Disclaimer for Rough Real-Time Transcripts

Do not quote or rely on this uncorrected transcript without obtaining written permission from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at: transcripts@usccr.gov.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + + UNEDITED/UNOFFICIAL

BUSINESS MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2018

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 10:00 a.m., Catherine E. Lhamon, Chair, presiding. PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair*

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner*

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

* Present via telephone

STAFF PRESENT:

LASHONDA BRENSON

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALEZ

BARBARA DE LA VIEZ

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

YOURSA ELKHAITA

ALFREDA GREENE

TINALOUISE MARTIN, OM

MARTHA MARR

WARREN ORR

SARALE SEWELL

JUANDA SMITH

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER

MICHELE YORKMAN

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART

JASON LAGRIA

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

ALISON SOMIN

IRENA VIDULOVIC

A G E N D A

⊥.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA5
II.	BUSINESS MEETING
	Presentation by Rhode Island Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Recently-released report, Payday Lending in Rhode Island
	Presentation by Vermont Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Recently-released Advisory Memorandum, Housing Discrimination in Vermont, a Handshake and a Smile
	Discussion and Vote on the Discovery Plan, Outline, and Timeline for the Commission's Project on Women in Prison
	Discussion and Vote on the Briefing Date for the Commission Project on Sexual Harassment in Federal Workplaces45
	Discussion and Vote on Extension of the Stand Your Ground Statement Deadlines48
	Discussion and Vote on a Letter to the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] Regarding Reported Plans to Define Gender50
	Discussion and Vote on a Letter to the Department of Homeland Security [DHS] as a Comment on the Proposed Public Charge Rule
	Discussion and Vote on a Statement Regarding the Commission's Legislative and Oversight Priorities for the New Congress63
	Discussion and Vote on the Statement Regarding Citizenship67
	Staff Director's Report78
ТТТ	ADJOURN MEETING 78

PROCEEDINGS

2	10:01 a.m.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: This meeting of the U.S.
4	Commission on Civil Rights comes to order at 10:01
5	a.m. on December 7, 2018. The meeting takes place at
6	the Commission's headquarters, located at 1331
7	Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C.
8	I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon and the
9	Commissioners who are present in addition to me are
10	Commissioner Adegbile, Commissioner Heriot,
11	Commissioner Kirsanow, and Commissioner Kladney.
12	On the phone, please confirm that you are
13	on the line after I say your name. I believe we have
14	Commissioner Yaki?
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Here.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
17	Goodson?
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I understand
20	Commissioner Narasaki will be joining us later and
21	she'll let us know when she's on the line. A quorum
22	of the Commissioners is present. Is the court
23	reporter present?
24	COURT REPORTER: Here.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is the Staff

1	Director present?
2	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: Present.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. The meeting now
4	comes to order.
5	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a motion to approve
7	the agenda for this business meeting?
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I move to approve
9	the agenda.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: This is Vice
12	Chair Timmons-Goodson, so moved.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'm going to
14	treat that as a motion and a second. I'll begin the
15	call for amendments with several of my own.
16	First, I move to amend to take off the
17	presentation from our Connecticut State Advisory
18	Committee Chair, who unfortunately could not make it
19	for today's meeting. We hope to hear from him in
20	January.
21	Second, I move to amend for consideration
22	of a statement I propose on the Commission's
23	legislative and oversight priorities for the new
24	Congress.
25	And third. I move to amend for

consideration of several statements that Commissioner 1 2 Narasaki will introduce, but she could not be here 3 with us at the outset of the meeting. 4 Those items are for consideration of a 5 [Department letter to HHS of Health and Services] regarding the definition of sex; a letter to 6 7 [Department of Homeland Security] for public DHS comment submission on the public charge proposed rule; 8 9 and third is a statement on citizenship. 10 Is there a second for my amendments? 11 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I so move, second. 12 Thank CHAIR LHAMON: you. Any other 13 amendments? 14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have an amendment. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki, go ahead. 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I would just like 17 to add to the agenda an item to change the dates for 18 the statements due on the Stand Your Ground Report. 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? 20 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Kladney, I'11 21 second. 22 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there any 23 other amendments? If there's no further amendments, 24 let's vote to approve the agenda as amended. All 25 those in favor, say aye.

1	(Chorus of ayes.)
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Any opposed? Any
3	abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.
4	II. BUSINESS MEETING
5	PRESENTATION BY RHODE ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE
6	CHAIR ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENTLY RELEASED REPORT,
7	PAYDAY LENDING IN RHODE ISLAND
8	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now hear over the
9	phone from our Rhode Island Advisory Committee Chair,
10	Jennifer Steinfeld, on the Committee's recently report
11	titled Payday Lending in Rhode Island. Chair
12	Steinfeld, we look forward to hearing from you for ten
13	minutes.
14	MS. STEINFELD: Wonderful, thank you so
15	much for having us speak today and for all of the
16	support that you've given to this effort. I'm really
17	pleased to be able to give you an overview of how we
18	arrived at our report.
19	But first, I want to thank Barbara De La
20	Viez and Evelyn Bohor, and an intern over the summer,
21	Nicole Carroll, who were incredibly instrumental in
22	preparing this report and in helping our Committee
23	come together.
24	We were reappointed just over a year ago
25	and have been lucky to be very active since that time.

We quickly realized in our reconstitution that we had an opportunity to have a substantial local impact on an important public policy issue around payday lending.

There was legislation that had been pending for several years, Rhode Island legislative consideration is an annual consideration, so legislation is reintroduced annually in January.

And there had been no motion, but there was a piece of pending legislation in the spring of this year that was some energy behind it and needed an extra boost.

So, we were able to convene a hearing on April 27, 2018, where we brought together members of the public. And that was our first in-person meeting since our reconvening.

We had invited representation from a wide variety of stakeholders, for several panels, speaking about the issue of payday lending in the state of Rhode Island.

And I'm sure you've all read the report, but we invited representations from the payday lending industry, their lobbyists, as well as some legislators who had been opposing the legislation, without any response, which Barbara De La Viez has told me is very

1 unusual for her, as a federal official, to have no 2 response to her calls. 3 We had unanimous information that not only articulated the harm of payday lending, which I think 4 5 we were all clear about, but also, really articulated 6 clearly the explicit targeting of both low-income 7 people and people of color. 8 And most compelling to me was a map that 9 was brought to us by a local advocacy organization -10 Economic Progress Institute- that showed the 11 overlay of maps of the census tracks with the highest 12 proportion of the African American community in our 13 state, that overlapped consistently with the map of 14 the highest concentration of payday lenders in the 15 state. 16 clearly a significant effort on behalf 17 of the lending industry to really look at low-income 18 people, looking at particularly low-income people of 19 color. 20 Another interesting finding was that one 21 of the arguments that's often made against payday 22 lending is that it serves an important service for 23 people who don't have access to traditional banking. 24 But another finding that we had was that,

in fact, to receive a payday loan, you must have a

bank account and a job in order to get a payday loan. So, that's actually not true, it's not serving an unbanked industry.

We also found that there are several local alternatives, including a local credit union that provides emergency loans and a local CDFI, Community Development Financial Institution, that offers lower interest loan alternatives.

So, we were able to pull together a summary of our findings to do advocacy in support of that legislation in the spring and two of our members met with the Speaker of the House, who has been a consistent opponent of the limitations.

So, essentially payday lenders have a carve-out from the state usury laws. And so, there's been legislation to try to put them back into the state usury statute, which limits the interest rate, I think at 28 percent.

And our members found not only did they —
they expected to have a very short, cordial meeting,
where they were sort of given the brush-off, but they
actually had an incredibly hostile 20-minute
conversation, where the Speaker of the House rejected
any findings that there was a civil right violation or
that these loans created debt traps, despite evidence

to the contrary.

So, we then moved tactics. He was up for reelection this fall, he was reelected in a very close race, and was just reelected as the Speaker of the House. So, it's unclear what the future of legislation will be this year.

But two of our members on our Advisory Committee are also part of an advocacy effort on this issue. And we'll be meeting next week, so they'll be updating us on what we can do for the 2019 legislative session.

Technically, our work on this issue concluded with the issuance of our report, but we just had a letter from Chair Lhamon go out to legislators outlining the recommendations that we made around payday loan alternatives, recommending legislative action to restrict the maximum interest rate to 36 percent APR and this is a recommendation to get the payday lenders back into alignment with the state usury laws.

So, stay tuned for additional advocacy on this important issue that's certainly impacting our community quite significantly. And I'll be happy to take any questions.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks so much, Chair

I'll open for questions from my fellow 1 Steinfeld. Commissioners. 2 I see Commissioner Kladney has a 3 question. 4 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I just would like to 5 make a statement. I thought the report was well done. We had proposed at one time, in my office, to do a 6 7 briefing here on payday lending and we subsequently 8 didn't do it. 9 But what our research found, and I don't 10 know if -- I don't think Rhode Island has very many 11 military bases. But where there are military bases, 12 these payday lending stores line the entranceway to 13 the main gate, because a lot of soldiers and sailors 14 use those services. 15 And as a result, if they miss a payment, 16 the payday lending place can just get a hold of their 17 commanding officer and they withhold from their pay. 18 And it's really been quite a detriment to military 19 members. 20 I just wanted to make that statement, but 21 I thought your report was excellently done. Thank 22 you. 23 MS. STEINFELD: Thank you. We actually did 24 reach out, we have a naval base and the Naval War 25 College is located here in Rhode Island.

1	We did reach out to military and the
2	statement that they gave us is that there actually is
3	a federal regulation that is now no longer allowing
4	payday lenders to they consider it to be a troop
5	insecurity issue to loan to active duty military.
6	So, it's quite a significant issue for the
7	military and they've taken action as well, which I
8	think strengthens the power of our report.
9	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. No questions?
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I guess I have some
12	questions.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Thank you for that
15	presentation. I was just working out what 26 percent
16	would be on a \$200 loan.
17	MS. STEINFELD: I'm sorry, it's actually 35
18	percent, 36 percent.
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's written here as
20	36, but I don't think it's going to make any
21	difference to my point. And that's less than \$3 on a
22	two-week loan, which is probably too little to make
23	processing worth it.
24	One response that a payday lender could
25	have to that would be to decline to make tiny loans

and make larger ones, where the interest rate might 1 2 pay at least the processing costs. 3 And they might demand of people who are 4 desperate for the money that they borrow more than 5 they would ordinarily need. Is this something that 6 you gave some thought to? 7 MS. STEINFELD: The information that we have is that, actually, the business model does not 8 9 make a profit on the initial loan. It requires that 10 the -- the business model actually requires the debt 11 trap to be viable. So, it requires people to take multiple 12 13 loans out and pay an initiation fee, as well as the 14 interest rate, over a period of time. And the model 15 requires around four loans. Most people we found were taking around six to eight loans in order to be able 16 17 to pay it back. It's very unlikely if, in one pay period 18 19 you don't have, let's say \$500 to fix your car, that 20 you have an extra \$500 in the next pay period, that 21 you have earnings in excess of the loan amount. 22 And so, really, this model 23 keeping people in multiple loans, which in 24 violation, they're Ι mean, not technically in

violation, but in violation of the spirit of the state

1	usury laws as well.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, but that just
3	makes my point
4	MS. STEINFELD: So, there are
5	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: all the more
6	telling. If that's the business model, then the
7	loan's going to be larger now. And so, keeping the
8	interest rate down will actually make things worse,
9	rather than make them better.
10	MS. STEINFELD: Well, I think our hope is
11	that there will be an increase in alternative lending
12	sources, including, as I said, there is a local credit
13	union and a local CDFI that offer
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Again, they're going
15	to want
16	MS. STEINFELD: emergency loans and
17	those are
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: the larger loans.
19	They're going to want the larger loans, which is
20	going to make
21	MS. STEINFELD: No, no, no
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: the matter worse
23	rather than better.
24	MS. STEINFELD: they're limited to
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Things exist because

1	
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
3	MS. STEINFELD: They're limited to
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, can
5	people go one at a time?
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: there's a market
7	for them.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot, we
9	should let the Chair of the SAC speak, at least allow
10	for a transcript.
11	MS. STEINFELD: Yes, I apologize. Those
12	emergency loans are actually limited, in one case, to
13	\$500, and in another case, to \$750.
14	They are quite small and they are not
15	designed they're a break-even product for the
16	lenders. These are services that are being offered to
17	the community.
18	One of the lenders is a credit union and
19	they're offering it to their members, because they
20	were noticing that a number of their members were
21	having their bank accounts closed due to overdraw, and
22	the overdraw is being done by the payday lenders.
23	And so, they started offering this product
24	to their members, because they spoke to their members

who actually don't want to see their bank accounts

1	shut down, but were in a short-term capital need.
2	And the local CDFI is mission-oriented
3	towards reducing poverty by reducing debt traps. And
4	so, they too offer emergency loan product. I should
5	say, I'm on the board of that organization, I'm the
6	treasurer of the board of that organization.
7	And that's a money loser for the CDFI, but
8	it's offered as a mission-oriented product. The loan
9	origination does cost more money than the loan
10	generates.
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: What organization are
12	you on the board of?
13	MS. STEINFELD: The Capital Good Fund,
14	which is a Community Development Financial
15	Institution.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And is that a paid
17	position?
18	MS. STEINFELD: No.
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is anybody on the SAC
20	in a paid position from that?
21	MS. STEINFELD: No.
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You had mentioned two
23	members are interested in advocacy here, is there
24	someone else from the organization that's on the SAC?
25	MS. STEINFELD: Not from that organization.
1	1

1	There are two members, one from the State Council of
2	Churches, which is very engaged in advocacy around
3	this, and one from an organization called
4	NeighborWorks, which is mostly focused on housing, but
5	also is working on this issue as
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is either of those
7	positions
8	MS. STEINFELD: predatory, as well
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: a paid position?
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot, I'm
11	going to ask you again to let Chair Steinfeld speak
12	before you speak so that we can have a clear
13	transcript.
14	MS. STEINFELD: Yes, those are their
15	professional positions, I believe both.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. And which
17	members are those?
18	MS. STEINFELD: That's Member Morriseau and
19	Member Anderson.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: From which
21	organizations? Which one goes with which?
22	MS. STEINFELD: Member Anderson from the
23	State Council of Churches and Member Morriseau from
24	NeighborWorks Blackstone Valley.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I guess I would

continue on this point that, like, you may be making 1 2 this worse. 3 You're talking about people who 4 desperate for credit. And you can dry up that credit 5 or you can make that amount larger. Drying up that 6 credit may drive them to other acts of desperation. 7 MS. STEINFELD: That's certainly possible, 8 but we don't think that it should be allowable to 9 create something that is so predatory on people, when 10 there are alternative sources available. 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Steinfeld, I wanted to 12 follow up on that question. This is Chair Lhamon. 13 The report notes that you have a set of 14 recommendations for what Rhode Island should do to 15 investigate the underlying financial circumstances 16 that leave Rhode Islanders, and particularly Rhode 17 Islanders of color especially, in need of the credit 18 advances that payday loans provide. 19 And you also mentioned that your State 20 Advisory Committee plans, next week, to discuss 21 possible next steps following from this report. 22 wonder if one possibility for 23 Advisory Committee might be to investigate those 24 underlying reasons and to address the civil rights 25 issues that follow from that level of financial

insecurity for Rhode Islanders.

MS. STEINFELD: Yes, absolutely. And it is certainly something that we're interested in looking at and just seeing if there are other areas where our Commission can investigate potential civil rights violations that lead to what we see as a significant income disparity based on race.

CHAIR LHAMON: I was very taken with the thoroughness of this report. And I also appreciate your noting at the beginning of your presentation that your Advisory Committee has seized on your reappointment as a moment to deliver results from your expertise.

And so, thank you for your productivity and also for the detail in this report. I generally am not, and in this instance am not, recommending a particular topic for any State Advisory Committee to take up.

I was very taken with the quantum of information that you took in on this topic and the kinds of civil rights issues that could follow in addition to the specific recommendations about payday loan caps that your report includes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a question to ask. I have a question, Madam Chair.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki, go ahead.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. Thank you very
3	much for this report. Have did your Committee
4	review at all the proposed payday regulations proposed
5	by the CFPB and did they have any response to the fact
6	that the CFPB is now indicated it's going to
7	reconsider those rules that were enacted in the last
8	year of the Obama Administration?
9	MS. STEINFELD: We did have somebody
10	present from the CFPB and we do have some information.
11	We have not considered it in light of the
12	reconsideration. However, I will say that the
13	reconsideration is largely due to the question that
14	was brought up by a member around access to credit.
15	And knowing that in our state, there are
16	alternative credit sources, really makes that be a
17	specific recommendation for our state, whereas, if
18	there was not alternative access to capital, we might
19	have a different finding.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Got it, thank you.
21	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair?
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?
23	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair,
24	this is Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson, I have a brief
25	question.

1 CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead, Vice Chair. 2 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. I see in 3 the report where you discuss the adverse effect that 4 payday loans have on the state economy. 5 I thought that was interesting, because 6 rarely do we think about the effect on the state's 7 economy, we usually focus on the individual. Would 8 you mind saying a word or two more about the adverse 9 effect on Rhode Island's economy? 10 MS. STEINFELD: Sure. Essentially, we have 11 significant enough portion of our population, 12 especially our low-income population, who, rather than 13 spending their income generating sales or et cetera, 14 they're spending their income paying back payday 15 lenders. 16 And the payday lenders are not located in 17 Rhode Island, that's not money that stays locally. 18 can make an argument that there are 19 employees, et cetera, who work locally, but that tends 20 to be very small proportion of the money that's 21 actually staying as part of our local economy. 22 So, it's essentially taking money from our 23 lower income folks, many of whom are receiving state 24 subsidies as well, and it's extracting that out of our

state economy and moving that to national corporations

1	and, therefore, not generating wealth.
2	In addition to more intangible costs of
3	stress, anxiety, et cetera, for people who get stuck
4	in this debt trap.
5	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank you very
6	much.
7	MS. STEINFELD: Sure.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?
9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. Thank you
10	very much for this report. I was just wondering if
11	the industry has explained or offered any explanation
12	about why the phenomenon that you describe on Page 12
13	exists?
14	On Page 12 of the report, you write, when
15	comparing neighborhoods with the same median income,
16	neighborhoods with significant black and Latino
17	populations had a 70 percent higher concentration of
18	payday loan stores that white neighborhoods at the
19	same income level.
20	Have we heard from the industry about what
21	the rationale of that economic model is?
22	MS. STEINFELD: We did not even get the
23	courtesy of a return phone call turning down an
24	opportunity to present at our briefing. So, no, we
25	have not heard any response from the industry.

1 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: anybody Has 2 elsewhere offered a rationale about why that pattern 3 would exist? MS. STEINFELD: The only rationale that we 4 5 have seen is from people with a particular advocacy 6 but the argument is that, 7 historical inequality in terms of access to credit and 8 suspicion or doubt about the ability of banks to serve 9 people, as well as a history of red-lining, and lack 10 of access to actual lending institutions in low-income 11 communities. COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thanks. 12 One other 13 on the points that Commissioner Heriot raised, do financial institutions have an independent 14 15 duty when they're lending to figure out whether or not 16 somebody whom they're lending to has the ability to 17 repay a loan? MS. STEINFELD: Traditional lenders do have 18 19 that requirement, payday lenders do not. 20 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: And so, would it 21 necessarily be the rational choice of a lender who 22 determines that they can't lend a low amount of money 23 to lend more money, a higher sum of money, in the way 24 that Commissioner Heriot posits? 25 MS. STEINFELD: Again, for a traditional

banking institution, certainly not. For a payday 1 2 lender, they essentially are doing an unsecured loan 3 and so, they would have -- it would depend on whether 4 the business model made sense for them, I quess, 5 whether they have a higher default rate than makes it 6 worthwhile. 7 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thanks very much. further 8 CHAIR LHAMON: Hearing 9 questions, Ms. Steinfeld, thank you so much for your 10 service and your leadership on the Rhode Island State 11 Advisory Committee and for taking the time to speak 12 very us today. We much appreciate your 13 presentation. 14 MS. STEINFELD: Thank you so much. PRESENTATION BY VERMONT ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR ON 15 16 THE COMMITTEE'S RECENTLY RELEASED ADVISORY 17 MEMORANDUM, HOUSING DISCRIMINATION IN VERMONT, A 18 HANDSHAKE AND A SMILE 19 CHAIR LHAMON: And we'll move to our next 20 item on the agenda, which is to hear from our Vermont 21 Advisory Committee Chair, Curtiss Reed, Junior, on the 22 Committee's recently released Advisory Memorandum 23 titled Housing Discrimination in Vermont, a Handshake 24 and a Smile. Chair Reed, we'll enjoy hearing from you

for ten minutes.

1 MR. REED: Good morning from yet another 2 sub-freezing day in Vermont. 3 (Laughter.) 4 MR. REED: My speech may falter here and 5 there I'm still recovering from lingering as 6 respiratory issues due a bout of bronchitis. So, this 7 will be a slow presentation. 8 On behalf of all the members the 9 State Advisory Committee, thank the 10 Commission for the opportunity to brief the 11 Commissioners housing discrimination on the 12 Vermont. 13 In addition, we wish to thank the staff of 14 the Commission's Eastern Regional Office, particularly Barbara De La 15 Viez for decades long support and 16 counsel to the Vermont SAC. 17 Vermont, by most any definition is a small 18 place, whether measured by land mass, population, or 19 productivity. 20 population of less than 624,000 21 10.3 percent of us are residents, disabled, 22 percent of us or ethnic or racial minorities, and 4.5 23 percent of us are foreign-born, according to the 24 latest census data. 25 We live on a human scale, where there is

1 seemingly a one-degree separation between any two 2 Our tendency is not to fight with our residents. 3 neighbor, lest we would need them to push our car out 4 of the snowbank during the winter or muddy road during 5 mud season. 6 And while our numbers are small, 7 impact of civil rights abuses on those of us 8 protected categories looms forever large. 9 Our memorandum titled Housing 10 Discrimination in Vermont, a Handshake and a Smile, 11 reflects on the one hand, a culture where everyone 12 needs to get along. 13 However, on the other hand, landlords and 14 property owners who do not fully understand their 15 legal obligations perpetuate housing discrimination, 16 particularly for those of us with disabilities, ethnic 17 or racial minorities, or foreign-born. 18 Since our briefing, Vermont, as part of 19 its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, 20 last prepared its required analysis of impediments in 21 2017. 22 This 2017 update to the 200-page 2012 23 report found that 46 Vermont fair-housing complaints 24 were filed with federal or state agencies between

January 2013 and July 2016.

1 Over half of these complaints involved 2 discrimination on the basis of disability, while the 3 rest involve discrimination on the basis of familial 4 status or presence of minor children, race, color, and 5 sex. 6 In additional, 189 people called Legal Aid 7 and made a housing discrimination complaint with 8 Vermont Legal Aid between March 2015 and November 9 2016. 10 The majority of these complaints, 11 percent, were related to disability discrimination. 12 The remaining complaints involved discrimination based 13 on other protected categories. 14 The analysis of impediments report found 15 that discrimination based on disability, familial 16 status, and other protected categories continues to 17 occur in Vermont. 18 The report also found that the supply of 19 affordable housing, especially affordable 20 accessible housing, in Vermont is inadequate. 21 Based on the information gathered by this 22 the Committee believes that housing 23 discrimination likely persists in Vermont. In part, 24 because many landlords do not fully understand their

legal obligations.

It is also clear that the lack of affordable housing in the state makes it even harder for individuals of color and individuals with disabilities in Vermont, who are often also lowincome, to find housing.

At the same time, the Committee's inquiry into housing discrimination has been impeded by its inability to independently investigate complaints.

For that reason, it is difficult for the Committee to complete a meaningful assessment of whether and the extent to which Vermont residents seeking housing are discriminated against based on the basis of race, disability, color, national origin, sex, religion, familial status, age, marital status, sexual orientation/gender identity, and the receipt of public assistance.

available literature and Based on testimony at the briefing, the Committee acknowledges persistence of housing discrimination in the state and its effect on Vermont residents of color and individuals with disabilities.

The Committee notes that additional training and education for landlords and other housing professionals regarding their legal obligations under the Fair Housing Act and the Vermont Fair Housing Act

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

has the potential to reduce housing discrimination in 1 2 Vermont. 3 It may also be beneficial to expand the 4 efforts to inform tenants of their rights under the 5 In other states, this has been accomplished laws. 6 through the use of flyers and bus advertisements that 7 educate readers on types of prohibited discrimination. The Committee also identified a need for a 8 9 discrimination hotline that would 10 landlords and tenants to access information on what 11 practices are discriminatory. 12 suffering through my thank you for halting voice, but I'm open to taking questions. 13 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Reed, thank you very much for your presentation, and also, thank you for 16 17 sticking with us notwithstanding illness. 18 much appreciate it. 19 I'll open for questions from my fellow 20 Commissioners. While people are formulating thoughts, 21 I'll jump in with a few questions of my own. 22 Chair Reed, I notice that the penultimate 23 page of your report, a reference to the analysis of 24 the impediments submitted in 2017 from the state, and 25 your description of that notes that there were 46 fair

housing complaints filed with federal and state agencies in a three-year period that report on the analysis of impediments, and separately, that there were 189 people who had called the Legal Aid Office in Vermont in, let's say, a six-month period, from March 2015 to November of 2016.

I wonder if you and your fellow Committee members were able to form views about what accounts for the difference in contacts between a nonprofit and government agencies with respect to fair housing, and if you could share thoughts about what may account for the difference in points of contact on what your Committee describes as a persistent concern in the state.

MR. REED: No, there was no particular conversation or discussion about the difference in the two.

One might conjecture that, given that Vermont Legal Aid has sort of a much broader contact out with community, they would be the natural point for community members to go to, as a known entity.

CHAIR LHAMON: And so, that would underscore your point about the value of notice to tenants about their rights, as one of the recommendations that you have on the last page of the

1 report, is that right? 2 MR. REED: Yes, that is correct. 3 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Also, as you may 4 know, the Commission is in the middle of an ongoing 5 investigation about the effectiveness of federal civil 6 rights enforcement across issue areas and agencies. 7 And so, obviously, one of the issues that we're investigating is fair housing and fair housing 8 9 enforcement. 10 And I note very strong parallels between 11 the information in your Committee's report 12 information that we took in from the HUD [Department of Housing and Urban Development] representative at 13 14 our briefing about the challenge in addressing the 15 volume of fair housing need in this country, with 16 limited ability to investigate complaints and identify 17 the scope of need. 18 And I wonder if you have thoughts about 19 what it would take to be able to evaluate what actual 20 circumstances are on the ground, in addition to the 21 points of contact that people make with federal 22 agencies, state agencies, and/or nonprofits. 23 MR. REED: There's -- in terms of improving 24 service, it's really a function of to what extent is

one able to be involved in the community, with the

community.

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

Ι think federal agencies have more constraints or may perceive they have more constraints, to get out, to visit and engage community groups in conversations about what the needs are in their particular communities, not only around housing, but in terms of law enforcement, in terms education.

That local groups have a much greater capacity, I think, for going to where community members are and listening with a critical ear, that allows community members to say, let's go to the nonprofit or state agency, as opposed to a federal agency.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I have just one more question, and that is, at Page 4 of your report, you note that the Champlain area NAACP received 50 complaints regarding the availability of housing in the 11-month that proceeding your briefing, which was in 2015.

And I wonder if you had views about the reliability of the state's analysis of impediments submitted in 2017 not referring to those kinds of complaints, specifically to that NAACP or more generally, to complaints to other nonprofits related

to fair housing issues?

Is that an oversight that is surprising to you or is that something that you would not consider an oversight at all?

MR. REED: It's not surprising. But also, keep in mind that, when people go to the NAACP, they're typically going with not just one particular complaint, but also sort of multiple complaints, out of which NAACP is teasing out the data specific to housing.

But that there are issues around discrimination in the workplace or the inability to get a job, education, and so, the -- places like the NAACP, whether it's in Champlain Valley or Rutland or in Southeastern Vermont, community members come in with a litary of issues.

And it's difficult for, difficult but not necessarily impossible for, federal agencies just to narrow-in on the housing issue in and of itself. Because I think there's a tendency not to want to hear what the other sort of complaint areas are, that they just want you to focus on housing or education or workplace discrimination.

But unfortunately, or maybe fortunately, the way community members' minds work is a much more

1	holistic fashion, in terms of the interconnectedness
2	of these various forms of discrimination and
3	harassment.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much, Chair
5	Curtiss. Are there questions from other
6	Commissioners? Hearing none, I will thank you very
7	much and we can move on to our next item.
8	But first, thank you for your service and
9	for your leadership on the Vermont State Advisory
10	Committee and for the Advisory Memorandum that you
11	shared with us today, and thank you again for
12	presenting notwithstanding illness, we appreciate it.
13	MR. REED: Thank you to you as well.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair?
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair, this
17	is Commissioner Narasaki, I just wanted to let you
18	know that I have joined before the Vermont Chair begin
19	his report.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Welcome, we're delighted to
21	have you.
22	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE DISCOVERY PLAN, OUTLINE,
23	AND TIMELINE FOR THE COMMISSION'S PROJECT ON WOMEN
24	IN PRISON
25	CHAIR LHAMON: So, our next item is a

1	discussion and vote on the discovery materials, namely
2	the discovery plan, outline, and timeline for the
3	Commission's project on women in prison. To begin
4	discussion, is there a motion?
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I move we adopt the
6	plan.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
8	second?
9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
10	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair, I
11	second.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific, thank you.
13	Commissioner Kladney, as the sponsor of this project,
14	would you begin our discussion?
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: My office has been
16	working closely with OCRE [Office of Civil Rights
17	Evaluation] and we have developed they have
18	developed this plan. And I feel it's very
19	comprehensive. It's an issue-oriented briefing, the
20	panels will be issue-oriented rather than group-
21	oriented.
22	I think it's a pretty well rounded
23	discovery plan. And recently, they have come up with
24	a list of witnesses that I think are all-encompassing
25	on the issue. And I urge adoption.

1 CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific, thank you. Τо 2 continue our discussion, I'll offer a few points. 3 First, I am very grateful for the Office 4 of Civil Rights Evaluation, the specific expertise 5 that we get to benefit from for this project. 6 also appreciate Commissioner Kladney leading this and 7 the research that has come from your office as well, 8 to move us forward. 9 I believe that you all together will lead 10 us through this investigation with a solid foundation 11 and I look forward to taking up this issue in more 12 depth, with a briefing in February 2019. 13 So, any other discussion? Commissioner 14 Heriot? COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just want to say, 15 the side of this that interests me the most is the 16 17 education side. I've spoken to Commissioner Kladney 18 on this and I just want to make sure that we're going 19 looking into what gets taught at various 20 prisons. 21 I mean, it seems to me that the reason 22 this is an interesting issue is that there are a lot 23 more men in prison than there are women and that, 24 therefore, there are economies of scale at men's

prisons that you don't get in women's prisons.

1 And I would like to see as much data as we 2 And I'm wondering get on that issue. if 3 Commissioner Kladney can talk about that for a second. 4 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you, 5 Commissioner Heriot, for your interest. I -- we have several witnesses who will speak to rehabilitation in 6 7 those terms. You've accurately pointed to an issue 8 that is a very lively issue in regards to women in 9 prison. 10 not have --They have -- they do 11 preliminary research, not to draw any conclusions 12 early, my preliminary research has shown that, 13 have more outlets of fact, men do in terms 14 rehabilitation and learning skills in prison. 15 While we were talking earlier, you had 16 mentioned, I think, welding. And that has come up, 17 electrics has come up, electrician training, plumbing, real construction type 18 jobs. And my office's 19 preliminary research has shown that they are not 20 available to women. 21 And we plan to have witnesses, there will 22 be witnesses at the briefing who can address that 23 specifically. We will have one lady, Alex McLaren, 24 who is BOP's [Bureau of Prisons] in charge of the

women's facilities, who will --

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The whole facilities
2	or just the education?
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: All facilities.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: And we'll just interrupt and
5	note that we do not know who will actually speak at
6	the briefing itself. We know who we might invite.
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Right.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: And we haven't voted on that
9	yet.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Let me put it this
11	way, I believe she will be invited. And I firmly
12	believe that she will probably attend. Although, I'm
13	speculating, a woman of her stature would be able to
14	address all those issues.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: What I would like to
16	see, if we can get this, is, like, have an appendix to
17	the report that says, here are the courses that are
18	offered at such-and-such a prison, here are the ones
19	that are offered at another.
20	So that we really instead of just
21	getting them off-the-cuff when we're asking them a
22	question, like what gets taught. We won't get
23	completely accurate information there.
24	I would like it if we could ask that
25	witness to give us just the straight data on it, like

1	in the year 2018, which by then will be finished, what
2	got taught at, maybe not every federal prison, but if
3	we had a good sample of men's versus women's prisons.
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I will try to obtain
5	that. I think, because BOP, I don't know how many
6	women's facilities they have, but it's not many
7	throughout the country.
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, that's the basic
9	problem.
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And the other
11	problem
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And I think it speaks
13	well for women, by the way.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you very much,
15	yes, it does.
16	
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Though I could say
17	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is
17	
17 18	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is
	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is that they are less likely to commit a crime that will
17 18 19	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is that they are less likely to commit a crime that will cause them to go to prison.
17 18 19 20	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is that they are less likely to commit a crime that will cause them to go to prison. COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I am speechless.
17 18 19 20 21	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is that they are less likely to commit a crime that will cause them to go to prison. COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I am speechless. Anyway
17 18 19 20 21 22	nice things about men, too. The one I can't say is that they are less likely to commit a crime that will cause them to go to prison. COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I am speechless. Anyway CHAIR LHAMON: So, keeping us moving,

1	for us to call the question and take a roll call vote.
2	So, Commissioner Adegbile, have
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair?
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, sorry, Madam Vice Chair,
5	go ahead.
6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Madam Chair?
7	Yes, I just wanted to thank Commissioner Kladney for
8	his leadership on this. What appeals to me is the
9	fact that this will come on, this report will come on
10	the heels of our collateral consequences one.
11	And so, to some degree, it allows us to do
12	a slightly different eye as we look at women in prison
13	and collateral consequences. And so, I like that and
14	good job thus far.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Okay. So, now,
16	we'll turn to calling the question and taking a roll
17	call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
18	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'll vote aye, on the
21	ground that Commissioner Kladney is going to try to
22	get that information that I just mentioned.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But did I just vote
25	aye on the timeline as well, is that part of the deal

1	here?
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Or are we voting
4	separately on that?
5	CHAIR LHAMON: I think Commissioner
6	Kladney's motion was to approval all of the product
7	materials, is that correct?
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes, it was.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I may have
10	something to say about the timeline.
11	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Do you want to pause
12	for discussion?
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. I'm just a
14	little bit concerned about Section 4 here, which is
15	kind of oddly numbered since the dates on Section 4
16	come after the dates on Section 3.
17	And it looks like we would be getting
18	affected agency review incorporated the very same day
19	that we are voting, which doesn't make sense to me.
20	It may be that there will be no such changes, but if
21	there are significant changes, I don't see how we
22	could be voting on the project on the same day.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: I think the vote is
24	actually, we disseminate the project for vote on that
25	day, but the vote itself takes place on November 8.

1	So, it gets disseminated on October 25. And that's
2	the day that the affected agency review.
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Is there some way to
4	move that affected agency review up? I mean, that
5	strikes me as very late in the game.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm sorry, also, just to be
7	clear, the affected agency review comes in on October
8	18 and the responses to it are incorporated on October
9	25.
10	And then, as those responses are
11	incorporated, they are submitted to the Commissioners
12	for a vote. And the vote follows on November 8. So,
13	we would receive the affected agency review October 18
14	and then, vote on November 8.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. Well, that's
16	good enough for me.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I am concerned,
19	though, that an affected agency review can be a big
20	deal.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes, agreed.
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And it can really,
23	really change the report. And if this one does, I
24	think we're going to have to put off the vote. But if
25	it doesn't, then we're okay.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Right. So, that's a bridge
2	we can cross then
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: but I appreciate your
5	concern, yes.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. So, turning back to a
8	vote, as we had proceeded, let me just confirm
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Then, I'm still a
10	yes.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: You're still a yes. And
12	Commissioner Adegbile, did that discussion change your
13	vote?
14	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: No.
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Commissioner
17	Kirsanow?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
20	Kladney?
21	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
25	Yaki?

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'd like a vote on
2	whether I can really understand anything that went on
3	in the previous discussion on the previous vote, but
4	I'll vote yes, anyway.
5	(Laughter.)
6	CHAIR LHAMON: I appreciate your informed
7	vote, Commissioner Yaki. Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
8	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. So, the
10	motion passes unanimously.
11	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE BRIEFING DATE FOR THE
12	COMMISSION PROJECT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN FEDERAL
13	WORKPLACES
14	CHAIR LHAMON: The next items is a
14 15	CHAIR LHAMON: The next items is a discussion and vote on the briefing date for the
15	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the
15 16 17	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal
15 16 17	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion?
15 16 17 18	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move
15 16	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move that we revisit the date of that report.
15 16 17 18 19 20	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move that we revisit the date of that report. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second?
15 16 17 18 19 20	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move that we revisit the date of that report. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'll second that,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move that we revisit the date of that report. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'll second that, Kladney.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussion and vote on the briefing date for the Commission project on sexual harassment in federal workplaces. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'd like to move that we revisit the date of that report. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second? COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I'll second that, Kladney. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I second that,

1	proposal?
2	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes, I'll speak to
3	it with great specificity. The motion is that we move
4	the date from the presently scheduled May 17 to May 9.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. So, is there a second
6	to that?
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Kladney, I'll
8	second.
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Timmons-
10	Goodson, second.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any discussion?
12	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. I would just,
13	before we vote, like to anticipatorily, thank the
14	Commissioners and staff for considering this
15	modification.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Any further discussion?
17	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: This is
18	Commissioner Narasaki. I understand that this falls
19	around Commissioner Yaki's anniversary and
20	Commissioner Adegbile might want to send a card or
21	something to his wife.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Flowers, candy.
23	(Laughter.)
24	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I'm happy to take
25	on the responsibility for all of the above and I also

1	would like to
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want to note
3	that
4	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: yield the floor
5	to Commissioner Yaki.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think for the past
7	ten years, I've endeavored to schedule this so it does
8	not fall on that, and every single time, it gets
9	changed. And the enduring patience of my wife is
10	something to behold on this particular matter, since
11	sometimes it fell on, like, key anniversary dates.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: The Commission is the gift
13	that just keeps on giving.
14	(Laughter.)
15	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: And special thanks
16	go to Commissioner Yaki, and I will pay penance to
17	your wife.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: So, unless there's any
20	further discussion, I'll call the question and we can
21	take a roll call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do
22	you vote?
23	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye, with extreme
9	reservations.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
12	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes.
14	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: And I'll
15	report on the extreme reservations to Commissioner
16	Yaki's wife.
16 17	Yaki's wife. (Laughter.)
	X
17	(Laughter.)
17 18	(Laughter.) CHAIR LHAMON: So, the motion passes
17 18 19	(Laughter.) CHAIR LHAMON: So, the motion passes unanimously again.
17 18 19 20	(Laughter.) CHAIR LHAMON: So, the motion passes unanimously again. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EXTENSION OF THE STAND YOUR
17 18 19 20 21	(Laughter.) CHAIR LHAMON: So, the motion passes unanimously again. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EXTENSION OF THE STAND YOUR GROUND STATEMENT DEADLINES
17 18 19 20 21 22	(Laughter.) CHAIR LHAMON: So, the motion passes unanimously again. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EXTENSION OF THE STAND YOUR GROUND STATEMENT DEADLINES CHAIR LHAMON: So, now, we'll take up our

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, this is
2	Commissioner Yaki. I'd like to amend the deadlines so
3	that the statements are due on January 11, 2019,
4	rebuttals due on February 11, and surrebuttal notice
5	due on February 18, text on February 25.
6	This has been worked and given the okay by
7	Commissioners Heriot and Kirsanow and other members of
8	the Commission, so I ask for this to be approved.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
10	second?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Commissioner
13	Narasaki seconds.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: I think Commissioner
15	Kirsanow beat you to the second. We'll take it, thank
16	you. Unless there's further discussion, I'll call the
17	question and take a roll call vote. Commissioner
18	Adegbile, how do you vote?
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
2	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
8	passes unanimously.
9	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON A LETTER TO HHS REGARDING
10	REPORTED PLANS TO DEFINE GENDER
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Now, we'll turn to our
12	second amended agenda item, which is a discussion and
13	vote on a letter to HHS [Department of Health and
14	Human Services] regarding reported plans to define
15	gender. To begin discussion, is there a motion?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, sorry, this is
17	Commissioner Narasaki. I move that we adopt the
18	letter to HHS concerning the definition of gender, and
19	will be happy to read it at the appropriate time.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
21	second?
22	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. To begin
24	discussion, I'll begin with Commissioner Narasaki.
25	Commissioner Narasaki, we would benefit from your

1 reading it, so we know what it is we're voting on. 2 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. And staying 3 with our tradition, I am not going to need 4 footnotes, so that we won't be here for days. Ιt 5 reads: 6 [Begin text] Dear Secretary Azar: The U.S. 7 Commission on Civil Rights writes to urge the 8 Health and Human Services Department of not 9 narrowly define gender to a biological, immutable 10 condition determined at birth. 11 We are concerned that such a definition 12 will have serious negative impacts on the health, 13 welfare, and civil rights of members the 14 transgender community. 15 Defining federal protections barring 16 discrimination on the basis of sex exclude 17 protections for transgender people runs counter to 18 longstanding legal precedents and will leave 19 transgender people vulnerable unlawful 20 discrimination. 21 Approximately million 1.4 Americans 22 identify themselves as transgender and are widely 23 recognized by the medical community as facing barriers 24 to accessing high quality medical care.

The transgender community is uniquely

vulnerable community and many of the Commission's recent investigations highlight the discrimination and significant health, social, and economic barriers they face.

For instance, in our report on workplace discrimination against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, LGBT, community, we found that LGBT pervasive workers have faced a long serious and history of official and unofficial employment discrimination by both federal, state, and governments and private employers.

Our research indicated workplace discrimination can drastically increase psychological stress and other mental health problems.

Many transgender workers report experiencing hostile work environments, where they are often mistreated, harassed, physically or sexually assaulted, forced to present as a gender they do not identify with, asked inappropriate questions, and deliberately taunted by the use of incorrect pronouns by their coworkers.

Our report also found many transgender individuals consider themselves underemployed because they are overqualified for their position. For example, transgendered people often report sex jobs

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because of difficulties of being hired.

According to a 2011 report, transgender respondents who were unemployed have nearly double the rate of engaging in survival sex work, four times the rate of homeless, and 85 percent more incarceration compared to those who were employed.

In addition, they are disproportionately likely to be HIV-positive, use drugs, or drink heavily and have multiple suicide attempts.

Our most recent report on police practices also highlighted the trauma members of the transgender community experience because of disparate treatment and harassment from law enforcement.

Members of the transgender community reported frequent harassment by law enforcement. The report found that 59 percent of transgender respondents reported being stopped by police and being profiled as sex workers, when they were conducting routine daily tasks in the neighborhood.

Of these individuals stopped, 51 percent of all LGBT respondents and 61 percent of transgender respondents reported that they had been physically or verbally harassed. And some also reported sexual abuse by police officers, including being forced to perform sexual acts under threat of arrest.

A 2013 research study by the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs found that 48 percent of LGBT [pause text] -- sorry, I'm trying to read this on my laptop - [resume text] hate crime survivors reported that they experienced police misconduct.

They found that transgender women were four times more likely to experience police violence compared to overall survivors. Transgender people overall were seven times more likely to experience physical violence when interacting with the police compared to cisgender survivors and victims.

As the Commission's research makes clear, it is critical that this community has the same level of access to healthcare and health services that all Americans have.

By adopting such a narrow definition of gender, the Department will effectively be erasing the identities of transgender people and endangering their access to healthcare that meets their unique needs.

Such a definition sends a message that the transgender community should not exist, fosters and encourages prejudice inconsistent with our core national values, and will have additional serious implications if adopted across other federal agencies.

Such a narrow definition would also be contrary to the good judgment of any federal court that has ruled on this very issue in interpreting federal civil rights laws and whose opinions are binding in their jurisdictions.

For instance, in a case challenging a transgender boy's exclusion from a boy's locker room, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit pointed out that Title IX does not use the term biological as a modifier for sex and went on to hold that the policy that requires an individual to use a bathroom that does not conform with his or her gender identity punishes that individual for his or her gender nonconformance, which in turn violates Title IX.

Similarly, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit rejected an employer's argument that Title VII's bar on sex discrimination was limited to biological sex and held that discrimination on the basis of transgender and transitioning violates Title VII.

The Commission calls on the Department of
Health and Human Services to reject any plans it may
have to narrowly define gender and to work to ensure
civil rights of members of the transgender community

1	are protected.
2	We request the opportunity to meet with
3	you or your staff at your earliest convenience to
4	discuss this urgent issue. We look forward to your
5	response. Sincerely. [End text]
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner
7	Narasaki. I noted as you were reading one friendly
8	amendment I'd like to offer, which is that in
9	Paragraph 1, in the third sentence, it begins,
10	defining federal protections barring discrimination
11	of, if we could change that "of" to "on," I think it
12	would just be more grammatically correct.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I'm happy to accept
14	the friendly amendment.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any further
16	discussion? Commissioner Heriot?
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: One concern I have is
18	that this is very premature. There is not yet a
19	policy out there.
20	But another clarification here is that,
21	your Footnote 1 refers to a New York Times article
22	that claims that such a policy is forthcoming. And in
23	that second line there, you say that the Department of
24	Health and Human Services is going to define gender.

Well, gender is not a statutory term in

58 most of these statutes. The term that, if the article 2 is correct, it quotes from a memo that talks about defining sex, not defining gender. And sex is indeed a statutory term and, hence, it wouldn't be terribly surprising if there's a 6 memo out there that does indeed attempt to define sex

within the meaning of those statutes.

But the notion that they're defining I don't know why they would be defining And so, the first thing I think we need to do gender. is make sure that there is such a memo and what it says.

But I'd just be shocked if there's a memo out there that defines gender, given that sex is actually the term that's in the statute and, hence, sex is the term that presumably needs defining. think that's a fundamental error in the letter as it's presented right now.

Also, I think that, from the standpoint of the progressive agenda, you're shooting yourself in If you're going to define sex in a way the foot. that's more in keeping with how we use the term gender these days, then you're going to eliminate discriminatory aspects of it.

I mean, under Price Waterhouse, you can

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

make an argument, it's been rejected by some courts, but you can make an argument that if you have an anatomical male who prefers feminine dress, feminine hairstyles, and such, and therefore says, gender is female, you can make the argument that if an employer rejects an anatomical male that adopts feminine dress and hairstyle, but not an anatomical female, that there's sex discrimination.

But once you start getting clever with the definition of sex, you make it so the arguments under Price Waterhouse can't be made.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKT: Well, addressing your first point, which I gather that you feel that it's premature, we're actually trying to prevent them from moving forward and not waiting for them to actually do it and complain later.

CHAIR LHAMON: I will say, to add to that response, Commissioner Narasaki, I fully support this letter and am planning to vote in its favor. I think it's important for us to speak to the issues.

And I also just want to confirm for the record that I am not here to advance a progressive agenda, I am here to advance the statutory and regulatory protections for civil rights that exist today and to help advise Congress, the President, and

1	the American public about what would be effective
2	additional civil rights policy and that is my one and
3	only agenda and my position here.
4	Any further discussion of the statement?
5	Okay. I will then call the question and take a roll
6	call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
13	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
19	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
21	passes, two Commissioners opposed, no Commissioner
22	abstained, all others were in favor.
23	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON A LETTER TO DHS AS A COMMENT
24	ON THE PROPOSED PUBLIC CHARGE RULE
25	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now turn to another

1	amended agenda item, which is the discussion and vote
2	on a letter to DHS [Department of Homeland Security]
3	as a comment on the proposed public charge rule. To
4	begin discussion, is there a motion?
5	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is
6	Commissioner Narasaki. I move that the Commission
7	file a response to the proposed rule to significantly
8	change the public charge rules as they pertain to
9	immigrants.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
11	second?
12	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Timmons-
13	Goodson, I second.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.
15	Commissioner Narasaki, will you begin our discussion?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I will
17	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm sorry, I was just going
18	to recommend that we not read all seven pages of the
19	proposed letter into this record, just because of the
20	length of time. But I do defer to you and how you
21	want to move us.
22	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, that was how I
23	was going to begin.
24	(Laughter.)
25	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Since this is a

1 in opposition to a notice of proposed filing 2 rulemaking, I will -- and it's a very lengthy piece, I 3 don't think it's helpful to read it. 4 All of the Commissioners received a draft 5 of it from my Special Assistant, Jason Lagria. Ι'd 6 like to thank him and the other Special Assistants who 7 have helped work on it. 8 This is an issue that I have been working on for, I think pretty much the 25 years that I have 9 10 in Washington. And what the USCIS 11 Citizenship and Immigration Services] is proposing to 12 do is to make it even more difficult for immigrants to 13 reunite with their family members. There is a requirement in the law that, 14 15 when looking at people applying for admission, that 16 they not be someone who would immediately need cash assistance. 17 18 And that has been how it has largely been 19 defined for a quarter of a century now, almost, and 20 will vastly -- would expand on a prospective basis, 21 what that means. 22 Ιt been on the totality 23 circumstances, which are rather -- raises the concern 24 that that opens up the ability for there to be

discrimination in its application.

1 And also, start to do something that some 2 people have been trying to do in efforts to change the 3 immigration laws and that is to introduce by the 4 backdoor requirement of some English fluency before 5 people would be able to enter. 6 We also think that it puts at risk people 7 whose circumstances may change after they come here, 8 they have to come here and do dangerous work, 9 get injured along the way. 10 They often have citizen children who then 11 would not be able to receive assistance and who would 12 be growing up without the necessary resources to make 13 sure that they can eventually become fully effective 14 and contributing adults. 15 will stop there and see if there are 16 any questions 17 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki, this 18 is the Chair. I want to thank you for exercising your 19 leadership to move us in this direction, to use the 20 expertise of the Commission in submitting public 21 comments for proposed regulatory rule. 22 I think that it is an important way to use 23 the voice of the Commission and the expertise of the 24 members of the Commission and I appreciate your

leadership.

1	In that respect, with this as a device,
2	and also on this very important issue, I plan to vote
3	in favor of the draft that you shared.
4	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I appreciate that.
5	And actually the challenge is that because this law
6	would fall disproportionately on different people of
7	different national origins that would be
8	discriminatory.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any other
10	discussion on this motion. Hearing none, I will call
11	the question and take a roll call vote. Commissioner
12	Adegbile, how do you vote?
13	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
19	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
25	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
2	passes, two Commissioners opposed, no Commissioner
3	abstained, all others were in favor.
4	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON A STATEMENT REGARDING THE
5	COMMISSION'S LEGISLATIVE AND OVERSIGHT PRIORITIES
6	FOR THE NEW CONGRESS
7	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now turn to another
8	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on
9	a statement regarding the Commission's legislative and
10	oversight priorities for the new Congress, as
11	circulated earlier this week.
12	To open the floor for discussion, I move
13	for approval of the statement as circulated by my
14	Special Assistant. Is there a second?
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Kladney, I'll
16	second.
17	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I second,
18	Commissioner Narasaki.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll begin with
20	a discussion of a few points, and I will, I think,
21	depart from our tradition of reading it into the
22	record, because it is also quite long, it is five
23	pages, unless anyone particularly wants to hear the
24	melodious tone of my voice at that length.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Let me think about

1 that. No. 2 (Laughter.) 3 CHAIR LHAMON: Fair enough. So, let me 4 just describe the goals of this draft that I know we 5 have all seen. And that is Congress's mandate to the 6 Commission is to advice the President, Congress, and 7 the public on civil rights policy and the state of 8 civil rights enforcement. 9 With the new Congress coming in in January 10 2019, and given the volume of work 11 important issues always facing Congress, I think it's 12 prudent to provide a priority list from the Commission 13 to highlight key recommendations resulting from the 14 Commission's focused attention and research over the 15 last few years. 16 The urgent message that we would send to 17 Congress with this statement is that Americans need 18 our members of Congress to prioritize civil rights 19 their with oversight investigations 20 legislation. 21 With that, I'll pause and see if there's 22 any further discussion on the statement. Hearing none 23 24 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: This is

Commissioner Narasaki.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead, Commissioner
2	Narasaki.
3	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I want to applaud
4	the Chair and her Special Assistant for their hard
5	work on this letter.
6	I think it is very appropriate, with new
7	Congress coming in and with so many new members, to
8	educate Congress, as is our mission, about the
9	concerns and recommendations that the Commission has
10	been raising recently, and look forward to supporting
11	this in my vote.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. If no further
13	discussion, I will call the question and take a roll
14	call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
15	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I vote aye,
16	however, I would like to note on the letter that I
17	take no position with respect to the recommendation
18	regarding consent decrees and I would appreciate it if
19	the letter would so reflect.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
21	Heriot, how do you vote?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
3	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
9	passes, two Commissioners opposed, no Commissioner
10	abstained, and all others were in favor, with the note
11	to be added that Commissioner Adequile raised.
12	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE STATEMENT REGARDING
13	CITIZENSHIP
14	CHAIR LHAMON: We now turn to another
14 15	CHAIR LHAMON: We now turn to another amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on
15 16	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on
15 16 17	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin
15	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion?
15 16 17 18 19	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is
15 16 17 18	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I move that we adopt a
15 16 17 18 19 20	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I move that we adopt a statement, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights warns
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I move that we adopt a statement, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights warns against attempts to end citizenship continued
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	amended agenda item, which is a discussion and vote on the statement regarding citizenship. To begin discussion, is there a motion? COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I move that we adopt a statement, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights warns against attempts to end citizenship continued hostility to immigrants.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second by Commissioner
2	Yaki.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. To begin
4	discussion, we'll start with Commissioner Narasaki.
5	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. This is
6	fairly brief and so, I will go ahead and read it.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: [begin text] The
9	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights strongly opposes the
10	President's announced intention to attempt to end
11	citizenship for children born in the United States to
12	non-citizens through Executive Order.
13	The President's proposal continues a
14	troubling pattern of statements expressing hostility
15	and animus toward immigrants or their nations of
16	origin that this Commission has previously noted.
17	This attempt is just the latest
18	manifestation of policies such as the Muslim Ban and
19	the proposed expansion of public charge termination to
20	curtain immigration from marginalized communities that
21	threaten the dignity, well-being, and civil rights of
22	immigrants and citizens in our country.
23	Attempts to end citizenship for children
24	born in the United States would clearly violate the
25	plain text of the 14th Amendment, which states: all

70 1 persons born or naturalized in the United States and 2 subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of 3 the United States. 4 The Supreme Court has been clear on this 5 In 1898, the Supreme Court held, in United subject. 6 States v. Wong Kim Ark, that a child born in the 7 United States to Chinese nationals who then were 8 barred from becoming naturalized U.S. citizens 9 entitled to citizenship under the 14th Amendment. 10 In 1982, all nine Supreme Court Justices 11 agreed in Plyler v. Doe that the equal protection 12 clause applies to undocumented immigrants physically 13 within the jurisdiction of state no less than it does 14 to documented immigrants and U.S. citizens, because 15 they are subject the jurisdiction of the United 16 States. 17 Others across the ideological spectrum 18 have also pointed out that the original intent of the 19 drafters of the 14th Amendment was for the amendment 20 to be broad and sweeping with very limited exceptions. 21 More than 13 countries offer similar

More than 13 countries offer similar birthright citizenship.

The President's proposal is a violation of the civil rights and equal protection of native-born children of non-citizens that diminishes the rule of

22

23

24

1 law in our country. 2 strongly advise the President 3 reconsider and publicly disavow any further effort to 4 end such citizenship. [End text] 5 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner 6 Is there any discussion of this proposed 7 statement? Commissioner Heriot? 8 **HERIOT:** COMMISSIONER Ι suspect 9 Commissioner Narasaki is correct about the 10 interpretation of the 14th Amendment here, but that's 11 just a suspicion on my part. The text, I think, seems 12 to go with her. 13 I have not read the argument in the other 14 direction yet. And I feel like I can't weigh in on 15 anything other than my gut reaction, as the text is 16 with Commissioner Narasaki and the text matters a 17 whole lot. 18 So, I'm going to have to abstain on this 19 Even if I'd read Professor Eastman's argument to 20 the contrary, at this point, and formed a firm opinion 21 that Commissioner Narasaki is correct, the rhetoric in 22 this particular document is not something that I could 23 support. 24 But the basic notion of what the 14th 25

Amendment requires, again, I think she's probably

1	right, but I can't say that definitively until I've
2	read the argument going the other way.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: That's fair, thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I'll take a
5	probably right from you, Commissioner Heriot.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, well, maybe at
7	some other point, I'll have a final opinion, but right
8	now, I just have to abstain.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
10	Adegbile?
11	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair, I want
12	to pick up on a point made by Commissioner Heriot.
13	There is a sense in which the animating events for
14	this statement are in part about rhetoric.
15	They're about the rhetoric of our nation's
16	leader, who has chosen a path of demonizing human
17	beings on a categorical basis who hail from various
18	parts of the globe on the strength of their national
19	origin, their religion, rather than pursuing a path of
20	using the bully pulpit to take exception and note
21	where the policies or leadership vision of foreign
22	leaders is inconsistent with American interests.
23	So, rhetoric is important in public
24	policy. But it's important to have leaders who don't
25	ongago in catogorical domonization of noonlo on the

1 of they strength where were born, what the 2 circumstances of their birth are, or their religion. 3 And so, I would like to note that this 4 statement is important, because it doesn't stop with 5 rhetoric. 6 Rhetoric can sometimes form the basis for 7 policies and those policies can have effects when 8 joined dangerous rhetoric / that with the 9 inconsistent with the American idea, with our history, 10 and with our finest traditions. 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow? 12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thanks, 13 I would largely concur with what Commissioner Heriot had just stated, although I would note that I 14 think it probably behooves everyone to engage in a bit 15 16 of humility as to whether or not the 14th Amendment 17 applies to this situation. 18 I do think that, first of all, at the time 19 the 14th Amendment was promulgated, one 20 contemplated this particular issue. But to the extent there was any discussion 21 22 about it, two of the principal drafters of it, Lyman 23 Turnbull and Jacob Howard, suggested that it wouldn't 24 apply as this statement would have it apply.

would not apply to the children of

25

illegal

1 immigrants born in America. 2 But I would say that it's a close reading. 3 If you look at the text, I would think the clear 4 reading of the text would say, most likely, 5 individuals born in the United States, regardless of 6 circumstance, are entitled to citizenship. 7 But beyond that, this document isn't 8 correct, in terms of its description of Wong Kim Ark 9 or of Plyler. 10 the distinguishing Kim Ark, 11 feature there is, even though these were Chinese 12 nationals, they were lawfully present in the United 13 States. 14 Second, with respect to Plyler v. Doe, 15 that was a narrow reading, that was a very narrow 16 case. 17 This suggests that somehow Plyler v. Doe 18 says that illegal immigrants born in the United States 19 are then entitled to citizenship, or the children of 20 illegal immigrants born in the United States are 21 entitled to citizenship. 22 And if you look at Plyler v. Doe, there 23 are a number of statements by the various justices 24 there that indicate that although individuals present

in the United States are subject to the equal

1	protection of the law, that doesn't mean that a
2	category of citizens or all categories of individuals
3	are treated identically. There may be classifications
4	of individuals treated differently for a host of
5	reasons.
6	So, for that and other reasons, I will be
7	voting against this.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: It would be a substantial
9	difference in treatment to say that you could not be a
10	citizen, as a category.
11	So, I do just want to point out that a
12	strict textualist reading of all persons born or
13	naturalized in the United States does suggest that,
14	unless these children are not persons, they are
15	citizens under that amendment.
16	Commissioner Narasaki?
17	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I just wanted to
18	note that we are using Plyler v. Doe for the finding
19	that children, undocumented children, or children who
20	are born here, are subject to the jurisdiction.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki, I
22	noted
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Madam Chair?
24	CHAIR LHAMON: I'm sorry, go ahead,
25	Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just wanted to make a brief statement. The cases, civil rights cases of the late 1800s, early 1900s, were brought by members of the Chinese American community at the time, a community that had been the subject of distinct and overtly racist laws designed to prevent them from entering the country, owning property, really having the civil rights that every American or every person who was in this country should be allowed.

And part of my pride in being half Chinese American is knowing that these are individuals who decided to challenge the interpretation of a law brought down against them by a power structure that was white and male, just to be factual about it, and went to a Supreme Court that was also white and male, and found these rights to be self-evident in the plain wording of the 14th Amendment.

They pooled their money together, they worked together as a community to fund these legal challenges. This was not something that they took lightly, given their status and the fear of retribution for them.

And we have to remember that and remember what it is that they did for every American who is here now, for every immigrant family, for everyone who

1 came through Ellis Island or Angel Island, their 2 children became American. 3 And the idea that one set of people or 4 sets of people, whether it is by faith or in the color 5 of their skin, somehow are not eligible to receive the 6 same types of benefits that millions of others who are 7 third generation second and Americans now 8 ridiculous. 9 And the rhetoric of President, а 10 Commissioner Adegbile said, means something, 11 especially when it means changing the very nature of 12 how we are defined and who we've seen ourselves and 13 who we've become as Americans. 14 And so, I strongly support this statement. 15 would have put perhaps even more inflammatory language that would have made Commissioner Heriot or 16 17 Commissioner Kirsanow even more on edge. I did not. 18 But I would say that, this is -- Wong Kim 19 Mick Wo, others are things that should be taught 20 in every history book about this Constitution and its 21 Amendments were meant to protect and bestow rights 22 upon every person in this country and not just for a 23 select few. 24 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner 25 Yaki. Commissioner Narasaki, I noted when you read

1	the statement, I think you added "such" before
2	"citizenship" in the last line, and I liked that
3	amendment and so, want to offer it as a friendly
4	amendment to the text, if you would be willing to
5	accept is.
6	So, the last sentence of the statement
7	would read, we strongly advise the President to
8	reconsider and publicly disavow any further efforts to
9	end such citizenship.
10	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, I would accept
11	that amendment. And I'm a little worried about the
12	title, because it seemed a little bit overwrought in
13	the way we phrased it, that somehow the effort to end
14	all citizenship is happening.
15	I was trying to avoid the use of the term
16	birthright citizenship, but I would add it there, just
17	for clarity, so we don't cause a huge panic.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. So, unless there's
19	further discussion, with those two amendments, I will
20	call the question and take a roll call vote.
21	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
22	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commissioner
24	Heriot?
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Abstain.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson?
10	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion
12	passes, one Commissioner opposed, one Commissioner
13	abstained, and all others were in favor.
14	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Next, we'll hear from Staff
16	Director Mauro Morales for the monthly Staff
17	Director's Report.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: Thank you, Madam
19	Chair. I don't have anything more to add than what is
20	already contained in the report.
21	I always remain available to discuss any
22	questions or concerns a Commissioner may have about
23	the report or anything else that the Commission is
24	working on.
25	I'd just like to say, since this is the

1	last business meeting of the year, I want to extend
2	good wishes to Commissioners, Special Assistants, and
3	all our staff for a wonderful job they did in 2018.
4	And I want to also wish everybody a wonderful holiday
5	and a safe one as well. So, thank you, Madam Chair.
6	III. ADJOURN MEETING
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. If there's
8	nothing further, I will hereby adjourn our meeting at
9	11:24 a.m. Eastern Time. Thank you.
10	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
11	off the record at 11:24 a.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



NEAL R. GROSS