a couple of things that they said, and I agree with them completely. And I'll save my comments and actually say what I could note from them.

According to them, they think it's the most comprehensive look at the state of Indian Country funding and commitment levels of need on a broad scale that they have seen in the last decade. And they wanted to draw special attention to the areas of infrastructure that they say that all available * will go towards building new schools and houses, but without water service, electrical grids, and communication systems, that they are practically valueless. And then the tribal *, that was especially important to them. That was mentioned.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

And tribal priority allocations.

Increased funding in tribal priority allocations gives tribes means which have no other discretionary funding the opportunity to pursue other priorities.

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

And they also wanted us to * actions of the executive agencies that they would encourage the Commission to turn an eye to Congress as well, but the legislative branch lies outside the the Commission's authority. scope of The appropriations process is twofold and the decision on funding amounts rests on the shoulders of elected officials, just as much as the executive agencies. So, regardless of the Commission's ability to directly influence legislative change, implementing these recommendations will create an environment that will seize Congressional attention.

So we are developing * submitting this report or writing this report * . The only other editorial thing that I would like to say is I would really like to see an executive summary attached to this because it is getting reviewed by a very wide audience. And an executive summary would be really in order.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Thank you.

Does anyone else have any comment,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1	64
1	suggestions about the Indian country report? Yes,
2	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. I think
4	its a good and long overdue report to * I am pleased
5	that in September we continue with our briefing. As a
6	Commission, we have neglected this topic far too long.
7	Here's another example where we must get through to
8	something besides measuring just the money, because
9	the money spent is *, but doesn't seem to produce any
LO	results. Or not enough results.
11	So I hope that in future * investigations
L2	we can explore what else is needed in addition to
13	resources. Or at least what's missing.
L4	So that's what I would say about it. Measuring the
L5	money isn't enough; it's where we stop with this one.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Absolutely. Okay, can I
L 7.	get a motion to approve this report?
18	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: So moved.
19	(Motion made off-microphone) .
20	COMMISSIONERS REYNOSO AND REDENBAUGH:
21	second.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Questions? All those
23	in favor indicate by saying "Aye."
24	(Chorus of ayes.)
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'd 1 like to 2 abstain. This is Braceras. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I abstain also. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Kirsanow and Braceras 6 abstain. 7 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: For the reasons I 8 mentioned earlier. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The report passes, 10 then, with two abstentions. And Terri and the staff, 11 let me thank you again for the wonderful work that you 12 do, and we really appreciate it. We appreciate your 13 staff. I'll have to come up with another way to show 14 my appreciation, but this is about all I can do. 15 thank you very much. 16 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: I have a couple of 17 matters, actually, just to wrap up. * which is the * 18 time that you need it. * You did a great job; I don't 19. know how many times you've done it, but the first time 20 *; an extraordinary job. *have an understanding on 21 many reports. 22 Terri said before, from Regional 23 Programs Unit, Dawn Sweet contributed much of the work 24 that very few people see, but people upstairs do, and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

those who work with her see her every day. She's an

extraordinary staffer. I don't get used to the fact that the * the staff and thank someone I like ? Terri, and I know you all have seen the work Terri does, but I just wanted to publicly acknowledge the leadership she has provided to all of these projects. Her contribution has been extraordinary in every phase, so I want to thank the staff.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is Commissioner Braceras leaving.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Braceras, thank you. We will now, after Terri Dickerson Superstar, move on to the briefing that we have scheduled for today, and we're right on schedule.

VI. BRIEFING ON COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT CHALLENGES: CREDIT ACCESS AND CAPITL ACCUMULATION ON LOW INCOME AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES

As you know, we are going to have a briefing on community reinvestment and specifically an examination of institutional structure and policy changes facing low-income and minority communities in assessing credit and accumulating traditionally capital, providing disadvantaged communities the chance to generate sustainable economic * .

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 * of ensuring that everyone is provided in every city an opportunity for access to education, 3 jobs, and improved standards of living. This will * of economic development issues impacting civil rights, such as our report on * reporting disparities. * 6 attention to American communities * confident * from 7 discrimination. We had the New York hearing in the report.

Today we will hear about various credit and capital access structures * by low-income and by communities, such as equal to lending, access predatory lending practices and insurance. We will also review our community reinvestment ads in the Federal Reserve Board under that legislation promoting community responses by lending institutions when reviewing applications for bank * acquisitions.

We have a number of panelists, and I would ask you to please come forward and tell our people how grateful you are, and that you were willing to come. I see Mr. Wayne Angell back there. The rest of you, I recognize him, only because he has testified before. Let me just say a few thank yous, and then I will start introducing our panelists.

Our first speaker will be Mr. Mark C. Yeung, Senior Banking Fellow at the Greenline Institute.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. MASHINGTON DC 20005-3701

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

will give background information on the Community Reinvestment Act and an overview of other issues related to unequal access to banking services. we will have Professor Gregory Squires, who is Chairperson of the Sociology Department at Columbia College of the George Washington University, who will talk to us about predatory lending practices *, and 8 then Dr. Wayne Angell, from Angell Economics and 9 former Board Member of the the Federal Reserve, 10 talking about analysis an of the Community 11 Reinvestment Act. * . 12 I might say that Mr. Angell is a * but I 13 can remember. I can tell you everything he said. 14

Finally, we will have Sandra Braunstein, Senior Associate Director of the Consumer and Community Division of the Federal Reserve System, who will discuss the role of the Federal Reserve in the Community Reinvestment Act in promoting credit responsibility by lending institutions when reviewing the applications for banking mergers and acquisitions.

We thank you all for coming to this event today, and we welcome your presentations. going to begin with Mr. Yeung. Mr. Yeung, please proceed.

MR. YEUNG: Thank you. Can you hear me?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, I can. Can everybody else hear him? I guess so.

MR. YEUNG: On behalf of the Greenlining Institute, I would like to thank the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for taking the leadership in helping to address the gap that exists between minority and White communities in terms of bank lending, investment and service.

My name is Mark Yeung and I am here today representing the Greenlining Institute. The Greenlining Institute is a multiethnic public policy organization whose thirty-nine civil rights, church and minority business member organizations include First AME Church, Hermandad Mexicana National and the Asian National Council of American Business Associations.

All of Greenlining's coalition members applaud this hearing as a historical and hopeful moment for the advancement opportunities of America's 100 million minorities. Last month, the Supreme Court, in a bold decision upheld the principles of affirmative action, declaring that we are not yet a colorblind society. This decision is consistent with President Bush's commitment to diversity and closing the homeownership gap between minorities and whites.

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

Despite the President's commitment to policies of diversity, the federal regulators including the Federal Reserve have continued to remain race blind. This is unfortunate, since the Federal Reserve's colorblind policies can inadvertently aid and encourage unintentional discriminations. discriminations are further encouraged by the Federal Reserve's policy of awarding "outstanding" CRA ratings institutions to financial that ignored have underserved minority communities.

These policies of the Federal Reserve, the nation's most powerful quasi-governmental agency, have never been scrutinized and these unintentional discriminations and civil rights violations have largely gone undiscussed. Today, this Commission can take direct action by offering observations and recommendations to reverse a history of unintentional discriminations, some of which Greenlining would like to share.

We believe our observations and recommendations are fully consistent with President Bush's commitment to ending the homeownership gap and the laudable objectives of financial literacy and moving the unbanked into banking once shared by Chairman Greenspan.

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

Finally, we believe that our observations and recommendations are consistent with the June U.S. Supreme Court decision involving the University of Michigan and affirmative action, stating that we are not yet ready to be a colorblind society. Race still matters.

Currently, banks and other financial institutions make an estimated less than one percent of their small business loans to African American, Latino or Asian American-owned businesses. financial institutions such Union Bank as οf California believe they could do much more effective outreach and lending to underserved communities if they could collect small business lending by race. However, the Federal Reserve's 1973 Regulation B prohibits the collection and maintenance of any small business lending by race and ethnicity.

This short-sighted colorblind policy directly contradicts the recommendations of former Secretary of the Treasury Rubin and Chairman Greenspan's own staff members.

In order to advance homeownership opportunities for minorities, Congress specifically gave the Federal Reserve authority to collect home lending data by race. The Federal Reserve should

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

advocate for the same authority regarding small business lending, especially since minority-owned businesses are the fastest growing segment of the American economy.

Currently, 74% of white Americans own their own homes, compared to 47% for African Americans and Latinos.

In 2001, Representative Barbara Lee.

In 2001, Representative Barbara Lee, working with community groups including Greenlining, asked the Federal Reserve to investigate banks' home lending records. Specifically, Representative Lee asked why the Federal Reserve was giving financial institutions a CRA exam score of "outstanding" when those financial institutions gave less than one percent of their home loans to African Americans. To date, the Federal Reserve has yet to effectively respond to Representative Lee's inquiry.

Whatever the response, we hope that the Federal Reserve will not continue to reward, with its most prestigious rating, financial institutions that fail to serve minority communities.

In 1992, the Federal Reserve conducted two studies showing a positive correlation between the diversity of bank management and fair lending and diversity of bank management and the safety and

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

soundness of a company. Despite these findings, the Federal Reserve and other regulators still do not gather data on the diversity of bank management during .

CRA exams and mergers and acquisitions. Consequently, the Federal Reserve provides no incentive for banks to promote diversity.

We ask the Commission and the Federal Reserve to look into this matter, since it directly impacts the advancement opportunities of low-income and minority communities.

On a related topic, we further urge the Federal Reserve to follow the recommendations of its study regarding its own diversity. The Federal Reserve sets an example for banks to follow. Yet, just 3% of the Federal Reserve's employees are Latino and less than 1%, two out of 235, of the Federal Reserve's economists are Latino. This lack of diversity at the Federal Reserve sets a bad example for banks and may adversely affect the ability of the Federal Reserve to service all communities, including minority communities.

