U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

MEETING TELECONFERNCE

UNEDITED

Friday, July 22, 2005

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Commission convened by teleconference at 3:00 p.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairperson, presiding,

PRESENT:

GERALD A REYNOLDS, Chairperson

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairperson

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

NEAL R. GROSS

STAFF PRESENT:

TERESA BROOKS

MARGARET BUTLER

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director

PAMELA A DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and

Clearinghouse Division

SETH JAFFE

SOCK-FOON MACDOUGALL

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

ANNA MARIA ORTIZ

AUDREY WRIGHT

MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

LISA NEUDER

KIMBERLY SCHULD

. A-G-E-N-D-A

| KOII (| Jall | • | 4 |
|--------|---|----|-----|
| I. | Approval of Agenda | | 7 |
| II. | Approval of Minutes of | | |
| | June 17, 2005 Meeting | ١• | 10 |
| III. | Announcements | | 11 |
| IV | Motion to Alter Scope of OCRE Study | | 15 |
| v. | Motion on publication of Adarand report . | • | 31 |
| VI. | Motion on FY 2007 federal civil rights | | |
| | enforcement report | | 64 |
| VII. | Staff Director's Report | | 65 |
| VIII. | Motion to approve the OMB FY 2007 budget | | 7.5 |
| Adjou | rn | | |

| 1 | P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. This is |
| 3 | Chairman Reynolds. |
| 4 | This is a telephonic meeting with all |
| 5 | commissioners participating, and a meeting from |
| 6 | different locations. |
| 7 | I will call the name of each commissioner |
| 8 | in order to determine if there is a quorum to hold a |
| 9 | meeting. |
| 10 | Vice Chair Thernstrom. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I'm here. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 13 | Taylor. Commissioner Taylor. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm here. Can you |
| 15 | hear me? |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 19 | Braceras. |
| 20 | (No response.) |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 22 | Braceras? |
| 23 | (No response.) |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Ken Marcus, are you |
| 25 | - is Ken Marcus on the line? |
| | NEAL R. GROSS |

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

| 1 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, this is Ken |
|------------|---|
| 2 | Marcus. |
| 3 | OPERATOR: I apologize. I think we're |
| 4 | having a little bit of difficulty. Give me just a |
| 5 | moment, and you should be able to hear her. |
| 6 | There you go. You should have her on the |
| 7 | line now. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 9 | Braceras? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Thank you. |
| 12 | Commissioner Yaki. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Present. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 15 | Kirsanaw? |
| 16 | (No response.) |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 18 | Kirsanow? |
| 19 | (No response.) |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Last time, |
| 21 | Commissioner Kirsanow? |
| 2 2 | (No response.) |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, well, |
| 24 | Commissioner Kirsanow indicated that he would - that |
| 25 | he might be joining us later in the conversation. And |

| 1 | I do believe that that's the case. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Okay, the meeting will come to order. |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Mr. |
| 4 | Chairman, is someone going to keep trying to get him? |
| 5 | I'm obviously eager that he do join us. |
| 6 | How is this going to work? |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Ken, please have |
| 8 | someone continue to try to track down Commissioner |
| 9 | Kirsanow. |
| 10 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this |
| 11 | is Ken Marcus, and since we're on the phone, we'll |
| 12 | make an effort to identify ourselves when we speak. |
| 13 | We do have someone who is trying to get |
| 14 | Commissioner Kirsanow on the line. |
| 15 | I might ask, Mr. Chairman, if you also |
| 16 | verified that the court reporter is on the line? |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is the court |
| 18 | reporter on the line? |
| 19 | COURT REPORTER: Yes, we are on line. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 21 | Okay, whenever a commissioner wants to |
| 22 | make a statement, please identify yourself first by |
| 23 | name so that the transcriber can know who is talking. |
| 24 | And whenever it's necessary to take a |
| 25 | vote, the following procedure will be followed: I |
| | NEAL D. CDOSS |

will call out the names of each commissioner. The 1 commissioner should then answer yes, no, or abstain. 2 After the voting has concluded, I will 3 read out how each one of you has voted in order to 4 ensure that the tally is correct. 5 If we are unable to conclude the meeting 6 today, the meeting will be recessed and continued 7 until a date in August to be determined after proper 8 consultation with the commissioners. 9 I. Approval of Agenda 10 The first item on the agenda is the 11 approval of the agenda. 12 May I have a motion to approve the agenda? 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: So moved. 14 15 This is Abigail Thernstrom. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, Jennifer. 16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, do we 17 need a second before we discuss or no? 18 19 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras indicated that she wanted to rearrange the 20 21 order of the agenda. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I'd like to move that we move up this Adarand discussion so that 23 24 it immediately follows the announcement and goes 25 before the staff director's report.

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
|----|--|
| 2 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Commissioner |
| 3 | Braceras, are you willing to alter that slightly so |
| 4 | that both Adarand and the federal funding report be |
| 5 | discussed before the staff director's report? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, that's fine. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, is there a |
| 8 | second? Is there a second? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: This is Commissioner |
| 10 | Taylor. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, do you second |
| 12 | Jennifer's motion? |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I do. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, discussion? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, this is |
| 16 | Commissioner Yaki. |
| 17 | The purpose of it is what? |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Is to make |
| 19 | sure that everybody is on there. People are having to |
| 20 | drop off. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: The purpose as I |
| 22 | understand it is to make sure that these two important |
| 23 | items be discussed when as many commissioners are on |
| 24 | the line as possible. |
| 25 | Any additional comments? Okay, when I |
| | |

| 1 | call your name, please indicate how you vote. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Vice Chair Thernstrom. |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 5 | Taylor? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 8 | Braceras? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: And I also support |
| 13 | the motion. |
| 14 | The tally is as follows. There are |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow here. |
| 16 | Mr. Chairman? |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Oh, okay. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: What was the vote |
| 19 | about? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay, Jennifer |
| 21 | moved that we move the Adarand report and the federal |
| 22 | funding of civil rights report, that we move that |
| 23 | discussion right after the announcement and before the |
| 24 | staff director's report. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. |

NEAL R. GROSS

| 2 | |
|-----|--|
| | - you're supporting it? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. The tally is |
| 5 | six in the affirmative. |
| 6 | There are no votes against the motion, and |
| 7 | there are no abstentions. |
| 8 | So the motion is approved. |
| 9 | II. Approval of Minutes |
| 10 | Next up is the approval of the minutes of |
| 11 | the minutes of a June 17th, 2005, meeting. |
| 12 | May I have a motion to approve the minutes |
| 13 | of a June 17th meeting? |
| 14 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: So moved. |
| 15 | This is Commissioner Thernstrom. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is there a second? |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second by Commissioner |
| 18 | Yaki. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I'm sorry? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second by Commissioner |
| 21 | Yaki. |
| | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Any discussion? |
| 2.2 | |
| 22 | Okay, at that point, Vice Chair |
| | Okay, at that point, Vice Chair Thernstrom, how do you vote? |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
|----|---|
| 2 | Taylor? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Aye. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 5 | Braceras? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 10 | Kirsanow? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. And I also |
| 13 | vote in the affirmative. |
| 14 | Okay, six in favor, none against, no |
| 15 | abstentions. |
| 16 | III. Announcements |
| 17 | At this point I'd like to read some |
| 18 | announcements. |
| 19 | I'm saddened to announce that earlier this |
| 20 | month Arthur Abe Fletcher, a former chairman of this |
| 21 | commission, died: |
| 22 | Dr. Fletcher served in the Nixon |
| 23 | Administration as the Assistant Secretary of Wage and |
| 24 | Labor Standards. |
| 25 | He advised Presidents Ford, Reagan and |

George H.W. Bush.

Dr. Fletcher was an ardent spokesman for civil rights, especially in employment and contracting. In 1972, as executive director for the United Negro College Fund, he coined the now familiar phrase, quote, "a mind is a terrible thing to waste," close quote.

President George H.W. Bush appointed Dr. .

Fletcher to the commission in 1990, where he served until 1993 as chairman. At the time of his death he was an active teacher and speaker.

Dr. Fletcher will be missed.

The second item, I would like to announce that this month marks the 41st anniversary of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, a law that has helped dismantle a racial caste system that was in place for much of this nation's history.

The sweeping success of the act can be measured by how many of its major features are taken for granted today including voter registration requirements that are free of racial classifications; rules that prohibit racial discrimination in public accommodations; and rules against discrimination in employment on the base of race, national origin, sex or religion.

