U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

Friday, March 10, 2006

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Abigail Thernstrom, Vice Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice Chairman JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner (via telephone)

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner
ARLAN D. MELENDEZ, Commissioner
(via telephone)

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

JOHN BLAKELEY
RACHELLE BRACEY

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

DEBRA CARR, Associate Deputy Staff Director PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearing House Division

BARBARA FONTANA

LATRICE FOSHEE

PATRICIA JACKSON, Chief, Budget and Finance Division

SETH JAFFE

SOCK-FOON MACDOUGALL

TINALOUISE MARTIN, Director of Management EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian EILEEN RUDERT

NEAL R. GROSS

STAFF PRESENT: (cont'd)

ANGELA ST. HILAIRE AUDREY WRIGHT MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS LISA NEUDER KIMBERLY SCHULD (via telephone)

A-G-E-N-D-A

		<u>PAGE</u>
I.	Approval of Agenda	4
II.	Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting	6
III.	Announcements	7
IV.	Staff Director's Report	86
V.	Management and Operations Special Assistant for Commissioner Melendez February 15, 2006 Letter to Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution February 15, 2006 Corrective Action Plan	95 97 98
VI.	Program Planning Voting Rights Act Statutory Report	8 16 27 32
VII.	Strategic Planning Working Group on Strategic Planning	50
VIII.	Future Agenda Items	100

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

2	(9:41 a.m.)
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.
4	This meeting will come to order. This is a meeting
5	with let me see four Commissioners present, two
6	participating by phone, Commissioners Braceras and
7	Melendez.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And one in a pear
9	tree.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Pardon me?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And one in a pear
12	tree.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And one in a
14	pear tree, right.
15	(Laughter.)
16	I'm afraid you've just referred to I
17	hope you have not just referred to the chair
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: who cannot
20	be here.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, not at all.
22	I. Approval of Agenda
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: The first item
24	on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Before
25	we vote to approve the agenda, could I have a motion

1	to amend the agenda so as to add an item labeled
2	"Special Assistant for Commissioner Melendez"?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved.
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I make another
6	motion to amend?
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. But can
8	we vote on this one first?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right.
LO	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All in favor
L1	any discussion?
L2	(No response.)
L3	All in favor?
L4	(Chorus of ayes.)
L5	It has passed unanimously.
L6	Commissioner Braceras, you want another
L7	amendment to the agenda?
L8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, yes. If
L9	it's possible, I'd like to throw out moving up
20	Items VI and VII, Program Planning and Strategic
21	Planning, before Items IV and V, Staff Director's
22	Report and Management and Operations. I just want to
23	make sure I can still be on the phone, because I have
24	to be off at 11:00 for a meeting out of town.
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm happy to

1	move that. Do I have a second on that?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And any
4	discussion?
5	(No response.)
6	All in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	Okay. So that's approved. So the order
9	of the agenda is changed, though, Commissioner
10	Braceras, I would say that I think you are needed at
11	this meeting for all items.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. But
13	the reason I couldn't be there personally is I have a
14	conflict at 11:30, so
	conflict at 11:30, so VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay.
15	
15 16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay.
15 16 17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late.
15 16 17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17,
15 16 17 18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second item for
15 16 17 18 19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second item for approval is minutes of February 17th. Can I get a
115 116 117 118 119 220 221	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second item for approval is minutes of February 17th. Can I get a motion to approve those minutes?
115 116 117 118 119 220	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. Okay. And we apologize for starting late. II. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2006 Meeting VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Second item for approval is minutes of February 17th. Can I get a motion to approve those minutes? COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.

	VICE CHAIRMAN INERNSTROM: Ally discussion:
2	(No response.)
3	All in favor say aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	Anybody opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	The motion is approved unanimously.
8	III. Announcements
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: One
10	announcement only. I'm pleased to announce that March
11	2006 is Women's History Month. It's a month in which
12	we celebrate the achievements of American women,
13	recognizing their contributions and accomplishments, a
14	recognition in part of how far we have come, even in
15	my lifetime.
16	Staff Director, you have a report?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I do, but I
18	believe the agenda was moved, so that I would speak
19	later.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, that is
21	correct. Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think we're
23	ready for Program Planning.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. So we
25	are going, what, immediately to Item VI. We do not
	1

1	even go through the motion to for a Special
2	Assistant for Commissioner Melendez? Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Where did we put it on
4	the agenda when we amended it?
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think it's all
6	in Management and Operations.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Usually that's
8	where we would put it.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I am lost.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I see it. That's
11	where it says on the motion. Okay.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm sorry. Is
13	it page 8? So, Jennifer, you want to start with the
14	question of the Voting Rights Act statutory report?
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I want to do all
16	of the substantive stuff first.
17	VI. Program Planning
18	Voting Rights Act Statutory Report
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Fine. Okay.
20	So item number 1 is the Voting Rights Act statutory
21	report, a motion to approve the FY06 statutory
22	enforcement report on the reauthorization of the
23	temporary provisions of the Voting Rights Act.
24	Can I have a motion to approve that
25	report, together with concurring or dissenting

Commissioners' statements received within two weeks of the agency's statutory enforcement -- two weeks of the report? The report was distributed to Commissioners earlier this week. Commissioner Yaki?

First of all, do I have a second on that?

And then, let's go to discussion.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I was going to amend the motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I was going to amend the motion that we defer -- we approve -- we defer this item to April -- to the April meeting. I have been reading the various drafts as they come forward. I did not receive the final draft until -- what day is today, Friday? Thursday, because it was sent while I was in transit to Washington.

In it -- in the e-mail that -- well, strike that. It was -- we were informed that changes pertaining to certain reports and comments had been made since the last draft. It is very difficult for me, given the short time period, to be able to fully debate and discuss a report.

And as I requested in an e-mail to my fellow Commissioners, especially for those Commissioners who do not have an assistant, having a

NEAL R. GROSS

redline available to distinguish between the last prior draft and the final draft, so that we could more easily understand the changes that were made from one draft to the other would be extremely helpful. And I would say that some point we should discuss whether that should be a permanent policy on statutory reports.

But for my -- for my sake right now, I am not prepared to vote on the report, and I would request that a redline be made available to Commissioners subsequent to this meeting, so that before the April meeting we will have ample time to have examined the changes in order for a full and robust discussion to occur.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Do you have -- Staff Director, do you have any problems with this?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, there isn't currently a redline version, so I suppose we would have to check to see whether it's possible retroactively to do one. So maybe that's sort of a caveat.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, is it possible, Commissioner Yaki, to simply take the existing draft -- I'm not -- this is not on the question of whether we have a vote today, but simply

NEAL R. GROSS

1 procedurally for you -- take the existing draft, read 2 the document as is, and comment on it? 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Ι think possible. 4 I don't think that, given the time period 5 that, one, I can comment on it now --6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- and, two, much less have the ability within two weeks to formulate any 8 9 additional statements. 10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Ι was separating that from the question of the timetable. 11 12 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure. I understand In other words, if -- if -- I mean, it strikes 13 me -- and maybe this is just because I live in a world 14 15 of word processing. It just strikes me as odd that we 16 wouldn't be able to have a redline. But if we can't, 17 then that even more goes to the need for further time for me to review this, because I do want to have a 18 19 careful comparison between the penultimate draft and this draft. 20 21 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I am very sympathetic to the notion of giving Commissioners time 22 to properly review the draft. Is there any down side 23 to delaying this a month? 24

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS:

25

I'm not surprised

to hear the motion, because, as Commissioner Yaki points there little time for out, was very also do have to say, Commissioner review. And I Commissioner Yaki, that there are a very large number of changes. It's not minor, so I can particularly understand your comment.

Is there a down side? Well, it is true that Congress is moving quickly, or seems to be moving quickly, on reauthorization. And any time we push back the date there is a possibility that our report will be less useful to Congress in its reauthorization.

It is also true that we specifically streamline the project somewhat in order to get the thing done to make it more likely that will be relevant. There is a possibility that a month's delay would mean the difference between some member of Congress having the ability to use this document for their deliberations or not.

But I certainly haven't heard anything to say for certain that that month would be dispositive, so it may well be that a month from now it will be as relevant as it is today.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I mean, the Senate has yet to hold hearings on the

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	reauthorization.
2	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's true. We
3	don't know for sure, but I suspect it will be as
4	relevant a month from now as it is today.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I think,
6	Commissioner Yaki, that you should propose an
7	alternative make an alternative motion here.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I did.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, do it
10	formally.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh. I would move that
12	this item be deferred to the April agenda for
13	consideration and approval.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And that, if possible,
17	if a redline draft could is possible and practical
18	I want to add that word, too that it be made
19	available. If not, that's okay, as long as but I'd
20	like to know that in fairly short order, so I'm not
21	waiting for something that might not occur.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We should be able
23	to figure out fairly soon
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: whether it's

1 feasible. 2 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Great. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Do I have a second on that motion. 4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I did second it. 5 6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, you did 7 second it, yes. Any further discussion? 8 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I would just 9 like to note that I think it might be useful in the future, on a go forward basis, to have redline copies 10 whenever we have changes to any kind of draft reports. 11 12 It just makes it a lot easier for us. We're not 13 going back and forth. And I think it would probably expedite 14 discussion and probably yield greater consensus more 15 16 quickly, because there is always a concern on the part 17 of any Commissioner that they're missing something. And I think it causes them to reserve judgment on 18 19 something when they don't necessarily have to do so. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 20 Now, I wonder 21 if there might be an additional part to this motion. 22 is, that concurring and dissenting statements 23 come in by the next meeting. Would that help in any 24 way?

NEAL R. GROSS

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS:

25

Ι

It would help.

1	have to say the reason that in the last couple of
2	meetings we've provided for the additional two weeks
3	is is on the possibility that the findings and
4	recommendations will change, that it might be that a
5	concurring or dissenting Commissioner will need to
6	know what they're concurring or dissenting to. So
7	that's why we've given additional time before that.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine. That
9	would be fine, if you just wanted to make it all due
10	the same day.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh. Let us
12	make it let us add that to your motion, that
13	concurring or dissenting statements are also due by
14	the next Commission meeting, so that we can really
15	wrap this up at that time.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I guess the question
17	is: are you going to concur or dissent? It's a
18	prejudgment, but oh well.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Excuse me?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, in other words,
21	you would have to prejudge what your vote would be on
22	that day.
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You would have
24	to do that. Look, we can
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. You could

1	submit a statement of your personal views, and then
2	decide what to label it after the vote.
3	(Laughter.)
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Two stamps.
5	(Laughter.)
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine. Not a
8	problem.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Let's take a
10	vote on this. All in favor?
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	All opposed?
13	(No response.)
14	This has passed unanimously. We will look
15	forward to a final vote on this statutory report next
16	month.
17	Anti-Semitism Findings and Recommendations
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. We go
19	straight to Anti-Semitism Findings and
20	Recommendations.
21	You all have a motion in front of you.
22	This obviously has matter has been pending since
23	the November briefing. We have postponed it now, I
24	believe, three times. And it is time, in my view
25	today, to move on this.

1 Now, Staff Director, do you want to say 2 something on -- where are we on this? We've got now amendments to --3 4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. This is 5 Commissioner Braceras. I just want to make sure that 6 everybody has the same version in front of 7 because there was an original version, and then there a redline version, and there had been 8 some 9 discussion at the last meeting by the Vice Chair that she wanted to go back to the original version. 10 And I tend to agree with going back to the 11 12 original version and just tweaking it ever 13 slightly, in the hopes of satisfying everybody, and sent that to Kat earlier this morning. 14 So I don't 15 know if people have that in front of them or are able 16 to look at it. 17 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The people who are in the room should have it in front of them. 18 19 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is this the --STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 20 Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- one that was handed 22 out, not the one in the packet? 23 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, let me just try to summarize the different versions. 24 There was --25 the briefing took place in November. During the

December meeting, an initial set of findings and recommendations were distributed.

Approximately in February, a revised set of findings and recommendations were distributed, together with a redline version showing the difference between the new ones and the initial ones. That same set was redistributed again in advance of this meeting, and then this morning Commissioner Braceras provided this alternative version, which was just circulated a few minutes ago.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So basically, just to summarize, the "Braceras version" is the same as the original version, except that it makes a small, almost grammatical stylistic change to finding number three, and it deletes some language from finding number four, which I know the chair wanted deleted. And then, it adds recommendation number six. So there are three changes to the original document.

I don't think the one -- the edit to finding number three is particularly controversial. The edit to finding number four basically just deletes reference to the OCR in order to avoid basically having to interpret their policy for them. To the extent that there's any ambiguity on their policy, my solution is simply not to reference it, and to move

1 forward with our own interpretation of the statute. 2 And then, the final thing, which is 3 recommendation number six, is the recommendation that 4 Congress act to clarify what we believe is already the 5 state of the law. And if I may just add, I think the only 6 7 person who may not have a copy of this before them would be Commissioner Melendez. And I don't know if 8 9 anybody can go and quickly e-mail this version to him, but I believe everybody else should have it. 10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 11 If people want 12 to take a minute to look at it, my -- I would like a approve the original -- the original 13 motion to 14 findings and recommendations with the amendments that 15 Commissioner Braceras has proposed here that you have 16 before you. But if people need a minute to look at 17 them --COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair? 18 19 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would propose a 21 motion that we continue this until April. Having 22 spoken to --23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. 24 you speak up? I can't hear you. 25 Yes. I would COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW:

propose a motion to continue this until April. Having spoken to the Chairman, who is not able to be here today -- he had a death in the family -- he expressed his desire to be involved in any discussion related to the campus anti-Semitism matter. And since he will not be available today, he asked that this be postponed until the next meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, but, Commissioner Kirsanow, his concern is with OCR policy and our response to it. We are -- it seems to me that Commissioner Braceras' solution is simply to eliminate that argument. And, frankly, we have now postponed -- we did this on an expedited basis to get it to the December meeting. There have been three postponements here.

I do think it is extremely important that the Commission -- I know there's a lot of interest on the Hill in this. Extremely important -- it's extremely important that the Commission come out with really what is -- shouldn't be a controversial statement at all, particularly as we are simply -- we are not engaging the question of OCR's policy here, which is -- was the concern of the chair.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I understand that, but he simply wanted to be involved in the discussion.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 I would note that if the Hill is interested in this --2 I don't know if there was any pending votes related to this, and I don't see any down side to waiting as an 3 4 accommodation at the explicit request of the chair to 5 hold this over until April. 6 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I am opposed to 7 postponing this a fourth time. COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is 8 9 Commissioner Melendez. Ι haven't received 10 Braceras' changes. Any time you make changes close to the last minute when we're voting, I think we need to 11 12 see those. So I would also support --COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's a very simple 13 14 If somebody could e-mail it to Commissioner 15 Melendez now, it is redlined. It's flagged, so you 16 can look at it very easily. It has the --17 DIRECTOR STAFF MARCUS: Excuse me. Commissioner Melendez, a copy was just faxed to you, 18 19 if you're near a fax machine. 20 COMMISSIONER **BRACERAS:** The original 21 document has been in our possession for, as the Vice 22 Chair noted, several months. And my edits to the 23 original document are actually quite minor, so believe that it's easy to eyeball it and consider it 24

assuming that

know,

quickly,

you

25

original

the

document, which we've all had since December, has been digested thoroughly by all of us by now.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay. My concern
-- Commissioner Melendez again. As I stated before, I
think that the Commission needs to come to consensus
as to when we all agree, and I don't think that's
totally there today, especially with the chair having
an issue with this. And I think we have to have the
proper respect that we should all be in consensus
before we even vote on this.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, consensus is not something that has been -- you know, there has been a long history of dissent on this Commission. We don't all have to sign on to a particular policy. Let me go to Commissioner Yaki, who is waving his hand frantically.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I would just like to know whether or not the chair -- the chair, in absentia -- and please communicate my personal sorrow for his loss -- if he has seen the changes proposed by Commissioner Braceras, number one.

But, number two, even if -- even if he has not -- has or has not, if he has expressed a desire to participate in the discussion given his former

NEAL R. GROSS

position at the agency -- I mean, I have no problems with what Commissioner Braceras has done, and I thank her for her hard work on this in attempting to meet this deadline.

Obviously, none of us can predict when events like what has happened to the chair will occur. And if he has expressed a desire -- a personal wish to be involved in this debate, I am inclined to give him that courtesy.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This is Braceras.

May I be heard?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, of course.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What I would propose, if it's workable, then, is rather than wait a full month until the April meeting, would it be possible to get a copy of this to Gerry, and to vote on this by poll vote sometime in the next 10 to 14 days? Because as the Vice Chair has noted, this has been hanging around a long time.

I would very much like for these findings and recommendations to be useful to Congress if, in fact, we do approve them. And I think the sooner we get them out the better. So I'm all for giving the chair an opportunity to look at the latest draft and have his vote heard. But if we could do it by poll

1 vote and not wait until April, I'm hoping that that 2 would satisfy the concerns of everybody. Point of information. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: 4 poll vote does not allowed for debate and 5 discussion. It's simply yes or no on the motion, is 6 that correct? 7 DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's STAFF right, Commissioner. Let me distinguish between a telephonic 8 9 meeting and a poll vote. A poll vote does not allow 10 for a deliberation, and can be held only if the Commissioners -- if no Commissioner objects, whereas a 11 12 telephonic call could be -- can include deliberations. COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would -- I think 13 14 what I heard from Commissioner Kirsanow, 15 perhaps he can restate, is that the chair wanted to 16 engage in discussion about it, and a poll vote would 17 not allow that. I understand you very much -- I sympathize 18 19 much, Commissioner Braceras and Vice Chair very 20 Thernstrom, with your desire to get this out the door. 21 But I just think that -- that as a courtesy to the chair and to his former office, I would either have a 22 23 telephonic meeting in the interim or postpone it to the next meeting. 24

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS:

25

Well, I would be

very much in favor, then, of a telephonic meeting sometime within the next 14 days to discuss solely this issue.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Can Ι make Since we don't know what the chair's suggestion? position will be relative to these new changes, can we leave it open, such that we can either be contacted for the poll vote or a telephonic meeting, is necessary? There's no need to have a meeting if Gerry reviews this and decides meeting satisfies his concerns, and we can do it by way of a poll vote.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. think Commissioner Yaki and Commissioner Taylor both make good points. I will communicate with the Chairman and ask him if it's feasible to simply do it by poll vote. And if that's the case, then I can relate that as soon as possible at the beginning of next week to the Staff Director, and then make the appropriate we can arrangements for either a poll vote or a telephonic conference if that's what the Commission decides.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is Commissioner Melendez. I'm out of the country until the 23rd of March. I think it's a Thursday, the 23rd, I come back to the United States. So I might have a

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	problem getting
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: When do you leave?
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I leave, actually,
4	Sunday to Los Angeles. I'm going to Rome, so I'll be
5	there a couple of weeks.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, is it
7	possible to for us to have some indication from you
8	before you leave?
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I think I actually
10	have Virginia Davis over at NC, National Congress. I
11	could talk to her about this. And when I look at this
12	thoroughly, I can you can contact her, and she
13	could give you my position, if that's possible.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know if,
15	procedurally, you can vote that way. Certainly, if we
16	did it by poll vote, you can fax in your vote at any
17	time.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would just note
19	that the 23rd is less than two weeks from now. I
20	think we could probably wait until Commissioner
21	Melendez returns back from Rome.
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'll be back on
23	that Friday, the 24th. I'll be in the office on the
24	24th.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So why

1	don't we let me put this in a motion. I move that
2	the findings and recommendations on anti-semitism are
3	strike that. I move that the Commission conduct a
4	vote on the findings and recommendations related to
5	anti-semitism, either by poll vote or by telephonic
6	meeting, sometime before April 1, 2006.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any further
9	discussion on this?
10	(No response.)
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're ready to
12	vote I guess.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Let's
14	take a vote. All in favor?
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	Anybody opposed?
17	(No response.)
18	All right. So we can move on.
19	And, again, I should note that I think
20	that the chair's concerns have been met by the
21	suggestions of Commissioner Braceras here by the
22	amendments to both the recommendations and findings.
23	I hope that that is correct.
24	We move on.
25	Minorities in State Foster Care and Adoption

NEAL R. GROSS

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. We
2	are at Minorities in State Foster Care and Adoption.
3	On May 17, 2005, the Commission approved a national
4	project on minority children in state foster care and
5	adoption, later converted to a briefing currently
6	scheduled for February '07. Approved project was
7	based on a concept paper whose scope only extended to
8	minorities in state foster care.
9	During discussion of the project at the
10	May '05 meeting, the scope of the project was extended
11	to cover minority children in state adoption.
12	However, the extension of the scope was not clarified
13	at that meeting. I had requested a clarification of
14	the scope at the meeting held last month on
15	February 20th, and there is a motion here to clarify
16	the scope of the briefing.
17	And somebody could read it, or I could
18	read it, but you should have it in front of you. Does
19	somebody want to read this motion?
20	(No response.)
21	Has everybody got the language in front of
22	them?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't believe I
24	do.
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It should be

1	right in your briefing book, right after the material
2	on anti-semitism.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I've got it.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Does
5	somebody want to make a motion and read the motion
6	into the record?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Can we waive reading?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Can we waive
9	reading it? Well, we can
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It would be
11	helpful for me if you read it.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Somebody
13	read the motion.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I've looked it
15	over, but if I could hear it
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Ashley, do I
17	hear a volunteer?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, he was clearing
19	his throat.
20	(Laughter.)
21	It's not American Idol.
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All right. I move
24	that the expanded scope of the briefing on minority
25	children in state foster care and adoption be

clarified to reflect the following. The Commission will examine the efforts of the Department of Health the Human Services in enforcing Multi-Ethnic Placement Act with respect to foster care and placement agencies.

As originally enacted in 1994, the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act provided that the placement of children in foster or adoptive homes could not be denied or delayed solely because of the race, color, or national origin of the child, or of the prospective foster or adoptive parents.

However, the Act expressly permitted consideration of the racial, ethnic, or cultural background of the child, and the capacity of the prospective parents to meet the child's needs in these areas when making placement decisions, if such a consideration was one of a number of factors used to determine the best interest of a child.

Furthermore, it required states to undertake efforts to recruit foster and adoptive families that reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of children in need of care. The Act was amended in 1995 to clarify the race -- in 1996 to clarify that race, color, or national origin may be considered only in rare circumstances when making placement decisions.

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	As amended, the Act states that placement cannot be
2	denied or delayed because of race, color, or national
3	origin.
4	Furthermore, the amendment removed
5	language that allowed routine consideration of these
6	factors in assessing both the best interest of the
7	child and the capacity of prospective foster or
8	adoptive parents to meet the needs of a child.
9	An agency making a placement decision that
10	uses race, color, or national origin would need to
11	prove to the courts that the decision was justified by
12	a compelling government interest, and necessary to the
13	accomplishment of a legitimate stated purpose in
14	this case, the best interest of a child.
15	Thus, under the law, the "best interest of
16	a child" is defined on a narrow, case-specific basis,
17	whereas child welfare agencies have historically
18	assumed that same race placements are in the best
19	interest of all children.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So this is a
21	motion to clarify the scope of the briefing, so that
22	it reflects the language that Commissioner Taylor just
23	read. Do I have a second on that motion?
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.

NEAL R. GROSS

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

Any discussion

on this?

2

(No response.)

3

1

Hearing none, all in favor?

4

(Chorus of ayes.)

5

Opposed?

6

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Abstention, one.

7

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Let the

8

record reflect one abstention. Otherwise, I lost

9

count here, we've got five in favor.

10

Annual Program Planning

11

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Annual

12

Program Planning. Here we've got a motion for

13

briefing on the American Bar Association Standards of

14

Diversity in Law Schools. The concept paper for the

15

briefing on the American Bar Association on the ABA

16

Standards on Diversity in Law Schools was included in

17

the packet of FY07 and FY08 potential projects.

18

this briefing in June of '06 -- that is, this coming

We have included today a motion to conduct

19 20

June -- because the ABA is set to vote on these

21

proposed standards in its meeting in August. I have

22

written -- I personally have written a letter to Sally

23

Stroop, Assistant Secretary for Post-Secondary

24

Education, expressing my view on the new ABA standards

25

NEAL R. GROSS

on diversity.

Τ	And I'd like a motion to conduct a
2	briefing on the ABA's new standards in this coming
3	on this coming in the meeting of this coming June.
4	So I need a motion to have a briefing on the ABA
5	standards.
6	We are already at that June meeting going
7	to hear from Professor Richard Sander on racial
8	preferences in law schools. And we will have,
9	obviously, somebody who is a critic of Sander's work.
10	This would mean a second briefing on that same day,
11	but it's obviously on a related topic. And I would
12	think we would have simply two speakers at each
13	briefing.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chairman?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It seems to me
17	that could they be they are so similar that it
18	would just be one briefing.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That you would
21	have, you know, Professor Sander and whoever the
22	critic is
23	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, that is a
24	possibility, of course, that we also ask Professor
25	Sander to not only talk about his work but talk about

1	the ABA standards.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. And
3	whatever impact that might have on his work.
4	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would concur in
5	that. My sense would be that we would have a more
6	robust discussion if we had all four speakers there at
7	the panel at the same time, and hopefully engaging in
8	significant exchanges, so hat
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I would think
10	we would want four speakers, however, then, whereas
11	before we had set the Sander up briefing up, we had
12	not thought of four speakers. But
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. Do we
14	know who is responding to Sander? Did I miss that?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, I don't
16	think we do yet. Do we?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No. We did have a
18	few names that were circulated as potential speakers,
19	but we don't yet have a single one that has been
20	selected.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, for what
22	it's worth, I like the idea of having four on one
23	panel.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, it makes
25	sense to me also. I've been that's been in the

	back of my milid as well. So it seems to me the motion
2	should read that we modify the briefing that is
3	already scheduled to include a discussion of the ABA
4	diversity standards, and that we have four panelists,
5	all of whom address both questions or are prepared or
6	what well, if somebody chooses not to address all
7	four questions, that, of course, is their prerogative.
8	But in any case, one briefing, four panelists. Can I
9	have a second on that?
10	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any further
12	discussion on this?
13	(No response.)
14	Let's have a vote. All in favor?
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	Anybody opposed?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. I oppose.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You oppose.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I oppose.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. But you
21	didn't want to discuss it? Fine. Out of the blue he
22	
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I move not to discuss
24	this.
25	PARTICIPANT: Second.

1	(Laughter.)
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Abstention.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any
4	abstentions?
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: One abstention
6	here.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. We've
8	got one opposed one opposed, one Commissioner
9	abstaining, Commissioner Melendez abstaining,
10	Commissioner Yaki opposing, and we have four
11	Commissioners in favor.
12	Okay. Motion for briefing or hearing on
13	elementary and secondary school desegregation. I am
14	I move to have the staff conduct a briefing or
15	hearing on the elementary and secondary school
16	desegregation on elementary and secondary school
17	desegregation in connection with our FY2007 statutory
18	report on October 13, 2006.
19	The briefing or hearing will be based on
20	the concept paper distributed to Commissioners on
21	Friday, March 3, 2006. Do I have a second on that?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second. But I can't
23	discuss it.
24	(Laughter.)
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Is there any

discussion?

(No response.)

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

All opposed?

(No response.)

It passes unanimously.

Friday, March 3rd, Office of the Staff Director recommended a process to facilitate discussion and approval of Commission projects for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. This procedure asked Commissioners to rank potential projects in order to streamline the process of developing a slate of potential candidates -- "slate."

Commissioners were asked to send the Office of the Staff Director a list containing up to five of his or her top preferences and potential fiscal year 2008 statutory reports, and up to five of his or her top preferences and potential briefings for '07 and '08, ranking them in order of preference, with one being the highest, two the second highest, and so forth.

By close of business on Wednesday,
March 8th, the Office of the Staff Director of the OSD
staff would then assign points to each proposal

NEAL R. GROSS

selected by each Commissioner, weighing them according to how high each Commissioner would place the item on his or her list -- five points for a number one choice, four points for a number two choice, and so forth.

So, in a subsequent e-mail, Commissioners who ranked reports separately for '07 and '08 were asked to advise OSD if they would like Commissioners to consider the '07 picks for '08, and indicate how highly you would rank them relative to your other '08 selections. Otherwise, they would be disregarded when the Office of the Staff Director tabulated the rankings for '08.

As for briefings, this subsequent e-mail asked Commissioners to rank their top five briefings from among our recommendations or your own ideas, and to refrain from dividing their choices between '07 and '08. If Commissioners selected more than five briefings, OSD assigned a half point for each -- for every briefing ranked below five.

To the extent that Commissioners are more enthusiastic about certain projects than others, we can discuss the scheduled briefings for FY07. It is my hope that Commissioners will come up with a list of at least eight potential briefings for '08, at least

NEAL R. GROSS

1	three potential briefings for '07. Currently, we have
2	five briefings scheduled for '07 through February.
3	Finally, the subsequent e-mail reminded
4	Commissioners that briefings they would like to
5	address in '06 would require a separate motion, and
6	would also require bumping a project that was
7	previously approved and scheduled.
8	There have been new tabulations,
9	evidently, which have these been passed around?
10	Does everybody have them?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: New tabulations?
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: New
13	tabulations. It has been a very mathematically
14	complicated process. Some ballot boxes have been
15	destroyed.
16	Does everybody have how have people
17	received these new tabulations?
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: This is an e-mail
19	dated Thursday, March 9, at 4:05 p.m.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Does everybody
21	have this? Commissioner Melendez, do you have this?
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I've got March 9,
23	1:05 p.m. Is there another one?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: That's the same

one?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's Pacific Standard Time.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It takes somebody in California to figure that out.

(Laughter.)

Okay. So we've got the final results. I don't think I have to read this entire list. Can people stare at it and --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Question. Point of information. Given that this -- these are fairly important decisions in terms of the planning of the Commission, I would feel much more comfortable if the chair were present for this -- for these rankings. I think not having him present -- because, as it was, these rankings were not meant to be binding, but were to provide the basis for discussion.

And I remember that last time when we did this we actually had a very full, informed discussion that resulted in a lot of consensus being arrived at, including moving things around from one column -- Column A to Column B. And I just think that it's important enough that the chair of this Commission should be involved in that discussion.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 So I would -- I would ask that we -- we 2 postpone this to the April meeting to allow the chair 3 the opportunity to participate. 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would second 5 that. That's fine. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 6 7 could we have a few minutes of discussion just to get a sense of the people who are here? No binding votes, 8 but just a brief --9 10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes, I think that would be helpful, a preliminary discussion here. 11 12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I quess I have two questions. And the first is: 13 are there any 14 proposals that any of you have that aren't on this 15 And, two, it's more of a procedural question --16 the No Child Left Behind Act project I believe was 17 proposed as a briefing, and not as a statutory report, although I voted for it as a statutory report, because 18 19 I think it could be most effective that way. 20 But I'm not sure if there is a procedural 21 reason why it cannot be or should not be a statutory So I just wanted to ask Staff Director about 22 23 that, because I just took the liberty of voting for it in Column A when it was proposed in Column B. 24 But I

wanted to find out what the procedural situation is on

1	that.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of information.
3	Didn't we also get distributed today two more one
4	briefing proposal and one statutory report proposal
5	that incorporates part of the No Child Left Behind Act
6	as well?
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't believe I
8	received any
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's why I'm saying
10	that it might be better to have the discussion later,
11	because these just were distributed today.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's fine.
13	So could somebody briefly just tell me what they are?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: One is a statutory
15	report proposed on topic. I can't read this without
16	laughing, so I let's have someone else read it.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: One is it's
18	called Six Civil Rights Initiatives of the George W.
19	Bush Administration. I suppose that Commissioner Yaki
20	is laughing because he doesn't think that anything
21	qualifies as a civil rights initiative by the Bush
22	administration. Am I correct?
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would not argue with
24	that description.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

Okay.

Τ	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So that again.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Commissioner
3	Yaki said this had given him the chuckles, and I
4	simply said I assume it has given him the chuckles
5	because he does not believe the Bush administration
6	has any civil rights initiatives that or any
7	initiatives that can legitimately be called civil
8	rights. I'm obviously in disagreement with that, but
9	that's fine.
10	So that's one statutory report proposal.
11	And what is the other one?
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The educational
13	achievement gap briefing proposal.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. These
15	were circulated by whom?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have no idea.
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Okay. I guess
18	let me try to answer a couple of questions. First,
19	Commissioner Braceras, there is no procedural reason
20	why we can't look at No Child Left Behind as either a
21	statutory report or a briefing.
22	Second, the documents that were just
23	circulated were circulated by staff based on requests
24	for comments from Commissioners. For instance, the
25	one on civil rights initiatives of the Bush

1 administration was based on some comments received 2 from Commissioner Kirsanow through his 3 assistant, although I don't know whether Commissioner 4 Kirsanow considers the concept paper to be a fair 5 reflection of his comments, but that's what the intent 6 was. 7 And the other one I believe --VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: The causes of 8 9 the educational achievement gap -- I believe that was submitted by the chair. 10 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 11 Yes. The one on 12 the causes of the educational achievement gap was also a staff effort to reflect comments received from 13 Chairman Reynolds. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: To go to the point 16 of procedure, given these new proposals, are we going to be asked to rerank our preferences? 17 I think we need VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 18 19 I also added by the way -- and I don't believe to. 20 anybody had a chance to rank it -- I added 21 religious discrimination in K through 12 schools. the reason it is only five points is because those are 22 my points. 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I never saw that. 24

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM:

25

Nobody

Yes.

1 else ever saw that. 2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Pay back. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Pardon me? 3 4 was thrown in there by me. 5 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. In the same 6 way that --7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. So I do think that there has to be now a new process of 8 9 But I wonder if, once again, as Jennifer ranking. suggested, we couldn't have a preliminary discussion, 10 so that we got this list down a little bit. 11 12 COMMISSIONER **BRACERAS:** Well, have to trim it. I just --13 I'm just 14 interested in people's views, and maybe it will form 15 my thinking. If we're asked to rerank or vote again, 16 you know, maybe I hadn't thought through some of these 17 ideas with clarity. And maybe if one Commissioner or another feels strongly about a proposal that would 18 19 help me -- help me make my tabulation. COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. 20 May I? Along 21 those lines, I did not vote for racial profiling the United States Department of Justice remedies, only 22 23 because I didn't have a sense of where it was going. Could someone who is supportive of that idea provide 24

me with a sense of that, particularly as it relates to

limiting it to DOJ remedies? I just don't -
COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know what

it means. I didn't propose it.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But it seems to me that it probably is something that relates to an assessment of to what extent DOJ and other affected agencies or responsible agencies have tracked and possibly taken action to prohibit racial profiling, consistent with the directive received from the administration I think it was two years ago. Is that when the anti-profiling statement came out? I don't know. I suspect that's what this would be.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: My suggestion about pruning the list a little bit was simply based on the fact that there are a number of potential briefing proposals here that got almost no support -- 1.5 points, 1.1 point, .5, 0.5 points. And it seems to me unless you have a sense that they didn't vote for it because they didn't understand the proposal that we could do a little bit of pruning here and get a little more consensus as a consequence.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That sounds fine with me. We're talking about there's virtually no

NEAL R. GROSS

support. I don't --

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I was proposing perhaps we should just eliminate the ones at the very bottom.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: There's a couple questions I have about that. One, one of the things that struck me is that there were two separate but also overlapping Title IX topics in this, number one. Number two, I think that some people -- it looks like some people voted for some stuff under reports versus briefings.

For example, if you look at the statutory reports, the FEMA thing has four. Even though it only has one under briefings -- that's what I'm saying, that there's a lot of -- I would rather have a fuller discussion with the chair present, because his leadership was very -- was very useful last time as we started playing with the fact that some votes were here, some votes were in that column, Column A, Column B, we have a couple more things.

While we're doing this, there is one more item that I was thinking -- that I've been thinking about at great length regarding the role of federal agencies, not just regarding to people with disabilities but also in particular looking at --

NEAL R. GROSS

looking at the federal response of Katrina and civil rights issues that have been implicated there as well.

So I -- what I would suggest is that this is a good way for people to start and sort of see where interest lies or may not lie, and then items that they -- that they do like or don't like, or more appropriately do like but may want to try strengthen a little bit, that within a week -- a deadline of a week any further ideas be brought forward and submitted to the Staff Director and to staff, so that they can be developed and circulated prior to the next meeting for another round of beauty we can have a nice, contests, and then discussion in the April meeting.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is Chairman -- this is Commissioner Melendez. This is my first time through this process, and I totally didn't understand it. The question I had was, you know, if I came up with something -- a topic that maybe nobody really knew about, and it wasn't on this list, I asked myself, well, what are the chances of that getting on this list? And if it wasn't going to be -- have much chance of even getting on the list because I might not be the only one voting for it, I kind of tied it to something that already had been done.

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

For example, I looked at the border town issues with Native Americans. That was an issue in the -- I think it was the Rocky Mountain region where their whole state was working on that issue. Then, we had the New Mexico report. You know, so I thought, well, in certain regions of the United States as far as Native Americans we're dealing with that issue. And it was on this list, so I -- I kind of voted for that.

But then, when you said that you had come up with a new initiative, I was thinking, well, what chance would that actually have? So I wasn't really sure exactly how to rank these, you know, on the racial profiling. And I had listed that, too, but I wasn't sure if I knew it affected minorities, so I naturally put it up there, because, you know, a lot of minorities are stopped by police and those type things.

So I was still trying to learn the process, and we hastily kind of put this together in a week. But I'm still not real comfortable with the chances of some of these issues. So I just wanted to just state that.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well,
Commissioner Melendez, I hope that if you have

NEAL R. GROSS

1	additional topics that you would you would send
2	them in as well, so that they could be part of the
3	list upon which we vote.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I already have a
5	motion to push this to April. I would amend that
6	motion to say that any other any other proposals by
7	Commissioners be forwarded to the Staff Director no
8	later than one week from close of business one week
9	from today, and that the Staff Director then prepare
10	another round of beauty contest votes to occur prior
11	to the April meeting for consideration.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Can I call
13	the question?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Let's
15	take a vote. All in favor?
16	(Chorus of ayes.)
17	All opposed?
18	(No response.)
19	It passes unanimously.
20	VII. Strategic Planning
21	Working Group on Strategic Planning
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Where
23	are we? We are at okay. We are now at Strategic
24	Planning, but I think we need to go back to your to
25	the beginning. Is that correct?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. Strategic
2	planning comes next, and then we go back to the Staff
3	Director's Report.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. All
5	right. Strategic planning. Well, wait. But, first,
6	a motion on postponing the briefing on historically
7	black colleges and universities, and instead holding a
8	briefing on strategic planning. That is the motion.
9	I don't know whose proposal that is.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm not sure. I
11	see that it's listed under mine. I'll make the
12	motion, and then we can have some discussion related
13	to it, so I can tell you where we stand with respect
14	to strategic planning.
15	I move that the Commission postpone until
16	April 2007 the briefing previously approved for May 5,
17	2006, addressing the effectiveness of historically
18	black colleges and universities, and hold instead a
19	briefing on strategic planning on May 5, 2006.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Could you say
21	something more about what you have in mind in terms of
22	the strategic
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I will second
24	that, and then open it up for
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. The

second --

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, no, I'd like to hear a little bit more about what he has in mind in terms of a briefing on strategic planning.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The strategic planning group has met by teleconference twice. On that call were Commissioners Braceras, Melendez, Chairman Reynolds, and Staff Director, along with certain members of staff.

We had discussed in general terms various aspects of strategic planning, and staff had prepared for us materials for our review, specifically templates that we might follow from other similarly-situated agencies such as the EEOC, so that we could -- we wouldn't be operating in the dark and we'd have a sense for the direction in which we should go.

They also prepared for us the letters that we had received from at least two affected agencies who reviewed the preliminary strategic plan prepared by staff, as well as letters from oversight commenting upon the drafts of the strategic plan.

We reviewed the comments of oversight with an eye toward what is it that is necessary to revise the current draft, so that it would at least meet, in some respects, the approval of oversight, but at the

NEAL R. GROSS

same time give us an overarching strategic plan, number one, that has goals and missions of the Commission, but also would have sort of the nuts and bolts under those goals and missions.

In other words, how do we achieve them? What are some of the benchmarks and measures necessary, so that we know, in fact, whether or not we're making progress toward the five-year strategic plan?

The bulk of the discussion surrounded how it is that we arrive at a strategic plan, and a proposal was made -- I think by myself that was -- kind of piggybacked off of something that Commissioner Yaki had said right at the outset of his appointment to the Commission in terms of having a briefing from affected parties or stakeholders that would inform the Commission as to what it is that they perceive the role of the Commission is in 2006 as opposed to when it was originally established in 1957.

And there was some discussion back and forth first about --

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.

Let's not get into discussion at this moment. All I

wanted -- I was hoping for two sentences, the last two

that you just gave, that -- so that I understood

NEAL R. GROSS

1 exactly what this briefing was. 2 Commissioner Braceras, you want to second it and have a discussion? 3 4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Ι just want to 5 second it for purposes of moving on to the discussion, 6 yes. 7 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. It has been seconded. I'm sorry, Commissioner Kirsanow. 8 Μy 9 request was misunderstood here. Let's pick up this. 10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You are now 11 12 into the discussion business. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The question is: 13 14 in such a briefing, what is the scope of the briefing? There are certain GPRA quidelines, for example, or 15 16 require requirements that that in preparing 17 strategic plan the affected agencies seek input from stakeholders. The GPRA statute provides that the 18 19 affected agency, meaning ourselves, would determine who our stakeholders are. So that's one -- we have to 20 21 determine who it is -- from whom we receive input in 22 preparing the strategic plan. 23 More important I think is the discussion surrounding when that input should be received. 24 Some 25 were of -- or at least I was of the opinion that we

should receive that input before we prepare strategic plan, GPRA contemplates. as There are logistical problems, possible logistical problems inherent in that, and there are certain substantive problems that were raised by I think Commissioner Braceras related to that, and she can speak for herself on that.

And then, there were other alternatives such as, do we do this on an ongoing basis? Do we have briefings at the same time that we prepare our strategic plan? Or do we have briefings after we prepare our strategic plan? Or do we have briefings at all? And then --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can I quickly be heard? Because I do have to go soon.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Sure.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I want to speak specifically to the motion. Number one, I'm not in favor of it for several reasons. First of all, I was very much looking forward to hearing a briefing on historically black colleges and universities. I think that's an important topic. I think it's a topic that the public would benefit from our putting on a briefing on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But that logistical point aside, I am very opposed to the idea of having the briefing proposed by Commissioner Kirsanow at this point in time. And the reason is: the mandate of strategic planning group was for us to develop a strategic plan for the Commission. I think that we, as Commissioners, need to exercise leadership and come the determination ourselves who to as to our stakeholders are, and what it is we want to achieve.

I don't think inviting every Tom, Dick, and Harry in to opine on the state of the Commission and the role of the Commission for the future is going to inform any of us in a useful and streamlined manner.

And so I actually think there are two different questions being asked here. I mean, one is: what is your strategic plan -- excuse me. One question is: what is your strategic plan, given the current statutory mandate that we have? And that is something that I think we're perfectly equipped to do without outside testimony.

Another question is: what role, if any, should the Commission play in the future going forward? And that seems to me to be a separate question which we might want to invite people to do --

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

2 want to hear from outside sources on that. That does 3 not answer the immediate 4 question, which is: what is your current strategic 5 And I think, you know, Congress plan for this year? has been waiting for the document, and we need to --6 7 we need to close the deal, put something together. I'm not in favor of any type of briefing like this 8 9 this spring. 10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In response to Commissioner Braceras, I don't know that there's a 11 12 dichotomy between whether or not we put together a strategic plan -- first of all, the strategic plan is 13 not for this year. It's for a five-year qo-forward 14 15 period. Second --16 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But they want it 17 this year. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, and I think 18 19 that's perfectly doable, although I will admit there's 20 a logistical problem if we have a briefing in May. 21 Just putting together the briefing itself causes 22 problems. 23 will say two things. 24 putting together a strategic plan for a current 25 mission is something that oversight and, in fact, some

give us their advice on, or to -- you know, just might

1	of the commenting agencies had kind of rebuked us on,
2	saying that, well, wait a minute, you're not looking
3	at something a little bit more overarching.
4	There have been they have contemplated
5	that there have been changes to the nature of civil
6	rights, and yet the Commission has not incorporated
7	those changes or the structural shifts in the civil
8	rights paradigm if you will into a strategic plan.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. But so why
10	is the goal of the briefing to throw open the doors
11	to, you know, every special interest group and every
12	member of the public and say, "What is your vision of
13	civil rights?"
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, absolutely
15	not.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: They are not
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: GPRA, for example,
18	says that this is something we're supposed to do
19	seek input from our stakeholders
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right. But
21	bear in mind
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: and we can
23	determine who
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: the problem,
25	Pete, because we, as a Commission, have to define our

2 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And that's 3 precisely what GPRA says, and we can do that. 4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. No, we can't 5 hold a briefing to figure out who our stakeholders --6 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, you're getting 7 it backwards, with all due respect. GPRA says we define who our stakeholders are, so we can do that 8 9 amongst ourselves, make a determination, and then those stakeholders are the individuals that we invite 10 to a briefing, not every Tom, Dick, and Harry. 11 12 don't think that there should be some kind of freeflowing debate that's out of control. We do want to 13 have something defined --14 15 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But here is the 16 problem. 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: and I think we've got control over it. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Once you define the stakeholders, if you select any special interest 20 21 group as a stakeholder, the question becomes: why weren't other groups included? So, for example, if 22 23 NAACP is defined as a stakeholder, the next question is: why wasn't the National Organization for 24 25 Women included? Why wasn't this Native American group

1

own stakeholders.

included?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And the answer to that is that GPRA gives us the ability to define who it is we want as stakeholders. And, second --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I understand that, but --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: -- that's a question that's inherent in virtually every briefing. There are a number of people who are interested in almost every subject matter that we have before the Commission, and we make a determination as to who is invited. There are a number of experts on any given topic.

If I have to chop COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: strategically selected stakeholders in the first draft a strategic plan that did not include special interest groups at all -- in other words, you did not include any special interest groups, you defined our stakeholders along the lines of other more governmental enforcement agencies, because once you define even a single interest group as a stakeholder that is a Pandora's Box, because you are going to inevitably be excluding some minority groups from the stakeholding process.

And once someone is defined as a

NEAL R. GROSS

stakeholder, we have a legal obligation to include them in our strategic planning process. And I just want to go down that road.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner Braceras, I don't think we have an argument here. I think we here will define, preliminary to any kind of a briefing, who it is that we consider to be our stakeholders. They may not include special interest groups if that is what the body here decides. I happen to think that -- and I wouldn't define them as special interest groups.

I happen to think it's healthy, and I also think it's contemplated within the confines of even our current statutory mission, that we've got stakeholders that go beyond agency heads, Congress, the President, to include those who are affected by our fact-finding mission.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The public -- the public at large is affected, but you can't say, you know, African-Americans are affected and Asian-Americans aren't. I mean, you're going to have to include everybody.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, that's very easily done. The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, for example, purports to represent a number of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	is the umbrella agency for a number of groups.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, come on. So
3	you're going to say the Leadership Conference on Civil
4	Rights is one of our stakeholders, but the Center for
5	Equal Opportunity isn't?
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We can invite both
7	of them. I think we have to have a balanced debate.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think
9	either of those groups covers the range of minority
10	groups out there and political perspectives out there.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't think it
12	is conceivable that any briefing on any subject will
13	include every single person who is interested in that
14	subject or might even conceivably be defined as a
15	stakeholder. I don't think that it is possible to
16	get, for example, you know, the I don't know,
17	someone from some outlying area that may be an
18	extraordinarily discrete minority group and invite
19	them in.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: What I'm saying
22	is
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's exactly my
24	point. If this isn't a briefing of stakeholders, then
25	what is the point of doing it before we develop our

_	scracegie pian.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The point is that
3	we comply with the express mandate of GPRA and also
4	with what oversight
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's not
6	complying with GPRA. I mean, because you just said
7	they're not necessarily going to be all our
8	stakeholders or that they would necessarily even be
9	stakeholders.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think we're
11	really not arguing on this point. I think the charge
12	of the Commission, pursuant to GPRA and oversight, is
13	to, one, define who our stakeholders are. GPRA gives
14	that us that authority. And if
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You don't need a
16	briefing to do that.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: and if we
18	exclude somebody, then we're going to be criticized,
19	and the Commission is used to criticism.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. We don't
21	need a briefing to define our stakeholders. That's my
22	bottom line.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, I've never
24	suggested that, and I think maybe that's the point of
25	the disagreement here or the confusion. I've never

suggested a briefing to --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think we need to have our strategic plan in place. We need to identify our stakeholders, and we need to meet with the stakeholders and develop our strategic plan before we have a briefing.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner Braceras, let me give you my -- my sense of the chronology that I think is consistent with GPRA. That is, the Commission determines who it is who the stakeholders are. That is done before a briefing.

We invite -- and if we choose to hold a briefing, then we invite those stakeholders to the briefing in advance of the preparation of a strategic plan -- again, as set forth by GPRA and by what oversight has suggested to us, but mainly by GPRA. And that's how all of the other agencies do it, by the way. They don't necessarily have a briefing, but they invite their stakeholders to --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I've never heard of one of them having a briefing.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, they invite
-- I'm suggesting that we do so -- you know, think
outside the box. And then, we bring them in here,
conduct a briefing, and that informs at least part of

our strategic plan. We can accept recommendations, reject recommendations, but I think it would be a healthy briefing to have for a couple of reasons. One, again, it's consistent with GPRA. Two -- or not inconsistent with GPRA.

And two is that we have radically changed landscape of civil rights, the SO that putting together a strategic plan based on our model of 1957 is not only something that oversight has told us we need to revisit, but it's something that is, you know, I think inherently the wrong way of going about it. I think we do have to look forward to what civil rights is going to be five years from now, because we have a five-year strategic plan.

Also, keep in mind that every year we are charged with doing updates for our strategic plan.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. That's why we need to get this one done.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And we can do so in a timely fashion. I think we'd better do it the right way as opposed to doing it fast. Oversight --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But the bottom line is I think that we, as individuals and as a Commission, need to exercise some leadership here.

And all of us are presumably knowledgeable in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

field of civil rights, or at least some aspect of the field of civil rights. And I think we can bring our own knowledge to bear on this question.

I don't think we need to hear from outside experts to inform us as to what -- what the meaning of civil rights should be five years from now. I think our strategic plan -- our statutory obligation is to develop a strategic plan that helps us perform our mandate under the current statute.

And I think the fundamental question that you would be asking these people to come in and opine on, which is, what is the new paradigm of civil rights, is inherently broad. And you'll inevitably be having panelists come in and speak to their own pet issues, and it would not end up informing anything.

And I guess I would finish by saying that if we really care so much what the so-called stakeholders think who have yet to be defined, can't we just ask them either to submit a written statement for the consideration of the subcommittee that would inform our deliberations? Why do we need to have a briefing?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, we have -- we have already done that, and we've gotten two responses back. And there's nothing that precludes us

NEAL R. GROSS

1 from doing so, and I don't think that these 2 mutually exclusive methods of seeking input 3 stakeholders. We can do --4 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think it's a 5 waste of time and money. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 6 We can do that, 7 and I -- actually, I think we -- it doesn't cost a whole lot. But I see Commissioner Yaki would like to 8 9 weigh in. 10 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Michael, one 11 second, just let me make one remark here. I mean, we 12 know what the vision of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights is. You only have to get on the website 13 14 and look at their leadership. I mean, what news are 15 they going to bring to us? 16 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm not going to 17 presume that what is on their website is something that they would repeat here. And, second, I think the 18 19 purpose of a briefing is not that they simply wrote or 20 just repeat what they have said on their website, but 21 it's to engage in a bit of interaction, so we can ask them questions. If we think that some of the things 22 23 they say on their website are silly, we can gauge them

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

on that. I think it's healthy and --

24

1	enlist the
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: and I think we
3	are not the gods of civil rights, with all due
4	respect.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, we're not
6	the gods of civil rights. We certainly are not.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I also think
8	leadership is not
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We have access
10	to
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: consistent with
12	getting input, balanced input, and I would like
13	Commissioner Yaki to speak.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.
15	But, you know, I have access to plenty of information
16	in terms of what the interest groups believe. I mean,
17	there's not going to be any news brought here. You
18	can write the literature of, you know, interest groups
19	on the right and interest groups on the left in your
20	sleep. You know the arguments. I don't see that we
21	need to have a what will amount to a circus here.
22	Anyway, Commissioner Yaki.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, as someone who
24	once served on a legislative body that was called a
25	circus many times, I have my own views on this. I

think that a couple of things that informed my thoughts listening to the spirited discussion between Commissioner Kirsanow and Commissioner Braceras.

One is that we are approaching the 50th year of our -- of the creation of this Commission. And as much as one might try and characterize Commissioner Kirsanow's proposal as -- well, or try to characterize it in any way possible, I would say that certainly it's a step I think in the direction of saying, you know, who are we now 50 years later? And where are we going?

Secondly, when you think about reauthorization of the statute, why wouldn't we take the leadership in hearing from individuals organizations who we believe would be useful in sort defining the next stage of the Civil Rights Commission, as distinct from what their individual organizations believe they are set up for?

We are different -- we are different than the Leadership Conference. We are different than the Committee for Racial Equality -- Equal Opportunity. We are distinctly different. We are mandated by government, by the Congress, created by appointments from the President and from the -- and from the legislative branch.

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

I think that if you were -- if you were designing a hearing for the reauthorization of this Commission, they would be going through very much the same kind of process that Commissioner Kirsanow is talking about. And I don't see why we wouldn't take the leadership and grab the reigns ourselves in terms of starting to define, you know, who and what we are and should be, and listening to our stakeholders who are out there whose views would be solicited by the committees anyway in a forum that we would -- we would be passive in rather than controlling ourselves.

And I think that in terms of controlling our destiny towards reauthorization in terms of fulfilling the mandate -- mandates of GPRA, as Commissioner Kirsanow has suggested, I am in favor of at least attempting. We may end up with --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But attempting to design a debate about reauthorization is a separate discussion from the one about, what should our strategic plan be that we need to submit now?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you -- I would not go so far as to make that distinction, given the kinds of rumblings all of us have heard from the committee of jurisdiction, and what we have gone through in the past year. I think that, you know, you can risk a

NEAL R. GROSS

circus, but, you know, I think -- I think that we're better than that and can -- and better stage managers than that from all of our different walks of life.

And I think that to me it's -- it's very worthwhile in terms of not sort of presuming, with all due respect, to say that we all have our collective knowledge of civil rights, and collectively we can decide together what our collective strategic plan of the future is going to be when we have reauthorization around the corner.

And I really do believe that they're connected, and I think that taking leadership on this issue in the way that Commissioner Kirsanow is suggesting is something that I find refreshing and worthy of support.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, this is the final few things I'm going to say about this. Number one, I'm against it, and I'm going to vote against it. Number two, should it pass, I want to be perfectly clear that I don't think there's a single special interest group out there, on either the right or the left, that is a stakeholder of ours.

Our stakeholders are the public and other government agencies, and I'm not interested in bringing any interest group in here to tell the United

NEAL R. GROSS

States Commission on Civil Rights what its platform or agenda should be for the next five to ten years. Not interested in hearing it.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What is the objection, Commissioner Yaki, to simply soliciting written views from any organization that would like to provide input into the long-run vision of the Commission on civil rights questions?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't have any objection to that. On the other hand, you know, I am deferring to Commissioner Kirsanow on this one.

that there are significant logistical hurdles to having people come in here for a briefing by May. And in our teleconference the Staff Director outlined those. I think it can be done, but I also don't want to do this simply for the purpose of doing it, going through the exercise. I think if we're going to do it, we should attempt to do it in the most competent way possible.

So when I propose this, I'm not saying this without any reservations. I do have reservations, but they're logistical reservations. I think this is necessary in terms of what's been directed to us by GPRA and by oversight.

NEAL R. GROSS

the same token, Ι think that perfectly plausible do this by seeking to We did so -- only received soliciting written input. two brief letters from stakeholders that I would simply characterize as not necessarily particularly helpful, and I don't think we'll get any more than that. I think it's more likely that people would appear for a live hearing.

Second, I think going to what Commissioner Yaki was talking about, we are at the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Civil Rights Commission. And something that may want to keep in mind we something that is related to but maybe somewhat distinct from this is having a briefing related to the next half-century of the Civil Rights Commission, if we last anywhere near that long.

But I think having a briefing along these lines -- and I disagree with Commissioner Braceras with all due respect. Ι do think that our stakeholders beyond simply the qo Congress and executive branch.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the public --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, I think --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But the public isn't represented by an interest group. We all know

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	that.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, you know, I
3	"interest group" is can be a loaded term. There
4	are interest groups, and there are groups I don't
5	necessarily think that I don't necessarily think
6	that the NAACP, for example
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I can't I don't
8	know if you're referring to the left or if you're
9	referring to all of those yahoos on the right. I
10	mean, these groups claim to have constituencies.
11	They're not membership organizations. They don't have
12	constituencies.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: But, Commissioner
14	Braceras, we invite individuals here who are members
15	or executive directors of interest groups all the
16	time. Roger Craig is here all the time.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right, because we
18	are interested in their academic
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And he doesn't
20	represent anybody but CEO.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. We are
22	interested in their view on a particular issue, a
23	substantive issue. We're not asking them for their

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And defining

view on us.

24

25

П

people as stakeholders has larger repercussions.

in hearing from somebody from the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. I very much would like to hear from them on certain topics on which they have expertise. I do not want to hear from them on what the mission of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission should be going forward. They certainly don't ask us what their mission should be going forward.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Let me just say this, and I'll -- I don't want to prolong this too much longer here. But when I talk about stakeholders in my own view, that it goes beyond simply Congress and executive branch, I threw out the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights as an example, and it's not necessarily definitive. Others may have other ideas as to whether or not they should be invited.

But I think that there are stakeholders who are members of the public who we can invite. Some of them I had mentioned on our conference call -- and I know there was objection to this -- maybe former Commissioners. I think there are people out there who can inform this debate credibly. I think it would be a useful exercise. I think, in fact, it is intrinsic to our mission to hear from these people, and I for

NEAL R. GROSS

one don't see as big a down side as Commissioner Braceras aside from the logistical aspect of this.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's not that I don't want to do a briefing like this sometime in the future. I just want to focus and streamline the work of the working group, and I don't -- I think it's a big sideshow, and I'd like to call the question.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is Commissioner Melendez. I just wanted to comment, since everybody is.

(Laughter.)

I just wanted to say, you know, I don't have a problem with some of the group on strategic planning -- listening to people, because ultimately, you know, we can take their comments or leave them, you know, because we're still basically the Commission.

And, you know, the question I had was: does this help us in our strategic planning? If it does, you know, I think it's a good idea to hear what the general public has to say. And, you know, it's -- and I don't want to take an attitude against special interest groups, because there are a lot of them out there. You know, it's like if I took an attitude

NEAL R. GROSS

1 against the Republican party. You know, I can't --2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not taking an They do very good work. 3 attitude against them. 4 just don't think that their views on what the U.S. 5 Commission on Civil Rights should do are relevant. Their views on substantive civil rights topics are 6 7 very relevant. Ι just want to be clear --8 I'm not 9 attacking them for what they do. I just don't think that their views are relevant in this case. 10 11 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Right. And the 12 issue I think is, you know, even though they may have their opinions as to civil rights in general, I'm not 13 -- I'm kind of differentiating it between them telling 14 15 me what to do as a Commissioner. I don't look at it 16 like that. 17 I just look at it as, you know, they're giving me input as to maybe it's the shift of how 18 19 civil rights were in 1964 as opposed to as I -- we all think there's kind of like a shift -- at least I do 20 21 when I came on the Commission. It just seems like things are not the same as they were back in 1964. 22 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's a 23 briefing that will take about two months to conduct. I 24

If you want people to come in and talk

mean, come on.

	about now things have changed since 1964
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, I'm not
3	saying that. I'm just saying
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Volumes have been
5	written on that.
6	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'm just saying
7	that, you know, I don't have a problem listening to
8	people. I'm not a closed-minded person that is
9	totally in control of
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Are you suggesting
11	I am?
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No. I'm just
13	saying I'm not, you know, that I have a
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, none of
15	us are, Commissioner Melendez.
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: You know, so I
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, the question
18	has been called.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, wait a
20	minute. Commissioner Ashley has had his hand up.
21	Commissioner Ashley? Taylor.
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Point of order.
24	Calling for a question prior to two-thirds vote of
25	those of those present. So, you know

1 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, we have 2 not finished this. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I have to 3 4 leave in about four minutes, so --5 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I will make my 6 comments very brief. My sense is that the time we 7 have for briefings is very precious. My sense is that I don't think inviting these groups for the purposes 8 9 of informing the strategic planning group is the best use of our time relative to the briefing. 10 I think we should do it by way of written 11 12 I think there will be a time for us to invite a lot of folks in. But relative to our 13 briefing time, I don't think this is a good use of it. 14 Well, if I could 15 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: 16 ask Commissioner Ashley --17 (Laughter.) VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I apologize. 18 19 meant to say Ashley, and I threw in a Commissioner before it. 20 21 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't want to be sloppy with our scope or our terms here. As I laid 22 out, the way GPRA contemplates this is I think we're 23 kind of presuming that a briefing would necessarily 24 25 include "special interests." I think as a preliminary

step we have to determine who it is we're inviting, and those may only include, for example, if we invited folks from Congress or their designated representatives, or somebody from the executive branch.

And let me just say that if the Commission decides that the best use of time, to which I'm very sensitive, is by written submission I'm completely comfortable with that. I don't have a problem with that. I simply would say that I think it is very useful to have a live debate on matters that will inform our strategic plan. And I don't think it would take that long.

I don't think it would be a sideshow. But, you know, I -- I am simply interested in using the best possible procedure, informing the establishment of our strategic plan, consistent with GPRA goals, consistent with Oversight. And, remember now, Oversight has kicked this thing back to us already. They've said, you know, "Your first stab at this didn't work." So I'm more concerned about getting it right than getting it fast, but I'd like to do both if we can.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, if -- look, the motion is altered. If we can come to some

NEAL R. GROSS

1	consensus that we can solicit views in the form of
2	written statements, we do not, then, have to postpone
3	the briefing on historically black colleges and
4	universities, a briefing that I also am extremely
5	interested in. And if we
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'd like to vote
7	on the motion as written. And if somebody has a
8	substantive motion to do something different, request
9	written testimony or what have you, then let them make
10	that motion. But I'd like to vote on the motion as
11	written.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, first of
13	all, I didn't propose I didn't write that motion.
14	I was simply repeating it something that was
15	written, but
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, Jennifer,
17	what is the down side to altering amending the
18	motion, so that we go ahead with the briefing on
19	historically black colleges and universities, and, in
20	the meantime, we solicit written
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: From whom?
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Pardon me?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Solicit written
24	testimony from whom?
25	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We need to decide that.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Can I propose this? I would make a motion, first, that we determine whether or not we have a briefing versus seeking any other kind of input. Second is the timing of such briefing. Is it something that occurs in May, if, in fact, we agree on a briefing? Or is it something that occurs at some other time, and maybe morphs into something bigger or different as a result of it not being truly informative of the strategic plan?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I don't want to do that, because if I have to vote on whether or not to have a briefing at all, first and foremost, then I'm going to have to vote no. I'd rather just vote on whether or not to do it this spring, and we can revisit the topic later. And you may convince me that it's worth doing later on, but I do not think it's worth doing now. And if I have to vote on the whole thing, I'm going to vote no.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. I'm calling the question on the motion as it exists, which is to postpone the briefing on historically black colleges and universities, and, instead, hold a briefing on strategic planning. And that is in May.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 That would be in May. To continue to -- to stick with 2 current plans of holding the briefing on 3 HBUCs. 4 COMMISSIONER **BRACERAS:** So read the 5 motion, because it --VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 6 The motion is: 7 I move the Commission postpone until April '07 the briefing prepared -- previously approved for May 5, 8 9 2006, addressing the effectiveness of historically black colleges and universities and hold, instead, a 10 briefing on strategic planning on May 5, 2006. 11 12 So this is simply a question of whether we postpone and substitute. Postpone the briefing on 13 14 historically black colleges and universities and 15 substitute a briefing on strategic planning. We can 16 take up later the question of whether we have a 17 briefing on strategic planning and what that briefing looks like. 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I need to vote. 19 20 I've got to go. I'm sorry. I've got to be out of 21 town in 15 minutes. All 22 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: right. 23 Let's have a vote on it. Can we call the question? All in favor? 24

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Roll call?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Kirsanow, aye.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Nay.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yaki, aye.
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Melendez, aye.
6	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Nay.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What do we have
8	there? Three and three. The motion fails. the
9	motion fails.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Did Commissioner
11	Melendez just get off the call?
12	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, I'm still on.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay. I
14	thought I heard you say good-bye.
15	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, no. I said
16	aye.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. The
18	motion fails. So we are not postponing the briefing
19	on the historically black universities and colleges.
20	That will take place, as previously approved, in May.
21	Commissioner Braceras, have you got
22	something anything more you want to say?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have nothing to
24	say. I think that the strategic planning working
25	group should continue to revise the document, and if
l	

1	somebody wants to propose having a briefing on this
2	topic in the fall, then a contact paper should be
3	drawn up, and it should be a narrowly-tailored
4	document, so we're all very clear on the focus of such
5	a briefing, and we can have a discussion about that
6	instead of a vague, nebulous idea.
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is it the view of
8	the strategic planning working group that we are
9	obligated as a matter of statutory obligation, that
10	is, to have a briefing?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: In fact, GPRA
14	doesn't say we have to have a briefing.
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Just input.
16	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It says we have to
17	have input.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right. Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It leaves it to us
20	to
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. But first
22	we need to figure out who we think our stakeholders
23	are. We need to define them, and then we need to ask
24	for input.
25	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And then, we need to

1	decide whether or not the input takes the form of a
2	briefing or written testimony.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm willing to
4	consider the idea of a briefing once we, as a
5	Commission, define our stakeholders privately.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. We're
7	this issue has been resolved, and, Commissioner
8	Braceras, you can hang up.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Sorry.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: That's okay.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm now 20 late
12	for my meeting. Okay. Bye.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Thank you very
14	much for staying.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, bye.
16	IV. Staff Director's Report
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. I
18	believe that we are back now to the Staff Director's
19	report.
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you, Madam
21	Vice Chair. Just a few points.
22	First, Commissioners may recall that for
23	next month the briefing topic is the census, and
24	specifically the minorities in the census. I'm happy
25	to say that Census Bureau Director Charles Kincannon

has agreed to address the Commission during the briefing, as have Professor Kenneth Pruitt of Columbia University, and Professor Sharon Lee of Cortland State University.

Invitations remain outstanding to Mr. Peter Scarey of The Brookings Institution, Mr. Ward Connerly of the American Civil Rights Institute, and Ms. Katherine Wallman, Chief Statistician at OMB's Statistical and Science Policy Branch.

I also wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission that we have begun conversations with the Government Printing Office and the University of Maryland's Thurgood Marshall Law Library about the possibility that the University of Maryland's Thurgood Marshall Law Library would serve as an alternative official repository for electronic official U.S. Commission on Civil Rights documents.

This would take place as a part of an existing GPO program. They have been in conversations with the University of Maryland about doing this. Under the proposed notion, if we were to do this, no money would change hands. Thurgood Marshall Law Library already maintains a collection of the official work of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. So it would not be a significant change in that respect, but

they would receive official recognition from the Government Printing Office.

In the event that we were to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Government Printing Office and the University of Maryland on this topic, it occurs to me that we would likely need to ensure that the holdings of the University of Maryland would comport with approved U.S. Commission on Civil Rights policies.

For instance, the Commission has, within the last -- a little over a year approved a policy regarding the way in which we oppose materials that were not approved by a majority of the Commission. And that is an issue which we knew would have to be worked out, and we would need to make sure that documents are kept in an official manner without extraneous or misleading markings, and that they are kept in an appropriate manner.

We're still in an early phase of the discussion, but I thought I should bring it to the attention of the Commission, in case there are members of the Commission who have either concerns or ideas about this.

Preliminarily, it appears to be a way of ensuring that, since the University of Maryland is

NEAL R. GROSS

keeping these documents anyhow, that they do it in a way which is neutral and objective and consistent with Commission policy, and without any expense to the Commission or to the GPO.

I don't know if there are any questions on that before I move on, or any input that people have.

(No response.)

So I will continue to keep Commissioners posted as we go forward in discussions with GPO and the University of Maryland on that topic.

Finally, I regret to inform the Commission that three very dedicated, very highly valued members of our staff have indicated an intent to resign and to take other positions elsewhere. Terri Dickerson, the Director of the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation, will be leaving the Commission to accept a position at the United States Coast Guard. She is leaving the Commission after almost six years of service. We expect that her last day in the office will be Friday, March 31st.

Seth Jaffe, an Attorney Advisor in the Office of the Staff Director, will be leaving the Commission to accept a position in the United States Office of Government Ethics. And Mireille Zieseniss, a Civil Rights Analyst in the Office of Civil Rights

NEAL R. GROSS

Evaluation, will be leaving the Commission after seven of service to accept a position in the years Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mireille's last day in the office will be Friday, March 17th.

All three of these individuals have provided excellent service. We have been privileged to have them among us, and are proud to have had them within the agency. I don't mean to lump them all together, except in the sense that they will all be leaving within approximately the same time, but we thank them for their service and will be sorry to leave them -- to see them go. But we do wish them well in their new employment.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I would certainly like to second that, that I'm very sorry to see all three of them go, and it has been a privilege and pleasure to have them here.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Madam Chair, a couple -- first, I would concur with that. They have all done very good work. And I've had the longest experience obviously with Ms. Dickerson, who has always been extraordinarily professional and has done a very, very good job for the Commission. That's not to diminish anybody else, but she has been I think

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

around a little bit longer, or at least I've had more interaction with her.

Second, just a question, actually two questions. One is, to what extent, if you've done this or assessed it already, is the budgetary impact on that attrition? It seems to me we're going to have to replace all three anyway, or maybe not. And next is, to what extent have we taken any steps, or where are we with respect to possibly finding replacements?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Those are good questions. We certainly will want and need to replace Ms. Dickerson, and we will be announcing a senior executive service position. Since all three of them have fairly recently given notice, we have not yet taken official step to announce their positions.

Similarly, Mr. Jaffe will need to be replaced by another attorney advisor in the Office of the Staff Director.

As for the upcoming vacancy in the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation, it seems to me that we have two options. We certainly have fewer people in that office than we need, so it will -- it would certainly hurt not to replace an outgoing civil rights analyst.

On the other hand, there are also other

NEAL R. GROSS

vacancies that are very important as well. One of the alternatives before the Commission is to -- is to hold off on replacing her and in the meantime using the funds that are saved to authorize the hiring of another Commissioner Assistant.

I've been asked in prior meetings whether it would be possible, consistent with our budget, to hire another Commissioner Assistant for Commissioner Melendez. One of the options that we now have available is to permit him to do that immediately on a permanent basis rather than a detail.

As for the question of the budget impact,

I would say that no matter -- I would say that no
matter how quickly we're able to bring people on,
there is going to be a bit of a lag, which means that
there will be some savings of money. On the other
hand, it certainly does mean it will be difficult to
handle our programs in the next few months.

It is at least fortunate that our statutory report is either done or nearly done, and that's the main work of OCRE. But it's still the case that we have a large number of briefings coming up for OCRE, and we're just going to have to work to try and do more with less.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Does the fact

NEAL R. GROSS

that Terri Dickerson is leaving and OCRE is really not properly staffed, should it have an impact on how we think about our priorities in terms of these briefings and in terms of the statutory report as well?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: To answer the question for me, Madam Vice Chair, it seems to me that we will still be able to do them in the same way or the same order. If it turns out that workflow just becomes unmanageable with the fewer people, I can report back to the Commission as to whether we need to cut a briefing or two that is scheduled for later in the year. But for the meantime, I think the best way is just to try and continue along the path that we're on.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And can we contract work out if there is social science expertise, for instance, needed on a particular topic?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, that's something we would have to look into. We do have an ability to contract out for work, but there are some statutory limitations on our ability to do that. Over the next several months, the main challenges that we have in the Office for Civil Rights Evaluation, once we get through the statutory report, will be to conduct the briefings.

1 Now, that work I think is best done --2 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: In-house. 3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: -- in-house. 4 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. 5 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: To do the public 6 education campaign on anti-semitism. I suppose we 7 could look into that question, but I think it could be done in-house. And I suppose OCRE will need to 8 9 provide backup support to OGC's project on elementary and secondary education, and perhaps to get started 10 early on the next statutory report. 11 12 I think that the projects they're working on probably at this point can best be handled in-13 14 it's just a matter of replacing the and 15 outgoing employees. 16 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Did somebody 17 have their hand up here? COMMISSIONER YAKI: I did. I just wanted 18 19 that in my year on the Commission I have 20 enjoyed working with Terri, Mireille, and with Seth, 21 and wish them all the very best success in their 22 future endeavors. 23 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, I know that's a -- it's a rare issue on which there is 24 25 consensus on the Commission.

V. Management and Operations Special Assistant for Commissioner Melendez

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And that really does -- the Staff Directors' report really does bring us directly into the next item, which is a Special Assistant for Commissioner Melendez.

This would be a motion in the nature of a substitute amendment to lift the moratorium on hiring Commissioners Special Assistants, to permit the hiring of one for Commissioner Melendez. Can I have a motion to that effect, that we lift the moratorium on the hiring of Special Assistants, and for the exclusive purpose of hiring a Special Assistant for Commissioner Melendez as soon a possible?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I wonder if the Staff Director could flesh out a little bit the impact of whatever budgetary savings we may have as a result of the attrition that was just discussed on the possible hire of a Special Assistant for Commissioner

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, I would envision that the new Special Assistant would replace the outgoing civil rights analyst, since we are

NEAL R. GROSS

Melendez.

1	replacing a civil rights analyst at a GS-13 level, who
2	as a Commissioner's Assistant, even if the new
3	Commissioner's Assistant were brought in at a GS-13
4	level, which is the maximum, it would be
5	essentially
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: A wash?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: a wash, yes.
8	Now, that would it would be essentially a wash.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any further
10	discussion?
11	(No response.)
12	Let's have a vote. All in favor?
13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	Opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	The motion passes unanimously.
17	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I want to thank
18	you very much for that. It will really help me out in
19	the work I have to do as a Commissioner, so thank you.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, it's our
21	pleasure, and, of course, every Commissioner should
22	have a Special Assistant.
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any time you
25	can tell members of Congress that, you're welcome to.
l l	1

It's appreciated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

February 15, 2006 Letter to Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. We need letter requesting motion post SAC term extension on the Commission website, authorizing subcommittees to extend the terms of the State Advisory Committees in reauthorization legislation. You should have the motion in front of you.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Do you need a second?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Well, I need somebody to make a motion, actually.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I move that the Commission post on its website the order submitted by the Chairman to our House and Senate authorizing committees to extend the terms of the State Advisory Committees in our reauthorization legislation.

This letter, submitted on February 15, 2006, recommended that Congress extend the terms of the SACs and their members to four years when it considers reauthorization legislation for the Commission.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: All right. Now

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 I need a second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Any discussion?

(No response.)

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposition?

(No response.)

Passes unanimously.

February 15, 2006 Corrective Action Plan

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Then, there's the question of the corrective action plan. The Commission submitted its corrective action plan, as requested by the Office of Management and Budget, on November 15, 2005. This plan addresses reportable conditions noted in the Commission's fiscal year financial -- '05 financial statement audit.

The plan presents audit findings, provides contexts or backgrounds related to each finding, summarizes the recommendations made by the independent auditors, and discusses the corrective actions the Commission has implemented or is in the process of implementing. The plan also provides the Commission's target completion dates for corrective action that are currently underway and indicated the actual completion

NEAL R. GROSS

1	dates for correction action already implemented.
2	And I simply need a motion to post the
3	corrective action plan on the Commission's website.
4	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madam Vice Chair, I
5	move that the Commission post on its website the
6	corrective action plan submitted to the Office of
7	Management and Budget on February 15, 2006. This plan
8	addresses
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: We don't have
10	to go through that whole language I just went through.
11	I know it says it there, but it's just a repeat.
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Oh, okay.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Precise
14	language.
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All right.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Have we got a
17	second?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Is there any
20	discussion on this?
21	(No response.)
22	All right. All in favor, aye?
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	Opposed?
25	(No response.)
	NEAL P. GPOSS

1	The motion is approved unanimously.
2	I think we're done. Do we have a motion
3	to adjourn?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So moved.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I second
6	it.
7	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Future agenda items?
8	VIII. Future Agenda Items
9	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Oh, future
10	agenda items. I'm sorry. It's because we have
11	reordered this things are out of order. Sorry
12	about that.
13	Future agenda items. I don't even have
14	this in front of me. I have no idea.
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We don't have any
16	future agenda items. Commissioner Yaki requested at
17	the last meeting that we place on the agenda an item
18	so that if anyone has future business issues they
19	could be raised. That's
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That makes for a
21	nice segue into a comment I wanted to make. In my
22	mind at least, I recognize that we're operating under
23	significant fiscal constraints. But I really think
24	it's important that we, to the extent feasible, try to
25	have a meeting outside of Washington. And Katrina was

the obvious situation for us to have a meeting, and we 2 -- for a variety of reasons, we didn't. 3 But I just want to go on record as saying 4 I think we should work as hard as we can to put our 5 house in order such that we can have that flexibility 6 in the future. I think we need it. I think it's 7 something we should do. And I think we will become conspicuously absent from certain events if we -- if 8 9 we continue to hold all of our meetings in Washington. 10 So --11 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You know, it 12 does seem to me that Katrina specifically -- that are going to hold -- have a 13 unless we have --14 briefing, hold some kind of hearings, do something 15 Katrina-related, we don't want to go down to New 16 Orleans. 17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, Ι don't I just we need that flexibility. We need 18 disagree. 19 to plan such that we have the flexibility to do those 20 things when circumstances warrant. And right now we 21 don't, but we need to get in a position where we do, because I think we're missing. 22 23 DIRECTOR Ιf STAFF MARCUS: the Commissioners have a compelling interest in doing that 24

this year, then we could look into it.

25

1

We are doing

1	better this year than planned, because of the extent
2	of the attrition and because we have because of the
3	time necessary to hire new people. So this year is
4	actually a better year for thinking about those than
5	future years. Next year may be harder because it
6	looks like the budget will be tighter for next year.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would note that
8	we have an extraordinarily pressing issue on the
9	Native Hawaiian matter that we had a briefing on, and
10	I suggest that we
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: A question on just
12	a followup on that. Are we going to when will that
13	report be ready, and when will Commissioner statements
14	be needed by for the Native Hawaiian briefing?
15	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We are working to
16	have it available for a vote at the April meeting.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
18	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: As for
19	Commissioner statements, I don't believe we've set a
20	date. We could either set it for the same for the
21	same date, which is to say the April meeting, or for a
22	couple weeks after that.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: After, because VRA
24	comments will be the same day as the April meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You're right.

1	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: That's a good
2	point.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: By the way, I would
5	also be in favor of holding a meeting on tribal land.
6	I don't know if every Commissioner has had the
7	opportunity to actually step foot on tribal land, but
8	if you have not I think it is helpful in terms of
9	forming our discussion of these issues. So
10	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Well, you know,
11	I think there's well, I am in agreement with that.
12	It would be nice to get out of Washington. I think as
13	an agency it lends adds to our credibility.
14	Any other business, future business?
15	(No response.)
16	All right. We are adjourned.
17	(Whereupon, at 11:37 a.m., the proceedings in the
18	foregoing matter were adjourned.)
19	
20	
21	
22	