Chairman Greenspan has been a leader and champion of financial literacy and moving the nation's fifty-six million unbanked into banking. The tragedy, despite his best intentions, is that he has ignored

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

the crucial role of bilingual services in promoting financial literacy and moving the unbanked into banking. For example, you cannot move Spanish-speaking populations into banking or promote financial literary without bilingual literature, signs and personnel.

In the Rabobank Greenlining case, demonstrated via two uncontested studies that Valley Imperial Bank, VIB, lacked the ability to serve the population Spanish-speaking of Imperial Valley, California where nearly three-fourths of the community is Latino. Competitor banks such as Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Washington Mutual and Union Bank of California operating in the same community demonstrated a substantially better ability to service the Spanish-speaking population, with literature, signs and staff.

Ignoring the needs of the community, the Federal Reserve has never raised questions about the ability of VIB to provide bilingual service. In fact, the regulators gave Rabobank an "outstanding" rating in its latest CRA exam. "Outstanding" for lending and for service to all communities.

This rating is absurd since two uncontested studies by the Greenlining Institute shows

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

Rabobank lacked bilingual literature, signs and staff to provide service in the established language of the community.

As the Supreme Court recently stated in the University of Michigan case, we are not yet ready colorblind society. On behalf Greenlining Institute and its thirty-nine coalition members, we would like to urge this Commission to make specific findings linking racial data as essential to promoting home loans, small business loans, service to minority and low-income communities and in closing the home ownership gap that President Bush is so concerned We urge you to use this Commission's prestige and other resources to promote the advancement opportunities of America's 100 million minorities.

One, speak out in various forms to encourage workforce diversity as essential to ending discrimination in lending and service by banks. One example is to examine the diversity of regulatory bodies that supervise banks, since it both directly and indirectly impacts banking services.

Second, Chairman Greenspan's goals of financial literacy and moving the unbanked into banking are laudatory objectives. However, financial literary among the poor and unbanked cannot be

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

achieved without full bilingual services and the Federal Reserve might consider following the examples of Bank of America, Union Bank of California and Washington Mutual, all of whom provide full bilingual services.

Third, colorblind policies don't work while discrimination and disparities in opportunity still exist. We know this is true of the home ownership gap that President Bush is committed to ending. We would know this to be true of the small business gap for certain if the necessary data were available.

Colorblind policies or refusing to gather racial data clearly discourages some of the most effective ways to eliminate unintentional discrimination. This Commission can uncover these discriminations and close the gap of financial service between minorities and whites. We encourage you to use your bully pulpit.

Greenlining will also be raising these issues on August 14th, when we meet with Chairman Greenspan, whom we respect and meet with semiannually and was a keynote speaker at our 2002 annual economic summit.

Thank you for your time.

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

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Thank you 1 2 There will be some questions for you. very much. 3 Dr. Squires, we would like to hear from 4 you next. 5 DR. SQUIRES: I was advised that I would 6 have ten minutes on insurance, and ten minutes on 7 predatory lending. Is that correct? 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's right. 9 DR. SQUIRES: The first thing I'd like to 10 do is put an advertisement up there that appeared in 11 the National Underwriter last summer. This is 12 actually an ad by the Lexington Insurance Company on claims liability practices, and, as you can see, it 13 14 says, "He's arrogant, duplicatous and lazy, and when 15 he sues you for discrimination, he'll be wealthy, 16 too." 17 I just want to point out what this ad does It does not say he's dishonest. 18 not say. It does not 19 say he's incompetent. It doesn't say he's unable to 20 do the job. The copy writers for this ad, I assume, 21 they carefully chose the words that they chose. They 22 intentionally chose to use the words "duplicitous and 23 lazy." 24 anti-Semitic, and anti-black racist 25 stereotypes that were used in the discussion.

argue that this represents just one more brazen attempt to use a racist appeal to appeal to fears about racism and discrimination in this * that are presumed to be trivial discrimination complaints for the purposes of benefitting the insurance company.

In 1988, the sales manager the American Family Insurance Company told one of his agents, "You write too many blacks; you need to find job-holding, premium-paying white people." Just in agent didn't get case this the message in conversation that was tape-recorded, the sales manager sent him a written memo that said, and I quote, "Quit writing all those blacks."

Now, this type of examples are not as pervasive in the insurance industry today as they were 15 years ago. But as I will say in a few minutes, the problems of disparate treatment of blacks in the property insurance industry continue.

And they are severe; they are critical, because as I think you well know, if you can't get your insurance policy, you can't get your mortgage. In the absence of a mortgage, most people can't afford to buy a house.

Like the * of the American Family case that followed the litigation of that quote, no

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

insurance, no loan, no loan, no house. Lack of insurance thus makes housing unavailable. Lack of insurance makes housing unavailable.

Now, perhaps the best piece of evidence that racial discrimination persists in the property insurance industry? there's a rather dry report issued by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which has been active * debate. They did issue a report about six or seven years ago, where they looked at the distribution of insurance policies in 32 metropolitan areas in 25 states, and found that the racial composition of neighborhoods remain statistically significantly associated with the number of policies and with the price of those policies, even after controlling * and other measures of risk.

Now recently, several fair housing groups have done testing to look at how this plays out *. It describes some examples of the disparate treatment that has been found in a range of testing. The fair housing group came up with some additional things but sometimes you can't read it.

What the fair housing people found is that where they've done their testing, white testers or residents from white areas are generally welcomed as customers and quickly signed up, whereas the minority

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

testers or the people from the minority neighborhoods frequently does not get the insurance policy. If they do, they're told that they need to do more inspecting. They cannot sign the * particularly if the person has overspent.

Generally, you would call the insurance agent and they would say, "We're going to cover you over the phone. You're good for 60 days, forget the formal application process, and then the company will have you covered * substandard company or some other inferior product *.

Different terms and conditions can be offered. Often they have to counsel them*. If there's a problem with the application, the white testers would often work with them to find some compensating factor in the application so he could help get that application *. * black testers would not be offered similar assistance.

There are different * they can often be asked to provided to provide Social Security numbers presumably so they can check the credit rating. They are told things like * policies for first-time homeowners or other kinds of subterfuge than not wanting to do business. And sometimes they will differentially apply their own company's underwriting

quidelines.

There is also a very disparate impact, which is perhaps more problematic in the insurance industry. Many commercial underwriting guidelines have a clear and disparate impact on minority communities. Common underwriting guidelines * a company does not want to insure a home that was built before 1970, was built in 1950, was more than 50 years of age, or does not want to insure a home that is valued at less than \$100,000, in some cases even much higher than that.

So racial minorities disproportionately live in homes that are older than *. And then one of my favorites is the * where the argument is that if your home would cost a lot more to replace than it would to sell on the market, it would cost \$150,00 to replace your home and you could only sell it for 100,000, you are going to burn it down and collect the insurance money. We know that that happens.

Agents' locations are a problem. We know that -- I'd bet if you took any city and looked at the Yellow Pages over the last 20 or 30 years and looked at the location of the agents, you'll find that the number of agents has been disappearing from central cities at a much faster rate than the population or

the economy is.

Agents are growing dramatically more quickly in the suburbs. This has an adverse impact because agents tend to do business in the neighborhoods where they live. Agents are licensed in the state, but that's not really what they do.

And the final item up on the screen there is the current hot topic today, which is credit scoring. Many state insurance commissioners have limited use of credit scoring, others are considering this. Many consumer groups are advocating that credit scoring be eliminated altogether, primarily because of the disparate impact. Racial minorities are more likely to have lower income, more credit problems, more likely to discover mistakes that are not of their making on their credit report.

The insurance industry claims that credit scores accurately predict risk; they don't know why, but they surmise that it's because if you're careless with your money, you're going to be careless with your house. But that is the hot issue today.

Having said this, it appears that redlining is not a brand new issue. It's been around for a while. State insurance commissioners have been ignoring this issue ever since it has been brought up.

We have seen since 1995, there have been administrative complaints filed, in one case a jury verdict found against a company, against the nation's leading insurers. State Farm, Allstate, Farmers', which are the three largest; and then American Family, Nationwide and Liberty, which are three of the ten largest, so six of the ten largest insurers have negotiated fair housing settlements.

Each settlement is a little different, but these are the major pieces vis-a-vis * compensation for the * and other victims, and the companies agree to open up their agencies within the neighborhoods that they have previously redlined, to advertise in those neighborhoods. In two cases that I am aware of, Nationwide and American Family, provided seven million dollars for reinvestment to help first-time home buyers find one, and to help current homeowners maintain their home. And vis-a-vis * companies were contacting the fair housing group to see if their agreements had the desired impact and often they would provide compensation for the services of these entities.

Now I need to back to the praxis for a minute. There's one that I forgot to mention to you that I just learned about last summer. * told me that

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

an insurance agent had told her that one of the companies that he worked for routinely asked the agent if the kids in the neighborhood played hockey or basketball. And my immediately reaction was that this was the first anti-Canadian bias I had encountered.

It seems to me the logical first step is to have * of the insurance industry. I should say that the insurers today claim that they do a lot in the way of reinvestment. And they are. There are lots of programs, lots of collaboratives, lots of individual companies. I describe the elements in the paper that I gave you.

The question is whether *. And I don't think you can possibly know without some kind of systematic data collection * to tell us what is going on. This is an issue that has been debated for 30 years. In 1995, actually, the House passed a *. It didn't go anywhere. One of my favorite explanations for * back in 1979 * U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

One of the reasons opposed to disclosure of insurance * was an inaccurate, incomplete disclosure would lead to incorrect improvements, to which I said, "We have a choice. We have got inaccurate, incomplete disclosure, and we've got complete and accurate disclosure." It seemed to me

those are the choices. We chose to go without any 1 2 disclosure. 3 About two Tom Dorr, years ago, Milwaukee, Chicago 4 congressman from and from 5 introduced the CRA Modernization Act, which would 6 provide disclosure, would provide CRA-type 7 requirements, and would require insurers to be responsive to their entire service area. And if it 8 9 failed to do so, they would be prohibited from merging 10 with the bank * mortgages on the home * proposal to 11 try to * the investment community. 12 And the last item that was * is offering a 13 regulation to clarify the opposition to fair housing 14 rights within the housing insurance industry. HUD 15 attempted to do this in the late '70s, early '80s, 16 they attempted to do it again in the mid '90s. * we 17 spent two years getting nowhere. * clarify what kinds 18 of practices are covered and define * disparate impact 19 and disparate treatment standards. * insurance is 20 state-regulated * to understand what is consistent 21 with the Fair Housing Act. 22 With that, I'd like to shift gears I guess 23 from * down to predatory lending. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Please.

SQUIRES: Some of you will disagree

with me on this -- I'm sure nobody disagrees with anything else that's been said -- but I think the * the Community Reinvestment Act has had the intended effect. A higher percentage of mortgage loans are going to low-income and minority communities and borrowers. Lenders who are covered by the CRA are doing a bit better of a job of reaching these markets. Lenders who are involved in CRA agreements are increasing their share of loans to these communities.

I am basing this decision on research done by the Federal Reserve Board, * housing study at Harvard, Treasury Department, * as it used to be. * the Federal Reserve, and they're going to greener pastures, I think.

So think there's some evidence that it's working. But it's clear in recent years that some of in the CRA has that progress we've seen been undermined by the growing presence of We don't have an official definition of lending. predatory lending. We don't have a good data set on predatory lending, but we do know quite a bit about sub-prime lending.

Not all sub-prime lending is predatory. A lot, if not most, sub-prime lending is actually good, it's what we want so people who have high risk can get

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

a loan, rather than no loan at all. But we do know that almost all predatory loans are sub-prime. And we've seen a dramatic increase in sub-prime lending. In the last eight or nine years, we've seen sub-prime lending, sub-prime share of home purchase loans going from one percent to about thirteen percent. And you see a growing *. Blacks are three times as likely as whites to finance homes through sub-prime loans. Residents of black areas are five times as likely to finance homes with sub-prime loans. Sub-prime buyers are eight times as likely to default, but *

Now, what are predatory practices? *

twelve pages of predatory practices. And it seems to

me these are the types of things we see most often.

First off, higher interest rates and fees than can be

justified by the risks. High balloon payments for

borrowers that have been making monthly payments for

several years will find themselves with a large

payment that they obviously can't afford to pay.

Requiring * credit life insurance, which is * into the loan, which increases the interest rate and makes the cost of the loan much higher than the average price of a loan. Insurance-based homeowner's insurance, where the mortgage lender basically decides who you are going to have your insurance policy with

and what * with your money. High prepayment * which traps people into the predatory loan once they get it. Financing fees for services that are not provided. Loan flipping to keep * one loan after another, getting deeper and deeper in debt, and loans based on the value of the property, rather than the borrower's ability to pay. It protects the lender but traps the borrower.

There's been lots of reasons for the rise of predatory lending, but I would argue there are two main sets of explanations for this. One is the tremendous growth of the economy. * equally distributed, concentrates wealth *.

The second problem is a series of several changes within the financial services industry. We all know about the * statistics. I am going to focus for a minute on the kinds of * changes that I am talking about.

Wе investments at have seen а least conventional financial institutions, or at services from urban areas for several years. 1975 and 1995, the number of banking offices in lowincome areas declined by 21 percent while growing by The number of check-cashers 29 percent overall. between the mid '80s and mid '90s grew from 2100 to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5500. And we know that they're heavily concentrated in certain neighborhoods, leading *Business Week* to describe this as a two-tiered marketing system that has emerged in financial services.

We also know that many different types of entities may get involved in mortgage lending. Depository institutions, which not too long ago had more than half of all mortgage loans that are covered by the CRA, now have about a third of all mortgage loans as independent mortgage banks and insurance companies and others not covered by the CRA have entered the market. So CRA is declining in terms of the percentage of the market that it covers.

I said a moment ago that conventional institutions are leaving central cities. Well, they have withdrawn conventional services, but they are not necessarily leaving. What is happening is large banks are contracting with or buying check-cashing operations, or payday lenders, and are working with predatory lenders as subsidiaries in central cities.

For example, Wells Fargo, I just noticed today -- my daughter lives in California, has her account with Wells Fargo -- very recently provided 700 million to three check-cashing chains that are clearly engaged in predatory lending around the country. And

Wall Street is a major investor as the sub-prime and predatory loans become securitized and become profitable investments for many people.

So what do we do? I would like to suggest three directions for change. One, we can apply the CRA to non-depository institutions. Short of that, we could at least apply the CRA to the affiliates and subsidiaries of depositories that are currently covered by the CRA, but these affiliates subsidiaries are not covered unless the bank decides voluntarily that it wants them to be covered. other words, if the subsidiaries *. If they don't, they won't.

It seems to me, at a minimum, those institutions should be covered. And it seems to me that the CRA * should look at the presence of predatory lending and if there is evidence of predatory lending, that ought to * weigh negatively in the CRA assessment.

I remember when I was on the Consumer Advisory Council a few years ago somebody from Chase Manhattan Bank saying that they have a CRA credit because they had opened up a lot of check cashers in neighborhoods in New York. They felt that if other people aren't serving them, they could serve them.

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

Some of us on the Council thought that was precisely what the CRA was supposed to prevent. And if you didn't want lenders to be able to pull out of the community and then go back and buy a check casher, and get CRA credit to do so, on top of that. I guess a new definition of *.

The second direction would be to allow anti-predatory lending legislation. About half a dozen cities and a half a dozen states have done this. There are three or four bills that I am aware of in Congress, one of them submitted by Congressman Ney, that this Commission I think wants to strongly reject. It's a federal bill that would weaken existing protections, it would override standards of lending * and others have introduced more aggressive legislation.

But there are things happening at the state level, starting with North Carolina, and I think there are some positive * impact of the North Carolina law that we can talk about later if you want.

And the third recommendation is to expand financial literacy programs and rescue programs that many lenders and community organizations are working on right now, where they take * on predatory loans and work with them so they can move them into less

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 predatory financial situations. And I just like that. 2 It seems to me the proverbial dream of 3 homeownership has become a real nightmare for a lot of 4 people who are losing their homes and their life 5 savings because they are being captured and trapped by 6 predatory lenders. I'm not suggesting that anybody *. 7 And, with that, I'm done. 8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Thank you, Dr. 9 Squires. Any questions? 10 (No response.) 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, as I understand 12 it, Dr. Wayne Angell is going to give us his reaction 13 to the CRA experience as well as a broad macroeconomic 14 focus on community reinvestment. Is that correct? 15 DR. ANGELL: Chairman Berry, I will do as 16 you suggest. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We appreciate it very 18 much. Please proceed. 19 DR. ANGELL: Thank you very much. It is a 20 delight for me to once again appear before the Civil 21 Rights Commission. And I was not sure * years ago 22 that I would be asked back. So I am delighted to be 23 back here. 24 As one who has devoted many years 25 theorizing about and observing individual and business

response to regulatory requirements in 1989 I expected that the Congressional enhancements of the CRA and the Financial Institutions Responsible Reporting Act would elicit the following changes.

First, many commercial banks, including most of the large banks I thought would further modify their policies and behavior to generally comply with the purposes of the Community Reinvestment Act. Commercial banks seeking Federal Reserve Board approval of new bank offices and new activities would feel compelled to review policies and procedures.

The bank safety concerns from 1989 through 1992 at the Board of Governors and among commercial banks were likely to reduce the chance of dramatic CRA related lending growth. The new requirements would elicit new steps into the water rather than wholesale changes.

Long term progress in serving disadvantaged communities and individuals subject to adverse discrimination would depend on whether or not CRA related lending were likely to be profitable. Servicing economically underserved individuals and localities were likely to encounter higher originating and servicing costs per dollar of loans, higher percentage credit losses, and a tendency to higher

pricing.

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

It seemed likely that some banks would find a niche in CRA-related lending that would be profitable, even though they faced the disadvantage of not being able to price the lending in proportion to the risk. Other banks might find they had generally overestimated costs and credit losses.

The tentative conclusions coming from the study undertaken by the Federal Reserve Board of Governors in response to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999 are not surprising. For instance, fifteen percent of CRA-related home purchase and refinancing lending were labeled "unprofitable" or "marginally unprofitable" as compared to only two percent of overall home purchase and refinancing lending. Only purchase 50 of CRA related home percent and refinancing lending were related as profitable as compared to 70 percent overall.

Our 25 years of experience with the Community Reinvestment Act suggests the following: notwithstanding that too many banks only reluctantly complied with the purposes of the CRA and some failed to meet the spirit of the Act, overall CRA-related lending has increased about as rapidly as could be safely accomplished.

Going forward, the public purposes that fostered the CRA are more likely to be realized by a new kind of emphasis on remedying the wealth disparity between citizens previously disadvantaged by adverse discriminatory practices in education, hiring, firing and lending.

Minorities who received loans to purchase

Minorities who received loans to purchase houses they would otherwise not have received, including those who encountered payment difficulties benefitted by learning directly about household wealth creation.

I would not suggest that non-business consumer credit extended under the act was of the same wealth generation benefit as were loans to purchase and refinance houses. Borrowing money to buy a car or durable consumer good is undoubtedly an obstacle to household wealth formation.

