U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2005

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at 9:30 a.m. in Room 540 of 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., GERALD A. REYNOLDS, CHAIRMAN, presiding. PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, CHAIRMAN
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, VICE CHAIRMAN
JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, COMMISSIONER
PETER KIRSANOW, COMMISSIONER
ELSIE M. MEEKS, COMMISSIONER
ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, COMMISSIONER
MICHAEL YAKI, COMMISSIONER

KENNETH L. MARCUS, STAFF DIRECTOR

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

STAFF PRESENT:

TERESA BROOKS CHRISTOPHER BYRNES DEBRA CARR, Esq., General Counsel IVY L. DAVIS, Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit BARBARA DELAVIEZ TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division BARBARA FONTANA LATRICE FOSHEE DORELLE GRAY GEORGE M. HARBISON, Chief, Budget and Finance Division SETH JAFFE SOCK-FOON MacDOUGAL TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director, Human Resources Division EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentaria. . ANA MARIA ORTIZ

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parlia
ANA MARIA ORTIZ
JENNY PARK
BERNARD QUARTERMAN
AONGHAS ST. HILAIRE
DEBBIE VAGINS
VANESSA WILLIAMSON
AUDREY WRIGHT
TIFFANY WRIGHT
MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

JACK DALY
PATRICK DUFFY
CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS
LISA NEUDER
KIMBERLY SCHULD
MELISSA SHARP

NEAL R. GROSS

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

I-N-D-E-X

I.	Approval of Agenda	. 1
II.	Approval of Minutes of February 18, 2005 Meeting	1
III.	Announcements	2
IV.	Staff Director's Report	9
V.	Program Planning	125
VI.	Management and Operations	73
VII.	Report of the Working Group on Reform	70
ZIII.	Future Agenda Items	167

,.... ****- PAGE

	1
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:28 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The meeting should
4	come to order now. We have a quorum.
5	I APPROVAL OF AGENDA
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The first item on
7	the agenda is the approval of the agenda. May I
8	have a motion to approve the agenda?
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second?
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?
13	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. No responses,
17	no opposition. The motion passes.
18	II APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF
19	FEBRUARY 18, 2005 MEETING
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Next, approval of

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Next, approval of the minutes of the February 18th meeting. May I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor
please say "aye."
(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
passes.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I have lost
my assistant and, therefore, all of my materials. I
am going to look over your shoulder until she shows
up.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fine.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: There she is.
Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much.
IIIANNOUNCEMENTS
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: At this point we're
going to go through a few announcements. The first
item on the agenda, as everyone knows, Commissioner
Redenbaugh has elected to resign. The resignation
is effective April 1st. Russell has served on the
Commission for approximately 15 years. Russell has

been an asset to the Commission. And his insights

1 | will be missed.

I was under the impression that Russell would be attending this hearing. Does anyone have better information than me?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I spoke to Russell. And he indicated he was not going to be attending today.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And I would also like to announce the retirement of a former Commission employee: Art Palacios. On behalf of the Commission, I'd like to state that he is one of our longest-serving Commission employees. He retired on March 1st from the Western Regional Office, where he worked as a civil rights analyst.

He had over 31 years of civilian governmental service. Of those 31 years, Art spent 26 of those years with the Commission. Art started at the Commission as an equal opportunity specialist for 8 years and spent the last 18 years as a civil rights analyst.

On behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank Art for his long and dedicated service to the Commission and wish him all the best in his retirement.

The second item on the agenda, I am pleased to announce that March is Women's History Month. During Women's History Month, we celebrate the achievements of our nation's women.

For generations, American women have

For generations, American women have helped to build our great nation through their leadership as writers, mathematicians, attorneys, teachers, artists, doctors, scientists, and in other professions. As mothers, daughters, and sisters, women have supported, led, and strengthened American families and communities. We celebrate those who have broken down barriers for women.

We commemorate Women's History Month.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights encourages all

Americans to celebrate the extraordinary

contributions and accomplishments of American women.

Finally, I would like to announce that on March 6th of 2005 we celebrated the 40th anniversary of the march over the Edmund Pettis Bridge in Selma, Alabama. That march contributed to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The brave actions of those who chose to march at great personal risk calls out to us today and requires us to honor and commemorate their

courage.

Now, are there any other announcements by other commissioners? Yes?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would just like to make a point with respect to Commissioner Redenbaugh. He served on the Commission for such a long time.

I got a chance to know Commissioner
Redenbaugh the three years that I served on the
Commission. I viewed him as extremely bright, the
most temperate of the commissioners, clearly much
more temperate than myself.

In the Post article a couple of days ago with respect to his resignation, I was quoted as saying that I thought his IQ was twice mine. I think I lied. It's clearly three to four times mine.

And I agreed with much of what he had to say in terms of his assessment of the Commission, structural problems related to the Commission, that significant reforms needed to be made. In fact, 99 percent of what he had to say I think I agreed with.

He was a consistent voice on reform. He had noted the fact that this Commission was in

extraordinary disarray, that we had informational vacuums that prevented us from implementing certain reforms, that we were possibly -- because we don't have fundamental controls in place to elicit the information necessary to determine the whole REN, we don't even what kind of whole REN.

He was a consistent voice in terms of reform and had recommended certain reforms. However, where I disagree with Commissioner Redenbaugh is with his conclusion that somehow because of structural problems within the Commission or maybe other reasons, that this Commission was not going to be moving expeditiously on reform.

This is something, a hole, that we have inherited that was engendered over a period of a number of years. It's a significant hole. It's something that is going to require prodigious efforts on all of us.

And I have not seen anything to this point that would indicate that we're not going to be moving forward. In fact, I know that the staff director has moved quite quickly to implement at least 20 of the 29 GAO recommendations.

My departure from Commissioner

Redenbaugh I think is that we will be moving expeditiously. I know we are going to be considering reforms today. In fact, I think the reforms that Commissioner Redenbaugh and I authored a while back are reforms that everyone agrees with.

As opposed to what he has to say in terms of his doubt that it may be implemented, I would be surprised, in fact, if we didn't have unanimity on implementing reforms basic to the structural integrity of this Commission.

So I am saddened that Commissioner Redenbaugh has resigned. He was a valuable member of this Commission. We I think will be using some of his ideas in the future. And I think that it's a new day at the Commission. We're going to be making some significant progress.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I would just like to add to that. There is no higher priority at the Commission than getting our house in order. The programmatic work that we do here is extremely important, but if we don't have operational and financial controls in place, then this organization cannot be effective.

The hole that we inherited, as

Commissioner Kirsanow phrased it, yes, we inherited some significant challenges. But all of us around this table have accepted the challenge. We intend to remedy the structural problems that exist at the Commission today.

So to the extent that anyone is entertaining the notion that we are not committed to reforming this agency, I am here to tell you that you are wrong.

Ken, you --

am delighted to announce that we were joined since the last meeting by a new employee, my new attorney adviser and special assistant, Mr. Christopher Byrnes, who will stand, please. He had previously been attorney adviser in the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education. And we're delighted to have him in the Office of the Staff Director. Thank you, Mr. Byrnes.

And also, to add that Mr. Seth Jaffe, who joined us last fall but might not have been introduced at that time, is a relatively new member of the Office of General Counsel, who has recently joined us temporarily as a special assistant in the

Office of the Staff Director. And we're delighted 1 to have him as well. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. 3 At this point -- well, I guess, Ken, you could continue. 4 5 We're up to the staff director's report. 6 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you. 7 IV. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, 9 Madam Vice Chairman, commissioners, if it please the 10 Commission, I would like at this time to supplement 11 my written report with additional remarks regarding 12 financial condition of the GAO the agency, 13 implementation, congressional compliance, 14 matters of concern to the commissioners. 15 During our last meeting, I was asked to 16 address the state of the budget during this meeting. 17 And I believed as recently as earlier this week 18 that I would be able to explain to the commissioners 19 the extent of the budget problem that we have. 20 During the last meeting, Ι indicated 21 that this would be a particularly austere year for 22

the Commission. Now, those who are familiar with the Commission know that we have had very tight years before, but this is earlier than in most years

23

10 to have gotten the message of that kind from the 1 2 It has been my intent to be as staff director. 3 transparent as possible as we identify the problems that we have inherited and as we try to turn them 4 5 around. 6 Unfortunately, I am not able to speak 7 with the specificity that I had hoped to about the extent of the problem. So what I propose to do is 8 to tell you what we do know; what we don't know; why 9 we don't know what we don't know; and, to the extent 10 we are able to, how we got here; and to answer 11 questions on that, for which if there are some 12 13 details, I may need to be joined by career staff as 14 well. 15 I had hoped as recently as earlier this 16 week to be able to give you a specific number. 17 believe that that number was going to 18 approximately \$150,000. 19 Based on our best estimates earlier this 20 week, it appeared that we were on track to overspend 21 appropriations by approximately \$150,000 if 22

serious changes were not made.

Now, that may sound like a small number relative to other government agency budgets, but it

23

is a large number relative to the \$9 million budget of this agency. Moreover, it is a large number relative to the rather minimal amount of discretionary spending available to this agency. It is a large number relative to the nonsalaried, non-benefit, non-rental money available to us. And that is why we have been looking at what might be some very painful decisions that would have to be made in rather short order.

At this point, unfortunately, I cannot tell you that we have that figure for certain, that, instead, what we have is a range of numbers which will require I think considerable explanation.

Over the course of the day yesterday, I looked at a variety of numbers that were prepared by staff, all of which for the most part showed a rather substantial budget deficit based on the assumption that we continue to spend, as we spend now.

All of them showed that we would be in the deficit by at least \$45,000. Some of them, however, showed that it could be as high as \$200,000 or more.

Now, that is an extraordinarily large

range. And we are, of course, really late in the fiscal year not to know the answer for sure. So I am going to take a little bit of time, if it please the commissioners, to talk a little bit about the background to the situation we're in and why it is that in March of the fiscal year that began last October 1, we know that we are in significant difficulty but we are not sure exactly what that difficulty is.

During an earlier meeting, I discussed the relationship that we had had with the Bureau of the Public Debt, which provided full accounting services for us. And so you may recall that they were our accounting service until fiscal 2004.

The commissioners were given a variety of explanations for why the relationship between the Bureau of the Public Debt and this agency was terminated. At the time, it was explained that the Bureau of the Public Debt would have been more expensive than what this agency was prepared to pay. And, in fact, it appears from the record that I have seen that the Bureau of the Public Debt did want this agency to put into place some controls or protections that would have been expensive.

But I have also shared with the agency received from I have correspondence that Department of Treasury indicating that the Bureau of the Public Debt made the decision to terminate our contract based on their determination that we were violating the significant risk of at such Anti-Deficiency Act that they did not feel that they would be able to continue to service our account. has been confirmed to me in explanation That conversations with employees of the Bureau of the public Debt.

As a result of that decision by BPD, my predecessor was forced during the midst of fiscal 2004 fiscal year to obtain a new accounting service provider. It is I understand always difficult to switch service providers in the middle of the fiscal year.

Moreover, the amount of money that we had budgeted for accounting services was evidently small relative to the needs of accounting service providers. It appears that there were not very many choices to be had.

We retained Booth Management Company at that time in the middle of the fiscal year. And it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

is a service provider which, by their admission, did not have much experience with respect to providing full accounting services to federal agencies.

At the same time, our budget and financial services staff has dwindled to the point that we had only one full-time employee in that staff, Mr. George Harbison, who has subsequently transferred to be our Director of Personnel and who is acting as Director of Budget and Finance.

We now have difficulties in terms of even analyzing the extent of the numbers. In terms of the most recent data set that we were reviewing over the course of the day yesterday, there were different sorts of assumptions that made it difficult to know exactly what the deficit is.

For example, the largest single variation in the numbers that I have seen is attributable to a variance in the amount of benefits that we are or should be paying to Commission employees.

The initial numbers that I had received from the Budget and Finance Office were based on an assumption that benefits that we are paying to employees are 23.8 percent of salary.

Mr. Harbison has subsequently determined that the numbers that these are using are lower than They are 20.8 percent. This has been a that. source of confusion among our budget and finance staff, who cannot so far determine the discrepancy between those two numbers. The most recent set of numbers I have seen has used the 21 percent figure, as what I explained is a compromise between those two figures as well as a rounding off. The difference between the 20.8 percent figure and the 23.8 percent figure, that 3 percent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

enormous amount of money relative to budget and could explain an entire budget shortfall. I have not yet been able to get an explanation from Budget and Finance as to why it is that this variation exists.

The Booth numbers are purported to be actual figures. As a general rule, I like using actual figures. On the other hand, we have not been able to understand why those actual figures appear so low relative to what we know of actual figures in prior years given what we understand about the increases in health insurance and other benefits.

The 20.8 percent appears low to our internal budget staff. We have a host of questions Are those really the actual arising from that. If they are the actual numbers, are we right amount of benefits or are we paying the Ιf they are the right underpaying benefits? numbers, does that mean the numbers we have from Why is it that we cannot prior years are wrong? have an agreement between our internal and external providers of accounting services?

When I first arrived in December, I was initially told that we did not know whether we were on track for the budget because budget matters had been centralized within the Office of the Staff Director and our career staff were not privy to all of the information they would need to know in order to determine whether we were overspending our appropriations.

For example, when I arrived in December

-- and keep in mind that the fiscal year began

October 1 -- it was still not clear to any of the

staff that I could speak to whether we had renewed

contracts with major vendors, including, for

example, McKinney and Company.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It took quite some time in order to get clarity as to the extent to which we have incurred financial obligations during the prior management which would bind us today.

There was a large number of questions about our obligations, which simply were not known at that time. For instance, I am now told that there were some \$75,000 in rental payments from last year that were deferred until this year. Now, that is a portion of last year's rent, but it is a significant amount of money which was deferred by my predecessor from last fiscal year until this fiscal year.

It was "" only in the January-February period that I started seeing data that indicated that we might be at risk of a shortfall. And that's why I indicated immediately in the last meeting that this was an extremely austere year.

What we are now in the midst of doing is having all of our resources intensely focused on coming up with the answers to the sorts of questions that I just described. We know that we have a significant financial problem, but we also have accounting weaknesses that have made it impossible

so far to know the extent of the problem.

Even the more optimistic scenarios suggest that we need to make very strong changes very rapidly. I have been asked by staff and others whether that means that we would have to consider such matters as office closures, reductions in force, and/or furloughs. Now, the answer, of course, is going to depend on the exact extent of our shortfall.

Under most of the analyses that I have seen, under all but the most optimistic, we will need to make very serious decisions of that sort.

And they will need to be made in very short order.

ending in September and the appropriate notice periods that are, of course, required in law by collective bargaining agreements and are simply right, we would need to make decisions rather rapidly in order for certain of our options to remain on the table.

So we will be looking very intensely over the coming days at what sorts of changes can be made so that we know the exact data. But it is clear that there will need to be very tough

decisions on those sorts of matters.

6.

Now, I have been asked about discretionary types of expenditures that I have added to the budget. And I will say that I have subtracted one and added two.

I have not requested any services from McKinney and Associates in the public relations area since my arrival. And we have been doing that work in-house and budgeting that all PR would be done in-house, which is a significant savings.

On the other hand, we have budgeted additional monies for a full-service audit as well as additional audit services. Those are the discretionary expenditures. And it is a total of approximately 62,000 that were budgeted for those 2 amounts. That figure is not terribly different from what we were planning to spend on McKinney.

Other than that, given the shortfalls that we have had in recent years, there is not a lot of wiggle room left for us. Moreover, we have to be prepared for future years. This is not an agency that has done a lot of future planning financially. But we understand that if we receive the President's budget this year; in other words, if we

20 received the same \$9 million that we have received over the last several years, the extent of shortfall we're looking at this year, will considerable expanded next year. So we have to look at cost-saving situations this year that will not send us in a similar sort of problem a year from now. What that means is that even if the extent of the shortfall is on the more conservative line of the spectrum, we still have to look at the

additional pressures, which the 2006 fiscal year budget will place on us this year and make sure that we are creating solutions that deal with both.

I have a few other topics on the staff director's report. And I don't know if it is the preference of the chairman and the commissioners that I continue through to the others or to see if questions with respect to financial there are conditions.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well. I think at this point, we should entertain some questions. Commissioner Kirsanow?

Staff Director, COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: you had indicated that we had to make some decisions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 with some alacrity. 2 I'm sorry. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Ι 3 can't hear you. 4 KIRSANOW: The staff COMMISSIONER 5 director had indicated that we had to make some decisions with some alacrity. And, second, because 6 7 we don't have I think institutional controls to 8 divine the kind of information necessary to get us 9 budgetary information, we're not even sure to what 10 extent certain monies may have been deferred from 11 the present fiscal year to future fiscal years. 12 So my question is, can you give us a 13 more definitive time frame or what the window is 14 within which we must act to forestall what you 15 currently believe may be the range of deficit given 16 the fact that we are halfway through the fiscal 17 year? 18 second, is, do you believe that 19 there may be other items or issues that have been 20 deferred from prior years to the present fiscal year 21 that we haven't yet gotten our hands on? 22 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Let me try both 23 of questions, Commissioner Kirsanow, those 24 reverse order. With respect to the question of

costs that were deferred to this year, the rent is 1 the one major item that I would describe as a 2 deferral, although I may need to defer myself to 3 career staff if there are any additional ones. 4 I will say that there are significant 5 expenditures that we have to pay for this year based 6 on things that were done in the past. For example, 7 we are paying this year for EEO claims that had been 8 resolved in prior years. That is a significant 9 drain on the budget of some \$188,000 this year. 10 I have not seen this as a specific 11 deferral but, rather, as a matter of we're finally 12 going to have to pay the bill on what was done in 13 14 the past during the prior management. Similarly, there may be other sorts of 15 decisions that were made in the past; for instance, 16 17 new hires and other obligations that we're paying for now, but rent is the largest. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But would it be 19 fair to say that we still don't have our hands 20 21 around the scope of expenditures that may have to fall on our watch that have incurred on a prior 22 23 watch?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: What I would say

information about given new 1 was is that Ι available 2 staff wasn't into expenditures that 3 January and February. It's always hard to know what you don't 4 5, I am not expecting to get more surprises of 6 that sort, but I have gotten certainly a number of 7 surprises over time with expenditures that I haven't 8 known about until fairly late in the fiscal year. 9 So what I would say is we are not 10 expecting to hear any more. And, as far as we know, 11 we have seen all of it, but we have been surprised 12 before. 13 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: \(\sigma \) And the second 14 question with respect to what is our window of 15 opportunity for making decisions on budgetary items? 16 That's a good STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 17 question, Commissioner Kirsanow. I believe that it 18 is very short because with the fiscal year ending in 19 September and given the notice periods, 20 three-four-month notice periods with respect to

different sorts of decisions that have to be made, there are certain options that either disappear or become more limited after even April 1.

So what I would say is we have to really

21

22

23

focus over the next several days and the next few
weeks on figuring out whether we need to make any
decisions that have to be made in advance of April

After that, there remain things that can
be done in the future that don't require so much
notice, but we really have a window over the next

notice, but we really have a window over the next couple of weeks that has options that we won't have after this.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks?

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, as I listen to this, you know, I completely agree that whatever financial controls weren't in place or whatever can be improved should be, but the whole conversation really is about we have had a flat line budget for 15 years.

And 'our mandate hasn't changed. There are many good projects that went forward, but with inflation and the fact that our mandate hasn't changed, this Commission is starved. Its budget is starved.

I don't see that that is going to change in the near future. So, I mean, I think this brings up a real question about how do we do meaningful

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

work.

I mean, get the controls in place, absolutely. But then I think it is a very serious question about what kind of projects or how many projects even or how we can fulfill our mandate. And I think that is the big question.

And it hasn't been just this administration, by any means. It's been many administrations that have starved the Commission.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'd like to respond,

Ken. Commissioner Meeks, you raise a very important question. I am in full agreement with you.

Ultimately the budget for this agency needs to be tied to inflation.

But the only way we are going to get there, I believe that we are going to have to get our financial house in order. We are going to have to demonstrate to members of Congress and the administration that we can be good stewards.

So the first order of business in my view is to implement all of the reforms that are necessary to enable us to track our expenditures.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: No, no. I mean, I absolutely agree with that, absolutely. There is no

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

1	doubt about that. I am just saying that that can be
2	fixed. Financial controls can be put in place. And
3	it sounds like they are. But in the end, with
4	inflation and with our mandate, we still have very
5	serious issues of how we really fulfill our mandate.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree with you. I
7	guess I'm making a small point. And that point is
8	that our ability to go and make the case for an
9	increase in our budget, it depends on what we do in
10	terms of reform.
11	The faster we implement meaningful
12	reform, the sooner we will be in a position to go to
13	Congress and to go to the administration
14	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Absolutely.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: to seek increases
16	in our appropriation.
17	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Absolutely. I
18	couldn't agree more.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner
20	Kirsanow?
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have a
22	question for the staff director. Based on what I am
23	hearing, is there any prospect at this point

think there is any prospect that this Commission can
embark upon any projects beyond a statutory report?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes,

Commissioner Kirsanow.

Now, I would say in response both to
that question and also Commissioner Meeks that we

that question and also Commissioner Meeks that we have reached a point with respect to the difficulty in dealing with the structural and financial issues that I have had to divert some resources from Adarand projects into financial matters. And I'm probably going to have to do a little bit more of that.

There are some people, including, in the Office of General Counsel, might otherwise be working on legal reports who are focused, instead, on either legal analysis supporting the financial side. So it is certainly the financial and structural the that case challenges that we have, even this year, are having an impact on our capacity to complete projects.

Nevertheless, under these very difficult circumstances, our staff is moving forward on a number of projects. The highest priority by law has to be the statutorily mandated enforcement project.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And the Office for Civil Rights Evaluation is working on an Adarand project, which has, of course, been talked about within the Commission since at least 2030.

Additionally, however, work is going on for other projects. The Office for Civil Rights Evaluation continues to do work to look at minority employment issues, for instance. Moreover, the Office for Civil Rights Evaluation continues to analyze federal funding for civil rights agencies.

Additionally, analysis has been ongoing regarding Voter Act reauthorization issues. So we have not stopped work on important projects. And what I would say, in addition, is this. Our staff had been under extremely difficult circumstances as they have been hearing about the budget, as they have been under tight financial straits, and as this week we received yet another threat to the employees combined with a threat to the President in the form of a purported anthrax attack, which is the third one that we have received recently.

So we are dealing with some very difficult circumstances for staff, but people are committed to doing their work and, even under

1 difficult circumstances, are engaged in those 2 projects. 3 REYNOLDS: Vice Chair CHAIRMAN 4 Thernstrom? 5. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, first I 6 want to say that I know how difficult a period this 7 is for the staff as they listen to these numbers, as 8 they contemplate possible actions that must be 9 taken. 10 And I know that the staff director is 11 committed to trying to protect the staff, and I 12 think every commissioner here is concerned about 13 morale at the Commission and appreciative of the 14 fact that the staff under difficult circumstances is 15 moving forward on the projects that are already on 16 the pipeline. 17 With respect to projects not already in 18 the pipeline, will we be able to attach a cost to 19 each project or at least have an estimate of the 20 cost before we vote on those projects, on those 21 proposed projects? 22 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Vice Chairman 23 if the Commission Thernstrom, would like

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

estimate, we can provide an estimate. I have to say

we don't have one available today.

.22

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. I understand that. Yes.

one in the future. Now, most of the costs of projects are staff salary and benefits, and very little is out of pocket. So it's largely a matter of estimating based on the number of staff per project. But we can provide that if requested.

Now, of course, some of the work on that would have to be done by the same person or people who are urgently trying to figure out the extent of the financial hole we're in and solve it. So it's also a matter of making sure that we extinguish the fire that we've got first.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken, when you put together these estimates, what I would like to see is something that -- I want you to red flag the projects that are going to cause you to take away resources from projects related to reform. To the extent that we can avoid redirecting resources away from reform efforts, that's the way we should go in my view.

Yes?

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: me. Well, I have two questions. The first, piggybacking 2 on this current discussion, it seems to me that the 3 4 relevant consideration is how much will a project cost above and beyond the staff, the cost of the 5 staff and the benefits because those people are 6 7 already here. And presumably, you know, if they're not working on one project, they're working on 8 9 another, they're working on reform efforts. 10 So what would be helpful to in 11 deciding whether to go forward with certain projects 12 or whether we anticipate any costs beyond that in 13 terms of hearings or public service announcements 14 that might go along with the project or consultants 15 that might need to be retained. And if that could 16 be at least broken out and itemized, that's the 17 relevant figure to me. 18 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, 19 absolutely. And I should have stated it as such. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because in terms 21 of the allocation of resources that are already in 22 place and whether or not particular staff are 23 working on A or B substantive project or whether

they're working on reform, that's a matter that I

.1	believe is within the staff director's discretion,
2	how to allocate staff time.
3	But what we need to know is whether a
4	project we might be voting on might cost more than
5	what we are already paying, how many hours somebody
6	is going to
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Basically
8	out-of-pocket expenses.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right,
10	out-of-pocket expenses, but knowing how many hours a
11	particular staff person is going to devote to
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: A as opposed
14	to B is irrelevant to me in terms of it's not an
15	additional cost. That's a priority issue that's for
16	the staff director.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I should
18	have made that clear that that is the question.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We would be very
20	pleased to do it that way with the one caveat that I
21	would add that it would be my order of priorities to
22	the extent that financial analysis is required to
23	have the financial people first focusing on making
24	sure we know the parameters of the problem and

dealing with that; and then, second, looking at the 1 out-of-pocket expenses of potential projects. 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 3 I agree. Ι 4 agree with that. 5 My second question has to do with how we got here. And that is you mentioned that the career 6 staff had been kept in the dark about a number of 7 matters or that they didn't have the information 8 9 because budgetary issues were consolidated in the 10 Office of the Staff Director. 11 Presumably, if accurate records 12 been kept by the prior staff director, when you came 13 in, you would then have access to that information. 14 But what I am inferring from what you said is that 15 budgetary information is consolidated in the Office 16 of the Staff Director under the prior regime and 17 that no records were left behind for you to access 18 or limited records were left for you to access. 19 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's correct, 20 Commissioner Braceras. And I can tell you what I 21 have found. And if you want more specifics about 22 what happened before my arrival, I will have to 23 defer to career staff. 24 What I will say is this. Most of the

1 questions that I have had about the finances of the 2 agency were not answerable to the career staff 3 because they indicated that finance and budgetary 4 matters were centralized within the office of my 5 predecessor, the prior staff director. 6 Moreover, we have not been able to 7 locate the records of the prior staff director, nor 8 has he been willing to speak with us about what 9 happened with the budgeting and finances. 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. 11 indicates to me that either: A) records weren't 12 kept or B) they were kept and something was done 13 They were either removed or destroyed. with them. 14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I can't think of 15 any other explanation, Commissioner Braceras. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner 17 Kirsanow? 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: First of all, I 19 concur with Commissioner Braceras in terms of the 20 cost breakdown. It seems to me only those costs 21 above the operational baseline are relevant to us. 22 And it goes to a subsidiary question I 23 And that is I asked earlier about projects,

whether or not we could implement projects, in terms

1 of the current projects. 2 presuming the projects I'm currently working on do not incur costs above our 3 In other words, there are no 4 operational baseline. 5 extraordinary costs beyond wages, salaries, 6 benefits, rent, et cetera, et cetera. Is that 7 correct? 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I have allowed 9 limited expenses connected with these projects. The 10 expenditures have not been extraordinary. There 11 have been some out-of-pocket expenses. 12 For example, staff used the telephone, 13 including long distance calls. Moreover, they used 14 the mains and occasionally have had to use other 15 means of transmitting documents. 16 have low-level So there been 17 expenditures with respect to those projects, but 18 there have not been significant expenditures 19 relating, for instance, to significant travel or 20 other out-of-pockets of that sort. 21 Now, there is one large expenditure 22 relating to the projects I mentioned earlier that 23 was made, but it was authorized prior to my arrival. 24

project regarding

I

referred

to

a

Voter

1	Reauthorization Act.
2	My predecessor apparently authorized a
3	contractor to do a considerable amount of the legal
4	and policy analysis. So that was outsourced. And
5	that has had to be paid by the Commission.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken, do you know,
7	what's that figure?
8	staff DIRECTOR MARCUS: I don't. I am
9	told that that figure is \$20,000.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And that was
12	something that was incurred on the watch of the
13	prior administration, but the bill came to you under
14	your administration?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It was
16	authorized by prior management. And I will have to
17	check to find whether that was paid during this
18	fiscal year or last.
19	The general counsel is informing me that
20	it was paid in three stages. And I could defer to
21	her for further explanation if you would like.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ms. Carr, would you
23	please provide us with whatever information you
24	have?

have?

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. And has 2 it been paid in full at this point? 3 MS. CARR: The contractor was billing in 4 three stages. The first two stages, I believe, were 5 billed under the prior staff director. stage was billed post-transition. And I do believe 6 `7 that final bill has been paid. 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. 9 Commissioner Yaki, you have been patient. 10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm the new guy. Ι 11 figure I always get picked last. 12 I wanted to go back to the central 13 question, which dealt with the short window of time 14 that we have to sort of figure out what the real 15 numbers are and what actions we have to take. 16 think it is very important for the integrity of the 17 Commission and for the staff who work here that we 18 make that as transparent as we possibly can. 19 I think whatever number we come up with 20 to be scrubbed, double checked, and triple 21 verified so that there can be no question about 22 where it came from, how it came to be, and what that 23 final number is because that number, whatever it is, 24 is going to going to be the determinant of very

tough decisions made very quickly, either by the Commission or by the staff director.

So I think it is very important that number, whatever, have immense that integrity attached to it so no one can question that it was this or that because ultimately when we talk about -- and we have been dancing around it during this entire discussion -- how the majority of our budget is salaries and benefits, I think everyone can kind of read between the lines -- and I am even it -- about what the dancing around still implications of that could be.

And I think we owe it to the people who have been working under terribly adverse conditions over the past years here doing yeoman's work in terms of producing reports, responding to commissioners, responding to document requests from whatever that number, have a very, very solid backing.

I also think it is important that we communicate very clearly in the actions that we do that reform is different from emergency measures. Somehow they are connected.

But any emergency measures we may take

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

are not a consequence of the agency continuing to spiral out of control. It is simply a short-term immediate remedy as a consequence of other things beyond our control, which reforms on a longer-term basis going forward are going to be addressing because, you know, I can just see the headlines coming out of the papers depending on what happens.

so I think it is very important that we make that distinction because, again, people can confuse things that any agency would have to do in a similar situation. No matter how good, no matter how well it is being run at the time, something may happen that causes you to have to do something drastic. But I don't think it necessarily means that the agency is spiraling out of control.

Finally, going forward when we talk about the fact that -- and, by the way, I was privileged to be at the hearing yesterday. And I heard very clearly -- I believe it was even from the chair -- that he was hoping that when we have our financial and management house in order, he would be very supportive of getting the block off of the appropriations and getting it retied and getting it starting to go up. So I think that that was very

encouraging.

But certainly if we can't solve this in six months and we're faced with fiscal year '06 with a level budget, then I think that we should start thinking very hard about the fact that nothing should really be sacred in how we look at it and we have to do it from a mission-oriented analysis, what is it that we need the most, what is it that we don't need the most and go from there in terms of how we prioritize staffing and whatever for the coming year.

I have heard about all of the concerns about projects going forward. And at a later time today, I will discuss a project that I was talking about with the director while we were waiting for during one of the 44 breaks we had during the hearing as the committee recessed as to move on to other interesting issues.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner Yaki, I very much agree with your points. And I would like to respond separately to as many of them as I can.

First, you began by calling for a transparency with respect to the determination of

1	our financial condition. I strongly believe that.
2	And I'm sure that everyone
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I know. And I
4	wasn't accusing you of not.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I understand
6	that.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was simply
8	restating what I thought was the obvious.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I suspect that
10	everyone in this room can agree that I have provided
11	a greater degree of financial transparency than they
12	have ever seen before in this Commission. And I
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: A hundred
14	percent.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Let me tell you
16	in one meeting alone, you have provided more
17	information than I have gotten in three years by a
18	magnitude of three or four-fold.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. I would
20	like to join in that. I joined the Commission three
21	years ago and Pete around the same time. From the
22	time we joined, we were continuously asking for this
23	type of information.
24	And you came before us in the first

1 meeting and confirmed what we had long suspected but 2 never really knew because nobody would tell us. 3 the increase in transparency is greatly, greatly 4 appreciated. 5 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I second 6 I've been here for five years -- no -- four. that. 7 I can't remember. 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you, 9 I am a strong believer and I will commissioners. 10 continue to provide it. And I tried to provide it 11 to staff even between the last two meetings. 12 Now, there is a cost to it in the sense 13 that it may cause premature concern in the event 14 that the more optimistic scenarios turn out to be 15 But I, nevertheless, think that it is the case. 16 important provide that transparency to to 17 commissioners, the staff, and our stakeholders in 18 Congress and elsewhere as well as to the public. 19 A related but separate point that you 20 made, Commissioner Yaki, deals with the solid basis 21 for the answer that we have. And I think that that 22 is critically important. As I provided what I think 23 was an unusually candid description of not just our

financial condition but our uncertainty right now,

it occurred to me that I would be thinking if I were 1 on the staff, "My God, they're making difficult 2 decisions that will affect me. And they don't yet 3 know the exact situation." 4 5 I think it's, nevertheless, important 6 that they know exactly what they know and what we don't know, but I will provide you my assurance that 7 8 as we go forward to making difficult decisions, we 9 will have the most solid possible basis that we can 10 prior to making those decisions. 11 Now, I earlier referred to the fact that 12 some of our options will be foreclosed as time goes 13 I would also say that we will not bv. But 14 prematurely make decisions that could 15 affect employees in the event that we do not have 16 sufficient information and time. 17 We will make decisions on a deliberate 18 We will take all measures in order to be 19 able to make decisions while options are still 20 available, but we will not take actions unless we 21 are able to do so clearly. 22 I will also say, as I have said to 23 staff, that we are committed to ensuring that before

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

we take any measures that would adversely impact

staff, that we will look for all other available avenues for cost cutting, but I have also said with candor that we do not have a lot of those options.

Finally, with respect to your comment that reform measures are different from emergency measures, I would say that that is a very good point. And I will say they are very different. In fact, I will have to tell you that the time we are dedicated to solving this emergency is delaying us somewhat in undertaking some of the reform measures that we would like to take.

I would like to be focused 100 percent on structural reforms right now, but I have had a very significant amount of my time diverted towards working with our financial people, not on the long-term solutions but on the short-term emergencies. So while the two are connected, they are competing for scarce resources.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I have a question for you, Ken. This uncertainty, our inability to quantify the deficit, what are we doing in terms of putting an accounting system in place that will enable you to answer these types of basic questions?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We continue to

have largely the same accounting systems, largely the same accounting systems, that we had a few 3 months ago. Now, we have put pressure on various 4 5 individuals, including our outside contractors, to solve certain other problems. But the fundamentals, 6 7 unfortunately, probably can't be changed during the 8 midst of the fiscal year. We still --9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What's the nature of 10 11 We have a ledger. Is that correct? 12

the problem? I mean, we have a system in place now. We have a system in place. Are we going to run into this problem again in the future? Do we have all that we need to avoid being in the situation now a year from now?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I believe that serious changes in the accounting system will be difficult to impose in the midst of the fiscal year, which is to say we will continue at least until the end of this year to have significant challenges in understanding our finances. We need to make changes, but some of the changes probably can't even be begun before October 1.

I will also say that one of the key

1

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23ء

1 components of the changes that I have planned to 2 make has been the creation of a new budget sheet 3 position at a GS-15 grade level. 4 We have announced that position. 5 had difficulty attracting, even have 6 relatively high rate of pay, the sorts of candidates 7 that we have wanted. 8 At this point, while the announcement is 9 open and we have been more aggressive in our efforts 10 recruit a strong new person, we also are challenged with a prospect of a potential hiring 11 12 freeze, which might be connected with certain of the So we do have some 13 options that we have to take. 14 real challenges as we look to change the accounting 15 systems. 16 Commissioner CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 17 Braceras? 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Again this goes 19 to Commissioner Yaki's point about the difference 20 between dealing with immediate financial emergencies 21 and reforming our systems for the future. 22 As all of you know, we have had a 23 working group on reform put together to deal with

some of the procedural issues with the Commission

going forward. And the mandate of the working group that we set up in January was to examine our policies on internal and external communications and as well as project planning and implementation.

And we have at this point come up with a series of recommendations relating to our external and internal communications. We have had a lengthy discussion about project planning and implementation. Although we have not committed our recommendations to specific proposals yet, that is something we hope to be working on in the next few weeks going forward.

But the idea with respect to project planning and implementation is basically to implement reforms that will improve both the integrity and the quality of our work product.

We specifically did not include budget and financial reform within the jurisdiction of the working group in order to give the staff director time to: A) compile the information that we needed to find out where we stand currently but also to give the staff director some discretion in dealing with the financial problems.

So I don't know if this is the right

.20.

1 time to move to extend the jurisdiction or the time 2 frame for the working group because previously we 3 had said we were going to come forward in March with 4 our proposals. 5 We do have a series of 14 proposed reforms, but they deal exclusively with external and 6 7 And we would like more internal communications. our project planning and 8 time to basically put 9 implementation thoughts into specific proposals. 10 want to extend know if we don't 11 jurisdiction to cover budgetary issues. That's 12 something we can discuss. 13 We had four commissioners as members of 14 Commissioner Redenbaugh has resigned. 15 So we need to replace a commissioner. 16 I don't know if this is the proper time 17 to take up these issues about the working group, but 18 I just wanted to raise them. 19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I do have a 20 question before we take them up continuing from the 21 prior discussion, Mr. Chairman. So I would at least 22 like to postpone the working group discussion to get 23 to ask one more question with respect to the staff 24 director's report and Commissioner Yaki's very, very

1 I think good comments. This is directed to the staff director. 2 3 Commissioner Yaki said we've got a very short window of time. And he also said whatever numbers 4 we're working with have to be triple verified so 5 6 there are no questions about what they are and he 7 added how we got there. 8 your view any tension there in Is 9 - between the short window of time and the necessity 10 - to have these, as it were, triple verified numbers? 11 That is, you've been having a lot of difficulty 12 getting your arms around the basic numbers here. 13 And while I agree with the sentiments 14 that Commissioner Yaki expressed, the question, I'm 15 not sure it's realistic to have those triple 16 verified numbers before you have to make some 17 decisions. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I'll take 19 double. 20 (Laughter.) 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You'll take 22 double? 23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, 24 Commissioner Yaki, you can correct me if I'm wrong,

1 but I believe that what you intended was that we use the best information available? 2 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right. 4 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, but it going to be short of that perfection that 5 Commissioner Yaki -- of the perfect picture that you 6 7 drew of indisputable data. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you both raise 8 points, but I think that the bottom line is that we 9 10 do have a short time. But we do have an obligation 11 to use the best data available. 12 So will it be perfect? No. Nothing we 13 do will be perfect. But we are going to use the 14 best available numbers that we can come up with. 15 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well. Ι simply wanted it on the record that what we will be 16 working with is the best available numbers and not 17 18 the triple verified ones in all likelihood. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. But let me --20 go ahead. 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may just 22 briefly respond? I believe I agree with that, Vice 23 Chairman Thernstrom. What I will say is we will act

on the best available information but that before we

take any action that would adversely affect any 1 single member of the staff, I will make sure that 2 that information is stronger than any information I 3 4 have seen so far. 5 aet perfect There is no way to 6 information, but I will want to make sure that it is 7 verified to a greater extent than what we have seen 8 in the numbers today. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And I'd like 10 to go back to Jennifer's point. Jennifer, I think . 11 that we should just hold off and finish with Ken's 12 report and then revisit the issue on the table. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I just 14 wanted to make it clear for the record that the 15 emergency measures that the staff director is taking 16 and may need to take going forward does not preclude 17 reform. 18 And we are in the process of reform. 19 started that process in January. And I recognize 20 that Commissioner Redenbaugh was disappointed with 21 the pace of that reform. However, it's only been 22 two months, and we have already tackled a whole host 23 of issues. And we are going forward to tackle more

And all of us here are committed to

of them.

1 reforming the agency's processes going forward. 2 So I just want to make clear that that 3 is on the agenda for today and for the indefinite future, that nothing we're talking about right now 4 of reform, 5 the ongoing work precludes institutional reform. 6 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure. Commissioner 7 8 Kirsanow? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I was just going 9 to say that I think, as Commissioner Yaki said, we 10 have been kind of dancing around an issue, and that 11 12 is layoffs. I've had the unpleasant task of having 13 to counsel hundreds of companies on that very issue. 14 And you never get perfect information. 15 It never 16 happens. 17 The unpleasant truth is that sometimes any of these enterprises, companies have got to take 18 19 actions with the best information they have. And, 20 unfortunately, I think in this circumstance, you are 21 between a rock and a hard place, which dictates that 22 you err on the side of making sure that we come in 23 within budget.

That is a difficult prospect. It is a

difficult thing to discharge for any staff director,
for anybody in an executive position. But I think
that is the ultimate mandate.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you.

Let me just say quickly in response to
Commissioner Kirsanow that I agree with that but to
emphasize that we have been trying to provide an

Commissioner Kirsanow that I agree with that but to emphasize that we have been trying to provide an extraordinary amount of candor, including discussing potentialities that may not come to fruition, and that everyone should understand that while we are looking at all possible alternatives, certainly no decisions have been made yet with respect to layoffs or anything else. But we are looking at some very tough issues.

If those are the questions with respect to the financial condition, I will continue with the staff director's report.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner Kirsanow had referred earlier to administrative instructions that I have issued which have not previously been discussed in a Commission meeting. And I'd like to say just a word about it because I think this relates very much to Commissioner

1 Braceras' concern that we not stop in our reform 2 efforts just because we have an emergency going on. 3 I think it is important to say that in just the first brief three months, we have already 4 tackled a large number of problems based on findings 5 6 of the GAO. 7 Now, I can't in open session go into too 8 deal with reforms detail about how our 9 What I will say is this. recommendations of GAO. 10 We are implementing over 20 reform measures that 11 relate to recommendations of the GAO in that at least some of them not only address findings of GAO 12 but address findings of GAO that are not yet even 13 14 final and formally announced. 15 So we are trying to be as aggressive as 16 possible, not just reacting to what has happened in 17 the past but looking at the best information we have 18 available and trying to get ahead of them. 19 I think that this is an indication that 20 we are so serious about reform that we are tackling 21 issues that haven't even yet become finally public 22 in order to make sure that we can bring our house 23 into order.

Commissioner Yaki had pointed out a few

55 ago that there is a difference between 1 emergency planning and long-term structural reform. 2 And I had indicated in response to that that, in 3 fact, dealing with this emergency may cause some 4 difficulty in dealing with the long-term structural 5 6 problem. 7 One way in which I have anticipated that 8 problem is by creating a new senior-level position 9 of a person at a high level who can focus on some of *-* 10 the long-term structural needs.

As I am focusing with our director of management and other of our management and financial staff on the emergencies, it is important that there be at least one high-level person who is looking at the long term in helping in reforms.

So I do have a new position that I am creating of associate deputy staff director, which will be a management-level person who will be looking at such matters as GAO implementation. The hope is that there will be one person who is not diverting attention to emergencies and who can help focus on the long term.

Finally, I have been asked to say a word about congressional compliance. We continue to work

z 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

as hard as we can, not only to meet the obligations imposed on us by our oversight committees but to exceed them. I had indicated in prior meetings that staff had been working around the clock to try and meet deadlines. Fortunately, at least for a little while, that has slowed down. But I would say that, even since the important to cooperate with the

last meeting, there have been multiple document productions given to Congress because we think it is committees.

In fact, not only have we been meeting our deadlines for document production, but over the last few weeks, we have gone ahead of time based on a concern expressed to me by House oversight counsel that they would like it quicker if possible.

And we have delivered to Congress some documents that they asked us to provide by April. And I believe some of the documents have met at May timetable. So we have, in fact, not only been working to meet but also to exceed our deadlines from Congress, thanks to extraordinary work from a large number of staffers, including our custodian of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Barbara Fontana, and solicitor, Emma 1 records, 2 Monroig. We are aware now, as of yesterday, that 3 another subpoena issued to 4 there will be Commission. As I understand it, it is likely to 5 look like the last one except that it will be 6 7 renewed. anticipate that this will involve 8 9 potentially substantial additional work in order to 10 make sure that we comply with the last one. 11 Now, some have asked me, "Well, if you 12 have already handed over virtually all of the paper 13 you have got and this is a renewal, how could it be 14 The problem that we have is that since my 15 arrival, we have done everything we can to fully 16 respond to those pending document requests for which 17 we're responsible as well as to attempt to go back 18 and certify our completion. 19 However, the fact is that we do not 20 entirely know what my predecessor did and didn't 21 produce prior to my arrival. We do not have records 22 indicating what was produced, what wasn't produced. 23 So with respect to those portions of the 24 subpoena that were dealt with earlier, we may have

- 11	
1	additional need for resources to be diverted to
2	comply with that portion of the subpoena.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
4	Kirsanow?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just a question.
6	Are the remaining documents Bates stamped?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We are Bates
8	stamping all documents, keeping a record and an
9	extra copy currently.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Good.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: As for the prior
12	production, we do not have a complete record. And I
13	might have to defer to career staff to address
14	whether there was Bates stamping and, if so, whether
15	it was page by page or document by document. I will
16	defer to our solicitor, Emma Monroig.
17	MS. MONROIG: Yes. Good morning. The
18	documents that were produced to Congress before mid
19	December were not Bates stamped. And we don't know
20	what they were because copies were not kept or
21	identified as a production, nor was there a list of
22	the documents produced.
23	The production in late December done by
24	the General Counsel was Bates stamped, and there are

And the ones afterwards that have been done 1 copies. during the current year are also Bates stamped. 2 we know what was produced because we have a copy of 3 4 them. But the initial ones, we have, you know 5 -- and some of the notes of the documents that have 6 been left have said that the production in some 7 categories were incomplete. That is why there is an 8 9 element of uncertainty. 10 I'm sorry. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Who 11 was responsible for supervising the production, the 12 earlier productions? 13 MONROIG: MS. Well, apparently 14 assistant to the staff director, Alex Sun, was a 15 person responsible. And the letters going out are 16 signed by the staff director, Les Jin. 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So would it be 19 fair to say that we may be duplicating at this 20 point? 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: It's a little 22 premature without actually seeing the subpoena and 23 communicating with staff, but my hope is that we 24 will be able to work together with them to be able

1 to determine from their records what they have and 2 what they don't have. I don't know yet entirely what sort of 3 indexing they might be able to share with us, but my 4 5 hope is they will work with us to minimize the additional cost and expense. And I'm certainly 6 7 facial expressions that oversight from 8 counsel is agreeable to that. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, before you go 9 on, going forward, I think it is extremely important 10 that we have good communication with the Oversight 11 Committee to ensure that the documents that we 12 13 provide are satisfactory. And if we cannot provide a complete 14 response, then we should be prepared to offer up our 15 reasons for being unable to provide a complete 16 17 response. 18 Yes? 19 Do we know VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: the condition of the records of the subcommittee, as 20 21 opposed to our records? 22 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think we're 23 going to have to have further discussions with the 24 subcommittee.

1	The one last point that I intended to
2	make in my report with respect to congressional
3	compliance was to answer a question posed to me last
4	meeting by Commissioner Yaki. He asked me if we
5	could determine the costs that we have incurred
6	during congressional compliance.
7	That cost is, in part, a matter of out
8	of pocket that we can determine with actual numbers
9	and is, in part, a matter of staff time, which we
10	have needed after the fact in some cases to estimate
11	based on beliefs about hours worked.
12	The analysis that we have done estimates
13	that we have had to incur costs of approximately
14	\$123,000 in complying with the congressional
15	subpoena.
16	That is my report.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
18	Kirsanow?
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think before I
20	had some additional questions, and I know Jennifer
21	has got some motions and so do I.
22	A few things. One is with respect to
23	the cost of complying with oversight, I view that as
24	part of reform, frankly. I view that as a cost that

1 is unavoidable. And I think we're going to comply 2 with that, regardless of the cost. It causes 3 problems possibly, but that is something that we 4 will see. 5 strikes that this Second, it me 6 informational vacuum that we have places us 7 very difficult position you have indicated. I guess 8 I'm repeating what you said, but I'm very concerned 9 that we're going to be able to make accurate 10 assessments about the measures that we need to take 11 on an agency basis because of that informational 12 vacuum. 13 Does the staff director have any idea as 14 to how we are going to make these assessments given 15 that informational vacuum? 16 Commissioner STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Kirsanow, you are asking me whether I know how we 17 18 will be able to get the accurate information we need 19 in order to take the emergency measures to deal with 20 the financial? 21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right, right. 22 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, I have 23 already begun adding additional staff to look at the 24 financial numbers and to check and double check.

some cases, these are not financial staff, but they're smart people who can work with me on it.

And we are doing the best we can now focusing all of our attention on this and making this emergency measure first priority to essentially be our top priority and even at the expense of some of the more long-term plans that we are doing.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I want to put on the table I think something that has been implicit in everything that has been discussed today. And I know it has been the subject of discussion between the chair and the staff director. But it's something that we haven't stated. The only person I saw that stated this was Commissioner Yaki in his testimony yesterday.

And so when he wanted us to be aware of and at least articulate the difference between our emergency measures and our reform measures, given what he said yesterday, I know he was talking about doing something in the context of enduring that we consider the context. And that is, whatever we do should be narrowly tailored so that it does not materially hinder the public function of our

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

I'm simply paraphrasing what he said yesterday because, as I view, we're not going to be judged in the short term. We're going to be judged in the long term on whether or not we are able to produce a quality product over the long term.

So what I would like for the staff director is that I'm not going to micromanage you, and you know that. What I want, though, is some assurance when you make recommendations to tell us that it will not materially hinder our public function and if you ever make a recommendation that you think will, that you tell us that and we put those issues on the table because that, from my perspective, is important and I don't want to lose sight of that we discuss these important as short-term issues.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner Taylor, my plan as we go forward on these reforms is to institute measures that will strengthen the institution so as to improve its ability to achieve its mission.

I don't see a tension between reform measures and mission accomplishment. I believe that

1	the long-term measures that we are doing will make
2	this a stronger agency that will be better able to
3	accomplish its long-term measures.
4	For that matter, I also see our
5	compliance with a congressional request as being in,
6	as Commissioner Kirsanow indicated, a part of our
7	reform. And I believe that as we work together with
8	them, that that, too, will enable us better to
9	. achieve our mission.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
11	Braceras?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm wondering
13	now if it wouldn't be wise to move up items 6 and 7
14	on the agenda, before we launch into program
15	planning, to sort of continue our discussion of
16	reform and operations,
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: instead of
19	totally switching gears for project planning.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Project planning,
21	after this discussion today, it seems to me that the
22	new ideas that we have been considering, that we
23	should not move forward until we know whether they
24	will entail additional costs.

1	We have a statutory obligation to
2	produce one report a year. And that report will be
3	the Adarand report. That decision was already made
4	in the past.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there was
6	a motion circulated that we do need to address
7	related to the Adarand report,
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: which is to
10	expand the focus of the report. And this body needs
11	to discuss that and decide whether or not to
12	authorize that.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Under program
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My question here
15	was only what order we should do that in.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, what I'm
17	suggesting is that program planning, that the
18	initial plan was to discuss all of the programmatic
19	activities, all of the concepts
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: that we have been
22	considering. I'm suggesting that that has been
23	narrowed until we get a handle on the costs
24	associated with each of those projects.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So are we moving
2	to defer that discussion? Is that
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: With the exception
4	of the statutory report, the Adarand report.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But, as
6	Commissioner Braceras has just said, the Adarand
7	report, there are motions to amend it. Those have
8	to be discussed.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, yes. What I am
LO	saying is
L1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. Let me
L2	make a motion, then. I move to hold on. I've
L3	just been handed something. Okay. I move to defer
L4	discussion of program planning until the April
L5	meeting with the exception of the change in focus on
16	the Adarand project.
L7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any
19	discussion?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of
21	clarification. Tied in that motion, Commissioner,
22	was a change of the agenda to move it to the back of
23	the agenda today or
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I was just going

1	to do that in a separate motion.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So the first
4	motion is simply to defer program planning with the
5	exception of Adarand until April.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussion?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor?
9	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
11	(No response.)
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So my
- 1	
13	second motion, then, is to first move the discussion
13	second motion, then, is to first move the discussion of the Adarand project until after the management
14	of the Adarand project until after the management
14	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on
14 15 16	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion.
14 15 16 17	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
14 15 16 17	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
14 15 16 17 18	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? (No response.)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the Adarand project until after the management and operations discussion and the working group on reform discussion. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? (No response.) CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Motion passes. 1 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Still not done 2 with the staff director's report. I just have a few 3 more questions with respect to the staff director. 4 Oh, I'm sorry. 5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 6 I thought that --7 That's okay. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 8 want to go back to operational baseline, where we 9 I think earlier on, you made are right now. 10 of the reports that reference some to 11 currently working on and that one was the voting 12 We're using rights report. a contractor to 13 discharge that function? 14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, in part, 15 Commissioner Kirsanow. The Commission previously, 16 as I understand it, approved a two-part Voting 17 Rights Act authorization study. The first part for 18 fiscal year 2005 is an OGC project looking at legal 19 aspects of voter rights authorization. 20 The fiscal year 2006 is an Office of 21 Civil Rights Evaluation project dealing with such 22 matters as access to voting by persons of limited 23 English proficiency and persons with disabilities.

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

The first part, which OGC is responsible

1	for, was contracted out to a contractor.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Who is the
3	contractor?
4	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The contractor's
5	name is Mark Posner.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And his work
7	is done. Is that correct?
8	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: He has issued us
9	a document that is characterized as a final report,
10	yes.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I believe all
12	payments have been made.
13	Okay. All right. Next up, management
14	and operations. And have some motions from
15	Commissioner Kirsanow.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think
17	Commissioner Braceras had a motion with respect to
18	extending the time frame for working group on
19	reform. And I'll let her go forward on that one
20	before I enter my motions.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fine.
22	VII REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON REFORM
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Well, as
24	I said before, the working group on reform was

1	established at the January meeting. Its
2	jurisdiction was to discuss external and internal
3	communications and project, process, and
4	implementation.
5	I noted earlier that we have completed
6	our work on two of the three of those items. And
7	I'd like to move now that we extend the time frame
8	for the working group on reform until May.
9	We have put together a list of
10	recommended rule changes on the first two agenda
11	. items, but I think perhaps it would be best to bring
12	forward all of our proposed rule changes at one
13	time. And we can do that in May, at which point we
14	will have detailed project planning or project
15	implementation template to bring forward as well.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a
17	second?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor?
22	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
24	(No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Since
3	Commissioner Redenbaugh has resigned by the
4	Commission and he was a member of the working group
5	on reform, I'd like to move at this time that we add
6	a new commissioner to the working group.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't think
9	it was actually a motion we voted on originally, but
10	I could be wrong.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think wasn't
12	it the chair?
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: The chair
14	simply
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think the
16	chair should just
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: The chair
18	simply appointed it. And I suggest
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So then
20	I'd like to suggest that the chair appoint a new
21	member of the working group. And I would like to
22	suggest that it be Commissioner Yaki.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki,
24	are you agreeable to being drafted?

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I really have no
2	choice.
3	(Laughter.)
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Sure, you do.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm the new guy.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You could
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. And
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You could
9	suggest someone else
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: A player to be named
11	later.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I wonder
13	if you would also designate Jennifer Braceras as the
14	chair of the working group, of the reconstituted
15	working group.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Jennifer, do
17	you have any objections?
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No objections.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. It's
20	done.
21	Commissioner Kirsanow?
22	VI. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I do have
24	a few motions of my own, as stipulated earlier,

1 about a week ago. There were some questions with 2 respect to them, and I am prepared to answer them. 3 What I will do is I think everyone has a copy of it. Again, this was e-mailed to everybody 4 in terms of the proposed motion. I will read them 5 into the record and then try to explain or answer 6 7 some of the questions that were posed offline and 8 probably have discussion on it. 9 As a preface to these motions, they are, 10 in large part, a function of some of the things that were raised by the staff director in his report in 11 12 terms of transparency, lack of information. 13 We don't know where we are on a number of matters because it appears as if records are 14 15 Institutional controls have not been in incomplete. 16 place. 17 In addition, these are matters that we 18 have been discussing for quite some time now. 19 think that many commissioners were in agreement that 20 some form of this motion was imperative. 21 think that going to Commissioner 22 Braceras' point about Commissioner Redenbaugh was 23 frustrated with the pace of reform when we have only 24 been working on this for a couple of months now

ŝ.

1	when, frankly, there hasn't been any reform,
2	significant reform, in 12 years. And now we are I
3	think moving forward on such matters.
4	Let me just read this. And then I will
5	answer some of the questions that
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. You
7	said "motions," plural, but this appears to be just
8	one. You handed them out separately?
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. They're
10	going to go out one by one so that you
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This is actually
13	one motion.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: . Commissioner
15	Kirsanow?
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes?
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, what I have
18	here, I have a motion with three subparts.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And that is
22	one motion? You're not breaking that down into
23	three motions?
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right, yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Financial and operational controls. The Commission shall take all steps necessary and proper to: implement on an expedited manner a time schedule all outstanding and forthcoming recommendations from the Governmental Accountability Office and the Office of Personnel Management certified by the Commission at its April 2005 meeting; B) pertain I have here "exceptionally" qualified accounting firm to conduct the comprehensive financial audit of the Commission's books for fiscal years 2003, 2004 to be submitted no later than January 1, 2006; and C) solicit the Office of Personnel Management to for the Commission's conduct desk audit a headquarters and regional offices.

Now, based on some of the discussions we had today, I think some of these motions, subpart C motions, need to be rejiggered a bit. I'd also like to address some of the concerns that were raised before related to these motions. There were some questions related to them.

First of all, the staff director has already gone a long way toward implementing some of these measures, most notably the GAO recommendations. I commend the staff director for

doing that.

Commissioner Thernstrom had expressed a concern that the staff director given all of the other labors that he is facing may not be able to implement these reforms in a nine-month schedule.

I trust the staff director to be able to do that since he was able to do 20 of 29 in fairly short order. Even if the other nine are a little bit more draconian or difficult to implement, I also think that this Commission is one that would respect the staff director's report to us at any point asking for more time. But I think that these things can be implemented within nine months.

I think given the circumstances that the Commission is in, that it is important for us to move as expeditiously as possible. And when I say "forthcoming recommendations from the Government Accountability Office," we have a draft recommendation from the GAO. There may be others coming down the pike.

And when I say "certified," this is another question that was raised by Commissioner Thernstrom, what does that mean? What I mean by that is we don't necessarily know all of the

recommendations that GAO may come up with. 1 I don't want to be delegating to GAO 2 also the prerogatives of the Commission. So we will 3 look at those GAO recommendations, certify them as 4 recommendations that we are going to implement. 5 then at that point, the staff director would move 6 7 forward to implement them. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, you didn't 8 9 formally enter a discussion period, correct? 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right. It needs to be 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It needs to be seconded. And we need to --12 moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And also, Pete, I 13 14 would suggest --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I want to be 15 16 heard first when we discuss. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Pete, are you 17 sure you want to have a package deal in here? 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I do. 19 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: With respect to retaining an exceptionally qualified accounting firm 22 23 to conduct a comprehensive financial audit, a few 24 points.

1	Commissioner Thernstrom had a question
2	as to what constitutes exceptionally qualified. I
3	would leave that to the staff director.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. How
5	about this, Pete? Why don't we have a motion, have
6	it seconded, start the discussion, and vote on it?
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If you wish. I
8	was trying to address some of the concerns that were
9	e-mailed in the e-mail traffic so that we could get
10	. ahead.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. My
12	assistant just reminds me that the maker of the
13	motion always has the first opportunity to discuss
14	the motion. So why "don't we just make the motions,
15	second them, and then you can continue.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, I would
17	make the motion that the motion I have just read
18	into the record be adopted.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. With
23	respect to B, I would leave it to the discussion of
24	the staff director to come up with what he considers

to be an exceptionally qualified accounting firm.

And I think he is perfectly suited to make that determination. I don't think we need to micromanage.

This is not a reflection on the accounting firm that we're currently using. I had a discussion with that person, who I think is very well-suited to doing what he is doing right now. And I think he had indicated that he may not be in a position to undertake a full-scope audit.

In discussions also with the chair, there was a suggestion made that this be a forensic audit. I am agnostic about that. Based on what I have heard today, that might be something that makes sense, but I have no handle on how much that would cost, what that would entail. And so at this point, I would simply go with a full audit, as generally understood by the account industry.

Third, solicit the Office of Personnel Management to conduct a desk audit of Commission headquarters and regional offices. I will say to you that after I made this motion and based on discussion we had today, this one, this subpart, might suitably be deferred until such time as this

so-called window, decisional window, that the staff 1 director faces right now as either closed or become 2 3 a little bit more transparent, no pun intended. think until such time as that decision is made, 4 possibly subpart C should be held in abeyance. 5 willing to retain that if others think that that is 6 7 appropriate. Okay. Commissioner 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 9 Braceras? 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okav. 11 all, I would like to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the spirit of this motion. And I hope that we 12 13 not this particular motion, pass if 14 something similar. 15 I also want to say, however, that in 16 relating to financial passing motion a 17 operational controls or in voting for such a motion, 18 I in no way mean to suggest that the staff director 19 isn't already taking strenuous actions to address 20 these concerns. 21 I understand why it might be wise to 22 formally adopt this motion, but I want to be 23 perfectly clear that the staff director has my full 24

confidence. I know that he has been tackling this.

He hit the ground running from the second he got here and has been struggling to grapple with the financial and operational mess that the previous administration left us in. So I just want to make clear my confidence in and support for the staff director's ongoing efforts in this regard.

I would also like to offer some amendments to this motion. With respect to the all outstanding and forthcoming recommendations from GAO, I really don't think we can say all forthcoming recommendations when we do not know what it is they could conceivably recommend down the road.

All forthcoming means in perpetuity years from now. So I think I would recommend changing the language to say "all final and draft recommendations" because we know what they are.

I guess still with respect to A, I would ask the staff director before voting to approve this language, which I think I can do, I would want to hear from the staff director on whether there are any final or draft recommendations of the GAO that he believes are either not feasible or with which he disagrees or that there is any reason why he thinks they might be difficult or unwise to implement. If

1	there aren't, then
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
3	Kirsanow?
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: just for the
5	effect of the manager, I'd like to know if he
6	anticipates any difficulty with any particular
7	recommendations.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And
9	especially within the nine-month period.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just to clarify,
11	Commissioner Braceras and I have no problems with
12	substituting "final" and "draft," but that is why I
13	said as certified by the Commission.
14	I don't think that we're here to certify
15	any of these things at this point. I think if the
16	staff director wants to take a look at it, make a
17	determination, report back to us. I don't want to
18	delegate necessarily to GAO recommendations.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine.
20	That's fine.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Certification
22	also means that anything that is forthcoming and
23	it's going to have to be forthcoming before the
24	April meeting are things that we adopt or at

1	least discuss the possibility of adopting.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But you don't
4	substitute "final" and "draft." That's
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think, just to
6	clarify, I would like to substitute the words
7	"final" and "draft" for the words "outstanding" "and
8	forthcoming." And I would like to insert the word
9	"as" after "Office of Personnel Management" and
10	before "certified." So it would read "All final and
11	draft recommendations from the GAO and OPM as
12	certified by the Commission at its April 2005
13	meeting."
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm agreeable to
15	that.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At this
17	point, Ken, would you respond to Commissioner
18	Braceras'
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Hold on. I
20	think Commissioner Meeks wanted to
21	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes, please. I
22	mean, C I think needs to be deferred. A, I would
23	suggest that the commissioners do not need a motion
24	that the staff director certainly probably appends.

I mean, I don't have any objection. 1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. 2 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: But I would assume 3 that he shouldn't be the staff director if he's not 4 5 implement these things without going to 6 commissioners passing a motion to do that. B fine. 7 That will be fine. 8 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just to respond 9 to Commissioner Meeks, I think it's important for 10 the Commission to provide direction to the staff 11 director on some of these GAO matters which impact 12 on policy. That is our prerogative. 13 I am in full agreement with what the 14 staff director has done so far. I concur with 15 Commissioner Braceras that the staff director has 16 done more in three months than I have seen in three 17 years. 18 But this is also a matter of our 19 statutory framework and who does what. Maybe I'm 20 being a little bit too technical, but I do believe 21 it's the prerogative of the Commission to instruct 22 the staff director on matters pertaining to GAO 23 recommendations. 24 And I also think, without getting too

1 esoteric about it, there are constitutional concerns with respect to the delegation of power. We don't 2 3 from GAO. We make simply adopt things independent assessment as to what recommendations 4 we're going to implement. That's a policy issue 5 6 that falls within the prerogative of the Commission. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? 8 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Just one quick 9 clarification and then a comment. So the author of 10 the motion and the author of the amendment, if I understand it correctly, what we will do in April is 11 we will decide of the final and draft which ones we 12 13 will wish to adopt? 14 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Correct. 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: It goes to the point 16 Commissioner Taylor raised that Ι raised that 17 yesterday, which is I want to make sure that there 18 is nothing in there that unduly inhibits our mission 19 in there as well. Then I am comfortable. Then I am 20 very comfortable. 21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think 2.2 that is clear from this particular language. And I 23 agree with you. I'm comfortable with the way you

just phrased it, but I don't think it's clear from

1	the way it is drafted that we're going to have a
2	discussion in April and we will vote on the
3	particular recommendations that we want to
4	implement.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just had a
7	comment, but if you wanted to finish my
8	clarification, go ahead. That's fine.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I want
LO	to ask you whether you have got in mind some
11	specific language that would make that that would
.2	clarify.
.3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would offer a
4	friendly amendment that to implement on the next
.5	nine months' schedule all final and draft
.6	recommendations from the Government Accountability
L7	and Office of Personnel Management adopted by the
18	Commission at its April 2005 meeting.
.9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm agreeable to
20	that. Just a point. I am as a lawyer in favor of
21	precision, but two points with respect to that. The
22	first is, again, I think these are all fine
23	> amendments. I am agreeable to them.

On a forward basis with respect to these

1	motions, I think we should offer motions with
2	precision, but we should also keep in mind that
3	these are not motions made through a court and we
4	are not drafting legislation.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I understand.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And I say that
7	because I think it's imperative that we not get too
8	bogged down in minutiae. We are a collegial body
9	here. I think on the record, the transcript will be
LO	reflective of the intent of this body.
11	I don't want to go back to the old days
L2	of just kind of freewheeling motions being made, no
13	one remembering what the motions were about. But,
L4	by the same token, I think that there is a balance
15	to be struck.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: May I take back my
17	time?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I agree. I was
20	just simply responding to Commissioner Thernstrom's
21	request. But I was fully in agreement that I
22	thought the intent was very clear.
23	The only concern I have about the

package has to do with B. And B I'm just worried

about we are deferring project planning because we want to make sure we have costs allocated, we are sure what the budget is available for each of those things. I understand the spirit of B. I am just worried about the cost of B given this particular time in our agency's budgetary drama.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a good point.

And it seems to me that the first thing that we have to do is decide that we want to do it. And then as to the cost associated with having a full-blown review conducted, we're going to have to get some cost estimates. And we may have to revisit this issue. And we may have to go and try to seek additional funds in order to get a full-blown review completed.

Yes?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And does that suggest perhaps a rewording of point B? And again I turn to Commissioner Yaki for suggested rewording that takes into account the fact that there will be costs associated and they need to be known.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, at this point, though, I think that Pete, Commissioner Kirsanow, makes a good point. We cannot nail down all of the

nuances. I think that we're going to have to trust each other in that -- I mean, I think that all around the table here, I think that we all understand that if we determine that we can't afford to do this, then the issue, we must revisit the issue.

It seems to me that we are going to have to find the money somewhere. Either we will have to

It seems to me that we are going to have to find the money somewhere. Either we will have to seek additional funds from Congress or we will have to review the '06 budget.

But the bottom line is that I don't think that we should spend a lot of time trying to nail down all of the variables because we can't because as long as there is not an indication that there is a different understanding amongst the commissioners, I think that we understand that this is going to cost us money and that we may have some difficulty paying for it.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, Mr. Chair.

I mean, I drafted this fully cognizant of the fact
that we're in financial straits but also with an
understanding that there are certain imperatives.

Getting a handle on the nature of the financial straits is one of those imperatives. I

1	also trust the staff director based on my brief
2	association with him to be able to report back to us
3	pretty quickly as to what constraints we may have in
4	terms of this financial audit. So we can revisit
5	this particular issue.
6	Nonetheless, having said all of that, I
7	can't emphasize enough how important I think based
8	on the reports given by the staff director that we
9	engage in full financial audit of this organization
10	for, if no other reason, we don't even know what we
11	don't know.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Commissioner
13	Yaki has his hand up.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Based on the
15	representation of Commissioner Kirsanow and the
16	Chair, then I have no problem with B at this point.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
18	Braceras?
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I guess I am
20	just wondering whether we should separate out A, B,
21	and C at this point and vote on them separately and
22	discuss them separately.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I posed that
24	question to Commissioner Kirsanow once before. Have

1	you
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would like to
3	do them as a package
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: with one
6	exception. I think, as I indicated before, I'm
7	amenable to C being backed on this only because I'm
8 .	not sure. I still think we are in a informational
9	vacuum that makes discussion of this perhaps
10	premature, although we could implement it on a
11	contingent basis. That is, you know, as of the
12	April meeting, we could possibly implement this.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And as a
14	friendly amendment, does this mean you would accept
15	a friendly amendment based on what Commissioner
16	Meeks has said, that we defer C until
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would defer it
18	until April.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Until April.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As quickly as
21	possible.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. So
23	that C, then, is off the table for this meeting.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. Let's back

.24

this out until April. I will reintroduce it in 1 April because I think by that time, we will have a 2 handle on what the transition is like. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So that the 4 5 package becomes simply A and B. 6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And just to be 7 clear what we're voting on right now, we're deleting 8 C from what we're voting on now. And I still have 9 problems with the language of A. And I am sorry. I 10 am a lawyer. I feel that what I vote on has to be 11 precise. 12 I think what you're really saying is 13 that at the April 2005 Commission meeting, we will 14 implementation of and the GAO OPM vote 15 recommendations and that all recommendations 16 approved at that meeting will be implemented within 17 nine months. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I quess I 20 would just like to phrase it that way because I'm 21 uncomfortable with the way it is right now. It just 22 seems to give the impression that we're voting to 23 recommendations that approve haven't we 24 discussed. And I just would rather have it phrased

1	in a way that I am comfortable with.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
3	Kirsanow, do you have any objections to the language
4	that she used?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Could you
6	repeat that language, Jennifer?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. At the
8	April 2005 Commission meeting, the Commission will
9	vote to adopt recommendations of the General
10	Accounting Office and Office of Personnel
11	Management. All recommendations that are adopted at
12	the April meeting will be implemented within a
13	nine-month time frame.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's fine. I
15	think, you know, the transcript reflects that. I
16	don't have a problem with that.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think
18	Commissioner Meeks said something.
19	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And does that leave
20	B in, then, too?
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, B is
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I was just
23	trying to tackle them one at a time.
24	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes. Well, I

1	never mind.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. Please.
3	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, I was just
4	thinking and sort of contemplating making a motion
5	to table this until April. And at that time, we
6	will know what GAO's recommendations are probably.
7	And we possibly could know what the cost of B will
8	be.
9	I mean, there are just so many
10	uncertainties right now about this motion, that it
11	could get changed. I mean, I'm
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner
13	Kirsanow?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I understand
15	Commissioner Meeks' point. And she makes an
16	interesting point. I don't think that there is a
17	reason to table at this point. I think we all
18	understand what is being proposed here. And I think
19	there are only a few uncertainties.
20	We do know, in large part, what GAO is
21	going to do. We have the draft. We know what that
22	is about. We doubt that it is going to change
23	significantly.
24	I think we will be prepared by April to

1	do it. I'd like to move as quickly as possible. I
2	think one of the problems that we have had on this
3	Commission, at least in the three years that I have
4	been here, is we have deferred things, whether it be
5	expenses, motions. And I think we need to act
6	quickly.
7	I don't think we're acting peremptorily.
8	I don't think we're acting hastily. I think we are
9	acting appropriately in adopting these motions now
10	so the minute we can hit the ground running, I don't
11	think there is any uncertainty as to what is being
12	adopted.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. I think
14	with respect to A now, all we are doing is agreeing
15	to take up the recommendations in April. And the
16	ones we agree to we're setting the time frame.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And is my
18	understanding correct that the definition of
19	exceptionally qualified is that which the staff
20	director arrives at in the context of our budgetary
21	constraints and any other considerations,
22	professional judgment?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In his

professional judgment, whoever is exceptionally

	1	qualified to do this. You know, I am not someone
	2	who can go down a list of accountants or auditing
	3	firms and tell you who is the best. I leave that to
	4	the staff director.
	5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Should we
	6	move the question?
	7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments,
	8	concerns, questions?
	9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I move it as
	10	amended.
ā	11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.
	12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote.
	13	All in favor?
	14	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
	15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
	16	(No response.)
	17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes.
	18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have a second
	19	motion. And I would also give an explanation of
	20	this one also based on I think Commissioner
	21	Braceras' question related to I'll read it into
	22	the record and then explain.
	23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is this the IG one?
	24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, this is the

Inspector General motion. Commissioner Yaki, you don't have this one because this one reflects some of the concerns that were raised by Commissioner Braceras in e-mail traffic but also substantially what the staff director had said in discussions I had with him and also what he said today.

This has to do with governance As soon as practical, the staff accountability. director shall take all steps necessary and proper to retain the services of an Inspector General to identify: one, whether the Commission unlawfully deferred any payments that properly should have been paid in fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005 in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act; -- and that is a colloquialism -- two, whether the Commission deferred any payments that properly should have been paid in the fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2004 or 2005 in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act; and, three, report findings and recommendations to the Commission on a schedule to be determined by the Inspector General in conjunction with the chairman and staff director.

The original motion had contemplated the appointment of an Inspector General. And the staff

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

director had already gone to great lengths investigating the ability of the Commission to do so, both financially, legally, and practically, what Inspector Generals are able to do.

Commissioner Braceras was concerned that there may not be legal underpinnings. I researched that in terms of having an Inspector General or having one detailed.

My understanding is under the Economy

Act of 1932 and by provision with the General

Services Administration, it is standard practice or

at least it is commonplace to have an Inspector

General detailed from another agency. It's done on

a fairly regular basis. We have got a memorandum of

understanding with the General Services

Administration to do just that.

I have narrowed the focus of this because the staff director had indicated that, first of all, getting an Inspector General to do all of the things that were in the original motion; that is, frankly, turn the place upside down, is something that he was not able to convince anybody to do.

It seems based on some of the

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

1	discussions we have had already today that a lot of
2	people run screaming from this agency faced with the
3	prospect of trying to help us out because they think
4	that it is something that might not even be
5	feasible.
6	So I have narrowed the focus because I
7	do have concerns that one of the reasons we are in
8	the fix we are in is because payments are being
9	placed in our watch, so to speak, and also because
10	we don't know to what extent those payments have
11	been placed on our watch. We don't have those
12	controls in place. The forensics aren't there. And
13	I would at least like to get that cleaned up.
14	Again, the staff director says we don't
15	know what we don't know. And that's one of the
16	reasons why we're in the position that we're in
17	today.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Someone
19	refresh my memory. Where are we in the process?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: This needs a
21	motion.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Need a motion
23	and a second.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I move that we

1	adopt this motion as I read into the record.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
5	Commissioner Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm going to oppose
7	the motion. I understand the spirit in which it was
8	made by Commissioner Kirsanow, but I have seen when
9	IGs come into an agency: one, they're not cheap;
10	and, two, they tend to turn things upside down.
11	And I think that this goes to my concern
12	about how in some ways we need to move on, get on
13	with the future, rather than keep on going into the
1,4	past and allocating scarce staff resources to comply
15	with an IG time, money, resources.
16	I think it would be nice to know. I
17	don't know if we need an IG to do it. And I just
18	will oppose.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
20	Braceras?
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: When this motion
22	was originally circulated, I had some concerns
23	because it seemed to be proposing that we create a
24	new position or have someone detailed over here

indefinitely to look at everything.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I do think that this revised motion addresses those concerns in that it seems to ask the IG to look at discrete issues and it seems to limit the role and the duration of the Inspector General's work here to these particular things. And when the work is done, that will be the end of his services, his or her services.

So I do think, Pete, that you have addressed those concerns. I wasn't clear on the legal questions that I had raised in the e-mail traffic, how that is resolved here.

I think I can support this motion, but I just wanted some clarification.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: At least based done and preliminary research that I have discussions or at least looking at what the staff director had, my understanding is that this is something that is done on if not a regular basis, it's not uncommon, that there are authority under Services Economy Act, that the General the Administration typically does things like this for an agency like this. So I think I have addressed those concerns. I don't have at this point any

concerns with respect to the legality of it. 1 I think when we talk about emergency 2 3 reforms and structural reforms, I think there is a 4 cost savings involved in getting out front on an issue and addressing it. Sometimes there is some 5 pain involved there, but I think we need to know 6 7 where we stand right now, how we got into this fix. 8 understand Commissioner Yaki's And I 9 I'd prefer to move on also. But we don't point. 10 know where we have been. One of the reasons why we 11 can't even discuss some of the things that we would 12 like to do or how much we are in the hole is because 13 we don't know where we have been. I think we need to make a clean brush of 14 15 it by first assessing where we have been, how we got 16 into that position, to what extent we may be in the 17 hole. 18 staff director The has worked 19 It's prodigiously to get us out of this hole. 20 unfair to him that we not assess exactly what 21 happened before we got here. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor? 23 24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I agree with the

spirit of the motion. I have just a couple of 1 2 questions. And I apologize in advance. This may be 3 obvious to everyone else. Someone just please explain to me. 4 these issues that GAO can't address for us? And I'm 5 thinking primarily of the fiscal issues that we all 6 understand. Is there a reason they can't do it? 7 Well, I 8 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. don't know that they can't but two issues with 9 10 respect to that. GAO is something that is more 11 I view this as something, a surgical periodic. 12 strike to come in, address this discrete problem. 13 I don't know when GAO could get around to coming and doing something like this. I think 14 15 this is something we have to do as quickly as 16 possible. 17 I had another point, which conveniently 18 I've forgotten, but I think that when you have got 19 individual charged with doing a discrete an 20 assessment like this, I have more confidence in 21 someone who is charged with a finite function than 22 somebody coming in and just kind of deciding, "Well, 23 let's figure out what we're going to do," making it

part of a package of reforms.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If I could
2	answer?
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks?
4	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And I have a
5	similar question. I mean, why would the IG be able
6	to do something that this audit firm could not?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'll defer to
9	Commissioner Braceras.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think one way,
11	just to speak to the concerns raised by
12	Commissioners Taylor and Meeks, I think one way that
13	this differs from what GAO does is that this
14	particular motion asks for an opinion on whether any
15	laws were violated.
16	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: But the audit will
17	do that, too, the financial.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The financial
19	audit also does that?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because GAO does
22	not do that. And that was when
23	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: An audit does.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And audit looks for 1 2 ways to --3 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The second point now I remember was timing. I think that if the 4 audit is something that is going to be done and I 5 6 don't believe that they're going to get a report 7 back to us anytime in the near future of the limited audit that was begun in November, was supposed to 8 last for about three weeks. Is that correct? 9 10 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Logistics was 11 supposed to be for a few weeks. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. 12 And it lasted and has lasted for several months. That's a 13 limited audit. This scope audit I believe will take 14 15 much longer. 16 I think an Inspector General can come here -- again, I don't know this, but I believe that 17 18 he can come in, surgical strike, get this assessed, 19 give us an opinion or recommendations, and then we 20 can move forward. 21 I don't know that we have got enough time to wait for an audit to include -- I think we 22 23 need to get these questions addressed as quickly as 24 possible.

follow-up

One

2 question, if I may.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes?

TAYLOR:

COMMISSIONER

commissioner Taylor: To be clear, I am in favor of the essence of this motion. My only concern is, quite frankly, fiscal. I just want to make sure we have considered all of our options and to make sure that to the extent that we need the expertise and someone is not in a position because of the lack of the expertise or because of the timing, which I also think is important, simply can't be done.

concerns are addressed, in large Mv qualifying phrase "as soon as by the practicable." If that were not in there, it was something that I would suggest we place in there. necessarily think that And don't inconsistent with the concerns raised by Commissioner Yaki because I think it is something we need to do in order to effectively move forward, which we don't repeat the mistakes of the past, but my concern is fiscal in nature only and that we consider all of the options and that we're smart as we go about it.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, the questions that Commissioner Yaki raised I also had 2 in mind. And I would like to ask the staff director 3 to answer the basic question of whether he thinks an 4 5 essential to identifying Inspector General is precisely the matters that Commissioner Kirsanow, 6 7 which are obviously important, has identified in 8 one, two, and three. 9 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Vice Chairman 10 Thernstrom, I do not know at this point whether it I had previously identified these 11 is essential. 12 issues as being potential issues for an Inspector 13 General to look at. 14 And I have asked for research, which is ongoing, to determine such issues as whether this 15 16 would be unlawful if true, conduct, 17 determining for sure whether we would retain an IG. 18 If it turns out that such an audit, even if true, 19 would not be unlawful, then my inclination is that 20 it's not essential. 21 question I have is Then the other 22 whether this would be within a full scope audit, 23 which we're still not sure of and would require

conversations with an auditor. And if either it

would be encompassed by an audit or, alternatively, 1 if an auditor would identify this issue or do some 2 of the groundwork, whether we should do that first. 3 So I would say at this point I cannot 4 say that it is essential. There are still some 5 questions that we have been looking at. 6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I mean, 7 8 in lieu of that, in light of that answer and in light of the two points that I think are correct 9 10 that Commissioner Yaki that, one, IGs are not cheap; 11 and, two, they tend to turn agencies down, I wonder 1.2 if we shouldn't postpone a decision on the IG until 13 we have more information about what an audit would 14 accomplish. 15 REYNOLDS: Commissioner CHAIRMAN 16 Kirsanow? 17 KIRSANOW: COMMISSIONER Mr. Chair, 18 without belaboring the point, first of all, I don't 19 believe the Inspector General is going to turn this 20 place upside down because it's for an extremely 21 narrow scope. 22 Second, I think that if we retain an IG, 23 think the staff director indicated he 24 uncertain as to whether or not it's essential if, in

fact, there is no legality. Can the GAO do this? 1 2 Well, that is one of the questions we 3 don't know. We don't know what we don't know. It's 4 one of the things I think an IG is perfectly suited 5 to address. I am sensitive to the concern that maybe 6 we're duplicating efforts. Could a full scope audit 7 address the same thing? I think it goes to the 8 previous point. There is a timing imperative here, 9 and I think that that needs to be addressed. 10 11 I would like to say once again I think that this is a reform, but I think it goes into the 12 13 rubric of one of those emergency reforms. absolutely no doubt based on the three reports that 14 we have gotten from the staff director that we're in 15 16 extraordinarily bad shape. And I think we have 17 extraordinary measures to dig us out of it. 18 I don't believe this is extraordinary. I think this is one of the minimal steps necessary 19 20 to get this agency back on the road toward the 21 fiscal and operational integrity which we hope it 22 would have. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner

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

Braceras?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm going to
2	support this motion. I do think it's discrete
3	enough that the concerns raised aren't particularly
4	concerning to me.
5	I guess the one thing is I'm not an
6	accountant. I'm a lawyer. I don't understand with
7	the specificity that some others do how these audits
8	work.
9	I personally have never heard of a
10	financial audit reaching a legal conclusion or
11	making a legal recommendation. If I'm wrong on that
12	
13	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: You're wrong.
14	You're wrong.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So they
16	typically make legal recommendations?
17	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Absolutely. If
18	they find illegal use of funds, it's part of an
19	audit.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Because
21	the one concern I'm left with is the duplicative
22	nature of it, but other than that, on the merits, it
23	seems perfectly reasonable to me to look at these
24	questions.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we have some
2	additional information. Ken has some information
3	regarding his efforts to get an IG to look into
4	this.
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I've had
6	preliminary discussions with an IG's office about
7	whether this specific topic would be doable, whether
8	it's the sort of thing that they could take, whether
9	it's the sort of thing that they would be inclined
10	to take on if asked.
11	I have not gotten a final or definitive
12	answer, but the preliminary responses that I got was
13	that this does look like the sort of thing that an
14	IG could do upon our request if we pay for it.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I think
16	you had expressed that to me before. That's one of
17	
18	the reasons why I tailored it in this fashion.
	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I'd also like to
19	add that it's normal. When these types of issues
20	come up, it's normal that the IG conducts the
21	investigation.
22	I don't know whether these allegations
23	are tantamount to illegality, but if it goes down
24	that road, typically it's the IG that investigates.

1	And at the end of that investigation, there may or
2	may not be a referral to the Justice Department.
3	That's just been my personal experience working in
4	the government.
5	Commissioner Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Just a final
7	comment. I just want to follow up on what the chair
8	just said. This is not an inconsequential action
9	because the IG when they come in is not restricted
10	by what we ask them to do but, really, by what they
~ 11	believe their duty is to enforce the laws of the
- 12	United States.
13	I have seen them go into agencies. It
14	is not a pretty sight. It takes a lot of time. It
15	will cost a lot of money. I understand the
16	sentiment behind Mr. Kirsanow's thing, but the
17	concerns operationally to this agency at this time
18	still compel me to pose it at this time. And I call
19	the question.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions
21	or concerns before we vote?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I just
23	have a question. What is the advantage of doing

basically the same thing through an auditor versus

1	an IG? What are the advantages and disadvantages of
2	having one do it versus the other if what you're
3	saying is they do the same thing?
4	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Not being an
5	absolute expert on this, an audit would
6	systematically go through and give you balances so
7	that you know where you are starting.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: They would also
LO	identify issues that we all even raised. I mean, if
11	we gave a mandate to the auditor to do what you're
12	suggesting the IG do, I mean, an auditor would do
13	that, too.
14	But they go and they make sure that
1,5	things are balanced. And so it's a more
1.6	comprehensive I'm not convinced an IG can
17	surgically cut to the chase on this because they
18	also have to systematically cut through things to
19	come up with anything that is definitive.
2:0	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner
21	Kirsanow?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Chair, I think I
23	have made my case a number of times with respect to

of these issues. In the interest of

all

collegiality and seeing if we can move forward, 1 though, I would for the moment move to table this 2 pursuant to what Commissioner Thernstrom said until 3 next month's meeting. We can look at this issue a 4 5 little bit more. 6 And I would propose a substitute motion. 7 This doesn't necessarily And I would explain it. 8 require us to do anything at this point but goes to 9 I think and incorporates the concerns that I have 10 heard around the table. I'll wait until everybody has a copy of 11 12 it, but this is similar to the motion that was 13 originally sent around last week, but it has a 14 contingency attached to it. 15 This is governance and accountability The staff director and Office of General 16 again. 17 Counsel shall investigate the cost and 18 requirements relating to retaining an Inspector 19 General, either independent contractor, as an 20 employee, or detailed from another agency to do the 21 things I mentioned before. 22 This is more expansive, but this is to 23 get an understanding as to what the consequences 24

one, identify any instance of fraud, waste,

are:

1	abuse, or mismanagement of tax dollars by the
2	Commission; two, evaluate the efficiency of the
3	Commission, eliminate effectiveness of the
4	Commission also pursuant to an objection by
5	Commissioner Braceras; three, report findings and
6	recommendations to the Commission on a regularized
7	schedule to be determined by such general in
8	conjunction with the chairman and staff director and
9	the staff director and Office of General Counsel
10	report its findings to the Commission by no later
11	than its April 2005 meeting.
12	In other words, let's get more
13	information. And then if it's the sentiment of the
14	Commission that, in fact, an Inspector General is
15	warranted in the limited scope that was contained in
16	the second motion that I proffered, then we can have
17	a vote on it.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second it.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Vice Chair
21	Thernstrom?
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I very much
23	appreciate the revision of this motion. And I think
- 24	it makes a very important point that has been lost

recent press on the Commission. 1 Ιt underscores the commitment to collegiality on the 2 part of all commissioners sitting, the commitment to 3 4 collegiality without compromising its commitment to And I'm very pleased by this process and 5 reform. thank Commissioner Kirsanow for this revision. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks? 8 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, in the spirit 9 fiscal responsibility, I would actually ask, of 10 that there be an amendment to this that examines the scope of an audit, the time period, and 11 the cost so that there can be a comparison and so 12 13 that it's not duplicative. I mean, I would offer 14 that amendment. 15 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Say it 16 exactly again. How do you want to change the 17 wording? 18 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Let's see. "Staff 19 and Office of General Counsel shall director 20 investigate the cost and legal requirements related 21 to retaining an Inspector General, either as an 22 independent contractor, employee, or detailed from 23 another agency." 24

I would also like to say, amend it to

1	say, somehow that within this amendment or within
2	this motion that there be investigation of what an
3	auditing firm's cost, scope of work, and time frame
4	would be so that there could be a comparison.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: To accomplish the
6	same task.
7	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: To accomplish the
8	same task, yes.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That would be
10	helpful.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I guess my concern
12	is it's not clear to me that the Inspector General
13	and the accounting firm that we would eventually
14	retain to conduct an audit, that they're going to be
15	doing the same thing. There may be some overlap.
16	There may be some overlap.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's the
18	question.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But that's
20	the question.
21	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That should be I
22	think incorporated into what we hear in our April
23	report from the staff director.
24	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: The Inspector

General may not be doing as wide a scope as the 1 auditing firm, but the auditing firm may be doing 2 3 that same scope as the Inspector General. And given that we're going to be paying 4 a lot of money for an IG as well as an auditing 5 firm, which we have already passed that motion for, 6 7 I think it's worth exploring the cost and the scope And if time is the issue, I mean, I think 8 of work. 9 that is a question for the IG also. You know, what 10 is the time frame around this? 11 And if'it clearly shows that an IG can 12 " better with less cost --13 REYNOLDS: Pete, it's CHAIRMAN 14 friendly amendment. 15 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Look, I think we 16 need as much information as possible. I'm not 17 looking to duplicate efforts, but, as I said, I 18 think I made my points, which I'll stand by, in 19 terms of it will be reflected on the transcript as 20 to what we will be doing if, in fact, the report 21 comes back with respect to cost, with respect to 22 legal requirements. I think it's going to be narrow 23 I'm satisfied that we can do that. in scope.

NEAL R. GROSS

I still think that Inspector General is

-- based on everything that I have read and have 1 been led to believe -- an imperative. I would think 2 that in April, we are going to be looking at the 3 real prospect of retaining an Inspector General. 4 the staff director 5 in fact. If, concludes or reports back to us that the audit will 6 accomplish the same objective, will do so in a 7 8 cost-effective fashion, and do so expeditiously, I 9 trust us here to do the right thing. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you accept the 11 friendly amendment? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Absolutely. 12 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner 14 Braceras? 15 I'd just COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. 16 like to say that I think that all of us here are 17 the finding out the answers committed to 18 questions posed by Commissioner Kirsanow 19 first motion, you know, questions one, two, 20 three, whether the Commission unlawfully deferred any payments that properly should have been paid in 21 22 fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005 in violation of 23 the Anti-Deficiency Act, et cetera, et cetera.

think we're all committed to having those questions

answered.

13-

The only question here is the best way to do so, whether it makes sense to do it through an auditor, through an Inspector General, or to retain both and have them have different mandates, separate mandates.

So I just want to be clear that, at least from my perspective, we're all committed to getting to the bottom of these questions. We're just grappling with the most economical and efficient way to get to the bottom of these questions.

I don't want there to be any impression left that by deferring this to April, that somehow we are not interested in getting to the bottom of this. We are.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And that was my point by saying, look, this whole process underscores the commitment of the collegiality on the part of commissioners without compromising the Commission's dedication to reform, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The staff director has comments.

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may, staff
2	have just reminded me that between now and our April
3	meeting, we have three weeks, rather than the usual
4	four, and that much of that time will be devoted to
5	handling the emergency issues that I have discussed
6	earlier. So I would just ask that commissioners
7	keep in mind that between now and then, most of the
8	time will be focused on that.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Ken, I
10	appreciate you've got subpoenas to answer and you've
11	got all kinds of things going. You're putting out
12	fires everywhere.
13	Everyone around here has made their
14	point. It's on the record. This is a new day.
15	It's not 2004. We're not going to hang you out to
16	dry if we don't feel like you come up with some
17	super-duper report.
18	But I would also say at the same time
19	that this is an imperative. Everything that the
20	staff director has reported to us has indicated that
21	we had better get our act together very quickly. We
22	only have a small window of opportunity.
23	We have got to get our act together for
24	other reasons, if for no other reason than to

1	satisfy Commissioner Yaki's concern that we still be
2	able to discharge our statutory imperatives and that
3	we make sure that we do the best we can to limit any
4	draconian cuts or changes to the Commission. And I
5	think this is the best way of doing it.
6	If we get ahead of the curve, we can
7	limit the damage financially, operationally, and
8	still possibly do our best to discharge our
9	statutory mission.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move as amended.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second to
13	move as amended.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's vote. All in
15	favor?
16	(Whereupon, there was a chorus of "ayes.")
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes as
20	amended.
21	Yes, Commissioner Kirsanow?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I've got one
23	last thing. And this is not a motion, but
24	Commissioner Braceras' working group on reform is

1	entertaining a variety of issues with respect to
2	projects. I have something that I would just like
3	them to consider when considering the manner in
4	which projects are planned.
5	I'm not going to address this. This has
6	to do with something we discussed in the past.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Can I just
8	speak to this briefly?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
LO	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I believe this
11	is at least drawn from proposals that Commissioner
L2	Redenbaugh put forward last year.
L3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.
L4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And we did
15	discuss that at our last meeting that we wanted to
L6	see those again and that we wanted to work from that
L7	template. So thank you very much.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's see
19	what's next. Adarand.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I was going
21	to say take a five-minute break. Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's take a
23	five-minute break.
24	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record

at 11:51 a.m. and went back on the record at 12:11 p.m.)

V. PROGRAM PLANNING

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's wrap this up. We have, actually, two issues left. Now, what's scheduled, the Adarand proposal, we're scheduled to discuss that, but Commissioner Taylor has an idea he would like to discuss. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It's an idea that I just want to put on the table for discussion. it's not feasible or practical, for whatever reason, that's fine. But if I were in a situation where I were representing a client that had entered into an agreement to make a payment -- and I'm referring EEOC Ι specifically the settlement that to understand we'll be making a payment on in this fiscal year of some \$188,000. Is that not true?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I've avoided characterizing the payment as being either one or more than one and avoided characterizing it as either a settlement or a claim that has been fully resolved because of concerns that the more specific one gets about it, the closer one gets to a confidentiality agreement, which is not anything

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	which we've entered into.
2	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: What I can say
4	is we have an obligation this year in the amount of
5	\$188,000 based on EEO matters from the past.
6	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Putting my private
7	hat on for a moment, if I were in a situation where
8	I represent a company that had an obligation of that
9	amount but also had some serious financial concerns,
10	it would not be inappropriate for me to go back to
11	plaintiff's counsel and seek some type of
12	accommodation.
13	The accommodation would not be
14	substantial. It would require a delay perhaps of
15	the obligation. And we could put some other issues
16	on the table.
17	But that would I think put us in a much
18	stronger position in the short term if we could
19	reach an accommodation with plaintiff's counsel, if
20	that's possible.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: This
22	accommodation would involve simply timing.
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Timing is all it

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: May I interpret
2	that, Commissioner Taylor, as a request for legal
3	analysis between now and the next meeting as to
4	whether that is something that could be
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It's feasible,
6	correct. Yes. I just want to determine whether
7	it's feasible, not knowing the details of the
8	arrangement.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We'll look into
10	whether it's feasible and what can be
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Even if it's a
12	partial relief, that would certainly I think put us
13	in a different position in the short term.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Was this an EEOC
15	or was this the private attorney?
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We have incurred
17	over \$300,000 in EEO settlements and adjudications
18	over the last 5 years or so, of which \$188,000 is
19	due this year.
20	I think I can answer any questions about
21	this if this were in closed session. As for what I
22	can say in open, we're somewhat limited because as a
23	small agency, we have had only a small number of
24	them. And I don't want to say something that could

1	make everyone aware of which one I'm talking about.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I would
3	say that I'm sensitive to the spirit of Commissioner
4	Taylor's comment is understood by all. We're in
5	dire straits.
6	I would also say, though, there is a
7	competing interest. That competing interest is that
8	this is the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. It's
9	an embarrassment that we have EEO judgments against
10	us.
11	If I had the money and it were up to me,
12	if I had control of the congressional
13	appropriations, I'd make sure that that's the first
14	thing that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
15	discharges.
16	That being said
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So it is my
18	understanding that
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: May I just
20	briefly respond to Commissioner Kirsanow? We have
21	taken measures just in the last three months to try
22	and correct any problems we have in that area.
23	Of course, I have issued to all staff a
24	restatement of the agency's commitment to protecting

all

the equal employment opportunity rights of 1 2 employees. In addition, we have also instituted the 3 practices that would protect the integrity of the 4 For instance, we have ensured that 5 EEO practice. there will be a firewall between different parts of 6 7 the agency that are involved with different aspects 8 of the EEO process that hadn't been there before and also have ensured that the director of EEO reports 9 10 directly on EEO matters to the staff director as 11 required by EEO practices. 12 Both of these are matters that the EEOC 13 has urged on all agencies but which we had not 14 previously been doing. But it is certainly for the 15 civil rights agency a priority to make sure that we 16 are putting that in order. And that is something 17 that we have proactively done. 18 And I commend COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 19 the staff director for doing just that. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. On to our 21 end. Pete, would you like to --22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't have the 23 I'm sorry. Actually, why don't you move motion. 24 this?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I move
2	that the OCRE project assessing the federal
3	government's role in implementing the Supreme Court
4	decision in Adarand v. Pena focus on government
5	compliance with the court's holding that when any
6	racial classification is imposed by a government
7	actor, the classification must serve a compelling
8	governmental interest and be narrowly tailored to
9	further that interest.
10	Specifically, I move that OCRE evaluate
11	governmental compliance with the requirement that
12	agencies consider race-neutral alternatives in
13	contracting under the Small Business Administration
14	programs.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No second?
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'll second it.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you.
20	Discussion? Yes, Commissioner Yaki?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have first a point
22	of information. This is a motion to change the
23	concept and scope of the previously approved
24	project.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Expand the focus
2	of it.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Expands it.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would say yes.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Expands it. If I
6	may be so dense, what is the previously approved
7	project?
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. We
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We all need a
10	copy of that.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is it in the
12	materials?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, we're talking
14	about the original motions? This proposal was
15	established prior to December?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And so I don't have
18	any personal knowledge.
19	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I have it.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Share.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I guess I have to
23	
	say that I think I mean, maybe I'm

1 it looks to me like it's a change and a narrowing. 2 I'm not sure. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. Ι 4 need the text of the original. 5 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Okay. 6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Do you have 7 it, Elsie, that we could photocopy it quickly? 8 Just for YAKI: COMMISSIONER 9 clarification, Mr. Chair, point of information. 10 This is a project proposal that had been previously approved, I believe, in 2004, before you came along, 11 12 Mr. Marcus, and before you came along, Mr. Reynolds 13 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct. 14 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner 15 Yaki, if I may, I believe it was approved during the 16 planning session in 2003. That would have been in 17 early 2003. 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: The reason I am 19 asking is that I got confused by what was in our 20 project planning materials in February that talked 21 about Adarand in the context of disparity studies. 22 attached, this motion And then this was 23 attached, on top of that, when we received it in the 24 binders.

1	Is the disparity study issue completely
2	separate and apart from the Adarand study, what
3	we're doing for September 30th?
4	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes,
5	Commissioner Yaki. There are two different
6	proposals. There's the Adarand proposal. And then
7	there's a separate additional próposal on disparity
8	studies. There are different potential projects.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, one
10	already has been approved. That would have been the
11	original Adarand study.
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's correct.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. And so what
14	appeared in the February binder is in addition to,
15	not a substitute for, the ongoing Adarand study?
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would view
17	that as well. Yes, that's correct.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And so the motion
19	only applies to the previously approved Adarand
20	project of 2003?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's how I
22	interpret the motion as well.
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Elsie,
24	why don't you read the text here?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is the original?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. This is the scope of the original.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Okay. The year 2005 will mark the tenth anniversary of the Adarand decision and, as such, offers an opportunity to review the decision's effect on contracting levels of women and minority-owned firms.

literature reviews, data Through and interviews, the Commission will analysis, analyze Adarand's effect based on the number of minority and women-owned firms that have received federal contracts to analyze the amount of federal funds awarded to these businesses; procurement examine whether the SBD certification process has reached the levels initially projected and whether, in turn, certified businesses have benefitted by federal contracts; examine the role of securing federal agencies, including SBA, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Justice in implementing procurement programs for women and minority-owned businesses; and examine why the goal of awarding five percent of federal contracts to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

women-owned businesses has not been reached and
measure the extent to which the contract assistance
for women-owned business programs is making strides
in that direction.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Just a point of clarification again. The amendment that I made that is contained in the agenda for this term, it's motion number three under tab five, the Yaki-Meeks motions. Number three basically is a restatement of the original Adarand study.

The reason for my confusion -- and this is I think a very sensitive and interesting subject -- is that I received a copy last night -- actually, no; I'm sorry -- this morning of a project concept for an Adarand study that was sent to different departments of the federal government that came from the Commission that is different from what Ms. Meeks just read, is different from what Commissioner Braceras read, and different from what I had amended and different from the disparity study in the February 18th proposal. And I'm just trying to figure out how --

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Do you know the date of that?

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think it was
2	February 8th. It's entitled "U.S. Commission on
3	Civil Rights Race-Neutral Federal Contracting
4	Project Concept." And it is
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It was sent from
6	whom to who?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It was sent out to
8	different departments of the federal government. It
9	contains within it interrogatories and document
LO	requests. The deadline was February 28th of this
11	year.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the wording of
14	this is distinctly different than that which
15	Commissioner Meeks read. And I'm just wondering had
16	there been a change approved by this Commission in
17	the interim that I am unaware of between because
18	I thought that I did not see anything in the
19	records of January, December concerning February.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So why don't we
21	let the staff director bring us up to date on the
22	project and its focus?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There were a
24	series of interrogatories that have been issued

regarding the race-neutral alternatives issues with respect to Adarand. Those issues are in a sense encompassed within the previously approved proposal. early draft an There was potential interrogatories that would go with the first proposal that dealt with a number of different issues along the lines that Commissioner Meeks just They were somewhat broad and covered a described. lot of areas but not in considerable depth. We focused on the interrogatories that recently the race-neutral on went out more which originally could alternative issue, construed as a part of the 2003 proposal but which is largely within the scope of the current proposal. The intention in issuing these interrogatories was to fall within the scope of the current motion. COMMISSIONER YAKI: My concern is not so much with the interrogatories as the fact that there was an attached project concept that in my view had deviation from what the Commission some previously approved.

I understand that the Commission has the authority and the obligation and the right to make those changes, as is evidenced by Commissioner

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

had

1	Braceras' motion. My concern is that we somehow the
2	Commission sent out and I think this went to many
3	departments, not just one. Is that correct? It
4	went to a number
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: To a number of
6.	agencies.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: a number of
8	different agencies attaching
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: If I may, the
10	interrogatories went to a number of different
11	agencies.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right.
13	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I can't say for
14	certain whether the document you were referring to
15	went to another agency.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, it was
17	attached to the cover letter to the agency. And,
18	again, it's a project concept. You know, I
19	understand that there are going to be disagreements
20	in philosophy and characterizations as we go along.
21	And I will always be sure to express mine, as I am
22	sure you will be to express yours, in a collegial
23	and decorous manner.
24	But my concern is that here this is a

it seems to be a substantive redefinition of a previously approved project that went out to federal agencies where in some ways it's almost misleading. speak substantively want to Commissioner Braceras' motion, but here we talk about although some of the text mitigates a little bit some of the title itself, it still doesn't go toward the actual goals, when I was looking at these, the actual goals that were stated in the original proposal. mention of the women-owned business

For example, when I was going through looking in the interrogatories, there was no special compliance efforts that was referenced in that. There are other issues involved as well.

I am just concerned that we've sent a lot of information out that may not: complete as it should have been for the original concept; and then, B) if we shift it to where this would be in addition to what you're talking about, that it may not be as -- we may have to send a whole other set to some of these agencies. I just want to make sure that we do it properly.

I guess I want to know where this came

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

was given to change how the project was defined in 2 the letters that went out to departments in early 3 4 February of this year. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I issued the 5 for interrogatories according process 6 to the issuance of interrogatories for the Commission and 7 followed the form for insurance of interrogatories. 8 So we're familiar with the way in which it was 9 This is the way in which it was done. 10 The interrogatories were done in such a 11 way that they would be consistent with the project 12 as I best estimated it would be agreed to in the 13 February meeting, at a time when it appeared that 14 the Commission might look at this during 15 16 But I also believe that the February meeting. 17 interrogatories would be pertinent to either the original 2003 proposal or the one which is on the 18 19 table today. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I be heard? 21 Commissioner REYNOLDS: CHAIRMAN 22 Braceras? 23 I think what COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 24 happened was that the motion to expand the focus of

from, how it came about, and under what authority

1 2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the project was supposed to come up in February and it was deferred and then the interrogatories went out.

And that is why I insisted that we still discuss this motion today, even though we were deferring other aspects of project planning. I think it was a mistake to defer this particular motion last time because I agree that if Commission wants to expand or change the focus of a project, that has to be decided by all of us by a majority vote and that the staff cannot change the focus of a project or expand the focus of a project without our consent.

So I think it may have been a mistake and an oversight that certainly I had come to the February meeting expecting to vote on this -- or not come to but come to via telephone. But I had expected to vote on this, and then it was deferred. And I think the next thing we knew, there were interrogatories that were going out.

So that is why I wanted to make sure that least retroactively authorize we at expansion of the project today. And I fully agree with Commissioner Yaki that that is not the best way

_	to do business going forward. I want to see any
2	changes come before us as a body before actions are
3	taken in the future.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, I
5	appreciate Commissioner Braceras' remarks. My
6	concern I guess is that I have read with a lot of
7	alarm how business was conducted in prior years.
8	And I know that there is a lot of good faith and
9	good will amongst my fellow commissioners to not
LO	repeat the mistakes of the past when it comes to
11	process. So that's why I bring this up rather
12	gently, rather than going screaming and foaming at
13	the mouth.
14	My problem continues to be that this was
15	at least the one letter I have is dated February
16	8th, which is ten days prior to our meeting on the
L7	18th. And I understand that if the staff director
18	believes that the interrogatories cover the original
19	scope, then I would ask that he demonstrate that
20	because I have some difficulty with it. But if he
21	could show how
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think it was clear
23	
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If it was in

1	pursuing the original project, I have no problem.
2	But the fact that a different project's scope was
3	attached with a different title, with a different
4	emphasis concerns me because we had not as a
5	Commission been allowed to make that change. And I
6	have no doubt that the Commission would have made
7	that change.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I
9	think that it's clear that those interrogatories
10	should not have gone out the door. They were sent.
11	And this process, at least with respect to this
12	particular project, has been tortured. There are a
13	number of different types of Adarand proposals
14	floating about. There's been the postponement of
15	discussion.
16	A mistake was made. It shouldn't have
17	happened. And I am sure that the staff director
18	will take steps to ensure that going forth this
19	particular type of mistake doesn't happen again.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: A question
21	for the staff director. What is this February 8th
22	memo that went out that doesn't seem to conform
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. I haven't

seen it. I don't --

1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just got it. 2 would like to be able to redact to whom it was sent so no one gets in any trouble, quite frankly. And I 3 will do that today, but it is dated February 8th, 4 5 2005 from this office. It is signed by the chair. It directs that any questions go to members of OCRE. 6 7 And then there were four pages of attachments. 8 project concept and three was the 9 interrogatories. 10 Again, because I don't want anybody in trouble -- I mean, this just sort of 11 12 landed on my doorstep. And I'm not trying to cause 13 I just want to make sure that this is something 14 that -- I accept your word that it was an honest 15 mistake. 16 I just would like to know that: 17 the relationship between these interrogatories and 18 the original Adarand proposal, I'd like to see where 19 the correlation is; and then, you know, that's as 20 far -- I just wanted to bring that up. 21 far as I want to go with that. 22 Commissioner I'd rather talk about

I'd rather talk about Commissioner
Braceras' substitute at this point, but I think it
is important in terms of how we move forward that I

23

get some explanations about this.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you 100 percent. Obviously I support the substance of the motion to expand the project, but certainly I never had the intent to begin to expand the project before this body had a chance to vote on that. And I didn't know that that was being done until I received copies of the interrogatories in the mail at the same time that everybody else did.

The larger point, however, is that this was an ongoing project. The interrogatories were an attempt to move forward in a way that the Commission was inevitably going to go. And, as a matter of process, though, you are 100 percent right in that that shouldn't happen again.

But with respect to the substance of the motion that I have just made, my intention would be for it to be an expansion of the work that is going on and the data that has previously been collected.

I think that one of the problems with our work product in the past has been a lack of balance. And I think that the integrity of our work product has come into question because of the lack of balance.

1	I think that adding this additional
2	element to the project will produce a more balanced
3	report.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Then if the intent
6	of Commissioner Braceras' motion is to add to and
7	not subtract from the original Adarand report, I
8	have less concern except for the word "focus."
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I agree
10	with that change.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It should be
12	"look at."
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Or "examine."
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or "examine."
16	Better.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I accept that.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I apologize
20	for the imprecise wording.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's not
22	imprecise. It's just misleading.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And when you speak
24	about the Small Business Administration programs,
	II

1	which ones are you referring to? Are you referring
2	to the certification process for federal
3	contracting? Are we talking about the 8(a) program?
4	I guess I just want to make sure that
5	staff has some specificity because there are two
6	different creatures in terms of what the standards
7	are.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, what are
9	your thoughts on
LO	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't know because
11	I am not the world's greatest Adarand expert, but I
L2	do know that if we're looking at the 8(a) programs,
L3	I think I don't even know if 8(a), if that would
L4	even yes.
L5	It sort of starts there but not really
16	because the SBA, SDB does the certification for the
L7	entire government contracting program, which I think
18	is what you are talking about.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What would be
20	your preference?
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't know. I
22	just want to make sure that I mean, substantively
23	with your motion I have a concern, but I think it is
24	less of a concern because the intent of the

examination, I understand what you're trying to do. 1 2 But I would just say that for purposes Commissioner is 3 the record that Braceras of 4 absolutely correct that the Supreme Court decision 5 in Adarand talked about the classification serving 6 compelling government interests be narrowly tailored 7 and that there to further that interest 8 agency consider race-neutral requirement that 9 alternatives in contracting. 10 But there is a second part, which I don't think needs to be stated in the motion but 11 12 just for clarification that under Adarand, which has 13 been upheld by the Eighth and the Tenth Circuits, that agencies are still able to use race-conscious 14 15 remedies in certain circumstances. 16 But I understand what you are trying to 17 do with this. And, as amended, I would have no 18 objection to it being appended to the original 19 Adarand proposal that was read by Commissioner 20 Meeks. 21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is the 22 We just changed the word "focus" to intention. 23 "examine."

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

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: To "examine."

by

1 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's the --2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have a 3 We have a date by which we have to submit problem. our statutory project. And the staff director just 4 5 indicated that certain changes are likely to cause us to miss that deadline. Ken, would you like to 6 7 elaborate? 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: After discussion 9 with staff, it was their impression that in order to 10 be able to meet our statutory enforcement deadline, 11 would have interrogatories to go out 12 time that the February approximately the 13 interrogatories went out. 14 Tf additional document requests 15 interrogatories of any sort go out, even today, it 16 has certainly been staff's impression that it would 17 be unlikely that the results could be integrated 18 into a project that could be completed within this 19 fiscal year. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 21

I'm confused because I thought that work had commenced several months ago and that data had been collected already on the first part of the project that Commissioner Meeks read into the record.

22

23

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No. 1 2 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I'm further confused, Ken, additionally confused. 3 Ι thought that the most recent interrogatories that 4 , went out were tied to what would be an expansion of 5 the program that we would be voting on today. 6 7 The MARCUS: DIRECTOR STAFF 8 interrogatories that went out in February were based 9 on our best expectation of what the Commission would 10 be able to approve. Under the time constraints if 11 12 to go out by interrogatories were not 13 February, it was extremely unlikely that we would be able to complete the project within the period. 14 15 few different practical We have a challenges in terms of completing projects within --16 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. 18 appreciate the time constraints, but my question is 19 what work had been prior to them. 20 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And haven't 21 all necessary interrogatories already gone out if, 22 in fact, we vote on this expansion of the project? 23 Only one STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No. 24 set of interrogatories has gone out, although it

1 went out to multiple recipients. It went out in early February, and it was directed to the sorts of 2 3 issues that are addressed in the motion that has 4 been made today regarding narrow tailoring 5 alternatives. That is the race-neutral 6 interrogatory that has gone out. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director, are 8 you saying that we may not have enough time to 9 complete the report that was originally proposed? 10 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Within this 11 fiscal year. We could do the original project as a 12 non-statutory report. We could do the original 13 report for next fiscal year. We could do it in a 14 way that combined this fiscal year and next fiscal 15 year. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: If we were to do 17 that, do we have another report that we can offer up 18 as our statutory report? 19 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I don't believe 20 The bind we have been in since the new members 21 came on board and since I came on board is that 22 there was an older project that was underway, which 23 appeared to be less likely to be what would be 24 approved.

1 There is a different concept here that 2 relates to narrow --3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's my 4 If it was underway, that presumes that work had been done. I had been led to believe that 5 data had been collected, that the idea that it was 6 7 underway meant that data had been collected and that 8 this was an expansion of the project that would 9 attempt to balance it out and would attempt to make 10 it more palatable to a bipartisan commission. 11 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Analysis had 12 been done but not data formally collected. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Because 14 my interest is in seeing a balanced report and 15 seeing a report that a bipartisan commission can 16 support, not in putting forward a report that looks 17 at issues that are only of interest to one side or 18 the other. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Let me interject. I 20 fully appreciate and understand what Commissioner 21 Braceras has just said. My concern goes, again, to 22 process. 23 has alarmed me in some of the What 24 have heard, not statements that Ι from you,

1	Commissioner Braceras, in the past few minutes is
2	that the interrogatories were promulgated under the
3	theory that this motion was going to pass and it was
4	sent prior to that passage by at least a full ten
5 ·	days. That's a problem that I have.
6	The second problem that I have is that
7	if and I was not on the Commission at the time.
8	I understand that there were some interesting
9	difficulties when you first met in December and
10	January just sort of getting accustomed to new faces
11	and everything like that.
12	But knowing that this project was on the
13	F.Y. 2005 calendar for September 30th, it appears
14	that there was a holdback on excuse me for using
15	that phrase but that somehow work either had not
16	been done or has been done or perhaps has not.
17	I just need to know. Was there any work
18	done at all prior to this?
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Because, again, I
21	understand what Commissioner Braceras says. She
22	wants to make sure that the report has the ability
23	to have a balance to it. And her objection is that
24	the prior approved report may not have reflected any

balance.

I would be willing to support her efforts to do that if the other part of the study were also being done, but what I heard — and this is what is disturbing — is that there was no such intent to do the other part of the study. And it was simply to fulfill the intent of the motion that was going to be brought by Commissioner Braceras ten days after the interrogatories were actually sent out in relationship to that proposal.

That I have more than a little concern about because I have been and will continue to work in good faith with the Commission on process. I understand that the numbers have changed, the reality of who is in charge has changed. I understand all of that.

All I want to make sure is that as we go forward, it is my intent to be respectful, fair, and process-oriented, and not to engage in the vitriol of the past.

I am a little perturbed about the fact that Commissioner Braceras and I had a nice colloquy about the fact that this would be in addition to the report, it would provide balance to the report from

_	ner perspective. That's line with me. But now i
2	discover that, despite our colloquy, we hear that
3	there won't be anything on the other section of the
4	report. That disturbs me greatly.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki,
6	we had a problem. Yes, the mistake was made. But
7	what we do now is if we cannot do the Adarand
8	project as amended, then we're going to have to find
9	another project to do for '05 to satisfy our
10	statutory obligation.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May I ask a
12	question about how much longer it would take because
13	I do believe in the past with the environmental
14	justice report, maybe you remember, Commissioner
15	Meeks, we were about a month or two late with that
16	project. And that seemed to be okay.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's
18	correct.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And so if it's
20	only a matter of a few more months, maybe we can do
21	that.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know.
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Staff are

1	indicating that that may not have been a statutory
2	report.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It was not a
4	statutory report?
5	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Not a statutory
6	report.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks?
8	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I would just like
9	to echo what Michael has said. I, for one, having
10	been part of the old regime, actually very much
11	appreciate the sort of openness that you all have
12	brought, then to find that these interrogatories
13	really do not reflect what was approved that I read
14	earlier.
15	And given that there has already been
16	work done on this, I am very willing to vote on that
17	expansion. I mean, that is going to be additional
18	information we have to gather when the work already
19	has been done on the one that has already been
20	approved or at least some of the work.
21	So I don't know how much more time that
22	this expansion will take, but I am willing to vote
23	on that and

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, for me, can we

1	expand the project and complete the project during
2	this fiscal year? Can we meet our deadline? If th
3	answer is no, it seems to me that we have to find
4	project that we can start and complete before th
5	deadline.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I need some mor
7	information on why the answer seems to be no.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No. Wait
9	minute. I need an answer to the question of, well
LO	is there a problem simply in completing the project
L1	. if we expanded or is there a problem in completing
L2	the project, period?
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. Goo
14	question.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Let me, if
16	may, speak generally to that. And then I may nee
17	additional more detailed information on that from
18	our director of civil rights evaluation.
19	My understanding was at the time that w
20	arrived in December-January, that we would have
21	difficulty completing, really, any project other
22	than exactly what had been approved before. That'
23	how tight the timetable was.
24	Even back in early February, trying t

1	either expand or alter the project would create
2	timetable difficulties. We're now certainly after
3	that. And so it's even more difficult in terms of
4	the work flow and the amount of time required to get
5	data.
6	But I'm certainly not the expert on what
7	is required in order to get the statutory report
8	out. So if the commissioners are interested in
9	hearing more,
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
12	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: that's an
13	OCRE issue. And I would defer to
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ms. Dickerson, we
15	need your help.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Where
17	are we with this?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, as originally
19	crafted, as originally crafted, can we complete the
20	project?
21	MS. DICKERSON: Part of what we run into
22	is that we issue interrogatories to agencies. And
23	we depend on their timely response in order to get
24	the data and documents that we need in order to

write the report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Even with the interrogatories that were sent in early February, we still don't have all of those back. That is even after a great deal of effort on our part working with agencies.

The interrogatories themselves contain probably a couple of dozen questions directed to each agency and document requests as well. It's a good bit of work that we ask them to undertake in order to respond and to respond on time.

I don't believe we had any -- we had requests for extensions from every agency. I don't believe we had any by the deadline. We have faxed, worked with staff since February 8th to get all of the interrogatories back. And we have almost all of them now, but we don't have them all.

So when we start to talk about issuing even other interrogatories to agencies, that would request more documents and depending information and being getting that able to qo through it, we're not talking in terms of just getting a reply that's a few pages long. In significant instance, it may be several boxes long. And the staff still has to go through all of these

1	documents and analyze them and prepare them to be
2	part of the report.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. How much work
4	was done on this project, December? How much work
5	had we
6	MS. DICKERSON: We had done all of our
7	preliminary research. And we had as well prepared
8	interrogatories based on the concept for all of the
9	agencies. And those had gone to the front office,
10	but they weren't signed yet. And then when the new
11	staff director came, you know, it became a matter of
12	presenting those to him in December.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What form
15	does this project have to take in order for it to be
16	completed by the deadline?
17	MS. DICKERSON: Well, at this time, it
18	would be very difficult to have the original scope
19	plus an appended scope. We haven't requested we
20	don't have the data and information to do all of
21	that. So it would have to be some subset of the
22	original at this point.
23	
ł	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: A subset of

1.	what you're saying?
2	MS. DICKERSON: Well, that wasn't my
3	decision, but
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, but, I
5	mean, that's what you're saying is
6	MS. DICKERSON: in response to
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm asking
8	what's manageable. And what you're saying
9	MS. DICKERSON: Yes. In response to
LO	your question, yes, only some subset because if you
L1	back into the deadline, I mean, the Commission
L2	doesn't meet in August. And the report has to be
13	produced and delivered to Congress, per my
L4	understanding, and the White House by September
L5	30th. So there is production time in there as well.
16	There is time for the commissioners to receive it,
L7	to read it, to discuss it, et cetera.
L8	At this point, there hasn't even been a
19	draft that has gone to the staff director because we
20	are waiting for the interrogatories.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Is there in
22	theory a possibility of dividing this project into
23	two parts, in effect, so that we produce part A as

meeting the statutory requirement and we go on to

1	part B subsequently? Is that a possibility?
2	MS. DICKERSON: In a subsequent fiscal
3	year?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
5	MS. DICKERSON: Certainly the
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean,
7	obviously we have to turn this into something
8	manageable in order to meet the statutory
9	requirement. I'm just trying to get at a possible
10	method of doing so.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It sounds like that
12	we need to take a look at the document and see how
13	we can slim it down. I don't see any other way to
14	produce this document in a timely fashion unless we
15	narrow the scope.
16	Commissioner Yaki?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I
18	OCRE
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I would
21	suggest that and I think this is the last thing I
22	want to say about what happened before. I mean, I
23	understand, you know, people do things and mistakes
24	can be made. I appreciate that. I'm not so

concerned about that. I think that the spirit of good will is still here.

Since the interrogatories have gone out that relate to Commissioner Braceras' motion, I would ask that table this until the April meeting and ask the director of OCRE to come back and recommend what aspects of the original proposal she believes could still be doable by the statutory deadline. I think I need that information before I am ready to proceed.

I would accept a proposal that had elements of both. I am not prepared to simply accept a substitute, which is really what is on the table instead. But I would appreciate it if the person who has to do the work but also knows the federal agency process can come back and say, "Well, these things we could do. And the other ones we might have to push off to another time."

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I second that. I like that very much. But I assume -- and I think this falls into a rhetorical question, but I assume that in the meantime, between now and April, you can continue to go full speed

1 ahead on this project to get as much work done as 2 possible. You're not being held up by this. 3 would not be held up by this motion, would you? 4 5 MS. DICKERSON: We have a team working on it full-time. And we have the interrogatories to 6 go through. I will say that it is significant to 7 8 I quess someone said three weeks, you know, 9 about having a definitive target of where we are 10 going since there is a full-time team working on it. 11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. But, I 12 mean, that's my concern. Is your work compromised significantly by accepting what I think is a very 13 14 good motion here or suggestion by Commissioner Yaki? 15 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am not ready to 16 have Commissioner Braceras' motion be 17 today, but I would be willing to state that for the 18 purposes of the work of the Commission -- and let me 19 I understand the realities under just say this. 20 which I operate. 21 So I think as a gesture of good faith, I 22 that she has think that to the extent 23 interrogatories that were promulgated that has data 24 that she must go through, she should be allowed to

1	continue on that pathway without any deal while she
2	looks in it to see what elements of the original
3	proposal she could still manage to do if she can in
4	the time period. At that point in April, then we
5	can vote up or down, but I would not want her to
6	stop any work on that.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I think the
9	staff director can have that discretion to do that,
10	rather than through a formal motion.
11	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And I suggest in
12	April, then, that I mean, I think that this
13	project will probably I mean, it will sift out to
14	be what is doable, that you will be able to get some
15	sense of that and that we be willing to go forward
16	with that so that we can fulfill our statutory
17	requirements and then in the next year look at doing
18	things
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So I would not
21	object if the staff director said she could continue
22	doing the work that she is doing.
23	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: But I think, I
24	mean, if we're going to approve this project, I

1	mean, I completely agree with Jennifer's motion if
2	it's an expansion.
3	But I don't think it's up to the staff
4	director to I mean, it's already been done. I
5	understand that. But changing the whole process,
6	why it wasn't approved by the
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Again, that was a
9	mistake. And I was involved in that mistake. I was
10	not aware that we had deviated from the project.
11	Now, after saying that, though, we need to come up
12	with a better plan for meeting our statutory
13	obligations. And I think that we have one.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. I mean, I
15	would just like to have a report in the end that
16	discusses some aspect of race-neutral alternatives.
17	And I'll leave it to Terri to tell us next month
18	what aspect of the race-neutral alternative side of
19	things she can bite off and do. And if that's part
20	of the project, then I'm happy with that.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair
22	Thernstrom?
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But I also
24	completely agree with Commissioners Yaki and Meeks

1	that we cannot this is not a substitute. This
2	has to be clearly an addition and that if this
3	report is to have integrity, the questions that were
4	originally posed and voted on by this Commission
5	have to be, at least some subsection of them, that
6	subsection which is doable, have to be part of this
7	report. And, therefore, you also have to feel, as
8	it were, that you own this report.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. That was
10	my intention.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, Terri, I'm
12	sorry for dropping this in your lap at this late
13	date, but this is where we find ourselves.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Good luck.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: May the force be
16	with you.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So there is
18	nothing to vote on here.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No.
20	VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Future agenda
22	items?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Why is the new guy
24	talking so much. Let me just say this

another month.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Give it

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I know. One of the things, during one of the breaks at the hearing yesterday, I was talking to the staff director about what is it that we could do that would not cost a lot of money but be very informative and important to the Commission.

One of the things that Commissioner Redenbaugh said is that we have no clear purpose. There is no clear purpose. And his solution, of course, was to detonate it and start all over again. Mine was to not do that. But I'm just wondering. I just throw this out for people to think about, and maybe we can discuss them next time.

I think in terms of how we think of the agenda in going forward that it would be I think very cost-effective to have a series of hearings here in Washington, D.C. that would basically be almost like an open mike for civil rights organizations of every ilk and stripe to come forth and give us five or ten minutes of what they believe are cutting-edge or interesting or new or neglected or what have you civil rights issues that they're

concerned about.

It would be just a way to -- I think it would be invigorating. I think it would be a positive sign of outreach by the Commission as a whole to every single organization in this country who could or would want to participate. I just throw it out there to think about.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, I think it's a great idea. I think that it gives us an opportunity. Well, one issue that I have been wrestling with is what does civil rights means in the Twenty-First Century.

There are different conceptions of what civil rights should be. And a lot of the friction, a lot of the disagreements among the different schools of thought flow from different first principles. And I think it would be healthy if we were to invite various groups in to articulate a particular vision. So I think it's a great idea.

Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I actually also think it's a great idea, but I would not want the people from whom we hear to be limited to the organized civil rights communities. There are also

1	scholars who work
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Exactly.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: as
4	individuals
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I agree.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: on civil
7	rights-related issues. And I would want to hear
8	from them as well.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: One of the concerns
10	that was brought up and as someone who used to
11	chair committees in San Francisco, I can truly
12	appreciate it is when people come up and, instead
13	of talking about you, start calling you names.
14	And my solution to that was that if you
15	were to do something on that, you were to put out an
16	order that they're at the first mention of an ad
17	hominem attack on any member of the Commission, you
18	will be removed. Your testimony will be stricken
19	from the record, and you will be barred. That's a
20	powerful chill on people going up and trying to make
21	a mockery out of the proceedings, just to let you
22	know.
23	I used to throw people out of committee

hearings all the time.

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, should
3	we entertain a motion to adjourn?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. I so
5	move.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
7	(Whereupon, at 1:06 p.m., the foregoing matter was
8	adjourned.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
j	II