#### U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2008

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, CHAIRMAN

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, VICE CHAIRMAN (via telephone)

TODD F. GAZIANO, COMMISSIONER

GAIL L. HERIOT, COMMISSIONER

PETER N. KIRSANOW, COMMISSIONER (via telephone)

ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, COMMISSIONER (via telephone)

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., COMMISSIONER

MARTIN DANNENFELSER, Staff Director

#### STAFF PRESENT:

HYGINUS AGUZIE

DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel
CHRISTOPHER BYRNES, Director, RPCU
DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director
DEMITRIA DEAS
ROBERT LERNER, Assistant Deputy Staff Director, OCRE
TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director, Office of Management
EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor + Parliamentarian
LENORE OSTROWSKY, Attorney-Advisor, (OSD)
EILEEN RUDERT
KARA SILVERSTEIN, Attorney-Advisor (OSD)
KIMBERLY TOLHURST
VANESSA WILLIAMSON
AUDREY WRIGHT
MICHELLE YORKMAN

## **COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:**

TIM FAY
JACK KAMMER
DOMINIQUE LUDVIGSON
RICHARD SCHMELCHEL
KIMBERLY SCHULD

# A-G-E-N-D-A

	<u>PAGE</u>
I.	Approval of Agenda 4
II.	Approval of Minutes  July 11, 2008 Meeting
III.	Announcements14
IV.	Staff Director's Report16
V.	Program Planning 2008 Statutory Report
VI.	Management and Operations  Evaluation of AI on Order  of Precedence
VII.	State Advisory Committee Issues Discussion of SAC re-charter process45
VIII.	Future Agenda Items54
TX.	Adiourn 54

# PROCEEDINGS

2	(9:40:07 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The meeting
4	will come to order. This is a meeting of the U.S.
5	Commission on Civil Rights taking place on August 19 <sup>th</sup> ,
6	2008. The meeting is being held at 624 Ninth Street,
7	N.W., Room 540, Washington, D.C., with Commissioners
8	Thernstrom and Kirsanow participating by phone. The
9	remaining Commissioners present are Commissioners
10	Heriot, Gaziano, Taylor and Reynolds.
11	The first item on the agenda is the
12	approval of the agenda.
13	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I move that we approve
15	the Agenda. Is there a second?
16	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
17	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Can we amend the
18	agenda?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, we can.
20	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I move to amend the
21	agenda wherever the to place wherever the Chairman
22	would like a discussion of the 2008 Statutory Report.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
J	

1	favor, please say aye.
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Abby, I didn't hear
4	you.
5	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, Gerry.
6	You're not going to be able to hear me very well. I
7	guess it's I didn't I'm sorry, I sort of blanked
8	out for a minute. I didn't really listen, but I'll go
9	along with whatever people are deciding on.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's just a motion to
11	add a discussion of the Statutory Report.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Oh, that's fine.
13	Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: The current
15	Statutory Report.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And we also voted that
17	you do all the work, and we're glad that you have
18	agreed to do this.
19	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Okay. I go along
20	with that, too. You're going to be delighted with -
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
23	passes unanimously.
24	Okay. Next up, approval of the
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Do we want the Chair
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	to decide where that's going to go?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, it's going to go -
3	- it will be the first item under Program Planning.
4	So it will go 2008 Statutory Report and 2009 Briefing
5	Topics, 2009 Statutory Report.
6	Has someone joined us? Pete?
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm here.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Abby?
9	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I'm still here.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Yaki, Melendez.
11	All right. The second item is the
12	Approval of the Minutes of the July 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2008 meeting,
13	along with the I'm sorry, the July 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2008
14	meeting.
15	II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
16	JULY 11, 2008 MEETING
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I make this motion.
18	Is there a second?
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
21	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. We're on the
22	first Minutes. Just clarification. Maybe the Minutes
23	are fine as submitted, but under Program Planning,
24	first paragraph
25	CUATOMAN DEVINOLDES The second Wile also
	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. Which one

1 are you looking at?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm sorry. Can we take them both separately. I have one comment for each. You want to take July  $11^{\rm th}$  first?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Just let me know where you are.

July 11<sup>th</sup>, COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Okay. Program Planning, first paragraph second page 2, previous sentence sentence. The says that "Commissioners approved the motion to compel list for the year of briefing topics, and then vote to select items from that list on a quarterly basis with the understanding that items can be added or subtracted from the list." That makes sense to me.

The sentence Т think needs next "In addition, the list will include clarification. all previously approved and unscheduled topics from 2008, 2009." I would like it clarified that the list will include them upon the request of a particular and not because Commissioner or two, they are automatically going to be continued from year to year for infinity. I, again, just don't want the -- and I think that reflects our discussion.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is that --

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Commissioner

1 Melendez on the line. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, good. very Commissioner Melendez has joined us. 3 4 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: So I don't know 5 that it needs to be corrected, but if you want me just to clarify, I can change the way it would read. 6 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Has anyone reviewed the this point to confirm that 8 Minutes on his clarification conforms to what was discussed, what was 9 agreed to? I'll take that as a no. 10 11 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: There was definitely some sort of motion. It was 5-2. 12 13 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Well, the 5-2 was 14 on the whole program, and then there was a back and 15 forth on whether these would automatically be put in. 16 And then, as I remember it, we just said well, since 17 you've requested it, they'll be on the list. But I 18 thought we did not take a vote, we did not have a 19 majority that they would --20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Automatically. 21 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: -- automatically 22 forever more be on these lists, that they were on the 23 list because any Commissioner wants them to be. 24 might not make a difference, but given the way these

things have operated in the past --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director?

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I take that to mean that they're on the original list, but that it does say that items can be added or subtracted, so that I would agree with you that that means that they do not have to remain on the list forever.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There was --

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: But it seemed like the Commissioners would have to make a decision to take certain items off the list.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But that's the issue.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's sort of the issue. And there was a debate about whether these should be privileged in some way, and they were automatically on, and that others would have to go on. And I think that we never, I think, took a formal vote on that, but there was never a majority that they were automatically on. It was just agreed that all those that any Commissioner wanted, including these, would be -- but if we need to clarify in the transcript, I'm sorry, I just noticed this last night. Maybe we could clarify it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, Commissioner Yaki, I believe, argued that they should automatically go on the list.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I don't think we had an agreement.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I know that there was push-back. How about this; why don't we, essentially, table this, review the transcript. And if that's how it unfolded, then we can take this up at the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sure.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And, also, it has the benefit of having -- well, Commissioner Yaki will be here to correct you, correct all of your mistakes.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sure. And one of my concerns that I hope expressed then and now is, I don't know that there's universal agreement on what was previously approved and unscheduled. So it's sort of dangerous to require that they automatically be put on, when we're not certain what those really were. And so it's incumbent upon Commissioners to take the responsibility, if they think ones were important to them, whether they're approved and unscheduled, or otherwise, to let the Staff Director know. But that's my reasoning.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So, Mr. Staff Director, will you have someone just review the transcripts and see what we said? I just want to get

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

11 confirmation that Todd's understanding is reflected in
2 the transcript.
3 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Yes, I'll do
4 that.
5 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: And, if not, then
6 maybe we should --

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Table the Minutes?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, for the -- we're going to table which one, the 11<sup>th</sup>, the July 11<sup>th</sup>. So we'll vote on that next month. But moving to the July 28<sup>th</sup> Minutes.

# II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

JULY 28, 2008 MEETING

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. have another amendment to that, just to, I think, more accurately reflect the letter under page 1, Program Planning, the DOT Guidance Letter. I think that our letter - it is less accurate to say we just requested the Department of Transportation to take the Uniform it Standard. I prefer to read as follows: "Commissioners agreed to send а the letter President requesting why the Department Transportation was departing from the United States' official position which prevailed in the 9th Circuit in the Western States Paving decision, requiring states

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	implementing their DBE programs to make local findings
2	of discrimination before using race conscious goals to
3	achieve local DBE participation." So that someone
4	reading the letter will understand, reading our
5	Minutes, will better understand what our letter
6	actually said.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there an objection?
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: A question. Did
9	that language come out of the letter, the language you
LO	just read?
L1	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Not necessarily
L2	I didn't compare it word-to-word. This is just a
L3	description of the letter, but I think that's pretty
L4	accurate. Is that pretty accurate, as you remember
L5	it, everyone else?
L6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's accurate to my
L7	recollection.
L8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections? Okay. I
L9	guess we vote.
20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Commissioner
21	Melendez here.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I think that we
24	need to either look at what we actually said in the
25	Minutes. I don't think we should try to align what was

1	said in the Minutes to the letter. I think we have to
2	say the gist of these Minutes, what was actually said,
3	even if it doesn't line up with the letter. I would
4	think that if we're not sure to take it verbatim, that
5	that's what we need to do.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I don't think
7	that it needs to be verbatim, but I do believe it
8	needs to be accurate.
9	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I'm even more
10	certain it's accurate as to why we sent the letter,
11	and what we were trying to do, since I led the
12	discussion. So I think it's both consistent with the
13	text of the letter and consistent with our discussion.
14	I think that you were you voted against sending
15	the letter, but I think that reflects what the
16	majority's position was.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Additional
18	discussion? All in favor please say aye.
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And we're only
20	voting for the second set of Minutes.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That is correct, as
22	amended by -
23	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Are we voting on
24	the amendment first, or all.
25	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Vote on this

	NEAL R. GROSS
25	III. ANNOUNCEMENTS
24	of August.
23	Next up, the announcements for the month
22	in favor of the motion.
21	Melendez abstains. The remaining Commissioners voted
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
19	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'm abstaining.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
17	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Abstain.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Objections?
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	please say aye.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor,
12	doesn't require any -
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Which I believe
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Friendly amendment.
8	Gaziano.
7	the July 28 <sup>th</sup> Minutes, as amended by Commissioner
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We're voting on
5	That's fine.
4	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: That's fine.
3	going to wrap it all -
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I was just
1	change of language.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This month marks the 43<sup>rd</sup> anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act. The Act was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson on August 6, 1965. The Voting Rights Act suspended literacy, knowledge, and character tests designed to keep blacks from voting in the south. It also authorized the appointment of federal voting examiners and barred discriminatory poll taxes. Today we recognize the impact of this important law.

I also want to acknowledge that President George W. Bush issues a Proclamation declaring July 26<sup>th</sup> as the day in celebration of the 18<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Americans With Disabilities Act, which ended discrimination against the disabled in employment, public services, accommodations, and 26, 1990, President telecommunications. On July George H.W. Bush signed this comprehensive Act into law. The ADA better enables citizens with disabilities to participate fully in all aspects of On this anniversary, we celebrate the vital life. contributions of individuals with disabilities, and the role the ADA has played in ensuring their full and equal participation in the workplace and elsewhere.

Next up we have the Staff Director's Report.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Wait a minute, Mr.
2	Chairman. The description of the Voting Rights Act is
3	incorrect. It does not include a ban on poll taxes.
4	That was both a constitutional amendment and a Supreme
5	Court case, but it is not the Voting Rights Act, which
6	simply has a mention of doing a study about poll
7	taxes.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, this is the
9	benefits of having an expert on the Voting Rights Act
10	as a member of the Commission. Thank you for the
11	correction, Vice Chair Thernstrom.
12	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: You're most
13	welcome, Mr. Chairman.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Next up we have the
15	Staff Director's Report. Mr. Staff Director.
16	IV. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
17	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank you,
18	Mr. Chairman. I want to update the Commissioners on
19	some of the projects Staff has been working on since
20	the last Commission meeting.
21	In the area of appropriations, Staff has
22	begun working on the FY 2010 budget process. Offices
23	and divisions have submitted their completed budget
24	call work sheets. These work sheets have been
25	forwarded to GSA, who will help the Agency draft a

budget and operating plan.

After a temporary delay due to negotiations with OMB, we are preparing to send our FY 2009 budget proposal to Congress. All of the budget proposals approved by Commissioners at the July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting remain intact, although some language, and a couple of charts that were previously in there received an objection from OMB.

In the Office of General Counsel, the Commission received notice that the Agency was successful in its defense of a contract appeal action, and OGC has also continued to work on a Merit System Protection Board claim, including preparation of several motions and pleadings.

In the area of complaints processing, between June 23<sup>rd</sup> and July 18<sup>th</sup>, the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation received and processed 178 complaints. And in the area of technology, last month the Agency's email server crashed due to building power outages, and the Agency's limited backup capability. Therefore, I have authorized the purchase of a new backup system with surplus funds from the FY 2008 budget.

Regarding performance management, on  $\hbox{August} \quad \hbox{8$^{th}$ managers and supervisors submitted}$ 

performance appraisals in order to close out the performance period for the fiscal year.

In the area of the Statutory Report, some of this will be subject, potentially, to change during the discussion I imagine that comes up shortly, but Commissioners received a revised draft of the FY 2008 Statutory Enforcement Report enforcing prohibitions of religious discrimination in prisons on August 8th. There was a request for comments on the draft to be submitted by August 22<sup>nd</sup>, and that it would then be sent back out to Commissioners on August 29<sup>th</sup>. draft has undergone the required reviews. And I've also, due to the concerns about some legal and policy issues in the report, I have asked Ken Marcus, our former Staff Director, who's also an expert religious liberty to provide us with some assistance on the legal and policy review of the document, provide some feedback to us on how -- to make sure we're saying things that are accurate. And, perhaps, how that can be improved.

In the area of regional activities, our regions have organized SAC meetings for the month of August. The District of Columbia had a SAC meeting on August 6<sup>th</sup>, Georgia has one scheduled for August 28<sup>th</sup>, Kansas also August 28<sup>th</sup>, Kentucky held one on August

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

8<sup>th</sup>, Missouri has one scheduled for August 20<sup>th</sup>, and 1 Utah also has one scheduled for August 20<sup>th</sup>. 2 3 There will be ten student interns working with the Southern Regional Office during the Fall 2008 4 5 semester, and the student interns will assist the regional office in research supporting SAC project 6 7 activities. And that's my report, Mr. Chairman. 8 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Questions? 9 10 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Commissioner 11 Melendez. I have a question on two reports, the Voter Fraud and Intimidation and Racial Categorization in 12 2008. Have these been issued, or what's the status? 13 14 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: The Voter 15 Fraud is about to be sent to the printer, and the 16 Census Report has been finalized but not printed yet. 17 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. The other 18 question I had, did you say Ken Marcus was hired as a 19 consultant, or what did you say? 20 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Yes. I've 21 asked him on a very short-term consultant-basis to 22 provide analysis of the report, and some feedback on 23 making sure that it's accurate in terms of the legal 24 section, in particular. But, also, general policy 25 feedback in terms of how we're characterizing issues

1 relating to religious liberty, given his expertise in 2 that area. MELENDEZ: And 3 COMMISSIONER the other 4 question I had, did we submit the 2008 budget 5 justification to Congress a month ago? 6 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: The 2009 I 7 think you mean. We're about to do that. We had a delay with objecting to 8 OMB some language, 9 objecting to a couple of the charts that were in 10 there. And we went back and forth with them over that 11 for a while, and are now ready to submit it. 12 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Are there any 13 changes to the budget since the last time we met on 14 it? 15 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: There's no 16 changes to the substantive part, in terms of 17 dollars and the hires and that sort of thing. 18 is some change to some language characterizing our 19 budget history and that sort of thing. 20 COMMISSIONER \$500,000 MELENDEZ: The surplus that we currently have, what's the status on 21 22 that? 23 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, from 24 the items that I described at the meeting in July, we 25 had been going through the procurement process on

1	moving forward on those. They're in varied stages of
2	approval going through the procurement process. And
3	the new thing that I mentioned a few minutes ago was
4	this backup system, so there'll be I believe the
5	marginal difference is about another \$26,000 on having
6	this backup system for our email. So we still
7	probably have a little bit of a surplus, but we have
8	made commitments on a large part of it at this point.
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
10	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: May I?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, sure.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Staff Director,
13	what is the status of the briefing report on the
14	educational effectiveness of HBCUs?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: That has
16	been sent out to Commissioners, the final draft has
17	been sent out to Commissioners, and it's a matter of
18	scheduling it for consideration at a meeting.
19	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Do we have a
20	particular deadline? I don't have one in my mind
21	today, but do we have a -
22	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, I
23	think we would -
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It has a natural
25	affinity for the subject of the next briefing.

1	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So I thought it
3	would be nice to -
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have a question.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
6	Melendez, hold on. Commissioner Heriot, are you
7	finished?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
10	Melendez?
11	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Were there
12	any other consultants that we hired before Ken Marcus?
13	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, we've
14	hired so far three of the consultants that we
15	discussed in terms of providing assistance to the
16	Commissioners. But those are separate type of
17	consultants. But all of them -
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Is that at an
19	extreme cost to us or is that coming out of the
20	surplus? How are we paying for those?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: The
22	consultants to help the Commissioners?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
24	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: That's money
25	from our surplus.
	NEAL D. ODOGO

1 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. Any idea 2 how much that is? 3 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, the 4 cap that we agreed to for those four consultants, 5 potentially four consultants was \$50,000 total. 6 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions? Okay. Next up, 2008 Statutory Report. 8 9 PROGRAM PLANNING 10 2008 STATUTORY REPORT 11 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The deadline for 12 distributing this report is looming. I open up the floor for questions or comments. 13 14 COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I maybe just begin 15 that discussion. I thought the most recent draft was 16 improvement on the earlier one, but I still thought it 17 had some substantial problems, which I've communicated 18 in part to the Staff Director. And I make mention a 19 couple of them, but I'd be interested in hearing 20 whether other Commissioners agree. 21 I think the legal section was much longer 22 than and contains necessary, some errors, 23 controversial passages that still are not worth us 24 trying to sort out. I made my thoughts on those

And I think that several of the other sections

known.

still need a fair amount of work, so I was just wondering whether other Commissioners are interested in commenting at this time.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Ι agree with Commissioner Gaziano that the legal background section needs quite a bit of work. And I think the direction we ought to go in is to make it very, very short, simply state what statutes, like RIFRA and RLUIPA, I also would put require. in а very brief description, mainly a quote from the Prison Litigation Reform Act, because I think that that bears a lot, in my opinion, on why RIFRA and RLUIPA are working reasonably well, why we don't see the floodgates of litigation opening thus far. So that's what I would do, I would leave out the constitutional treatment entirely, very controversial from what I know of this area of law.

I would say it's pretty much as subtle and difficult as any area of constitutional law you are ever going to run across. If you were to take the top ten experts in this area, they wouldn't agree with each other, and we don't have to weigh in on issues like that. There's no particular reason, nothing from our standpoint turns on this, so I would very much

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

like to see the section on the law tamped down to a minimum.

As for the rest of it, I think that there is information in here that would be useful to Congress, useful to policy makers. I wish there were more such information. There's still a fair amount of sloppiness in these sections. For example, let me see, one of the tables in here that was identified as "Comparison of Religious Affiliations of United States Adult Population to Inmates in Federal Prisons."

If you look down further on the page, you find that it's not inmates in federal prisons, but rather federal inmates engaged in faith-based activities in prison, which is a subset of the federal prisoners. And there's a big difference there. The federal prisoners themselves, collectively, may have a very different religious demography here. So I think that we need a lot of work here.

I think that the current findings and recommendations don't comport with what I would find and recommend. And I did send in my comments, and so I was actually, frankly, surprised to find recommendations that didn't seem to comport with any of the Commissioners I had spoken to.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

comments?

All right. Next, 2009 Statutory Report Topics.

#### V. PROGRAM PLANNING

#### 2009 STATUTORY REPORT TOPICS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: During the July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, we approved a process for selecting briefing topics. Starting with fiscal year 2009, we'll compile a list of topics, including a description of the subject matter, and then vote on a quarterly basis to select topics from the list that will be the subject of public briefings.

Topics can be added and subtracted throughout the year, and all previously approved and unscheduled topics from 2008 and 2009 will be included on the list, provided a Commissioner makes that request.

For fiscal year 2008, we approved, but did not schedule five briefing topics. They are the Patriot Act and Anti-Arab/Anti-Muslim Discrimination, Religious Discrimination in the Workplace, Racial Profiling, the U.S. Department of Justice Remedies, review of the Community Reinvestment Act, the Faithbased and Community Initiative.

For fiscal year 2009, we were scheduled to

take up the issue of Voting Rights in the U.S. territories as our first -- in November of 2008 as our first topic for the new fiscal year, but agreed at our last meeting to reconsider the subject for this briefing under the new process.

We had also previously agreed to consider six additional briefing topics for 2009, including School Choice as a Civil Right, Racial Disparities in Health Care Access and Outcomes, Misuse of the Disparate Impact Theory, Disparate Treatment of Native American Victims in Criminal Investigations and Prosecutions, Application of State and Local Marriage and Family Law to Gay and Lesbian Americans, and Single Sex Education.

On August 7<sup>th</sup>, the Staff Director sent an email to Commissioners seeking ideas for additional topics. This is the last call briefing Commissioners to submit new topic ideas for the list under consideration. Please submit the briefing topic with a brief description of what the briefing proposes to study. A final list of topics will be circulated by the Staff Director in advance of our next business meeting, so Commissioners can write their preferred topics to pare down the list. We will select from the pared down list of topics at our next business

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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	meeting.
2	At this time, I'd like to open the floor
3	for discussion and suggestions from Commissioners.
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is
5	Commissioner Melendez here.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Since the first
8	quarter of 2009, in trying to determine three months
9	in advance, which will be sometime in I believe either
10	October or November, and it sounds like we were
11	scheduled to have a business meeting in October
12	therefore it follows that in November, the $7^{\text{th}}$ of
13	November, we were looking at both the Voting Rights
14	and U.S. Territories. Is that where we kind of stand
15	now?
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that our current
17	posture?
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I thought we
19	eliminated all previous commitments, that those topics
20	are up for a vote, are up for reconsideration, but
21	that officially we have nothing approved for the
22	November hearing. That's my understanding -
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: My point is that I
24	thought we had scheduled this though already.
25	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: My understanding is

our vote -

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: For November  $7^{\rm th}$  on Voting Rights and the U.S. territories. I recommend that we keep that there since we don't have a lot of time.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: My understanding of our vote at the last meeting was that we took it off the schedule. What goes back there is subject to the process that the Chairman described.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And so that's why it's important for all of us to give this a fair amount of thought, so that we can come up with our list, and eventually settle on a topic for at a minimum, the November -

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Sure. May I ask a question just about how -- if they're going to be circulated beforehand, maybe -- I don't know if you have an idea of the best way to proceed. Maybe we should vote, and narrow it down to the top two or three, and then just vote at the next meeting. So instead of just necessarily our individual choices without conversation resulting in the topic prior to the next meeting, that we use that process to narrow it down to the top two or three, or something like that.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is Commissioner Melendez. My understanding that when we clean the slate of all of the topics that the Commissioners had agreed to the November 2009 Voting Rights and U.S. Territories. I think we need to clarify if we said that or not.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: No, there's no question that we didn't say that - I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, to bust in like this. There was quite a low level of interest in that topic, and the last--if somebody can go back to the transcript, but we left that November slot open as a "to be decided". But that was the one topic on which we were clear that it was not a real decision to support for, in order to keep it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom, just to add to the complication, if we're going to vote on the briefing topic in September, the question has been raised whether we should push it back, the actual briefing, push it back to December to allow the staff adequate time to prepare.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Well, I think that that's a good idea. And I also think it would be an excellent idea to tie the topic in some way to the November vote, because there are bound to be issues

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

involving-- and there are bound to be allegations of disfranchisement, and so forth, that would fall under the rubric of our authority to investigate. So I think we -- I think both, we should push it to November, and we should try to think of formulating the topics that comes out of the November results.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think that we will add that topic to the pot.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Yes, we can add it to the pot. That's fine. I'm just throwing it out for consideration.

if we should -- I'm disinclined to want to push back the time for it at this meeting. In September when we select a topic, then we can decide whether or not it needs to be pushed back to December, or whether November would be better. If we select a topic that the Staff can put together easily, then we might want to go forward in November. If we select a voting issue, we might want to do it in December, or if we aren't sure, we might want to do it in December, or we pick something that needs more preparation. But why decide to push it back at this meeting?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Staff Director, what are your concerns about Commissioner

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

	Heriot's proposal? What are the logistical
2	challenges?
3	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I think one
4	of the main logistical challenges is lining up the
5	panelists, scheduling the panelists. And if we have
6	only less than two months to schedule the panelists,
7	that will be one of the problems.
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: My point is, we
9	don't know the topic yet, so we don't know how hard
10	it's going to be to schedule the panelists. They may
11	be very obvious ones that can be done very quickly.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So your proposal,
13	essentially, is that we remain flexible, and make that
14	decision once we have more information.
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, just in case,
16	there may be a topic, like there may be something hot
17	before Congress to where we want to get it in more
18	quickly.
19	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: There may be a lame
20	duck session that we want to have some -
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes, don't commit
22	ourselves to pushing something back at this point.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Other comments?
24	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Commissioner
25	Melendez. The reason for the two topics is that we

33
should stay with the Voting Rights and U.S.
Territories is that it is right after the Presidential
election, so I still think we should do something on
Voting Rights so it's a small enough size topic that I
think our staff should have ahead of time, and still
be interested in the election rather than focusing on
something else. So that's my reason on focusing on
this election, it would be important I think that the
Commission should be looking at something along those
lines as far the Voting Rights.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, we will
circulate all the topics, and I trust that you would
re-circulate that particular briefing topic. And then

d in September, we would have a discussion and make our selection.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. I don't know decided that it needs to be today, but is suggestion on how the process would work reasonable, or do you want any discussion of that right now from other Commissioners?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, if anyone has any additional comments -

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We should vote and narrow down the range, and then have a discussion among the range, whatever that -

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, describe the mechanics. Do you envision -

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: I imagine the first step, obviously, is we're all going to get our topics to the Staff Director. The Staff Director is going to circulate the list to us, and then instead of just - we voted in the past, I understand, rank order, do you want us to send votes back to the Staff Director? If we do that, he can tell us what the review, what the top three are, the top two are.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Or we could just discuss them all, and decide. But I think it's best that whatever that vote is not be an automatic vote, because I might vote -- my second best might be something -- anyway, you understand that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Staff Director?

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I think what we could do is once all of the recommendations come in, I could then, with some explanation, a brief explanation of the topic, that I could then turn list around and send that back out the to Commissioners and ask them to rank their top five choices in order, and then give a point system to those top choices, that the top choice would be worth

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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	five points, the second choice four points, and so on.
2	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Right. And maybe
3	we could then still have them all, and anyone can
4	still advocate, but we'll know something about other
5	people's preferences at the time we have that
6	discussion. Does that make sense?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. In fact, we did
8	something similar in the past in terms of the scoring
9	system.
10	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. I may have
11	misunderstood -
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. It's important
13	to make sure that the top voters have automatic -
14	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: Yes. I just
15	misunderstood maybe the way it happened in the past,
16	but I understood it was more automatic in the past.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It was. It was.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: We would
19	just have to make we could make a decision on the
20	top three, or four, or five to consider among those.
21	That might be one way of doing it.
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. The point is
23	just to make sure that it's not the top vote getter is
24	automatically the winner.
25	COMMISSIONER CAZIANO: I actually think it

1	may be informative to see that certain ones don't get
2	any votes time and time again, so I think it's fine
3	just to give us a list of all of them, and we can just
4	consider it.
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chair, is there
6	a date certain by which suggestions should be in?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Staff Director?
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So you could have
9	time to turn it around, we can make sure the process
10	is orderly.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I would say
12	by Friday of next week.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does that work for
14	everyone?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: The 29 <sup>th</sup> .
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes. Although I've
17	given proposals before that just seem to get lost.
18	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: They won't this
19	time.
20	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'll have it
21	delivered by an eagle or something.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Additional
23	conversation, additional discussion?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Could you just
25	repeat the day this is due, Friday?
	NFAL R. GROSS

1 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Friday, August 29<sup>th</sup>. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. Next up is 3 a discussion of the 2010 Budget Submission. 4 5 PROGRAM PLANNING 6 DISCUSSION OF FY 2010 BUDGET SUBMISSION 7 Mr. Staff Director, CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: please provide an update. 8 9 STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: 2010 10 budget, again, as I said, Staff has gotten what's 11 called a budget call, and they've submitted their proposals. And we are then going to roll that up and 12 13 get that to the -- the plan is to get the detailed 14 information to the Commissioners by Friday, August 15 29<sup>th</sup>. And what I would like to propose, what has 16 happened in this regard is that OMB normally requires that this budget be submitted by September 15<sup>th</sup>. 17 18 year they've moved the deadline up a few days to 19 September 10<sup>th</sup> because of the impending change 20 administration. So what I would like to propose is that we have a telephone vote on or about September 5<sup>th</sup> 21 22 so that we can consider the 2010 budget. 23 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is that enough time 24 for everyone?

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER

MELENDEZ:

25

Commissioner

Melendez here. We haven't received anything having to do with the 2010 budget, as far as I know, and it's already August. And if you're talking about doing something before the September briefing, I don't think that's going to be enough time, unless you try to do a business meeting along the list of briefing. And I don't really like to do budgets over the phone. I hope that we can do it face to face, have the documents in front of us.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a good point. Commissioner Melendez makes a good point. If we're going to receive this by the 29<sup>th</sup>, and have a vote by the 5<sup>th</sup>, that assumes that this group of Commissioners, that there's a high probability that this group of Commissioners will come together, reach a consensus, not have many questions, and looking at our past track record, I suspect that that's not likely to happen.

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: I think historically, though, this particular budget proposal has been less contentious, the one to go to OMB has been less contentious than the idea of going to Congress, because, for instance, I would anticipate that we would request eight Commissioner's assistants

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2	budget we would submit to OMB. And that has been a
3	big topic of concern for Commissioners in terms of the
4	budget.
5	Now, if we come back with getting less
6	than we asked for, then we get into some tougher
7	decisions in that regard. And, of course, the
8	Commissioner's Assistants were pared down to four, as
9	an example. We could get some summary information
10	earlier than August 29 <sup>th</sup> . August 29 <sup>th</sup> is in terms of
11	what GSA is helping us prepare, the kind of documents
12	that they are preparing, we can put together perhaps a
13	two-page background, and that would describe the
14	highlights of the proposed budget that could be sent
15	to Commissioners prior to that date.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That would be helpful.
17	It's nice to have the draft document, I guess the
18	final draft we'll call it. But that works for me.
19	Commissioner Melendez, is that
20	satisfactory, that approach?
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: What was that
22	again?
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That prior to the
24	$29^{\text{th}}$ , the Staff Director will provide some information.
25	And he also made a good point, that this is just our

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: -- in the

	40
1	submission to OMB. This is not our final submission.
2	And in this particular submission, for example, some
3	of the contentious issues, like special assistants for
4	each of the Commissioners - well, this budget
5	submission would request funds for special assistants
6	so that we can all have a special assistant.
7	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. I still
8	need to see some material at some point, then I'll
9	kind of weigh in after that.
0	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I don't know or have any idea where we're going to have an obligation far meeting our statutory duties of as Commission that have to do with money going to the back to the different regions so that's why it's important to me to see the big picture, when we're going to be appropriating money for the 2010 budget. So if you can give me that stuff, I'll look at it at that point and see what my comments will be, whether we can meet face to face, or try to do it by phone.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up is the Evaluation of the AI on Order of Precedence.

#### MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS VI.

## EVALUATION OF AI ON ORDER OF PRECEDENT

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: During the July 11<sup>th</sup>

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

business meeting, Commissioner Melendez raised a question about the current chain of command at the Commission, AI 1-18B states that, "When the Staff Director and Deputy Staff Director are both absent, the Assistant Staff Director for the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation shall assume the duties and authority of the Acting Deputy Staff Director."

At this point, I open up the floor - well, actually, Mr. Staff Director, would you like to speak to this issue?

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an AI that was developed in February 2002, it in place under and has been Commissions that have been majority Democratic appointees and majority Republic appointees, I believe that it is clear how it works. is something that we can operate, if need be. There is a mechanism in place for the Assistant Staff Director for the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation to assume the duties.

And beyond that, I am still able, barring some more serious situation, I'm still able, even when I'm away, to be in communication with the staff through email, and telephone, and so on. I was away, actually out of the office all last week, but staff is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

well aware, I was in frequent contact with them. And there was one situation where we needed to have a signature for moving forward on these consultants, and I was able to delegate the authority for signing of the paperwork that was needed. So we do have a mechanism for doing that, Ι think this SO ultimately a judgment call for the Commissioners. I do believe that this is a mechanism that is place, and it has existed on a bipartisan basis for about six years now.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is Commissioner Melendez. It's my understanding that the 2002 AI is kind of outdated, based on the fact that the order of precedence one of the positions has entirely been eliminated, and that was the position of Deputy Staff Director who has been in that kind of chain of command, and that the position of Assistant Staff Director for the Office of Civil Rights basically been Evaluation and has changed downgraded, I'm not sure from an SES or a GS position, which doesn't change the position and you're referring to the 2002 chain of command to do things like--it kind of creates a problem, whether or not that AI has to be changed, or what are you actually saying here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, Commissioner

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Melendez, has anything happened that has caused you to be concerned? I guess I'm suggesting an approach of if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

The system that -- the AI that's been in place for I guess six years, it appears to me that it's worked. And, in fact, I -- I'm just trying to get a better understanding of what's driving you on this issue.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, I -

COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: May I ask a question, too?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well I know that in the past, I believe that Marty has done a great job by having the cell phone and all of those different things so that he can be reached, but I still think that somebody has to be in charge, and I also believe they have to have the authority based on the AI's that should be in charge, should he be gone for vacation, or whatever it may be. I just think that we should follow the regulations, whatever they are. People have, for example, Debra Carr's different position I wonder why she isn't being put into the order of precedence on this whole issue. I'm not talking about individual personalities or you know partisanship or anything like this, I'm just saying following the AI,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

as who should be in the chain of command, whatever the regulations say.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, it appears as if you're objecting to the current chain of command.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, who is that? COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: If I can take minor exception with one thing that you said, Commissioner Melendez, we -- as I understand it, we certainly didn't eliminate the position as Deputy Staff Since we're going to request funds, and Director. we're going to get millions and millions of extra dollars, at some point, hopefully, the Commission will be able to fill that position. But I think that we ought not to change an AI succession that makes perfect sense for the positions just because you think in any given moment the person who sits in it isn't you would prefer take over under to hypothetical situation. So I think it makes logical sense to have the people in the chain of succession

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And the other concern I have is that it also has to do with who can supervise who as far as the SES person is being able to supervise a GS-8 person, does that create a problem whether they're SES or General Administration.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that we have right now.

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	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, it could.
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: or General
3	Schedule.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It could create a
5	problem, depending on the length of time. It's my
6	understanding that a GS-15 can supervise an SES for a
7	limited period of time. I believe that period is 240
8	days.
9	Now, I suspect that if Marty were to find
10	a better opportunity, although I don't believe that
11	one exists. But, in any event, if Marty gets hit by a
12	bus, or if Marty leaves, we have 240 days to locate -
13	the President would have to locate and recommend a
14	replacement. And I believe that we can get that done
15	in 240 days. And, if necessary, we can do what we've
16	done in the past, which is to get a temporary SES
17	slot. So these concerns that you bring up, some of
18	them are hypothetical, but some of them are not, some
19	of them have actually happened, and the system has
20	worked as planned.
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. I've
22	skirted away from the issue, so
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Next up is a
24	discussion of the SAC re-chartering process.
25	VII. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES

## DISCUSSION OF SAC RE-CHARTER PROCESS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: At the July 28<sup>th</sup> -- during the July 28<sup>th</sup> teleconference, some concerns were raised about staff implementation of the Lean Six Sigma re-chartering process that the Commission voted to adopt, that the Commission adopted, rather, in January of 2008.

On August 14<sup>th</sup>, the Staff Director sent a memorandum to Commissioners detailing how the Lean Six Sigma process has been applied to the re-chartering of State Advisory Committees. Mr. Staff Director, do you have any additional information for us?

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Yes, as you noted in the memorandum that I did send to the Commissioners, many of the SACs that were re-chartered were well in process by the point that we adopted the Lean Six Sigma process. And the other cases, the regional offices have kept to the quality parameters that critical to Booz Allen identified. And we are sending out directives to the regional directors; in fact, I mentioned in there that I sent a memorandum to them on August 8<sup>th</sup> to formalize this process, so to make sure that they are following the various checklists that were developed. And we

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

are going to institute with myself and the regional programs coordinating unit chief, we're going to institute monthly meetings with each one of the regional directors to go through where they are with every state, and also to reinforce the point of Lean Six Sigma. So I don't suggest that the process has been followed perfectly in the past, but I think in most cases, that regional directors have applied the process, and we are going to, based on these concerns of the Commissioners, to more vigorously oversee this process with the regional directors to make sure that it's applied in the future.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does this involve the use of checklists? And do we have checklists they're to use to make sure that we have jumped through the proper hoops? And is that submitted to the Office of the Staff Director by regions? I mean, how do we --what's our quality control like? How do we ensure that since we're rolling out this process, and since with any new process there are going to be bumps along the way, how are we checking up to make sure that people are implementing Lean Six Sigma properly?

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Well, we're going to require that whenever any new package comes in to us, that it will contain the three checklists

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

that were developed. And we are going to, again, meet with them, well, by telephone on a monthly basis to go through each one of their situations, and using the checklists at that time, ask them where they are in the process of developing their packages for rechartering.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions?

Commissioner Melendez?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. On this, are you doing that -- for example, the Arkansas SAC, do you think that that would adequately reapply to the Lean Six Sigma, or do you think that our effort was pretty lean on -

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: -- all the different people we were trying to broaden? As I mentioned before, I thought we just went to the Governor, and the Federalist Society and there was only about four or five. And I think my concern was if you look back at at least Arkansas do you think that can improve that quite a bit and the other thing is that does the Commission get to see the checklist and some of the things that we look at, so that we can kind of compare each line item in the checklist to see if - that enough people have contacted?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Wе can supply the information that the checklists call for to the Commissioners when we send those packages out to them for consideration. And I believe Arkansas did abide by the critical to quality parameters of Lean I believe they could have done better in Six Sigma. terms of more systematically following the checklists, and I think that's something that we are going to be more meticulous about in future efforts with the various regional offices. VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom?

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Didn't we talk about this, or did we agree that we were going to uniform checklist with list of have а the organizations that may or may not be relevant in a particular state; that is, a particular state may not have a chapter of a national organization of one sort another, but that we were going to uniformity here.

Well, my recollection CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I believe what we agreed to was that the Staff Director, whenever we voted on a SAC package, one of the things that would be provided to Commissioners is a list of the organizations that were

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reached out to, as opposed to saying that -- and, in fact, it was Commissioner Yaki who wanted certain groups to be consulted, or that we would ask certain groups automatically. And I believe that there was no consensus to do that.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chair, if I may?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER is TAYLOR: That mУ recommendation, as well, Commissioner Thernstrom, that we did not agree that there should be uniformity for the nation, given the diversity among the states. That would be more appropriate, and more informative, I think, for individual Commissioners to receive in our re-chartering package for that particular state simply a list of organizations that the Staff has contacted as part of the process. Commissioner Melendez, I think that would go a long way toward asking or answering your very appropriate question which you asked with respect to every re-chartering package; that is, what organizations have contacted.

It would then, however, shift the burden to the Commissioners once that re-chartering package is received before the meeting to, hopefully, raise questions once they review that list, if they have

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

questions before the meeting so the Staff Director can be in a position to address whatever particular questions about that specific state may arise.

I would urge each individual Commissioner, if they have a state of particular interest, to contact groups in that state, and to send a copy of that letter, or written correspondence to the Staff Director, if it's - I won't name a group, whatever group you want to contact. But we certainly have that right as individual Commissioners. I don't think we should shift that right to the Staff. I think the Staff's job should be to provide us with a list of contacts for each state, as part of the regular package. And I think it's information they have already, and it's just a matter of adding it to the re-chartering package as a matter of routine.

VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: That's fine with me. I just wanted clarification on what we had already decided, so that we were sticking to whatever the record shows.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Commissioner Melendez, hope that addresses your question and concern, which, frankly you raised, and I had the same ones.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. The other

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	concern is, I am a strong believer that the regions
2	should be submitting the names, not the Commissioners.
3	I think that we're kind of overdoing it and the
4	Commissioners submitting the names from our respective
5	regions, and I hope that we can kind of make sure
6	that those names are coming up to us. Unless they
7	have the final say in terms of the vote, I just kind
8	of am a little wary that the Commissioners are the
9	ones that are pushing certain people forward on these
10	SACs.
11	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: Wait a minute. I
12	don't understand why we can't make suggestions, if we
13	have contacts in states. I mean, it's hard enough to
14	find people to do this with no compensation at all.
15	What is your objection?
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'm just saying
17	that our goal, we could move in that direction and
18	delegate down to the SACs, and also rather than us
19	trying to hand-pick people ourselves.
20	VICE CHAIR THERNSTROM: I don't think it's
21	Hand-picking, just a question of making suggestions if
22	we have contacts in particular states.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that members
24	of SACs, folks in the regions should all be a part of

the process, and that would include Commissioners in

1	that group.
2	Commissioner Heriot?
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: For that matter,
4	there's nothing to prevent anybody in the United
5	States of America from making a suggestion.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: So there certainly
8	is no reason why Commissioners, in particular, should
9	be discouraged from making suggestions. In fact,
10	anybody in the country can do it.
11	COMMISSIONER GAZIANO: We have a special
12	responsibility to help, so -
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Not help. All the
14	power of the Commission is held by the actual
15	Commission, the eight members of the Commission
16	collectively, so there's certainly no reason that we
17	shouldn't be making proposals like this.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other comments? I
19	understand that Commissioner Heriot was going to raise
20	two environmental justices -
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Oh, this is for the
22	next agenda item.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Future agenda items?
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Are we there?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
3	VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Okay. I just
5	recently became aware of a couple of environmental
6	justice bills that are pending in Congress right now.
7	I have not had a chance to look closely at them yet,
8	but given that the Commission issued a report on this
9	issue a few years ago, and the Commission's views may
10	have changed somewhat during the period between then
11	and now, I think this may be an area where the
12	Commission would want to weigh in with a letter.
13	I don't have any proposal at this time. I
14	just wanted to flag this as an issue that might come
15	up.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Staff
17	Director, would you get a hold of these two bills and
18	distribute them to all the Commissioners, and we'll
19	take a look at them, and move from there?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR DANNENFELSER: Sure. Yes,
21	I'll do that.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Unless there are
23	additional items, this meeting is adjourned.
24	IX. ADJOURN
25	(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
	11

record at 10:43 a.m.)

2

1

3

4

5

6

# **NEAL R. GROSS**