I would suggest that the Commission on Civil Rights would do well to move its focus forward to consider public policy changes that will enable individuals encumbered by past discriminatory practices to advance under policies that will increase economic growth and thereby employment opportunities.

During the 1980's, tax rate reductions and sound monetary policy improved economic incentives

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

that put the dismal days of stagflation behind us. Improved economic incentives increased the demand for both capital and labor while increased defense spending, general government spending and entitlement spending put upward pressure on resource prices, rate of return and interest rates.

In the late 1980s the Congress of the United States turned the corner on Federal spending by qo" philosophy adopting "pay as you that implemented by a new Republican Congress fiscally centrist Democrat President. As a result of the restraint on government spending resources were effectively released to the private sector. The stock market led the way to a new era of capital goods use record employment growth. Rising labor and productivity fostered rising real wages an acceleration of employment opportunities.

Employment conditions improved so rapidly that public policy was prompted to replace an old counter-productive welfare system for work incentives. It worked for all segments of our population and workers including workers and unemployed workers in our most disadvantaged minorities.

Then as record Federal revenues responded to rapid economic growth and to the rise in household

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

wealth brought on by soaring stock prices and a long upward move in house prices a view emerged that the prosperity depended on paying off the Federal debt. In the four quarters ending in the second quarter of 2000 Federal individual income tax receipts grew at exactly twice the rate as personal income; 11.4 percent growth, while personal income registered a 5.7 percent.

Failure to reduce Federal income tax rates to offset the surge in taxable income resulted in goods sector employment peaking in July of 2000. The attached charts depict the path of goods sector employment during the 35 months of decline in goods sector employment and the 28 months of decline in non-farm employment.

Chairman Berry, I would just want to point out that this development is really most, most unfortunate. Now, for the first time since the 1930s, you have goods-producing employers reduce their employment 35 months. And over that 35 months we now have employment and the staffing * employment in goods-producing jobs is now 2.7 percent below the peak that was achieved in July of 2000.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wow.

DR. ANGELL: So that is why I have such a

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

strong feeling about how necessary it is that the 1 2 market system economy moderate the growth of our 3 individual income tax receipts. It's so important 4 that even though we often think that the amount of 5 people spending and shopping is related to their 6 income, we have many studies that show that high-7 income people have reduced their spending dramatically in 2000 as high-income jobs began to decline. 8 9 The following policy changes, I believe, 10 would restore modest employment growth. Now I did not 11 mean, Chairman Berry, that Ι say that modest 12 employment growth. I just want you to understand that 13 I believe *. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I see. 15 DR. ANGELL: ? modest employment growth. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You wouldn't be 17 unhappy if it were higher? 18 DR. ANGELL: Not only would I not 19 unhappy, but Chairman Berry, I and other members of the * believe that economic * ultimately has to be 20 21 judged by the improvement of the * of the American 22 people. * and I do not know of anything that is more 23 of an obstacle particularly in the area of mortgage, * 24 this bit of * to use legislation to lift up these

So no, I am not satisfied with modern *

communities.

but * if it did not do what I am suggesting here, *. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 3 DR. ANGELL: The following policy choices 4 would restore modest employment growth by encouraging 5 a growth in output at a rate above the 4 to 5 percent 6 growth rate of labor productivity: .7 First, keep the cap on Federal individual 8 income and corporate income tax rates at or below 35 9 percent. 10 Two, keep the double taxation of corporate 11 income paid out in dividends or capital gains by stock 12 buy-backs at the 45 percent rate stemming from a 13 corporate tax rate of 35 percent and a dividend / 14 capital gains individual tax rate of 15 percent. 15 Prior to the recent tax rate changes to double tax 16 rate was 60 percent. 17 Reduce the growth rate of Federal 18 expenditures by re-implementing the "paygo" rules 19 adopted in the 1990s. Federal spending needs a 20 special restraint as the Federal government does not 21 have the borrowing restraint experience by state and 22 local governments. To the extent that the private 23 sector grows more rapidly than the federal sector, 24 economic resources are continually released to fuel

economic growth.

13 14

15

16

11

12

17

19

18

20

21

22

2324

25

Fairness to the elderly and retired as well as to retirement plans suggests that interest rates may be too low, as well as being too high. When * high interest rates it doesn't take a lot of insight to know that high interest rates * and that there is a *. But I just want to point out that in all fairness, the Federal Reserve today, I mean it *, taking additional steps to reduce the target * unfair result for a lot of people that are holding a lot of money market funds and money market accounts. Now, I * to people holding money market funds and because it might be that there are individuals that are hoarding that kind of money and * being willing to take risks that this contributes to our * economic growth.

The current level of interest rates should remind us that Federal deficits only reduce economic growth when those deficits crowd out business and household borrowing. * quite often say this Federal borrowing, this Federal deficit is still too low. We are not going to have this borrowing * what do you mean? *

When we decided to pay down the Federal debt, we decided to pay our household debt at a fast enough rate to offset the paydown of the Federal debt.

We decided to pay business debt at a faster rate.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we appreciate what
2	you outlined.
3	DR. ANGELL: Chairman Berry, I often *
4	(Laughter.)
5	DR. ANGELL: * enthusiasm * hasn't been *
6	for 29 years. I still have not felt that * great
7	opportunity *
8	The last item * shows is a * that *
9	without them, this is the *. And I *
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I understand that.
11	DR. ANGELL: So that's why I would like to
12	see I want you to know that there's no way in the
13	world that * but I just don't * in the rest of the
14	world.
15	And I want to point out that * value added
16	tax system and * adopted a value added tax * export
17	goods are taxed by the U.S. government based on this
18	tax. And then U.S. exported off-loads * is available
19	* value added tax * and * by United Airlines, the
20	value of the value added tax is *, as it is no cost *
21	government of *, government *.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
23	DR. ANGELL: So my suggestion that we just
24	must * tax system, * income tax system * because the *
25	is not *.

_

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

* value added subsidy *

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, well, thank you very much and we'll be back to you with some questions.

Now we'll hear from Sandra Braunstein from the Consumer Affairs -- Community Affairs from the Division of the Federal Reserve. Please proceed.

MS. SANDRA BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you very much. And first of all, I'd just like to thank you, Madam Chair and Commissioners for inviting us here today. We're pleased to be here to share information about a * low and moderate income and under served populations.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve system has a new approach to these issues and it's discussed in full detail in the progress report that I submitted prior to this meeting. And I'm not going to go through all the facts. I just want to give you a broad brush and then I'll be willing to entertain questions.

Basically, I made mention of the approach that involves the regulatory process, the supervisory process which includes examinations for the Community Reinvestment Act. We have a complaints process, an applications process, a community affairs program, a

consumer protection program and we conduct research.

Just to touch briefly on each of these, under our regulatory responsibilities, the Federal Reserve regulates many consumer protection statutes. And * like truth in lending, truth in saving, privacy, equal credit opportunity act, * disclosure act. We also have some regulation rating responsibilities for the Community Reinvestment Act. The statute is a little different from the others because these responsibilities also extend to other regulatory agencies, not just The Federal Reserve.

And in addressing consumer protection regulations, we always have to be mindful of several things. One is to remain true to the statute as it was amended. We also have to be mindful of consumers' need for protections and remember, we're also trying to balance that with concern for undue industry favor.

In our supervisory responsibilities, the main issue that the Commissioner invited us here today So I'd like to talk a minute or so about And the Community Reinvestment Act which came about in 1977 was based on the very wrongful premise insurance petitions continuing that have a affirmative obligation to in community engage reinvestment. And with this in mind, Congress enacted

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CRR. And CRR, some people -- it's very, when you read it technically, it actually doesn't require notes. It really is a law that was enacted to require regulatory agency action. And it basically requires that the federal banking regulatory agencies a sense of being selected and moving the credit needs of the entire communities, including low and moderate income neighborhoods consistent with the safe and sound operation of the bank.

Now in order to implement this, the banking agencies must conduct examinations of both banks and agencies that they supervise. In the case of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Reserve Board delegates the examination process of state member banks and state chartered banks which are the banks that we supervise and we gave the responsibility of the examinations to the 12 Federal Reserve banks that are all over the country.

In 1995 in response to a Directive from President Clinton, the banking regulatory agencies revised the CRR regulations. And these are the regulations under which we currently operate. And under these regulations, the examiners assess an institution's performance in the assessment area that is designated by the bank as its safest market.

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

We also make that assessment of the institution's performance in the context of economic,

competitive and other environmental factors that would contribute to the bank's ability to engage in

community reinvestment activities.

The examinations that we conduct result in the preparation of a credit performance report, a performance evaluation and also a rater. And one thing that's interesting that Congress mandated the rating system which was not something that the regulatory agencies came up with and the statutorily mandated ratings: outstanding, satisfactory, needs to improve, substantial noncompliance.

When we revised the regulations in 1995, we made separate examination procedures for large banks and small banks and other kinds of things and basically * are those institutions over \$250 million or greater and all * petitions that are submitted with assets greater than \$1 billion. And for these large institutions, there are three different tests that are done during the evaluation. The examiners make up the expense lending, the services and the investments.

For smaller banks which are those under \$250 million there is a new * in the books and there the examiners will rip up consumer complaints *, they

this

We

rip out the deposit ratios, look inside and outside 1 the bank's assessment area and they do review the *. 2 3 For institutions that aren't satisfactory, 4 under the small bank test, if they wish to get a 5 higher rating, they can request the examiner to permit investments and services, but that's not done on a 6 7 routine basis. there's other variations on 8 Now 9 methodology which are discussed in the policy paper 10 but I'll leave those details. I want to touch on the consumer complaints 11 12 program because this is a very important part of what we do. And we respond to consumer complaints and the 13 14 of financial services issues. wide range 15 investigate complaints against the member banks. rate a lot of other agencies including State Attorneys 16 17 General's office, banking commissioners in terms of 18 addressing the complaints. 19 Consumer complaints also are a very good 20 resource for us into what issues are out there and it 21 also helps the examiners when they get asked to 22 conduct examinations, if there have been complaints 23 filed against the bank to investigate those areas

Many * the commissioners express interest

during the examination process.

24

is our applications process. The Federal Reserve application process entails considering the banks record of moving credit needs and banking needs of the communities it's chartered to serve * the applications. * seeking to expand * operations through acquisition, merger, or branching activities must be * Federal Reserve.

And in processing these applications, the Federal Reserve takes into account the effects of the acquisition in key areas such as competition, the community, the financial and managerial resources and the future prospects of the bank holding company and the subsidiaries.

In looking at convenience and needs, the *
must look at the *, most recent exam and look at their
compliance with other consumer protection statutes and
also we get comments on many applications and these
public comments that we receive are often referred to
as * or application *.

And consideration during this application process. And even under certain circumstances, this is under the Board's and discretion, when it is deemed necessary to complete the record needed to make a decision in the application, the Board will hold a public meeting on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

an application to allow for any * to supplement the written comments that were given.

Another one of our efforts to * the needs of * community is a community affairs program. And a community affairs program was originally established in meeting the community actually to assist us reinvestment obligations. It's evolved a bit over the years and it really supports the economic the Federal Reserve by promoting objectives of community development and better access to credit. And basically, as I'm sure, * can tell you, is that * is good information. And one of the things our community affairs program does is help to supply information and undertake markets to help facilitate the operation of those markets.

We facilitate public-private partnerships into communities, conduct * outreach; educational and technical assistance activities to help financial institutions, to community based organizations, government entities and the public understand and adjust financial service needs affecting low, moderate income persons and communities.

We have worked with a number of organizations. We publish newsletters and other kinds of publications and issues. We sponsor conferences

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

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 seminars and we conduct research on community development topics.

One of the principal projects we are engaged in right now on a national basis has to do with financial education and in fact, Chairman Greenspan, who you may know doesn't really go in for public appearances except for when he's summoned to Congress to testify. Chairman Greenspan made a public service announcement which is being broadcast on TV and on radio in both English and Spanish on the importance of *. It's something that * to promote those objectives.

The last thing I wanted to discuss is we also have very active consumer education and research components to the Federal Reserve. And we have produced just a slew of reports on consumer education topics for consumers and * entities under various consumer protection regulations that govern credit and deposit transactions. And the kinds of included are things like home equity lines of credit, mortgage shopping tips, leasing agreements, credit card protection laws and these public portions are available in hard copy as well as on the web and most of them have been translated into Spanish.

We also conduct a lot of research banking

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

communities, consumer behavior, CEO performance and we sponsor a research conference every two years that is focused solely on community development issues and it's become kind of a namesake for a lot of people and part of this was to try to not only --we want to be the ones to produce research, but we want to encourage others to produce research on community development issues so by having this research conference and putting out a crop of papers ahead of time, we are hoping that we are able to help promote some of that research.

We also have Internet research on community development activities that is run by the Chicago * and we have a lot of things up there that relate to this research.

In conclusion, this whole area is a very important topic to discuss and the Board feels strongly about this and we, as a system, as a Federal Reserve system devote significant resources to activities to promote * to low and moderate income people and services and we have active participation - our presidents, our chairmen, from top to bottom we are working on these issues.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, I want to thank you for that. Before I recognize Commissioner Edley,

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

I don't know if Commissioner Meeks, do you have --. 1 2 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I also have to leave 3 I do want to say that I do appreciate the 4 thoughts, involvement interest and in consumer 5 financial literacy. * people involved * leaders * 6 across the country. They picked up the cost for it 7 and that's very helpful. 8 And in the issue on predatory lending and 9 I think we're not talking a lot about that. 10 Indian Country is affected by the predatory lending 11 more than any -- as much as any other minority 12 community. The CDFR * financial institutions really 13 got involved and covered the gap and now we find that 14 most of the CDFR's are really happy to educate and 15 compete with the predatory lenders because sometimes 16 the CDFR's aren't as limited. Predatory lenders are 17 extremely creative about how they can make money. And 18 I think that's an area of interest that the Commission 19 needs to look at more fully. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley? 21 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'll be brief. 22 What are we not doing well? 23 (Laughter.) 24 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, I don't know what 25 you're saying about not doing this or that well.

application

think that there's always room for improvement in any 1 2 one of us and I think we are possibly striving to 3 improve our examination process, our 4 process and I think that there's room for improvement 5 there.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that's going on now, actually, to talk about that is that the CRA regulations are currently under review. As Ι mentioned before in 1995 and at that time * look at them again in 2002. We are in the midst of that revision right now and that's one of the things we're working on together. It's * are there other ways we can improve the * process and all those things that need to be changed.

* process now.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can you quantify, in approximate terms the frequency with which a charter or major application is denied or a modification is required as a consequence of CRA analysis?

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, I can tell you that first of all, applications for mergers and acquisitions are rarely, if ever denied on I mean they're just not. Usually what happens in the applications process is when a bank * says they're going to do that, the final * there

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. ואואפאואופדרוא חיר אחחה אזחו

1	identifies right off the bat and sometimes the
2	financial institutions go away or they ditch them
3	before they actually formally submit an application.
4	So in that sense the things that worked out from *
5	demands. Given that, * and denials over the years, I
6	think there have been six denials on the basis of CRA
7	grants.
8	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: In what time period?
9	Since the Act?
10	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Since the Act, the first
11	denial was back in I think something like 1989 or
12	1990, something like that.
13	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Has the Federal
14	Reserve taken a policy position with respect to the
15	I know it's outside your purview but with respect
16	to the extension of CRA or CRA-like requirements to
17	small business? Is this really outside your purview?
18	Small business
19	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, CRA does * .
20	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: * depository
21	activities and I think this goes to the question of
22	extension to affiliates of depository institutions.
23	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: The primary regulator of
24	affiliates to * which I think is what you're
25	referring to, is actually the FTC.

1 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: The FTC?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: We have taken the position that we have not, on a regular basis, examined these affiliates. If there's some reason that we have found on a piece by piece basis that there was a reason to look at something the new petitioner * and we have done that a few times.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: But how do you deal with the situation that was described in which a depository institution might effectively spin off some of these activities in a given community. It sounds as though that would be a device for -- let's just take an egregious case. A depository institution withdraws from some activity in a minority community а low income community, but then continues practicing through a check cashing operation or something else that doesn't fall directly within your regulatory --

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: * We require some sort of ?-.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: They've got out from under CRA scrutiny of their activity in that minority community.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: But CRA is not statutory

* depository institution. If it's not a depository

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

1 institution, it's not covered by CRA and that's not 2 regulation, but actually statutory. *FDIC depository institutions are covered 3 4 by CRA. 5 That's a loophole. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 6 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: * made institutions 7 despite low lending rates to low income communities. 8 How many have come to pass? 9 Well, there are several MS. BRAUNSTEIN: 10 things that would happen with that. Some of the 11 information that is put out in the CRA process is 12 proprietary. So the public is not privy 13 everything. There also needs to be taken into account 14 that ?- the bank is evaluated in a context of some 15 environmental factors, as well as * factors and some banks choose to be agricultural banks, wholesale banks 16 17 and they don't necessarily do high value * with 18 consumers on a retail basis. And we take those 19 factors into account and we look at their activities. 20 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Two more quick things, 21 if I might. With regard to the regulations on the 22 Fair Housing Act and applying those to insurance 23 activities, why did you fail -- what's the hang up 24 Was it political, bureaucratic, were there there?

people concerned about this? How did it primarily *?

the

2 Federal * does not apply. 3 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Right. 4 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: -- The one appeals * to 5 that effect * 1984 or something. There have been two 6 appeals cases since then that have explicitly rejected 7 not as being * and there is a memorandum that * makes 8 available written by Republican and Democratic 9 Administrations serving to help as identify the 10 insurance * one line rule for Housing Amendments Act 11 of 1988 citing specifically the discrimination that 12 happened was unlikely. 13 * So there is that * item and I suppose * 14 but I think * those of us who have advocated this kind 15 of action didn't have the same clout as those who * . 16 And then there's the * of 1994. 17 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Right. 18 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: 19 MS.BRAUNSTEIN *: This is part of a long 20 standing debate, I quess, about the inappropriate 21 federal role in insurance regulation generally which 22 is traditionally a view of state regulation and I 23 quess the question is whether or not the anti-24 discrimination context will and ought to be viewed as 25 a matter of principle and politics as a justification

The industry maintains that because of a *,

for a larger federal waiving as seen historically in 1 2 the insurance industry. 3 The industry has traditionally fought *: against state regulation. But when it came to needing 4 5 backstop of terrorism coverage, they were quick to 6 come. 7 *: That is not true. ? threat levels to preserve state 8 9 infrastructure *. But they still insist it's a blow 10 out and now some of the * are beginning to rethink the 11 reason the states regulate and see the benefits * to 12 be able to buy one legislative body instead of having 13 to buy 50. In addition to that, federal regulations 14 are being * view deregulation and *that the American 15 Insurance Association is looking at quite favorably. 16 So we do see that even from the industry's perspective 17 there is more of an interest in thinking about how the 18 federal government can be of assistance. 19 But when it comes to consumer issues, the 20 focus *. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's amazing how the 22 19th century, before the Civil War, decision, of the 23 insurance being state regulated would still 24 standing up all this time. 25 We keep * them, and there's absolutely no