All commission staff and the members of 1 the commission should be proud as I am to serve on a 2 commission that helped to put this law on the books, 3 and continues to serve the stated goal of the act - to 4 regardless of race from protect all Americans 5 6 discriminatory conduct. 7 I would also like to announce that on July 25th, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed into law 8 the Americans with Disabilities Act. This law 9 individuals with disabilities from 10 discrimination in public accommodations, commercial 11 12 facilities, employment, transportation, and government services. • 13 14 By striving to ensure that no American is 15 denied access to employment, education or other vital 16 activities because of a disability, we strengthen our 17 nation. 18 On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil 19 Rights I applaud this goal. 20 At this point I would like to announce the 21 names of some of our new interns. On July 11th, 22 Christopher Anderson began an internship in the office 23 of the staff director. 24 Christopher is a third-year law student at 25 the University of Tulsa College of Law. Last summer,

Christopher interned in the House Majority Whip's 1 Office of Congressman Roy Blunt. 2 The Department of Employment Services, 3 Office of Youth Programs, office D.C.'s teenage youth 4 an opportunity to explore the working world. 5 summer the Commission is hosting five high school 6 students under the auspices of this program. 7 Ashley Menkins will serve in the Eastern 8 regional office. 9 Stefan Suber will work in the library. 10 And Talia Edwards will be in the budget 11 12 and finance division. And finally, Nicholas White will be in 13 14 OCRE. Okay, we have switched the - oh, I'm 15 sorry, I'm sorry, I left one individual out. Leonard 16 Harding will work in the administrative services and 17 clearinghouse division. 18 And I just wanted to remind everyone that 19 the order has changed. At this point we will be 20 hearing a discussion about the Adarand report. 21 And so at this point, Abbey, will you take 22 care of the motions? 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I will 24 Just let me get the first one here. 25

Mr. Chairman, we've got two-thirds of a 1 page here, I presume given the fact that this is a 2 phone meeting, I need to read it in its entirety. 3 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: That's correct. 4 IV. Motion to Alter Scope of OCRE Study 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: All right. 6 Well, this is a motion to alter the scope 7 of the OCRE Adarand enforcement study. And it reads: 8 project make the 9 In order to manageable, I move that the scope of the OCRE Adarand 10 study and its resulting proposed final report, Federal 11 12 Procurement After Adarand, focus on evaluating government compliance with the requirement in Adarand 13 that consider 14 agencies race-neutral Pena alternatives in their procurement activities. 15 16 In Adarand v. Pena the Supreme Court held 17 that when a government actor imposes any racial 18 classification, the classification must serve 19 compelling government interest and be narrowly tailored to further that interest. 20 21 Specifically under this proposed scope the 22 project would ask, one, whether agencies seriously 23 consider workable race-neutral alternatives in their 24 procurement activities as required by Adarand.

NEAL R. GROSS

Two, whether federal agencies sufficiently

and participate in practices promote such 1 as Mentor/Protégé programs, outreach, and financial and 2 technical assistance. 3 Three, let federal agencies employ and 4 disclose to each other the specific best practices for 5 consideration of race-neutral alternatives. 6 Four, how federal agencies measure the 7 federal effects of race-neutral programs on 8 9 contracting. And five, what mechanisms exist to ensure 10 federal contracting is not discriminatory? 11 12 Under this proposed scope, the project would not evaluate the existing disparity study, or 13 whether or which aspects of the federal contracting 14 process disparately affects minority-owned firms. 15 I understand that this would substantially 16 17 alter the scope that was approved during our May meeting on April 8th, 2005, and bring us closer to the 18 19 project that Commissioner Braceras suggested in your 20 motion on March 18th, 2005. We have now seen various draft reports 21 22 prepared to comply with different project scopes and concept papers. In general our attempts to cover too 23 24 much ground in too little time have not been 25 successful.

| i | 17 |
|------|--|
| 1 | The proposed final report, presented by |
| 2 | the staff director, complies with the scope that I am |
| 3 | asking the Commission adopt by this mission and is in |
| 4 | my view more successful than prior efforts. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is there a second? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner |
| 9 | Yaki. |
| 10 | I have some serious issues with this |
| 11 | proposed motion. First and obviously is the fact that |
| 12 ' | I'm trying to grapple with the fact that we are now |
| 13 | changing the scope of a project to fit the results |
| 14 | that came out of the project rather than trying to |
| 15 | adhere to the original scope of the project that was |
| 16 | approved. |
| 17 | I think a little history for those people |
| 18 | on the line would be useful. |
| 19 | In 2004, the Commission unanimously |
| 20 | approved for its 2005 statutorily mandated enforcement |
| 21 | report. Ten years after Adarand, the title was The |
| 22 | Effective Change of Federal Procurement Standards on |
| 23 | Women and Minority Owned Businesses. |
| 24 | There was some concern that in the |
| | |

aftermath of Adarand what impact did it have on some

of the federal programs that called for federal contracting and procurement with minority and disadvantaged businesses.

And then what happened is that in March of 2005, we found out that the scope had been changed. And we don't need to go over the history of how the scope had changed, but interrogatories were sent out different with project scope in mind. Coincidentally? I think not. The same project scope that we are approving here today. But what bothers me is that in April of 2005, on a motion by Commissioner Braceras, we did allow for the change in scope of the Adarand enforcement study to include information, quote, on federal agencies' use of residential contracting vehicles in addition to elements of the original project proposal.

The resulting study will, one, report the amount of federal procurement funds going to small, disadvantaged, and (hot zone 3;25:46) businesses.

Two, analyze continuing barriers facing socially and economically disadvantaged firms.

Three, examine the role of federal agencies including SBA in implementing procurement programs for these firms following the Supreme Court decision.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And finally, specifically, OCRE research 1 into how federal contracts or federal agencies change 2 procurement practices to fulfill the compelling 3 interest and narrow tailoring components of the 4 Adarand decision. 5 This was a motion brought by Commissioner 6 It was passed unanimously by us. At that 7 time we asked questions of the OCRE director who 8 9 indicated that this scope was achievable. And in fact 10 that scope was achieved in the very first draft of 11 this report. It is only through subsequent drafts when 12 entire sections have been eliminated that went toward 13 14 the original scope of this project that we come before us now with a considerably slimmed down report that is 15 16 now going to be changed to conform to what was 17 initially tried, without Commission consent, in February of 2005. 18 19 I object strenuously to the fact that we 20 are - that we are essentially reshaping the scope of 21 this project. 22 I think that in terms of what we have 23 represented to the public, and represented 24 Congress, this report does not track to that. It does 25 not include the data that was mentioned in the

original scope. 1 And I will talk more about the merits of 2 the report later, but I think that it is a disservice 3 to the public for us to attempt to simply change the 4 scope to fit - change the scope after the fact to fit 5 the conclusion that we're already foreseen in February 6 7 of 2003. I object strenuously to this motion, and 8 those are my views. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: May I speak 10 to that, Mr. Chairman? 11 Vice Chair CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes, 12 Thernstrom, please. 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Unless you 14 want to do so first. 15 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: You go firth. 16 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Look, 17 Commissioner Yaki, I'm sympathetic to what you're 18 I understand it. And it's not - I don't 19 20 dismiss it casually. But the fact is, I think you misconstrue 21 this history when you say that the scope was changed 22 in order for us - it was reshaped as it were for a 23 political agenda. 24

your

That

25

implication unless

I

misunderstood. 1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I never used the word, 2 political agenda. I simply said that it was changed 3 to fit the - I think - preordained conclusions. 4 That's not political. That has nothing to do with 5 political. 6 CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Okay, 7 VICE illogical or whatever. But it amounts to the same 8 9 thing it seems to me. And I think a more accurate telling of 10 this story is that once the entire report came to us, 11 12 in a draft I should say, the entire report came to us, it was the chapters that we eventually deleted were in 13 my view in such poor shape that given the time 14 constraints they could not be fixed. 15 And I guess there is a lesson here, that 16 17 we really need to define these topics in a more manageable way. 18 This turned out not to be a manageable 19 20 topic, and the draft very clearly indicated that. 21 But I think what was driving this was a 22 concern about quality, and not a concern about shaping 23 this to fit an agenda. I would have been delighted to have had 24 25 those chapters if I could have signed on to their

22 1 quality. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, with all due 2 Thernstrom, I appreciate respect, Commissioner 3 everything that you're saying. And certainly, I am 4 not impugning anyone's motives here. 5 But my concern, you brought up one of my 6 And that is, a decision was made to 7 concerns. eliminate sections from one of the drafts, a decision 8 by the way of which I was told after the fact. 9 There was no notational vote. There was 10 no telephone conference about that. It was simply -11 by fiat they were removed. I don't know how. 12 simply told they were gone. 13 No one enunciated the reason why. No one 14 told me what the purposes were for the elimination of 15 those chapters. 16 I was not afforded the opportunity to 17 confer with the staff director of the head of OCRE as 18 to what were the issues. So perhaps no argument could 19 be made as to why they would be put in, they were 20 simply gone, and they have been gone for quite a long 21

> So I respect what it is, you're trying to It's just that for me, this say, Commissioner. particular process did not go the way it is.

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

time.

