U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

TELEPHONIC COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2006

+ + + + +

WASHINGTON, D.C.

+ + + + +

The Commission convened via teleconference at 2:00 p.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman
JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner
PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner
ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner
MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner
KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, Attorney Advisor to the Office of the Staff Director

DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director

PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division

SOCK FOON MacDOUGALL

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director for Management

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

AONGAS ST. HILAIRE

AUDREY WRIGHT

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS LISA NEUDER KIMBERLY SCHULD

NEAL R. GROSS

$\underline{\mathsf{C}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{O}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{E}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{N}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{T}}$ $\underline{\mathsf{S}}$

		PAG	ΞE
I.	Approval of Agenda		4
II.	Approval of Findings and Recommendations		
	of the Campus Anti-Semitism Briefing		5

3 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (2:06 p.m.)let's start. 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, 4 This is Chairman Reynolds. We are having a telephonic 5 meeting with all Commissioners participating from different locations. I will call the name of each 6 7 Commission in order to determine if there is a quorum 8 to hold a meeting. Vice Chair Thernstrom? 9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm here. 10 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras? 11 12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Here. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow? 13 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 14 Here. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Melendez? 15 16 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Here. 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Yaki? 18 (No response.)

MR. MARCUS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is the Court Reporter

(No response.)

on the line?

present?

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

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is the Staff Director

19

20

21

22

23

24

COURT REPORTER: Yes, Chairman. 1 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Whenever Commissioner wants to make a statement, I would ask 3 4 that you please identify yourself first by name so 5 that the transcriber can know who is talking. Also, 6 please let's not speak at one time so that we can have 7 a clear transcript. Whenever it is necessary to take a vote, 8 9 the following procedures will be followed. of 10 call out the name each Commissioner. The 11 Commissioner should then answer yes, no, or abstain. 12 After the vote is concluded, I will read out each of you -- I will read out how each of you has voted in 13 order to determine what the tally is. 14 15 I. Approval of Agenda 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, may I have a 17 motion to approve the agenda? VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. 18 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second? COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second. 20 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? 22 (No response.) 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote. All in favor, please vote in the affirmative -- oh, no. 24 25 I'm sorry. Vice Chair Thernstrom, how do you vote?

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I
2	believe this will probably be unanimous and that we
3	could just do an aye on this. We're just approving
4	the agenda.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I understand
6	that. But
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Aye.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, Commissioner
9	Braceras?
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Kirsanow?
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And let the
14	record reflect that I, Chairman Reynolds, voted in
15	favor of the agenda as proposed.
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Melendez, aye.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.
18	Okay.
19	II. Approval of Findings and Recommendations
20	of the Campus Anti-Semitism Briefing
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We have a motion to
22	approve the findings and recommendations of the Campus
23	Anti-Semitism Briefing, which was held in November
24	2005. It has been pending since the December meeting.
25	The original findings and recommendation, which I will

1 refer to during the call as the December version, were 2 circulated to call Commissioners in advance of the 3 December meeting. 4 These findings and recommendations were 5 made available on an expedited basis in December due 6 pending legislation. These findings 7 recommendations have been tabled since the December meeting. 8 9 In February of `06, a revised set findings and recommendations, which I will refer to as 10 the February version, was distributed together with a 11 12 red-line version showing the differences between the original and the new version. 13 At the March 2006 meeting, Commissioner 14 Braceras submitted a third version, which I will refer 15 16 to as the Braceras version. 17 May I have a -- interesting -- may I have a motion to approve the Campus Anti-Semitism Findings 18 and Recommendations? Let's start -- let's assume that 19 20 we are talking about the February version. 21 way we can get the conversation rolling. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I would -- I 22 23 think, Mr. Chairman, there may be more support for the Braceras version. And I would rather start with that. 24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

25

Well, I don't know

1	what the support is at this point. So let's
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'd like to start
3	with the Braceras version as well.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Hello.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, what I
6	want to do at this point is just start the discussion.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. So
8	we can start arbitrarily any place. Why don't we
9	start with the Braceras version.
LO	MR. MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, this is the
L1	Staff Director speaking. I understand from the
L2	operator that Commissioner Yaki may have joined us
L3	now. But that Commissioner Taylor will be unavailable
L4	to join us.
L5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki,
L6	hello? Have you joined us?
L7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I have.
L8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Great.
L9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: My life is complete.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, that's
22	more than any of the rest of us can say about any
23	aspect of our life.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'm going to
25	stick with the original my original recommendation.

1 Again, it is arbitrary. This will get the 2 conversation going. And we can vote on it up or down 3 and then if it doesn't have support, we can move on to 4 the Braceras version or even the December version. 5 Is there a second? 6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is Braceras. 8 9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, this not 10 the Braceras version. 11 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, no, I'm 12 identifying myself for the record before I speak. I guess I would start by saying that I was 13 essentially on Board to support the original version 14 15 which, I guess, is being called the December version, 16 correct? 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And didn't like 18 19 some of the changes that were made by the Chair in the February version but also understood some of 20 21 concerns. And so the reason I put together the third version, the Braceras version, was an attempt to do 22 Number one, just clean up some of the 23 two things. 24 language. And number two, to try to create

compromise document that would address some of the

1	concerns that I believe the Chair had.
2	That being said, I'm not even happier with
3	the third version than I was with the original version
4	just because of the way the events unfolded. I think
5	that deals with the facts on the ground, as they are
6	right now.
7	So I intend to vote against all versions
8	but this one, I suppose. All versions but the
9	Braceras version.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Anyone else?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I also this
12	is Commissioner Thernstrom I also think that there
13	is a that the Braceras version answers the concerns
14	of the Chair as well as being just, you know, cleaner.
15	And I will support only that version.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Vice Chair
17	Thernstrom, why do you think that it addresses my
18	concerns?
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, you know,
21	can I speak to that
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: since I was the
24	one who crafted it. As I recall from our earlier
25	discussion, the chair was concerned as to whether or

not we were accurately describing the position of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education.

And there has been some back and forth with OCR as to what their position is. And I think that the version I put forward was an attempt to basically disembroil ourselves from that debate. And just take an independent position and to stake out the Commission's position without reference to what other government agencies might hold.

So I thought I was addressing the Chair's concern that we may be inaccurately describing another government agency's view.

To the extent that the Chair was concerned with the substance of the findings, then I make no claims to have done anything to address that because I don't view this as particularly controversial. And, in fact, I would go out on a limb by saying that I find it rather appalling that we have taken this long to put out a document condemning anti-Semitism on college campuses. And I think it should be relatively straightforward and have broad-based support.

But that said, I thought I was addressing the procedural concern of the Chair.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I think that we

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

are all on the same page -- this is the Chairman -- I think we are all on the same page in terms of the substance. My concern is not the substance. My concern is our characterization of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education, its jurisdiction.

We nor the Department of Education can expand or contract the jurisdictions that Congress has provided OCR. Now if we believe that it is a good idea that religion be covered by Title 6 then I think that that should be the recommendation that comes from the Commission.

But as of today, Congress has not seen fit to expand OCR's jurisdiction to include religion. We have played an interesting game here in terms of our language. I mean this is not about -- this is not nearly about anti-Semitism since anti-Semitism can take the form of conduct aimed at national origin or religion.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, could I -this is Braceras -- if I could just be heard. You
said a couple of things that I think need responding
to. The first is that the briefing we held was
strictly about anti-Semitism on college campuses. And
our findings and recommendations are appropriately

1 limited to that topic. 2 The broader question of whether religious discrimination should be prohibited by Title 6 is a 3 4 much larger question and one which I don't think the 5 Commission is ready to stake out a position on having 6 not heard testimony on that broader issue. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ι agree wholeheartedly. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: the But 10 findings and recommendations that we are voting on today deal exclusively with anti-Semitism. 11 And as I 12 see the purpose of them, the purpose of them is to clarify existing law, to explain essentially for the 13 14 uninitiated that Judaism is an ethnicity. And that anti-Semitic conduct does, therefore, violate Title 6. 15 16 And I specifically --17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras, would you entertain the possibility that someone would 18 19 engage -- well, would harass a Jewish student solely Say a Christian or a Christian 20 on religious grounds? 21 arguing that the Jewish student will not or the Jewish student needs to accept Jesus as his or her savior. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 23 That's not 24 harassment.

I agree.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is
2	proselytizing.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no. If a
4	teacher were to again tell someone that they cannot
5	participate in classroom discussion because they have
6	not accepted Jesus Christ as his or her savior
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I wouldn't
8	describe that as anti-Semitism per se. That may be
9	intolerance of other sorts because certainly that
10	would apply to ACS
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras,
12	let me finish. In my view, that is rank anti-
13	Semitism. However, it is a form of anti-Semitism that
14	is not covered by Title 6 in my opinion.
15	Looking at how OCR has conducted its
16	investigations, we don't have cases where OCR has
17	asserted jurisdiction when an investigation reveals
18	that the conduct, the harassing conduct was aimed
19	solely at religion.
20	OCR doesn't do that. So if you are saying
21	that there was change made in 2004 with a Dear
22	Colleague letter, then I would say that that change
23	has several problems.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, no. Frankly
25	two things. First of all, I specifically took out of

1	my version any reference to OCR so as not to get into
2	this debate about what they did and when they did it.
3	But putting that aside, it is clear to me that what
4	OCR did do in 2004 was to clarify the law and not to
5	change the law. Clearly only Congress can do that.
6	They were clarifying their enforcement
7	approach. And that seems to me to be absolutely
8	appropriate that they did that. But that is not what
9	I think we are here to debate today. We are an
10	independent agency capable of analyzing the law and
11	capable of coming to our own conclusions as to what
12	that law intends to prohibit.
13	And in my view, anti-Semitic harassment is
14	prohibited by the statute as it currently reads.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The statute does not
16	make reference to anti-Semitism. The statute makes
17	reference to race, color
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, if I may
19	finish
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And to the extent
21	anti-Semitism falls within one of those three buckets,
22	it is covered. To the extent anti-Semitism is
23	directed to something outside those three categories,
24	it is not covered.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And that

1	is why the findings and recommendations that I
2	circulated that this is a clarification that needs to
3	be communicated to students who may not know their
4	rights. And the final recommendation that I included
5	in my version says, "Congress should amend Title 6 to
6	make clear that discrimination on the basis of Jewish
7	heritage constitutes prohibited national origin
8	discrimination."
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Jewish heritage?
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me, let me
11	finish lest there be any more confusion about this.
12	Now all I can say to you, Chairman Reynolds, is that
13	to me, and I believe to most Jews, ethnicity and
14	religious belief are inseparable in this context, in
15	this unique context.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that true for the
17	atheist who is Jewish?
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that true for the
20	atheist who is Jewish?
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know. I
22	am sure there are many people we can ask about that.
23	But yes, for the atheist who is Jewish, they are still
24	Jewish. Absolutely. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS:

25

Culturally you can be

1	a Jewish culturally. You can be a Jewish, in a
2	religious sense.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You can be a
4	convert to Christianity and still be a Jew.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right. And
6	that is why OCR investigates allegations of anti-
7	Semitism to determine whether the conduct is covered.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But let me
9	clarify. You can be an atheist and be a Jew. And you
10	can be a convert to Christianity and still be an
11	ethnic Jew.
12	On the other hand, there can be harassment
13	of somebody based on their religious beliefs
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: in Judaism
16	which is inseparable
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me finish
19	please. Which is inseparable
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm agreeing with you.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. I am
22	speaking. It is inseparable, the harassment
23	religious harassment of a Jew is inseparable from
24	ethnic harassment of that Jew. And I'm not sure that
25	there I don't know of any Jews that would make that

distinction.

And so all I'm saying is that these findings and recommendations should not be controversial. We should take a firm stand against anti-Semitism on college campuses and inform students of their rights to file complaints if they are subject of such conduct.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This is Kirsanow. I'm perfectly willing to sign on to the proposition that anti-Semitism is a function of both ethnic heritage and religion. I am perfectly comfortable with clarifying at least where we stand on things. And I think it is imperative that we have a finding condemning anti-Semitism on campus.

The one question I have, and it is a concern is I'm not sure the briefing that we had addressed whether -- addressed to the point of being able to have a finding as to the marriage of ethnicity and religion as part of anti-Semitism.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You know what? I don't -- I've got to be honest with you here. This is basic to me. I don't think there needs --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If you could hold on one second, I just have a question. I don't know. I've gone through the briefing materials -- maybe not

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

fine-tooth comb --1 with but the findings 2 recommendations should flow from what the testimony 3 was --4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, but Pete --5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- and everything 6 else that was presented to us. 7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But Pete, there are certain things that you can take judicial notice 8 9 There doesn't have to be testimony on this 10 particular point that Judaism is both an ethnicity and a religion. That is something that is a given. 11 12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But we are a fact-I'm perfectly willing to do that. 13 finding agency. 14 And I'm saying heck, if we have other people come testify, I'm perfectly willing -- I don't have an 15 16 objection to that. But what we are doing there is 17 simply opining or injecting our own set of facts into the discussion. 18 19 I think we have to be careful about that. 20 I think we have to take what we have on the ground in 21 terms of what people testified to. And I don't know. I'm just saying I don't recall -- and I don't recall 22 after having reviewed the material there being any 23 testimony as to the aspects of anti-Semitism that deal 24

both with religion and ethnicity as being intertwined.

1	I don't recall that.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But well, I'm
3	not sure that that was explicitly stated. But it was
4	inherent in the entire discussion.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean it was a
6	given. There weren't findings there wasn't
7	testimony on that question simply because the question
8	was not even raised. Nobody thought it was a question
9	that was necessary to raise.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It was an
11	assumption. All of the panelists assumed basic
12	knowledge.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: See, I don't like
14	making assumptions.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, look
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't recall
17	there being an assumption as to that. And I have no
18	problems with coming to that conclusion if the
19	question is asked and if there is testimony or other
20	evidence on that particular issue.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Look, all we are
22	doing in these findings and recommendations is saying
23	number one, we oppose anti-Semitism on campus, number
24	two, it is prohibited by law and students should be
25	made aware of their rights, and number three, to the

1	extent that there is a gray area where, you know,
2	where certain conduct may be religious in nature but
3	not ethnically based, we would like Congress to
4	clarify and state specifically that Title 7 prohibits
5	discrimination on the basis of Jewish heritage, be
6	that Jewish faith or be that Jewish ethnicity.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Title 6 you
8	mean.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, what
10	did I say?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Title 7.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, yes. Of
13	course I meant Title 6.
14	The point being that the Commission
15	occupies a place of moral leadership or at least
16	should. And we should be willing to stake out this
17	position without having to, you know, make further
18	investigation. I mean this is a simple thing. It is
19	taking a moral stand against anti-Semitism.
20	I don't think it requires anything more
21	than what we have already heard.
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow. I don't
23	think anybody is objecting to taking a moral stand
24	against anti-Semitism. I'm simply saying that the
25	findings that we render should be based on what the

evidence is.

And not any assumptions. Otherwise we start -- and I don't have -- look, if we want to go out and solicit something from somebody -- if we want to reopen the record where someone then in a position of authority or a position of -- well, a position of authority, I suppose, being somebody who has some background in this says yes, it is both a function of ethnicity and of religion. That's fine. I don't have a problem with that.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think if that is the case, all we have to do is reopen the record for a week. And I'm sure Susan Tuchman would be happy to submit a letter stating just that. I mean

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But what happens if someone else submits a letter and takes a different position?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Look I would like to know from Commissioner Kirsanow exactly what sentence in these findings and recommendations he is staring at that poses a problem in this regard for him.

For instance, the last sentence of Finding
No. 1 in the Braceras version is when severe

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

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	persistent or pervasive, this behavior may constitute
2	a hostile environment for students in violation of
3	Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. May
4	constitute a hostile environment.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. We're not
6	saying it automatically does.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It requires
9	investigation by the fact-finding agency.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. I want
11	to know where the language is that you find
12	objectionable here. This seems to me extremely
13	cautiously written.
14	We are not going out on any legal limb
15	here. And indeed the last recommendation is for
16	further clarification from the legislative branch of
17	government that is responsible for going out on legal
18	limbs if they want to.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well this is
20	the Chairman and in response to that question, we can
21	start with, I guess, it is my recommendation it is
22	number ten but it is the first recommendation.
23	It says OCR should protect college
24	students from anti-Semitic and other discriminatory
25	harassments by vigorously enforcing Title

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Wait a minute.
2	I'm looking only at the Braceras version. And my
3	question to you was what in the Braceras version
4	specifically do you still find offense or in any way
5	troubling? And it was a question directed to
6	Commissioner Kirsanow.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I've taken the
8	liberty to put in my two cents. And I am reading from
9	the Braceras version.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well there is
11	no recommendation six in what I've got in my Braceras
12	version.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, there is
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean there is
15	no recommendation ten. The last one is six. Congress
16	should amend Title 6 to make clear that discrimination
17	
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let me read it
19	for you. It is the first one. OCR should protect
20	college students from anti-Semitic
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I thought you
22	just said ten.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, and I also
24	pointed out that I believe that that is wrong.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. All right.

	so go anead, Gerry. The first recommendation, tell us
2	what is troubling you.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What concerns me is
4	the fact that it is not tethered to the statutory
5	language, the magic language, race, color, national
6	origin.
7	If it is tethered to those three
8	categories, then it is clear, at least in my mind, it
9	makes a distinction and it recognizes the fact that
10	there will be an investigation to determine if the
11	harassing behavior is aimed solely at religion. If it
12	is a mixed question, then the investigation goes on.
13	That has been OCR's position all along.
14	And that continues to be its position.
15	But if it is directed, the harassing
16	conduct is directed solely at religion, then it is not
17	covered. The investigation ends. The case is closed.
18	And that has been OCR's position and it continues to
19	be OCR's position.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think that
21	
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let me finish. The
23	only thing I am asking for is that we tighten up the
24	language so that it tracks the statute.
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, the

1 statute obviously has been open to a variety 2 interpretations. It seems to be -- I mean we have a declared OCR policy still on its website. 3 4 not been changed. 5 Why do you pick what CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 6 is on the website versus the recent letter from the 7 Assistant Secretary from OCR? VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That letter was 8 9 a private letter to us only. It wasn't in any sense a 10 revision of policy that is being publicly issued. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And you believe that 11 12 the 2004 letter is revision of policy. And because it was one the website that that trumps what --13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I don't 14 15 think it was а revision. Ι think it was 16 clarification. But in any case, a private letter to 17 this agency only is not a policy statement. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But again, I don't 18 19 think it is necessary to have this discussion. Ι should be 20 think the discussion about our 21 interpretation of Title 6. And what we are saying in recommendation number one is that OCR should protect 22 23 students college campuses from anti-Semitic harassment under Title 6. It is tethered to the 24

statute.

26 And we don't say that all anti-Semitic conduct is necessarily a violation of the law. Or student negative conduct towards a happens to be Jewish is necessarily a violation of the We simply want to make clear to Jewish students law. they may have a right to redress under the That they are included within the scope of the statute. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, they are. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And we want to make that clear. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I mean there is a lot of consensus despite our going back and forth.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I mean there is a lot of consensus despite our going back and forth. I think that it is clear that everyone opposes anti-Semitism. For me the question comes down to jurisdiction.

I think that it is important that our passions and our beliefs are tethered to the law. And in this particular case, despite my personal feelings about anti-Semitism and anti-Semitism that is directed towards religion solely, despite my personal feelings about it, my personal feelings don't trump the law. It doesn't trump jurisdiction.

And to say that OCR's interpretation of its own rules don't matter, I don't understand that.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Why not?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, first of all we are not -- I don't want to get into the debate of what the current head of that office happens to think right now as compared to the prior head of that office. That is irrelevant. We are an independent agency. We can come to our own conclusions.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What is the basis -- I mean what you have is a clear line of interpreting Title 6 in the fashion that I have laid out. You are hanging your hat on a single letter that is on the website.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I'm not because, in fact, I care not either about the letter on the website or about the subsequent letter we received. I simply want to make our own statement irrespective of what OCR has said in the past.

I don't care about that. That is why my version takes out references to OCR policy.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, if we are not talking about talking about Title 6 and we are not talking about jurisdiction, if we are just solely making a point -- if we are just registering our opposition to anti-Semitism on college campuses, that is easy.

But if we are talking about what the law

NEAL R. GROSS

protects, if we are talking about jurisdiction --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We are saying that look, there Ι don't understand why jurisdictional problem. I really don't. If somebody is harassing a Jewish student on campus, calling them a stupid Jew or they can't participate in class Jewish, that is ethnic because they are discrimination. That has nothing to do with religion.

I mean they may also have something to do with religion but it is ethnic discrimination. If in your example a professor is proselytizing from the podium and saying that unless you accept Jesus Christ as your personal savior you can't participate in class, that is not discrimination on the basis of Jewish heritage or anything else.

That is discrimination against atheists and Jews and a whole host of other people who may not accept Jesus Christ as their personal savior. But I agree with you that that would not, under the current language of Title 6, classify as prohibited conduct.

Now I don't think we disagree about that.

But I simply am trying to clarify that when you are singling out somebody because they are a Jew and even if the religion -- I'm sorry -- even if the statement appears to be based solely on that personal religion,

it is still ethnic origin discrimination.

If you are not singling out Jews per se and you are launching your attacks against Jews and atheists and Buddhists and all sorts of other people, then that is not discrimination on the basis of Jewish heritage. But any time you single out Jews as Jews, be it because of what they look like or what synagogue they go to, that is ethnic origin discrimination.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let me take it from a somewhat different angle. Would you agree that no American regardless of religion is protected under Title 6 when it comes to religious harassment? So the Christian who is --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, they are not currently. I agree with you. That is not what the statute prohibits.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Gerry, what language specifically in the first recommendation do you object to? We are saying -- or Jennifer is saying OCR should -- should protect college students from anti-Semitic and other discriminatory harassment. Do you object to that?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: My objection -- my concern is the fact that the recommendation is not closely tied to the statute. It doesn't recite the

1	magic language. The way this is written now, anti-
2	Semitic harassment is broad. It could be pointed to -
3	-
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I guess my
5	question is what type of anti-Semitic harassment do
6	you think doesn't fall under Title 6?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. Please
8	repeat that question.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What type of anti-
10	Semitic harassment and I'm not talking about the
11	severe pervasive question or any of that but what
12	type of anti-Semitic harassment would not be covered
13	by Title 6.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The only thing that is
15	not covered in my opinion by Title 6 is something
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But give me an
17	example because if you
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm trying to.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: if you draw
20	swastikas all over a synagogue, that is anti-Semitic
21	harassment on the basis of religion and race.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you going to
23	answer your own question or are you going to allow me
24	to answer it?
25	The only anti-Semitic conduct in my view

1 that is not covered by Title 6 is harassment that is 2 grounded solely in religion. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And how would 4 you know that? 5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And give me an 6 example of that kind of harassment. 7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I can't imagine it, Gerry. I don't know what you are talking about. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, OCR has a ton of 10 They looked at, I believe, several hundred cases. 11 cases in response to a FOIA request submitted by 12 Irvine and we can't do that now but there are -- there have been instances where OCR has terminated 13 investigation because it had gathered sufficient facts 14 15 to convince it that the conduct was aimed solely at 16 religion. 17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, talk about things that were not on the record in our 18 19 briefing, that wasn't on the record. And it doesn't 20 seem to me -- I don't understand how you can find 21 objectionable the sentence OCR should protect college students from anti-Semitic and other discriminatory 22 harassment by vigorously enforcing Title 6 against 23 recipients that deny equal educational opportunities 24

seems

That

all

students?

25

to be boilerplate

language.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The only thing I am
requesting is that it be tied to the statute. That's
all.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It is tied to the
statute.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Color, national
origin.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And my
only point and I believe the point of the people
who came to testify before us and the point of these
findings and recommendations is that any harassment of
Jews as Jews is harassment on the basis of ethnic
origin. Even if it is aimed at a synagogue. That's
the whole point.
If it is broad-based criticism of people
who don't accept Jesus, that is not harassment of Jews
as Jews. But any harassment of a Jew as a Jew is
inherently ethnically based. And it may also be
religiously based. But it is always ethnically based.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, that is not a
position that has been that position has not been
accepted by the agency that has been charged with
enforcing Title 6.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

Well, that is a

	33
1	matter
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And we are saying
3	that whether or not it has been accepted by OCR, it
4	should be. And it is common sense that it should be.
5	And it is outrageous that it hasn't been.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And that
7	distinction was not made, Gerry, at the briefing that
8	we held nor did you raise the question at that
9	briefing to my knowledge.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Much of the things
11	that we have been discussing haven't been weren't
12	discussed.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right but I
14	just heard from Commissioner Kirsanow that he is
15	uncomfortable with going beyond the briefing. You are
16	going beyond the briefing, Gerry.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, I'm not.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: This statement
19	does not go beyond our briefing.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chairman
21	Thernstrom, when you have the time, look at the
22	transcript. You will see that my comments are

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

directed -- well, they are made in response to a

question.

23

24

25

You

I'm sorry.

1 comments at the time of the briefing -- what are you 2 saying? 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: My comments, 4 comments now that you say don't fall within the ambit 5 of the briefing, those comments were made in response 6 to a question posed by either Commissioner Braceras or 7 you. You asked me a question, I answered it. 8 9 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. Ι 10 still don't understand what you are saying but it doesn't matter. I still am back to the point that all 11 12 we are doing here on this first recommendation is saying what OCR should do. It is so innocuous. 13 level, I said kind of a boilerplate 14 as 15 statement of taking а moral stance. Ι can't 16 understand your discomfort with it. I'm lost. Well, let me see if I 17 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: can help. If all we are doing is just registering our 18 19 outrage at anti-Semitism in general, Ι 20 comfortable with that and I support it wholeheartedly. 21 But if talking the we are about OCR, then we have a fundamental 22 jurisdiction of disagreement of --23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't think 24 25 we are talking about its jurisdiction. We are saying

1 OCR should -- should -- protect all students --2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I support that. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, then you 4 support this first sentence which is what you said you 5 were having trouble with. I cannot figure out where 6 you could be running into trouble on this 7 OCR should protect college students from sentence. anti-Semitic and other discriminatory harassment. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let me -- well, this statement is merely about registering our outrage 10 at anti-Semitism, then with your clarification, I can 11 12 accept that. But if that sentence is intended to describe the jurisdiction of OCR --13 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: is 14 Ιt 15 recommendation. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry? 17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Ιt is recommendation. It doesn't describe jurisdiction. 18 Ιt 19 is a recommendation from this independent agency. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And, Gerry, to the 21 extent that OCR does currently not have which I disagree with, recommendation 22 jurisdiction, number 6 clearly says Congress should amend Title 6 to 23 make sure that discrimination on the basis of Jewish 24 25 prohibited heritage constitutes national origin

2	So we are saying, you know, we think that
3	there is a good argument to be made that under the
4	statute as it is currently written, anti-Semitic
5	harassment is prohibited by Title 6. However, if we
6	are wrong, Congress please act.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, when the issues
8	are presented in that light, I think that we have a
9	whole lot less disagreement. If we are saying the
10	Congress should clarify this issue, I would support
11	that recommendation.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, but that
13	is exactly
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But we are saying
15	we think it is clear but if we are wrong and we have
16	been wrong before, Congress should take action.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: that is all we
19	are saying.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: if we are seeking a
21	clarification for Congress, I support that. I don't
22	think it is clear that
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that is why
24	we wanted to start with the Braceras version because
25	the Braceras version does ask for that at the end.

discrimination.

1 And we asked for it as a clarification by Congress 2 because we believe that the statute already does just that. 3 4 But again, we put that provision in to, as 5 a sort of safe harbor, if you will, in case we are 6 wrong in our interpretation. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I mean we are within our -- we are well within our rights to ask 8 9 Congress to amend the jurisdiction --10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not asking them to do that. I'm saying look, that's why -- you 11 12 know, we need to look at the document and you can either support the document or not 13 support document. But the document speaks for itself. 14 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well --15 16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean if you 17 through the recommendations, Jerry, the six recommendations here ending with Congress should amend 18 19 Title 6 to make clear that discrimination on the basis Jewish heritage constitute prohibited national 20 21 origin discrimination. If you go through these recommendations, I 22 23 just can't -- I mean it seems to me you are not disagreeing with them. There is nothing here that is 24 25 in any should in any make way way you

1 uncomfortable. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, obviously there 3 is something that does. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I still 4 5 haven't been able to pin it down since, you know, I 6 read you the first sentence I think now three times 7 and I have asked you what actually is wrong with that very innocuous statement. OCR should protect college 8 9 students -- should OCR not protect college students? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 10 Let me -- OCR should do what it is permitted to do under the law. 11 12 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And it can't 13 do anything more. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And you agree that 16 anti-Semitic harassment, when it is found 17 constitute national origin discrimination violates the statute. We agree about that. So --18 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is the import and should be investigated. 20 21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And so the only place we differ is in my statements to you that 22 23 discrimination on the basis of Judaism is almost always national origin discrimination. It seems to me 24 25 that that is the only place -- that that is the place

where we disagree.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And we do not enter into that -- or Jennifer did not enter into that dispute in these recommendations.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is implicit -- it is a collapsing of categories. It is collapsing religion and national origin. That is my concern. And just by way of background, there are -- I mean there is a concerted effort to collapse the concept of religion -- Judaism with national origin.

There are advocates who are pushing that position. And I think that they are well within their right to do that in their capacity as advocates. But in my capacity, in terms of describing the extent of the law, the extent of jurisdiction as it exists today as opposed to what I want it to be or as opposed to what I feel that it should be, I just don't think that -- I just can't support the collapse of these two concepts.

commissioner braceras: But, Gerry, we are not describing what the law -- we are making a recommendation about enforcement. We are not -- we are making a recommendation. And to the extent that the law doesn't currently today support that position, we are asking that the law be changed.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, and we are
2	also certainly we are within our right as an
3	independent agency
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: to say
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: finish?
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: what we
8	recommend.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I finish my
10	thoughts?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Language.
13	Language is important. And what I see is language
14	that is ambiguous. For example, the use of the term -
15	- the phrase Jewish heritage, the statute is more
16	specific.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What
18	recommendation or finding are you looking at?
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The one I added,
20	number six.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Six, okay.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The statute is more
23	specific. The statute is more precise. The statute -
24	- the precision contained in the statute suggests
25	strongly to me that they or that Congress did not
	NEAL D. ODOGG

want to include religion.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So but this is a recommendation that if it doesn't, that if there is a collapsing of categories here, that Congress should amend the act to make clear that discrimination on the basis of Jewish heritage. It doesn't say that that is what is clearly in Title 6 today. It simply says, as Jennifer has said, if it is not in Title 6, then Congress should amend the law. That's all it says.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Could we amend it slightly then? Just ask Congress to decide whether -- ask for a resolution -- asking --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, we don't want them to decide. We think there is a moral clarity to this issue. We think we know what the right answer is. I don't --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, no, no, no, the issue that I am referring to is jurisdiction. I agree with you --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't want them to decide anything. I want them to state that OCR has jurisdiction to address claims of discrimination on the basis of Jewish heritage. And frankly I think Jewish heritage is the best way to say it because you could be a practicing Jew or a non-practicing Jew but

	you still have bewish heritage.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes but if the conduct
3	I mean the focus is on the conduct and the intent
4	of the harasser. If the harasser's intent is to
5	harass solely based on religion, then once OCR obtains
6	sufficient facts to make that conclusion, the
7	investigation should end.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You know what?
9	There is only one circumstance where I can see that
10	ever happening. And that is in the case of somebody
11	who may not have been born Jewish but converted to
12	Judaism. That is the only case where I can see that
13	happening.
14	Anybody who is born Jewish, any harassment
15	against them whether it is based on their religion or
16	what they look like is ethnic origin harassment
17	because their religion is their ethnicity. That's the
18	whole point.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean Ashkenazi,
20	Sephardic
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It makes no
22	difference.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How they look. I'm
24	not sure that I can look at someone and conclude that
25	they are Jewish. I don't have that skill.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, but people
2	who harass
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But people who
4	harass are basing their harassment on stereotypes.
5	There was testimony about just that. That you have
6	comments being made on the basis of someone's, you
7	know, the size of their nose, or the color of their
8	hair, or the color of their eyes. I mean there are
9	stereotypes. But clearly Jews come in all colors
-0	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or the way they
L1	talk, the way, you know, whatever.
L2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's not the
L3	point
L4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Their manner,
L5	their personality.
L6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But the bottom line
L7	and I think that we should get around to voting on
L8	this, the bottom line for me is it is a rule of law
L9	question. Either we are going to respect the limits
20	placed on federal agencies by Congress or we won't.
21	Either we are going to try to expand jurisdiction
22	through regulatory actions and hope that a court
23	doesn't strike it down or we are not.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Where is the
25	disrespect here?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Look, you know
2	what, we are never going to come to terms on this. I
3	can see that. And it's fine. I respect your right to
4	disagree and to see it in the light that you see it
5	in, Gerry. But I disagree. And you are right. I
6	think we should just vote.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well then
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I think that
9	the version that is currently on the table is not the
LO	version I wish to support. So you can call the
L1	question on that and then I'll make a motion to put
L2	the Braceras version forward.
L3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, why don't
L 4	we do that now. I mean after this motion.
L5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Go ahead.
L6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I move to vote on the
L7	Braceras motion.
L8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, you guys
L9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Are you
20	withdrawing the previous motion?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. You
23	need to state that as such.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, the idea is to
25	withdraw the I believe the February version and

	replace it with the Braceras version. Is there a
2	second?
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I second that.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Brief
5	discussion. Commissioners Yaki and Melendez and we
6	haven't heard from you. Do you have a position that
7	you would like to make?
8	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is
9	Commissioner Melendez. You know my main, I guess, is
10	the discrimination in anti-Semitism. I know that this
11	issue on jurisdiction is not real clear to me. But
12	you know my main point is that we, you know, support
13	the issue broadly. And so I don't have a problem with
14	the Braceras I guess the version. So that is just
15	my comment.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
17	Yaki?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just will say that
19	from the testimony that we have heard, there is an
20	issue out there on our university and college campuses
21	
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, there is.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: that must be
24	addressed. And I believe that the Braceras version
25	sends a strong signal from the committee that it

1	should be dealt with.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And did
3	Commissioner Taylor join us?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, he can't
5	join us.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. All
7	in favor? I'm sorry. Let me go down the list here.
8	Bear with me. Vice Chair Thernstrom?
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. This is
10	yes I support the Braceras version. I am voting for
11	the Braceras version.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Braceras,
13	should I assume that you support your version?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, I vote in
15	favor of my own version.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
17	Kirsanow? Commissioner Kirsanow?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
20	Melendez?
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, I vote yes.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. And I vote
25	against it. Not on the merits. Strictly on the
	NEAL R GROSS

1	jurisdictional concerns that I have.
2	Commissioner Kirsanow?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I guess we have
5	lost Pete.
6	Okay, that being the only issue that we
7	were going to discuss
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think you
9	should announce the total vote.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So the motion
11	carries?
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, I'm sorry, yes.
13	The motion carries with Vice Chair Thernstrom,
14	Commissioners Braceras, Thernstrom, Melendez, and Yaki
15	voting in favor. The Chairman voting against, and
16	Commissioner Kirsanow not voting. Apparently we have
17	lost Mr. Kirsanow.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, he's not
19	present.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So the motion carries.
21	Is there any other business?
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I move to
23	adjourn the meeting.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
	NEVI D CDOSS

	48
1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor?
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. No
4	objections? We conclude this meeting.
5	(Whereupon, the above-entitled Commission
6	meeting was concluded at 2:56 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	