1	reason for that anybody can imagine and the historical
2	circumstances were such that it was an anomaly. But I
3	don't want to get too into that.
4	Go ahead, Christopher, you have another
5	one?
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Do we know to what
7	extent the growth in minority ownership rates has
8	taken place in the subprime sector rather than the
9	main sector, just as an empirical matter. Do we know
10	the answer to that?
11	DR. SQUIRES: I think there are some
12	figures on this. I don't think I can give you a
13	precise number on that. I am not sure whether it's
14	available, but it may well be. HUD has a list of
15	subprime lenders.
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I think you gave us
17	the growth in subprime lending and I'm just trying to
18	figure out are there data about the modest progress in
19	terms of the disparities in home ownership rates. I'm
20	just trying to figure out to what extent the growth in
21	subprime lending explains
22	DR. SQUIRES: My guess is that the *
23	Reinvestment College may have some information along
24	those lines.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we try to

1	get that?
2	DR. SQUIRES: They've done more research
3	on this. Or the National Consumers Legal
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: * would know answer to
5	that. Is that the kind of stuff that * ?
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Dr. Squires you
7	mentioned some settlements on the
8	DR. SQUIRES: Insurance side.
9	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: insurance side.
10	What is the cause of action in those cases? Is it
11	sort of a 1991 suits, or is it
12	DR. SQUIRES: Well, some of them have been
13	brought under state law, like in the State of Ohio and
14	in the State of Virginia. But some of them are being
15	brought under the Fair Housing Act, and I know the
16	American Family case in Wisconsin was I think it
17	was both state and federal because the Justice
18	Department intervened in that.
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Interesting.
20	DR. SQUIRES: And the Ohio Department of
21	Civil Rights did an administrative action against
22	Farmers' under that state's civil rights statute.
23	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: *.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I had a whole bunch of
25	questions, but I'll let you go up next, if you want

to, Vice Chair. 1 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Let me just ask 3 a couple of questions. Mr. Yeung, I know that you folks have 4 5 filed a number of these complaints * and the Federal 6 Reserve Board. And I just wondered what your reaction 7 was to the filing of a response by the Board on the 8 institute that you filed *. 9 MR. YEUNG: I believe you * in cases 10 *Spanish-speaking and a bilingual issue. And, you 11 know, as I just stated in my testimony we had done two 12 studies on the VIB * to service the Spanish-speaking 13 population in Imperial Valley. And to date the 14 studies have not been *. 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I think you're 16 raising some issues * response by the agency if they 17 say, "We don't consider that," or *, because of 18 evidence that we have that's not public we still think 19 they ought to have an outstanding category. 20 been their response? MR. YEUNG: * We haven't heard from them. 21 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No response? 23 MR. YEUNG: No response. 24 MS. Well, the letter that BRAUNSTEIN: 25 you're referring to about the institution examination,

1	we just received last week. So it still does have to
2	be responded. So it's not that we we don't * what
3	we got to everyone.
4	And then, consumer complaints. Maybe I
5	just need to clarify it. When I talk about our
6	complaints process, that's where consumers file
7	complaints against specific financial institutions
8	you know, their checking account, their credit cards,
9	their but what we've gotten from Greenlining is a
10	series of letters *.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: * complaints *
12.	procedure to do that chronologically?
13	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Absolutely.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: And all of
15	that?
16	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Absolutely.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: With respect to
18	your testimony and establishing an agenda, I just
19	wonder if it's time for establishing an outstanding
20	example, particularly in terms of CRA, of *. Do you
21	have a list or a *?
22	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: I can tell you generally
23	what we look at. It's not one of the problems with
24	CRA ever since it was enacted. It's that it never
25	addressed the big question of how much is enough.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: It has always been somewhat subjective although we tried to make it objective. And just interestingly, when we did this in 1995, we actually tried to quantify a few things. We tried to fit in a number objective for the profit ratio and, you know, a few other things. And we got them to come *.

It was the financial -- not just the financial institutions, but even the community side was *. The earned credit allocation that was not the intent of CRA. It was just -- we just got excoriated about it, and we went back to not actually quantifying things.

But in terms of what we looked at to determine the outstanding rating, we look at the distribution of lenders geographically. That was the * of that. It deals with *. We look at Census tracts, we look up -- first of all, if there's somebody lending, look at their *, if there's * data available, we would look at that distribution to evaluate.

we also would look at the distribution we
* for * borrower. We do mapping of small business
needs and other major products also. And we'd look at

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

2 tracts are being served, as well as higher income 3 Census tracts. We also get at the fair lending aspects 5 through the Fair Lending * that's been conducted. 6 the analysis of race and gender and those types of 7 variables are done through Regulation B, through Fair 8 Lending, through ECOA and the Fair Housing Act. 9 that rating will come into play in the CRA rating, and 10 they have to have a good rating there in order to get 11 an outstanding CRA. 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So you did --13 look at the performance of services 14 minorities; ethnic minorities, racial minorities, and 15 so on. 16 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, we do. We look at 17 that through Fair Lending. That's not CRA. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Someone is whistling 19 All right. Go ahead. something. 20 Here are the questions; I have some for 21 all of you. Ms. Braunstein, I'll just start with you, 22 since we're already asking you questions. 23 described an enormous amount of responsibility for the 24 Office, with CRA as one of the responsibilities. How 25 much staff is devoted to the CRA function?

those and sure that low and moderate income Census

1	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: That's a really good
2	question. At the Board, we have approximately 90
3	people in the Division of Consumer and Community
4	Affairs, and that includes our * to the regulatory
5	banking people who work on things like CRA
6	regulations. It includes the complaints people, it
7	includes the examining supervisors.
8	But the real CRA * branch, as I've said,
9	is delegated out to *. And they are * examiners. And
10	that examination I really don't have that with me,
11	the size of that, but that's fairly low.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm sorry.
13	What?
14	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Several hundred
15	examiners. So we're talking systems; we're really
16	talking the Board does policy and has oversight
17	over the Reserve Bank, but the actual examinations
18	themselves are carried out by examiners that are out
19	in *
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you give us that
21	data? Could you get it for us?
22	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Oh, we could yes.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If you could you
24	provide that. The other thing, I have forgotten how
25	many banks there are, how many banks there were.

1	Anybody know?
2	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: The * about a thousand;
3	the ones we supervise.
4	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: But * has about three
5	thousand? Four thousand?
6	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Something like that. I
7	think Federal banks now
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm just trying to get
9	a ratio.
10	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: I believe it's around
11	14,000.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does that sound right?
13	14,000 or so?
14	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, I would think it's
15	about 14,000. I will try and get the information and
16	*. Yes, I mean, it's somewhere between thirteen and
17	fifteen thousand, I think. And systems are
18	approximately about 900 to 1,000.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well when you
20	actually get the data about the examiners, could you
21	also submit data on the numbers *. And if you know
22	thousands, generally, I'm trying to get some idea of
23	the workforce as compared to the amount of work*.
24	The other thing I wanted to ask,
25	Regulation B, which was referred to as *. Regulation

1	B, which effectively raised the bar on data collection
2	which office is responsible for modifications under
3	Regulation B? Is that within your purview?
4	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And so I'm just trying
. 6	to find out, if the Commission decides it wants to,
7	consistent with the policy of the * Act, which is, of
8	course, to support CRA, non-discrimination, and to
9	support data collection as a way of finding out facts,
10	if we decided we wanted to address concerns about
11	Regulation B, where would we address those?
12	Now, let me ? it's to your office, right?
13	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The other
14 15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The other question I wanted to ask is
15	question I wanted to ask is
15 16	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the
15 16 17	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B
15 16 17 18	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prohibits.
15 16 17 18	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prohibits. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: prohibits
15 16 17 18 19 20	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prohibits. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: prohibits the collection of data by race and ethnicity?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prohibits. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: prohibits the collection of data by race and ethnicity? MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	question I wanted to ask is VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Is the representation correct that the Regulation B CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Prohibits. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: prohibits the collection of data by race and ethnicity? MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Why?

1	colorblind society that asking your race in the credit
2	application, bore no relation to your ability to repay
3	that debt.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In other words, it was
5	some nonsense. * systematic Commission reports of
6	rules that * search.
7	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: It's
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I just want to make
9	sure people are clear on that. Are we talking about
10	Regulation B loans other than housing loans or *.
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: There's no policy
12	the federal government has no policy * with the *
13	data. And neither with respect to Reg B and ECOA.
14	And the explanation for that policy difference is
15	what?
16	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, I wasn't around
17	when it was enacted, but *. And * in terms of the
18	District was the idea that that especially in the
19	days it was enacted, race was a factor. Oftentimes
20	discrimination played into people not getting credit,
21	and the idea was to *. So this was * available to the
22	public decision.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's regulatory, not
24	statutory.
25	MS REALINGTEIN. Woll +ba+la

1	questionable.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The statute, I don't
3	think it's questionable. * always the statute
4	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, we think it's
5	questionable because there are different opinions on
6	that.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If there are different
8	opinions then it must be possible that it doesn't.
9	Which document are you talking about?
10	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: ECOA.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't think ECOA
12	says anything about data collection, but I may be
13	wrong.
14	DR. SQUIRES: Your *, so, to me collection
15	of
16	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Only for tracking
17	purposes.
18	DR. SQUIRES: Right. And it's not
19	publicly available, but language cannot correct that
20	data. It
21	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Only for discrimination
22	testing within the institutions.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Lenders may collect the
24	data. Do they submit it to the Fed?
25	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: No they don't. It's

useful internal discrimination testimony.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So, in other words, if
we wish to take up with the Fed this issue of data
collection, it is ripe for taking up and discussion?
MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, I will tell you
that this decision in Reg B was just made, not that
many months ago. And, I mean, you're right, yes, you
can you're welcome to send letters in. But I don't
know that the Board members are going to want to be
opening in that discussion at this time.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we
VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: This is a new
new regulation?
MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, it's not a new
regulation, but in a sense it is a modification made
to the regulation.
VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just want to
find out that years ago, I was * in California *
and we were concerned about local city and county
property used for lending, and so on. But we
recommended at that time, at least the section * that
data. So that would be taken into account in a
decision * happened *.
There are ways of getting figures on what
has happened that can be part of the decision-making

But I just wondered if that --1 process. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I'm told that 3 the * statute doesn't prohibit it. It's a matter of 4 the regulation. But we will take up this issue, and 5 consistent with the policies we have, I think that we may wish to visit it with the Federal Reserve Board, 6 7 because I don't understand how we can tell whether 8 you're serving people, or whether you're *, black 9 communities are being served or people who want loans 10 are being served, or what the bank is doing, if you 11 have no idea about what the data are. 12 I mean, you have to know what data is --13 and what data do you collect? Not you personally. 14 What data does the Fed collect to make sure that all 15 banks * that you are, in fact, getting the results 16 that one might --17 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Obviously * that we have. 18 We also collect data, one thing is that the CRA 19 revisions in 1995 mandated that banks do submit data 20 on small business lending and community development 21 But it's not race-based. loans. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 23 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: But it is data on the 24 location of loans. We also collect data during our *.

