U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY,

APRIL 8, 2005

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at 9:30 a.m. in Room 540 of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 645 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., Chairman Gerald A. Reynolds presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner, via

teleconference

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

ELSIE M. MEEKS, Commissioner

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY

TERESA BROOKS

MARGARET BUTLER

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

DEBRA CARR, Esq., General Counsel

IVY L. DAVIS, Director, Eastern Regional
Office

BARBARA DELAVIEZ

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director

PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative

Services and Clearinghouse Division

BARBARA FONTANA

LATRICE FOSHEE

DORELLE GRAY

GEORGE M. HARBISON, Director, Human Resources

Division/Acting Chief, Budget and

Finance Division

SETH JAFFE

SOCK-FOON MacDOUGAL

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director for Management,

Office of Management

JANICE MINOR

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

ANA MARIA ORTIZ

NEAL R. GROSS

STAFF PRESENT:

JENNY PARK

BERNARD QUARTERMAN

MICHELLE ROYSTER

EILEEN RUDERT

DEBBIE VAGINS

VANESSA WILLIAMSON

AUDREY WRIGHT

TIFFANY WRIGHT

MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

PATRICK DUFFY

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

LISA NEUDER

KIMBERLY SCHULD

<u>CONTENTS</u>

	PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda5
II.	Approval of Minutes of
	March 18, 2005 Meeting6
III.	Announcements7
IV.	Staff Director's Report13
V.	Management and Operations61
VI.	Future Agenda Items92

5 1 PROCEEDINGS (10:00 a.m.) 2 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have a The meeting will come to order. 4 quorum. 5 I. Approval of Agenda The first item on the agenda is the 6 7 approval of the last meeting's agenda. 8 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second? 10 COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor indicate 11 12 by saying aye. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me, Jerry. This is Jennifer. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just wanted to table the discussion of the Working Group on Reform 17 18 until May until we have all of the proposals and we 19 can consider them all together. 2.0 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I quess that 21 will require a motion. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So I move

that we remove the report of the Working Group on Reform from today's agenda.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?

23

24

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second it.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All those in
3	favor please indicate by saying aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
8	passes.
9	All right. Back to approval of the
10	agenda as amended. I guess now that it has been
11	amended I'd need a motion.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. A second?
14	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor?
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion carries.
20	II. Approval of Minutes of
21	March 18, 2005 Meeting
22	Okay. The second item is approval of the
23	minutes of the March 18th meeting. May I have a
24	motion?
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
2	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any changes or
4	discussion?
5	(No response.)
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor
7	indicate by saying aye.
8	(Chorus of ayes.)
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
12	passes.
13	III. Announcements
14	Okay. I would like to make an
15	announcement.
16	Fred Korematsu passed. I regret to
17	report that he passed away March 30th at the age of
18	86. As many of you well know, Fred Korematsu became
19	a symbol of the civil rights movement for challenging
20	the World War II internment orders that sent 120
21	Japanese Americans to government camps.
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: One hundred and
23	twenty thousand.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I'm sorry.
25	That's right. One hundred and twenty thousand

1 Japanese Americans to American camps. His conviction for opposing the 2 3 internment was finally overturned in the U.S. District Court in 1983. When the internment order 4 5 came down in February 1942 after the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, the U.S. Army issued orders to round 6 7 up 120,000 Japanese Americans living on the West 8 Coast into ten internment camps. 9 Mr. Korematsu did not turn himself in and 10 was arrested, jailed, and convicted of a felony for 11 failing to report for evacuation in late 1942. 12 appealed his case to the U.S. Supreme Court alleging the constitutionality of President Roosevelt's 13 Executive Order 90-66 authorizing -- It couldn't have 14 been Roosevelt. Any historians here? 15 16 In any event --It was 17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 18 Roosevelt. 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yeah, it was FDR. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, okay, okay. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yeah. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: In any event, 23 challenging the constitutionality of Roosevelt's Executive Order 90-66 that authorized the internment. 24 25 The high Court ruled against him

declaring in 1944 that the internment was justified by the need to combat sabotage and espionage. I'd just like to point out that that war was not -- that war was also fought against Italy and Germans, and there were German Americans and Italians walking around the United States and that order did not apply to them.

And also I believe that the order did not apply to the Japanese living in Hawaii.

In any event, Mr. Korematsu's case stood for almost 40 years, until the early 1980's when Asian American lawyers and civil rights advocates unearthed new evidence that undermined the internment order. It was on this basis that the Korematsu case was reopened in 1983 resulting in the erasure of his criminal conviction for defying the internment.

In 1988, President Reagan declared the internment a grave injustice and signed legislation authorizing the reparations of \$20,000 each to thousands of surviving internees, including

Korematsu. In 1999, President Clinton awarded

Korematsu a Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor.

Mr. Korematsu remained active in civil rights throughout his life, and President Clinton

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

1	noted the significance of these achievements when he
2	said, "In the long history of our country's constant
3	search for justice some names of ordinary citizens
4	stands for millions of souls, Plessey, Brown, Parks.
5	To that distinguished list we now add the name of
6	Fred Korematsu."
7	On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil
8	Rights, I wish to acknowledge Mr. Korematsu's long
9	and distinguished service to his country and, as
10	well, acknowledge the enormous debt owed to him by
11	all Americans. His passing is a significant loss for
12	the United States and the world.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chair.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: yes.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Could I just add a
16	few words to that?
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, sure.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: My father and his
19	family were interned in camps pursuant to Executive
20	Order 90-66, and I also knew Fred Korematsu
21	personally. I worked with him on a number of
22	occasions.
23	Most recently I saw him at the annual Day
24	of Remembrance of Events in February, which marks the
25	anniversary date that the Japanese American community

observed every year for the internment order. And I was as shocked as anyone that just a few weeks later he had passed.

But I just wanted to say on behalf of the Japanese American community thank you for your kind words. I will be attending his service in California on the 16th, and just want to say that it is one of the great injustices perpetrated in our constitutional history, and I think that a sad reminder of a terrible time in our nation's history

what is unfortunate though and still remains is that while his personal conviction was overturned, as well as those of four other plaintiffs, who produced by clear and convincing evidence that there was no wartime sabotage, there was no fifth column of enemy aliens in the Unites States among the Japanese community, that the decision in Korematsu v. United States still remains on the books and still is there, unfortunately, as precedent for the future, and that, I think, is an unfortunate legacy that still remains, but can't detract away from the personal courage and honor that Fred Korematsu showed throughout his entire life.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.

Yes?

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

2.0

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: However,
2	Michael, we do not agree that it is a disgraced
3	decision. It goes down in history, along with, you
4	know, a short list of decisions in which the Supreme
5	Court reacted appallingly.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think that, without
7	a doubt, when you put up there with Dred Scott,
8	Plessey and Korematsu the only unfortunate thing is
9	that the other two decisions were overturned either
10	by an act of amending the Constitution or an act of
11	the Supreme Court. The last one has yet to be.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, and
13	arguably, Plessey has yet to be, I mean, in very
14	narrow legal terms, but we won't go further into that
15	now. But in legal terms, Plessey hasn't been
16	overturned either, of course. <u>Brown v. Board</u> didn't
17	overturn Plessey, but anyway
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think it did.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, the
20	point is well taken.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have
22	would you hold a moment?
23	(Pause in proceedings.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, during
25	our last meeting we discussed the need to take

corrective actions in order to avoid exceeding our budget authority for fiscal year 2005.

The Staff Director and a number of

Commissioners have spent a lot of hours trying to

come up with a battle plan that is going improve the

fiscal health of the institution.

We have a battle plan. The battle plan is unfortunately going to be painful, but we don't have any choice in the matter. I think that this is going to be the first step that we take along the road of recovery.

At this point I will ask the Staff Director to provide his report.

IV. Staff Director's Report

MR. MARCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Madame Vice Chairman,
Commissioners, if it please the Commissioners, I
would like to supplement my written report for this
month with additional remarks concerning the
financial condition of the agency. It may be that
there are other issues that the Commissioners would
also like to discuss, but the fact is that over the
last few weeks since our last meeting, we have been
focused intensely on addressing the immediate
financial concerns that I described in the last

2.0

meeting.

2.0

As you know, those current concerns are intense, and they are immediate, and that is why the solutions will necessarily be painful ones.

During the Commission's February 18, 2005 meeting, I indicated that this would be a particularly austere year financially, and I added to that in testimony on March 17, 2005, before the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution, indicating that as of my arrival the spending plans and assumptions of the Commission place the agency on course to overspend its appropriations by a considerable sum and that we are now working on cost cutting measures to close this gap and provide a sufficient cushion against unexpected costs.

I indicated further during the March 18 meeting that we had yet to determine the precise parameters of the shortfall, but that based on present spending patterns and assumptions, we had a range of figures that could be as low as \$45,000 or as high as over \$200,000.