22

23

24

| 1 | And I think that, you know, from reading |
|--|--|
| 2 | some of what you went through under a prior regime, |
| 3 | you would understand my frustration. |
| 4 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Does anybody |
| 5 | else want to speak to this? |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, this is |
| 7 | Commissioner Braceras. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner |
| 9 | Braceras. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I, too, want to |
| 11 | echo Vice Chair Thernstrom's comments that this was |
| 12 | done for reasons of quality, not ideology. |
| | |
| 13 | When I received the report, I felt that |
| 13 14 | When I received the report, I felt that the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a |
| | |
| 14 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a |
| 14 15 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time |
| 14 15 16 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would |
| 14 15 16 17 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would be able to turn them around in time to get a report to |
| 14 15 16 17 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would be able to turn them around in time to get a report to meet our statutory obligations in terms of submitting |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would be able to turn them around in time to get a report to meet our statutory obligations in terms of submitting a report by the end of the fiscal year. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would be able to turn them around in time to get a report to meet our statutory obligations in terms of submitting a report by the end of the fiscal year. So in my mind it came down to a question |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | the chapters that were ultimately removed needed a substantial amount of work. And given the time constraints, I realized that there was no way we would be able to turn them around in time to get a report to meet our statutory obligations in terms of submitting a report by the end of the fiscal year. So in my mind it came down to a question of not having a report that was able to garner |

So I do appreciate Commissioner Yaki's

24 I think, and the staff director can speak 1 to this more fully, the reason that the chapters were 2 omitted without any type of vote is that I believe the 3 staff director realized that in its original form it 4 didn't have the votes to pass, and therefore, the 5 edits were made by the staff, and in fact it garnered 6 7 majority support for the report. Some of the problems, just for the record, 8 that I found in the chapters that were ultimately 9 deleted were both problems of accuracy, as well as 10 problems that I thought were problems of tone and 11 Those chapters were filled with assumptions and 12 unsupported premises that I could not buy onto. 13

The data, the raw data that was contained in those reports, I'm happy to have that in the public domain. And indeed, if you would like to include them in a dissenting statement, Commissioner Yaki, I'd be happy to have the data in the public domain.

But I personally did not feel I could sign on to those chapters as they were written, including the assumptions and the premises that were in the narrative of those chapters.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: This is Chairman Reynolds. I just want to make two quick points.

The first is, when we agreed to try to

NEAL R. GROSS

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

accommodate both approaches, at the time we thought 1 that it was possible. 2 Once we got the first draft, maybe it 3 would have been possible if we'd had more time to 4 incorporate both approaches. 5 But looking at the amount of time we have 6 7 to complete our statutory report, and looking at the amount of work that would have been required, it just 8 9 wasn't possible. And finally, I just want to respond to the 10 statement that we changed it to - so in order to 11 12 guarantee a particular outcome - well, at the time we didn't have data. At the time we didn't know what the 13 14 agencies were going to provide us in terms of the response to the interrogatories that eventually went 15 16 out. 17 So I guess those are my two points. 18 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this 19 is Staff Director Marcus. 20 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. 21 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: By way of context 22 I'd like to point out that this report is 23 statutory enforcement report. That means it is the 24 one report which we are statutorily required to not 25 only produce but to approve and to publish and distribute to Congress and the White House by the end
of the fiscal year.

While efforts were made to produce a
report that complied with the scope approved in the
spring, it became clear from the commissioners
comments that that report would not garner a majority

Now the commissioners recall that distributing this draft was essentially a new process

. We were trying to get as much input from extent than the Commission has done in the past.

of the votes, if indeed it would garner any votes at

When we distributed an early version that complied with the former scope, no commissioner expressed that they appreciated the scope or thought that it was successful, and several commissioners indicated that they intended to dissent.

In fact, there were so many commissioners indicating that they intended to dissent that it became clear that if we continued to pursue the previously approved scope we would not have a report by the end of the fiscal year that would garner a majority of the votes.

I did speak with a number of commissioners

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

all.

to explain to them the input that I was getting from 1 the Commission. 2 personally instance I called For 3 Commissioner Yaki to let him know that I had been 4 hearing concerns from other commissioners including in 5 particular about Chapter 2. 6 might also mention concerns 7 about Chapter 3. 8 And I indicated that there might have to 9 be cuts or other changes. 10 That was unusual in that that sort of 11 information, input, hadn't been made in the past. But 12 13 I thought it would be useful for people to know that. Through a process of communicating with 14 15 various commissioners on both parties, we were able to 16 determine that altering the scope of the report would enable us to get to the point at which there were at 17 18 least several commissioners who would be comfortable 19 with the direction in which we were going. 20 And that is how we got to the version that 21 we're looking at today. 22 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chairman, this 23 is Commissioner Kirsanow. 24 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes, Commissioner 25 Kirsanaw.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I want to echo what the staff director articulated when asked how he got to this particular pass.

We frankly didn't have much choice or much recourse. And I think that all of the appropriate due process measures were taken into account in making sure that we crafted the best possible report given the constraints that we obviously faced.

I think we were at a point - and again,

I'm repeating what the staff director said - but I

think we were at a point where the time constraints

would dictate that we would either violate our

statutory obligation to issue a statutory report or

because we wouldn't have the consensus of

commissioners necessary and we wouldn't be issuing a

statutory report, or we'd be issuing a fundamentally

flawed report.

I appreciate what Commissioner Yaki had to say with respect to experience in a prior composition of the Commission.

I will say that despite the fact that we're under enormous time constraints, and despite the fact that we've had to edit certain portions of the report, and this report went through various iterations, and I think the staff did a remarkable job

trying to accommodate the wishes or needs 1 pertaining to this particular report. 2 In spite of that, this particular process 3 was preferable and was better than the process we've 4 seen in previous reports when reports would be 5 presented to us as a fait accompli without any kind of 6 7, comment on the part of commissioners. And in fact, despite the fact that this 81 particular report has a sense of having - where 9 sausage is being made, you don't want to see it done 10 - it was nonetheless superior in the process to 11 12 previous reports where we didn't have any kind of heads up, and there wasn't as much input, and there 13 wasn't as much commissioner involvement. 14 15 So I think this will be avoided in the because we won't have the similar time 16 17 constraints. Was this a perfect process? Probably not. But it was still superior to processes that I've 18 19 been involved with - actually, haven't been involved 20 with, have observed at the Commission in my three 21 years. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is 23 Commissioner Braceras. 24 I'm just wondering if we could move the

NEAL R. GROSS

discussion along to the substance and call the

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

| 1 | question, because I'm going to need to get off the |
|----|--|
| 2 | phone soon. |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I do call |
| 4 | the question. I do, but before I do so just want to |
| 5 | underscore the fact that I think this is really going |
| 6 | to be a unique experience in that it was driven by the |
| 7 | time constraints here. |
| 8 | But I call the question. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, at this |
| 10 | point, Vice Chair Thernstrom, how do you vote? |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Aye. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Ashley |
| 13 | - I'm sorry, Commissioner Taylor. |
| 14 | (No response.) |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 16 | Taylor. |
| 17 | (No response.) |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 19 | Braceras. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 24 | Kirsanaw. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Abstain. |
| | NEAL R. GROSS |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I'm sorry? |
|------|---|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Abstain. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, and I vote in |
| 4 | favor of the change. |
| 5 | Staff Director Marcus, please have someone |
| 6 | try to contact Mr. Taylor. |
| ,7 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We'd be pleased to |
| 8 | do that, Mr. Chairman. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, this is how |
| 10 | it shakes out. |
| 11 . | Commissioners Thernstrom, Braceras, and |
| 12 | Reynolds voted in favor; Commissioner Yaki voted |
| 13 | against; and Commissioner Kirsanow abstained. |
| 14 | The motion passes. |
| 15 | Commissioner Thernstrom, please read the |
| 16 | next motion. |
| 17 | V. Motion on Publication of Adarand Report |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: The next |
| 19 | motion is approval of federal procurement after |
| 20 | Adarand for publication, very simple. |
| 21 | Simply reads, I move that the Commission |
| 22 | approve |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 24 | Thernstrom, we voted just now to alter the scope. Now |
| 25 | we have to vote to approve the publication of the |

| 1 | Adarand report. |
|----|--|
| 2 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: That is what |
| 3 | I'm doing. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Oh, okay. Sorry. |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: That's how |
| 6 | it reads. |
| 7 | I'm simply reading the motion as written. |
| 8 | I move the Commission approve the proposed |
| 9 | - we have done that already - for publication as our |
| 10 | statutory enforcement report for FY 2005 in the form |
| 11 | presented by the staff director. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, I'm with you |
| 13 | now. Sorry about that. |
| 14 | Is there a second? |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? |
| 17 | Okay, Vice Chair Thernstrom, how do you |
| 18 | vote? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Aye. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 21 | Taylor? |
| 22 | (No response.) |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, Commissioner |
| 24 | Braceras? |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye. |
| | NEAL R. GROSS |

| 1 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait, wait wait. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Point of information. |
| 3 | This is the motion to approve the report, |
| 4 | right? |
| 5 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: No, it's a |
| 6 | motion simply to put it up for publication, to post |
| 7 | it. And it's just badly worded, frankly. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It is my |
| 9 | understanding that it is a motion to approve the |
| 10 | proposed final report. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: For |
| 12 | publication. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, but it's to |
| 15 | approve the report, which therefore, I would want |
| 16 | discussion on. |
| 17 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this |
| 18 | is Staff Director Marcus. |
| 19 | It would be appropriate at this time if |
| 20 | there were a motion to approve the report not only for |
| 21 | publication but for all purposes, and to consider this |
| 22 | to be an approved report. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is |
| 25 | Commissioner Braceras. |

| 1 | I just think there was some confusion. I |
|----|--|
| 2 | believe that called for a discussion, and no one said |
| 3 | anything. And we've happy to have a discussion. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: That is correct. |
| 5 | But Commissioner Yaki expressed his desire to have |
| 6 | some discussion. |
| 7 | So at this point, Commissioner Yaki, |
| 8 | please start the discussion. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a couple of |
| 10 | points of information first on this motion. |
| 11 | Is this the - are we voting on the draft |
| 12 | that we just received this morning with the last |
| 13 | changes of the red line version? |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I'm not exactly |
| 15 | sure which version you're talking about. But yes, we |
| 16 | are voting to approve |
| 17 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Not for release |
| 18 | 7/22/05 redline version, Mr. Staff Director, is that |
| 19 | what we're voting on? |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I suspect that |
| 21 | there have been some amendments to that document. I |
| 22 | know that I faxed some documents to the staff |
| 23 | director, which were distributed to the commissioners. |
| 24 | And I don't know if other folks have made |
| 25 | edits to that red line version. |

1 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I just - one of
2 the reasons why I have an issue with the process, and
3 I appreciate the fact that it is - at least from
4 reports I have been receiving - light years ahead of

what used to be the process.

But I am just coming from my own point of view, which was, as a former elected official and former congressional staffer who had to respect process and transparency as much as possible, my concern is that now I am being asked to vote, this is a matter of principle, because I definitely am not going to be voting to support this project.

But as a matter of principle and transparency, how can we be voting on a final version if the last version that I received on this was sent, let's see, at 10:35 a.m. your time, if there are versions or red lines subsequent to 10:35 a.m. our time, I believe that all the commissioners should be entitled to see it.

This also goes to the point that I raised in correspondence earlier in the week, and that is, for the public who is listening in, notwithstanding the fact that they don't have access to the report to even look at or follow along to understand what the heck we're talking about, even if they did, it would

be compounded by the fact that apparently changes are 1 made up to the very last minute, if there have been 2 anything since past 10:35 a.m., I may be unaware of 3 it, and other commissioners may be unaware of it. 4 And I think for a transparency issue, 5 there is a significant issue. So I pose as a point of 6 7 information, not to speak on the main motion yet, but as a point of information, is what we're voting on the 8 9 10:35 or 10:19 a.m. draft, or a subsequent draft with 10 subsequent revisions? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It is the red line 11 12 version that was sent this morning, plus my handful of I believe faxed to that were all 13 edits commissioners. 14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I did not receive a 15 16 fax. 17 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hear the staff director on this. 18 19 I think that Commissioner Yaki brings up a serious 20 issue here, I'm afraid to say. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this 21 22 is Staff Director Marcus. 23 The only proposed changes that we have 24 received from any commissioner since the red line 25 version was distributed this morning were the proposed

changes from Chairman Reynolds.

It is my understanding that those proposed changes were faxed to all commissioners earlier today. Since I've just heard that Commissioner Yaki doesn't believe that he's received the chairman's recent proposed changes, we'll confirm to make sure that they are faxed around.

Just as a reminder to the commissioners, the only changes that were in the red line version this morning as compared to the version distributed a week ago consisted of comments received from the Small Business Administration as an affected agency, or comments suggested by an expert, Dr. George LaNoue, who we retained to review the proposed final draft for quality purposes.

The current draft has not been changed to incorporate the chairman's proposed changes that were just received and distributed earlier today.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So while we figuring if those changes were sent, what should we do?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me, this is Jennifer Braceras again.

I have previously informed the staff director that I would need to get off the call at 4:00 o'clock, and it is now approaching 4:00 o'clock.

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | I apologize for that. I do have a family |
|----|--|
| 2 | situation that I need to attend to. So in light of |
| 3 | Commissioner Yaki's concern and my need to depart, I |
| 4 | would just ask the chairman what he thinks is the best |
| 5 | course of action. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, Commissioner |
| 7 | Yaki, if we were to discuss my changes right now, |
| 8 | would that be sufficient? |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that would be |
| 10 | sufficient. I still reserve the right to comment on |
| 11 | the entire report, though, which I have not had the |
| 12 | opportunity to do. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Sure. |
| 14 | Okay, if that is the case then, I will |
| 15 | just discuss my changes. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me, Mr. |
| 17 | Chairman. |
| 18 | Given that Commissioner Yaki has a number |
| L9 | of comments I think that he wants to make on the |
| 20 | substance of the draft, it does not look like I will |
| 21 | be able to be on the line for the vote on this report. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I understand. |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I want to |
| 24 | apologize to the other commissioners, and I want to |
| 25 | apologize to the public, but I have a family |

| 1 | obligation I need to attend to. I was hoping we could |
|----|--|
| 2 | have voted on this report and wrapped it up before |
| 3 | 4:00 o'clock. |
| 4 | But if that's not going to be able to |
| 5 | happen, I'm going to hang up at this time. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Before I do, |
| 8 | though, I'd just like to say for the record that I do |
| 9 | support the report in its latest draft. |
| 10 | As I said, I had many concerns with it at |
| 11 | the beginning. But I think that in its current form |
| 12 | it is a high quality work product of which we can be |
| 13 | proud, and I look forward to seeing Commissioner |
| 14 | Yaki's dissenting statement, because I do encourage a |
| 15 | robust debate on this and every other issue upon which |
| 16 | this Commission will decide. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So thanks, and |
| 19 | have a good weekend. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, Michael, |
| 21 | would you like to discuss your concerns, or my edits |
| 22 | first? |
| 23 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Your edits first. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, just turning |
| 25 | to Chapter 3, Findings and Recommendations. The |

second paragraph, first sentence, it reads, prior to 1 my edit it reads: Ten years ago in the landmark case 2 of Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, the Supreme 3 Court held that programs that use racial criteria must 4 be subject - well, I deleted criteria and inserted 5 classifications. 6 And the footnotes, footnote number three 7 is, it says Adarand at page 239, I believe that's 8 wrong, I believe it's 237 and 238. 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Do you carry Adarand 10 around in your back pocket? 11 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: It's near and dear 12 13 It's always close. 14 Now going to page two of Chapter 3, the third full paragraph, last sentence, it reads: Lack 15 of data collection rendered impossible the efforts 16 this study made to measure the effectiveness of race 17 18 neutral and race conscious programs independently. In general, agencies do not seriously 19 consider whether new race-neutral initiatives could 20 21 provide adequate alternatives to current programs. 22 changed that to current race-conscious programs. 23 The following paragraph, the sentence that I changed reads, effective race-neutral procurement 24 2.5 systems would include elements that ensure equal

I changed that to ensure access on a access, comma. 1 nondiscriminatory basis. 2 Page three of Chapter 3, fourth paragraph 3 from the top, the sentence I changed reads: an 4 integrated race-neutral approach would ensure focused 5 reliance on race-conscious programs. 6 I changed that to, an integrated race-7 neutral approach would ensure less reliance on race-8 conscious programs. I believe that is just a typo. 9 Flipping to page four of Chapter 3, the 10 third paragraph, it reads, DOJ and SBA should without 11 delay facilitate agency development and implementation 12 of prominent civil rights enforcement policy. 13 I deleted the word, prominent. 14 The next sentence reads, agencies must 15 16 establish strong enforcement systems to provide a means for victims of discrimination to file and 17 resolve complaints. 18 19 I changed that to, agencies must establish 20 strong enforcement systems to provide individuals a 21 means to file and resolve complaints of discriminatory 22 conduct. 23 That same paragraph, last sentence, it 24 reads: Doing so will help ensure that potential 25 contractors and subcontractors have equal opportunity

to compete for federal funds. 1 I changed it to: Doing so will help 2 ensure that potential contractors and subcontractors 3 have an opportunity to compete for federal funds 4 without fear of discrimination. 5 Now I'm on page five of Chapter 3, looking 6 at the last sentence, which reads: Agencies have not 7 established procedures to re-assess presumptions of 8 9 disadvantage and instead generally rely on Congress to decide what programs are permissible. 10 I changed it to read, Agencies have not 11 12 established procedures to re-assess presumptions of 13 disadvantage, period. Finally, turning to of 14 page eight 15 paragraph - I'm sorry, of Chapter 3, the last sentence of the conclusion that reads: To achieve that goal 16 17 federal agencies should demonstrate sincere efforts to equalize outcomes through race-neutral procedures. 18 I changed it to read, to achieve that goal 19 federal agencies should demonstrate sincere efforts to 20 21 expand minority-owned firms' access to federal 22 contracts through race-neutral procedures. 23 Those are all of my edits. 24 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have another point 25 of information for the staff director.

Staff Director Marcus, are you there? 1 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, I am 2 here, this is Staff Director Marcus. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: In the last set of 4 documents there is reference to the fact that we have, 5 or the Commission had retained George LaNoue as a 6 7 technical expert. For what reason was he retained, and how 8 was that done? 9 10 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Commissioner Yaki, 11 he was retained in order to review the proposed final 12 document, and to provide us quality assurance to review the technical aspects of the document and let 13 us know whether there were flaws that he saw, and 14 provide comments to us about whether there were 15 16 problems with the document. 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: And how 18 retained? Was this a no-bid at the suggestion of 19 somebody, or how did that come about? 20 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: This was at my 21 direction, I believe the term is a micro purchase. 22 is well below the dollar requirement on competitive 23 bidding. He was hired based on his reputation for 24 experience in the area of federal procurement and on 25 issues relating to Adarand v. Pena. Because the

amount at issue was well below - I believe the amount is \$2,500 - because it was well below that amount, this process did not require competitive bidding. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes? COMMISSIONER YAKI: May I speak to the main motion, then?