As I said, we do require a * form on geographic

locations and then map them. So obviously not on 1 2 small business loans, but *. 3 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: So what kind of a * 4 locations. 5 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Right. . 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So let us be clear 7 what I'm asking you. I'm not asking generally what 8 data you collect, but what data do you collect that 9 tells you whether, in fact, you are 10 communities of color? If you don't have any data that .11 tells you who these people are and who is being served 12 and who isn't, how do you know whether you're 13 achieving your responsibility? Not you personally. 14 Again, this is not --15 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: No, I understand. 16 I think that the way we tried to do that is * look at 17 that as a demographic *, where they're collecting information reflecting where they're making their 18 19 loans. 20 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Why bother to take 21 out Census data on the demography of communities? The .22 way you're looking at the Census, I see that you go 23 behind that and look at the demography, the racial 24 demography of the community, because you have it in 25 your mind that it's valuable to know whether or not

1	racial and ethnic minorities are being effectively
2	served.
3	But if you do see that that's an important
4	thing to look at, then why not develop the data fields
5	that are going to allow me to get at that directly,
6	rather that going in through the back door trying to
7	correlate the geo * with the Census data.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, she's not
9	disagreeing with you. It's a policy matter that I'm
10	sure you didn't decide. But
11	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, it was a decision of
12	the Board.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You didn't decide
14	that.
15	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes.
16	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Me personally, no.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to be
19	pursuing this issue and taking it up. You may want to
20	inform your superiors when you go back that we will be
21	taking up this issue with them, and we will fully
22	inform ourselves after some staff work, so that we'll
23	know what the facts are. But it does sound like one
24	of those Ward Connolly things out there in California.
25	Okay. If you don't know what did you

1 say? -- don't ask, don't tell. 2 Let me just say, I have another couple of 3 questions, if I can read my own writing. One is about 4 bilingual services. 5 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes. If I may just direct the 6 YEUNG: 7 Commission's attention to a letter written from the * 8 California regarding the amendments to Req B. Just to 9 supplement sort of the limitedness of the scope of 10 these amendments to adequately, you know, collect the 11 data on race. And we have our testing papers, 12 submitted into the Commission's written testimony --13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. 14 MR. YEUNG: I'm talking about the Vice 15 President of Union Bank. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. The bank is 17 complaining because they can't collect the data, in 18 order to do their jobs effectively. 19 On bilingual matters, you talked, 20 Braunstein, about all of the things that you 21 translating into Spanish, and you gave us a long 22 But I understand that there is no laundry list. 23 requirement that banks provide bilingual services. Ιs 24 that correct or not? 25 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: That is correct. There

are no specific requirements. 1. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And that the 3 regulators have decided not to do that. I mean, not 4 to require it, although many banks do it. 5 So let me ask Dr. Angell, who is a great 6 free marketeer, and believes in it, as we all do. 7 won't ask you questions about your macroeconomic 8 views, because I think the proof in the pudding will 9 be * on those. We've already had the tax cuts and all 10 the rest of that, and the dividend checks and so on. 11 So we will either get great job growth, or modest job 12 growth, or goods-producing jobs and the like, and we 13 will all be able to see whether we in fact get those. 14 And that would be great if we did. 15 But as I understand from listening to you before, and reading what you say, and listening to *, 16 17 people behave or businesses behave in order to 18 maximize profit. Is that correct? And you can kind 19 of --20 Well that's * but there are DR. ANGELL: 21 people out there who are * that would get better rates 22 if *. 23 Okay. So why would CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 24 banks, or why would lenders, unless they think that 25 the customer has no information and doesn't know any

better, why would lenders charge perfectly valid borrowers who have all the credentials and are creditworthy subprime rates when they are eligible for prime rates? Is that just to make money? Well, they're assuming they don't know any better, so they'll make money.

And, secondly -- I have two questions. Why wouldn't a bank provide bilingual services, or why wouldn't the Fed require them to, to communities who are bilinguals * might not have the profits? I mean, I don't understand this. Could you explain it to me, please?

DR. ANGELL: There can always be some individuals in an organization who went too far in regards to saying, if this is classified as subprime, then the interest rate is higher, and believe that that is fulfilling their purpose. And another reason, we would hope, in a market system society, that there would not be just the one institution, but there would be other institutions. And it is the reduction of * to classify some loans that time will not * that debt around, and you can verify *.

So a lot of this can be found * everyone.

has the * to act in a pure and gracious way is * has
been done * of the *. And that's why -- that's why

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

Ø

the Federal Reserve and other regulatory agencies will 1 2 be looking to see whether they can * structure that. 3 Now, in regards to the bilingual question, 4 it seems to me that my experience with this is, quite 5 often perhaps, Spanish messages are written 6 Now obviously this growth of bilingualism, 7 I presume is proper *. That is, I have * bilingual * 8 If the Spanish community has a chance to is *. 9 respond to *, in Spanish, then I presume that that's 10 that. 11 I presume also that if there are who get -- English-speaking people ? get 12 people 13 irritated by having to listen to just less than 45 14 seconds of Spanish in order to do business, then they 15 might select a way to *. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now, so, Mr. 17 then why hasn't this market-driven approach 18 solved the problem that you're writing to the Fed 19 I mean, if people don't like the fact that 20 this bank doesn't offer bilingual services, or if the 21 bank doesn't, why don't you just go to another bank 22 that does, and then the Fed doesn't have to do 23 anything about it? 24 And if they don't like, Dr. Squires, 25 having subprime rates, why don't they just go to the next bank in the neighborhood and get a loan from them? Could you please -- can you both respond, please?

MR. YEUNG: Sure. I think the answer is part of the update, in some communities, there is just that one choice in terms of banking, and we saw that in Imperial Valley. We did have *, and people have, you know, sort of a lack of access to transportation anyhow to get to the different branches.

So, I mean, we're talking about sort of a population that doesn't necessarily have a lot of access to sort of, you know, do comparisons, and what not, and they just sort of go to the first place that's in the neighborhood. And if that branch is not providing the necessary services, then it almost seems like they have nowhere else to turn to.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

DR. ANGELL: I would follow up by saying that if the subprime designation is not *, getting that subprime loan, it seems to me is better than being rejected for the loan, because getting a subprime loan is not a permanent position. And so that subprime loan provides the opportunity for the borrower to demonstrate prime by paying back most of it, and thereby be * to the bank.

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

1 Now, you do have * to understand that 2 subprime designation is not a lifetime event. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: * 4 MR. YEUNG: that they * understand. * at 5 one point and they told me, "You're going to get ten point zero percent interest." I said, "That sounds 6 7 Then, they set up a computer and say, "Sorry, 8 the computer says 16 percent." So I said, "Sorry, 9 that's too much for me." I'm not going * 16 percent. 10 Everybody * initially. * I don't know why the bank is telling me that's the only thing I can get. 11 12 This notion that the borrower gets, actually it's --. 13 DR. ANGELL: Unless you concede that the 14 average * debt and consumer price * about five percent 15 16 * you have to average *. And so naturally, then, a 17 monetary system where the standard and the *. And so 18 what the * is that if we need to have some 19 modification, I would think, as a *, that I 20 there's people who borrow on credit cards and then go 21 under water, and thereby the rest of the people get 22 stuck with higher credit card borrowing rates. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Edley? 24 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: But before you get 25 into that * --

(Laughter.)

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

-- I think what you're responding to is, among other things, the statement that * 30 to 50 percent of subprime housing mortgage lending, if the borrowers should qualify for conventional prime rates.

Now, the owners of this kind of bank have, certainly, a self-interest in the * might be analyzing, so let's stipulate that some of that may be going on.

It certainly goes to the presence of at least two factors: a) a lack of competitive forces of the sort that Dr. Angell describes, a lack of competitive forces that would drive the opportunity for lenders to exploit consumers uneconomic mortgage packages and products.

And then, secondly, just some of, perhaps your reaction on uneconomic home loan *, discrimination of the sort that this agency needs you folks * studies; in lending, in automobile sales, and so forth, where the prices that are quoted to minority and women consumers are above those quoted to white male consumers, even at some risk to the seller of being unable to consummate the deal, that there would just be the inclination of, this is the neighborhood that I'm selling in, these are the consumers that I'm selling to, and I just attract more of these kinds of

1 customers.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, you know what?

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: It's a non-economic judgment.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But Commissioner, just a minute if I could, to reinforce what you just said.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's why we have the Commission. That's why we have * because the markets don't.

Should get some of these lenders in here, because you all here are experts on business loans and bonding economic development. And the head of the largest banking company in this country testified under oath that they charged minority construction firms higher bonding rates than the rates for people who were risky. I forget what he called them, half-credit, something, bonding. And they charged them more money.

And when we asked that, he hustled, and he talked to his staff, and he did all of these things, and he came back and said, "Well, we don't know that. We know that our track record shows that they * time. They did a wonderful job sorting. So how *. And we don't know if they know, but we also charge them the highest rates. It is just something we have been

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

doing ever since we've been in business, and they continue to do it."

And the effect of that was when these construction firms got ready to compete, and sent out their bids, they had charged more, because they had to account for their product without it, which was -- it put them at a competitive disadvantage, and they were having some problems getting these jobs.

And in this case, it may be okay to say that somebody gets a subprime rate, and then later on they can work their way into the ? but when they're getting the subprime rate, they're getting less money in their own pockets to do other things with, because they're paying a higher rate all the while they when could be paying in order to get housing, and they're going to * educational system here that Ms. Braunstein works on.

You talked about the education and the information. Do you * people *? Do you * subprime issue, and about how this issue * they should be looking out for and be aware that this happens?

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, we have * and organizations again. We have been involved in a lot of programs out in communities on predatory lending, on subprime lending in terms of knowing what to look

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

1	for. We have been involved in quite a bit of that.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Are you doing enough?
3	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Well, I mean, you can
4	always do more. You're just raising access. Yes,
5	these are *.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Dr. Angell?
7	DR. ANGELL: What I would like to remind
8	the Commission is, that there are * other lenders is
9	categorizing someone as subprime when they are indeed
10	prime. That would be a very horrible
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: *
12	DR. ANGELL: ? and I'm telling you that
13	that's a horrible, * If there are institutions that
14	are serving them that way, and making that kind of
15	profit, then that would go a long way to
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Dr. Angell, that's the
17	theory.
18	DR. ANGELL: The numbers, that
19	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: The * gets belied by
20	the 30 to 50 percent data offered by someone in the
21	Fed. That's exactly what I'm suggesting is that if
22	the * would shift with the market risk, if the
23	competitive pressures would in fact * all of these
24	communities in which the supprime lending is taking
25	place. If the consumer is the backdrop, then I would

1	not want to see * out of the * do the shopping, and so
2	forth.
3	But the data
4	DR. ANGELL: No, the data * under the
5	Gramm-Bliley-Leach * by the staff, and the Federal
6	Reserve study shows there's no profitability. * gets
7	better and better when you're talking about *, and the
8	* of this debate * they would be *. And it's like, my
9	goodness, these are *. But if it was on there*, it's
LO	it's *. So if it's not viable, then there are not
L1	these there's not that profitability.
L2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: These 15 percent were
L3	the subprime lenders or not. *.
L4	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: The study that Governor
L5	Angell is referring to was our CRA-covered
16	institutions. And from what we know, these are the
L7	predatory lenders, which is not the * of an
18	institution.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So they're
20	not
21	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, they are not a
22	depository. They're a lending affiliate.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. That reinforces
24	the point.
25	Yes, Commissioner Redenbaugh.

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Thanks. I think
2	* even been more complicated than it seems.
3	(Laughter.)
4	My question to you is, as one who
5	understands the *, and understands the economy in such
6	a way that it is personal investment decisions causing
7	them to * on those investments * very high rate of
8	return, which is now *. Okay?
9	* these days is * is understood how to *
10	making investments. And * that would be *? * You
11	know, if you adjust * than they used to. And I think
12	that this * to see if there is this * your suggestion
13	is * and * unreasonably high rates of return on those
14	kinds of economic activity.
15	I mean, I think and this is what I'd
16	like * that the * eliminate the problems that we
17	all * have, and do have, with predatory lending is to
18	enforce the amount on predatory lending. That is,
19	what is it we have to do to make sure there are more
20	lenders out there making those * and * driving down
21	each other's prices and rates of return?
22	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: More check-cashing
23	operations.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. *. *, but
25	that it's *.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Financially. 1 2 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Financially, or 3 in an economic sense. This is * check cashing. I know a *, and * helped * 4 DR. ANGELL: 5 family business *. And the * thing about it was that 6 in spite of * effects in the *, the *. I thought it 7 was very commendable *. 8 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Some of the argument 9 In other words, I'm going to stipulate that it 10 is economically rational and non-discriminatory to 11 charge a risk premium. But the risk is * in terms of 12 investment. Rather than being a risk, that is simply 13 a perception of risk, and it *. 14 So to the extent that the * of --15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, first of all, it 16 may not be * of risk * and prejudice. Would you add 17 also to your definition, your stipulation, * that it 18 is a * decision made because a particular community is 19 seen as captive and underserved, and it's not because 20 there is prejudice, they just know that that's the 21 place that they can go because they don't have anybody 22 else *. 23 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's a third case. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. 25 That's a third case COMMISSIONER EDLEY:

in which it's not simply about charging a rationally * 1 2 risk premium, it's that I'm exploiting the market *, 3 because of the * competitive pressures --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 4 Right. 5 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: -- to drive up the 6 margin, to * the margin. I agree. And there may be 7 lots of reasons why that competitive pressure doesn't exist, including * values that * in that community. 8 9 It may be that consumers aren't aware that they could shop around to get a lower price. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: *. 12 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: * and other things of 13 that sort that aren't discrimination. I agree with 14 that, but whether the case is *, as you've described, 15 Mary, * is perceived risk. It seems to me both of 16 those are predicates for regulatory action, because 17 the market isn't working. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. 19 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I would disagree 20 because there was a researcher at Princeton * who 21 should decide if the rate being charged is sufficient? 22 * the market *. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But, Russell, would 24 you agree that if the decision is based on the factor, 25 among the Christopher identified of ones race

1	discrimination, then there ought to be some regulation
2	to prohibit that. If that *.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's
4	different.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, the *.
6	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: *.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: * discriminate *.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's right.
9	But I think that's a different
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you would agree,
11	then, that idea is *.
12	*: * because that's not a data problem.
13 [.]	That's not a data collection problem. * I think the
14	magnitude of that aspect of the problem, the magnitude
15	to which discrimination is contributing to the setting
16	and the enforcement of the risk premiums, unless I
17	have data to analyze the comparison.
18	What they * is they're going back and
19	they're reengineering the * made by the lenders, and
20	they're seeing what's the evidence about the credit
21	risk associated with this loan. And they're seeing
22	that the evidence is that this borrower should have
23	had access to a conventional market product. * they
24	didn't.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's a huge *.

1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, which they have 2 identified. 3 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Herė. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And somebody ought to 5 be in there. 6 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 8 (Laughter.) 9 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Yes. I just wanted to 10 say that one of the other things I think that needs to 11 be factored in when you're talking about addressing 12 the issues of predatory lending is that what we have 13 identified * on this -- this is in the data, but we 14 did find * of * regulations, which is the *. 15 And from what we've seen, there are people 16 that generally argue that these big scenarios of being 17 victimized are that people are claiming they've been 18 And it's more than just markets that *. I mean, 19 it's * who generally are desperate for funds quickly. 20 A lot of times we find it's people who 21 medical bills need have that to be paid like 22 immediately, because they have somebody collecting and 23 calling them all the time, threatening them. It's * 24 and older people. A lot of it is senior citizens who

may have *. And it's that *, it's the * people.

And so, I mean, there's a whole aspect of this, and it's there -- there are a lot of people who are predatory lending. It's not a matter of people going into loan offices. It's the fact that the creditors are out in the neighborhood putting flyers * in the city, and I think they hang the flyers *.

I mean, I * all the time when I go home.

I read them * in D.C. And so -- so, anyway, if there's *, then you *, and especially if you happen to get somebody who is vulnerable, who happens to need

I read them * in D.C. And so -- so, anyway, if there's *, then you *, and especially if you happen to get somebody who is vulnerable, who happens to need money, *, and * is that often times these lenders really * those people, and especially you get somebody who might be isolated due to illness or may be elderly or homebound, someone comes in and makes them tea and cookies, and they have *, you know.

And there's those kinds of things * that fall into this as * of the * market *. I just want to * very difficult in terms of consumer *. And we work with a lot of * organizations around the country, and we talk to them about the * the need for counseling.

It is that * people *, and one is you can have * the time to necessarily go and have somebody look at their paperwork and say *. And then what happens on the other side, flip side, is * the loan *. * a decision about the *. Sometimes it's too late.

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

Then they * the local sheriff is going to 1 2 and get them and foreclose on their house, 3 instead of * when you first have to * be late with a payment, because * they got into this bad loan. 4 5 it's that * that's going on out there. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we want to thank 7 all of you for * a very educational *. Did you want 8 to say something *? 9 You DR. ANGELL: made reference something that I \ast to respond to, and that is that the 10 11 * with regard to these *. I do want the Commission to 12 understand that in my view * that we are * under * in 13 regards to the severity of *. It is more of a longrun * than it is a * reaction event. And so * of the 14 15 *, and that *. But I do not * that if we have not 16 done * at this time, it would be even worse. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, my gosh. Wow, 18 that's *. 19 DR. ANGELL: *. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: * my hearing. I will 21 * to the data collection issue *. As soon as we have 22 briefed ourselves on this *, we will go back to the 23 agency to discuss this issue of data collection, and 24 to see if, you know, we can resolve *. 25 only way you can talk about the

1	discrimination issues is if you focus on that and not
2	on the other market issues, and we do need some data
3	in order to try to, you know, get some kind of fix on
4	that. So we will get back to you on that.
5	We very much appreciate your coming. This
6	has been very informative. Thank you.
7	*: Thank you very much.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: *. Anybody second
9	that?
10	*: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's non-debatable.
12	Thank you.
13	(Whereupon, at 1:16 p.m., the proceedings
14	in the foregoing matter were adjourned.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	I and the second se