And subsequently I have indicated that as our Office of Management refined those figures, that we had no room for optimism, and that, in fact, the

1 shortfall based on current spending patterns and assumptions as of March was well over \$200,000, and 2 in fact, in the range of 260 or \$265,000 if 3 corrective measures were not taken as of March. 4 5 Now, we've also indicated some interim corrective measures that are bringing those numbers 6 7 down, but we'll need to discuss today additional 8 measures to make sure that we are serving at least 9 five goals. 10 First, we need to fully close the 11 shortfall that we have projected to have in fiscal 12 2005. 13 Second, to do so in a way that anticipates and closes the shortfall that we would 14 15 otherwise have in fiscal year 2006. 16 Third, that enables us to do at least those sorts of reforms that the Commission has 17 18 discussed to date for fiscal year 2005 and 2006. 19 Fourth, and not in any particular order, 2.0 fourth, we need to make sure that we are doing each 21 of these things in a way that protects and advances 22 the ability of the Commission to achieve its mission. 23 And, fifth, and all throughout as we look 24 at any options to do so in a manner that as best as 25 possible preserved the well-being of the dedicated

employees of this agency.

2.0

Those are very important goals. They're very difficult goals, and we attempt to reach those goals in the context of the Anti-deficiency Act, which has very strict penalties for agencies and leadership of agencies which overspend their appropriations or otherwise act in a manner which fails to comply with the appropriations laws.

So these are very serious, very serious matters, indeed. We know that as recently as 2004 an arm of the U.S. Department of Treasury cut off its dealings with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and a significant part of their reason for terminating the relationship was a concern that the Commission in 2003 and 2004 was not sufficiently seriously dealing with the provisions of the Antideficiency Act in a conversation with senior staff of that agency.

Earlier this week, they indicated to me that their biggest concern was an attitude of denial towards the shortfalls that we've had in prior years. It is my commitment to insure that we are focused with seriousness on complying with our requirements under the various appropriations laws, including the Anti-Deficiency Act.

We have looked at a number of short-term measures that can provide very quick reductions in spending. Some of these are items that I generated together with senior staff.

In addition, the entire staff of this agency has been very helpful in developing ideas for how we might reduce cost expenditures. Some of them were provided directly to management, some through union officials who have been helpful in facilitating the transmission of ideas.

Of those ideas, some of them we've looked at. Some of them we will continue to look at, but there are certainly a number of ways that we will continue to focus on for how we can reduce costs.

Some of them I'll mention right now.

First, we have placed a freeze on new hires in this agency. I'm very much aware that some of the Commissioners of this agency have made the sacrifice of doing without full-time special assistants, which Commissioners have all traditionally had.

The decision to go without special assistants for the rest of the fiscal year for those Commissioners who have not brought them on brings down the shortfall tremendously from \$265,000, and

2.0

has helped cut the figure down into the ballpark of \$135,000 for this year.

In addition, we have made serious cuts in spending, including ceasing to use temporary staff at this agency, curtailing travel and other discretionary expenditures, making every cut that we can in discretionary expenditures as severely as we can.

And, third, we have sought authorization from the Office of Personnel Management to offer voluntary early retirement to employees within certain offices within the agency.

Now, given the restrictions in the rules regarding voluntary early retirement, that will, at most, affect a small number of employees at the agency, but given the numbers of the agency as a whole. Certainly any savings could make a difference in terms of the sort of pain that could be experienced by other employees of the agency.

As the Commissioners are aware, the bulk of the budget for this agency falls within the categories of salary, benefit and rent. The expenditures for all other categories are so small that there is really very little room to materially affect the status of the agency without touching one

or more of those three areas.

2.0

Now, that is not to say that we will continue aggressively to seek ways of cutting expenditures in other categories, but the fact is that a shortfall of this fiscal year of 265,000 or even \$135,000 cannot be met without looking to one of those three categories.

Moreover, we know that we have had for many years a flat line budget of approximately \$9 million. We also know that we have seen federal salaries increase by approximately three or four percent or so per year, including the locality pay adjustments for the areas where the bulk of our employees reside.

In addition, we know that benefits have continued to rise each year. Assuming that the federal wages continue to increase in the range of three to four percent and that the benefits increase, we would be looking without serious corrections to a deficit for fiscal year 2006 which not only equaled the shortfall of 135 or \$265,000, depending on the use of special assistants, but which increased by an amount beyond that, which could be 180 or 200 or 220 or \$250,000, depending on the extent of any increase in federal wages and the extent of any increases in

health and other benefits.

2.0

So what we are looking at is not only a significant shortfall for this year, but a projected shortfall for next year which is substantially greater.

The three main categories of long-term corrections that could address some or all of those challenges would have to include a furlough, a reduction in force, a closure of offices and associated RIFs. Those are the three categories of changes that would have the greatest material effect on our ability to close that gap.

We do not look lightly at any one of those prospects. We are committed to the mission of the agency. We are committed to the welfare of the employees of the agency, and we know that any one of those changes would have a very serious effect on the lives of all of the people who are dedicated to this organization and will create very significant challenges as we attempt to achieve our mission in future years. At the same time we're obligated by law to live within our means.

The prospect of a furlough would have an ability during this fiscal year to close the gap, but it has certain disadvantages. First, it would have

an adverse financial impact on every single employee of this agency. The only kind of furlough that I have considered or that I would consider appropriate would be a furlough on every single employee, including management and including the Staff Director.

At this point in the year, are furloughs sufficient to close the gap for fiscal year 2005? It appears based on Office of Management calculations to be necessarily at least seven days in duration. A furlough of less than that period of time would not meet that gap.

Moreover, even a furlough of seven or eight days during this fiscal year would have no impact on the much greater shortfall that we are anticipating for next year. If the shortfall were increased by another \$200,000, we would be looking at approximately another ten days of furlough next year, which is to say at least 17 or 18 days furlough next year if we continue to go that route, which is to say close to a month's time.

Moreover, since even that would not affect in any way the shortfall anticipated for further years if straight fall, if flat line budgets increased, this would put us in a position where we

are simply expanding every year in fairly dramatic terms the amount of time that people are out of work, and that is certainly not sustaining over time. It would within a very short order reach the point at which the furlough actually would constitute a reduction in force since 30 days or more is considered a reduction in force.

Moreover, it would not really enable us to effect savings of any sort or to reform or correct any of the problems within the agency. It would simply be a matter of delaying resolution of our problems if it were done to the exclusion of any other sort of remedy.

We have also looked at the question of closure of offices, and again, as with any of the other options, even considering this is something that has been very painful to us because we know that every office within this agency has historically and currently provided great contributions.

The regional offices, for instance, do the important work of servicing our state advisory committees in providing the regional and state reports that they have done over the years.

Moreover, the employees of our regional office are as important to us as the employees here

at headquarters.

2.0

Closure of regional offices can enable the agency to appreciate substantial savings over a period of time. However, we have reached the point in this fiscal year, given the notice requirements involved, given the requirements of the GSA and other entities of the federal government, that there are very few offices that could be closed with net gains for this year.

There may be one or two offices whose closure would enable us to appreciate any savings this fiscal year. Any of the other offices would be closed at a net cost to us through this fiscal year.

on the other hand, closures taking place early in a subsequent fiscal year would enable us to appreciate a more substantial savings so that any plan involving a closure of regional offices would enable us to deal with long term structural deficit problems, including fiscal year 2006 fiscal problems, but would not be sufficient to enable us to correct the problems with respect to this fiscal year.

Finally, there is a question of a reduction in force. A reduction in force that would not involve office closure could address the shortfall that we have within the agency. Now, this

is an extremely painful and difficult issue to consider and to discuss because it has arguably the most severe impact on those employees who are affected.

At this point in the fiscal year, a reduction in force of two or three or four or five individuals taken alone would not be sufficient to close the shortfall. According to Office of Management Calculations, it would likely require, if a reduction in force were the sole means of addressing the shortfall, it would likely require as many as 11 employees to be separated from the agency if that were the sole means of addressing the shortfall or a reduction in force of approximately nine employees if combined with a short furlough of one or two days.

Those are the basic alternatives. Beyond that, of course, there are various sorts of combinations of those three approaches that we have looked at.

None of the combinations of those three elements is an attractive one. All of them involve a great deal of pain for the agency. As we have looked at various permutations though, there is one permutation that appears to achieve the sorts of

2.0

goals that we described and to do so in a way that balances the desire to protect as many employees as we can while still achieving the savings that we need in order to live within our means.

And that proposal would entail closing two offices early in the next fiscal year, presumably during the first fiscal quarter of fiscal year 2006, and affecting both a reduction in force of four employees during this fiscal year and a furlough of such time as is required to fill the remaining shortfall during this fiscal year, and that period of time will need to be calculated by the Office of Management, but we expect it to be shorter than ten days and perhaps as short as approximately four to five days.

That combination of measures would be an extremely painful one. There are other alternatives that would give us a much greater ability to effect reforms and otherwise to advance strategic initiatives in future years, but which would come at a cost of separating a greater number of employees than under this proposal.

There are other proposals that would involve fewer cuts, but which would not enable us to deal in a serious, long-term manner with the problems

2.0

that we face.

2.0

This is a combination that appears to be among all of the difficult, painful alternatives, one that can meet the objectives that I've articulated.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So that we can get the discussion started, I would like to move that we have a four-person RIF, also an office closure, well, actually two office closures that would take place during the first quarter of fiscal '06, and a furlough. We would furlough -- we would choose a number of days sufficient to insure that we did not exceed our budget authority.

May I have a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? Yes.

mentioned a seven day furlough. That's seven working days? I know you said a possibility. You weren't sure of how many days it would be, but you said seven days, and I'm wondering is that calendar days or working days. Obviously a seven working day would affect a cost savings.

MR. MARCUS: I'm sorry. Under the proposal that I characterized, it would be approximately five, for five working days.

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

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Could that be offset by any leaves of absence that may be taken during the course of the year?

MR. MARCUS: Yes. Thank you,
Commissioner Kirsanow.

2.0

We have looked at ways of offsetting both the reduction in force and the furlough, and here is what I am planning to do with respect to potential offsets. We are still aggressively looking for any way of cutting costs that could reduce those numbers if done quickly enough, and there are possibilities that we would be able to effect some savings that would enable us to reduce the numbers both with respect to the furlough and with respect to the reduction in force.

You've asked about the furlough. What we are looking into is the prospect of permitting employees to take additional leave without pay for periods beyond the furlough, if there are some who are able to, and there are certainly employees who have approached me and who have said that if it could help their fellow employees, they would potentially take a longer leave without pay.

To the extent that the sum of the savings leaves without pay are sufficient to reduce the

furlough, we will do that. However, we will need working with the Office of Management to provide very specifically the circumstances and conditions under which that leave without pay would have to take place including the period of time within which we would have to receive notification of that intent.

So if the leave without pay is taken within the parameters of the conditions that I will work out with the Office of Management and for which I hope union representatives may have input, there is a possibility of ameliorating the furlough.

Similarly, to the extent that we are permitted by the Office of Personnel Management to offer voluntary early retirement and to the extent that there are employees who are provided that option and who accept under the terms that we will need to promulgate, we would look into reducing the number of persons subject to a reduction in force.

Since the number of persons who would appear to be subject to a reduction in force is as small as four, it's a large number in some respects, but since the number is four, it is possible that that could be substantially affected by voluntary early retirements.

COMMISSIONER KIRSNOW: And what would be

2.0

the time frame by which you could determine whether or not you could simply do this either completely or in the main by voluntary early retirement as opposed by RIF?

Presumably you have a time frame in which you have to engage the RIF and complete it for a notice standpoint. If early voluntary retirement was being offered, what is the time frame for that so that you could then make plans to either implement a RIF or not implement a RIF?

MR. MARCUS: Commissioner Kirsanow, we would need to know that information very soon because the plan works the way it does with the smallest number of RIFs and the shortest furlough days only if we get notices out very quickly to the employees who are subject to these matters.

If we are to notify people in the very early part of May, we would need to know at some point in late April of the decision that employees make with respect to voluntary early retirement.

Now, I will need to work with the Office of Management and perhaps speak with union representatives in terms of setting an exact date, but I believe that it would need to be in late April and in the ballpark of the third week of April.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And without getting into too much detail, I know you've addressed this to some extent insofar as the bulk of any savings would be achieved through salary and benefit cuts or rent. You indicated that you're trying to put freezes or reduce the amount of discretionary travel.

Does anybody have a ballpark figure for how much Commissioner travel on an annualized basis would be?

MR. MARCUS: I don't have that on the top of my head. We could try and see if staff can look that up perhaps during a break.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It would probably be marginal, but I think it might be helpful to see where we can achieve cost savings to minimize any pain that may be spread throughout staff, and also making sure we can discharge our mission.

I think there's a balancing act. I think from time to time staff -- I mean Commissioners do need to meet face to face, but to the extent we might be able to affect or have meetings by teleconference, if, in fact, that does give any kind of substantial cost savings, that's something we might want to consider.

2.0

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: On that last point, is there not a statutory obligation that we 2 3 actually meet once a month? MR. MARCUS: I don't believe that there 4 5 is a requirement that there be a face-to-face meeting 6 once a month, and I'm confirmed in that by legal 7 counsel. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. This 9 is Jennifer. 10 Even if we were required to meet face to 11 face once a month, that doesn't mean we all have to 12 be there face to face. I mean, I'm not there now, 13 and again, I don't know how much this would save, but 14 perhaps there could be for the next couple of months 15 a rotating system of people who don't come and come 16 in by phone, and if that would save us, you know, 17 some pains for some of the staff at least in terms 18 of, you know, furlough days, I'd be willing to do 19 that. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that these 21 are all things that should be considered, but I think 22 that it's important to note that what we're wrestling 23 with is a structural deficit. 24 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And these types of 25

32 recommendations will affect our ability to discharge our obligations to fulfill our mission. So at the end of the day I think, yes, we should consider them, 3 4 but these are stop-gap measures. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean, obviously we need the longer term solutions, but in terms of, you know, furloughs for this year, if I can

> CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.

help the staff in any way --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: -- you know, I'm willing to make that sacrifice because, you know, I can participate from here. So it's just something to think about or at least to consider how much it would save us. Maybe it's so negligible that it wouldn't make a difference. I don't know.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Look. very strongly also about protecting the staff to the degree to which we can. At the same time, this agency has to function, and I'm not sure that -- I suspect that fiddling around with some kind of teleconferencing meeting or rotating participation in person at these meetings -- we're really into serious compromises at this point in terms of the functioning of the agency.

Jennifer, I'm sure you would be the first

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

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

person to say it is not the same to come in by phone as it is to meet, and I am concerned. Obviously I'm concerned about the staff, but I am also concerned about crippling the agency. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just use their

competing considerations. I just want to make sure that we do everything we can pursuant to, I think, what Commissioner Yaki had indicated last month, and that is that we take whatever cuts that seem to be necessary only after we have exhausted all other alternatives.

And I am persuaded by what Jennifer had to say in terms of it's not going to affect the structural deficit. We know that, and we're probably talking about pennies, but pennies mean a lot to the staff in terms of making rent and everything else.

A furlough is a big hit, and if we can reduce the number of furlough days, if it's possible, I don't know if it is, but I think it is something that is worth examining.

And I'm also interested and I'm just not familiar with what the agency does, whether or not there are any -- in the private sector whenever we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	implement RIFs, we have out-placement programs.
2	We've got things that are done for staff who are
3	affected, if any are going to be affected by a RIF,
4	to ease the transition, possibly help them find other
5	opportunities.
6	Is there anything like that that we have
7	examined or can we examine something like that?
8	MR. MARCUS: Our Office of Management is
9	looking into what we can do within the parameters of
10	our budget and ability on that.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Does OPM have any
12	kind of role in that?
13	MR. MARCUS: We have been regularly in
14	touch with OPM about what we're planning to do and
15	the resources that they can make available. I am not
16	aware of any resources that they have yet provided
17	regarding out-placement specifically, but we'll
18	certainly see if they can provide any help in that
19	regard.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Thank you very
22	much, Mr. Chair and Mr. Staff Director.
23	As you know, I've had some difficulty
24	with this arrangement, and I just think that there
25	are some questions that I think we will need to put

taking the action that we're doing. 2 3 My understanding is that although a 4 furlough could close the gap for this year, and let 5 me just say that in terms of, you know, sacrifice or whatever you want to call it, I have chosen, I have 6 7 deliberately chosen, as has the Chairman, not to hire 8 a special assistant for this year, and I have 9 indicated that if it is needed I will do so for the 10 following year as well. 11 That, of course, means that this pile in 12 front of me will get ever messier every month, but I think we can live with that. 13 But so although a furlough for this year 14 15 could close the gap in and of itself, that would not 16 achieve the savings for next year, correct? 17 MR. MARCUS: That's correct, Commissioner 18 Yaki. It would not reduce the gap for next year or 19 provide any additional savings. 20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Now the next question 21 I have is in the scenario that you described, which 22 is the four-person RIF this year plus the two office 23 closure next year, what is the anticipated savings estimated for fiscal year '06? 24

out there so that the staff knows why it is we're

MR. MARCUS:

That's a good question,

25

Commissioner Yaki, and I appreciate the word

"anticipated" because it's difficult to predict

exactly for a number of reasons, including the fact

that once one does a reduction in force, it tends to

take on, as some people have said, a life of its own,

which is to say it is not always possible to

determine exactly in advance the individuals who will

necessarily be subject to it and the amount of

savings to the institution for future years will, of

course, depend on which individuals unfortunately

have to be subject to --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure, but you must have a ballpark.

MR. MARCUS: We do. The ballpark figure that we have for the total savings in fiscal year 2006 from both the four person reduction in force plus, the office closure involving two offices and associated employees and expenses next year would be between seven and \$800,000, roughly in the middle sevens, and of course, that would be required both to close the shortfall for that year and to provide some additional cushion.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Then that's the next question I want to ask. What is the delta between the anticipated shortfall and the savings that you

1 would achieve, in other words, the cushion that you talk about for next year? 2 MR. MARCUS: Well, as I tried to 3 indicate, Commissioner Yaki, the shortfall for this 4 5 year is approximately 135 or \$265,000, the difference between those figures being largely the freeze on 6 7 hires, including Commissioner assistants. 8 Based on either figure, the 265 or the 9 135, depending on whether assistants are hired next 10 year, would increase by an amount of that could be as 11 low as \$180,000, but could be \$250,000. It will be 12 somewhere in that vicinity. 13 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So we're talking 14 about a cushion that could be anywhere between 500 or 15 \$250,000, depending on how it breaks on the high end 16 or low end. Is that --That's about right. 17 MR. MARCUS: 18 think 500,000 would require a lot of things breaking 19 in the favor of the Commission, but that's an 20 approximate range. 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I assume that in 22 our budget submission for next year, we would be 23 anticipating what we would hopefully be spending that money on. So what is it that we would be using the 24 25 cushion for if we could and why?

MR. MARCUS: Well, let me tell you,

Commissioner Yaki, some of the things that we need,
and it's a question of what we will be able to
afford, based in part on whether the savings are at
the low end or at the high end. We need stronger
accounting services than what we have now. That is a
big one, and that includes in-house staff and
potentially additional expenditures to outside staff
to insure that we are able to get a clean audit.

We have not been able to get a clean

audit in the past. I think it's extremely unlikely that we would get a clean audit for 2003 or 2004 based on the accounting services we have right now. I think it's extremely unlikely that we could get a clean audit for this fiscal year. I think it's already too late in the year for that to happen.

I think we need to focus on getting the accounting services required for a clean audit for 2006.

In addition, to general accounting services, we will need to get a full-scope audit.

That is something that is required by law and that we have not had yet.

In addition, we may need other services provided by an Inspector General's audit team. Those

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

are among the highest on our list.

2.0

We also have certain critical vacancies, not all of which could be filled. We may be able to fill some or none of them depending on how the figures break. Certainly filling the General Counsel position would be high on the list. We also have vacancies for the head of Congressional Affairs, Public Affairs, and Deputy Staff Director.

We certainly wouldn't be able to fill all of those positions. I'm not sure if we would be able to fill any of those positions, but they certainly are on the list of things that we might do depending on what money we have.

So I would say the highest on the list would be accounting and related services, both internal and external.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: So that would be a combination of in-house hire and external contracting for the services that are currently provided by this other company that we have right now?

MR. MARCUS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And have we estimated the delta between what the contract is for the current accounting company and another one as well, what that would be?

MR. MARCUS: We have requested cost information from the Treasury Department's Bureau of the Public Debt, and we have asked them questions about what we would have to do in order to become the sort of agency that they would be willing to have contractual relationships with again. What they have told us is that they believe we need additional procurement services that we're not receiving in order to insure that we are

not violating procurement laws and regulations, as well as additional budget services to rectify what they consider problems in that area.

We have not yet gotten those cost It was Mr. Harbison's recollection that estimates. in the past when they have indicated the services that they believed that we required, but do not have, that the figure was over \$100,000, but we don't yet have that figure.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: That wouldn't be new 100,000 because that would be just the difference between what we're paying the current company and what BPD would be asked. So you've got a full 100 there.

MR. MARCUS: It would be -- it would be -

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I mean in terms
2	of the agency overall budget it wouldn't be an
3	additional 100,000 spent because we're already
4	spending some amount on accounting services already.
5	It would just be that difference over and above that
6	would be the net requirement for our budget for next
7	year.
8	MR. MARCUS: It was his understanding
9	that it would be an additional \$100,000.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Over and above what
11	we're currently paying.
12	MR. MARCUS: That's right. That's right.
13	Now, I should say again that we have
14	requested cost estimates and not yet received them.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And how much would it
16	cost for in-house budget personnel that you're
17	indicating? What kind of positions are we talking
18	about?
19	MR. MARCUS: A senior budget official
20	with sufficient level of expertise to serve as a
21	chief budget officer at a GS-15 level who could
22	assist both with basic budget matters and also to
23	turn around the strategic planning process at this
24	agency, which has been so severely criticized would
25	probably cost in the ballpark of \$150,000, more or

less, depending on the step at which the person comes in, including salary and benefits.

The highest, I believe, salary could be about \$135,000, but depending on seniority, it could be a bit lower than that, with the benefits being approximately a quarter of whatever the salary is.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. It's just important, I think, to get this information out there because, as you know, I've been troubled by the drive to create I wouldn't call it a surplus, but the cushion, as you call it, for each year. I understand that it is your feeling and the Chair's feeling that we need to demonstrate these kinds of reforms to Congress in order to put ourselves on a better footing with them, and I certainly appreciate that.

You know, as we go forward, I just want you to know, and I don't think it's any secret, that I'm hoping that at some point we can make the case that for this agency to function we need more money to work.

I know that's your feeling, Mr. Chair, and the feeling of every single person here not because -- simply to keep up for the lack of purchasing power or personnel that we've lost over the past ten and 15 years.

1 I appreciate the fact that we have to engage in actions this year to close the deficit. 2 Ι 3 understand and appreciate the fact that we have to do I wish we didn't have to do it in a 4 so next year. 5 way or in a manner that was based on a timetable that seems almost forced upon us by others, but that being 6 7 the case, as you know, I've been working very closely 8 with you and the Chair on how to make this work and 9 how to preserve our core mission at headquarters as 10 much as possible, and in the end, I will support 11 this, but I just think we need to be able to say why 12 it is we're doing, what it is we're doing, and, 13 again, for my part if it were not for, as you have 14 said to me repeatedly, the need to demonstrate 15 reform, I would have another alternative in mind. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Actually I'm going to 19 exercise the Chair's prerogative. 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The problems that we 22 are wrestling with now are problems that have been 23 festering for a number of years, and, Commissioner Yaki, I share your concerns, but I think that at this 24

point we are going to have to -- we don't have any --

44 there are no good decisions. All of the options that we have, all of the viable options that we have are bad, and it's just a matter of picking the best of the bad choices. I think that it's important to our staff that we make the hard decision now and create that cushion so that we don't have to go through this process again in '06. I think it's important that

9 '06 staff and the Commissioners and the special

10 assistants have some space so that we can get our

11 arms around the problems that we have, come up with a

12 battle plan without having to worry about RIFs,

13 layoffs, furloughs, office closures.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So while the options that we have will adversely affect the lives of some of our employees, I think over the long term, we have to make this decision. This decision will put us on the road to restoring the fiscal health of the agency, and at the end of the day we can't fulfill our mission if the back office issues, like budget matters and operational matters aren't dealt with.

Commissioner Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thanks very much.

I concur in large part with comments made

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

by Commissioner Yaki. I think it's extremely important to have a great deal of transparency when it comes to making decisions such as this. For the time that I've been on the Commission we have been kicking the can down the road, so to speak, and not been making hard choices, and I think that has gotten us to the point where we now have to do this, which is an extremely unpleasant task.

Possibly we could have avoided this at some point. I'm not sure if we could have, but if things had been done earlier, maybe we would not be in this particular spot.

The one thing that I am a little concerned with, Commissioner Yaki is troubled by the cushion. I'm troubled by the cushion from a different perspective, and it seems to be consumed almost completely by our need, in fact, our mandate to implement structural reforms that haven't been implemented over the course of a number of years.

That leaves us with virtually no additional revenues, no additional money for discharging our statutory mission, and at least that's my perspective, but I'm wondering if you might be able to give us an explanation of what you perceive to be our ability to do what we're here to

1 do, that is, produce reports, look at the issues pertaining to civil rights throughout the country. 2 3 In 2006, for example, if much of the cushion is consumed by audits and all of the other 4 5 things that have been deferred for years and years and years, will we have the ability, for example, to 6 7 conduct hearings, fly people in if necessary? Will 8 we be able to discharge our mission? 9 MR. MARCUS: Yes, Commissioner, the work 10 of the Commission will continue despite the cutbacks. 11 Just as we have less resources than last year and 12 last year than the year before, we will have less 13 resources next year than a year ago. However, we will still be able to hold 14 15 hearings and briefings even under the tighter 16 circumstances. We will need to be a little bit 17 tighter in terms of expenses in '06 than we have been 18 in prior years. 19 Even this year we have fewer in the way 20 of analysts and related staff to do reports than 21 we've had in the recent past, and certainly 22 significantly fewer than in the distant past, and 23 we'll have somewhat fewer again next year. Whether this reduces -- I think it will 24 25 reduce the number of reports that we do, but we will

still be doing reports. We will still be doing analyses. We will still be holding hearings and briefings if that is the Commissioners' intent, and I expect it will be.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair, Vice Chair Thernstrom.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I just have with respect to what Commissioner Yaki said just one question for him.

I very much appreciate what you said. I'm in agreement with it, but there was one point you made that I think could be easily misunderstood. You said you understood the necessity of impressing Congress with the seriousness of our dedication here to reform. You would agree, I hope, that we're not simply here talking about a public relations problem as it were, but we are talking about restoring the fiscal health of the agency, which is not -- I mean, the question of impressing Congress is, you know, simply one aspect of that larger picture, in that it's important to communicate the seriousness of our commitment to restoring the fiscal health, but you seem to imply that this was driven solely by the need to impress Congress.

And I'm sure that was a misunderstanding,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but --

2.0

COMMISSIONER YAKI: May I respond?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, that wasn't a misunderstanding at all. Since I have been appointed to the Commission and been in meeting after meeting, it has been stated over and over that we are taking these particular reforms in response to Congress.

And to me the point is that if I had my druthers, which I will not and which is why I'm supporting this, I think, kinder, gentler version of what had originally been talked about, is because that I'm not going to win the argument of perception, which is that I believe that we have taken serious steps toward reform.

Our internal agency instructions have been amended to the nth degree by the Staff Director and by the other members of the Commission before I came on. I'm being very meticulous in all of my record keeping to meet all of GAO's requirements so that I don't charge anything that I shouldn't.

I have foregone a special assistant, as has the Chair, because I take my contribution to this very seriously, but I do not believe and continue to not believe that we need to go as far as we need to

at this time and at this moment to maintain our fiscal health. I think that natural attrition will come in. I think the voluntary buyouts are part of it.

On the other hand, I recognize the handwriting on the wall, and when so many people have said to me over and over again, you know, we're being watched, we need to take serious action and we have to show that we're committed to all of these things, which I really think we are. That's why I agree to go along with this proposal, because, to put it bluntly, I just want to make it less worse than it is.

And no one likes what we're doing. I know that the Chair, I know that the Staff Director nor you, Vice Chair nor any of the other

Commissioners who are here want to do what it is that we're doing. I certainly don't, and I don't because I don't believe that the timing is such that we actually need to do everything all at once.

And I think that we have the ability, and I think we have the means and bipartisan basis to go forward to policy makers and say, "We have gotten your message."

We certainly did that at the hearing last

2.0

month. This is what we are doing. This is what we're going to continue to do. I would rather have seen a three-four year plan rather than an overnight plan that forces us to engage in essentially, you know, a five to ten percent cut of our staff in the next year and a half.

But I don't have the majority on this

Commission, and in wanting to work constructively

with a majority in this Commission, I'm willing to

say that I do not separate myself out and just be a

naysayer and say no. I understand that's where they

want to go. That's the perception. Whatever I can

do to make it less worse, so to speak, I will, and

that's why I support what the Staff Director and the

Chair put forward.

But make no mistake. I do not have any misunderstanding in all my conversations over the past two months about why we are being driven down this road at this time.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: well, I'd like to respond.

Commissioner Yaki, the two of us, we've had conversations about these ugly choices, and I just want to be clear that I share many of the concerns that members of Congress have expressed

1 about this agency. The decisions that we're making today I don't believe are driven solely by Congress. 2 3 Is it a factor, and an important factor? Yes. But we can't get a clean audit in our 4 5 present state. We don't have an accounting system in This agency has neglected over the years, and 6 that's why we've reached this point. 7 8 And I believe that strong measures are 9 needed now, not down the road, and these measures are 10 needed in order to enable us to function. 11 And after saying that though I appreciate 12 the fact that while we disagree on some issues, I 13 appreciate the manner in which we have disagreed and the manner in which we have worked to reach 14 15 compromise. 16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Staff Director, I wonder if you have anything to add to 17 18 that. 19 MR. MARCUS: The measures which we are 20 taking are necessary to deal with the problems that 21 we have. If they also serve to send a signal of our 22 seriousness either to Congress or to anyone else, 23 that may be helpful, but we would need to take measures of this sort regardless. 24

The fact that we are on target to

overspend our budget unless various corrections are taken, that's a fact. Now, there are many ways of dealing with it, some of which demonstrate a seriousness of reaching long-term solutions and some of them are not, but we need to do what we need to do because it's legally required and because it's the right thing to do regardless of whether it also pleases any of our stakeholders.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just by way of clarification, has the number that we've put forth for next year -- does that include the fact that I probably will not hire a staff assistant or not?

MR. MARCUS: I've tried to give both sets of figures, Commissioner Yaki, some on the assumption that the Commissioners hire special assistants and some on the assumptions that they do not, and that's part of why there's a range.

All of them, all of the figures that I've given you, however, are predicated on the assumption that as the Staff Director I do not hire any of the four Schedule C special assistants that I'm authorized to hire because I think it's important to demonstrate that resolve.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner

Thernstrom?

2.0

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Can I just say something on the special assistant question? I have repeatedly expressed my willingness to, as it were, being so lucky as to have a special assistant, repeatedly expressed my willingness to share my special assistant so that other Commissioners have some help as well.

You know, I think we're all here ready to pitch in in any way that we can. Again, going back to our concern for the staff and our concern for the impact on the regional offices and so forth of the measures that are on the table here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow?

commissioner KIRSANOW: I just want to emphasize I think with both what Staff Director and yourself said, that we came to this pass not in a vacuum. Even in the few meetings we've had so far this year, we were told astonishing things, things that we were not told for at least my tenure on the Commission, and we discovered were pretty significant, pretty serious.

We were told we didn't even have a

general ledger. That in and of itself should send sirens wailing throughout the Capitol.

We did not implement GAO reforms. When you read GAO reports, they try to say things in a kind of sterile manner, but anyone who has read any kind of accounting reports or assessments of an agency or a firm would look at it and say this place is completely out of control and is spiraling into a ditch quickly.

We have not implemented or did not implement prior to Staff Director coming on board OPM recommendations. We did not have an audit for 12 years. Every time I would pick up the paper to read about the agency, it would have something to do with how it is completely out of control.

So we did not come to this pass without any history, and we did not get here -- the measures that are being taken are not being done in a vacuum.

I think everybody here would prefer not to have done this, but I think had we had the kind of information that the Staff Director provided to us over the last three months, had we taken a hard look and a sober, responsible look at this agency in the past, we may not have had to take these kinds of Draconian actions.

1 I still think we have a structural 2 deficit with which we would have to deal, but it's conceivable we could have implemented controls and 3 reforms that would have cushioned the blow a little 4 5 bit more. So are we trying to impress people? 6 7 agree with the Staff Director. Whether it impresses 8 anybody or not, and I frankly doubt that it will 9 because I don't think anybody is paying a whole lot 10 of attention to what we're doing, these are reforms 11 that need to be taken, and my only concern is are we 12 going far enough. 13 What I don't want to do is have to 14 revisit the issue two years down the road, a year 15 down the road. I'm persuaded by what the Staff 16 Director has to say that we're taking cuts 17 significant enough or sufficient enough to avoid that 18 eventuality. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments, 2.0 questions? 21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'd move the 22 question. 23 Second? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 24 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second. 25 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote.

1	All in favor say aye.
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes.
6	Okay. At this point let's take a ten-
7	minute break I'm sorry?
8	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Could I? Before we
9	leave the Staff Director's report, because I assume
10	that's what we're doing now.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I just wanted to ask
13	one question which is completely off the subject of
14	the budget, but can you tell me what the status of
15	the request that the Indian Affairs Committee put
16	forth to the Commission to testify regarding the
17	Indian health care report, the Broken Promises
18	Report?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That
20	invitation was sent to me. I declined for various
21	reasons. So that's
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, and the reason
23	I ask is because then they have gotten hold of me
24	because they were disappointed, and I am disappointed
25	to say the least, because, I mean, they felt like it

1	was protocol asking you, but in fact, I mean, they
2	would have been happy with I mean, they actually
3	did want me to testify, and if that wasn't possible,
4	then anyone from the Commission, Debra Carr's office
5	or someone to go testify and report concerning what
6	the contents of that report was.
7	So, you know, I really am very
8	disappointed that this Commission would turn down the
9	Indian Affairs Committee, to appear before them.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, It was a
11	Jennifer, were you about to jump in?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I'm just
13	confused, but, Elsie, did you say they asked you?
14	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, according to
15	them, protocol they felt required them to ask the
16	Chair, to extend the invitation to the Chair, but you
17	know, assuming he could not do it, that it then would
18	be passed to someone else.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The issues,
20	well, some of the complexities of this issue at least
21	for me, I wasn't here when that report was issued,
22	and that report, I believe, was approved by four
23	Commissioners and there was four abstentions.
24	There's a lot in that document that I agree with and
25	support, but there are other issues that I have

serious concerns about, but that's me.

2.0

And I felt that it was not -- I don't think it would be appropriate for me to be unable to give my full support to a Commission document, and so those are some of the reasons why I --

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Fine. The report was approved though.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And so the fact that the Indian Affairs Committee wanted someone to come talk to them about that report, you could disagree with part of it if you wished, but you know, I just am -- I think that the Indian Affairs Committee, for one thing, deserves more respect than that.

I also think that this was a very important report, and things haven't gotten better in Indian Country since that report, but it's a very, very important report.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, the conditions in Indian Country are issues that I hope one day we would be able to -- well, I want to spend some time looking at some of the issues in Indian Country, but getting back to the current issue, now, are you suggesting that, okay, fine, I may be uncomfortable but you, on the other hand, would be willing?

_	COMMISSIONER MEERS: I Would Celeathly
2	be. I mean, in the past, I know that Terri
3	Dickerson, if it was her report, went and, you know,
4	testified. This came out of OGC. So, you know,
5	someone from there. I mean, depending on budget, it
6	would mean an extra trip out here for me so
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. How about
8	this? Let's
9	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I would be glad
10	to do it.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's talk about our
12	options. We still have some time.
13	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: It's next week.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Is it? I was
15	about to say isn't it next week.
16	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Yes. But I would
17	very much like someone to go.
L8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, excuse me.
19	This is Jennifer.
20	I mean, why don't you do it? You seem to
21	be the most knowledgeable about the report and the
22	most passionate about the report, and it seems that
23	you would be the best person to do it.
24	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'm happy to do it.
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Commissioner
1	

1	Meeks would obviously be the best person to do it.
2	As we're talking about saving pennies here, the only
3	question is whether we should send somebody from the
4	staff instead, and why don't we leave this for
5	Commissioner Meeks and the Chair to settle?
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right, okay.
7	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: I'm fine with that.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's take a
9	ten-minute break.
10	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
11	the record at 10:47 a.m. and went back on
12	the record at 11:15 a.m.)
13	V. Management and Operations
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We're going to
15	start.
16	Next on the agenda is Management and
17	Operations, and I believe Commissioner Kirsanow has
18	several motions.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, Mr.
20	Chair.
21	Last month we discussed several different
22	motions and that we would revisit them at this
23	particular meeting. Since that time we have had GAO
24	come out with their report. One of the motions, you
25	may recall, was a motion to adopt GAO and OPM

1	recommendations within an expedited nine-month time
2	frame.
3	And to ward that end, I move that the
4	Commission adopt the policy recommendations of the
5	GAO reports of 2005, 2004, 2003, and 1995, and also
6	the OPM report of 1997, and that the Staff Director
7	implement those recommendations within a nine-month
8	time frame consistent, however, with any strictures
9	or confines imposed by the Anti-deficiency Act, of
10	course.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. I
12	don't seem to have a copy of these motions.
13	Oh, okay.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can somebody
15	recap the minutes? I don't know if that makes a
16	difference one way or the other.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. Jennifer,
18	please repeat what you just said.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Our discussion of
20	this the last time was not recapped in the minutes
21	for some reason I don't believe.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I haven't
23	reviewed the minutes.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's I don't
25	know.
1	

1 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Jennifer, it's not in the minutes per se. 2 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's here. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, I see it 4 5 here. It is in the minutes under Management and 6 Operations. 7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay. 8 sorry. My mistake then. I was looking in another 9 section. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a 11 second? 12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yeah, I second 13 it. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion. 15 Commissioner Yaki. 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yeah, I would just like to add a friendly amendment, hopefully a 17 friendly amendment to say that after the nine month 18 19 thing, to the extent they are non-repetitive and to 2.0 the extent funds are available because I would not 21 want us to -- I understand what you meant by the 22 Anti-deficiency Act, but there are also other -- even 23 within their priorities regarding which of these 24 things we're going to do, there are money costs 25 associated with each.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow, do you accept that as a friendly amendment? 2 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yeah, I have no 3 objection to it. 4 5 And I'd also want to just state for the record that I would like these implemented as quickly 6 7 as possible, but I told the Staff Director off line 8 that I wasn't going to hang him if he didn't have 9 them within nine months. We understand he's laboring 10 under a lot of pressures right now. 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other discussion? 12 Any other comments? Okay. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I'm sorry. 14 I'd just like to hear from the Staff Director 15 whether there are any in particular of these 16 recommendations that are problematic either from a 17 financial point of view or a management point of 18 view. Does he have any concerns about seeing all of 19 these take place? 2.0 MR. MARCUS: Commissioner Braceras, I do 21 not have any concerns about any single recommendation 22 from either of those two perspectives under the 23 motion as amended. There are some recommendations 24 that may require expenditures, including, for 25 instance, some that may require either additional

1	training or that may require purchase of software.
2	We will need to assess the cost in order to comply
3	with the motion, but it seems to me that I would not
4	recommend accepting any single one of the
5	recommendations. I think it is appropriate to move
6	forward on all of them.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I just
8	wanted to make sure that you were supportive of this
9	before I signed on, but if you're supportive of it,
10	then since you're the one who has to implement them
11	all, I'm on board.
12	MR. MARCUS: Thank you, Commissioner,
13	and, yes, I do wholeheartedly support this.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Time to vote.
15	All in favor?
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, I've
21	got another motion. This is fairly simple. I move
22	the Commission authorize the Staff Director to post
23	documents on the Commission Web site, specifically
24	the congressional testimony of Commissioners Yaki and
25	Redembaugh and also the correspondence sent to

1	Congress by Commissioners Braceras and Vice Chair
2	Thernstrom.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would that include
4	the testimony of Staff Director?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm sorry. Yes,
6	also the Staff Director. That's correct.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I'll
9	second it.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?
13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I have one last
18	motion for right now, and last meeting we had a
19	discussion with respect to conducting a full scope
20	audit of the Commission. As a preliminary matter we
21	had determined it was necessary to engage in an
22	examination of what the costs would be, what the
23	scope would be, and chronologically when we should
24	fit this in, given that we have GAO and some other
25	things going on. We were possibly talking about a

restructuring of the Commission in terms of a RIF.

During that period of time, there has been an examination as to what the costs would be and whether or not, in fact, we could even conduct an audit, and as a result of that particular examination, it was determined that the Commission is not in auditable shape; in other words, that reputable auditing firms, major auditing firms would not even Take on the Commission because of the fact that we don't have the appropriate financial controls, and they couldn't conduct an audit that they can put their name to.

They indicated that before that would happen, certain necessary controls would have to be put into place, and before that happened an assessment would need to be done as to the nature of the controls and what else needed to be done so that we would be audit ready.

So toward that end, I would simply move that the Staff Director take all necessary steps to make the Commission audit ready as soon as practicable.

I know that's a very large or expansive motion. It's not specific, but I would leave it to the discretion of the Staff Director to employ

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

2.0

1 whatever means are necessary, whether it be engaging a contractor to conduct that assessment. However, if 2 we could do it inside, in house, if that can be 3 accomplished, that's fine also. 4 5 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second? VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second it. 6 7 I would like to hear from -- you were 8 about to say, "Any discussion?" -- I would like to 9 hear from the Staff Director any thoughts. 10 MR. MARCUS: Well, I think that 11 Commissioner Kirsanow raised some very good points. 12 It is distressing to hear that several of the major 13 accounting firms that were contacted have indicated 14 that they suspect that we are not auditable at this 15 point or that they could not conduct the audit. 16 think it will be very difficult at this point to be 17 able to entice a large major accounting firm to do 18 such an audit, and questions about whether we could 19 get a mid-size firm. 20 So I think that it is appropriate to do 21 preparatory work to get to the point where we can be 22 auditable. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director, do we 24 have a sense of how far away we are from being 25 auditable? Have we established the scope of our

problem yet?

MR. MARCUS: We have gotten preliminary information, as I believe Commissioner Kirsanow indicated.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I can speak to that. The Staff Director and I had a brief

discussion about this.

It may take about four weeks for someone to do whatever assessment is necessary to make recommendations as to what controls are put into place.

So it's conceivable that after today's meeting that if we worked diligently, then maybe by the June meeting we'd be in a position where we would know what controls need to be put into place and possibly even put those controls into place, and then thereafter we could perhaps commission an audit.

Obviously we're going to have to take a look at the costs, but the preliminary step before we do all of this, and we must have an audit, is to conduct this assessment.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you suggesting that we can't audit prior years? I mean once we put the controls in place, our ability to conduct an audit, that would be prospective.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What about the prior
3	years?
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My understanding
5	is it's unlikely we could do that effectively. Now,
6	I think what you're referring to would have to be
7	done in a forensic way. They'd have to reconstruct a
8	whole lot.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And have we had any
10	discussions about a forensic audit so that we will
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sounds like "CSI."
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Have we had those
13	types of discussions?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, not
15	specifically with respect to forensics. My
16	understanding is though, I mean, I've done this
17	before, not personally, but I've been involved
18	situations where that has happened. A forensic is
19	obviously a little bit more time consuming and a lot
20	more expensive.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Are we
22	ready to vote? Okay. All in favor say aye.
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
25	(No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes. Okay. Pete, Commissioner Kirsanow, you 2 have another motion. 3 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. This is a 5 motion to amend the scope of the approved project on federal procurement following the Supreme Court's 6 7 decision in Adarand v. Pena, and this is the motion: 8 I move that OCRE reshape the scope of the 9 Adarand enforcement study to include information on 10 federal agencies' use of race-neutral contracting 11 vehicles, in addition to elements of the original 12 project proposal. The resulting study will, one, 13 report the amount of federal procurement funds going to small, disadvantaged, and HUBZone businesses; two, 14 15 analyze continuing barriers facing socially and 16 economically disadvantaged firs; and, three, examine the role of federal agencies, including SBA in 17 18 implementing procurement programs for these firms 19 following the Supreme Court decision that government 20 procurement activity involving racial classification 21 be subject to strict scrutiny. 22 Specifically, OCRE --23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. is Jennifer. I can't hear people well because I'm 24

picking up interference from somebody else's

1	microphone.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. Let me go
3	back to
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do we have copies of
5	this?
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think I have a
7	copy here, but
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I just wanted
10	to let you know that I'm picking up murmurings from
11	other people.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I believe the
13	Chair was murmuring.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Jerry, stop
15	murmuring.
16	(Laughter.)
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Hold on, Pete.
18	A copy of the motion was circulated
19	electronically, Commissioner Yaki. Unfortunately we
20	just brought down a single copy.
21	Well, no, hold on. The cavalry has
22	arrived.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You always have
24	copies. Audrey is the thank you.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I left off where

1	I indicated, made reference to the Supreme Court's
2	decision regarding racial classification subject to
3	strict scrutiny. Specifically, OCRE will research if
4	and how federal contract or federal agencies changed
5	procurement practices to fulfill the compelling
6	interest and narrow tailoring components of the
7	Adarand v. Pena decision.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Excuse me.
9	Commissioner Braceras, have you now got the entire
10	motion or do you need Commissioner Kirsanow to read
11	it?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, no, I have
13	it. I just wanted to make you aware that I was
14	having trouble hearing.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, okay.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because of the
17	microphone issue.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's the
21	motion.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion.
25	Commissioner Yaki.
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I want to thank the
2	Chair and the other Commissioners in pulling this
3	together. I just need time to read it in view of
4	what I had done before. Can I ask a question of
5	staff on this one?
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Ms. Dickerson.
8	MR. MARCUS: I would add that Ms.
9	Dickerson is prepared to give a few words on this
10	that would also require some transparencies if you
11	would like and some discussion.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you have a mic?
13	Yes. Okay, great.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm trying to get the
15	original wording. Ms. Dickerson, can you sort of
16	tell me what you now understand the scope of the
17	presently moved but not yet approved project to be?
17	presently moved but not yet approved project to be? MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to
18	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to
18	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to explain that with some of the presentation?
18 19 20	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to explain that with some of the presentation? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
18 19 20 21	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to explain that with some of the presentation? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. MS. DICKERSON: Because it might be
18 19 20 21 22	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to explain that with some of the presentation? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. MS. DICKERSON: Because it might be helpful to look along with me at a few things.
18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. DICKERSON: Would it be okay to explain that with some of the presentation? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. MS. DICKERSON: Because it might be helpful to look along with me at a few things. COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure.

1	out a little bit.
2	I understand we don't have a PowerPoint
3	projector anymore.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That was on eBay last
6	week, wasn't it?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, in order to
8	avoid violating the Anti-deficiency Act, we had to
9	auction off a few things.
10	(Laughter.)
11	MS. DICKERSON: This is just in response
12	to some of the questions that came up at the last
13	meeting, and I just thought I would do a quick
14	comparison of the original scope compared to the race
15	neutral one.
16	So the first transparency has the program
17	ceiling start. It does point out that one effect of
18	the change in scope is that whereas the original
19	scope was going to focus on procurement trends and
20	procurement itself and how Adarand changed
21	procurement strategies, the new focus, which is on
22	the right side, would be race neutral strategies to
23	achieve contracting goals.
24	Okay. This isn't working.
1	1

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

I'm sorry,

1	Terri. Can I ask you a question?
2	MS. DICKERSON: It doesn't matter how
3	close you sit to that one. It's not going to work.
4	This one does.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Terri, could I
6	ask a question here?
7	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Now, those are
9	two separate questions. One is not really a
10	substitute for the other. They are both legitimate
11	questions. The reason you came down on the side of
12	one being a substitute for the other is what?
13	MS. DICKERSON: Well, maybe I can fast
14	forward to sort of the time line of what's happened
15	with staff.
16	If you could just fast forward to number
17	28, and I'll go over.
18	Some of the significant dates with
19	respect to what has occurred with the statutory
20	report. December 1st was when staff submitted draft
21	interrogatories, but that was to the former Staff
22	Director, and those were presented for the former
23	Staff Director's and Chair's signature and approval.
24	And so I assume those were undergoing an
25	approval process, and then there was a change in the

1 Staff Director's office. So by December 17th, the staff had 2 3 revised -- I believe Mr. Marcus may have been named around the 8th, and I don't know. I mean, it was 4 5 just my recollection. I think maybe he was in the building by the 13th. 6 7 MR. MARCUS: I came in around December 16th or 17th. 8 9 MS. DICKERSON: Sixteenth or 17th. Okay. 10 So the day after the new Staff Director was here, 11 along with a mountain of other things he was dealing 12 with, we presented the new. That's going to be where 13 we end up. 14 We presented the new and revised 15 interrogatories with just the signature block 16 changed. That was December 17th. On January 10th, the Staff Director had 17 18 reviewed those, you know, just like we were waiting for the former Staff Director to review and comment, 19 2.0 and he asked us to expand on some of the questions, 21 which we did. 22 And then by the 13th of January, he gave 23 us a little bit more guidance on some of being more

specific and less vague on some of the race neutral

questions.

24

Meanwhile the staff was still working on the project, and they submitted to me a draft report according to the plan that the Commission had approved last year. So the original draft came to me at that time. It was kind of sketchy and lacked some detail, but it was our first draft.

By the 26th, I met with the Staff
Director and he gave me kind of his last changes on
the interrogatories, and we revised that, and by then
the concept paper, it was really a shift because
there was a lot more focus on whereas the race
neutral component had been a part of the original
concept, we were elaborating on it so much that the
concept paper necessarily, you know, became
different as well.

So by February 1st, we had revised the interrogatories, and we submitted those for signature and approval. By the 8th we had received changes from the front office, and we sent those interrogatories to agencies.

The deadline to the agencies was February 28th. Most of the agencies requested extensions, and some just stated that they disliked the February 28th deadline because they were only getting it on the 8th, but we only received requests for extensions

2.0

from some of them.

2.0

By February 8th, we had received no replies to our interrogatories -- on February 28th, which was the deadline.

Between March 3rd and March 21st, we had received all of the interrogatories by March 21st, but we had only gotten five by March 11th.

By the 31st, we, the staff, submitted to me the new report draft because that had to start coming to me, and now today is April 8th. We're hoping to get some guidance on which of these directions we're supposed to go. By the 11th, the draft report is due to the Staff Director.

And then the last date I have posted here, May 24th through June 8th is legal sufficiency review. The 24th through June 8th is also the editorial review. According to the schedule or, you know, what we could see as a doable revised schedule, by June 16th we would give it to the Staff Director in the hope that that would be the version that would go to the Commissioners, and their review would be simultaneous with affected agencies, which would be June 16th through 29th, and I assume looking to a discussion in July, at the July meeting.

Those are a review of some of the things

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

1 that occurred. Maybe it would be helpful then to go back to two to talk. 2 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yeah, let's do 4 that. 5 MS. DICKERSON: Okay. Oh, back to one, yeah. That's right. 6 7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 8 MS. DICKERSON: Yeah. So because of the 9 more specificity that we were getting from the front 10 office, the focus of the project really did change 11 from how Adarand changed procurement strategies to 12 how agencies are really implementing race neutral 13 strategies to achieve contracting goals. 14 In the original version we were going to 15 look at minority and women owned businesses, and in 16 the revised version we're only looking at minority 17 owned businesses. This is partly because -- well, 18 I'll get to that in the next slide. 19 And then in the original we were going to 20 look at procurement trends, 1994 to 2004. That was 21 really because we were looking at right after 22 Adarand, but then in the revision we were only 23 looking at what agencies had been able to implement. 24 So we were looking at programs that they had 25 started, 2000 to 2004.

The HUBZone project or program that Mr.

Kirsanow referred to didn't even start I don't think until about 2000. So agencies had to have time to get those programs in place that were going to comport with Adarand, and so we changed the date of what we were looking at from 1994 to beginning with 2000.

I want to amplify the second bullet. Can you put the next slide up?

I want to amplify the second bullet is reasons we're not studying the women owned -- it's number three -- reasons that we're not looking at the women owned businesses along with minority owned firms.

Number one, because different legal standards apply to women owned procurement. Women owned firms are subject to intermediate and not strict scrutiny, and agencies sometimes nonetheless apply policies to both, but the legal basis for doing so is very different.

So I think we probably would have, irrespective of which direction we had gone, we would have had to come to that conclusion anyway, that it's almost a separate study to look at women owned firms. There's a different program infrastructure. There

are, you know, sometimes women owned procurement offices that are separate from the minority offices within agencies. There are, as I said, different statutory mandates, and the character of women owned businesses is different.

So that component wouldn't be addressed at this point.

emphasis is that we would not be relating procurement trends to Adarand. That is foremost, I guess because we didn't ask for data exactly post Adarand. As I said, we made the data request from 2000 to 2004, and not 1994 or pre-Adarand through 2000 because the whole nature of the project changed. We really weren't looking at procurement post Adarand.

But within that there were also so many other legislative and regulatory changes, changes to federal acquisition streamlining, changes to small business programs and policy. Those probably could not be isolated anyway and analyzed separately from the effects of the Adarand decision.

I guess I'm kind of getting into some of our findings, preliminary findings, with you at this point. So it's advantageous that I'm able to present this to you, but this is another component of the

2.0

1	original concept that we would not be able to
2	deliver, but I don't think we would have been able to
3	get to this anyway even if we had ten years' worth of
4	data. We would have been able to look at trends a
5	little bit more from 1994 to 2004, but I don't think
6	we would have been able to isolate the effects of
7	Adarand from all of the other legislative and
8	regulatory changes that have occurred in that ten-
9	year period.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Ms. Dickerson,
11	before you go on, going back to Vice Chair
12	Thernstrom's point, the shift from looking at
13	procurement to race neutral policies, do we have
14	sufficient information to do both, sufficient
15	information and time?
16	MS. DICKERSON: Oh, to do both? Yes, we
17	can do some aspects of the original and as well as
18	the race neutral piece.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And still meet the
20	deadlines that were in that earlier
21	MS. DICKERSON: Yes, provided we get that
22	specific direction from you today.
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You know, I
24	understand your point here, looking at trend lines
25	from '94 to '04 you can't separate out the effects of

Adarand from other legislative and regulatory changes, but nevertheless the trend lines in themselves are interesting to me.

You know, I think if it's possible for you to provide information on them worth looking at.

MS. DICKERSON: It's not on the slide,
but I do have kind of an idea of an outline that the
staff has generated in this whole discussion of
what's possible to cover at this point, which I would
like to -- there would be six chapters, and I'm only
-- would only indicate broadly what they would cover
just to give an indication of what would be covered
and what wouldn't.

Chapter 1 would certainly just be the introduction, scope, methodology, et cetera, overview of the Adarand case, narrow tailoring what it means, strict scrutiny, all of that, the DOJ guidance, just sort of like to lay the landscape for what procurement is all about and has been in the last ten years.

Chapter 2 is based on data that we received from agencies, and as well as literature review. We would present data on federal contracting, data on minority owned businesses, federal contract growth, barriers to contract

opportunities, et cetera. We would really deal with procurement and looking at the seven agencies that we're now looking at.

Maybe you can just post the seven agencies, Teresa so that everybody has an idea of which ones we're looking at now. Do you have that? Number five, yes. Thank you.

In the original, we were only looking at DOD, DOT, SBA, and GSA. And in the revised we've dropped GSA because we were really looking at the GSA schedule, and effect of the GSA schedule on minority and women owned businesses and not implementation.

So we kind of dropped them, but we added agencies that do a fair amount of federal procurement. We added energy, housing, and urban development, Department of State, and the Department of Education. So now we're looking at seven agencies, and so Chapter 3 would be looking at, you know, their level of procurement with minority and women owned businesses.

The third chapter we would -- would be where we would discuss race conscious aspects of federal procurement. I guess the small disadvantaged business programs, the 8(a) program, et cetera, and that was in the original proposal.

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

We also would talk about other federal programs like mentor protege program, which may or may not be race specific depending on the agency and also the HUBZone program, which is a non-race -- well, it does have race conscious aspects, but it was something that was implemented after Adarand.

Chapter 4 would focus specifically on race neutral alternatives in federal contracting.

Some of the ones that have been identified so far in the research are, for example, financial assistance, relaxed bonding requirements, unbundling of contracts, outreach and technical assistance, those things that do not have race conscious aspects.

How agencies define race neutrality and narrow tailoring, and this we would get from the interrogatories that we've sent. The programs and strategies that benefit all small businesses irrespective of gender or race.

And then Chapter 5 would be any other elements of narrow tailoring. For example, enforcement, and again, I'm kind of getting into findings, but one of our chief findings is that there really isn't an enforcement mechanism within all of this. I mean, all of these agencies have Title VI responsibilities, but there's not really an agency or

2.0

1	an entity that is functioning making sure that these
2	programs do not have discrimination. So there's not
3	an enforcement aspect to it.
4	Also, how do agencies measure the
5	effectiveness of their race conscious or race neutral
6	programs? What are they doing to determine whether
7	they should expand these, the extent to which they
8	should be offering them?
9	We want to make some recommendations with
10	respect to that, how they should periodically
11	evaluate programs, whether they're race neutral or
12	race conscious, and the periodic evaluation and
13	review, which don't seem to be built in very much to
14	any of these programs.
15	And then Chapter 6, we would offer
16	findings and recommendations.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And as you
18	outlined those chapters, you feel able to do the work
19	you just depicted?
20	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, well,
22	the word "capable" may have some unfortunate
23	connotations.
24	MS. DICKERSON: Yes.
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I just meant

_	given the time, given the stair, given, you know,
2	whatever.
3	MS. DICKERSON: I was taking it that way.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
5	MS. DICKERSON: But, you know, the time
6	had definitely been compressed, and it has been a
7	little bit of a moving target, but, yes, we do feel
8	that we can do this.
9	There's been one person on the team from
LO	the beginning of the fiscal year. Someone joined the
L1	team around November. Dr. Rudert has been on from
L2	the beginning, and Mireille Zieseniss since about
L3	November. Ana Maria Ortiz joined that team in
L4	January, and then on a part-time basis Latrice Foshee
L5	in addition to her compliance analysis duties is also
L6	a part of that time.
L7	So if we can keep that team together and
L8	moving toward those states, we ought to be able to
L9	deliver what I just said.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks.
22	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And so to be clear,
23	this motion will not change the scope as Terri has
24	outlined.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Geez, I don't believe

1	so, but let me take a quick look here.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, let's
3	ask Commissioner Kirsanow. Do you envision that this
4	motion would have an impact on the
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I am not the
6	proponent of the motion.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I thought you
8	were. I'm sorry.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm simply the
10	mouthpiece.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I believe that the
12	motion as drafted is broad enough so that it would
13	encompass the approach that's just been discussed.
14	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Well, I mean, I can
15	support this motion as long as the contents that
16	Terri has outlined is included in the report.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I would
18	second that.
19	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Can we ask Terri
20	what her view of it is?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, sure, sure.
22	MS. DICKERSON: Yes. I believe if I
23	heard the motion correctly that we are
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Terri, let's
25	have you look at the exact wording.
]	

MS. DICKERSON: Okay. Illalik you.
Yes, it is true. The only thing that it
doesn't have, which isn't addressed in the motion or
what I just said is, you know, we would like to skip
the women owned business piece.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
MS. DICKERSON: Okay. So, yes, I think
this comports with our new outline.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.
COMMISSIONER YAKI: Seeing as this is a
motion that was the progeny of a discussion that
Commissioner Braceras and I had at the last meeting
and given that Terri has committed her team to get
this done, I'm satisfied and will support the motion
and move it.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions
or comments?
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: But I second
moving it.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We've had the
discussion. Unless there are additional questions or
comments, Jennifer, anything from you?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. I obviously
couldn't see the visuals, but everything that Terri
spoke about seemed on track with what I had hoped to

1	have the Commission produce. So that sounds great.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor
3	say aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition say
6	nay.
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
9	carriers.
10	VI.Future Agenda Items
11	Okay. Now, future agenda items. Are
12	there any times that the Commissioners definitely
13	want to discuss at our next meeting?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Don't you have
15	one that you wanted to discuss?
16	PARTICIPANT: I thought we were short on
17	one motion.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Actually that motion
19	wasn't circulated.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I thought there
21	was another motion.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, there was a
23	another motion, but after discussion, it was not
24	clear that this motion was circulated, and I believe

1	writing and be circulated so that Commissioners would
2	have an opportunity to review them before the
3	meeting.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That is
5	correct.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Which motion are we
7	talking about?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Special ed.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I haven't seen that.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yeah. No, we
12	have to have prior notification.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. May I have a
14	motion to adjourn?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
17	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: Second.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Before doing so,
19	I just wanted to make note, and I should have done it
20	earlier during the announcements portion, of the
21	passing of John Paul II, who probably is one of the
22	chief human rights activists in the history of the
23	last 100 years.
24	Anyone reading <u>Veritatis Splendor</u> , <u>Gospel</u>
25	of Truth, or any of his other writings see him not
	1

_	Just as a numan rights activist but, by extension, a
2	civil rights activist, and I think his passing is
3	obviously mourned by millions, if not billions,
4	throughout the world.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you, Pete.
6	I agree with that statement.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, folks,
8	until we meet again, this meeting is adjourned.
9	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
10	the record at 11:54 a.m. and went back on
l1	the record at 11:55 a.m.)
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Meeks'
L3	appointment is coming to an end. I hope that she is
14	reappointed. While we have disagreements on the
15	substantive issues, I believe that her voice adds to
16	the
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Hello?
18	(Laughter.)
L9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Welcome back,
20	Jennifer.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We thought your baby
22	was teething on the microphone there.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Jennifer, I was just
24	commenting, well, just pointing out that Commissioner
25	Meeks, her term is up, and I was saying that I hope
1	

that you're reappointed.

Again, while we have a different approach to dealing with these issues, I think that you have taken principled positions and that the manner in which you have disagreed has been a model. This is how this agency should operate, where we have people who have different views, but who understand the importance of fighting in a respectful manner.

So I want to thank you for the quality of conversations that we've had since December, and again, if it were my decision, you would be reappointed. So I keep my fingers crossed.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I would like to kind of second that. I'd very much like to see Commissioner Meeks reappointed, and I don't think of her as somebody I will necessarily disagree with in the end to all matters at all, and I think this is a remarkably collegial group as it stands, and she is part of that collegiality.

And I have a great deal of respect for her opinions when I agree with them and when I disagree with them. So I hope that she will be back sitting in that chair, and I hope that there's some way of communicating to the minority in Congress our hopes.

1	COMMISSIONER MEEKS: And if I can just
2	say I actually am pleasantly surprised to say that I
3	think we've had some good agreement and that we've
4	also been able to disagree. I agree with that.
5	This has been a learning experience, and
6	I've said that I had a lot to learn, and so this has
7	been quite an education for me these last six years.
8	The one message I did send, you know, to
9	the powers that be is that whether I get appointed or
10	not, I really very much have an interest in someone
11	from Indian Country being appointed because I think
12	these issues need to continue to be looked at.
13	And so it's with mixed emotions then I
14	say goodbye or maybe I'll say hello.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Until we meet again.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Thank you very
18	much. I'm glad that you remembered that, Jerry.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: On, no, actually it
20	was Commissioner Yaki.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh. I'm glad
22	Commissioner Yaki remembered it.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We're now
24	adjourned.
25	(Whereupon, at 11:58 a.m., the Commission

meeting	was	concluded.)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701