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair, just to follow up from what the staff director said, I am disturbed that a technical expert who has written extensively on the need to abolish all use of race in public contracting was brought in to determine the sufficiency of our report.

And indeed, if I believe — if some of those last-minute changes that I saw in the draft were attributable to him, I would say that they seem to be in violation of the proposed altered scope that we just approved, that the majority just approved, in which it said that the project would not evaluate existing disparity studies, or whether or which aspect of the federal contracting process disparately affects minority-owned firms since in Chapter 1 a new sentence has been added that basically questions the disparity studies and the benchmark studies done by the

Department of Commerce, and recommends the National Academy of Sciences to conduct one, which Mr. LaNoue has published in before.

That to me sets the tone and the framework for my concerns about this report. I was supportive of the original report, because I believe that the data we would receive, and certainly the - everyone brings their own experiences to this. I - when I was a member of the Board of Supervisors in San Francisco, I helped author and shepherd through our MBE/WBE contracting program through, which has survived legal challenges. We did disparity studies. We collected anecdotal evidence.

What I see here today in this reconstituted study is a step backwards from what we have been doing for the last half century as a commission and as a nation. And under the cloak of the term, race neutrality, this report I believe seeks the termination of all race-conscious programs and remedies from federal contracting and procurement.

I have a problem with that, given that in our hearing last week both Dr. Besherov and Harry Holzer said, from the left and from the right, or from the conservative and the liberal point of view, that discrimination persists in our society; that it has

not gone away.

And I believe that the challenge of the Commission has been, and always should be, to engage in fact finding, in figuring out ways how best to combat invidious discrete intention discrimination in our country.

And I believe that this has been our challenge. And with this report today we failed in that challenge.

It is so ironic that when we mentioned today in the beginning, that in the announcements about Dr. Arthur Fletcher, who was called the father of affirmative action, who helped put together the revised Philadelphia plan, that withstood court challenge, that did goals and timetables and created racial categories; that today is the anniversary of the 64 Civil Rights Act; that at this time, we would present a report that basically tells the federal government to put a halt to race-conscious programs, and to instead engage in a race-neutral analysis that I think actually has no foundation in the cases that are cited in the report.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, this is Chairman Reynolds. I have a different read of the report. I must say that my view is radically

different from yours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I believe that the theme that you object notion that the that there is an is interpretation through the document of Adarand that the document states that Adarand stands for the proposition that you must consider race-neutral alternatives; that that is a part of the process; that is what judges must look to to determine the of racial constitutionality the of use classifications.

Now that is my read of not just Adarand but Paradise and a long line of other cases that discuss this notion of race neutrality - I'm sorry, race-neutral alternatives.

And by citing George LaNoue's work, George LaNoue's did not make many edits of the document. So his personal views on the legality or appropriateness of the use of racial classifications, that's one thing. But in this document, the few comments that he made did not address that particular issue.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I was about to address that.

CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And yes, I have read, and I understand - I may not have it in my back

NEAL R. GROSS

pocket, the Adarand decision, but I believe that the report, as it is drafted, seriously misconstrues what the mandate of Adarand is.

The report for example page - Chapter 1,

I believe it's still page 17, it may have changed
states that Adarand requires the agency to consider an

employee race-neutral strategy before resorting to a

race-conscious one.

That is simply a reading of Adarand that does not exist in the text. To the contrary, when you read Adarand, you see that Justice O'Connor wrote that when race-based action is necessary to further a compelling interest, such action is within constitutional constraints if it satisfies the narrow tailoring test.

I don't - I do not believe that we can simply take and lift examples, for example, let me just go to the methodology, I do not think that we can simply lift for example what the Department of Education does in applying Grutter, which is not - which is not a contract discrimination case, but has to do with law school admissions - or university admission - and apply that to the complexities of federal procurement and contracting, especially when the Department of Education in a relative scale is not

.13

a large player in the contracting arena.

Yet the majority report seems to indicate, seems to lift verbatim, Department of Education policies that I believe have no - that A, I think take an absurd reading of Grutter, must narrower than I think anyone could reasonably interpret it, and then from there, apply it to the instances of contracting.

I don't believe - I think that is flawed from the beginning, and because of that flaw, I think that this report is fatally flawed.

I mean they talk about the six practices, and if that's a talisman for determining whether federal agencies meet or engage on the serious consideration test. And you know, when I objected to the removal of the two chapters that had data in it, I did not see much data put back in to it from other sources, much less whether or not anything that DOED has done has resulted in any actual data collection that would show that those six practices have any application in the real world, much less application to multi-year, multi-employer, multi-contract procurements that DOT or DOD do.

It's one thing to talk about university admissions on a yearly scale done by individual universities, than it is to say, we're going to

analyze what procurement was on the big dig, multi-1 year, multi-year funding, several levels of contractor 2 levels. 3 I just don't think it's as easy as the 4 majority would have it say. 5 And when it comes right down to it, I 6 think that the fact that we have omitted substantial 7 amounts of data from this report, data that suggests 8 that African-American businesses, for example, lag 9 substantially well behind all others in terms of 10 of of growth, in terms in terms 11 revenue, survivability, those are issues that I think the 12 Commission needs to address. 13 But by eliminating that data, it's as if 14 Instead, we're talking about it's never there. 15 application of criteria that is theoretical only, and 16 criticizing the Clinton post-Adarand reforms, which 17 the majority says, well, the agencies haven't followed 18 19 them. Well, that may be true. It may be true. 20 But is a necessary example then to say, let's junk it 21 and start all over? Or, let's figure out how better 22 to ensure that agencies are following the DOJ post-23 Adarand instructions of 1996? 24

VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM:

25

Can I jump

in here?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want - these

are just - this is just -
VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I didn't

realize you weren't finished; I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is just touching the surface of what I think are serious substantive flaws in how this report is produced; the methodology upon which it relies; the legal theories upon which it stands; and why I cannot in any way, shape or form subscribe to it.

I appreciate that we are going to differ on this, and I'm not saying that I am right and you are wrong, or you are right and I am wrong. What I am saying though is, I think from my own point of view, there are serious methodological and legal - legal underpinnings of this that are fundamentally flawed and I think lead to the wrong conclusions.

And finally, I fail to see how this is a civil rights enforcement report. We are talking about - to me an enforcement report, and maybe this is just my point of view - is one that says, how can we do better to ensure - to ensure the promotion of economic opportunity to end racial discrimination, what have you?

| 1 | And while that may be the intent of the |
|----|--|
| 2 | report, as written, I think the practical application |
| 3 | of the report, especially in its recommendation of an |
| 4 | acting nondiscrimination legislation for contracting |
| 5 | would have the absolute contrary result. Because all |
| б | that will do is create a private right of action for |
| 7 | people who feel that there should be no race-conscious |
| 8 | programs in SBA, in DOG, in DOD. They should have a |
| 9 | prior right of action to kill it. |
| 10 | I do not think - I would not think that's |
| 11 | what the majority intended. But that to me is the |
| 12 | natural result of nondiscrimination legislation |
| 13 | specifically on federal procurement. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki, |
| 15 | this is Commissioner Reynolds. |
| 16 | You've made some points there that I think |
| 17 | are good, and I look forward to reading your dissent. |
| 18 | But I guess I just want to go back to the |
| 19 | constitutional question. |
| 20 | Is it your position that the Constitution |
| 21 | does not require federal agencies to use race-neutral |
| 22 | approaches when they are available and just as |
| 23 | effective as race-conscious approaches? |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that what the |
| 25 | Constitution says, as interpreted by the Supreme |

| 1 | Court, is that the government agencies must give |
|----|--|
| 2 | serious consideration to the use of workable race- |
| 3 | neutral alternatives. However, it does not require |
| 4 | exhaustion of every alternative that could be there, |
| 5 | and it does not certainly not accommodate for what has |
| 6 | been certainly Supreme Court at least dicta in three |
| 7 | or four different cases, which is the relevant |
| 8 | differences between individual programs. |
| 9 | I just don't see this - I don't see a |
| LO | cookie cutter working on this. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well |
| L2 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: What we've created is |
| 13 | a cookie cutter |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Do you believe that |
| 15 | the report requires an exhaustion of race neutral |
| 16 | remedies before race conscious remedies could be used? |
| L7 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that the word, |
| L8 | exhaustion, may not be used. But I would certainly |
| L9 | say that the six practices that are enunciated, put |
| 20 | together a process that is unwieldy, cumbersome, and |
| 21 | in the end destructive to the ability of many of these |
| 22 | agencies, particularly the SBA, to continue its |
| 23 | mission and fulfill its statutory mandate. |
| 24 | And it may be that this report is very |
| 25 | careful not to say, we have to exhaust everything. |

because they know that it can't stand under the Adarand or the Grutter test. And by the way, I still wonder how you're going to apply education standards to contracting.

But nevertheless, the standards put forth, the kind of burdens that agencies must assume, the mere fact that it said rather blithely that you could do it by annual review of your programs because the Department of Education says you can, well, that might be okay for Harvard University. I doubt it's okay or workable for DOD or DOT.

And yet it's said as if it's easy to do.

So I think that is there any complete erroneous reading? Well, I do think that there is some erroneous reading of Adarand and Grutter in this.

But I also believe that the procedures, the recommendations that have been put forth create such a burden for federal agencies who are working, one, with statutory mandates like Congress to fulfill; two, have been working with - who have experience in their own measure. And may I - and I might add that the report continually rips the Department of Transportation as being - well, they tried, but they are only partially successful. Yet DOT has survived, at least so far, a challenge all the way up to the

Supreme Court once, and many of the other DBE programs 1 have survived facial challenges in other circuits as 2 well. 3 So to say that they're somehow doing it 4 wrong when the Supreme Court didn't see a reason to 5 call it up and knock it out is just going a step too 6 7 far. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Now, did the court 8 take up the case, or did it just deny cert? 9 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Denied cert, but it 10 let stand a lower court ruling. And other circuits 11 have let - have allowed - have disallowed facial 12 challenges on DBE programs post- Adarand. 13 14 So maybe John Roberts might change all But the fact is that I think that this report 15 that. 16 takes Adarand and Grutter, and takes part of them, and then puts the threshold bar so high that 17 inconceivable that federal agencies are going to be 18 19 able to meet it without a massive reallocation of resources that should go toward ensuring that they're 20 21 doing what they can to promote equal opportunity and 22 economic opportunity in procurement and contracting. 23 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner 24 Thernstrom, you were about to say something? 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Yeah. All

of this, much of what Commissioner Yaki has to say 1 can't be dismissed; let's put it that way. 2 The whole problem here, we're back to the 3 problem of this report being the time constraint that 4 we were under. And I don't think, or I hope not - I 5 hope - that with respect to the Adarand decision 6 specifically that no one would disagree that all that 7 decision said was that federal racial classifications 8 have to serve a compelling government interest and be 9 narrowly tailored. 10 Okay, it was remanded to determine whether 11 that test had been met. Adarand itself, as I remember 12 it, did not go beyond that. 13 14 So as Commissioner Yaki suggests, we are cobbling together here Clozen (phonetic) and other 15 16 decisions. I would like a really good report. I do 17 not know how, on a really careful report, I don't know 18 19 how to do that. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: This is Chairman 20 Reynolds. We don't have time to produce the type of 21 report that I would like. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Yeah, well, 23 24 that's what I was about to say. 25 REYNOLDS: Yes, and CHAIRPERSON

| 1 | Commissioner Yakı raises some good points. I think |
|----|--|
| 2 | that his points on what Adarand means, I think that he |
| 3 | made some legitimate points. Whether it's appropriate |
| 4 | now, after Adarand, to look at Crozen and Paradise and |
| 5 | other cases, interpreting what strict scrutiny means, |
| 6 | whether that is appropriate or not. |
| 7 | I would like to have a fully fleshed out |
| 8 | conversation about that issue and many others. But I |
| 9 | don't have time. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Let me make |
| 11 | a suggestion here if I may, which is, that we at least |
| 12 | hold a briefing on this whole issue such that we can |
| 13 | further explore with more care and nuance the |
| 14 | complexities that Commissioner Yaki rightfully pointed |
| 15 | to. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, I agree, I |
| 17 | think that that would be a great idea. |
| 18 | That doesn't relieve us of what we have to |
| 19 | do here today, which is to vote up or down. |
| 20 | Are there any other comments from other |
| 21 | commissioners? |
| 22 | (No response.) |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. I take that |
| 24 | as a no. |
| 25 | So at this point then I would like to call |

| 1 | a vote. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Commissioner Thernstrom? |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Well, I will |
| 4 | vote aye on it because of the time constraints. But |
| 5 | I very much appreciate what Commissioner Yaki has |
| 6 | said. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 8 | Taylor. |
| 9 | COMMIȘSIONER TAYLOR: This is Commissioner |
| 10 | Taylor. I am going to vote aye and the debate that - |
| 11 | I apologize for the background noise. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Are you ordering |
| 13 | lunch? |
| 14 | . COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, I'm traveling |
| 15 | with my family, so I apologize. But I wanted to make |
| 16 | one brief comment. Because I do think it's important |
| 17 | that we discuss the issues raised by Commissioner |
| 18 | Yaki. |
| 19 | But I will tell you, I feel very |
| 20 | comfortable, given our time constraints. If we are |
| 21 | viewed as setting the bar very high relative to (audio |
| 22 | cuts out 4:20:10) federal agencies seriously |
| 23 | considering race-neutral targets in 2005, I feel very |
| 24 | comfortable with that position. |
| 25 | And I think it is too easy for a |

| 1 | governmental agency - too difficult. It requires us |
|----|---|
| 2 | to re-shift our resources to accomplish that task. |
| 3 | It would be much easier if we could simply |
| 4 | establish racial categories. |
| 5 | So I have no problem particularly given |
| 6 | our time constraints with standing behind this report |
| 7 | in its current form for that reason. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 9 | Commissioner Yaki, shall I mark you down |
| 10 | for a no? |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 13 | Kirsanow? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, Mr. |
| 15 | Chairman. I would like to echo what Commissioner |
| 16 | Taylor had to say. But toward a very narrow point, I |
| 17 | do think that when it comes to race-neutral |
| 18 | alternatives, there is a little bit of gamesmanship, |
| 19 | it strikes me. |
| 20 | And I'm not sure that those alternatives |
| 21 | are adequately explored. |
| 22 | Having said that, for reasons other than |
| 23 | the commentary I just made, I'm going to abstain. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, and I vote in |
| 25 | favor of it. |

| 'n | So what we have is we have three votes |
|----|--|
| 2 | from Commissioner Thernstrom, Taylor and the Chairman |
| 3 | in favor. |
| 4 | One abstention, and one no vote. |
| 5 | So the motion carries. |
| 6 | At this point Vice Chair Thernstrom, would |
| 7 | you please read the next motion. |
| 8 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: The next |
| 9 | motion involves approving the funding of federal civil |
| 10 | rights enforcement report. |
| 11 | And I move that the Commission approve the |
| 12 | proposed final report funding the federal civil rights |
| 13 | enforcement, the president's 2006 request, for |
| 14 | publication in the form presented by the staff |
| 15 | director. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki, |
| 17 | second. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, discussion. |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki |
| 20 | here. |
| 21 | I would just like to say, to follow up on |
| 22 | comments that I made at the last meeting, I think this |
| 23 | is a very valuable report. It is one of the few means |
| 24 | of collating data from all the federal agencies with |
| 25 | regard to their civil rights enforcement budgets and |

| 1 | activities that can be made available to the public |
|----|--|
| 2 | for review. |
| 3 | I would hope that we would consider doing |
| 4 | this, as it has been a practice every year, and urge |
| 5 | its passage. |
| 6 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I have a |
| 7 | point of order here. |
| 8 | I have made the motion because you have |
| 9 | asked me to make this series of motions. In fact I'm |
| 10 | going to abstain on this, and I wonder if I was the |
| 11 | appropriate person to make the motion given the fact |
| 12 | that I'm going to abstain. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I don't see a |
| 14 | problem. |
| 15 | Staff Director Marcus, does that pose a |
| 16 | problem? |
| 17 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, I |
| 18 | see no problems in the rules. I might defer to our |
| 19 | parliamentarian, on Roy, to advise as to whether there |
| 20 | is any parliamentary problem would arise in the event |
| 21 | that the commissioner who advances a motion then |
| 22 | abstains on the vote. |
| 23 | I don't know if the court reporter was |
| 24 | able to hear that? |
| 25 | MS. MORNING: As far s I can tell, there |

is no problem. 1 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, any other 2 3 comments? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I just 4 want to say, I think I made this comment last time 5 around, a comment that I believe was consistent that 6 something that Commissioner Yaki - I just want to 7 commend the staff on this particular report. 8 One of the things that we always I think 9 in mind is, we've got a number of 10 must keep commissioners, we have a number of different points of 11 view on this particular commission. 12 The topics we address, the topics we 13 attempt to tackle, are sometimes enormous, very 14 important topics, topics that are likely to cause a 15 great amount of friction and disagreement. 16 And we leave it to staff to try to come up 17 with the data, collate the information that goes into 18 these reports. And it's a daunting task. 19 And I think that while no report can be 20 perfect obviously, the staff goes to great lengths to 21 try to come up with a report that will serve the 22 23 nation. 24 And I think that this report, while not perfect, is a remarkable improvement over the caliber 25

| 1 | of reports of the same ilk that I've seen in the past. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And I just want to commend staff for their |
| 3 | vigorous efforts, their attention to detail, in |
| 4 | putting together this report. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Hear, hear. |
| 6 | Okay, Commissioner Kirsanow, is that a |
| 7 | yea? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 10 | All right, Commissioner Taylor? |
| 11 | (No response) |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 13 | Taylor? |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's an aye. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: A hamburger to go. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, and initially |
| 20 | I was going to abstain from voting on this. I too |
| 21 | agree that the staff has done a very good under the |
| 22 | circumstances. But the type of document I'm looking |
| 23 | for is not merely a collection of data points. |
| 24 | I think that ultimately once we have the |
| 25 | appropriate benchmarks, we should judge I believe any |

| 1 | administration and Congresses in terms of the amount |
|----|---|
| 2 | of money that is provided to federal civil rights |
| 3 | enforcement. |
| 4 | I do believe that it is possible to starve |
| 5 | the federal civil rights agency to death. So I'm |
| 6 | going to vote for it, but I do have some reservations |
| 7 | about the approach used. I think that once we get our |
| 8 | benchmarks, and get a working framework for talking |
| 9 | about what's a sufficient amount of money, what's an |
| 10 | effective use of federal funds, at that point I would |
| 11 | want to change the direction of the report. |
| 12 | But after saying that, though, I vote in |
| 13 | favor of it. |
| 14 | So there is one abstention, and four votes |
| 15 | in favor of the report: Commissioners Taylor, Yaki, |
| 16 | Kirsanow, and the Chairman voted in favor. |
| 17 | The motion carries. |
| 18 | Okay, could someone tell me, where are we |
| 19 | now? |
| 20 | VI. Motion on FY 2007 Federal Civil |
| 21 | Rights Enforcement Report |
| 22 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: We're at |
| 23 | the motion to approve the FY 2007 budget request of |
| 24 | OMB. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no, according to |

the motion, we're back to the staff director's report. 1 We just moved those two items up out of 2 order on the agenda. 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I'm sorry, 4 you are perfectly right. 5 VII. Staff Director's Report 6 Okav. Staff 7 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Director Marcus. 8 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, 9 Madam Vice Chairman, Commissioners, thank you. 10 If it please the Commission I would like 11 to revise my written staff director's report with 12 brief additional remarks regarding the financial 13 condition of the agency; auditor provider issuers; 14 15 accounting services provider issues; human capital management; and commissioner review of SAC reports. 16 17 First, with respect to the financial 18 condition, let me say this. As the Commissioners are aware, we have inherited an exceptionally difficult 19 budgetary situation for this fiscal year. In prior 20 21 meetings I have described the challenges that we face 22 as an agency and you have voted to adopt various financial corrections. 23 24 During our May meeting I reported that 25 our budgetary condition had approved due to staff

attrition, commissioner vacancies, significant costcutting measures, the decision by commissioners to not to fill vacancies for commissioners' special assistants, and the decision by certain staff members to take leave without pay in order to strengthen the condition for the agency.

At that time, the Commission voted to defer reductions in force and the furlough that had been projected for this fiscal year.

Since that time, the agency has experienced significant additional attrition, and has also benefited for continued cost cutting measures and leave without pay.

Needless to say, the loss of staff has challenged our ability to maintain production levels, but it has also significantly ameliorated our financial status.

We have now reached the point where I can say the following: if the commissioners should forego from hiring new special assistants for just one additional year until the start of fiscal year 2007, we should be able to avoid reductions in force or a furlough during this fiscal year. And provided that we receive approximately the appropriation recently approved by the U.S. House of Representatives, we

should be able to defer closure of the Denver and 1 Kansas City offices through fiscal year 206 pending 2 our appropriation for fiscal year 2007, and we would 3 still be able to fill a few key vacancies over the 4 coming months. 5 This subject is appropriate for a vote of 6 the Commission, and a pertinent item appears on the 7 agenda under management and operations. 8 Second, I'd like to say a few words about 9 auditor-provider issues. 10 As the Commissioners may recall, the 11 accounting firm of Parker-Whitfield is conducting a 12 limited scope audit of the Commission for fiscal year 13 2004. 14 Parker began the audit during the end of 15 fiscal year 2004 approximately ten months ago and has 16 yet to complete the partial audit. 17 The audit was initially schedule for 18 19 completion by November 15, 2004. The completion of 20 this audit, however, will not fulfill the Commission's 21 statutory obligation under the accountability and tax dollars act requiring full scope audits annually 22 23 beginning with fiscal year 2004. 24 During the March 2005 commission meeting the commissioners asked the staff director to hire 25

auditors to conduct a full scope audit for fiscal year 1 2004 if financial feasible. 2 After certain auditing firms were 3 contacted, it became a concern whether the commission 4 was currently auditable, and that the commission might 5 want to hire an auditing consultant during fiscal year 6 2005 to help the commission receive a clean audit for 7 fiscal year 2006. 8 Recently, the commission placed 9 statement of work on Fed. Bis. Ops. In an attempt to 10 retain auditing services. The statement of work 11 includes requests for bids for full scope audits for 12 fiscal year 2004 as well as fiscal year 2005. 13 In addition the statement of work includes 14 a request for bids for consulting services to begin 15 this fiscal year to help prepare the commission to 16 receive a clean audit for fiscal year 2006. 17 A portion of the money to pay for these 18 services will consist of fiscal year 2005 funds, while 19 a majority of the money will consist of fiscal year 20 2006 funds. 21 Third, I'd like to say a word about 22 accounting services provider issues. 23 Booz Management currently provides the 24 commission with accounting services. Booz was hired 25

during fiscal year 2004 after the Bureau of the Public Debt, the commission's previous accounting services provider, dropped our account after expressing concerns about the lack of internal financial controls then present at the commission.

As a result of our subsequent experiences with a small private accounting services provider, the commission has sought a more experienced federal agency based accounting services provider beginning for fiscal year 2006.

The Bureau of the Public Debt, the National Finance Center, and the Veterans Administration, all indicated that they would be unable to provide accounting services to the commission beginning at that point in time, or prior to fiscal year 2007.

However, the General Services Administration has provided a proposal which would comply with our substantive accounting needs and timing requirements. On July 15 the commission executed a letter of intent with GSA, initiating GSA's preconversion and implementation activities. And we are now having discussions with GSA about that.

Fourth, I'd like to say just a few words about human capital management. In its 1999 oversight

review of the commission's human capital management,
the Office of Personnel Management identified a number
of recommended human capital improvement actions.

Of these the GAO selected six that it
viewed as broader systemic human capital

Of these recommendations, one has been fully implemented concerning timely performance appraisals. And efforts are underway to fully implement three others.

Following a recent internal review, under the leadership of an OPM manager who is now detailed to this agency, and in ensuing discussions with OPM, we have concluded, and OPM has concurred, that no additional action is required for the two additional recommendations which relate to the delegation of human resources management authority to commission managers, and the establishment of an annual survey to provide for the collection of employee feedback.

As part of its regular oversight cycle,
OPM is again scheduled to review the commission's
human capital management during the fourth quarter.
We anticipate that our efforts to date to address
previous OPM and GAO recommendations, coupled with
other human capital reform initiatives we have

15,

recommendations.

undertaken, will position us well for the upcoming OPM 1 2 review. I think that this is an example of the 3 substantial work that is currently going forward in 4 order to implement GAO and OPM recommendations. 5 Fifth, I'd like to say a few words about 6 commissioner review of State Advisory Committee, or 7 SAC, reports, to amplify on responses that were made 8 to commissioner questions during the last meeting. 9 There has been some confusion as to what 10 the commissioners are allowed to consider when voting 11 on whether or not to accept the SAC report for 12 publication and requests were made to staff for 13 clarification. 14 15 On March 4, 1994, the commission voted, 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstaining, to implement a 16 17 recommendation of the SAC process task force, chaired 18 by Commissioner Redenbaugh, to have commissioners vote 19 accept SAC reports for publication without 20 considering whether or not they agree or disagree with 21 the content. 22 To vote to accept the report only reflects 23 that the process was followed correctly. 24 The process was also established by the 25 SAC process task force.

| 1 | The commissioners at that meeting, in |
|----|--|
| 2 | 1994, explicitly indicated that they could, if they |
| 3 | decided, they could take separate vote on whether they |
| 4 | agreed with the conclusions or recommendations after |
| 5 | they voted to accept the report for publication. |
| 6 | However, even if a majority of the |
| 7 | commissioners voted to disagree with the conclusions |
| 8 | or recommendations, this vote would not stop |
| 9 | publication of the report. |
| ٥. | This is an issue, I know, that |
| .1 | commissioners have expressed some concern about. I'm |
| L2 | also aware that there is a pending motion with respect |
| L3 | to the establishment of a working group on State |
| L4 | Advisory Committees. |
| L5 | If there are concerns about the |
| L6 | appropriateness of this policy, they could be |
| .7 | appropriate for discussion by a SAC working group, |
| 8. | should one be established pursuant to the motion which |
| .9 | was circulated today. |
| 20 | I would be please to respond to any |
| 21 | questions that any of the commissioners should have. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: This is Chairman |
| 23 | Reynolds. |
| 24 | Can - we've managed to stave off risks, |
| | office alegures, and other painful acts |

73 But the manner in which we've done this 1 though is primarily through shrinking the agency. And 2 that has been the vehicle we've used over the last 3 decade or more to deal with this structural deficit 4 that we have at the commission. 5 Now on the one hand I think that it's 6 decision by 7 great, that between commissioners to refrain from hiring 8

certain special assistants, and also the savings that resulted from attrition, I think that's a good thing in part.

But long term, though, long term it seems to me that we're in the same situation that we were in last year; we still have that structural deficit. We've bought some time. We bought a year basically by refraining from hiring special assistants, and through the savings that resulted from attrition.

But would you care to comment on my view that our fate really depends on either a significant reduction in our expenses, and most of our expenses are fixed costs so that's highly unlikely, or an increase in our appropriations.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus again. I don't see how one could disagree with that point, given the fact that our appropriations have been essentially flat while

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

costs have been increasing. 1 This has meant that the only way we've 2 been able to meet our budget has been through 3 shrinkage together with cost cutting. And the fact is 4 that we have cut costs to the point where the only 5 significant savings that we can achieve are through 6 attrition. 7 Now there has been sufficient voluntary 8 attrition recently to enable us to continue throughout 9 the next year without involuntary layoffs, provided 10 that we get approximately the same \$9 million a year. 11 However, each time we have additional 12 attrition we have a loss in the ability to produce the 13 important products that we do. So at some point we 14 will need either to receive further appropriations, or 15 else we will see that our level of staffing will 16 shrink to the point where it is extremely difficult to 17 achieve our mission. 18 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Any other comments? 19 Okay. Well, in that case, thank you Staff 20 Director Marcus. 21 At this point we're going to move on to 22 23 management and operations. 24 Vice Chair Thernstrom, do you have a 25 motion for me?

| 1 | VIII. Motion to Approve the OMBFY 2007 Budget |
|----|---|
| 2 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I do, and |
| 3 | this is a motion I started to read before. This is a |
| 4 | vote to approve the FY 2007 budget request to OMB. |
| 5 | I move that the commission approve this |
| 6 | submission to the Office of Management and Budget, |
| 7 | OMB, for fiscal year 2007, budget request, consistent |
| 8 | with the budget presented to commissioners in advance |
| 9 | of this meeting in the amount of approximately \$12 |
| 10 | million. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Is there a second? |
| 12 | |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow seconds. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Discussion? |
| 15 | (No response.) |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, well, let's |
| 17 | vote. |
| 18 | Vice Chair Thernstrom, how do you vote? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Aye. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 21 | Taylor? |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Aye. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki? |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye. |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| | NEAL R. GROSS |

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | Kirsanow? |
|------|--|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. And I vote |
| 4 | in favor of it also. |
| 5 | So this is how the vote breaks down. |
| 6 | There were no votes against the motion. Commissioners |
| 7 | Thernstrom, Taylor, Yaki, Kirsanow and the Chairman |
| 8 | voted in favor. |
| 9 | The motion passes. |
| 10 | What's next, Abby? Which motion? |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Next is - |
| 12 | sorry about this |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: While Abby's |
| 14 | looking, Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I am going to have |
| 15 . | to leave to catch a flight. If it's all possible I |
| 16 | can rejoin at some point, I'll try to make |
| 17 | arrangements with my assistant to do so, although I |
| 18 | think that's highly unlikely. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Commissioner |
| 20 | Kirsanow, are you carrying a cell phone? |
| 21 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, I am, and |
| 22 | that's how I'm going to try and re-up with you guys. |
| 23 | The problem is that I noted at certain places where |
| 24 | I'm currently at I'm having difficulty receiving a |

signal.

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Got you. |
|--|---|
| 2 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So I'll try to re- |
| 3 | up if possible, but I don't think it's likely. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, thank you. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. |
| 6 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: Mr. |
| 7 | Chairman, there seems to be a motion in my binder, a |
| 8 | motion for 7/22/05 commission meeting with regard to |
| 9 | SAC membership criteria. |
| 10 | And I believe that is next; is that |
| 11 | correct? |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I think we have a |
| 13 | problem. |
| | |
| 14 | Staff Director Marcus? |
| | |
| 14 | Staff Director Marcus? |
| 14 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this |
| 14 15 16 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. |
| 14 15 16 17 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need |
| 14 15 16 17 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need for a quorum? |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need for a quorum? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, do |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need for a quorum? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, do you hear me? This is Staff Director Marcus? |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need for a quorum? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, do you hear me? This is Staff Director Marcus? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. How many |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Staff Director Marcus? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is Staff Director Marcus. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: How many do we need for a quorum? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, do you hear me? This is Staff Director Marcus? CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Yes. How many commissioners are required for a quorum? |

have four. 1 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. 2 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Under our rules, 3 it is my understanding, and parliamentarian Roy could 4 5 commend that we have the ability to vote on matters postponement adjournment relating 6 to oror7 rescheduling. But I do not believe that there is any 8 other subject to which we may conduct a formal vote. 9 10 There may be discussion, but I don't believe a formal 11 vote. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, that's my 12 13 understanding. At this point, let's stay on the phone 14 awhile, and Staff Director Marcus, please try to 15 contact Commissioner Kirsanow on his cell phone. And 16 17 in the event we are unable to reach him, we will have 18 to adjourn. 19 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We are in the 20 process of doing that, Mr. Chairman. 21 I would say that there are two items under 22 management and operations that we haven't yet gone to. 23 If Commissioner Kirsanow can be contacted, they would 24 be appropriate for a vote. If he cannot be contacted, 25 I think it would be appropriate at least to get a

sense of the commissioners. 1 They refer to first, the question as to 2 whether commissioners would be willing to forbear 3 from hiring special assistants through the end of 4 5 fiscal year 2006; and second, whether it is the intent of the commission, given the new changes in the 6 7 financial condition given attrition, to forbear from 8 closing either the Denver or Kansas City office 9 end of fiscal year 2006 through the pending 10 appropriations for 2007. CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, it will be a 11 short conversation, at least according to my count. 12 13 I've spoken with several commissioners on both of 14 these issues, and there seems to be a consensus that we would vote in favor of these motions provided we 15 16 have a quorum. 17 But does - are there any comments or questions or concerns that need to be discussed? 18 19 (No response.) 20 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay. 21 (Tape changed.) 22 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Move to adjourn? 23 CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, why don't we 24 just wait say three minutes to see if we can locate

Commissioner Kirsanow, then if now, yes, we would move

| 1 | to adjourn. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Hard to do a quorum call via |
| 3 | teleconference. Can't exactly send the sergeant at |
| 4 | arms to track them down. |
| 5 | The sergeant at arms, he quit last year. |
| 6 | And because of our shrinking agency, because of budget |
| 7 | constraints, we weren't able to back that position. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: We have a corporal |
| 9 | grade now, is that what you're talking about? |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Oh, no, he's gone |
| 11 | too. |
| 12 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I would just |
| 13 | comment here. I think that we should do everything we |
| 14 | can in the future to avoid meetings by conference |
| 15 | call. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: I agree. |
| 17 | All right, may I have a motion to adjourn |
| 18 | with the understanding that we will reconvene this |
| 19 | meeting at a date to be determined in August. |
| 20 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: So move. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Second? |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: All right. |
| 24 | All in favor? |
| 25 | (Several ayes.) |
| | 1 |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, that was two. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Am I missing someone? Commissioner Taylor? |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Oh, I said aye. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Okay, well, it's |
| 5 | unanimous. |
| 6 | This meeting will adjourn until we select |
| 7 | a date in August, at which point we will cover the |
| 8 | remaining items on the agenda. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a point of |
| 10 | information for the staff director. |
| 11 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, Commissioner |
| 12 | Yaki, this is Staff Director Marcus. |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: When does the Adarand |
| 14 | Report become public, so the public can review it? |
| 15 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, we will need |
| 16 | to receive any dissenting or concurring comments or |
| 17 | statements, and the deadline for that is the 29th. |
| 18 | You are the only commissioner has so far indicated to |
| 19 | me an intent to provide a statement of that sort. |
| 20 | After that, we have a copy editor who is |
| 21 | doing one last review immediately after the 29th, and |
| 22 | I expect that we could be able to make the document |
| 23 | public in - during the month of August. |
| 24 | It will not of course be formally |
| 25 | published until the month of September, at which point |

| 1 | it will be formally delivered to the Congress and the |
|----|--|
| 2 | President. |
| 3 | I believe the formal delivery will |
| 4 | probably be toward the end of the month of September. |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the ability of the |
| 6 | public to have access to the document before delivery, |
| 7 | do you see that happening? |
| 8 | STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I see that as |
| 9 | something that we can do during the month of August. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's all I wanted to |
| 11 | know. |
| 12 | VICE CHAIRPERSON THERNSTROM: I would just |
| 13 | like to make one closing remark that is directed to |
| 14 | the staff. In abstaining on the federal funding |
| 15 | report, I do not in any way mean to suggest that the |
| 16 | staff did not do good work. |
| 17 | I've got some basic problems with the |
| 18 | formulation of the entire question focusing on funding |
| 19 | levels. But the staff did do a very good job given |
| 20 | how the question was posed. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON REYNOLDS: Well, in a similar |
| 22 | vein, I think that the staff has done an excellent job |
| 23 | when you take into account the conditions under which |
| 24 | they have to work. |
| 25 | There are a new cast of characters at the |

| 1 | commission. We're still trying to learn how to work |
|----|--|
| 2 | with each other, and also, we came in midstream. So |
| 3 | for example, the statutory report, we've had to rush |
| 4 | the job, but I think that staff has done a good job of |
| 5 | pulling this thing together under these circumstances. |
| 6 | So on that note, we will adjourn. Thank |
| 7 | you, everyone, for joining us. |
| 8 | (Whereupon at 4:50 p.m. the aforementioned |
| 9 | meeting adjourned.) |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |