U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2022

+ + + + +

The Commission convened at the National Press Club, 529 14th Street, Northwest, 13th Floor, Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m. EST, Norma Cantu, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

NORMA V. CANTU, Chair

J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, Commissioner

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

STEPHEN GILCHRIST, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

DAVID GANZ, General Counsel & Parliamentarian

STAFF PRESENT:

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division (ASCD)

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director, Office of Management
DAVID MUSSATT, Director, Regional Programs
Coordination Unit

JULIAN NELSON-SAUNDERS, ASCD Pathways Intern
ESSENCE PERRY, ASCD Pathways Intern
MICHELE YORKMAN-RAMEY, Deputy Chief Information
Officer

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

JOSHUA DANSBY

ALEC DUELL

ALEXIS FRAGOSA

JOHN K. MASHBURN

CARISSA MULDER

JUANA SILVERIO

THOMAS SIMUEL

IRENA VIDULOVIC

AGENDA

APPROVAL OF AGENDA 5
BUSINESS MEETING
Presentations by State Advisory Committee Chairs
on Released Reports and Memorandums 6
Discussion and Vote on FY 2023 Crime Victims
Report Timeline and Discovery Materials
Management and Operations
Staff Director's Report
ADJOURN MEETING

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

(10:07 a.m.)

CHAIR CANTU: Welcome to the business meeting for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. meeting comes to order at 10:08 a.m. Eastern Standard Time on Friday. I am Chair Norma V. Cantu, and we thank the staff who completed the public notice needed for this meeting, and arranged for today's business meeting. We thank the general public for their interest in attending. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we're hosting the general meeting for the public by phone conference.

We commissioners are both in person, and by phone conference, and I think one by Zoom. At this time I would like to confirm the commissioners present, and we'll take a roll call. Please say present when I say your name. Commissioner Adams? He was on the line, I'll come back to you sir. Commissioner Adegbile?

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Present.

CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Gilchrist?

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Present.

CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Heriot?

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I am here.

CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kirsanow?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here.
2	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kladney?
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Here.
4	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Yaki?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I am virtually here.
6	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. And based on the
7	response, a quorum of the commissioners are present.
8	Is the court reporter present?
9	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
10	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. Is the staff
11	director present?
12	MR. MORALES: I am present.
13	APPROVAL OF AGENDA
14	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you Mr. Morales. The
15	meeting will now come to order. Before we begin, I'd
16	like to remove item B from the agenda, as I've been
17	advised that we will need more time to consider the
18	other items on the business meeting. Do any
19	commissioners have their proposed amendments to this
20	agenda? Anyone online? If there are no other
21	amendments, let's vote to approve the agenda as
22	amended. All those in favor please say aye.
23	(Chorus of aye.)
24	CHAIR CANTU: Anyone opposed? Anyone
25	abstain? The agenda is approved.

BUSINESS MEETING

PRESENTATIONS BY STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRS ON

RELEASED REPORTS AND MEMORANDUMS

CHAIR CANTU: For our first order of business, we're going to turn to a presentation from the advisory committee. Today's presentation will be by Georgia State Advisory Committee Chair Chantel Mullen on the commission's report on civil asset forfeiture, and its impact on communities of color in Georgia. Chair Mullen, you've got the floor for ten minutes, please proceed.

MS. MULLEN: Thank you, and good morning
Chair Cantu, and members of the commission. Thank you
for the opportunity to share the key findings, and
recommendations from the Georgia Advisory Committee's
report on civil asset forfeiture. The committee held
hearings on civil asset forfeiture, and its impact on
communities of color in the state of Georgia. The
committee examined the extent to which civil asset
forfeiture resulted in a disparate impact on
communities of color in the state.

Following our hearing, the committee made seven findings, and six recommendations. I would like to go through those findings, and recommendations for you this morning. And for the purposes of the

presentation, I grouped those findings into three buckets, relationships, data, and rights. Starting with relationships, findings one, and two focus on how civil asset forfeiture impacts criminal activity in the community.

Finding one focused on how law enforcement agencies viewed civil asset forfeiture, and its purpose, which was for disrupting criminal activity that is otherwise outside the reach of the criminal justice system. During the hearing we heard from law enforcement that civil asset forfeiture is a necessary tool to use against criminal enterprises, and it could be a powerful deterrent to criminal activity, and could decrease crime rates in the jurisdiction.

We heard that it works best when it is targeted towards organized illegal activity. However, finding two was from the perspective of the advocates, it focused on their feedback, because they argued that civil asset forfeiture wasn't necessary in our hearings, and it didn't necessarily make the community safer. They viewed it as very damaging to the relationship between law enforcement, and the community.

And we had multiple panelists that suggested that civil asset forfeiture could have the

opposite impact, and making communities less safe.

First by damaging community, and police relations, and also by creating incentives for police to pursue suspected criminal activity. What the committee heard consistently from each side is that law enforcement viewed civil asset forfeiture as a positive.

While the community, and advocates viewed it negatively, and questioned the motivation of law enforcement. The next bucket that I want to talk about, I placed findings three, six, and seven into a data bucket. Starting with finding seven, it focused on the challenges that we had around the access, and availability of data related to civil asset forfeiture in Georgia.

Until 2015, based on the testimony at our hearing, Georgia did not have any requirements around data collection, or transparency. And even when they passed legislation to create those requirements, they weren't consistently implemented, and they still don't address concerns around misuse of funds, and potential abuse of defendants.

We heard that the changes still don't allow for a connection to particular cases to convictions that follow forfeiture, what property is returned, and where the forfeited funds are being

spent by law enforcement agencies. When we look at finding three, it focused on the fact that most cases of civil asset forfeiture are not targeting high level organized criminal activity, and it is instead impacting low income individuals who are rarely charged with any crime.

We heard repeatedly that it's not used for its intended purpose. It's rarely used for large value forfeitures, or to target international criminal activities, or organizations. In fact we had panelists that shared 58 percent of the forfeited property between 2015, and 2018 at the state level was cash, and it was worth less than 540 dollars. And we also heard consistently that there were no arrests, or criminal charges that could be connected to those civil asset forfeiture cases.

Lastly, we focused in finding six, on the data that is available related to Georgia. Now, this was very difficult, because there is a lack of data in Georgia. But the data that we did find showed a disturbing pattern. It showed that it had disparate impact on several protected classes under civil rights law. It showed consistently that civil asset forfeiture is disproportionately deployed against poor people, and people of color.

When we looked at Georgia's data, and our panelist made that presentation, it showed that the median civil asset forfeiture is 500 dollars, and used primarily against communities of color, and low income communities. Lastly, findings four, and five are around rights, in that rights bucket. We found, and heard testimony around the fact that law enforcement agencies have a strong financial incentive around civil asset forfeiture.

The panelists shared that Georgia law allowed law enforcement agencies to keep up to 100 percent of the profits from forfeited assets, and it is a significant source of revenue for many agencies. We also heard from our panelists that between the years of 2000, and 2016 that more than 108 million dollars in property was seized at Hartsfield-Jackson Airport, one of the busiest airports in the country.

And remember, the panelists consistently shared that most of the forfeitures are around 500 dollars. Finding five raised questions around many fundamental constitutional principles, and just a basic idea of fairness, and justice for all. Our panelists noted that in these civil asset forfeiture cases, the property right owners are denied the presumption of innocence.

There's no right to an attorney, there's 1 no protection against self incrimination. And we 2 heard from multiple panelists, as well as community 3 4 members, that just being near criminal activity, or having cash was sufficient to trigger a search, or 5 6 seizure, and eventual forfeiture of property. And 7 many of these persons were not charged with, or convicted of any criminal activity. 8 9 From these seven findings, the committee made six recommendations to the committee. We 10 11 recommended a national study of civil asset

made six recommendations to the committee. We recommended a national study of civil asset forfeiture, and for Georgia specifically to look at the elimination of the use of civil asset forfeiture. However, if that cannot be done, we've recommended some reforms to civil asset forfeiture, including establishing the right to counsel.

Using those forfeiture funds to improve data collection, and to fund public defenders to require a criminal conviction. To also look at the evidentiary standard, raising it from preponderance of the evidence to clear, and convincing evidence.

Developing a more robust, and electronic reporting system that tracks civil asset forfeiture data, and publish an annual report as well.

We've looked at -- one of our

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

recommendations was around eliminating it at the federal level, including federal equitable sharing agreements, and in the alternative, look at some reforms for civil asset forfeiture. Lastly, a data tracking system for any agency that monitors, and collects civil asset data. I'd like to conclude my presentation with a description of how one panelist described civil asset forfeiture in Georgia.

One officer alone made 1400 stops, but issued just 8 citations, made 47 arrests, and out of the 47 arrests, 44 were people of color. This is what it looks like in Georgia. Thank you for considering our findings, and recommendation, this is the end of my presentation, and I'm happy to answer any questions that commission members may have.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you Chair Mullen.

We now have time for the commissioners to ask

questions of Georgia's presentation by Chair Mullen.

I'll turn first to the folk here, do the commissioners

have any questions? And then I'll turn to folk on the

line. Commissioner Adegbile.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you, you very much for that presentation. I noted in the report that one of your witnesses was trying to draw a distinction between criminal forfeiture, and civil

asset forfeiture, and the point that I took from the testimony was that there was an assertion that criminal forfeiture is adequate, and that civil asset forfeiture is thus unnecessary. Can you help us understand whether that's true, and if so, why?

MS. MULLEN: Thank you, you for your question. Yes, we did have a panelist make that distinction. The panelist focused on the fact that there are a number of rights available in criminal asset forfeiture that are not mirrored in civil asset forfeiture. And it made sure that you walked through the whole process giving the person the right to defend themselves, the right to have an attorney.

And none of those rights are present in civil asset forfeiture. And one of the biggest points that our panelist consistently made is you can't tie it to any crime, because one, of the data reporting system, but also there is no encouragement to continue through that process after the property is taken.

With civil asset forfeiture, officers don't have to continue through the criminal process.

But with criminal forfeiture, you do. And so, they wanted to err on the side of making sure community members were safe, and had their rights protected as well.

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I have one other question, and thank you for that response. This question goes to another theme that ran through the report, which is the extent to which civil asset forfeiture may not have adequate guardrails in place, and you mentioned specifically, I think that there is not a lot of information, or limitation on how the money that is yielded from the seizure of people's property is used, and disposed of by the seizing authorities. Do I have that right?

MS. MULLEN: You, you are correct, there are no quardrails.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Okay, so I see at least two problems with that. You've described in some sense that it creates a system of incentives. somebody has the opportunity to obtain the property of another, which is another way of saying to obtain money, or things that have cash value, and there is no guardrail, or limitation, it may create a weird incentive to use that power in ways that some of the evidence bears out, at least in some places asset forfeiture is being used.

You've also described the racial disparity that is associated with it, and how it's being used. But I think one of the problems that we need to walk

up to, and own, is that to the extent that law enforcement agencies are making bona fide claims that they have funding needs that are not being met, I think there's a democracy distortion problem if we allow legislative bodies that have the responsibility for determining law enforcement budgets to not address those issues openly, and publicly.

And instead allow law enforcement in a sense to raise their own budgets through this power, which has no checks, and balances. So, in a sense, it's a democracy distortion, and a dereliction of duty on the part of the responsible elected officials, and leaves law enforcement to sort of make its own way, to find such funding as they either need, or want. How do you respond to this assertion?

MS. MULLEN: I would say that we actually had a panelist, a couple of panelists that made your same assertion, talked about how the use of civil asset forfeiture allowed law enforcement agencies to effectively create a shadow budget, and it is a budget that is outside the realm of what the legislature, or their local counties give to our sheriff's offices, or other law enforcement agencies.

And so, that was problematic, because there is no guardrail for it, and there is no

oversight for it. And there's no way to track how those funds are spent. And so, we found that to be problematic in several senses. Because one panelist suggested that we put police officers, or law enforcement agencies in a very weird position, because one, they are on the street making a probable cause call in taking that property.

And then they get to keep that property, and use that property, and there's no intervening agency, or oversight looking at that. Which is why one of our recommendations in terms of reform is to remove those funds from going back to the police officers for their use in their budgets, designate them for other budgetary uses.

And there have been a couple of legislators in Georgia who have proposed that specifically in previous legislative sessions, however it has not advanced.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you, you.

And I said that my last question was my last question,
but I misrepresented myself, I have one more, and I
apologize, I'll yield the floor after this one. So,
as we focus on this issue, during your examination,
did anybody put this issue to the law enforcement
officials, and ask them whether they think that, at a

	Unedited
1	minimum, there is some level of guardrail, or
2	additional oversight that should be in place?
3	I understand that the advocates took that
4	position, and we've talked at some length about why.
5	But did anybody put to the law enforcement officials,
6	the ones with the power, the question about whether
7	the absence of guard rails is a problem, creates a
8	weird system of incentives, and whether they agree,
9	have ideas about guard rails that should be put in
10	place?
11	MS. MULLEN: Thank you for that question.
12	You know, we would have loved to have asked that
13	question to law enforcement, unfortunately it was ver
14	challenging to get that perspective for our hearing.

or that question. e asked that nately it was very challenging to get that perspective for our hearing. We were able to get law enforcement testimony around some specific issues, but not that particular issue. And we would have loved to have that perspective, however we were unable to get it.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. Online, would any commissioner have any comments, or questions please?

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Christian Adams, I hope you can hear me.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes, and thank you, we

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	called roll, and I said that I knew you were on the
2	line.
3	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Indeed. Just a
4	question, you indicated you were not able to get that
5	perspective from law enforcement, why not?
6	MS. MULLEN: Well, we sent out several
7	invitations to multiple law enforcement agencies, and
8	we either did not get a response, or they declined to
9	participate.
10	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Did they ever offer
11	any reasons why they were reluctant, or didn't want to
12	participate?
13	MS. MULLEN: We did not receive any
14	reasons.
15	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Thank you, that's all
16	I have.
17	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you Commissioner
18	Adams. Does anyone else have questions please?
19	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Madam Chair,
20	Commissioner Gilchrist here.
21	CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Gilchrist,
22	please proceed.
23	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Chair Mullen,
24	thank you so much for your testimony today. I have a
25	quick question for you. Do you know of any

initiatives, or programs that could potentially have used civil asset forfeiture profits to help support initiatives back into communities, and, or jurisdictions which the resources were derived from?

Did you guys highlight any of that in the report?

MS. MULLEN: We did not. However -- well, let me back up. We actually did reference in our report, two bills that were proposed in the Georgia legislature during the 2019, and 2020 sessions. One actually proposed to halt civil asset forfeiture proceedings until the conclusion of any criminal proceedings.

The other was House Bill 1036, which would direct seized funds to an indigent care trust fund, and safety harbor for sexually exploited children fund instead of local district attorneys, or law enforcement agencies. So, those were proposed by some of our legislators. We did not highlight anything in particular. We did point to using the funds develop a more robust data, electronic data reporting system, and possibly using those for public defenders.

Because if you give people access to the right to an attorney, they also -- there may be those who need a public defender. So, this could be one way of funding that as well, so those were some of the

suggestions we listed in the report.

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: So, there were two legislative proposals that obviously did not come to fruition, is that right?

MS. MULLEN: That's correct, House Bill 1086, and House Bill 1036, and those were in the 2019, and 2020 session.

COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Okay, thank you very much.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you Commissioner Gilchrist, anyone else online? Yes, Chair Mullen, I do have a question. I am concerned that your witnesses were consistently saying there was a denial of due process, and that there was not much data, or any data where in Georgia, agencies were collecting information about whether the civil asset forfeiture actually made people feel safer, or whether it actually in fact made it safer for the residents of Georgia.

I see in your report that you pointed to

New Mexico, where they collected data, where they went

through the extra effort of tracking what was the

follow up to that incident, and what was the follow up

to the civil forfeiture. And so, collecting data

before, and after a change in state law, the state law

involved in 2015, they eliminated civil forfeiture under their state practices.

And they found that there was no improvement, or impact at all on crime rates. That removing the civil forfeiture did not make people in New Mexico safer, would you comment please, on that part of your report?

MS. MULLEN: Well, in looking at our report, it's very difficult to get data. We had one of our panelists provide data from the Georgia Center for Opportunity, and it had gone through the known reports from 2016 to 2018. Over 130 reports were missing, and that's significant, because in Georgia, we have 608 law enforcement agencies. We have 156 sheriff's departments, we have 346 local police departments.

And so, that's a significant number of reports. A good percentage, about a third of those reports that were filed were incomplete, about ten percent were not in the proper format. 22 percent omitted required details, and attachments, and 61 percent just failed to report currency accurately. Looking at the reports, the way Georgia reports, it's basically paper, and pencil.

They fill out a report, and upload it.

And so, you can actually pull it up, and look at it, but if you want to do any analysis, it's very difficult to do so. There's no case numbers attached, you can't figure out if there has been an arrest, if there were any charges. So, you can't really determine -- although law enforcement said it made it feel better, there's no data either way to support that assertion.

We had community members that said how it made them feel, but you can't really tell if this practice makes anyone in Georgia better if you're doing a data analysis. And so, one thing that we would need is better data. And we need to know what is happening in the communities, and to whom.

CHAIR CANTU: And I thank you for that.

Just as a follow up, are you aware whether in Georgia
the police use what is called evidence based policing,
where they use data to reflect, to reexamine, and to
determine if their practices are in fact reducing
crime?

MS. MULLEN: I am not aware of that Madam Chair.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. With regards to feeling safe -- I should not have said feeling safe, we do need evidence that people are in fact safer.

So, I do appreciate your answering the question, that without the data, we will not have the facts, or the evidence that people are in fact safer. Do any folk have any other questions? If there are no further questions, then we're going to move onto the next agenda.

But before that, I need to very warmly thank you Chair Mullen, for your patriotism, your service, your leadership on the Georgia State Advisory Committee, and for taking the time to speak with us. The service that you all provide is unpaid, and yet so deeply respected, and valued by us here on this commission. So, thank you, Chair Mullen, if you'd like to stay on the line, you're welcome.

But if your business is pressing, you may certainly move on to your next responsibilities today.

MS. MULLEN: Thank you for having me.

CHAIR CANTU: You're welcome.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON FY 2023 CRIME VICTIMS REPORT

TIME LINE AND DISCOVERY MATERIALS

CHAIR CANTU: The second item on today's agenda is a discussion, and vote on the fiscal year 2023 Crime Victims Report. We have an outline, a discovery plan, as well as a time line to discuss.

The vote today will consist of the outline, time line,

research plan, and this is something that for those

2	who have not seen what we do with a briefing report,
3	it's where we ourselves at the national level look at
4	a national problem, and lift it up so that we can see
5	where we can affect disparities.
6	And this is a report that is based on
7	disparities in the way that people of color,
8	particularly African Americans, have experienced
9	violent crimes in the United States. So, to start
10	this discussion moving, I move to open the floor for
11	discussion, and vote on the crime victims discovery
12	materials. Do I have a second?
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair?
14	CHAIR CANTU: Yes, I'm sorry?
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I do have an
16	amendment.
17	CHAIR CANTU: We would need the second.
18	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, it may be that
19	it won't get a second without the amendment.
20	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Adams, as co-
21	lead
22	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Second, I'm having
23	hard time with this phone system, so second.
24	CHAIR CANTU: I'm so sorry commissioner,

but yes, I can hear you. And for those listening,

1	Commissioner Adams is co-lead on this proposed
2	briefing report, so we have a second. Now, we can
3	turn to your procedural amendment.
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay, I've been
5	asked to make an amendment here. This amendment is
6	intended to clarify what was already agreed to with
7	the adoption of the concept paper for this report, and
8	that is that the report include a section examining
9	crime in New York City, and the effect on rising crime
10	on minority members there in New York City.
11	So, my motion, I move that the report
12	include a section examining crime in New York City,
13	and the effect of rising crime on minority members
14	there in New York City.
15	CHAIR CANTU: We open the floor for
16	discussion.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I think you need a
18	second.
19	CHAIR CANTU: Excuse me. We need a second
20	to the proposed amendment to the motion.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow second.
22	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kirsanow, I
23	open the floor for discussion.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair?
25	CHAIR CANTU: Yes?

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: My understanding is
2	that
3	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Heriot.
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Commissioner Heriot,
5	whatever.
6	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you.
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: We thought that this
8	was part of the concept paper in the first place, and
9	the concept paper says that we will have a field
10	hearing, or a field briefing there, and that this was
11	the plan from the concept paper, and that this is
12	simply to clarify that that is what the commission has
13	already agreed to.
14	CHAIR CANTU: Any further discussion on
15	the proposed amendment?
16	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: It's Commissioner
17	Adams.
18	CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Adams?
19	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Question for
20	Commissioner Heriot. Is this redundant, this motion,
21	with what's already agreed to? In other words didn't
22	the original plan contemplate something, and I'm
23	wondering what the difference is between the original
24	plan, and your motion, that's all.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Well, my motion is

simply to clarify that this was agreed to, because 1 apparently some staff members don't understand this. 2 COMMISSIONER ADAMS: So, there was 3 4 something inserted by staff that was contradictory to 5 the originally agreed on plan? 6 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You, you may want to 7 talk to Commissioner Kirsanow about that. COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Okay. 8 9 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow Here. 10 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, Dave 11 Kladney -- go ahead Commissioner Kirsanow. 12 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, you 13 Commissioner Kladney. Yeah, the last time we discussed this, we talked about having a briefing in New York 14 15 City, and that we would be studying crime victims related to New York City, and the presumption was that 16 17 this would include an analysis of crime data related 18 to New York City. In fact I think if you go back to 19 the transcript of the hearing, we talk about that. 20 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, 21 Commissioner Kladney here. 22 CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Kladney? 23 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: As I recall it was 24 not in the paper, and the paper was passed, I guess,

as I recall. As I recall, Commissioner Kirsanow spoke

about it in his presentation that that might be a possibility, but it was never in the paper as far as I can see. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki.
CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Commissioner Yaki, I thank you very much Chair Cantu. My recollection of the conversation was that it was more about the site location of a field briefing as it was convenient to several groups that study the issue that was behind the proposal, and not that it was because it was going to study New York City either. I agree with Commissioner Kladney.

When I supported the motion, it was because of the ease of access to individuals, and entities associated with groups who have studied the issue of crime, and not because it was going to study the issue of crime in New York City.

CHAIR CANTU: This is Cantu, and my recollection was that the concept paper talked separately about having a place for a briefing, and that we did discuss the types of organizations that were relevant, and pertinent to a briefing. We did not talk about that in the context of what kind of data that would supplement national data already

public.

separately from having people come forward, and deliver testimony at our meeting when we voted to approve the concept paper. I also caution the commissioners that we're kind of drifting out of our lane, where we set policy, where we choose the concepts, and getting kind of into the weeds on the specific details.

Generally, I've been here only a year, and a half, but in that close to two year time, I have learned to trust, and respect the work of the staff of the commission who come forward with their best ideas, and then after we've heard from the staff then, we do vote ultimately to approve a concept paper, and then approve the research plan, and approve the time line, and outline.

Those of you who have been here, and are more senior, can you please speak to whether we are still within our lane as commissioners?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CANTU: Yes please, who is speaking?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This is Kirsanow

again.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: When we voted on this, we voted on the concept paper that said the commission will hold field briefings in two studied cities in order to facilitate more participation from local law enforcement, and local organizations, etcetera. So, the presumption was we're holding a field briefing in a studied city, which is New York City. So, for that reason, I think that having New York City as -- Commissioner Heriot asked whether, or not this is redundant, and it's already baked into the original motion.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: and again, we moved to hold the field briefing in New York City, the commission approved that motion. The concept paper says that the briefings will be held in a city that we will study. This is a done deal, I just want to make sure that everybody understands that.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't consider that a done deal, the tenor of the discussion was a last minute amendment that was part of a discussion that was not focused on this particular paper, but rather the fact that there was a desire to have both a field,

and a D.C. briefing for both the anti-Asian racism paper, as well as the crime issue brought forth by my colleagues.

We did not get into the substance of this, it's just purely a procedural issue in which I acceded to their request to do that out of fairness. But it was not in the -- there was never any discussion of the substance of the actual paper at that time. It's just simply a matter of geography, and fairness. Secondly Madam Chair, we have for better, or for worse, as commissioners, the ability to work with staff in a way to see if we can ensure that what we're looking at is what it is we should be looking at.

Which is a long way of saying that I have been in the past, and continue to be more than willing to ask questions, and request further detail as to why, or where, or what subject, or what areas they are looking at before we actually approve a final discovery plan. And we went through many iterations of that with other projects in the past.

And not only did I want to hear back from staff about in response to the question by Commissioner Heriot, and Commissioner Kirsanow about why New York City was not on the list, I also have my own questions about what cities are on the list given

what I believe the tenor of the paper is. Which is about the impact of violent crime on the protected classes which we are charged by our charter.

And curious to know how we do that
analysis without doing an analysis under which the
statutes under which we deal with, which are the Civil
Rights Act, etcetera, and what standard of legal
review? Are we doing a disparate impact analysis, are
we doing a disproportionate burden, what is it that
we're looking at? Because that to me is going to
govern sort of the selection sample that we would take
a look at.

Because right now, I'm not sure if the sample that exists in the current outline is either adequate, or truly representative of the issue of violent crime in the United States. So, I have a number of issues with this on any number of different levels, and for that, I just peremptorily wanted to say I will be opposing approving this at this time until further clarification, and responses are able to be received from staff on this matter.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you. Any other questions, or comments from commissioners?

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair?

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I yield to Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, you

Commissioner Adegbile. Just one observation, in

addition to the concept paper being very clear about

this, that is that New York City is a studied city, we

didn't propose, or I didn't propose going to New York

City just to go on vacation. It doesn't make sense

for us to be going to, having a location briefing if

we're not going to be studying that city.

We could be obtaining documentary, or testimonial evidence from almost any place, we could have stayed within Washington D.C. The evident purpose of this was to study New York City, and it says so in the concept paper.

CHAIR CANTU: I've read all of the documents -- this is the chair -- and in the documents, there was an original list proposed of places where we would ask for supplemental data. Just for clarity, for my co-lead Commissioner Adams, and for you Commissioner Kirsanow, we've not had very much conversation as a commission as to what it is we intend to study that is supplemental to what the federal government has already collected.

Last week I thought we had three national

databases, one being the uniform crime study, the other being the crime victimization, and the third, a new version of the uniform crime, which is called NIBRS, and it looks at incidents as opposed to solely looking at aggregate numbers of crimes. The fourth that I learned from Commissioner Kladney was that the Center for Disease Control also does a national crime victims study, and that it's generously funded, and it's multi year.

Learning all this, I am also puzzled if whether we've had enough conversations to know what it

Learning all this, I am also puzzled if whether we've had enough conversations to know what it means to be a studied city, and what exactly are we studying that four databases from the federal government don't provide us enough data? Knowing that we're going to be having two briefings where people personally will share with us what their expertise, and what their experiences have been relevant to violent crimes.

So, my co-lead Commissioner Adams, can you please help me explain to the other commissioners, what you have in mind that will be studied in a studied city, and in other cities, so that we can vote on this amendment? The phone line's given up?

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Can I say something before Commissioner Adams?

1	CHAIR CANTU: Yes, and I worry that the
2	phone line gave up again. Yes, please proceed, is
3	this Commissioner Kladney?
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes. I can't find
5	anywhere in the paper that was uploaded in September
6	where it says New York City.
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's a separate
8	motion.
9	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Can someone quote
10	me where it says can someone quote me the passage
11	where it says that in the September upload?
12	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: There was a motion,
13	and it carried at the business meeting in October to
14	amend that.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: It said that we
16	would have a hearing there, it didn't say that we
17	would study there.
18	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Well, look at the
19	transcript.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It said it was a
21	field briefing, and the concept paper itself says the
22	commission will hold field briefings in two studied
23	cities.
24	CHAIR CANTU: And we've not referred to
25	field briefings as studied meetings before, so it is
I	

a new concept to me, at least in the two years I've been here.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: But it's the concept paper that connects the two, the field briefing is for a studied city, and it says specifically this would be in order to facilitate more participation from local law enforcement, local organizations, and concerned citizens.

CHAIR CANTU: But somewhere the communication has not reached our staff. Our staff would have eagerly included in the original list of cities from which we would study, which is not different from a studied city, and New York would have been on that first list. I agree with Commissioner Kladney, New York did not show up. And I'm becoming repetitive, so I apologize. Is it time for Commissioner Adams to come back on?

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yeah, I think you can hear me now.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Okay. It does seem strange that we would go to New York just to go there. I also know that there's a variety of data that can easily be looked at, and it's not complicated to look at it, which raises the question why this is such a

fuss. I don't think it's going to add weeks of work to pool a bit of extra data, and decide. And I saw some emails from staff who did not seem to have any awareness of the motion in the October business meeting.

And so, all of it is a bit perplexing as to why we're even having this controversy. It seems that the staff didn't hear the motion, or something in the October business meeting. I don't understand, and perhaps someone could explain, and I understand that we don't want to deviate from what we agreed to, but what is the down side to doing this? That's the part I'm not sure about.

CHAIR CANTU: In the federal government, as we collect information, we abide by a system where we do try to avoid wasting the tax payer's money, and avoid duplication. We also try to be transparent about it is our intent to gather data, or our intent to conduct surveys. This process where our staff draft up a proposed outline, timeline, and research plan is so that we can be transparent.

And I haven't found the transparency, as far as what is different, what is additional information that we have a research plan to gather from New York as a studied city, and from the first

1	six cities, and now a different list of five cities,
2	where we will be doing additional collection of data
3	I'm just trying to be transparent. There should not
4	be any secrets here, and I've not heard it before.
5	I'm using this as an opportunity to share out.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair?
7	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Madam Chair Adams?

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: As I understand it,

New York is a bit of an outlier as far as the system

they use to gather, and collect data, and report data.

And perhaps that was viewed by staff as a disqualifier

to avoid an apples to oranges comparison. My question

is isn't it something worth examining that it is an

outlier, and therefore we can't do apples to apples

comparisons?

CHAIR CANTU: Yes, Commissioner Adams.

If for no other reason, we at some point focus on the data collection methods, and it seems a meritorious inquiry to ask why New York doesn't do what everybody else does. Because it might have the downstream effect of delaying responses to crime increase, because we don't know what the crime increase is.

CHAIR CANTU: To whom are you directing that question?

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Well, really it's not directed at anybody. I'm trying to understand the 2 fierce objection that seems to manifest every month to looking at an issue that I would think people would care about, and that is that New York doesn't even seem to use the same system to record data, and that alone would seem to merit at least a paragraph that perhaps might take an hour, or two for staff to write. COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair? CHAIR CANTU: Yes please, Commissioner Heriot.

> COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I've got a different comment here. I've been on this commission I think 15 years, or so. We almost always get discovery materials of this sort. They're almost always very thin, poorly conceived, seat of the pants. And yet for some reason this report is getting massive push back that other reports with much less well thought out discovery plans didn't get.

> To me it is utterly baffling that we have an increase in crime, you would think that everyone on the commission would be interested in studying this, interested in New York City. And yet for some reason this is getting massively more push back from the progressive caucus than anything else we've ever done

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

from what I can	n see, to the point	where I was told
that one staff	member said over my	dead body will we
even look into	the increase in cri	me.

I'm just baffled why this is so difficult.

Four members of the commission want to study New York

City. They made a motion, the motion passed, I don't

see why this is such a problem.

CHAIR CANTU: May I reply?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: May I respond?

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CANTU: Everyone wants to respond.

Yes, I always defer to the other commissioners before
I speak, so will someone identify themselves?

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Go ahead

Commissioner Yaki.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes, Commissioner Yaki, please.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you Commissioner Kladney. First, I have to respond to the statement made by the previous speaker. We have had, in the time that I've been here, which is longer than she has been here, a number of different reports that -- and briefings, and discovery plans that were, how shall I put it? Lacking in many instances.

against it because of the overtly political, and completely unsubstantiated facts, in fact there were no facts, and this is even before alternative facts became a word, in some of the projects that her former, and current colleagues pushed. And I'm just going to say again, that this commission spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, and years of time pursuing a ghost called the New Black Panther Party.

And that to me, is one of the nadirs of what this commission has done over time. So, there is more than ample evidence of people like me pushing back hard on issues, because to me, this is just because we approve the concept paper on this does not mean that we subscribe to what is in the concept paper by any stretch of the imagination. Nor do I suppose that they will subscribe to the concept paper that would approve that I put forward.

This is who we are, this is how we act, there's healthy, and considered debate, and discussion, and hopefully facts will bear themselves out. And the facts on this one are simply that. I am not confining my objection to the inclusion of New York City. If New York City merits inclusion, I would be one to support that. However, I have objections to

the focus on cities as with regard to where the quote unquote increase in violent crime has occurred.

I have concerns about how you can possibly study this issue without studying why, and where, and what other conditions may, or may not be surrounding it. Because we are going a little far afield in terms of taking an issue that anyone has yet to identify a correlative predicate for the statutory jurisdictions under which we go, because at best I think we're using some kind of disproportionate impact analysis.

Which of course has usually been rejected by colleagues who are in favor of this report today, unless they're willing to concede the validity of disproportionate impact, and disproportionality analysis, in which case let's see how this would apply in these kinds of situations. So, there is a lot about this to still discuss.

I am more than willing, as I have said, to accept a New York City, if under the analysis that we adopt, and I don't think we've adopted really a good statutory analysis with regard to what it is we do, and what our charge is, as well as the data, as well as other things that I think are deficient in the papers that we have before us right now.

We are committed to making this go

forward, I am not going to stop that. But I do want to make sure that in going forward, we do so in a considered way that is in the best interests, and within the jurisdictional charge of the commission.

And right now, just simply saying we're going to pick this city because there is violent crime there, does not, to me, meet that test.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. Any other commissioners? Because I still have something I want to say as a co-lead. Commissioner Kladney?

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, I would just indicate that I believe that -- I again assert that New York City was not in the paper, that in fact when Commissioner Kirsanow made his presentation, he basically talked about New York City, having a hearing there because the institutions were there, like John Jay College, like the American Enterprise Institute, and other national nonprofits that deal with crime.

so, that we would have access to expertise. I don't believe there was ever a comment about studying New York City itself, and I just maintain that until someone can show me something different. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CANTU: Yes. Is this --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yeah, all you have to do is look at the first paragraph of the concept paper. The commission passed studying this issue, and doing so in -- holding field briefings in a studied city. And New York City is where we're having the field briefing, it is a studied city. After we passed that, we got back from staff, a list of cities, I have no objections to the cities per se, other than New York City was not included.

That completely vitiates the concept paper, what we passed. And it's baffling to me why we're even having this discussion, New York City is inherently part of this. And I'll say it again, why are we going to New York City? Just to go on a little junket? No, we're going there to study New York City.

word study in a form of jargon that I don't understand. New York City can be studied through the interaction with the eight, or ten different working groups, and nonprofits that were listed in the motion to amend. So, studied meaning to me, and I've read all of the rules about research -- folks, in my real life, I direct dissertations, and I coach students on how to do research.

and I also have been an administrator for eight years in the federal government. The federal government conducts research in a way that protects the taxpayers. That means that anything that is new that we have not collected before as a federal agency, we have to be sure that we comply with the paperwork reduction act. We have to be sure that we also comply with the ethics in research that all federal agencies do, which is part of the Belmont Report.

Where HHS was conducting studies, and funding studies, and it was on prisoners in Tuskegee, and prisoners were not given medication, and studied to see if they will die, and guess what, they died.

And so, we have had in this country, a duty to respond in an ethical, and in a legal way to conducting research, and that requires transparency. When this report began, the first concept that was presented to me was a concept of let's just look at everything.

Let's just fish, and it's easy, and there doesn't need to be a whole lot of deliberation.

Fortunately, the entire commission reigned that enthusiasm back, and said we will move forward in a deliberate way, and we will produce something that is credible, supported by evidence. The system that we're doing is hard, because we are wading into an

area, where as I have said, there are already four federal databases.

And we are looking for a niche, a gap in data, or a way to better understand what those four federal agencies tell us. If you go to the website for the FBI, it says you may not rank, or conduct listings where you prioritize which city is the most safe, and which city is not. I had to work with my colleagues to have them understand we have to follow that caution, because it guides all researchers.

There's no exception that says except for Norma in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, she can do rankings, and she can list cities in particular orders, and groupings. If I were doing what you have suggested, and pick cities based on one sole database, I would probably lose my certification as a higher education professional. But I'm sitting here wearing a chair hat, and I want the conversation to continue.

The cities have been mentioned, including
New York, for the purpose of additional information,
and yet, I have not heard from any of our
commissioners what is it that you are studying that we
cannot get from the Uniform Crime Report, the NIBRS
Report, the Crime Victimization Report? And while
it's not in the concept paper, and I'm not adding it,

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

Washington DC

there also happens to be a crime victims database over at Center for Disease Control.

And it affects mental health, and it also includes inquiries into the why the crime rate is going up. I am not haranguing, I am not harassing, I am trying to coach here.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair, if we're comparing this to the Tuskegee Experiment, then the commission has lost its mind. That is just crazy.

CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: The commission voted to hold a field briefing in New York City. We've done that vote, it's over. The concept paper says that we will hold a field briefing in a studied city, hence the commission has agreed this will be a studied city.

CHAIR CANTU: The reason I mentioned the experiment is the Belmont Report concludes that when research is conducted using federal funding, that research shall benefit the people who have experienced the harm, the victim, and who will somehow benefit from being subjects in the experience of the research. In this situation, our entire commission voted that we believe the folk who experience the harm are those who are the victims of violent crime.

Which are predominantly people of color,

which are African American in particular. The study is going to look at certain cities without telling the folk who will benefit from it, those victims of crime, what is the benefit of going into that city, what is it we will look at that the federal government hasn't already looked at? And that is why I brought in the Belmont Report.

Because you don't study folk for your information as a general population, you study folk to see if in some way the study will benefit those people who are experiencing harm right now.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair,

Kirsanow here.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I yield to Kirsanow.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you, you

Commissioner Adegbile. All due respect, the burden of
proof in changing this is not on those advocating for
the motion as passed. The concept paper was clear, it
says the commission will hold field briefings in two
studied cities, that's the basis of the motion, that
was passed. That is the motion that staff is supposed
to discharge, that we're going to be implementing
pursuant to a field briefing.

	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
1	0		
1	1		
1	2		
1	3		
1	4		
1	5		
L	6		
1	7		
1	8		
1	9		
2	0		
2	1		
2	2	1	

23

24

25

And then study of that particular city, and it's going to be incorporated into a report. I'm baffled as to why we're having this discussion. This shouldn't be a discussion, New York City is in.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CANTU: Yes, Commissioner Adegbile.

it, we're having the discussion because Commissioner
Heriot, Commissioner Kirsanow assert that the voted on
documents were clear, and yet they move to introduce
an amendment that has created the conversation that
we've been having for approximately 30 minutes. So,
whatever else may be said, there seems to be some lack
of clarity, and disagreement.

needed to have the amendment that Commissioner Heriot put forward, and we would have gone forward. And so, there is something that is not clear here. I don't understand why we are talking out of both sides of our mouth, and asserting on the one hand that everything is crystal clear, and on the other hand we need to amend what we've done.

That's the first point. The second point is the voted on report did not mention New York. The third point is that previous versions of the concept

paper did mention New York, but those were not voted on. I understand the submission that there was a statement made, and an amendment proffered by Commissioner Kirsanow about where the field briefing would happen.

I recall, as Commissioner Kladney has, I think accurately characterized, the rationale that Commissioner Kirsanow offered for New York as a venue, citing the organizations, and the institutions that would be available there, and readily accessible. It was an argument about convenience, principally, as I recall it. Though the transcript will say whatever the transcript says.

Next, one reason we have OCRE weighed in on the jurisdictions, and help us work through it, and it is an important, and complex process is because we have to attend to the availability of data. And I take Commissioner Adams point that sometimes statistical anomalies can be interesting to study for their own merit.

But there also is a point in making sure that there are relevant comparisons where that's acceptable under the applicable research standards that can be made, and that what we are talking of is of a piece. And so, OCRE does have a role in helping

us work through that. It doesn't mean that we reflexively have to adopt, and approve that, which is why we're having a vote on this plan today.

So, that we can see if we ratify it, but there is a role to be played. The submission that the staff doesn't understand in light of all of this, seems to me to be unfair, and not well put.

Certainly, we all have subjects on which our understanding can improve. But this discussion is one that reveals a lack of clarity, and not the existence of it.

Finally, Commissioner Yaki has noted that there are broader questions about this plan that's before us, prior to the amendment, and I would like to call a vote so we can see whether commissioner

Heriot's vote will carry, and if not, then to see if the vote on the research plan as it exists before us will carry.

CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Adegbile has called a question on the vote, and I'm going to go ahead, and proceed, and ask each of the commissioners how they will vote on the proposed amendment. We're not voting on the entire plan itself. We're just on the proposed amendment to clarify that New York City is a studied city, and that everyone understood what

studied city meant.

2	I'm sorry, I will be serious here. That
3	what we are doing is voting on that amendment only.
4	Any questions before we vote? Then I'm going to call
5	the vote, Commissioner Adams, how do you vote?
6	COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yes.
7	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Adegbile?
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Nay.
9	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Gilchrist?
LO	COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Aye.
L1	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Heriot?
L2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote yes.
L3	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kirsanow?
L4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
L5	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kladney?
L6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: No.
L7	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Yaki?
L8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
L9	CHAIR CANTU: And I vote no, and please,
20	always I need someone to help me with my math. Is
21	that a four, and four?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, the motion
23	fails.
24	CHAIR CANTU: The motion fails. So, we
25	are back to the original discovery materials, the

outline, and the time line.

through.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Was your motion seconded?

CHAIR CANTU: I don't believe --

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, it was.

CHAIR CANTU: Who seconded?

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Adams seconded.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Call the vote.

CHAIR CANTU: There's a discussion -because there's a point that was raised that has to go

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Fair enough.

CHAIR CANTU: So, I am opening the floor for discussion on the motion on the crime victims briefing report. Discovery materials, outline, time line, research plan. I mean I can start with -- I notice in mentioning the different cities where we would collect supplemental information beyond those federal databases that there were six cities, and the criteria for selecting the cities were shared with us.

Then some discussion occurred, which I encourage, I really do appreciate when commissioners do ask questions of our research, and evaluation staff. That those conversations produced a shorter

24

25

list of five. The only city that remained from the first list that carried over to the second list was Memphis. And the criteria were not repeated in the report.

The criteria in the original draft talked about we want to be sure that cities are representative of not just one political party, so if we have cities where the mayor appoints the head of law enforcement, we will look at cities that are Republican mayors, as well as Democrat mayors. When I checked the newer list, all of the cities were operated by law enforcement chiefs who had been appointed by a Democrat mayor.

And again, if folk are going to benefit, and receive feedback from the report, we're going to give only a feedback on additional information collected by Democrat led cities. The other comment I want to make regarding to that short list, is there could have been cities that were Republican led. I looked at the 50 largest cities, and I understand from the criteria used by our research staff, is they kind of took out the outliers.

The ones in the top 50 list, they took out the top five, and maybe the bottom five, and I'm getting this from a conversation I had with my co-

lead. And what remained in the middle were 25 cities. Well, in those 25 cities, there were republican led cities available in the pool. But not produced in the final list that was shared in our materials for this meeting.

So, one is I've encouraged people from the very beginning to keep the politics out of it. And I know police chiefs, and I've gone to their conferences, I've been meeting with police chiefs since 1980 when I worked in a nonprofit. And so, I know police chiefs, and they don't want the politics in how they protect citizens. They believe it is their duty, and their oath, and their responsibility to protect everyone.

So, I'm kind of embarrassed to go back, and talk to my friends, and colleagues, and say yeah, we're going to visit five cities, and this is the list that we came up with. So, I'm not prepared yet to give them an answer. So, I'd like some discussion on how we came up with the five cities to be further studied.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Madam Chair, this is Commissioner Yaki.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes commissioner.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean you bring up to

me, the points that I was concerned about in my previous statements on the previous motion. Which is how this relates to our charge as a commission. Everything I think must be viewed through that lens. I voted for this out of respect for you, and my other colleagues. And I'm still not convinced where this especially is going.

And the points that you raise to me, are not about politics. I am one of the few people on this commission, because I don't know everyone's biography to the Nth degree, I can't say I'm the only one, but I am one of the few that has served in local government that has been involved in hiring law enforcement personnel.

People associated with the process,
whether it be district attorneys, whether it's the
police chief, whether it's the allocation of resources
for police throughout the city when I was on the board
of supervisors for the city, and county of San

Francisco. I have some knowledge on the ground of how
this issue manifests itself, and to me there are many
other factors that should go into the selection of
cities beyond whether they are lead by a D, or lead by
an R.

Just because there are many factors that

lead to how, and why crime may, or may not be on the rise, or certain types of crime, versus other types of crime may, or may not be on the rise in certain jurisdictions across this country. And I think that those kind of criteria need to be part of that selection process, and I'm going to be very specific about this.

I think that there are issues related to
-- nonpolitical, that are related to issues such as
what is the nature of the state penal code, and how it
treats certain types of crimes. You would have to
look at issues of prosecutorial conduct, and charging
decisions, again, that may not be that reflective, or
may not be in the federal databases that we have
access to.

There are other issues related to the prevalence, and widespread availability of handguns in certain neighborhoods, and to determine certain types of violent crimes that people may, or may not be discussing. There's a coterie of different kinds of cross tabs here that I do not believe we have even begun to think about, and need to be reflected in the selection of the jurisdictions that we're talking about.

And I also want to reiterate the point

that's been made by my fellow Commissioner Kladney, which is there are crime rates, and there are crime rates, and some of the states with the highest crime rates in the country are not reflected anywhere in the selection of jurisdictions that we see here, and that came on the list. So, why is it that a state can have a high crime rate, but not be susceptible by analysis by this commission, but a city can?

A city not in a one of these states with the highest violent crime rates, especially violent crime rates against persons of color, or sex, or because of their -- or gender. So, these are all issues that I think, to me, need to be fleshed out a little bit more, and why I opposed the first motion, and why I am opposing the plan as it currently stands right now.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Madam Chair?

CHAIR CANTU: Yes Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: You asked why the particular cities were selected that were on the staff's list. My understanding is that your special assistant, and the commission staff, which has been utterly unresponsive to the conservatives on the commission, they chose this, not us. So, I'm not quite sure why you're asking us why those five cities

were chosen. I would have thought that you had something to do with this.

I don't know, if you didn't, that's fine, but it was your special assistant, and the staff that has done this, and not the conservatives on the commission.

CHAIR CANTU: No, my assistant, and I have been talking through the entire process, and things were continuing to be under discussion. I called on my co-lead on Monday to continue the discussion, and he said not in those words, but to the effect of the words you used, it was already a done deal. That there was no need for any further discussion. And then he sent an email confirming it's a set deal, we've already agreed on this.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Already agreed on New York City, sure.

CHAIR CANTU: No, no, no, I was calling about the cities.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Madam Chair? Adams.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: The specific language
I used was that the documents that were sent to me, I
believe on Wednesday, the drafts, were identical to
what I thought my SA, and your SA, and staff had

agreed upon. In other words, there were no changes, and the documents were sent to me right before the deadline for Sunshine Act, compared to what they had agreed to.

It's not that it was a done deal, it was that there was consistency between the two documents, and that's all I was concerned about, to make sure we didn't have to reopen the can of worms on the document that was sent to me on Thursday, or maybe late Wednesday.

CHAIR CANTU: And my purpose for the call was to talk to my co-lead, and to communicate. And apparently that did not -- you did not see that as the purpose of my call. You just wanted to see if I wanted to confirm if something that I saw in front of me was the same thing you saw in front of you, and that's not why I called.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Well, the purpose was, I thought, to make sure I was on board with what you, and your SA, and my SA had come up with. And I said that it looked good.

CHAIR CANTU: And that's right, I asked -I'm trying to remember exactly what my words were. I
asked do you see that all of these, that there's not
any people who are led by Republican mayors on this

list, is that okay with you? And you said if that's what it says.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Right, because I hadn't thought about politics in this analysis whatsoever. That was the first time I heard that anybody had raised a political issue, and my understanding was that you, and your SA, and my SA, and OCRE had come up with this list of cities, and I was deferring to that contemplative process.

CHAIR CANTU: I think your answer to that was we took out all of the smaller cities, and the Republicans might have dropped out because they were smaller cities. There aren't that many on the list of the top 50 cities where Republicans are in charge of appointing the chief law enforcer. What I did after our call is I went, and looked at the 50 cities list, and I saw that within the pool, there were Republican led agencies. And somehow those got missed out, and did not end up in the final selection.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: I hadn't even considered politics, if you want to throw them in there, go right ahead, I don't really care. That wasn't the criteria that I was looking at.

CHAIR CANTU: And what I needed was more time to figure out what does this mean? It also

brings up the issue of time. The time line is compressed. I've tried to be sensitive to the staff director's explanation, and it is an accurate explanation. This is hard work, I do it with my students, we plan on two, or three years on a very small project, not a national one like we're undertaking.

I've looked at the website in the

Department of Justice programs, and also on the Bureau

of Justice statistics. And when they do an overview

analysis, the federal government will offer out a

contract for a multi year review. I do think that

time is something also that you, and I need as co
leads with input from the rest of the commissioners

before we can be satisfied that we're doing a quality

job here.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Madam Chair, this is Adams again.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ADAMS: We frequently -- I have heard over, and over since I have been on this commission, deferring to the very careful work of staff, okay? And more often, than not, the commission endorses the very careful, thorough work of staff.

Well, these cities are the very thorough, careful work

of staff. They want commissioner cities. This was

OCRE who came up with this list of cities based on who
reports to NIBRS, the federal reporting.

This had nothing to do with Commissioner, or Chair Cantu, or Commissioner Adams, or our SA's coming up with it. These are staff cities, so what about this long deference to OCRE, and staff for their careful, thoughtful work? This is their list, not ours. And I'm happy to endorse it. That's all I have.

me that we are -- that we don't have a city where people -- we've excluded people who did not turn in their reports. It is a voluntary system, they don't have to turn in their reports. The law enforcement agencies, God bless them, have so much on their plate, that having to submit a report to the federal government can be a problem, a burden for them, and I understand that.

But what I also understand is as a researcher, I can't show any bias, I can't show any preference for one group, or another group. As a researcher, my obligation is to follow the federal government's rules on ethical research, and I'm leaving out maybe 25, 30 percent of law enforcement

local jurisdictions who did not turn in reports. 1 2 I need to account for that somehow. 3 And that takes some conversation with you, 4 my co-lead Commissioner Adams, and with others on how I will explain that, and be transparent about that. 5 6 COMMISSIONER ADAMS: It's Commissioner 7 Adams. 8 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Adams. COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Does one of the 9 10 jurisdictions that do not report, that exclude data, like you just referenced, is one of those New York 11 12 City? 13 CHAIR CANTU: I believe that -- I have to check. Yes, New York City is one of the ones, did 14 15 they answer incomplete, or did not answer at all? MS. SILVERIO: Mostly incomplete. 16 17 CHAIR CANTU: Mostly incomplete. 18 MS. SILVERIO: Particularly in 2021. 19 CHAIR CANTU: Did you hear that? 20 Particularly 2021. 21 COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yes, thank you. CHAIR CANTU: All of this the staff would 22 23 have told us if we asked, and you, and I could have told each other if we'd had more conversation. 24

Further comments please? Questions? Are we ready for

a vote? 1 2 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Call the vote. 3 CHAIR CANTU: All right. On the report on 4 crime victims, the outline, time line, and research plan, Commissioner Adams, how do you vote? 5 6 COMMISSIONER ADAMS: Yes. 7 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Adeqbile? 8 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Nay. 9 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Gilchrist? COMMISSIONER GILCHRIST: Yes. 10 11 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Heriot? 12 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote yes. 13 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kirsanow? 14 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. 15 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Kladney? COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: No. 16 CHAIR CANTU: Commissioner Yaki? 17 18 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. 19 CHAIR CANTU: And I vote no, the motion 20 fails. We have one -- we now turn to the staff director for the monthly staff director report, and 21 22 after he is done, I'd like to recognize our 23 Commissioner Adegbile. But so, Mr. Morales, would you 24 like to talk to us about your report? 25 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MR. MORALES: Yes, thank you Madam Chair.

I have nothing further to add in the interest of time,
and what's already contained in the report. As
always, I'm available to discussion with any
commissioner any questions you may have about what's
in the report. I do want to acknowledge the
outstanding work of our administrative services team,
and our budget, and finance team.

Pam, Robert, John, Mayowa, Tina on their work to complete the performance, and accountability report, the PAR. I'll release that to all of you this week, and for the 6th year in a row, USCCR has received an unqualified audit opinion which is the highest opinion that we can achieve. That means that USCCR is being administered in the best financial, and budget procedures available.

So, congratulations to the staff for that.

And lastly, on behalf of USCCR employees, we wish -we want to say, and we want to wish the best for
Commissioner Debo Adegbile, we thank you for your
integrity, and kindness, and respect to us you have
given us, and all the tremendous work. We really
appreciate your example of hard work, and concern not
only for USCCR, but for civil rights.

1	Your services will be missed by all. Best
2	of luck to you Commissioner Adegbile, on your future
3	endeavors. We look to see you continue your fight
4	here in the civil rights sector, so thank you. Madam
5	Chair, that's all I have.
6	CHAIR CANTU: Thank you.
7	APPRECIATION OF COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait, we don't have a
9	cake for him? Actually this brings up a question
10	Commissioner Chair, which is we have a number of terms
11	expiring in the first two weeks of December. Are we
12	having a meeting in December, or not?
13	CHAIR CANTU: I am planning on having a
14	meeting, but I live on day to day waiting for news as
15	to who is returning. And so, I have no news that
16	would tell us we're changing our plans.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Because Commissioner
18	Kladney may not be back, I may not be back. So, I
19	think it's important to prepare accordingly.
20	CHAIR CANTU: I will talk with the staff
21	director, and we have a meeting scheduled for
22	December.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And cake would be
24	appropriate, I'm just saying that.

CHAIR CANTU: I would like to recognize

25

our colleague Commissioner Debo Adegbile, whose term expires on December 5th, and since our December meeting falls on December 9th, this could make it your last one for this term. I don't know how to speak for the future. I mean I don't believe in goodbyes, but I do want to talk about Debo.

During his tenure, Commissioner Adegbile
has led six major USCCR reports on voting rights,
sexual harassment, health disparities, environmental
justice, racial equity, hate crimes, hate speech,
immigration, and he's issued -- brought our country
around a conversation, and has issued us with his
powerful, eloquent expressions on topics such as civil
rights, and the protection in the federal response to
natural disasters.

Racial disparities in mental health, the federal MeToo, examining sexual harassment in government work places. In the name of hate, examining the federal government's role in responding to hate crimes. Trauma at the border, the human cost of inhumane immigration policies. Minority voting rights access. Along with these reports, he led, he provided input, and advised, and voted on 17 civil rights reports on federal civil rights enforcement.

And this covered disability rights,

women's rights, criminal justice, immigration, national American rights, education, LGTBQ+ rights, and prisoner rights. He's authored, co-authored, and advised on over 60 policy statements issued by the commission on urgent civil rights issues such as immigrant's access to justice, bail, and sentencing reform.

Prisoner healthcare in the pandemic,
police use of force, the Muslim ban, religious
intolerance, anti-Asian racism, and xenophobia. When
I go out, or go on Zoom, and speak to civil rights
organizations, and speak to nonprofit groups, I'm
asked why I joined the U.S. Commission on Civil
Rights. And I explain to people, because of the
people who are commissioners.

and after I do the presentation, folk come up to me, and some of them are cabinet secretaries come up to me, and say I know him, I've known him for years. I know Debo Adegbile, and respect him, and say hi to him for me. My personal reflections of Debo is that he has worked in the vineyards. That he has worked in the shadow of great civil rights leaders, but he himself has become a civil rights icon.

And I'm not going to say goodbye to him, because I'm going to continue relying on his counsel,

	Offedited
1	and relying on the expertise of the wonderful
2	Commissioner Debo Adegbile. And I'm going to open it
3	up, you're going to have to listen to other
4	commissioners say things about you commissioner, and
5	hopefully you have something as well that you'd like
6	to say.
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: With respect, I'd
8	like to invite some commissioners to hold what they
9	may want to say, and send it to me in a letter.
10	CHAIR CANTU: Commissioners? I'm opening
11	it up.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: This is Commissioner Yaki.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you, you.

Adegbile, but I am being forced against my will to say these -- I'm just cheesing. The only word I can describe for you that I think is -- embodies who, and what you are is fierce. You are fierce. You are someone who is a fierce advocate. Fiercely passionate, a fierce believer in civil rights for all in this country.

And you are a fierce defender, and prosecutor of those rights, and I admire the hell out of you for that. And I will miss you on this

commission for the ferocity with which you attack these issues. And I know that we have done our best to drive you crazy during these past six years. I know that we have not succeeded.

And that you will continue the great work that you have done with us, and without in the future.

And it's just been a great privilege to have served along side you for these past six years.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, Dave Kladney here.

CHAIR CANTU: Yes commissioner.

Adegbile, I would second, and support everything that Commissioner Yaki just said. You've been a colleague, you've been a friend, you've been a good advisor, and you give me hope for civil rights in the future. I thank you for all that, and your time, and effort. Finally, I'd like to thank you for teaching me many words in your vocabulary, and your muted presentation.

Boy from the west has learned a lot from a kid from New York City. Thank you very much commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you Commissioner Kladney, and thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIR CANTU: I think you have the floor.

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Great. Well,

thank you for all of those kind words, more than I deserve, but I do appreciate each, and every one of them. The road of the fight for civil rights is long, and twisting, and indeed, my own road to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, as some of you may know, turns out to have been long, and twisting as well.

I had hoped to serve this commission many years ago when I was a junior lawyer, and was hoping, and planning to serve as Commissioner A. Leon Higginbotham's special assistant. He was my mentor, he was a presidential appointee to this commission during the Clinton administration. A former colleague was stepping away in his role as special assistant, and I hoped to take on that role.

But unfortunately Judge Higginbotham would pass away before we could execute on that plan, and so I wasn't able to come to the commission in the 1990s, as I hoped to sort of start a career of service in civil rights. And the road would wind a bit, and down the road, I would come to serve on the commission, and had the great pleasure when we were meeting in our offices for about half of my term, I would sit across from Judge A. Leon Higginbotham's portrait on the wall

from his photograph.

And so, he continued in many ways, to watch over me. I just want to share some thank yous with all who do the work of the commission, and all who I've had the great pleasure to do it with over these six years. I'd like to thank Mauro Morales, our staff director, and Tina Martin from the director of office and management, as well as Pam Dunston.

Some of the leaders of our staff who stand in the trenches, and have helped us navigate a pandemic which has challenged our work, but saw to it that the work would never the less continue. And I thank each, and every one of you, and all who report up to you for what you do to continue the work of this commission.

And OCRE has been much in dialogue today, and obviously the work of civil rights is contested, as we have demonstrated for the country on this very day. But never the less, I would like to thank Marik Xavier-Brier, and Julie Grieco, as well as all of the folks who have served in OCRE, working on the reports, and helping us speak to the country about civil rights, and hopefully light a path about what more we can do to expand a quality, and opportunity.

I also need to recognize, I was appointed

six years ago on the same day as Catherine Lhamon, who served as the first chair during my time, and gave excellent service, and vice chair Pat Timmons-Goodson was superb, as was Commissioner Karen Narasaki, and many of their staffers, and the SAs, Amy, Rukku, Sheryl, Jason, Allison, the whole gang. As the chair mentioned, we did work on a lot of reports during my time.

And as I recall it, when we came to the commission six years ago, there was a backlog of a dozen, or so reports that were in the queue, but had not been released. And we worked diligently, and vigilantly to clear that backlog, and then to continue the many reports, Madam Chair, that you mentioned, and to see that we were continuing to address the issues of the day, even as we were trying to catch up on some work that had not been completed.

And we were grateful to do that, including many statutory enforcement reports, and I was pleased to lead one of the reports that caused us to go back into the field, the way the U.S. Civil Rights

Commission used to be. Not just to sit in D.C., and talk about it amongst ourselves, and have people come to talk to us, but to have the experience of going, and seeing the issues, and witnessing them as they

unfold in the jurisdictions.

And we have done that, as you know, in North Carolina, and we did that in Puerto Rico. And I think it added to the quality, and understanding both of the commissioners, and was reflected in the reports. Part of that work is aided by the state advisory committees, and there were many that had not been appointed for a long time. And I think we treated seriously the obligation to appoint the state advisory committees.

They are the eyes, and ears of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. All of us who sit on the federal commission, the United States Commission, we do what we can. But all of you on these state advisory committees give of your time freely to lift up the issues as they are presenting themselves in states across the country. And now we have expanded this to some of the territories, and we look forward to the outputs.

We heard a wonderful report today, and in some of our reports, we have incorporated your work.

It's been a great pleasure to attend the state advisory committee meetings in places like Alaska, New York, Florida, among other places, and to call in, and to participate remotely, and many others to hear of

the work. You mentioned the policy statements in which I've had the pleasure to participate.

I want to thank the commissioners for the unanimous in support of three that were particularly meaningful to me, and I guess to the commission. One was the statement we had after the tragedy in Charlottesville, where every sitting commissioner voted in support of that statement. And we had unanimity on two other statements that I had the opportunity to draft one, recognizing the extraordinary contributions of the life of John Lewis after his passing.

And the Reverend C.T. Vivian after he passed. One of the things that I would say to the future commissioners, is that whatever degree of expertise you have when you come to this job, you will leave with a deeper understanding of the nature, and structure of civil rights challenges in our country. And you will touch issues that you didn't know too much about.

And so, it's a learning experience as much as anything else, and I had that experience with our broken promises report, and the civil rights issues as they unfold in Indian country, and for some of our first Americans. Dave Kladney's sub minimum wages

report, and the rules under the Fair Labor Standards

Act, and the like that have allowed us to pay sub

minimum wages to some people on account of their

differences opened my world, and understanding about

some challenges that we face.

As did the disaster relief report in the first ever maternal healthcare report. Sometimes we go talk to Congress about our work, and it's interesting to get grilled up there every once in awhile. And I thank Chair Cantu, and Chair Lhamon before her, for letting me carry the mantle for the commission in some of those briefings. I've greatly appreciated it, and appreciated being on the road to talk about the work of the Civil Rights Commission.

One thing we added was the speaker series, and we had lots of experts come before us, and talk about civil rights issues, and to travel with some of you, many of you, to the U.S. Holocaust Museum. Dave Kladney, and I traveled to Rikers Island, which we're hearing about almost every day in the news, to experience some of the civil rights issues that are presented there.

And of course we traveled to some of the workshops at issue in the sub minimum wage report, and went to Vermont, and Virginia together to see those

places, as well as the travel to Puerto Rico that I mentioned. I'll close with two thoughts, and the first is that as I reflect on civil rights in my time laboring in the vineyards as Commissioner Yaki put it, I've come to understand civil rights a little bit in the following way.

And that is that our constitution, and lots of our great documents make what I like to call, and think of as high promises to the people. We promise equality, and equal protection of the laws, and due process. Too often, not always, but too often those high promises are met with low practices. And so what we're dealing with in this country too often, not always, but too often, is a gap between what we promise, and what we do.

And I have come to understand the work of civil rights as an effort to narrow the gap between what we promise, and what people experience. Each, and every one of you on this commission, and your predecessors, I think take up that mantle. And we have different ideas sometimes about what that requires, and what that involves.

There is a strain of thought in American history, and perhaps in contemporary American life that draws parallels between discrimination itself,

and the remedies, and responses to it. This strain in a sense equates the disease with the cure. And this equivalency is perhaps best exemplified in an old case from the reconstruction era called the Civil Rights Cases.

In that case, the supreme court disabled a federal civil rights statute in the area of public accommodation saying that the federal government could not intervene with respect to public acts of discrimination, and that the federal statute couldn't reach it. But what was important about that decision was not only the ruling, which created problems for a country that was trying to rebuild itself after the institution of slavery, but it was also the words of the ruling that we need to remember.

And in the ruling, in explaining why the court was disabling this important civil rights protection, the court in the reconstruction period, where people with the bondages of slavery are walking about having scars on their body, in that time the court said that there comes a time when a man must cease to be the special favorite of the laws.

Again, equating efforts to provide the equality we promise with the remedy -- with the harm to which we're trying to respond. I think that we can

navigate these issues, even through our fights I know that we have. We have on this commission, we have on this country, but it's hard work. And so, I leave with thanks, and appreciation to all of the commissioners with whom I've served, to Chair Cantu, to the commissioners for their generous words.

A special shout out of thanks to Irena
Vidulovic, who is the special assistant whom I had the
good fortune to inherit from a previous chair, and who
was a hold over, and who became a font of
institutional knowledge that greatly aided me. The
commissioners aren't here full time, but the staff is,
and the essays really advance our work.

Work an extraordinary number of hours, there was a way that those reports got out, and it was the work of OCRE, and the essays through the years, day, and night working to get it done. And so, I'm grateful to each of you. I know that I will see many of you in the fights ahead. Sometimes we will be sitting on the same side of the table. I've lived long enough to know sometimes we will be sitting on other sides of the table.

But I will greet you with warmth, and admiration for the time that we spent here together, and I'm grateful to President Obama for having given

me this opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIR CANTU: Thank you. In the spirit of gratitude, I am very grateful for you Commissioner

Adegbile. I am grateful to the entire commission. We know we are in a time of transition, and we have done it here, and we are continuing to do it here peacefully, and with kindness to each other. So, that concludes the business meeting on the agenda for today.

ADJOURN MEETING.

CHAIR CANTU: If there is nothing further,
I adjourn the meeting at 12:00 o'clock, and almost one
minute. We are adjourned, thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:00 p.m.)

a.m 1:10 4:2,5 abide 37:15 **ability** 31:11 able 17:15 18:4 32:20 72:19 above-entitled 81:14 absence 17:7 abstain 5:25 **abuse** 8:21 acceded 31:5 accept 42:19 acceptable 50:23 access 8:12 19:22 28:15 43:20 57:15 68:22 69:6 accessible 50:10 accommodation 79:8 account 64:2 77:3 accountability 66:11 accurate 62:3 accurately 21:22 50:7 **achieve** 66:15 acknowledge 66:7 act 32:7 41:19 45:7 60:3 77:2 activities 9:10 activity 7:4,8,13,16 8:4 9:4 11:4,8 acts 79:9 actual 31:8 Adams 1:14 4:17 17:23 17:23 18:3,10,15,18 24:20,22 25:1 26:16 26:17,18,19 27:3,8 33:20 34:19,25 35:12 35:18 36:17,18,21 38:7,7,8,9 39:1 50:18 52:5.6 53:7.7 59:20 59:20,22 60:18 61:3 61:20 62:17,18,20 63:5 64:4,6,7,8,9,21 65:5.6 add 37:1 66:3 added 75:4 77:15 adding 46:25 addition 33:5 additional 17:2 37:23 38:2 46:20 54:16 address 8:20 15:6 74:15 **Adegbile** 1:15 4:19,20 12:21,22 14:1,13 16:19 17:19 32:24 33:1,4 48:12,15,18 49:5,6,7 51:19 52:7,8 53:2,9,13 65:2,7,8,23 66:21 67:2,7 68:1,7

```
69:19 70:2,7,16 71:9
  71:14,24 72:2 81:4
adequate 13:3 14:5
  32:15
adjourn 3:21 81:10,12
adjourned 81:13
administered 66:16
administration 72:14
administrative 2:6 66:8
administrator 45:1
admiration 80:24
admire 70:24
adopt 42:20 51:2
adopted 42:20
adoption 25:7
advance 80:13
advanced 16:18
advised 5:17 68:23
  69:4
advisor 71:16
advisory 3:12 6:2,6,7
  6:15 23:9 75:7,10,15
  75:23
advocate 70:20
advocates 7:17 8:7
  17:3
advocating 48:19
affect 24:5
afield 42:6
African 24:8 48:1
agencies 7:7 9:1 10:8
  10:11,13 15:2,19,23
  16:5 18:7 19:17 20:15
  21:14 45:8 46:5 61:18
  63:16
agency 12:5 16:10 45:5
agenda 3:8 5:13,16,20
  5:21,25 23:6,22 81:8
aggregate 34:5
ago 72:10 74:1,10
agree 17:8 28:12 36:14
agreed 25:6 26:13,21
  27:1,5 37:11 47:15
  59:15,16 60:1,4
agreements 12:3
ahead 27:11 40:15
  51:21 61:22 80:19
aided 75:6 80:11
Airport 10:17
airports 10:17
Alaska 75:23
ALEC 2:19
ALEXIS 2:20
Allison 74:6
allocation 56:17
allow 8:23 15:5,8
allowed 10:11 15:19
```

77:2

```
alternative 12:3 41:4
amend 35:14 44:22
  49:22
amended 5:22
amendment 24:16.19
  25:3,5,5,20 26:15
  30:23 34:23 49:11,16
  50:3 51:14,22,24 52:3
amendments 5:19,21
American 43:17 48:1
  69:2 78:23,24
Americans 24:8 76:25
ample 41:12
Amy 74:5
analysis 22:2,12 27:17
  32:5,5,8 42:10,15,19
  42:21 58:7 61:4 62:11
annual 11:24
anomalies 50:19
answer 12:14 55:19
  61:10 64:15,15
answering 23:1
anti-Asian 31:1 69:10
anybody 16:24 17:5
  39:2 61:6
apologize 16:22 36:16
apparently 27:2 60:13
apples 38:13,15,15
applicable 50:23
apply 42:15
appoint 75:9
appointed 54:13 73:25
  75:8
appointee 72:13
appointing 61:15
appoints 54:8
appreciate 23:1 53:23
  66:24 72:4
appreciated 77:13,13
appreciation 67:7 80:4
appropriate 67:24
APPROVAL 3:8 5:13
approve 5:21 29:5,15
  29:16,16 31:18 41:14
  41:18 51:2
approved 5:25 30:14
approving 32:19
approximately 49:12
area 46:1 79:7
areas 31:17
argued 7:18
argument 50:11
arranged 4:8
arrest 22:4
arrests 9:14 12:10,11
ASCD 2:7,11,12
asked 17:12 25:5 30:9
  58:19 60:22,24 64:23
```

69:13 asking 58:25 assert 43:13 49:9 asserting 49:20 assertion 13:2 15:15,18 22:8 asset 6:8,16,17,19 7:4,7 7:11,19,25 8:6,13 9:3 9:16,23 10:3,9,23 11:11,13,15,23 12:4,6 12:8 13:1,3,10,10,15 13:20 14:4,21 15:19 19:2,10 20:16 assets 10:12 assistant 58:22 59:4,7 72:12,15 80:8 **ASSISTANTS** 2:17 associated 14:24 28:16 56:15 attached 22:3 attachments 21:21 attack 71:1 attend 50:17 75:22 attending 4:10 attorney 11:1 13:13 19:23 attorneys 19:16 56:16 audit 66:14 authored 69:3 authorities 14:10 availability 8:13 50:17 57:17 **available** 9:18 13:9 50:10 55:3 66:5,17 avoid 37:16,17 38:13 aware 22:16,21 awareness 37:4 **awhile** 77:10 ave 5:22,23 52:10 В

B 5:16 back 4:18 16:12 19:3,7 27:18 31:21 36:17 39:18,24 41:1,13 44:8 45:22 52:25 55:15 67:18,18 74:20 backlog 74:10,13 **baffled** 40:4 49:3 **baffling** 39:20 44:12 **bail** 69:6 **baked** 30:10 balances 15:10 **ban** 69:9 based 5:6 8:15 22:17 24:6 46:15 63:2 **basic** 10:22 basically 21:24 43:15

basis 48:22 bear 41:21 **bears** 14:21 becoming 36:15 began 45:17 beginning 55:7 begun 57:22 **behalf** 66:19 believe 32:1 43:12,21 47:23 53:4 55:12 57:21 59:24 64:13 68:5 believer 70:21

Belmont 45:9 47:17 48:7

benefit 47:19,20 48:3,4 48:10 54:14

best 7:15 29:13 42:9 43:3 66:16,20 67:1 71:2 79:3

better 22:7,11,13 31:10

beyond 53:19 56:23 **bias** 63:21

biggest 13:15 Bill 19:13 20:5.6

bills 19:8 biography 56:11

bit 37:2,6 38:10 58:14 72:21 78:5

Black 41:9 bless 63:16

board 56:18 60:19

bodies 15:5 **body** 40:2 79:20

bona 15:2

bondages 79:19 **border** 68:20

bother 63:11

bottom 54:24

Boy 71:21

briefing 24:2 25:2 26:10 27:14 28:9,21,23 30:7 30:13 31:1 33:9 35:21

36:4 44:7 47:12,14 48:25 50:4 53:16

briefings 30:3,15 34:15 35:22,25 40:24 44:5

48:21 77:12

bring 55:25 **brings** 62:1 67:9

broader 51:13 **broken** 76:23

brought 31:2 48:6

68:11

bucket 8:9,11 10:6

buckets 7:2 budget 15:20,20 66:9

66:17 budgetary 16:14 **budgets** 15:6,9 16:13 burden 32:9 48:18

63:18 Bureau 62:9

busiest 10:17 **business** 1:3 3:10 4:3,8 5:18 6:1,5 23:15 35:13 37:4,9 81:8

C

C.T 76:13 cabinet 69:17 cake 67:9,23 call 4:16 16:7 51:15 52:4 53:9 60:11,14 61:16 65:2 75:24 78:8 called 18:1 22:17 34:3 41:9 51:20 59:9 60:17 79:4

calling 59:18 care 19:14 39:5 61:22 career 72:20

careful 62:22,24,25 63:8

CARISSA 2:22 Carolina 75:3 carried 35:13 54:2 carry 51:16,18 77:11 case 22:3 42:15 79:3,6 cases 8:23 9:2,16 10:24

79:5 cash 9:13 11:5 14:18 catch 74:16

Catherine 74:1 **caucus** 39:25

cause 16:6

caused 74:20 caution 29:5 46:10 cease 79:22

Center 21:10 34:7 47:2 certain 48:2 57:2,3,11

57:18,18 certainly 23:16 51:8 certification 46:16 Chairs 3:12 6:2

challenged 73:11 **challenges** 8:12 76:18 77:5

challenging 17:14 **change** 20:25 changes 8:22 60:1 changing 48:19 67:16

Chantel 6:7 characterized 50:7 **charge** 42:22 43:4 56:3

61:14

charged 9:6 11:7 32:3 **charges** 9:15 22:5 charging 57:12 Charlottesville 76:7 charter 32:3 **check** 64:14

checked 54:11 **checks** 15:10 cheesing 70:17 chief 2:6,13 56:17

61:15 chiefs 54:12 55:8,9,11 children 19:15

choose 29:7 **Chorus** 5:23 **chose** 58:24

chosen 59:1 Christian 1:14 17:23 citations 12:10

cities 30:4 31:25 34:22 35:23 36:12 38:1,1 42:1 44:8,9 46:13,15

46:19 48:2,22 53:18 53:20,21 54:6,8,9,11 54:17,19,20 55:1,2,3 55:17.20 56:23 58:20 58:25 59:19 61:8,11

61:13,14,16 62:25 63:1,2,6

citing 50:9 citizens 36:8 55:12 city 25:9,10,12,14 27:15 27:16,18 28:12,18

30:7,8,9,13,15 31:24 33:6,6,8,10,14 34:12 34:22 35:6 36:5,13 37:25 39:23 40:6 41:24,24 42:19 43:6 43:13,15,22 44:6,6,7

46:7,8 47:12,14,15 48:4 49:1,4 51:24,25 52:1 54:1 56:18,19

44:10,13,15,16,19

58:8,9 59:17 63:12 64:12,14 71:22

civil 1:1 4:4 6:8,16,17 6:19 7:4,7,11,19,25 8:6,13 9:3,16,22,23 10:3,9,23 11:11,13,15 11:23 12:4,6,8,25 13:3,10,15,20 14:4

15:18 19:2,10 20:16 20:24 21:1,5 32:6 46:12 66:25 67:4

68:13,23,24 69:5,11 69:13,22,23 70:21 71:17 72:5,7,21 73:17 73:22 74:21 75:12

76:18,23 77:14,17,21 78:3,5,17 79:4,7,17

claims 15:2 clarification 32:20 **clarify** 25:6 26:12 27:1 51:24

clarity 33:20 49:14 51:10

classes 9:22 32:3 clear 11:21 33:5 48:20 49:10,15,18,21 74:13

Clearinghouse 2:7 **Clinton** 72:14 close 29:11 78:2 **Club** 1:9

co- 24:20 54:25 62:13 co-authored 69:3

co-lead 25:1 33:20 34:19 43:10 59:10 60:12 64:4

coach 44:24 47:6 **code** 57:10 **colleague** 68:1 71:15

72:14 **colleagues** 31:3 41:6 42:12 46:9 55:16 56:6

collect 37:15 38:11 53:19

collected 20:21 33:24 45:5 54:17

collecting 20:15,24 collection 8:17 11:18 38:2.18 collects 12:6

College 43:17 color 6:9.18.21 9:25 10:4 12:11 24:7 47:25 58:11

come 4:18 5:15 20:3 29:3,13 36:17 60:20 61:8 69:16,18 72:19 72:22 74:23 76:16 77:16 78:5,16

comes 4:5 79:21 coming 63:6 **comment** 21:6 39:13 43:21 54:17

comments 17:21 32:23 64:25 **commission** 1:1,8 4:4

6:13 12:15 23:13 26:12 29:13 30:3,14 33:22 35:22 39:13,22 40:5 41:7,11 43:4 44:4 45:21 46:12 47:9 47:11,15,22 48:21 56:3,10 58:8,22,24

59:6 62:22,23 69:5,13

Jnedited

71:1 72:7,9,13,19,22 73:4,15 74:10,22 75:12,13,13 76:5 77:12,14 78:19 80:2 81:4 commission's 6:8 commissioners 4:13 4:15 5:7,19 12:17,19 29:6,20 31:11 32:23 34:20 40:13 43:9 46:22 51:21 53:23 62:14 69:15 70:4,8,10 75:5 76:3,15 80:5,6 80:12 committed 42:25 committee 3:12 6:2,6,7 6:16,19,22 8:4 11:9 11:10 23:10 75:23 Committee's 6:15 committees 75:7,10,15 communicate 60:12 communication 36:10 **communities** 6:9,18,21 8:1 10:4,5 19:3 22:14 **community** 7:5,20,23 8:2,7 11:3 13:24 22:9 compared 60:3 comparing 47:8 comparison 38:13 comparisons 38:16 50:22 complete 66:11 **completed** 4:7 74:17 **completely** 41:3 44:11 complex 50:16 complicated 36:24 comply 45:6,7 compressed 62:2 **concede** 42:13 conceived 39:16 concept 25:7 26:8,9,11 28:20 29:5,15 30:2,14 33:5,15 35:21 36:1,3 41:14,15,17 44:3,11 45:17,18 46:25 47:13 48:20 49:25 concepts 29:8 **concern** 66:24 concerned 20:12 36:7 56:1 60:7 concerns 8:20 42:3 conclude 12:6 concludes 47:17 81:8 conclusion 19:11 conditions 42:5 conduct 37:19 46:6 57:12 conducted 47:18

conducting 45:10,15 conducts 45:3 conference 4:12,14 conferences 55:9 confining 41:23 **confirm** 4:15 60:15 confirming 59:14 congratulations 66:18 Congress 77:8 connected 9:15 connection 8:23 connects 36:4 conservatives 58:23 59:5 consider 5:17 30:21 **considered** 41:20 43:3 61:21 considering 12:12 **consist** 23:25 consistency 60:6 consistently 8:5,19 9:14,23 10:18 13:16 20:13 constitution 78:7 constitutional 10:21 contained 66:4 contemplate 26:22 contemplative 61:9 contemporary 78:24 contested 73:17 context 28:24 continue 13:18.21 31:15 46:18 59:10 67:3 69:25 71:5 73:12 73:14 74:13 continued 73:2 **continuing** 59:9 74:15 81:6 contract 62:12 contradictory 27:4 contributions 76:11 **Control** 34:7 47:2 controversy 37:7 convened 1:8 convenience 50:11 convenient 28:9 conversation 28:8 33:22 46:18 49:11 54:25 64:3.24 68:12 conversations 34:11 53:25 convicted 11:8 conviction 11:19 convictions 8:24 convinced 56:6

convincing 11:21

Coordination 2:10

correct 14:11 20:5

correlative 42:8 cost 68:20 coterie 57:20 counsel 1:22 11:16 69:25 counties 15:22 **country** 10:17 45:14 57:4 58:4 68:11 70:22 73:18,22 75:17 76:18 76:24 78:13 79:13 80:3 county 56:19 couple 15:17 16:15 course 42:11 77:23 **court** 5:8,9 79:6,17,18 79:21 **covered** 68:25 **COVID-19** 4:10 crazy 47:9 71:3 create 8:18 14:19 15:20 created 49:11 79:12 creates 14:15 17:7 creating 8:3 credible 45:24 **crime** 3:15 7:14 9:6 13:17 21:4 22:20 23:19.23 24:11 25:9.9 25:12,13 27:15,17 28:17,18 31:2 32:2,16 34:1,2,3,7 38:21,22 39:21 40:3 42:2 43:6 43:19 46:23,24 47:1,4 47:24 48:3 53:15 57:1 57:2,3 58:2,2,3,7,10 58:11 65:4 **crimes** 24:9 34:5,18 57:11,19 68:10,20 **criminal** 7:4,8,9,12,13 8:4 9:4,9,15 11:4,8,19 12:25 13:3,9,21,22 19:11 69:1 criteria 53:21 54:3,5,21 57:5 61:23 cross 57:21 **crystal** 49:21 **cure** 79:2 curious 32:4 currency 21:22 current 32:14 41:6 currently 58:15

D **D** 3:6 56:23 **D.C** 1:10 31:1 33:13 74:22 **damaging** 7:21 8:2 **DANSBY** 2:18 data 7:2 8:11,13,17

9:18.19.20 10:1 11:18 11:23 12:4,6 13:17 19:20,20 20:14,15,21 20:24 21:9,10 22:7,12 22:13,18 23:2 27:17 28:25,25 33:19 34:14 36:23 37:2,18 38:2,11 38:11,18 39:6 42:22 46:4 50:17 64:10 database 46:15 47:1 databases 34:1,13 46:2 53:20 57:14 Dave 27:10 71:10 76:25 77:18 **DAVID** 1:19,22 2:9 day 67:14,14 73:19 74:1 74:16 77:20 80:17 dead 40:2 deadline 60:3 deal 30:16,22 32:6 43:19 59:12,14 60:5 dealing 78:13 **debate** 41:20 **Debo** 1:15 66:21 68:1,6 69:19,20 70:2 **December** 67:11.12.22 68:2,2,3 decide 37:2 decision 79:11 decisions 57:13 declined 18:8 decrease 7:14 deeper 76:17 deeply 23:12 defend 13:13 defendants 8:21 defender 19:24 70:23 defenders 11:18 19:21 defer 40:13 deference 63:7 deferring 61:9 62:22 deficient 42:23 **degree** 56:11 76:15 delaying 38:21 deliberate 45:23 deliberation 45:20 deliver 29:4 democracy 15:4,11 **Democrat** 54:10.13.17 demonstrated 73:18 denial 20:13 denied 10:24 Department 62:9 departments 21:15,16 deployed 9:24 **Deputy 2:13** dereliction 15:11

derived 19:4

describe 70:18 described 12:8 14:14 14:23 description 12:7 deserve 72:4 designate 16:13 **desire** 30:25 detail 31:16 details 21:21 29:9 **determine** 22:6,19 57:18 determining 15:6 deterrent 7:13 develop 19:19 Developing 11:22 deviate 37:11 dialogue 73:16 die 45:13 died 45:13 difference 26:23 differences 77:4 different 32:17 36:13 37:23 38:1 39:12 40:23 43:24 44:20 53:18 57:20 78:21 difficult 9:19 21:9 22:3 40:4 diligently 74:12 direct 19:14 44:24 directed 39:2 directing 38:24 director 1:21 2:8,9 5:11 65:21,21 67:21 73:7,7 director's 3:19 62:3 66:1 disability 68:25 disabled 79:6 disabling 79:17 disagreement 49:14 disaster 77:6 disasters 68:15 discharge 48:24 discovery 3:16 23:20 23:24 24:11 31:19 39:14,19 40:24 52:25 53:16 discrimination 78:25 79:10 discuss 23:24 28:22 42:17 discussed 27:13 discussing 57:20 discussion 3:15 23:19 23:22 24:10,11 25:16 25:23 26:14 30:22,23 31:7 41:21 44:13 49:3 49:4,8 51:9 53:10,15

59:13 66:5 disease 34:7 47:2 79:2 disparate 6:20 9:21 32:8 **disparities** 24:5,7 68:9 68:16 disparity 14:23 disposed 14:9 disproportionality 42:14 disproportionate 32:9 42:10,14 disproportionately 9:24 disqualifier 38:12 disrupting 7:8 dissertations 44:24 **distinction** 12:25 13:8 distortion 15:4,11 district 19:16 56:16 disturbing 9:21 Division 2:7 document 60:8 documentary 33:11 documents 33:17.18 49:10 59:23 60:2.6 78:8 doing 22:12 32:5,8,9 37:12 38:2 44:5 45:25 46:14 52:3 62:15 **dollars** 9:13 10:3,16,20 41:8 downstream 38:21 dozen 74:11 draft 37:20 54:5 76:10 drafts 59:24 draw 12:24 draws 78:25 drifting 29:6 **drive** 71:3 dropped 61:12 due 4:10 20:14 48:18 78:11 **DUELL** 2:19 **Dunston** 2:6 73:8 duplication 37:17 duty 15:11 45:14 55:13

Е

E 3:6
eagerly 36:11
ears 75:11
ease 28:15
easily 36:24
Eastern 4:5
easy 45:19
education 46:17 69:2
effect 25:9,13 38:21

effectively 15:20 effort 20:22 71:18 78:17 **efforts** 79:23 eight 44:20 45:2 either 15:14 18:8 22:7 28:12 32:14 elected 15:12 electronic 11:22 19:20 eliminated 21:1 eliminating 12:1 elimination 11:13 eloquent 68:13 email 59:14 **emails** 37:3 embarrassed 55:15 embodies 70:18 employees 66:19 encourage 53:23 encouraged 55:6 encouragement 13:18 endeavors 67:3 endorse 63:9 endorses 62:24 **enforcement** 7:6.11.22 8:5,9 9:1 10:7,11 15:2 15:6,8,13,19,23 16:5 16:24 17:5,13,15 18:5 18:7 19:17 21:14 22:6 30:5 36:7 54:9.12 56:14 63:15.25 68:24 74:19 enforcer 61:15 **ensure** 31:12 Enterprise 43:18 enterprises 7:12 enthusiasm 45:22 entire 45:21 47:22 51:23 59:8 81:4 entities 28:16 environmental 68:9 equal 78:10 equality 78:10 79:24 equates 79:2 equating 79:23 equitable 12:2 **equity** 68:10 equivalency 79:3

evaluation 53:24 eventual 11:6 everybody 30:17 38:20 everyone's 56:10 evidence 11:21,21 14:21 22:17,25 23:3 33:12 41:12 45:24 evident 33:13 evidentiary 11:20 exactly 34:12 60:23 examination 16:23 examined 6:19 **examining** 25:8,12 38:14 68:17,19 example 66:24 excellent 74:3 exception 46:11 **exclude** 64:10 excluded 63:13 **Excuse** 25:19 **execute** 72:18 exemplified 79:3 existence 51:10 exists 32:14 51:17 expand 73:24 expanded 75:17 **experience** 47:21,23 74:24 76:21,22 77:21 78:18 **experienced** 24:8 47:19 experiences 34:17 experiencing 48:11 experiment 47:8,17 **expertise** 34:16 43:21 70:1 76:16 experts 77:16 expires 68:2 expiring 67:11 explain 34:20 37:10 64:5 69:14 explaining 79:16 explanation 62:3,4 exploited 19:15 expressions 68:13 extent 6:19 14:4 15:1 extra 20:22 37:2 extraordinary 76:11 80:14 eyes 75:11

F

face 77:5

era 79:4

err 13:23

EST 1:10

ethics 45:8

especially 56:7 58:10

essays 80:13,16

establishing 11:16

etcetera 30:6 32:7

ethical 45:15 63:24

ESSENCE 2:12

53:22 55:19 59:9,10

facts 23:2 41:3,4,4,21 41:22 **failed** 21:22 fails 52:23,24 65:20 Fair 53:13 77:1 fairness 10:22 31:6,9 falls 68:3 far 28:2 37:23 38:10 42:6 favor 5:22 42:12 favorite 79:22 **FBI** 46:6 federal 12:2,2 33:24 34:13 37:14 45:2,2,5 45:8 46:2,5 47:18 48:5 53:20 57:14 62:11 63:3,17,23 68:14,17,19,24 75:13 79:7,8,10 feedback 7:18 54:15,16 feel 20:17 22:7,10 feeling 22:24,24 **fellow** 58:1 ferocity 71:1 fide 15:2 field 26:9.10 28:9 30:3 30:7,13,25 35:21,22 35:25 36:4 44:5,7 47:12,14 48:21,25 50:4 74:21 fierce 39:3 70:19,19,20 70:21,23 Fiercely 70:20 fight 67:3 72:5 **fights** 80:1,19 figure 22:4 61:25 **filed** 21:19 fill 21:25 final 31:18 55:4 61:19 **Finally** 51:12 71:19 finance 66:9 financial 10:8 66:16 find 9:20 15:14 35:4 **finding** 7:6,17 8:11 9:2 9:17 10:20 findings 6:14,23,24 7:1 7:3 8:10 10:5 11:9 12:13 fine 59:3 first 6:4 8:2 12:19 26:8 36:14 37:25 40:20 44:3 45:17 49:23 54:2 58:14 61:5 67:11 74:2 76:25 77:7 78:3 fiscal 23:22 fish 45:19 **five** 10:5,20 38:1 54:1 54:24,24 55:17,20

58:25 fleshed 58:13 floor 1:9 6:10 16:22 24:10 25:15,23 53:14 72:1 Florida 75:24 focus 7:3 16:23 38:18 42:1 focused 7:6,18 8:11 9:2 9:17 13:8 30:24 folk 12:19,20 23:3 47:23 48:3,8,9 54:14 folks 44:23 73:21 follow 8:24 20:23,23 22:16 46:9 63:23 **following** 6:22 78:6 font 80:10 force 69:9 **forced** 70:16 forfeited 8:25 9:11 10:12 forfeiture 6:9,16,17,20 7:4,7,11,19,25 8:6,13 8:24 9:3,16,24 10:3,9 10:23 11:6,12,13,15 11:17,23 12:4,8,25 13:1,3,4,10,11,15,20 13:22 14:5,22 15:19 19:2,10 20:16,24 21:1 21:5 forfeitures 9:9 10:19 form 44:18 format 21:20 former 41:6 72:14 forth 31:2 Fortunately 45:21 fortune 80:9 forward 29:3,13 41:18 43:1,2 45:22 49:17,17 75:18 found 10:6 16:2 21:3 37:22 four 10:5 34:13 40:5 46:1,4 52:21,21 fourth 34:5 FRAGOSA 2:20 Francisco 56:20 freely 75:15 frequently 62:20 Friday 1:5 4:6 friend 71:16 friends 55:16 front 60:15,16 fruition 20:4 full 80:12

fund 11:18 19:14,15

fundamental 10:21

funded 34:8 funding 15:3,14 19:25 45:11 47:18 funds 8:20,25 11:17 16:2,12 19:14,19 further 23:4 26:14 31:16 32:20 55:20 59:13 64:25 66:3 81:11 fuss 37:1 future 67:2 68:5 71:6,17 76:15 FY 3:15 23:19

G 3:6 **GAIL** 1:17 gang 74:6 **GANZ** 1:22 gap 46:3 78:14,17 gather 37:18,24 38:11 gathering 29:2 **gender** 58:12 general 1:22 4:9,11 48:9 Generally 29:10 generous 80:6 generously 34:8 geography 31:9 **Georgia** 6:7,10,15,18 8:14,16 9:18,20 10:10 11:12 12:8,12 16:16 19:8 20:15,19 21:10 21:13,23 22:11,16 23:9 Georgia's 10:1 12:18 getting 29:8 39:17,24 54:25 **qhost** 41:9 **Gilchrist** 1:16 4:21,22 18:19,20,21,23 20:2,8 20:11 52:9,10 65:9,10 give 15:22 19:22 54:16 55:19 71:17 75:15 given 31:25 34:23 45:12 66:23 80:25 **giving** 13:12 God 63:16 goodbye 69:24 goodbyes 68:5 govern 32:11 government 33:24 34:14 37:14 45:2,3 48:5 56:13 62:11 63:18 68:18 79:8 government's 63:24 68:19 grateful 74:18 80:18,25

81:3.4 gratitude 81:3 greatly 77:12 80:11 **greet** 80:23 Grieco 73:20 grilled 77:9 ground 56:20 group 63:22,22 grouped 7:1 groupings 46:14 groups 28:10,16 44:21 69:12 guard 17:7,9 guardrail 14:19 15:25 17:1 guardrails 14:5,12 guess 27:24 45:13 76:5 **guides** 46:10

Н

half 29:11 72:24 halt 19:10 hand 49:20,21 handguns 57:17 **happen** 50:5 happening 22:14 happens 47:1 happy 12:14 63:9 haranguing 47:5 harassing 47:5 harassment 68:9,17 harbor 19:15 hard 24:23 41:13 45:25 62:4 66:24 80:3 harm 47:20.23 48:11 79:24 Hartsfield-Jackson 10:16 hat 46:18 hate 68:10,10,18,20 head 54:8 health 47:3 68:9,16 **healthcare** 69:8 77:7 healthy 41:20 hear 17:24 24:25 31:21 36:19 37:8 64:19 75:25 heard 7:10,15 8:4,22 9:7,14 10:7,14 11:3 29:14 38:4 46:21 61:5 62:21 75:20 hearing 6:22 7:10 8:16 17:14 26:10 27:19 35:16 43:16 77:20 hearings 6:17 7:20 **held** 6:16 30:15 hell 70:24 help 13:4 19:2 34:20

Jnedite

50:15 52:20 **helped** 73:10 helping 50:25 73:22 **Heriot** 1:17 4:23,24 24:13,15,18 25:4,17 25:24 26:1,3,4,4,7,20 26:25 27:6 30:9,12 31:23 35:7,20 36:3 38:6 39:9,11,12 47:7 47:11 49:9,16 52:11 52:12,22 53:5 58:17 58:18,19 59:16 65:11 65:12 Heriot's 51:16 **HHS** 45:10 hi 69:20 Higginbotham 72:17 Higginbotham's 72:12

72:25 **high** 9:3 58:7 78:9,12 **higher** 46:16 highest 58:3,10 66:15 **highlight** 19:5,18 hiring 56:13 history 78:24 hold 30:3.13 35:22 47:12,14 48:21 70:8

80:10 holding 30:6 44:5 Holocaust 77:18 hope 17:24 71:17 hoped 72:9,16,20

hopefully 41:21 70:5 73:23 **hoping** 72:10 hosting 4:11 hour 39:8 **hours** 80:14

House 19:13 20:5,6 human 68:20

hundreds 41:8

icon 69:23 idea 10:22

ideas 17:9 29:13 78:21 identical 59:24

identify 40:14 42:7 illegal 7:16

imagination 41:16

immigrant's 69:6 immigration 68:11,21 69:1

impact 6:9,17,20 8:1 9:22 21:4 32:2,8

42:10,14 impacting 9:5 impacts 7:4

implemented 8:19 implementing 48:24 **important** 50:16 67:19 79:11,17

improve 11:17 51:9 improvement 21:4 incentive 10:8 14:20

incentives 8:3 14:15 17:8

incident 20:23 incidents 34:4

include 25:8,12 27:17 included 36:11 44:10

includes 47:4

including 11:15 12:2 46:19 74:18

inclusion 41:23,24 income 9:5 10:4

incomplete 21:19 64:15 64:16,17

incorporated 49:2 75:21

increase 38:22.23 39:21 40:3 42:2

incrimination 11:2 **Indian** 76:24

indicate 43:12 indicated 18:4

indigent 19:14

individuals 9:5 28:15 information 2:13 14:7

20:16 37:15.24 46:20 48:9 53:19 54:16

inherently 44:14 inherit 80:9

inhumane 68:21 initiatives 19:1,3

innocence 10:25

input 62:14 68:23

inquiries 47:4 **inquiry** 38:19

inserted 27:4

instances 40:25

Institute 43:18

institution 79:14 institutional 80:11

institutions 43:16 50:9

integrity 66:22 intend 33:23

intended 9:8 25:6 intent 37:18,18

interaction 44:20

interest 4:10 66:3 **interested** 39:22,23

interesting 50:19 77:9 interests 43:3 Intern 2:11,12

international 9:9

intervene 79:9 intervening 16:9 intolerance 69:10 introduce 49:10

invitations 18:7

invite 70:8

involved 21:1 56:13 involves 78:22

Irena 2:25 80:7 **Island** 77:19

issue 16:23,24 17:16 28:10,17,18 31:2,5

32:15 39:4 42:4,7 44:4 56:21 61:6 62:1 77:24

issued 12:10 68:11,12 69:4

issues 15:7 17:16 32:17 41:13 57:8,9,12,16 58:13 69:5 71:2 74:15 74:25 75:16 76:19,23

77:17,21 80:1 item 5:16 23:21 items 5:18

iterations 31:19

J 1:14 jargon 44:18 **Jason** 74:6

Jay 43:17 **iob** 62:16 76:16

John 2:21 43:17 66:10 76:11

joined 69:13 **JOSHUA** 2:18

JUANA 2:23

Judge 72:17,25 **JULIAN** 2:11

Julie 73:20

junior 72:10 junket 44:16

jurisdiction 7:14

iurisdictional 43:4 jurisdictions 19:4 42:8

50:15 57:4,23 58:5 64:1,10 75:1

iustice 7:10 10:22 62:9 62:10 68:10 69:1,6

Κ

K 2:21 **Karen** 74:4 keep 10:11 16:8 55:7 **key** 6:14 kid 71:22

kindness 66:22 81:7 kinds 42:16 57:20

Kirsanow 1:18 4:25 5:1 25:21,21,22 27:7,9,9 27:11,12,25 29:21,23 29:23,25 30:1 31:23 32:25 33:2,3,21 40:11 43:14,25 44:2 48:13 48:14,16,17 49:9 50:4 50:8 52:13,14 65:13 65:14

Kladney 1:19 5:2,3 27:10,11,13,20,21,22 27:23 28:13 34:6,24 35:3,4,9,15 36:15 40:10,15,20 43:10,11 50:6 52:15,16 58:1 65:15,16 67:18 71:10 71:11,13,25 77:19

Kladney's 76:25 knew 18:1 **Knowing** 34:14 knowledge 56:20 80:11 known 21:11 69:18

Labor 77:1 laboring 78:4 lack 9:19 49:13 51:10 Lacking 40:25 lane 29:7,20 language 59:22 **large** 9:8 largest 54:20 lastly 9:17 10:5 12:4 66:19 late 60:9 law 7:6,10,22 8:5,8 9:1 9:23 10:7,10,11 15:1 15:6,8,13,19,23 16:4

16:24 17:5,13,15 18:5 18:7 19:16 20:25,25 21:14 22:6 30:5 36:7 54:9,12 56:13 61:15

63:15,25 laws 78:10 79:22 lawyer 72:10

lead 24:21 55:1 56:23 56:23 57:1 74:20

leaders 69:22 73:9 leadership 23:9

leads 62:14 learned 29:12 34:6

71:21 learning 34:10 76:21 leave 76:17 80:3

leaves 15:13 leaving 63:25

led 54:17,19 55:2 60:25 61:18 68:8,22

Jnedited

legal 32:7 45:15 legislation 8:18 legislative 15:5 16:17 legislators 16:16 19:18 **legislature** 15:21 19:9 length 17:4 lens 56:4 Leon 72:11.25 let's 5:21 42:15 45:18 45:19 **letter** 70:9 letting 77:11 level 9:3,12 12:2 17:1 24:3 **levels** 32:18 **Lewis** 76:11 **LGTBQ** 69:2 **Lhamon** 74:1 77:10 life 44:24 76:11 78:24 lift 24:4 75:15 light 51:6 73:23 limitation 14:7,19 line 4:18 12:21 18:2 23:14,20,24,25 29:16 35:2 53:1.17 62:1 65:4 line's 34:23 list 31:24,25 33:18 36:11,14 38:1 44:8 46:13 54:1,2,2,11,18 54:23 55:4,17 58:6,21 61:1,8,13,16 63:2,8 listed 20:1 44:21 listen 70:3 listening 24:25 listings 46:7 little 42:6 44:15 58:14 78:5 live 67:14 lived 80:20 local 15:22 19:16 21:15 30:5,5 36:6,7 56:12 64:1 location 28:9 33:9 long 31:14 63:7 72:5,8 75:8 80:21 longer 40:22 look 9:1 11:12,19 12:3 22:1 24:3 32:12 35:18 36:24 40:3 44:3 45:18

34:5 39:4 46:3 61:23 looks 12:12 34:4 **lose** 46:16 **lost** 47:9 lot 14:7 42:16 45:20 71:21 74:7 lots 77:16 78:8 loved 17:12,17 low 9:5 10:4 78:12 luck 67:2

М

Madam 18:19 22:21 24:13 25:24 27:10,20 29:21 31:10 32:24,25 38:6,7 39:9 40:10,11 43:11,25 47:7 48:12 48:13 49:5 55:22 58:17 59:20 62:17 66:2 67:4 71:10,25 74:14 maintain 43:23 **major** 68:8 making 8:1 13:23 15:2 16:6 42:25 50:21 man 79:21 management 2:8 3:18 65:25 73:8 manifest 39:3 manifests 56:21 mantle 77:11 78:20 Marik 73:19 Martin 2:8 73:7 MASHBURN 2:21 **massive** 39:17 massively 39:24 materials 3:16 23:20 24:12 39:15 52:25 53:16 55:4 maternal 77:7 math 52:20 matter 31:9 32:21 81:14 **Mauro** 1:21 73:6 mayor 54:8,13 mayors 54:10,10 60:25 **Mayowa** 66:10 mean 41:15 51:1 53:17 55:25 61:25 68:5 meaning 44:22 meaningful 76:5 means 34:12 45:4 66:15 meant 52:1 median 10:3 medication 45:12 meet 43:7 meeting 1:3 3:10,21 4:4

4:5,8,9,11 5:15,18 6:1

68:3 72:23 81:8,10,12 meetings 35:25 75:23 member 40:2 members 6:13 11:4 12:15 13:24 22:9 25:10,13 27:2 40:5 Memorandums 3:13 6:3 Memphis 54:3 mental 47:3 68:16 mention 49:24 50:1 mentioned 14:6 46:19 47:16 74:7,14 76:1 78:2 mentioning 53:18 mentor 72:12 merit 39:7 50:20 meritorious 38:19 merits 41:24 met 15:3 78:12 **methods** 38:18 **MeToo** 68:17 Mexico 20:21 21:6 MICHAEL 1:20 MICHELE 2:13 middle 55:1 **million** 10:15 mind 34:21 47:9 minimum 17:1 76:25 77:3.24 minority 25:10,13 68:21 minute 30:23 81:13 minutes 6:11 49:12 mirrored 13:10 misrepresented 16:21 missed 61:18 67:1 **missing** 21:13 **misuse** 8:20 **Monday** 59:10 money 14:8,18 37:16 monitors 12:5 month 39:3 monthly 65:21 **Morales** 1:21 5:12,14 65:23 66:2 73:6 morning 6:12,25 motion 25:11,20 26:20 26:24,25 28:14 30:11 30:14 35:8,12 37:4,8 40:6,6 44:21 48:20,22 48:23 52:22,24 53:2 53:15 56:2 58:14 65:19 motivation 8:8 mouth 49:20

29:4 35:13 37:5,9

55:5,9 67:12,14,21

25:11 45:22 49:10 **moved** 30:12 **moving** 24:10 MULDER 2:22 Mullen 6:8.10.12 12:16 12:18 13:6 14:11 15:16 17:11 18:6,13 18:23 19:6 20:5,11 21:8 22:21 23:8,13,17 multi 34:9 62:12 multiple 7:24 11:3 18:7 **Museum** 77:18 **Muslim** 69:9 MUSSATT 2:9 muted 71:20

Ν

N 1:18 3:6 **nadirs** 41:10 name 4:17 68:18 Narasaki 74:4 **narrow** 78:17 national 1:8 11:11 24:3 24:4 28:25 33:25 34:7 43:18 62:6 69:2 natural 68:15 nature 57:10 76:17 navigate 73:10 80:1 Nay 52:8 65:8 near 11:4 necessarily 7:20 **necessary** 7:11,19 need 5:17 14:25 15:14 19:24 22:13,13,25 23:7 24:17 25:17.19 45:20 49:21 52:20 57:5,22 58:13 59:13 62:13 64:2 73:25 79:15 needed 4:7 49:16 61:24 **needs** 15:3 negatively 8:8 neighborhoods 57:18 **NELSON-SAUNDERS** 2.11 never 28:2 31:7 73:12 73:19 new 20:21 21:6 25:9,10 25:12,14 27:14,16,18 28:12,18 30:7,8,13 31:24 33:6,7,14 34:3 35:6 36:1,13,15,22 37:25 38:10,19 39:5 39:23 40:5 41:9,23,24 42:19 43:13,15,22 44:6,9,13,15,16,19 45:4 46:20 47:12 49:4 49:24 50:1,8 51:24

move 23:5,16 24:10

48:2,5 54:9 57:12

67:3 75:18

looked 10:1 11:25

36:24 48:6 54:20

60:21 61:16 62:8

looking 16:10 21:8,23

31:13,13,18 32:10

59:17 64:11,14 71:22 75:23 **newer** 54:11 **news** 67:14,15 77:20 **NIBRS** 34:4 46:23 63:3 **niche** 46:3 night 80:17 nonpolitical 57:9 **nonprofit** 55:10 69:12 nonprofits 43:18 44:21 Norma 1:10,13 4:6 46:12 **North** 75:3 Northwest 1:9 noted 10:23 12:23 51:12 notice 4:7 53:18 NOVEMBER 1:5 Nth 56:11 number 13:9 21:17 32:17,17 40:23 67:10 80:14 numbers 22:3 34:5

0

o'clock 81:12 oath 55:13 **Obama** 80:25 **objection** 39:3 41:23 **objections** 41:25 44:9 **obligation** 63:23 75:9 observation 33:4 obtain 14:16,17 obtaining 33:11 **obviously** 20:3 73:17 occurred 42:2 53:22 **OCRE** 50:14,25 61:8 63:2,7 73:16,21 80:16 October 35:13 37:4,9 offer 18:10 62:11 offered 50:8 office 2:8 73:8 officer 2:14 12:9 officers 13:20 16:4.13 offices 15:22 72:24 officials 15:12 16:25 17:5 old 79:3 omitted 21:21 once 77:9 ones 17:6 54:23 64:14 ongoing 4:10 online 5:20 17:20 20:11 open 24:10 25:15,23 70:2 opened 77:4 opening 53:14 70:10

Unedited operated 54:12

opinion 66:14,15 **opportunity** 6:14 14:16 21:11 38:5 73:24 76:10 81:1 **opposed** 5:24 34:4 58:14 opposing 32:19 58:15 opposite 8:1 **oranges** 38:13 order 4:5 5:15 6:4 30:4 36:6 orders 46:14 organizations 9:10 28:22 30:5 36:7 50:9 69:12 organized 7:16 9:4 original 26:22,23 30:11 33:18 36:11 52:25 54:5 originally 27:5 outlier 38:10,15 outliers 54:22 outline 23:23,25 29:17 32:14 37:20 53:1.16 65:4 outputs 75:19 outside 7:9 15:21 outstanding 66:8 oversight 16:1,10 17:2 overtly 41:2

Operations 3:18 65:25

P 1:15 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4.1 **p.m** 81:15 Pam 66:10 73:8 PAMELA 2:6 pandemic 4:11 69:8 73:11 panelist 10:2 12:7 13:7 13:8,16 15:17 16:3 panelists 7:24 9:11 10:10,14,18,23 11:3 15:17 21:10 Panther 41:9 pants 39:16 paper 21:24 25:7 26:8,9 26:11 27:24,24 28:2 28:20 29:5,15 30:2,14 30:24 31:2,8 32:1 33:5,15 35:5,21 36:4 41:14,15,17 43:13 44:4,12 46:25 47:13

overview 62:10

owners 10:24

48:20 50:1 papers 42:24 paperwork 45:6 **PAR** 66:12 paragraph 39:7 44:3 parallels 78:25 Parliamentarian 1:22 part 15:12 21:7 26:8 30:23 37:12 44:14 45:9 57:5 75:6 participate 18:9,12 75:25 76:2 participation 30:4 36:6 particular 8:23 17:16 19:19 30:24 46:13 48:1 49:1 58:20 particularly 24:8 64:18 64:20 76:4 party 41:9 54:7 pass 72:18 passage 35:10 passed 8:18 27:24 40:6 44:4,7,12 48:20,23 76:14 **passing** 76:12 passionate 70:21 Pat 74:3 path 73:23 **Pathways** 2:11,12 patriotism 23:8 pattern 9:21 pay 77:2 payer's 37:16 peacefully 81:7 **penal** 57:10 pencil 21:24 people 9:25,25 12:11 19:22 20:17 21:5 22:25 23:3 24:7 29:3 34:15 39:4 41:12 47:19,25 48:10 55:6 56:9,15 57:19 60:25 63:13,13 69:14,15 74:23 77:3 78:9,18 79:19 people's 14:8 percent 9:11 10:12 21:20,20,22 63:25 percentage 21:18 peremptorily 32:18 performance 66:11 **period** 79:18 perplexing 37:6 **PERRY** 2:12 person 4:13 13:12 personal 69:20 personally 34:16

persons 11:7 58:11 **perspective** 7:17 17:14 17:17 18:5 pertinent 28:23 **PETER** 1:18 phone 4:12,14 24:23 34:23 35:2 photograph 73:1 pick 43:5 46:15 **piece** 50:25 place 14:5 17:2,10 26:8 28:21 33:12 placed 8:10 **places** 14:21 33:19 68:18 75:23,24 78:1 plan 23:24 24:1 26:11 26:22,24 27:5 29:16 31:19 37:21,24 51:3 51:13,17,23 53:17 58:15 62:5 65:5 72:18 planning 67:13 72:11 plans 39:19 40:24 67:16 plate 63:16 played 51:5 please 4:16 5:22 6:11 17:22 18:18,22 21:6 29:19,22 34:20 35:2 39:10 40:18 52:19 64:25 **pleased** 74:19 pleasure 72:23 73:5 75:22 76:2 **point** 13:1 19:19 38:17 40:1 49:23,23,25 50:18,21 53:11 57:25 pointed 20:20 points 13:15 56:1,8 **police** 8:2,3 16:4,12 21:15 22:17 55:8,9,11 56:17,18 69:9 policies 68:21 policing 22:17 policy 29:7 69:4 76:1 political 41:2 54:7 61:6 politics 55:7,11 56:9 61:4,21 **pool** 37:2 55:3 61:17 poor 9:24 poorly 39:16 population 48:9 portrait 72:25 position 16:5 17:4 positive 8:6 possibility 28:2 possibly 19:21 42:3 potential 8:20 potentially 19:1

personnel 56:14

openly 15:7

professional 46:17

proffered 50:3

power 14:20 15:9 17:6 powerful 7:13 68:13 practice 22:11 practices 21:2 22:19 78:12 predecessors 78:20 predicate 42:8 predominantly 47:25 preference 63:22 **prepare** 67:19 prepared 55:18 preponderance 11:20 present 1:12 2:5,17 4:16,17,20,22 5:7,8 5:11,12 13:14 presentation 6:5,6 7:1 10:2 12:7,14,18,23 28:1 43:15 69:16 71:20 Presentations 3:12 6:2 presented 45:17 77:22 presenting 75:16 President 80:25 presidential 72:13 presiding 1:11 **Press** 1:9 pressing 23:15 presumption 10:25 27:16 30:6 prevalence 57:17 previous 16:17 40:21 49:25 56:2,2 80:9 primarily 10:4 principally 50:11 principles 10:21 prior 51:14 prioritize 46:7 **prisoner** 69:3,8 **prisoners** 45:11,12 privilege 71:7 probable 16:6 probably 46:16 problem 15:4 17:7 24:4 40:7 63:18 **problematic** 15:24 16:3 **problems** 14:14,25 79:12 **procedural** 25:3 31:5 procedures 66:17 proceed 6:11 18:22 35:2 51:21 proceedings 19:11,12 process 13:12,19,21 20:14 37:19 50:16 56:15 57:6 59:8 61:9 78:11

profits 10:12 19:2 programs 2:9 19:1 62:9 progressive 39:25 project 62:6 projects 31:20 41:5 **promise** 78:10,15,18 79:24 **promises** 76:23 78:9,12 **proof** 48:19 **proper** 21:20 property 8:24 9:12 10:16,24 11:6 13:19 14:9,16 16:7,8,9 proposal 28:11 proposals 20:3 **propose** 33:7,7 proposed 5:19 16:16 19:8,10,17 25:1,20 26:15 33:18 37:20 51:22,24 prosecutor 70:24 prosecutorial 57:12 protect 55:12.14 protected 9:22 13:25 32:2 protection 11:2 68:14 78:10 79:18 protects 45:3 provide 21:10 23:11 34:14 79:23 provided 68:23 **public** 4:7,9,12 11:18 19:21,24 29:1 79:7,9 publicly 15:7 publish 11:24 **Puerto** 75:3 78:1 **pull** 22:1 **purely** 31:5 purpose 7:8 9:8 33:14 46:20 60:11,14,18 purposes 6:25 pursuant 48:25 pursue 8:3 pursuing 41:9 push 39:17,24 41:1 pushed 41:6 pushing 41:12 put 16:4,24 17:5,9 40:25 41:18 49:17 51:7 78:4 **puzzled** 34:10

quality 62:15 73:24

question 13:7 14:2,3

75:4

16:20,20 17:6,11,13
18:4,25 20:12 23:1
26:19 31:22 36:25
38:13,25 51:20 67:9
questioned 8:8
questions 10:20 12:14
12:18,20 17:21 18:18
23:4,5 31:16,25 32:23
51:13 52:4 53:24
64:25 66:6
queue 74:11
quick 18:25
quite 58:25
quorum 5:7
quote 35:9,10 42:1

R

R 56:24 racial 14:23 68:10,16 racism 31:1 69:10 rails 17:7,9 raise 15:9 56:8 raised 10:20 53:11 61:6 raises 36:25 raising 11:20 ran 14:3 rank 46:6 rankings 46:13 rarely 9:5,8 rate 47:4 58:7 rates 7:14 21:4 58:2,3,4 58:10,11 ratify 51:4 rationale 50:7 reach 7:9 79:11 reached 36:10 read 33:16 44:22 readily 50:10 ready 64:25 real 44:23 realm 15:21 reason 30:8 38:17 39:17,23 47:16 50:14 reasons 18:11,14 **rebuild** 79:13 recall 27:23,25,25 50:6 50:12 74:9 receive 18:13 54:15 received 32:21 66:14 recognize 65:22 67:25 73:25 recognizing 76:10 recollection 28:7,20 recommendation 12:13 recommendations 6:15 6:23,24 11:10 12:1 16:11

recommended 11:11

11:14 reconstruction 79:4,18 record 39:6 81:15 reducing 22:19 reduction 45:7 redundant 26:20 30:10 reexamine 22:18 reference 19:7 referenced 64:11 referred 35:24 reflect 22:18 78:3 reflected 57:22 58:4 75:5 reflections 69:20 reflective 57:13 reflexively 51:2 reform 16:11 69:7 reforms 11:15 12:4 regard 42:1,21 regarding 54:18 regards 22:23 Regional 2:9 reigned 45:21 reiterate 57:25 rejected 42:11 related 8:13 9:18 27:16 27:17 57:8,9,16 relates 56:3 relations 8:2 relationship 7:22 relationships 7:2,3 release 66:12 released 3:13 6:3 74:12 relevant 28:23 34:17 50:22 relief 77:6 religious 69:9 reluctant 18:11 relying 69:25 70:1 remained 54:1 55:1 remedies 79:1 remedy 79:24 remember 10:18 60:23 79:15 remotely 75:25 remove 5:16 16:12 removing 21:5 reopen 60:8 repeated 54:3 repeatedly 9:7 repetitive 36:16 reply 40:8 report 3:16,19 6:8,16 11:24 12:24 14:4 19:5 19:8 20:1,20 21:7,9 21:22,25 23:19,23 24:2,6 25:2,7,8,11 38:11 39:17 42:12

produce 45:23

produced 53:25 55:3

45:9.17 46:23.24.24 47:17 48:7 49:2,24 53:16 54:4,15 63:17 64:10 65:3,21,24 66:1 66:4,7,12 73:13 75:20 76:23 77:1,6,7,24 reporter 5:8,9 reporting 11:22 13:17 19:20 63:3 reports 3:13 6:3 21:12 21:12,18,19,23,23 39:18 40:23 63:3,14 63:15 64:1 68:8,22,24 73:21 74:7,11,14,19 74:20 75:6,21 80:15 representative 32:15 54:7 republican 54:10.19 55:2 60:25 61:17 Republicans 61:12,14 request 31:6,16 require 11:19 required 21:21 requirements 8:16,18 requires 45:16 78:22 research 24:1 29:16 37:20,24 44:23,25 45:3,8,16 47:18,19,21 50:23 51:17 53:17,24 54:21 63:24 65:4 researcher 63:21.23 researchers 46:10 residents 20:18 resources 19:4 56:17 respect 29:12 48:18 56:5 66:22 69:19 70:7 79:9 respected 23:12 respond 15:15 40:9,12 40:20 45:14 79:25 responding 68:19 response 5:7 14:2 18:8 31:22 68:14 responses 32:20 38:21 79:1 responsibilities 23:16 responsibility 15:5 55:13 responsible 15:12 rest 62:14 resulted 6:20 returned 8:25 returning 67:15

rights 1:1 4:4 7:2 9:22 10:6,6 13:9,14,24 32:7 46:12 66:25 67:4 68:8,14,22,24,24,25 69:1,2,2,3,5,11,14,22 69:23 70:21,24 71:17 72:5,7,21 73:17,23 74:21 75:12 76:18,23 77:14,17,21 78:3,5,17 79:4,7,17 **Rikers** 77:19 rise 57:2,3 rising 25:9,13 road 72:5,6,21,22 77:13 **Robert** 66:10 robust 11:22 19:20 role 50:25 51:5 68:19 72:15,16 roll 4:16 18:1 row 66:13 **Rukku** 74:5 rules 44:23 63:24 77:1

SA 59:25,25 60:20,20

ruling 79:12,15,16

61:7.7 **SA's** 63:5 safe 8:1 13:24 22:24,24 safer 7:21 20:17,18 21:6 22:25 23:3 **safety** 19:15 **sample** 32:11,14 **San** 56:19 **SAs** 74:5 satisfied 62:15 **saw** 37:2 60:15,16 61:17 73:11 saying 14:17 20:13 31:14 43:5 67:24 79:8 **says** 26:9 30:15 33:15 35:6,10,11,21 36:5 46:6,11 47:13 48:21 50:13 61:2 scars 79:20 scheduled 67:21 **se** 44:9 search 11:5 seat 39:16 second 23:21 24:12,17 24:19,22,23 25:2,18 25:19,21 49:23 54:2 71:14

seconded 53:3,6,7

secretaries 69:17

Secondly 31:10

secrets 38:4

section 25:8,12 sector 67:4 **seeing** 74:25 seen 24:2 seized 10:16 19:14 seizing 14:9 **seizure** 11:6 14:8 selected 58:20 selecting 53:21 selection 32:11 56:22 57:6,23 58:5 61:19 **self** 11:2 **send** 70:9 **senior** 29:19 sense 14:15 15:9,10 33:8 79:2 **senses** 16:3 sensitive 62:2 sent 18:6 59:14,23 60:2 60:9 sentencing 69:6 separate 35:7 **separately** 28:21 29:3 **September** 35:5,11 **series** 77:15 serious 52:2 seriously 75:9 serve 72:9,11,22 served 56:12 71:7 73:21 74:2 80:5 **service** 23:9,11 72:20 74:3 services 2:6 66:8 67:1 session 20:7 **sessions** 16:17 19:9 set 29:7 59:14 seven 6:23 8:10,11 11:9 sex 58:11 sexual 68:9,17 sexually 19:15 **shadow** 15:20 69:22 **share** 6:14 34:16 38:5 73:3 **shared** 9:11 10:10,19 53:21 55:4 sharing 12:2 sheriff's 15:22 21:15 Sheryl 74:6 **short** 54:18 shorter 53:25

significant 10:13 21:13 21:17 **SILVERIO** 2:23 64:16 64:18 simply 26:12 27:1 31:9 41:22 43:5 SIMUEL 2:24 sir 4:18 sit 72:24 74:22 75:12 site 28:8 sitting 46:17 76:7 80:20 80:21 situation 47:22 situations 42:16 six 6:23 8:10 9:17 11:10 38:1 53:20 68:8 71:3 71:8 73:6 74:1,10 slavery 79:14,19 **small** 62:6 **smaller** 61:11,13 sole 46:15 solely 34:4 somebody 14:16 **sorry** 24:14,24 52:2 70:15 sort 15:13 32:11 39:15 72:20 **source** 10:13 **speak** 23:10 29:19 40:14 68:4 69:11,12 73:22 **speaker** 40:21 77:15 speaking 29:22 **special** 58:21 59:4 72:12,15 79:22 80:7,8 **specific** 17:16 29:9 57:6 59:22 specifically 11:12 14:6 16:17 36:5 **speech** 68:10 spent 9:1 16:2 41:7 80:24 spirit 81:2 **spoke** 27:25 staff 1:21 2:5 3:19 4:7 5:10 27:2,4 29:12,14 31:12,22 32:21 36:10 36:10 37:3,8,19 38:12 39:8 40:2 44:8 48:23 51:6 53:25 54:21 58:22 59:4,25 62:2,23 62:24 63:1,6,7 64:22 65:20,21 66:1,18 67:20 73:7,9 80:12 staff's 58:21 staffers 74:5 **stand** 73:9

shout 80:7

63:21

10:2

show 36:15 43:23 63:21

showed 9:20,21,23

side 8:5 13:23 37:12

71:8 80:20

sides 49:19 80:22

reveals 51:10

revenue 10:13

Rico 75:3 78:1

Reverend 76:13

review 32:8 62:12

standard 4:5 11:20 32:7

standards 50:23 77:1 **stands** 58:15 start 24:9 53:17 72:20 **Starting** 7:2 8:11 **state** 3:12 6:2,7,18,21 9:12 20:25,25 21:2 23:9 57:10 58:6 75:6 75:9,14,22 statement 40:20 50:3 76:6.8 statements 56:2 69:4 76:1,9 states 24:9 32:16 58:3 58:9 75:13,17 statistical 50:19 statistics 62:10 statute 79:7,10 statutes 32:6 statutory 42:8,21 74:19 **stay** 23:14 **stayed** 33:13 **STEPHEN** 1:16 stepping 72:15 **stop** 43:1 **stops** 12:9 strain 78:23 79:1 strange 36:22 street 1:9 16:6 stretch 41:16 strong 10:8 structure 76:18 **students** 44:24 62:5 **studied** 28:16 30:3,7 33:6 34:12,21,22 35:22,25 36:5,13 37:25 44:5,7,19,22 45:12 47:14,15 48:22 51:25 52:1 55:21 studies 45:10,11 **study** 11:11 28:10,12 28:17 30:16 33:14,23 34:1,8 35:17 36:12 40:5 42:4 44:16,18 48:1,8,9,10 49:1 50:19 studying 27:15 33:10 34:13 39:22 42:4 43:22 44:4 46:22 **sub** 76:25 77:2,24 subject 31:17 subjects 47:21 51:8 **submission** 50:2 51:5 **submit** 63:17 **subscribe** 41:15,17 substance 31:4,8 succeeded 71:4 sufficient 11:5 suggested 7:25 16:4

46:15 suggestions 20:1 Sunshine 60:3 superb 74:4 supervisors 56:19 supplement 28:25 supplemental 33:19,23 53:19 support 19:2 22:7 41:25 71:14 76:4,8 supported 28:14 45:24 **suppose** 41:16 **supposed** 48:23 supreme 79:6 surrounding 42:5 **surveys** 37:19 susceptible 58:7 suspected 8:4 system 7:10 11:23 12:5

13:18 14:15 17:8

38:10 39:6 45:24

19:20 24:23 37:15

63:14 Т table 80:20.22 tabs 57:21 taken 13:19 **takes** 64:3 talk 8:9 27:7.19 28:24 29:2 55:16 60:12 65:24 67:20 68:6 74:23,24 77:8,14,16 talked 15:18 17:4 27:14 28:20 43:15 54:5 talking 49:19 50:24 57:23 59:8 target 9:9 targeted 7:16 targeting 9:3 tax 37:16 taxpayers 45:4 teaching 71:19 team 66:8.9 tell 22:10 46:5 67:16 telling 48:2 ten 6:10 21:19 44:20 tenor 30:22 32:1 tenure 68:7 term 68:1,4 72:24 terms 16:11 42:6 67:10

territories 75:18

testimonial 33:12

testimony 8:15 10:7

thank 4:7,9 5:6,10,14

6:12,13 12:12,16,22

13:2 17:15 18:24 29:4

test 43:7

13:6 14:2 16:19 17:11 17:19,20,25 18:15,17 18:24 20:8,10 22:15 22:23 23:8,13,17 26:6 27:12 28:3.7 29:25 32:22 33:3 36:20 40:19 43:8,24 48:17 53:8 63:11 64:21 66:2 66:21 67:4,6 70:14 71:9,18,19,22,24,25 72:3 73:3,6,13,19 76:3 77:10 81:1,2,13 thanks 80:4,7 theme 14:3 thin 39:16 things 14:18 42:23 59:8 70:4 76:14 third 21:18 34:2 49:25 **THOMAS** 2:24 thorough 62:24,25 thought 26:7 33:25 39:18 59:1,25 60:19 61:4 78:23 thoughtful 63:8 thoughts 78:2 thousands 41:8 three 7:1 8:10 9:2 33:25 62:5 76:4 throw 61:21 Thursday 60:9 tie 13:16 timeline 3:16 37:20 **Timmons-Goodson** 74:3 **Tina** 66:10 73:7 **TINALOUISE 2:8** today 18:24 23:16,25 42:12 51:3 73:16 75:20 81:9 today's 4:8 6:6 23:21 told 40:1 64:23,24

transcript 27:19 35:19 transparent 37:17,21

traveled 77:19.23 treated 75:9 treats 57:11 tremendous 41:1 66:23 trenches 73:10 tried 62:2 trigger 11:5 true 13:5 truly 32:15 trust 19:14 29:12 try 37:16,17 trying 12:24 38:3 39:2 47:6 60:23 74:16 79:13.25 turn 6:5 12:19,20 25:3 63:13,15 64:1 65:20 turns 72:8 **Tuskegee** 45:11 47:8 twisting 72:6,8 two 7:3,17 14:14 19:8 20:3 29:11 30:3 34:15 35:22 36:1,4 39:8 48:21 60:6 62:5 67:11 76:9 78:2 types 28:22 57:2,2,11 57:18

U

U.S 1:1 4:4 46:12 69:13 72:6 74:21 75:11 77:18 ultimately 29:15 **unable** 17:18 unanimity 76:9 unanimous 76:4 understand 13:5 17:3 27:2 37:9,10 38:9 39:2 44:19 46:4,9 49:7,19 50:2 51:6 54:20 63:19,20 78:5 78:16 understanding 26:1 51:9 58:21 61:7 75:4 76:17 77:4 understands 30:17 understood 51:25 undertaking 62:7 unfair 51:7 unfold 75:1 76:24 unfortunately 17:13 72:17 uniform 34:1,3 46:23 **Unit** 2:10 United 24:9 32:16 75:13 unnecessary 13:4 unpaid 23:11 unqualified 66:14 unquote 42:2

tool 7:12

topics 68:13

touch 76:19

tracks 11:23

tragedy 76:6

50:12,13

transition 81:5

37:22 45:16

38:3 64:5

Trauma 68:20

travel 77:17 78:1

transparency 8:17

track 16:1

top 54:23,24 61:14

tracking 12:5 20:22

unresponsive 58:23 unsubstantiated 41:3 upload 21:25 35:11 uploaded 35:5 urgent 69:5 USCCR 66:13,16,19,25 68:8 use 7:12 11:13 14:20 15:18 16:9,13 22:17 22:18 38:11 39:6 69:9 uses 16:14 usually 42:11 utterly 39:20 58:23

V V 1:13 4:6 vacation 33:8 validity 42:13 value 9:9 14:18 **valued** 23:12 variety 36:23 venue 50:8 **Vermont** 77:25 version 34:3 versions 49:25 **versus** 57:2 vice 74:3 victim 47:20 victimization 34:2 46:24 victims 3:15 23:19.23 24:11 27:15 34:8 47:1 47:24 48:3 53:15 65:4 Vidulovic 2:25 80:8 viewed 7:7,21 8:6,7 38:12 56:4 vigilantly 74:13 vineyards 69:21 78:4 violent 24:9 32:2,16 34:18 42:2 43:6 47:24 57:19 58:10,10 Virginia 77:25 virtually 5:5 visit 55:17 vitiates 44:11 Vivian 76:13 vocabulary 71:20 voluntary 63:14 vote 3:15 5:21 23:19,22 23:25 24:11 29:15 34:22 47:13 51:3,15 51:16,17,20,22 52:4,5 52:5,12,19 53:9 65:1 65:2,5,12,19 voted 29:4 30:1,2 47:11 47:22 49:9,24 50:1 56:5 68:23 76:8

68:21

wading 45:25

waiting 67:14

walked 13:11

walking 79:19

wages 76:25 77:3

wage 77:24

Wait 67:8

walk 14:25

wall 72:25

W

wanted 13:23 32:18 60:14.15 wants 40:12 warmly 23:7 warmth 80:23 **Washington** 1:10 33:13 wasn't 7:19 61:23 72:19 wasting 37:16 **watch** 73:3 way 14:17 15:13 16:1 19:24 21:23 22:7 24:7 31:12,14 43:3 45:3,15 45:23 46:4 48:10 74:21 78:6 80:15 ways 14:20 73:2 wearing 46:17 website 46:5 62:8 Wednesday 59:24 60:10 weeds 29:8 week 33:25 66:13 weeks 37:1 67:11 weighed 50:14 weird 14:19 16:5 17:8 welcome 4:3 23:14,18 went 20:21 31:19 61:16 77:25 81:14 weren't 8:19 west 71:21 whatsoever 61:5 widespread 57:17 willing 31:15 42:13,18 wind 72:21 wish 66:19,20 witnesses 12:24 20:13 witnessing 74:25 women's 69:1 wonderful 70:1 75:20 wondering 26:23 word 41:5 44:18 70:17 words 26:21 59:11,12 60:1,23 71:20 72:3 79:14 80:6 work 29:12 31:11 37:1 46:8 50:15 51:1 62:4 62:22,24,25 63:8 66:8

66:11,23,24 68:18 71:5 73:4,11,12,14,17 74:7,17 75:6,21 76:1 77:8,14 78:16 80:3,13 80:14.16 worked 55:10 69:21,22 74:12 working 44:20 73:21 80:17 works 7:15 workshops 77:24 **world** 77:4 **worms** 60:8 **worry** 35:1 worse 31:11 worth 9:13 38:14 **wouldn't** 49:15 write 39:8

Χ

Xavier-Brier 73:20 xenophobia 69:10

Υ

Yaki 1:20 5:4,5 28:4,4,5 28:6,6 30:18,19,20,21 40:9,16,17,19 51:12 52:17,18 55:22,23,25 65:17,18 67:8,17,23 70:12,13,15 71:15 78:4 year 23:22 29:10,11

year 23:22 29:10,11 34:9 62:12 66:13 years 10:15 36:1 39:14 41:8 45:2 62:5 69:19 71:3,8 72:10 73:6 74:1,10 80:16 yield 16:22 33:1 48:15

yielded 14:8 York 25:9,10,12,14 27:14,16,18 28:12,18 30:7,9,13 31:24 33:6 33:7,14 35:6 36:13,15 36:22 37:25 38:10,19 39:5,23 40:5 41:24,24 42:19 43:13,15,22 44:6,10,13,15,16,19 46:20 47:12 49:4,24 50:1,8 51:24 59:17

64:11,14 71:22 75:24 YORKMAN-RAMEY 2:13

yous 73:3

Zoom 4:14 69:11

10:00 1:10 **10:07** 4:2 10:08 4:5 100 10:11 **1036** 19:13 20:6 **108** 10:15 **1086** 20:6 12:00 81:12,15 **130** 21:12 **13th** 1:9 **1400** 12:9 **14th** 1:9 **15** 39:13 **156** 21:14 **17** 68:23 **18** 1:5 **1980** 55:10 1990s 72:19

2000 10:15 2015 8:15 9:12 21:1 2016 10:15 21:12 2018 9:12 21:12 2019 19:9 20:6 2020 19:9 20:7 2021 64:18,20 2022 1:5 2023 3:15 23:19,23 22 21:20 23 3:16 25 55:1,2 63:25

30 49:12 63:25 346 21:15

44 12:11 **47** 12:10,11

5

5 3:8 **50** 54:20,23 61:14,16 **500** 10:3,19 **529** 1:9 **540** 9:13 **58** 9:11 **5th** 68:2

6

6 3:13 **60** 69:4 **608** 21:14

61 21:21 **65** 3:19

voting 51:23 52:3 68:8

	Uned	nea	ı
6th 66:13			
7			
8			
8 12:10 81 3:21			
9 9th 68:3			

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Business Meeting

Before: US CCR

Date: 11-18-22

Place: teleconference

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate complete record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &