U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2004

+ + + + +

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Commission convened at 9:30 a.m. in Room 540 of 624 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., Mary Frances Berry, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY Chairperson

CRUZ REYNOSO Vice Chairperson

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS Commissioner

CHRISTOPHER EDLEY, JR. Commissioner

PETER KIRSANOW Commissioner
ELSIE M. MEEKS Commissioner
RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH Commissioner

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM Commissioner

LESLIE R. JIN Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY MARGARET BUTLER

DEBRA CARR, ESQ.

Diditi Chia, 100.

IVY DAVIS

Deputy General Counsel

Chief, Programs Coordination

Unit

TERRI DICKERSON Assistant Staff Director,

Office of Civil Rights

Evaluation

PAMELA DUNSTON Chief, Administrative ...

Services and Clearinghouse

Division

DORELLE GRAY

GEORGE HARBISON

SOCK FOON MacDOUGALL

TINA MARTIN

EMMA MONROIG

JENNY PARK

KWANA ROYAL

MICHELLE ROYSTER

ALEXANDER SUN

DEBORAH VAGINS

TIFFANY WRIGHT

Director of Management

LIBRARY

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

MASHINGTON D.C. 20005-2701

12021 234-4433

STAFF PRESENT CONT'D.: MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

LAURA BATIE
PATRICK DUFFY
JOY FREEMAN
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
KIMBERLY SCHULD
MELISSA SHARP
KRISHNA TOOSIE

NEAL R. GROSS

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

しろひろし シスヤーマイズス

usus nealmmee com

AGENDA

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:4
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2004 MEETING 4
STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
FY 2006 BUDGET ESTIMATE TO OMB
STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS FOR ALASKA, COLORADO, NEVADA, OHIO, SOUTH DAKOTA, AND UTAH
"BROKEN PROMISES: EVALUATING THE NATIVE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM" REPORT
"TOWARDS EQUAL ACCESS: ELIMINATING LANGUAGE BARRIERS FROM FEDERAL PROGRAMS" REPORT 64
"FUNDING FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT: 2005" REPORT
FIRTURE ACENDA TITEMS

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

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

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So ordered.

The next

item on the agenda is announcements. The first one is

to welcome Dorelle Gray, who is the new Secretary in

the Office of General Counsel. She must be here

I don't know - to the Commission. She somewhere.

comes from the Justice Department, where she worked in

the Appellate Section six years, and then also in the

Office of Commercial Litigation Corporation. She also

has worked with USIA.

election cycle.

The other point to make is since our last meeting, of course, we had the anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in August. And, of course, one of the issues that we'll be considering, or the issue we'll be considering later today concerns the Voting Rights Act and voting rights issues during this

is also Hispanic Heritage Month, September 15th. 2004 to October 15th, 2004, and the Commission joins the nation in celebrating this month. And we, of course, have worked on as a Commission -the Commission has long worked on issues concerning the status of opportunities available to Latinos who now represent the largest minority group in the country, nationwide ethnic minority group.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. MACHINICTON D.C. 20005-2701

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For example, in March of last year, Commission held a briefing revisiting the civil rights implications of the Mt. Pleasant disturbances and the state of affairs in the Latino community here in D.C. since the 1991 civil unrest in Mt. Pleasant. OCRE has completed most recently its FY 2004 report examining federal attempts to provide language access to the public. And this report successfully reviews seven federal agencies and areas on the agenda for consideration by the Commissioners today.

understand that removing We language barriers or addressing the issue is an important civil 19th rights issue in the Latino community. Amendment to the Constitution was ratified in August in 1920, saying that the right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied on account of sex. After a long campaign by its advocates, years to gain women's suffrage through modification of individual state laws.

The desegregation of Central High School in September 1957 is also an anniversary that takes place this month. After Brown v. The Board was decided 50 years ago, of course, there was resistance to its implementation, and some of that resistance eventually was focused at Central High School when

President Eisenhower eventually had to order troops in to protect the black students who were entering Central High School.

The Martin Luther Kings "I Have a Dream" speech, of course, took place in August of 1963, so we mark the 41st anniversary of that, and the influence of the civil rights movement and Dr. King in moving our nation forward in terms of the struggle for equal opportunity for everyone in our society.

September 15th, 1963 was the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham. A few weeks after the speech, the Ku Klux Klan bombed the church, killing four girls. They were eleven-year-old Denise McNair, and three fourteen year olds, Cynthia Wesley, Carol Robertson, and Addie Mae Collins, when a dynamite bomb exploded at the church. The bombing and the killing of these four little girls was one of the most heinous domestic terrorist acts of the civil rights era.

We also take time to remember the myriad of people representing over 90 nations who were killed three years ago in wake of September 11th, when the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in D.C. were attacked, as well as the airplane that crashed in Somerset County, Pennsylvania - a grave

moment in American history. And the impact of it, of course, is still being felt in every aspect of our lives, including issues of civil rights. We have discussed at this Commission

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

violence, threats, and discrimination issues of against Muslims, Arab Americans, and other people who people think are Muslims and Arab Americans in the aftermath of that.

The anthrax contaminations and that environment which occurred killing people. found out who, in fact, did it. Renewed concerns about disparities in our healthcare delivery systems, which we discussed here at the Commission, and more attention to the disparities in our healthcare delivery systems. So that all of these matters are things I think we should take note of at this time.

Does any Commissioner have anything they wish to mention or announce? Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, my wife doesn't fly, so she and I have been having motorized trips across the country for nearly half a century. And it used to be very rare to find a Mexican restaurant other than the southwest. The most recent trip was this last summer. There was a Mexican restaurant and a Chinese restaurant in practically

ì	1
1	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: We think he
2	should have come in his medals.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, indeed, adorned
4	with medals.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Arnold also got a
6	medal, didn't he?
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm pretty sure.
8	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I'll never disagree
9	with him again.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks.
11	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, this week
12	actually a federal judge ruled on a redistricting case
13	in South Dakota that involved two districts that were
14	actually one of them was my district, but it packed
15	two reservations into one district, and so the ACLU on
16	behalf of Alfred Bonshirt sued the state, and the
17	judge ruled this week that, in fact, there was voter
18	packing, and so that the state will have to redraw the
19	lines. That's I think very good news. It offers
20	Indians a better chance.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That is wonderful.
22	The other thing on the subject of Native Americans, on
23	Indians, is that we did receive the letter we had
24	mentioned before from the National Congress of

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

American Indians commending the Commission for its

Commission to decide what's on their schedule, but 1 we'll have that passed out right now. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And people can take a 3 4 look at it. COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I would 5 liked to have had this prior to the meeting. I wonder 6 7 if --8 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you sent out --9 did you send out a note --10 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We did send out a 11 I agree. Normally we would try to send this note. 12 out with the mail-out, so I apologize for that. 13 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Or even in the 14 email that you sent us, we could have -- it could have 15 included the dates, at least for me would have been a 16 major convenience. 17 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. I agree, but I 18 think to keep in mind though -- I mean, this is the 19 exercise uniquely to the Commissioners to decide what 20 works and what doesn't work, so hopefully this is 21 helpful, but there's nothing magical about these 22 dates. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In other words, 24 just spread them out and then you tried to skip 25 holidays.

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

work on the health care issues, "Quiet Crisis", and 1 2 the other report, the name of which I don't remember. 3 Health STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: The Care 4 Report. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What's the name of the 5 other one? That they really are -- "Broken Promises", 6 7 which is on the agenda today. Right? 8 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, it is. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And that letter should 10 be distributed to the Commissioners. They already 11 gave us an award for our work on these. As I told you before, I went up to their meetings to accept the 12 13 award on behalf of the Commission. It really was the work of Terry and her staff on these issues. 14 15 Anybody have anything else that they'd 16 like to announce? Okay. Hearing none, the next item 17 on the agenda is the Staff Director's report. 18 there anything you wish to say to us, or you'd just 19 like to answer questions. 20 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Madam Chair, I think 21 we're going to bring up - we have a draft proposal 22 that is basically designed, so that I think we missed. 23 any major holidays, and we try not to have meetings 24 within three weeks, so it's kind of like spread out in

But, of course,

that regard.

25

to the

it's up

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, that's right. 1 We generally meet the second or third week of a month, 2 and so we tried to keep that practice, and tried to 3 miss the holidays and tried to spread it out. This is 4 5 pretty typical of a normal year. 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, I was 7 not aware of the email. I probably got it, but I get about 150 a day so sometimes I miss them if I don't 8 9 see it as a flag item or priority item. 10 speaking to some fellow Commissioners, I guess they. 11 did it and said the email requested that we bring our 12 I didn't bring my calendar today. calendars. 13 wondering if we could table this consideration for --14 consideration of this schedule for sometime in the 15 future. 16 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That sounds like 17 that would accommodate me, as well. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, the problem --19 would you like to --20 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, Ι 21 difficulty -- I mean, I guess I would yield if both of . 22 you -- it's just I'm filling up with this new job I 23 They're having to schedule lots of fund raising 24 trips and alumni events and so forth for me, and I'm 25 just getting worried. Well, I guess we don't have any

	choice.
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: It's very hard
3	for Russell.
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No, I appreciate
5	that. I understand. So could we try to do it next
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe you could do it
7	by email. Would that be too confusing? You could
8	simply review your calendars once you go back and
9	figure out if these work or if they don't, suggest
10	something else, and send emails to the Staff Director.
11	And then he could try to make up some new chart or
12	something.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. I just
14	noticed there's one date on here that must be a typo
15	because December 18 th is a Sunday.
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, that's a
17	new convention to try.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It must be the
19	16 th . Right?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, it is a typo.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Should we change
22	that on our
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that right? Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm just
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, how would that

1	be, Commissioner Thernstrom.
2	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I have a
3	question for Commissioner Edley. With respect to you,
4	am I correct to say that your term expires in March?
5	Is that correct?
6	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I don't know when it
7	does. It's March, April - I'm honestly not sure.
8	When does yours expire?
9	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: In April.
10	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. So with
11	respect to the two of you then
12	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: So April or May, just
13	the first couple.
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: It's just the
15	first few meetings.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, they could
L7	be reappointed.
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: They could be
19	reappointed.
20	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's not nice.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You mean -
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I was going to
24	say does Commissioner Edley really want to come for
25	the rest of the year all the way across the country.
İ	NEW D 0000

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

1	the same base.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That would be worth
3	it. Let's do that, because if people already know
4	they can't meet by the
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, just one -
6	fifth of July, that's the Fourth of July week, and we
7	typically go on vacation for that week.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And since we're
10	not meeting in August anyway, and it wouldn't push too
11	close to the next meeting, if we could move that to
12	the following week, that would be helpful. So that
13	would be July 15 th . And then like I said, the December
14	date looks to be incorrect. Friday, September 9 th , I
15	have a conflict. I don't know if it's possible to
16	have a different date.
17	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Which date was that?
18	I'm sorry.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Friday, September
20	9 th . And I guess the week before is Labor Day weekend,
21	so the week after would be the 16 th .
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So why don't you write
23	the 16 th there. Any others?
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Now would that
25	conflict with Rosh Hashanah?

i /

<u> </u>	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It does not.
2	Well, it doesn't say it on this calendar, but I'm
3	no, Rosh Hashanah is in October next year.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that's the 16 th .
5	Anybody off-hand see anything that you know you can't
6	do.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I won't be at the
8	February I'll participate in February by telephone
9	since we'll be having our fourth child. But other
10	than that
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, my. You know that
12	already.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: February 5 th .
14	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes, there
15	aren't nine months between now and February.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As long as I can
17	come back from
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Russell, what we're
19	all doing is Christopher is doing something. I think
20	he's taking
21	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: February 18 th would
22	be terrific. I mean, I have to be here in the east on
23	Thursday anyway.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So why don't we then
25	say that that's what will happen. You've plugged in

- 1	1
1	these new dates, and everybody has written those in,
2	and then people will email you to say whether all
3	these dates seem to work; which can, of course, be
4	changed. And then you can do a calendar, and then
5	Christopher will know how to and if that doesn't
6	work, then you just have to do it next month.
7	Okay. What else were we doing? Oh, the
8	Staff Director's report. Anyone have anything on the
9	Staff Director's report that they'd like to discuss?
10	Are you still doing dates?
11	III. Staff Director's Report
12	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, I was just
13	going to ask people to at least consider April 8 th
14	instead of 15 th .
15	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I can't do the
16	8 th .
17	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Can you do the
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You'll be
19	scrambling to get your taxes
20	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Oh, wait a
21	minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I may be
22	wrong on that, Chris. Just hold on a second. Let's
23	go back. No, I'm wrong. I can do the 8 th . I'm sorry.
24	
25	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That would be great.

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

1	That would be my last meeting.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What did you say, what
3	date?
4	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: April 8 th instead of
5	the 15 th .
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 8th instead of the
7	15 th .
8	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes. Understanding
9	that Russell and Pete still have to check.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And luckily, I
12	think that the first time since I've been on, it
13	doesn't overlap with either Good Friday or Passover,
14	so that's nice to see.
15	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: The 8 th .
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Either of those,
17	either March or April.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Is the Staff
20	Director going to make a report?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He said did you say
22	you were going to make do you have anything else to
23	report?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: No, I'll answer
25	questions.
	I control of the cont

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I do have a couple of questions. One had to do with the budget estimate for this year. It's \$15 million?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's the next item we'll be going to, if you'd like. Would you like to go to that?

I guess a couple COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: of other questions. One is, at some point in the last week or more than a week, there was a notice in the "Federal Register", I believe, about the hearing related to subpoenaed documents from the Commission. Can someone explain to me what that related to, and give some background?

Sure. I think you're STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: talking about the proposed Congressional hearings regarding subpoenaing some documents from the It was set up for this last Wednesday. Commission. I had one of my staff go over there, and he told me when he got back that it had been cancelled. And he called, and I understand it's been reset for this This only happened a couple of days upcoming week. ago, and nobody called us in advance to notify us, so we're still in the midst of finding out exactly what happened. But as the Commissioners know, we've been in the last couple or three months, four months, been

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

engaged in extensive work with GAO on two reports that they're doing. And additionally, in the midst of that, we got a very substantial request from Congress for documents. And we've been working very much with GAO to try to comply with their expedited schedule, which they informed me was driven by the requester's desires.

We wrote back Congress and explained that we were working diligently on the request that they had made of us, but that a lot of the documents they had asked for were actually in the possession of other request went back almost parties, and that the uniformly to 1995. Many of those documents we don't have and are not required to keep, so we told them we were still in the process of copying documents, trying to assess what we do have, who has what. And that we were also working very closely with GAO, because the people that requested GAO to examine us were really the same people in Congress who had asked for these So they wrote back to us, and among other documents. things that they said was that you should definitely prioritize responding to GAO, which we've done, and we're still engaged with them. And so I can only assume at this point that the subpoena relates to some of those documents that they had requested earlier.

KIRSANOW: You haven't 1 COMMISSIONER subpoena itself, or haven't seen 2 received a 3 subpoena? STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We have not received 4 5 the subpoena itself. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I thought you said it 6 7 was put off until next week. STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes, it was going to 8 9 be -- my assumption was that they were going to act on 10 it last week because it was noticed up, like you said, 11 but that it was pushed off. And like I said, my 12 staffer I asked to call, called the House Judiciary 13 Committee and was informed that it had been pushed 14 off. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wasn't the hearing to 16 decide whether they would issue a subpoena? 17 STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. Because under 18 the House rules, they have to have a vote, so I think 19 there were some discussions among members at this 20 point as to what they're going to do, but officially 21 that's all we know, because they never let us know in 22 advance what they were thinking or whatever, so that's 23 what I know at this point. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anybody have anything 25 else? Yes, Commissioner Thernstrom.

_

..

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'm just puzzled by something you said. You said that they want documents going back to what you said, `96?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: `95.

commissioner Thernstrom: '95. And that you're not required to keep such documents and you don't have them. But as I understand it -- fair enough. But as I understand it, the Commission has subpoenaed documents from DOJ and others that way predate, go back to dates as early as 1982 and so forth. Now, of course, if we're not required to keep documents going back to '95, are they required to keep documents going back to '82, and is there a bit of a double standard here?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Well, I expect that different documents have to be kept for different lengths of period of time, and so I think that without knowing exactly what documents we're talking about, it would be hard to answer that question. I mean, some of the documents they requested of us, you know, only have to be kept a few years, some are longer and so forth, so I'm not saying that -- I didn't indicate which of the documents, and I couldn't tell you at this moment we're only required to keep for a couple of years, which for three years, which for longer than

2 | 3 |

that. But my point was simply that the law did not require us to keep all the documents requested of us for that period of time.

In terms of our request, again, I don't know exactly which request we make that go back to beyond three years or beyond five years. But, obviously, if we request a document or set of documents and the agency doesn't have it and they're not required to keep it, certainly we wouldn't penalize them for it.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, isn't the short answer that financial management documents, which is what we're talking about here - right? Bills, things like that having to do with -- they have dates on them and you have to keep them for that length of time. The kind of stuff we subpoena from agencies has to do with policy matters and so on. And also, they are usually put in the archives after they are done, so when you say you don't have them, you may not have them here, but if they're policy documents they would be in storage, and that would be true of any agency.

Also, if an agency doesn't -- I just happen to know this because I have to request documents from people all the time, and the kind of research I do, government agencies, and I go to the

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

1	archives all the time. But anyway, if they don't have
2	something, they'll tell you they don't have it. And
3	if you don't have it, then you don't have it. But by
4	and large, if they're policy documents, they're either
5	somewhere around the agency or they're the National
6	Archives or some place in storage. It just takes you
7	time to get them. You can't get them tomorrow. That
8	doesn't mean you couldn't get them eventually. But
9	certain things, like the bill you paid for pencils or
10	whatever it is, there's a length of time which you
11	have to keep those. Isn't that right?
12	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that right? Okay.
14	That's my understanding.
15	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: That clarifies
16	it.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have
18	anything else on the Staff Director's report?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I do.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: One other thing.
22	There was a posting for the General Counsel position
23	recently, and I think we had sent a memo requesting
24	some kind of the status of that. My recollection was

there was a question about the regulations pertaining

to that particular position, the duties, the description of it, and so forth. Can you tell us what the status, number one, of the posting is, and whether or not there's been any reconciliation of the posting with the necessity, what I believe to be the necessity to get some kind of finalization of the regulations?

And this I don't recall, but is there some type of imperative that derives from there had been an EEOC complaint or settlement out there that may have some kind of impact on the General Counsel posting the position?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: The short answer is that there's nothing out there that impedes the posting of the General Counsel's position. The regs that you're talking about has nothing to do with the position of General Counsel, nor the duties.

What happened was, as I think you noted in your memo to me, back in `88 or so, `98 or so, the Commissioners had agreed, pursuant largely to GAO's suggestion, clarify our own regs to make sure the public out there had a good understanding as to how the Commission is structured, what positions are there and so forth. And it did get delayed for a variety of reasons in terms of getting published, but at some point it did get published.

to that, there was 1 Subsequent variety of reasons, we needed to put the Solicitor's 2 organizational 3 in terms of in, back position But there's nothing in there that affects 4 structure. the authority to post any position, and certainly not 5 General Counsel's position. And so I checked with 6 7 to confirm personnel as lawyers and the General understanding that the posting of 8 Counsel's position is appropriate. And the reason is 9 because we are authorized to have that position, and 10 we do have a job description for it which delineates 11 the duties, and the duties of the General Counsel and 12 the duties of the Solicitors are very different. 13 To list their delineated duties and their 14 position description, General Counsel essentially, of 15 course, is the Chief Legal Officer for the agency, as 16 well as the Manager of our law office. 17 So again, 18 after I got your memo, I did check to confirm that we 19 were operating appropriately. 20 Commissioner CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 21 Thernstrom. 22 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have a modest 23 request of the Staff Director's office; that is, that 24 when we send emails to the office in response to a 25 request of one sort or another, that those emails get

1	acknowledged, because I never know whether you've
2	actually received them or not. And I find that I'm
3	sitting there wondering well, did they get it, did
4	they not get it, and it would just help with a
5	received, thanks.
6	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Okay. We do try to
7	either acknowledge the response or assistant to
8	assistant, stuff like that, but we'll try to keep an
9	eye on that issue you raised.
10	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes, I mean
11	things get you know, emails go astray, so it would
12	help.
13	IV. FY 2006 Budget Estimate
- 1	1
 14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the
 14 15	
	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item
15 16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate.
15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate. Commissioner Kirsanow, you had a question about the
15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate. Commissioner Kirsanow, you had a question about the budget.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate. Commissioner Kirsanow, you had a question about the budget. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I just — I
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate. Commissioner Kirsanow, you had a question about the budget. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I just — I think the estimate I saw was for \$15 million.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anything else on the Staff Director's report? Hearing none, the next item on the agenda is the FY 2006 budget estimate. Commissioner Kirsanow, you had a question about the budget. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I just — I think the estimate I saw was for \$15 million. STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Fifteen point one.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Nine million, more

like nine point zero.

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

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Nine million, whatever it is, somewhere in that neighborhood. First, how is the estimate constructed in light of the fact that we've been flatlined? And I guess there's a reasonable presumption that that would be the case this time. Well, that's the first question.

Well, STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: let before I go and explain this how we go about constructing it, I mean, let me just say as a preface kind of what goes through my mind in terms of that as I work with staff. I think like you said, we've been flatlined for many, many years at \$9 million. think that, my understanding that even before I got here, that the Commission's approach was let's ask for what we think we need, and then we'll work through it. And so the first step is after the Commissioners in January, February, whenever decide on the projects, shortly thereafter our Budget Director, Mr. Harbison, writes each of our offices, including our two program offices, primarily responsible who are for effectuating the projects the Commission has voted on, and ask for budget estimates, what we call a budget And so we get those estimates from the various call. offices, and then Mr. Harbison tries to pull them

together in a preliminary document. He goes back to each of the offices as needed to get clarification and things like that. If things look like they're just totally out of line, I think he has some preliminary conversations with the offices on that. And then at some point he gives me a document combining all these proposals, and then he and I have conversations. And sometimes I go back to the offices, but he and I then try to craft something that ensures that we can do the projects that the Commission has asked for, as well as all the other things that we either feel we need, or we're told that we need from our various office managers.

Now we don't just accept each of the office manager's requests. We both look at what we consider to be the reasonableness of it, as well as equity among offices. So that's what we do, and so that's how this budget gets developed.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have anything else?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I understand that, and it kind of strikes me in terms of allocation of budgetary resources if -- I mean, it's I guess always a projection of every agency that you're going to acquire more, and hope to get more than you did in

the previous year. But in terms of allocating the budgetary resources for any given project, department, any other kind of endeavor of the Commission, if you know that you've been at nine plus million for a while, and then you have an estimate of \$15 million, which is more than a 50 percent increase, how do you then reconcile whether or not you're being realistic in your estimates with respect to what's going to be happening in the next year?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Well, like I said, I mean my understanding has been that the approach the Commission historically has taken is let's ask for what we think we need, and then if there's discussions to get less, that's fine. I mean, in the four years since I've been here, my understanding is that there's been times in the past where the Commission would make a request, and I think in the 90s the Commission was making requests for probably ballpark the same number, and OMB would ask the Commission to come in and talk There would be some discussions, and I think to them. in at least several of the years, they probably agreed on a number like 11, 11 and a half, which Congress didn't pass either, but there was discussion. four years since I've been here, OMB has never asked to have those discussions, so I guess the argument

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 could be made that if we're totally realistic, maybe 2 we should just ask for \$9 million. But again, based 3 on my understanding as to how we've historically 4 approached this, is that really would not be a good 5 thing to do. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner 7 Redenbaugh, then Commission Edley, and did you have 8 your hand up too? 9 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, if I could 10 sort of join Pete. It is exactly the way that the 11 Staff Director said. And this goes back well before 12 he joined us, and it troubled me then. And I think 13 I've seen submissions even more unrealistic than the 14 \$15 million, maybe 16 or 18. I mean, they must think 15 we inhale over here. And I've objected to them for 16 about a dozen years as really unrealistic. I don't --17 I'm very reluctant to associate myself with an 18 unrealistic request. And it's been the practice in 19 the agency for a long, long time to submit these huge 20 requests. 21 22 23

What I can't remember, and the question I want to ask the Staff Director is, let's say the number comes back at \$9 million roughly. Then what's the allocation process?

> STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: The process after it

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. MASHINGTON DC 20005-2701

24

1	comes back from OMB, what's called the pass back, is
2	then we have to submit documents to Congress. And
3	what we do, because it's my understanding that we have
4	to submit a budget number that's what we do is
5	this. We re-allocate our items in the format that the
6	Congress asks us for to be consistent with the \$9
7	million, but we also indicate that we still felt that
8	\$15 million was what was appropriate. And we give a
9	verbal explanation for that. But that in terms of the
10	charts and the numbers, it's a line with the pass back.
11	number.
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Now when you say
13	"we"
14	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: The "we" is basically
15	Mr. Harbison and myself. It's "we" in terms of the
16	Commission, but Mr. Harbison and myself.
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: You know, it's
18	been a whole year, and I just can't remember that far
19	back. Do the Commissioners vote on that again? Does
20	that change the priorities?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: No.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: We don't vote on
23	it, or it doesn't change the priorities?
24	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: It's not at that
25	level of detail. There will be a lump sum for program

1 stuff, but --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You are recognized for 2 3 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I apologize. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, you're recognized 5 for point of information. Go ahead. 6 7 It's not at that COMMISSIONER EDLEY: level of detail. There would be a lump sum. 8 It won't break down which projects are being undertaken or 9 10 anything of that sort. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So it doesn't 11 12 pin it off to any particular programmatic --13 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No. 14 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: All right. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Edley was next. 16 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I just wanted to say 17 that I'm not quite sure what unrealistic means in this 18 context. Again, just speaking from my experience at 19 OMB, from an OMB vantage point or from a Congressional 20 vantage point, if this agency were to ask for \$15 21 million or \$20 million, it's not unrealistic in the 22 sense that if they want to give us the money, they can 23 give us the money, and they can afford it.

question of their priorities. And with all due

respect, if I were a Republican appointee to this

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commission with the prospect of having control of the Commission, I would be asking for at least \$15 million and trying to persuade a Republican White House to support it, because with Republican control of the Commission, the opportunity to drive an agenda that's congenial to the Administration is going to be —might make it a much more attractive investment option for the OMB.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're not supposed to be driving agendas favorably for one administration or another.

COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, that's good to hear. That's good to hear, but it's -- in the same way that -- so I guess what I'm saying is that whether -- this is a trivial amount of money, absolutely trivial amount of money to OMB or to the Congress. It's only a question of whether they think programmatically what it is that the Commission would be doing starting a year hence is worth a couple of million additional dollars. And I think that depends upon their sense of who the people are who are running the Commission and what the Commission is setting out to do. And that, presumably, is going to be changing, so I don't think it's -- it's not unrealistic in a fiscal sense. It may be unrealistic as a matter of

political prediction. But even that I would say is 1 kind of -- is really sort of up for grabs. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Meeks. 3 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'm pretty much just 4 5 following on what Chris said, but I mean I think the 6 term is really, is it a reasonable budget. And I 7 more reasonable to ask for think it's reasonable, rather than to say it's unrealistic. 8 9 Maybe it's unrealistic doesn't get funded, but it's 10 still below reasonable in my mind. 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you have your hand 12 up, Commissioner Thernstrom? 13 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I did, but I --14 Commissioner Kirsanow has already been involved in 15 this. I'd like to hear what he has to say, and then 16 I'd like to go after him. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I mean, Chris, I 19 don't disagree with what you have to say in terms of 20 asking for a certain amount. That's not really my 21 question. It's really a question of if you're asking. 22 for \$15 million, but then the pass back, as you put 23 it, is at \$9 million, I'm concerned about the process 24 and the analysis that goes into getting to that \$15 25 million. And then finding out that you have \$9

million.

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

If I'm going to be constructing a budget that is 50 or 60 percent greater than what I'm likely receive, that budget, seems to me, has significant defects in it, and needs to be re-examined So that's what I'm concerned about. Ιt very closely. would be nice if you ask for \$15 million, you got back \$15 million, but historically that's not been the it's a matter of the underlying So case. understandings and frame works that goes into that request. Are we being - I'm not saying that we're not but are we being realistic and reasonable in assessing what components get funded, and how?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you still wish to speak?

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I do - a Yes, This piggybacks on things. couple of Commissioner Kirsanow said in part. I mean, I am -the difference between \$15 million and \$9 million is a radical difference in how the priorities of this Commission are structured. And to the best of my knowledge, we've never seen the pass back budget of \$9 million after the larger requests are denied. mean, money does drive the agenda to some extent of the Commission. That's an important number. I don't

-- I'm bothered because you can't separate priorities 1 from actual funding by simply ignoring the likely 2 3 reality here. And my second point is just to reiterate 4 5 what Jennifer said, and to say another word on that. 6 I hope, going to become a I mean, this is not, 7 Republican Commission. I never want to think of it 8 that way, but --9 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I agree with that 10 sentiment. 11 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes, but if -- . 12 think COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I your 13 comment was a Freudian slip. 14 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: But if one does 15 think of it that way then, of course, those who are 16 not Republicans on this Commission should be trying to 17 reduce the budget, not expand the budget, and deny the 18 future Republican majority of funding. 19 Now I would hope that the Democrats and 20 Independent/Democrats who are on this Commission would 21 not think that way, and I certainly don't want to 22 think of our future as ideologically driven, or driven 23 by partisan affiliations. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I would say point of 25 personal privilege, as the only Independent I think on

Ι

reached

this Commission, I am not a "Slash Democrat", thank 1 you. And I wish to define myself as I have a right to 2 do as a human being in whatever way I choose, and so 3 these snide little pejorative comments are not --4 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No, it's wasn't 5 a snide --6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I have already stated 7 what I am, and I am the only Independent on here. 8 have a point of personal privilege to say that. 9 have nothing else to say about this. Vice Chair, 10 11 please. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just -- my 12 own experience has been that the budget process is one 13 make a request. 14 in, we 15 Α different figure is negotiation. administratively. It eventually goes to the White 16 They come back with a fixed 17 House and Congress. When we discuss priorities, my recollection 18 figure. is that we keep in mind how much money we have, so 19 20 I've seen no incongruity in the process. Secondly, many of us have these type of 21 budgetary responsibilities with other organizations, 22 and it seems to me that the governmental process is 23 not much different than the process that I go through 24

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

with other organizations, where if you have so much

money you'd like to do XYZ. Think of the work that our advisory committees could do if they had more money, for example.

Nonetheless, at the end of the legislative day, we've got so much money, and we take that into account in our programmatic meetings, which take place in-depth once a year. And then we re-analyze, depending how much money we have. I guess I haven't seen as a problem the issues that are being raised in terms of our not being able to plan realistically, because we have the hopes that we'll get \$15 million, so that's been my own experience.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have one last question on this. And I want to reiterate again, it's not so much a function of how much money we're requesting, but the presumptions underlying that request. And to calculate what is a reasonable estimate, I think requires a look at what's been done in the past, and also where we are right now.

My understanding is that we have an obligation to conduct audits or self-audits, and I don't know that we've done that yet. I know that we had an extension or something of that nature for a couple of years. And I don't know how we can make a

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

1	request unless we have conducted such an audit, and we
2	know what the template is for making such a request.
3	Have we conducted any kind of an audit along those
4	lines? And if we haven't, where are we in that
5	process? I think we have until the end of this year
6	to do that.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I don't know
8	about an audit.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He's working on that.
10	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: I'm sorry. An audit
11	of what, Commissioner?
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: A self-audit, or
13	commissioning an audit for the agency. Don't we have
14	a I think all other agencies have got
15	responsibilities to conduct audits, and I don't know
16	if we have done so, or if we're in the process of
17	doing so, or are we exempt somehow?
18	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Audit of?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Of the finances.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. Sure. No, and
21	we are in the process, consistent with the Tax
22	Accountability of 2002 Act, of getting an audit for
23	2004. I mean, yes we are. That's a financial audit.
24	That's a little different.
25	Let me just add maybe something that, I

1	n
2	V
3	ç
4	ā
5	t
6	j
7	ā
8	7
9	
10	ā
11	ŀ
12	F
13	C
14	7
15	Ι
]
17	t
18	1
19	t
20	ā
21	ā
22	

24

25

mean, in terms of like you said, Commissioner, I mean we know that there's a good likelihood that we're going to operate under no increase, and so mentally we And as I told the Commissioners many times before, that gets tougher every year because of inflationary factors. But, you know, if we don't get a budget increase, then basically it's the Commission you see. I mean, and this proposal, basically a third associated with supporting of. the increases is advisory committees better. A third of the proposals basically is associated with enhancing programmatic offices, our General Counsel's office and The other third is enhancing support functions, you know, our Human Resource Division, our Budget Division, Administrative Services, Library and stuff like that. So again, you know, if we got more money, the kind of money we're talking about, I can get my regional offices, we can get our regional offices back There's an infinite to a full level and increase it. amount of stuff we can do on regional offices and advisory committees. And unfortunately, we're doing only really small part right now, decreasing every year because of financial problems.

We have no choice. I mean, that's what we're faced with, but with additional money we can

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

double the staff in each of those regional offices.

And it probably still wouldn't be beyond what was the capacity in the past. And as Commissioner Edley said,

I mean I think what Commissioner Edley said is absolutely true.

Back in the early 80s, if you take what we got in the early 80s as a budget, extrapolate it to the present date accounting for inflation, we would be well over \$20 million. I mean, there's a need out there.

We have a staffing level right now about 65. Once upon a time the Commission had 250 people, so I mean the kind of stuff we would do is not that much different than the stuff that we would like to do. We don't have that money, we do what we've been doing. I mean, that's what it comes down to.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The -- I think that we don't have more time to consider this, unless somebody has something that's really, really, crucial. And the issue is, the staff has done what they've done in the past, which is try to come up with what the Commission needs based on the projects that have been approved, the fact that the regional offices don't have staff, SACs can't do their work. And to do all that and propose, and they've come up with 15 whatever it is

1 million dollars. Whether or not that's approved depends not 2 the pass back, but it depends on what 3 iust on negotiations take place after that, if there are any. 4 And the budget, of course, is not itemized. 5 It's one big number, as Commissioner Edley says. You get one 6 So the real question is, does the 7 . big number back. Commission want to support this budget estimate to 8 OMB, or does the Commission want to reject this budget 9 10 estimate to OMB? And so I would like someone to move 11 the approval of the budget estimate so we could vote 12 And then get a second, and then we can have on it. 13 further discussion, if you'll just hold. 14 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a motion to 16 approve. 17 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I move. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can I get a motion to 19 second. 20 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Second. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Now, please. 22 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I think, Staff 23 Director, what's bothering some of us is that if we 24 support this and the pass back is \$9 million, it is

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

correct, as the Vice Chair says, that when individual

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

projects come up we consider them, but there is no point at which we have a chance as Commissioners to look at the overall picture, and to say okay, we've got \$9 million to work with. That turns out to be the What are priorities, rather than this kind of piecemeal should we do this, should we do that? Ι mean, there is no kind of big picture discussion given what the budget actually turns out to be. And so I guess my question is, if we would vote for this \$15 million, would -- wait until we see what kind of money we've got, would we have an opportunity not to go, as we have in the past as the Vice Chair correctly described it, piecemeal throughout the year, but have a chance to look at the whole picture and talk about it.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The answer the Staff Director cannot give, but I will give it to you, is yes, you can, if you say that's what you want. After all, you are the Commission. All you have to do, instead of asking the question, is to say you would like to modify the motion, and to include in it that the Commission would review the pass back, and review the priorities when it is received by the Commission before it is returned. That's all you have to do. Would you like to do that?

i	1 A 7
1	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I would like to
2	do that.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Second.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Would you maker
5	of the motion and the seconder accept the
6	modification?
7	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Yes.
.8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, are you ready for
10	the question?
11	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No, I'd like to make
12	a comment. Sorry. My suggestion would be here's
13	my back in the 90s when I was at OMB, somebody from
14	over here, I think it was the Chair
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, what did I do?
16	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: came over to me
17	and made a pitch for OMB to put more money into the
18	Commission. And she described what the situation was,
19	and the important work that could be done if there
20	were some additional resources, and I shoveled money
21	into the President's request.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Sure.
23	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Which Congress didn't
24	go along with it, but what I'm saying all I'm
25	saying is that there was sort of a pitch to the White

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20005-2701

House at that level about why it would be
substantively valuable to do it. So with all respect,
my recommendation to those of you who know folks at
the White House would be, if when you're running the
place, you want to have the ability to go further down
that list of project priorities, and do more things,
that you might at least think about in the next couple
of weeks going over there and saying maybe 15 is too
much, but 9 is too little, and can't you find some
nickels on the floor somewhere to at least put into
the President's request to Congress.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, they could take
your advice or not, but are we ready for the question?
COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's the only way
it's ever going to get off of 9.
COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No budget
document has much salesmanship in it.
COMMISSIONER EDLEY: That's right. That's
right. That's exactly right.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: May we vote on the
motion, please, Commissioners. All those in favor of
the motion as amended
COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: As amended.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's what I said,
Commissioner Thernstrom.

. .

- 1	I
1	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes, yes,
2	yes.
3	(Chorus of ayes.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Those opposed. So
5	ordered.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'll abstain for
7	the record.
8	V. SAC Appointments
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Kirsanow
10	abstained. The next item on the agenda is SAC
11	appointments. Can I get a motion to approve the SAC
12	appointments? Did you say yes or no?
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: May we separate
14	Alaska?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Could I get a
16	motion to approve everybody except Alaska?
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, just to
18	approve Alaska. Is that right?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I beg your pardon?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Motion to
21	approve Alaska.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you said approve
23	Alaska.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh. Could I get a

1	motion to approve Alaska? You moved that. Right?
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, I moved
3	that.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion? All
7	in favor indicate by saying aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed. So ordered.
10	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Do we have the Vision
11	Statement for Alaska?
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know. I
13	assume so. Yes, we do.
14	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We do not have a
15	Leadership Statement from Alaska. What I was going to
16	suggest to the Commissioners is we have Leadership
17	Statements from the proposed Chairs for Nevada, South
18	Dakota, and Utah. And those I would ask that the
19	Chairs be confirmed with the rechartering. For the
20	other three states, I would ask that the states be
21	rechartered, but that when we get the Leadership
22	Statement that we're satisfied with, we would let the
23	Commissioners know, and at that point we would ask the
24	Commissioners to approve the
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We already approved

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

1	Alaska. We just did it.
2	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Oh, we did.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But we'll tell them to
4	send their Vision Statement in by a certain time.
5	It's a condition subsequent. Right?
6	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about the other
8	ones? Shall we do them one by one or all together?
9	One by one, is that your idea, Russell?
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, the idea is
11	
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Not to do them one by
13	one.
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, I would
15	like to have more balance, more political party
16	balance on all the others.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: More political party
18	balance on all the others.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I thought party
21	didn't matter. I'm confused.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think it does
23	on SACs.
24	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: I see.
25	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: It does on SACs.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Of what does that
2	consist? How short are we? Do you know?
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I can't recall
4	the data, but it's in the submission.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which ones did you say
6	you had Vision Statements on?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: We have them for
8	Nevada, South Dakota and Utah.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So you want to table
LO	these with the idea of reviewing the party balances.
11	Is that your point?
.2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
L3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Anybody have an
4	objection to doing that, and bring them back next
L5	month? Any objection? Okay. Without objection.
6	Objections?
L7	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: No, I was just going
8.	to ask what the Commissioners wanted us to do, because
L9	the rules require that we try to make sure there's
20	diverse representation among a number of factors,
21	including parties which we try very hard to do. And
22	in some states historically, I don't know with this
23	group historically to the extent that a party has been
24	substantially under-represented, we try to go to the

party, and I think we've done that, for example, the

Republicans in a number of states in the midwest. And I don't know what the instruction is to me, whether it's to try to get balance or try harder, or what to do.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, let me ask you this. Have you gone to the parties in the states where -- or has someone gone to the political parties to ask for nominations in these states where you were short?

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Well, we've done that in some states. I mean, it was never my understanding that we had to -- my understanding is that we were good representation. And find supposed to historically, this is consistent in my mind with what we've done as a Commission historically, that we did not go to these states, as far as I know. I mean, I don't know. I don't personally get involved in this. I don't think we've gone to the parties and said well, we only have four Republicans here. We have seven We're trying to look for three more Democrats. Republicans. We wouldn't do that. I don't know that that -- I don't think we're supposed to do that, so I'm not guite sure what we're supposed to do at this point.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What are you asking

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

1	them to do, Russell, go to the parties?
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think it would
3	help going to the parties. I mean, in hindsight, it's
4	probably easy to find Republicans.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Again, I don't want
6	to get into a situation where it sounds like I'm being
7	critical but getting people to serve is sometimes not
8	easy.
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It isn't,
10	believe me. I question that myself all the time.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Point of information,
12	the staff just gave me the one in Colorado has four
13	Republicans and four Democrats.
14	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: South Dakota has six
15.	Democrats, four Republicans, three Independents.
16	. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: What are we
17	talking about here, guys?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're talking about
19	appointees.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, I
21	understand. I'm talking to my team here.
22	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I thought we had
23	
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Am I on the
25	wrong page?

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, this page,
2	Colorado says four-four.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It has 13 members all
5	together, Russell. It has four-four, Republicans and
6	Democrats, and five Independents. That's Colorado.
7	That's what the makeup of it would be, so I don't know
8	what we want them to do about that.
9	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Can we table
10	this until the next meeting, go over this more
11	carefully.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, let's ask - it's
13	for the staff and for the SACs. Are there any
14	concerns as to why we should do any of these now
15	instead of making them wait, and that we should look
16	at these tables to make sure that they are
17	representative? .
18	MS. DAVIS: If I may
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, here.
20	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: No, I see Utah seven,
21	Democrats four, Republicans three, four Independents.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think that's
23	the one
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So let's put
25	Utah aside. Okay. What else? Anybody got the rest

Colorado we just did, and it's balanced. 1 of them? 2 Utah is not. And South Dakota is --3 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: It looks balanced to 4 me. 5 COMMISSIONER EDLEY: What does it say? 6 There's summary table at the end of it. 7 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: South Dakota, six, 8 three, and four. 9 MS. DAVIS: It's at the end of the memo, 10 just before the file forms, so probably about page 7 11 on each one. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, the only reason 13 why I'm hesitating is sometimes people who are willing 14 to serve on SACs, and it's sometimes hard to get them, 15 get a little irritated if there isn't some substantive 16 reason why you keep delaying appointing people. So if 17 it's true that it's not balanced, like the Utah one 18 isn't, so obviously we shouldn't vote on it. I want 19 to make sure the others are. Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Ι the mean, 21 I don't have it in front problem of me, 22 unfortunately - but one of the problems with this is 23 the large number of Independents on the Colorado SAC, 24 is that when one looks at the description of the

individual Independents, it does look as if they are,

1	in effect, adding to the Democratic roster, so that
2	the imbalance is a bit camouflaged by the label as
3	Independent, but it is very imbalanced.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, Commissioner
5	Thernstrom, you may understand that after the comment
6	you made earlier to which I took personal exception, I
7	think
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I'm sorry that -
9	-
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: that you're
11	assuming that anybody who's an Independent, therefore
12	must be a Democrat.
13	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: No, I stated it
14	very carefully.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because they can't be
16	Independents to be on the Commission committees, or
17	what?
18	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I stated it very
19	carefully, that when one looked at the biographical
20	information given, that one can legitimately draw that
21	conclusion.
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: How can we not take
23	this at face value though. I mean, what basis do we
24	have to question
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: People's affiliations.

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

1	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Where they fall if
2	they're an Independent.
3	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, I mean, I
4	can go register tomorrow as an Independent, and I'm
5	not
6	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Sure. I could
7	register as a Republican.
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: And I don't
9	think they would take us at face value.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think we're getting.
11	into a sticky wicket, if we start challenging people's
12	acknowledged affiliation, and reading things and
13	deciding that we think they belong to some party or
14	other, because people have a right to determine that
15	they are Republicans, Democrats, Independents.
16	There's no reason why anybody has to be a Republican
17	or a Democrat.
18	COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Well, both parties
19	allege that they're Big Tens, so
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. And more and
21	more people are deciding not to belong to any party,
22	so we should penalize them?
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Those parties
24	are Big Tens.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm not prepared to

1	penalize people to be on SACs because they are
2	Independents, and to start nosing about trying to
3	figure out whether you, even though you say you're an
4	independent, are you really one or not. It seems to
5	me then if the balance is there, we can either vote it
6	up or down. But as in the case of Utah, I can
7	understand Commissioner Redenbaugh's point.
.8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, and I
9	should have looked more closely at the others.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So I don't understand
11	why we should object to these other people. Yes,
12	Commissioner Meeks.
13	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Then, you know in
14	that case, I make a motion that we move all but
14 15	that case, I make a motion that we move all but Utah's.
15	Utah's.
15 16	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
15 16 17	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
15 16 17 18	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all -
15 16 17 18 19	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all - CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we get a second
15 16 17 18 19 20	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all - CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we get a second to that?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all - CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we get a second to that? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all - CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we get a second to that? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there further
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Utah's. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MEEKS: That we vote on all - CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we get a second to that? COMMISSIONER EDLEY: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there further discussion?

1	the governing statute here is very clear about party
2	affiliation.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What do you mean "very
4	clear about party affiliation"?
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: The FACA statute
6	speaks to party affiliation, and doesn't ask us to
7	look under the covers.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: To see what people
9	are.
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But if anyone
,11	can speak to that point, I could be corrected.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. Staff Director,
13	what does it say?
14	STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. Madam Chair, I
15	was just talking to Ms. Davis, our Regional Program
16	Coordinating Unit Director, and my understanding is
17	that the standard is that no one party should
18	dominate. That that's the standard.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So the motion
20	is before us to approve all of them, except the one
21	from Utah, which has to be reviewed carefully.
22	Further discussion?
23	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Yes. Now Ohio,
24	could we look at Ohio? I believe it has nine
25	Democrats, two Independents, and again one seems very
	II

1	politically left-winging, but six Republicans, so an
2	imbalance there.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Seems particularly
4	what, Commissioner?
5	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Ohio.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, the word you
7	used.
8	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Well, let's just
9	leave it - nine Democrats, two Independents
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Left-wingy I thought
11	you said.
12	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: six
13	Republicans.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I thought you used the
15	expression I'm trying to see what word you used.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think she said
17	left-leaning.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Left-leaning.
19	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Of the two
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which means that
21	they're a Democrat. Is that your point?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The point is that
23	nine to six isn't balanced.
24	COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Nine to six, and
25	the Independents both can't be assumed to be totally

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

:12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 ,20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Staff Director.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Madam Chair, can I just ask for the record, in Ohio once he gets the statement in, our chair that we're proposing is a Republican.

That's fine, but COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: nine to six still isn't --

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: What I'm saying is again, if you're telling me that what you want me to do is come up with equal balance, I mean then tell me that, and I will say that I don't think that's the But I don't think a state with nine right standard. of one party, six of the other, and the party -- and the Chair being from the party with six meets the standard of one party being dominating.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And two Independents.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: I don't think it does.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, you want to take Ohio off, you can do that. Now we're down to, if the maker of the motion will accept it, we will set Utah and Ohio aside, and approve the rest of them, which consists of one, two, three. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying aye.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Chorus of ayes.)

VI. Broken Promises: The Native American

BERRY: Opposed. Hearing CHAIRPERSON Abstentions? So ordered. Okay. So that's Now the next item on the agenda is "Broken Promises: The Native American Health Care System" report. Could I get a motion to approve it?

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: So moved.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any further discussion of that report?

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Can I just --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: '-- make few a comments about it, and I really want to commend the staff on their work on this project. I think it's an excellent report, good recommendation. This report indicates, as does the "Quiet Crisis" report that we did last year, that the unmet health care needs of American Indians are still among the most abandoned in the United States.

You know, with the passage of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act of 1976. Congress established a goal of raising the status of health

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

1	care for American Indians, and nearly 30 years later
2	this still has not this goal has not been realized.
3	And so I think it's long overdue for Congress and the
4	President to honor the federal government's obligation
5	to provide adequate health care for all Native
6	Americans, and so I'm very happy that this work was
7	done.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Questions?
9	All those in favor of the report on Indian health
1,0	care indicate by saying aye.
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed? Abstentions?
	The
13	One, two, three, four abstentions, four approval. The
13	report is approved. So ordered.
	•
14	report is approved. So ordered.
14 15	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language
14 15 16	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report
14 15 16 17	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward
14 15 16 17 18	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from
14 15 16 17 18	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs" report. Could I get a motion to
14 15 16 17 18 19	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs" report. Could I get a motion to approve this?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs" report. Could I get a motion to approve this? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	report is approved. So ordered. VII. Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs Report The next item on the agenda is "Toward Equal Access: Eliminating Language Barriers from Federal Programs" report. Could I get a motion to approve this? VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I get a second?

1 All those in favor of the Equal Access question. 2 report indicate by saying aye. 3 (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Opposed 4 5 (Chorus of Opposes.) 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Those opposed? One, 7 two, three, four. Did you say you were opposed? 8 motion is 4-4, and so the motion fails for want of a 9 So the report "Toward Equal Access: majority. 10 Eliminating Language Barriers" for reasons that remain 11 mysterious to us, since no one who is opposed to the 12 report indicated why they are opposing the report -13 Terry, they don't like your report, but they don't 14 want to tell us why they don't like your report, so 15 they voted against it. Okay. 16 VIII. Funding Federal Civil Rights 17 Enforcements: 2005 Report 18 All right. "Funding Federal Civil Rights 19 Enforcements: 2005" report. Could I get a motion to 20 approve it. 21 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved. 22 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Second. 23 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion, 24 further discussion of this report? Yes, Redenbaugh. 25 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: My compliments

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

to the staff in two ways. This is a difficult report 1 to do in that it's a report that measures outputs 2 rather than inputs. It's a very hard thing to do. 3 The staff accepted that challenge, did that. 4 this is a report that I had very serious concerns 5 about that you may remember from the July meeting. 6 met with Terry and the Staff Director and reviewed 7 parts of the report, and that process went very well. 8 I think it's a very good report, and I found the 9 10 staff cooperative. And I think the process went very 11 well. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All those in 13 "Funding Civil Rights Federal favor of the Enforcement" report indicate by saying aye. 14 15 (Chorus of ayes.)

IX. Future Agenda Items

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Those opposed. My gosh, so ordered. The report is approved. Are there any future agenda items that anyone would like to bring up at this time? Yes, Commissioner Thernstrom.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: I have a question as to what the current status is of the education accountability report.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director.

STAFF DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. And I believe I

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had a short conversation with your special assistants on this, but --

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM:

Unfortunately, she has a dental emergency and can't be here.

As DIRECTOR JIN: Yes. the STAFF Commissioners remember, at the last commission meeting you, Commissioner Thernstrom, articulated a number of .concerns, and I think it was agreed upon that you would put those in writing, and we would share that with the Commissioners, which we have done. I think that between -- I think maybe you were a little overoptimistic in terms of how long it would take you to get your comments, and my vacation schedule. time we were able to really look at it carefully, it was awful late, and you had a number of comments and suggestions. And we're still trying to figure out how to best appropriately address those concerns. . So we could not get it done in time for this meeting, so we expect that we'll have it up at the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER THERNSTROM: Okay. Let me make one comment on this. I think that the experience of Russell and the unanimous vote that came out of it does suggest how the potential for working with the staff that has not really been realized in many past

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

We can get unanimous votes out of this reports. Commission if we work together, and I'm sorry that the process of working more closely together did not occur earlier with the Education Accountability.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Anything else? All right. Then we have concluded the agenda, and we will begin at 11 a.m., as scheduled, with the "Voting and Election Reform: Is America Ready to Vote." have just a few minutes to take a very brief break, and to have the panelists come forward so that we can start on time. And that's what we'll do at this moment. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the aboveentitled matter went off the record at 10:51 a.m. and went back on the record at 11:00 a.m.)

17

19

22

23

24

25

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

LIBRARY

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS