U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 17, 2006

+ + + + +

WASHINGTON, D.C.

+ + + + +

The commission convened at 9:00 a.m. in room 550 of 624 $9^{\mbox{\tiny th}}$ St NW, Gerald Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

Present:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, Chairman

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Member

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Member

ARLAN D. MELENDEZ (via telephone), Member

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Member

MICHAEL YAKI, Member

Staff Present:

KENNETH MARCUS, Staff Director EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor DAVID BLACKWOOD, General Counsel

A-G-E-N-D-A

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA
II.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13 MEETING4
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS5
IV.	PROGRAM PLANNING6
	Briefing Report Benefits of Diversity in Elementary and Secondary Education
V.	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
	Orange County Voter Harassment Letter
	2007 Business Meeting and Briefing Calendar
VI.	STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES101
	Recharter Package for California State Advisory Committee
VII.	FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS117
VIII.	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT118
IX.	ADJOURN

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

2

1

(9:20 a.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I apologize for the late start. Is Commissioner Melendez on the line? Is anyone on the line?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** Very good. Okay. This meeting will come to order. This is a meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at 624 9th Street, Washington, D.C. N.W., Room 540, All commissioners are present, except for the Vice Chair, Commissioner Melendez is participating by telephone. We were previously scheduled to conduct a briefing in Voting Rights the Territories. today on Unfortunately, due to scheduling conflicts, we have had a low rate of acceptance from potential speakers. We will try again to conduct this briefing next year; however, today we will conduct only our regular monthly meeting. First item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Once we have a motion to approve the agenda, I suggest that we amend the agenda just to rearrange the order.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

In any event, may I have a motion to approve the agenda?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I move to
5	change the order of the items to be considered so that
6	the Staff Director's Report will be the last item on
7	the agenda. Is there a second?
8	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
10	favor?
11	(Chorus of ayes.)
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
13	Okay. The motion passes unanimously.
14	The second item is the Approval of the
15	Minutes of the October 13 th , 2006 meeting.
16	II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 13 MEETING
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a motion?
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
22	favor?
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
25	Any abstentions? The motion passes unanimously.
	NEAL D. CDOSS

Next up, we have the Announcements for the month of November.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: November is National American Indian and Alaska Native Heritage Month. This month is dedicated to recognizing the intertribal cultures, events, lifestyles, designs, achievements of American Indians and Alaska Natives. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has marked this observation since 1976, and on behalf the Commission, I urge all Americans to celebrate National American Indian and Alaska Native Heritage Month by participating in appropriate programs and activities.

Also, November marks the 22nd anniversary of Fred Korematsu and Min Yasui, and Gordon Hirabashi, their petition to overturn their World War II convictions for violating curfew and the evacuation orders directed at Americans of Japanese descent. It is also the --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: The coram novis cases.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: They were called the coram novis cases.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I guess we could have a briefing on that alone, and have you as one of 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

panelists. It is also the 16th anniversary of the signing by then President George H.W. Bush of a law requiring the payment of \$20,000 to each surviving Japanese American internee.

And, finally, November 29th marks the 30th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities and Education Act. IDEA mandates the provision to allow students with disabilities to obtain a free appropriately structured public education. This anniversary reminds us of the importance of working together to ensure that all children are provided with educational opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential.

Next up, we have the Briefing Report on the Benefits of Diversity in Elementary and Secondary Education.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: On July 28th, 2006, the Commission conducted a briefing on the impact of racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools. The Commission directed staff to prepare a briefing report after the briefing. The Office of the Staff Director distributed the first draft of this briefing report to the Commissioners on September 29th, 2006, at which time we were asked for

NEAL R. GROSS

those comments and redistribute a proposed final draft 2 in time for a vote at the October 13th meeting. 3 4 Based on the request of some 5 commissioners, additional time needed. was 13th October 6 Consequently, at the 7 Commissioners agreed to have OSD distribute another draft on October 20th; whereas, Commissioners' comments 8 were due to OSD on November 2nd. The Staff Director's 9 Office then turned around a proposed final draft 10 briefing report incorporating those 11 comments on November 9th for a vote at this business meeting. 12 It's now been three and a half months 13 since the briefing, and a month and a half since the 14 Commissioners were first provided with a draft of this 15 16 report. May I have a motion to approve the briefing report sent to the Commissioners on November 9th, 2006? 17 18 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So moved. 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second. 20 21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? Oh, yes. Why am I not surprised? Commissioner Yaki. 22 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, you should not be surprised. Are the staff who wrote this report 24 25 present?

our input with the hopes that OSD would incorporate

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Unfortunately, one of the individuals who put in a lot of time called in sick this morning.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's unfortunate, because I would like to ask questions about --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Who is that, by the way?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Chris Byrnes.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Some of the statements in here, I'd like to know the source of many of the changes that were made, and I would especially like to familiarity with the rather voluminous his bibliography that was attached, because I believe that there are statements made about certain of the studies that do not comport with what their conclusions were, other ones are all lumped together, and I'm not too sure whether they should be lumped together in terms of citations. And, again, I have no idea where some of the changes came, especially in the findings which are radically restructured in a way that would enable me to get some idea about who participated, and why certain changes were made.

In the absence of that, I cannot -- in the absence of the author being here, I really believe I

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

cannot, in good conscience, vote on this in any way, shape, or form, given the fact that this is our first opportunity publicly to discuss this document, and to ask questions that go toward the heart of the justification for many of the findings, and to ask whether or not aspects of the bibliography were, indeed, read cobbled together, or just relied upon from other citations in other works; which, for me, goes to the whole issue of why I have objections to the very nature of doing findings and recommendations in briefing reports.

I recall when I first came here a year ago, we had many discussions about the fact that we wish to do items that had a much more raw nature about the data and the research, that we would put it out I remember the quote, "Put it out there on the website and let people draw their own conclusions, or use it they would in proceedings before the as legislature, in Social Science, what have you." We diverged radically from those have declarations, in that the briefings which I always thought would be a good way to get issues out on the table, to hear divergent points of view, discussion and dissension on topics, and let public, let the policy makers, let the researchers use

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

that material, much as you would a hearing report in the House of Representatives or the Senate, where conclusions are not drawn, but the raw material is out there for people to access and use. And when I looked at - I don't want to jump too far ahead of myself - when I looked at Commissioner Braceras' attempts to put some structure to briefing reports, which I greatly admire and commend her for doing that, it still seems to me that it's like our dear late friend, Ann Richards, used to say - you can put lipstick on a cow and call it Susie, but it's still a pig.

This is an issue where the idea that we can somehow from three hours of testimony, go to a body of literature afterwards and create findings and recommendations, I think is inconsistent with this. It's a drain on staff resources. I would love to know how much of our staff time is spent combing through the one, two, three, four - seventy-odd, hundred-odd citations in the bibliography, given that we already are screaming about lack of staff resources for our national reports, as it is. As you know, two meetings ago we cut back on our national report, because we don't have the kind of resources in which to do that.

So in the absence of Chris being here, I

NEAL R. GROSS

understand he's a hardworking guy, respect him greatly. I would have appreciated him being here to answer these questions, which I believe go toward the credibility and the changes in the report over time, and in the absence of that, I can't vote on it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner Braceras.

isn't COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: This specifically about this report, but I just wanted to raise, at this time, the issue of reforming process going forward. And just to note for the record that as Commissioner Yaki said, I did submit to of you for discussion purposes, a draft proposed rules for briefing reports that I hope will eliminate many of the concerns that Commissioner Yaki has, and I share many of those concerns. while I realize that we cannot grind our work to a halt while commissioners deliberate on new rules, and come up with a new plan for briefing reports, I would like just to be very clear that this will be the last briefing report that Ι will vote for until implement, not necessarily my rules, but a system that hopefully we can get buy-in on from the Democratic members of the Commission, as well. Because I think really important to our credibility going that's

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

and I think that it's important 1 forward, have 2 integrity in the process, and have all of the commissioners feel 3 comfortable with that process, 4 whatever it may turn out to be. So I hope that you'll 5 all carefully look at the draft I put together, and we 6 can maybe conference about it; and, ideally, bring it 7 up for debate and vote at the next meeting. So with that in mind, I'm going to vote 8 9 for this report because a large amount of work went 10 into it, and I think it's a good report, but it will be the last report I will support until we have some 11 12 better procedural rules in place. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'd like to --13 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is 14 Commissioner Melendez here. 15 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. Can you hear me? 18 19 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. I just wanted to 20 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: 21 say, I did submit some comments on this report. And I appreciate Jennifer's working on this issue, because 22 it's really overdue and needed. 23 But, again, what I said in my comments was that I believe that we go 24 25 beyond the testimony, similar to the Native Hawaiians,

where we interjected most of our own opinion about staff, and I think we kind of see that here in this So just based on the fact that we don't want to seem biased to either of the presenters at that time, I would hope that we could send in a report to Congress that was basically without findings, similar to what we did before. And, hopefully, they can make up their own minds as to that testimony of all of the presenters, so that's kind of my position until we can actually get a better process in place, so I would concur with Mr. Yaki that the findings are what I'm having trouble with. We don't have the expertise as far as Social Science review in our office, I don't believe, or it hasn't been done, except for Chris Byrnes maybe reviewing this. And I think we go beyond what the people actually testified to, so that's my opinion, and hopefully -- I would vote not to include the findings, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, I'd like to say that -- well, first of all, I'd like to commend the staff. I think that this report is quite good. I think that the staff put in a lot of time, and they came up with a -- the product is good, in my humble opinion. I find it interesting that we are spending this much time talking about our procedures.

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

So far, no one has identified any fatal flaws with the document.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let me finish. We're talking procedural issues, tactical issues. If we can point to something in the document that is fatally flawed, then I think that we should address it. Hold on, folks, let me finish. I'll get to everyone.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Don't raise a question that you know I'm going to have an answer to.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, well, no. I don't I want to have this discussion. The notion mind. that we issue briefing reports without any findings, I don't think that's the way we should go. This is the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and it would be a deviation from the role that we have historically played. We are not neutral observers. Sometimes things are right, sometimes things are wrong. This agency, this commission has always had a particular point of view. If you will, it's been biased against say the South's attempt to deny the vote to blacks. not unusual for the commission to leadership role when it comes to civil rights issues. That's why we're here. This is not a think-tank.

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

Our job is not to just deliver facts to decision makers. Our job is to influence decision makers, in my view.

This particular document, I think that the findings reflect what was said. I think that the main thrust of the document is that when we look at the literature out there, at best, the benefits are modest in reading. In math, I think that there is consensus that there is no benefits that have been quantified, so that was the main thrust findings. I think those findings are supported by the testimony.

This is not an instance where a particular panelist was singled out. I think that the findings are a -- this is the consensus of all the individuals that participated in the briefing. Modest findings for reading, no benefits in math, and some screwy findings with respect, and in one study showed that segregation, in some instances, helped Hispanics, so the data is all over the place. That's what I took away from the hearing.

Commissioner Braceras.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you on the merits, that I think that that's what the evidence demonstrates. However, I have to

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

respectfully disagree with your comment that we're spending too much time discussing process. I think process is extremely --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no, no. I don't think I said that. I said I find it interesting that we're focusing on process --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I think process is critical, because --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, let me rephrase my statement then. I am not -- I think it's a good idea that we're going to have some clear guidelines with respect to our briefing reports, but looking at the merits, looking at this particular document, I don't see --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Under a revised process, it may very well be that we'd come out with the exact same -- well, I think we would come out with the exact same findings and recommendations. However, I think what would be different about it is that the findings would be findings that -- rather than staff findings, I think they'd be commissioner findings. And I think there would be a chance to explore each of the findings at a commissioner level, instead of just voting for the report in and all or nothing format. And this -- it's the same objection I had under the

NEAL R. GROSS

old regime with Mary Frances Berry, where at that time, when we were in the minority, we were presented with reports that had conclusions and recommendations with which not everyone agreed, and we were asked to vote up or down on the entire thing, even though there may be some very good, interesting material in the report. We, as minority commissioners at the time, didn't necessarily agree with all the findings and conclusions. And what we wanted from Mary Frances Berry, and what we never received, was an opportunity to deliberate over each of the findings, and have an opportunity to vote on them individually.

Now under that regime, we still would have lost those votes. And under this administration, the Democratic commissioners may still loose particular votes on particular findings, but I think that if they had an opportunity to discuss the findings one by one, and to dissent from each particular finding so that would give the process greater integrity. That's all. I'm not saying that the findings would be different, or that the report is in any way academically flawed, but I do think the process is extremely important.

Anyway, putting that aside, I'd just simply like to ask Commissioners Melendez and Yaki if there's any compromise possible on this document that

NEAL R. GROSS

would satisfy them, and enable them to vote for it?

Is there anything, short of tanking the whole thing,
that you would remove from the report? I mean, is
there some way we can come up --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or object to?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Are there sections of the report that could be removed, and would then satisfy your concerns?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, point of clarification. With respect to -- well, I would -- am I correct that with our national reports, our statutory report, for example, we have the flexibility to support particular findings, but not others. Is that already in place?

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Right. So when the working group on the reform came up with its original rules, they were focused on national reports because we hadn't, as a commission, yet moved to this But then when we moved to this model, we found in the position of having to vote ourselves findings and recommendations that hadn't been vetted in the same way by the commissioners themselves. And it's not that I think that the commission should not the business be in of making findings and recommendations. I think it's fine for us to make

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

findings and recommendations, but I think that as with other study groups, and even governmental commissions, I think that each finding needs to be considered separately, and there needs to be an opportunity to explain the positions of the majority and minority on each finding.

I think, for example, to the report on Title 9 that was done by you guys at the Department of Education. Right? That was under your leadership. Where the findings were stated, and then underneath it would say something like dissenting commissioners were concerned that blah, blah, blah, blah, concern about each finding was listed. There weren't voluminous dissenting statements, but it was broken be down in what seemed to а more procedurally democratic way. That might be a model that we would look to, and that's something that we need to discuss as commissioners, whether that's a model we want to adopt.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think we should redouble our efforts to get the procedures in place, and with any luck, vote on it at our next meeting.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, that's what I'm trying to do, but in the meantime, I would like to

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

to

whether there are specific paragraphs or things that 2 3 if removed they could support the report, or would you 4 vote against it anyway? 5 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, I think --6 this is Commissioner Melendez. Again, I have problem 7 with a lot of the findings and a lasso citation to some of the Social Science portions of this. 8 And 9 really what that would require would be to delay this 10 until another meeting, and go back over it, 11 basically see if it's acceptable to delete certain 12 things, even more so; otherwise, I'd have to still vote against the way it is now. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me just put it 14 15 to you this way. If there were no findings and 16 recommendations in this report, would you vote for it? 17 COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: If there were no findings, yes. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Commissioner Yaki? 20 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let me just talk just a little bit about procedure. 22 I am somewhat And, again, this has nothing to do with 23 the qualifications of Mr. Byrnes, who I think does a 24 25 fine job, but this was, in many ways, an exercise in

from Commissioners Yaki and Melendez

1

hear

understanding the Social Science research of this. It is my understanding that we have Social Science people in OCRE, and my first question is, did they review the bibliography and literature to determine whether or not some of the conclusions made about the literature, or characterization of the literature were accurate or not?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: making In assignments, I think that we had the luxury of having staff someone who is particularly expert rights policy, and who educational civil unusual amount of expertise dealing with regarding diversity in education, and that's You may be aware that he joined us from the Office for Civil Rights at the Department Education, where a large percentage of his work dealt with looking at issues of diversity in education. he is, I think, a person who has an unusually strong background in the subject.

He was joined in this work for parts of it by an analyst that we had on detail from HUD. We did not have anyone --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is she an analyst or an attorney?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Pardon?

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 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Was she an analyst or 2 an attorney from HUD? She was 3 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 4 attorney. Ι don't recall her exact personnel 5 designation, but she was some form of analyst. 6 COMMISSIONER YAKI: And what kind of 7 training did she have? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Her background is 8 9 in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity dealing with fair housing issues at HUD. 10 We did not 11 precisely the sort of exercise that you 12 described, but we did have a review of at least some of the findings by OCRE, just where it appeared that 13 some technical quidance would be necessary. 14 15 kind of a reality check. 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: But the basic answer is no. 17 DIRECTOR MARCUS: I don't think 18 STAFF 19 that's the basic answer. The basic answer is what I 20 just gave. 21 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I think the basic answer is that OCRE's Social Scientist did not play a 22 significant role in reviewing whether or not 23 characterizations of the Social Science research and 24 25 the bibliography, as characterized in the findings,

were accurate or not.

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

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: They played only a supporting role in the findings. That's right.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you. The reason I'm bringing that up is that, like I said, I have great fondness and appreciation for the comments of Commissioner Braceras, and if you were to ask me, I would say that, to me, the significant flaw, fatal flaw of this document is in tone, characterization. When you start with Finding One, first sentence, "There's little academic consensus", that sentence in -- that phrase, in and of itself, I believe, is misleading. You had in the testimony from Professor Kurlaender and Attorney Coleman that they believed there was broad consensus on the idea that there were educational benefits.

Now part of this definitional issue that we have, as the Chair said, the Chair keeps on talking about math, but the educational benefit, the educational experience in the American primary school system, and its impact on secondary and post-secondary goes far beyond simply whether or not it's a math score, or the English score.

I like, for example, the points brought up about should there be differential research on

NEAL R. GROSS

economics, and some of the other areas? I think those are good questions to pose. I think those are the kinds of things that briefing reports should look at to say, everyone seems to be focusing on these two factors, but there are other differentials that we should look at to see what kind of impact there is on that. I like that.

What I don't like, though, is the idea that you say there's little academic consensus, where there is clearly two people saying there is, two people there are not --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why don't we just say the evidence is mixed?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: The evidence is -- I would say we would simply characterize the panel as they said it, which is that two of them believe there was broad academic consensus, and cite who it was they believe constitutes that broad consensus, and the two said there wasn't, cite the one or two studies, which I know that they were doing, to say that there wasn't. That, to me, is how these findings should be done. So, number one, as it starts off, is just completely off the chart.

I could go --

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, before you go on

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

25

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, you asked me for my response.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, no. Oh, no, no, And I want you to continue, but before you do, no. since my memory isn't what it should be, I would like to respond to the first bullet point. I mean, we have to sit in judgment of the evidence that's put before us, and to judge the credibility of the panelists, and at times, will come the evidence. And we, different conclusions, and I think that that's all But in terms of the academic piece of this, I don't think - at least I don't recall any panelist stating that there were significant academic benefits to diversity.

Now to put it in context, I mean, the issue before the court - okay --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Did you say academic? What did you -- rephrase that.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Academic benefits? I said that, no, I don't recall any of the panelists stating that there was significant academic educational benefits to diverse settings in schools. Now the background, though, is a court case. The court is going to need a compelling state interest.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now if we're saying that on the one hand we have to meet the strict scrutiny standard, and on the other, at best, what we have in one subject area is modest educational improvement, and even that is mixed. The high-performing black students, they seem to benefit; whereas, the low-performing black students do not. That's what the court is going to look at, and so when I discuss this issue --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that a mixed result, or is that a differential result? In other words, you have a clear measure of higher performance in one category, and not in another. Now is that mixed, or is that a differential?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: In that particular case, it's mixed. Overall, I believe all of the Social Scientists on the panel said that with respect to math, nothing; with respect to reading, it's modest. I believe the best we can do is two points.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, just with respect to this first sentence, the word "consensus" means agreement. The fact that we're even having this discussion proves the validity of the sentence, that there is little academic agreement. I mean, if some people think that are benefits to racial and ethnic diversity, and some people think that there are not

NEAL R. GROSS

_	benefits, then there is no constitution.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would disagree
3	with that, Commissioner Braceras, because if you and I
4	were to say based on, let's say Panelist A and
5	Panelist B. Panelist A said there was consensus,
6	Panelist B said there's no consensus, and you
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And if they don't
8	agree, there's no consensus.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that may be,
LO	except that Panelist B is talking about two reports,
11	and Panelist A is talking about 125. I mean, to me,
12	that is part of the methodological and open
13	scholarship
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's still
15	not a consensus. It could be 99 to 1, and that's not
16	a consensus, that's a majority viewpoint.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, in that case
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You wouldn't call
19	it a consensus.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In that case, then we
21	should rephrase it to instead of using the weak
22	phrase, "There's little academic consensus", we could,
23	instead, say that the majority of academic reports
24	support blankity-blank, versus us taking it back
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or we could just

say the evidence is mixed.

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 YAKI: -- and saying mixed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The evidence is mixed.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: But see, that's what I don't believe that the evidence is as mixed as you say it is. When I look at the bibliographies, and I see who it is that's saying no, and who it is that's saying yes, it's one thing to say there's 25 reports here, and 25 reports here. There's nothing to say there's 25 different reports by different authors in different studies over here, versus 25 of the same people jinnying up the same thing over and over again.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you backing out the flawed studies? I mean, the two panelists who were most expert in this area both agreed, there was studies had that most of the fatal consensus, methodological flaws. There are not many studies out there, there are not many sound studies out there on this particular issue, so when you talk about studies here, are you including the flawed ones?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I'm talking about the fact that when I received one of the big globs of backup material that we got from -- very late in the game that would support the -- that would go toward

NEAL R. GROSS

supporting the findings in this document, and then I started looking at it more closely, it looked to me like complete rehashes by the same people over and over again, versus a much more distinct, varied, and broad-based set of studies on the other side. And that, to me, is --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, but can Ι just say one thing? I'm genuinely trying to sort of strike out a compromise, and if that means going over these findings one by one, and rewording them in a way that you think has a more neutral tone, then I'm willing to do that. But it seems from Commissioner Yaki's most recent statement that that may not solve the problem, because it seems like what you're really concerned about is not necessarily whether language of these findings is neutral, but rather, the underlying studies. I mean, it seems, in other words, that you're not willing to acknowledge, for example, that the evidence is mixed. You don't like a certain set of studies, so you don't want to acknowledge them at all.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I would say -- I would characterize it -- let me just put it to you another way. I am not a Social Scientist, I'm a lawyer, I'm a politician. I acknowledge that, that's

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

who Ι am. We have staff here who are Social Scientists, who can look at the data, arrange it in such a way and say these studies tend to favor these, these are the kinds of things these studies looked at. There really was very little variation in what these studies were saying over and over again, versus the kinds of data that these people were going. I would say in that case, there seems to be a greater range of research supporting this on this side, a narrower range of research on the other side, and just leave it I wouldn't say it's mixed. If you want to say it's mixed at that point, yes, but as long as you accurately characterize what it is within Column A or Column B. And, quite frankly, I don't think that I am functionally competent to do that in the document as it's here right now.

Part of the reason why I wanted Chris here was to sort of ask him some of the questions about where some of these things came from, to help understand better what he relied on, and didn't rely upon. But if you want to go one thing, is completely off the which Ι think chart, Recommendation 17, which just pops out of nowhere from anything that I can think of.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Which page is that on?

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

COMMISSIONER YAKI: 20. And just to finish, because I think that this is -- I just have one final statement to make.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I see.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: And that is, I just find -- the difficulty I have with briefing reports, and I was a big fan of the briefing report. It was a means of dealing with issues with a lack of resources. We do findings and recommendations on the national report. We do findings and recommendations on the big Briefings in the original hearings that we do. context, and I was a big supporter, was to get issues on the table, hear about them, get it out so that we quickly to react what was going Ι understand what the Chairman says about having a point of view. Of course, we have a point of view, and the commission is charged with having a point of view. But take three-hour hearing with limited to а panelists on short timetables with limited staff, and that staff with going through task different studies, and not even ask our OCRE folks, who have Social Science degrees and are called Social Scientists, to take a look at it, as well, and provide feedback back, Ι think is а methodological fundamental flaw, weakness of the entire document. Ι

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 cannot support this document. I'm not going to --2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: In any form. 3 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to sit 4 here and try to improve it any way, other than to say 5 I think that for the benefit of the credibility of 6 those of you who are going to be voting on it, Number 7 17 just really sticks out there as -- well, let me just throw --8 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you. 10 COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- a bias out there real far. 11 12 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree with you, I think it should be removed. 13 COMMISSIONER YAKI: So, in other words, I 14 15 don't want to take up more of the commission's time. 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, I understand that. 17 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I think there is a fundamental methodological and analytical weakness of 18 19 this document. Ι think that the findings mischaracterize and do not do justice to the kinds of 20 21 opinions and studies that are out there. If we're going to do this kind of work, it should be done in a 22 23 much deeper, broader, and more coherent point of view that uses our Social Scientists at OCRE, and I cannot 24

support this report.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But the whole
2	point of the testimony, as I understand it, was that
3	these people were brought in, these experts we brought
4	in were Social Scientists who said that the Social
5	Science data out there is both unreliable, and a mixed
6	result, so how would we expect our staff of Social
7	Scientists, who, while they might be well-trained, are
8	not the experts that we brought in before us, to make
9	sense of data that even they are saying they cannot
10	make sense of?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, just in
12	response, Mr. Chair, and thank you for indulging this
13	colloquy. In that case, we shouldn't have a report
14	chock-full of references to studies that were not
15	discussed in full by any of the panelists, because
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, then we can't
17	have any briefing reports I mean, the standard that
18	you just set forth
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The standard I set
20	forth is more like what I'm used to, which is a
21	hearing report, which is people come, they give
22	testimony, they have other stuff that's in there.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You want to dissect
24	the report and any statement in there has to be traced

back to not only a particular document, but we have to

1 explore the whole body of literature to see where that 2 particular statement, how it sits --3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, the opposite. 4 COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, no, no. If we --5 BRACERAS: Ι think COMMISSIONER he's saying the opposite. 6 7 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Ιf we are using statements that were not spoken of on the record, if 8 9 we are using source data that was only alluded to by panelists - and if you look at the findings, they're 10 like multiple, multiple, multiple citations 11 12 for this and that; although, of course, there's no citation for the widely cited 1984 review of research 13 14 in the second sentence. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: In the Cook Report? 16 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we're not citing 17 it. Anyway, the --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 18 Okay. 19 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I --20 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I mean --21 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You know, just -- I find this beneficial because it's causing me to think 22 23 about the role of the findings and who owns findings. Is it the panelists who come before us? 24 Is 25 our job merely to regurgitate what they have said, and if they haven't said it, offer no opinion on a particular topic. I have a different point of view.

I think that the commissioners are here to exercise their judgment, to gather information, to cogitate, to think about it, to draw their own conclusions.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But Commissioner Yaki is right that there was, at some point in time, conceptually, at least, a difference between hearings briefings, and hearing reports and briefing reports, and the whole notion was that hearings, we would hear from all of the witnesses, and there would be probably more than one panel of witnesses, but then our own staff would get involved in doing their own research, be it legal analysis, or Social Science Whereas, a briefing was meant to be just research. bringing together people of different perspectives to give us their views, and for us to synthesize those views for the public, but necessarily back and do exhaustive qo our own research.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Changed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Huh?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That changed.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I don't 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

if I agree with that part, but the point is that there were supposed to be two different vehicles for us to be relevant in the civil rights debates that are happening, and the line between hearings and briefings seems to have become blurred. And I think that's where a lot of the objections we're hearing from Commissioners Melendez and Yaki are resonating with me, because it is procedurally confusing.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I agree that we need to get our arms around the procedural issues, and I think that the document that you put together is a good starting point. And I don't see any reason why --well, we have some holidays coming up, but I'm hopeful that we will be able to have a serious discussion, and hopefully vote on these new procedures at the next meeting. So I don't think there's any push-back in terms of the need to formalize our rules in terms of briefings.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, no. I understand that. I mean, with respect to this report, I think it would be a useful exercise; and, frankly, I think it's something we should do all the time, to go over -- to take each finding and recommendation and discuss them. And I know we're not going to get agreement from Commissioners Melendez and Yaki on a

NEAL R. GROSS

but if there are some that 1 majority of them, 2 particularly either inaccurate or biased, then I would 3 like to strike them for the integrity of the report. 4 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's nothing 5 stop us from discussing any aspect of this briefing report, whether it's the findings, or --6 7 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So let's do that right now. 8 9 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Thank you for 10 your patience, Commissioner Kirsanow. 11 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Just a couple of 12 quick statements on the record. Ι concur with Commissioner Braceras, and I'm also sensitive to the 13 questions that have been raised 14 procedure by 15 Commissioner Yaki. Just a couple of observations with 16 respect to some specific aspects of it. 17 With respect to the point of the Social Scientists and who's considering the data, analyzing 18 19 the data, it's my understanding from what the Staff Director said, that perhaps the person most suitable 20 21 on staff to do that was, in fact, Chris Byrnes. Maybe it would have been helpful to run 22 it by Scientists, also, but my understanding was that in the 23

allocation of resources, Chris Byrnes was probably the

individual who could do it the most efficiently, and

24

with the greatest amount of background.

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

Second, I would prefer a process similar to what was described by Commissioner Braceras, and that is that the statutory reports, of course, would have much more guts to them, been vetted a number of times, and could yield findings and recommendations; briefing reports, Commissioner Yaki whereas, as indicated, would probably consist οf the facts gathered, maybe with some summarization or synthesis of those facts gathered, and put it out into the public domain.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow, let me ask you; would the commission be within its authority, would it be proper if there were some civil rights event for us to issue a statement condemning --

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No, I agree with you on that. I think we don't sit simply as kind of solons that kind of throw things up and let them fall where they may. I think we do come to conclusions, and we have -- that's part of our charter. point goes to process, and I think having reviewed Commissioner Braceras' emails that she had sent around, I think that we're going to be going a long way toward establishing a process that Ι think everybody can sign on to.

NEAL R. GROSS

A couple of other quick observations, and these are just very minor. With respect to findings and Recommendation 1, maybe I would have phrased it a little bit differently, but that was probably, in my estimation, the most accurate finding. I recall that we spent a good portion of time cross examining, for no other better term, the witnesses as to specific aspects of the purported educational benefits yielded by diversity. Not only did we go through the Grutter standards of whether or not it promoted cross-cultural understanding, eliminated stereotypes, prepared students for a global marketplace, those that were cited by Grutter, but went through we academic disciplines to determine whether or not the extant data yielded any benefits. We asked them, given that they are the experts in the area, please cite for us the data that supports, or literature that supports a finding of benefit, if there is any.

I recall specifically what those findings were, and we can go through the transcript. There was a marginal increase in spelling scores, there was a disputed report with respect to an improvement in geography, there was а disputed report to improvements in attendance and tardiness, or overall discipline, virtually every includes and this

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

Kurlaender, Coleman, Thernstrom, and Armor. Armor was, perhaps, the most knowledgeable. If there was a consensus, the consensus was there was hardly anything out there to support benefits. Later we received Ι believe it Professor literature from, was Kurlaender, which I went through in great detail, which purported to be literature in support possible benefits in K-12, solely by virtue of diversity. That literature was, at best, at very, very best, yielding the most liberal interpretation mixed, and more likely than not saying nothing, simply coming up with conclusions that well, diversity is intuitively considered a good thing, but can't point to any particular standards whereby there have been objective measurements that show that there are either hard facts supporting improvements in academic scores, or the Grutter standards, the kind of soft standards of - and I don't even know how you measure these promoting cross-cultural understanding were improved, so with respect to number 1.

Now going to another one, Commissioner Yaki's point with respect to 17, I agree with that entirely. If it were up to me, I would vote to excise that. And the reason I would is, I think we can come to conclusions like that. I think we have 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	authority to do it. I think it's wise to avoid doing
2	that, because I think it tends I think we go beyond
3	really standing in judgment, to the point where we go
4	make another leap beyond judgment, and even maybe
5	beyond advocacy, to coming to conclusions. It's a
6	very conclusory statement, but more important is, it
7	is consistent with what - and maybe Jennifer Braceras
8	and I, the old timers here - had been faced with
9	during the previous regime, these kind of conclusions.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Battered
11	Commissioners' Syndrome.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I can't help it.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think we have to
15	eliminate that one, even if we could somehow argue
16	that the data there supports it, I don't know that it
17	does, I think that's really a matter of opinion.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Now on 17
19	actually, I like 17, but I have no objections to
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Can I just say, I
21	agree with 17, but for the purpose of this commission
22	and its integrity, the fact of the matter is, I think
23	it is wise for us to avoid certain types of
24	statements, even if we could make reasonable arguments

in support thereof.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Isn't there a moral,
2	an ethical cost associated with distributing benefits,
3	at least here in America
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree.
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: benefits and
6	burdens on the base of risk. Isn't there an ethical
7	and a moral
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We can have that
9	discussion, but I think let's just not I mean,
10	it seems like the majority of the commissioners don't
11	want number 17 in there. It's not that I disagree
12	with you on the merits.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no, I think
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just get rid
15	of it and move on.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think that
17	we're in agreement that 17 goes, but I think it's
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You want to have
19	the philosophical discussion, and we could do that at
20	lunch.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, no. I think
22	that it's an important issue.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there are
24	lots of important issues, but we have an agenda, so if
25	the majority of the commissioners don't support number

1	17, let's strike it and discuss the philosophy later.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, there's the
3	discussion piece of the meeting here. This is the
4	first time since we started the discussion of this
5	briefing where we wanted to cut off discussion.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I'm not saying
7	that. I'm just saying that the moral and
8	philosophical question is one that could be debated
9	from here to eternity, and we
0	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, I disagree. I
.1	think that the issue is settled in America, at least,
_2	amongst most Americans, that it is, at a minimum,
.3	unethical.
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I would say this.
_5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just deal
_6	with the report.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My recollection is
_8	that Item 17 actually encapsulates something that
_9	Professor Thernstrom said in his testimony.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know that
22	I would prefer not to have it in there, but I think
23	that it is, at least, supportable on the basis of
24	something that someone had made a statement, somebody
5	made a conclusion that an expert had come to based on

1	a considered analysis and a longstanding, I mean, 30
2	years analysis of the purported benefits of diversity,
3	and also assigning students or others on the basis of
4	race.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's fine, but -
7	_
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So I would like to -
9	somebody tell me the procedure - move to amend the
10	document so that this particular finding is deleted.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: May I make a
12	recommendation?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with
15	Commissioner Braceras. I don't think Commissioner
16	Yaki - he's already indicated he's not going to sign
17	onto the document, but for - I think there is an
18	institutional imperative for us to go through each one
19	of those and say yea or nay.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I do. And I
21	think we should do that every time.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And I would let
23	me add to that, because I think it will improve our
24	work product. Despite the fact that Commissioner Yaki
25	and Melendez may not be inclined to support the

1	document, I think it's helpful for purposes of
2	improving the document to hear their criticism on each
3	particular point, because I think it will help us in
4	terms of our deliberative process. And we may want to
5	tweak some language in response to the criticism, so I
6	just encourage those two to participate.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And Commissioner
8	Yaki's strong arguments from time to time persuade me
9	that I am wrong.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They should.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I think we
12	should go over it, and then vote on the revised thing
13	at the end.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So number one, can
16	I make a proposal?
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would propose
19	that we delete the first sentence, and instead say,
20	"The academic literature on the effect of racial and
21	ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary education
22	is mixed." Leave the rest of it as it is.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I think it would
24	be more accurate to say that there is very little
25	academic literature to support the notion that

1	diversity improves academic performance. When
2	Commissioner Kirsanow went down the line, it was a
3	long laundry list of subjects, and the response for
4	most of them, the overwhelming majority was no, there
5	is no evidence to support it. So to say that the
6	evidence is mixed, I think is not
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there are
8	studies. It's just that we believe, and the panelists
9	believe that many of them are flawed. There are
10	studies.
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just
12	have a question. Are you distinguishing in your own
13	mind between academic evidence and educational
14	benefits?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm thinking test
16	scores improved, academics.
17	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's what I'm
18	so are you using the two terms interchangeably?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: My sense was that
21	the the way I heard the evidence come out, there
22	seemed to be more evidence on the soft side, which I
23	put in the category of educational benefits, which I
24	have a difficult time getting my arms around, versus
25	the harder academic aspects, the test scores, things -

1 - I mean, just those tangible things. And I didn't 2 know if you were using the two interchangeably. 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, when I 4 academic or educational, I'm referring, basically, to 5 subject matters like spelling, Social Studies, math. 6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Things you can test, 7 versus cultural efficiency. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So how --9 10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: As we all know, as 11 think everybody here is a lawyer, there's 12 difference between evidence and opinion. And the evidence that was adduced during the hearing didn't 13 even yield any standards with respect to the soft 14 15 characteristics. They were simply conclusory 16 statements made, and then when you go through the empirical - if you go through the literature, there's 17 nothing there. In fact, if I have any flaw with 18 19 number one, I wouldn't even say there was a consensus - there's little academic consensus on whether it 20 21 results in significant education benefits. There's almost a consensus that it doesn't. 22 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you don't want 24

to use the word "mixed". You want something stronger.

	CHAIRMAN REINOLDS: I CHILL CHAC
2	actually, when I look at this, I think that this was
3	well, this could have been even harder. I think
4	that there is very little evidence to support the
5	notion that diversity raises test scores. And if we
6	take a step back and just look at where is all this
7	achievement taking place, when we look at school
8	districts well, you pick the city where they have
9	mixed classes, so you have the academic literature,
10	you have the NAEP data, whatever benefits that are
11	being generated by diverse classrooms, those benefits
12	are modest.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. So what's
14	your proposed edit?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Come up with
17	something concrete.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There is little
19	evidence to support that racial and ethnic diversity
20	results in improved academic performance.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There is little -
22	say it again - little academic
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's little
24	evidence.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There's little

1	evidence.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That racial and ethnic
3	diversity results in improved academic performance.
4	Yes, increased reading level by two to six weeks, I
5	mean
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Let's
7	just
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. I'm
9	trying.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So there is little
11	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
12	elementary and secondary schools
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Results in improved
14	
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: results in
16	improved academic performance.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would strike the
19	word "any", and keep the word "significant", so that
20	it reads results in significant
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's better.
22	That's more accurate.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. There is
24	little evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
25	elementary and secondary schools results

1	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: In significant
2	academic.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: in significant
4	academic performance.
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait, significant
7	
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Improvements in
9	academic performance.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Significant
11	improvements in academic performance. Does everybody
12	agree with that?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Or is there
15	majority support for that sentence? There is little
	majority support for that sentence? There is little evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
15 16	
15 16 17	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in
15 16 17 18	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in
15	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in significant improvement in academic performance.
15 16 17 18	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in significant improvement in academic performance. That's the new first sentence of number 1.
15 16 17 18 19 20	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in significant improvement in academic performance. That's the new first sentence of number 1. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does that get your
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in significant improvement in academic performance. That's the new first sentence of number 1. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does that get your support?
15 16 17 18 19	evidence that racial and ethnic diversity in elementary and secondary schools results in significant improvement in academic performance. That's the new first sentence of number 1. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does that get your support? COMMISSIONER YAKI: No.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Number
3	2, does anybody have any concerns, or proposed
4	language changes?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have none.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's go to number 3.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have no comments
9	on number 3.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Neither do I.
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Neither do I. But
12	I just want to interject, so far in the first three in
13	going through this, I just want to relay to Chris
14	Byrnes that I think he has digested accurately and
15	truthfully what was represented at the hearing.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I disagree.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: One small point on
18	3.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Steven?
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. That's
21	supposed to be Thernstrom. Right? Not Steven.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: He was probably
23	calling him up at the time.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay. I
25	didn't know who he was referring to.
	NEAL D. CDOSS

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I was going to make
2	the same comment.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So maybe a last
4	name should a first or last name should be
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I assume this is a
6	last name.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I believe it's
8	reference to Professor Walter G. Stephan.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can we say Walter
LO	G. Stephan?
L1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Or Professor Stephan.
L2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's just a little
L3	confusing, since the panelist was Steven Thernstrom,
L4	Steven spelled that way. I don't know. Maybe it's
L5	not a big deal.
L6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I agree with
L7	Commissioner Braceras because in findings and
L8	recommendations, there's no previous reference to
L9	Professor Stephan, so it would be confusing as to
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I know. I know
21	that's the way Social Scientists do it, though.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We tried to follow
23	the usual form, and in future findings we also refer
24	to a number of Social Scientists by last name.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Let's remain
2	uniform, at least.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just keep it
4	as it is.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Number 4.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Wait. I just want to
7	make an objection on number three.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And cite studies by
10	Braddock, Crane, McPartland, Dawkins, Eric Fulcher,
11	Hallanan, Hawley, Schofield, Ward, Slavin,
12	Sandleitner, Woods, and Amy Wells as being to the
13	contrary.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Contrary to what?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The idea that their
17	
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It says mixed
19	results.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Right.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So those studies -
22	- how do those studies
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I don't think they're
24	mixed. I don't think that what we heard had anything
25	to do with being mixed. I thought that what I heard

1	from Thernstrom and Armor was much more on the
2	academic achievement side, and much less contradiction
3	of Professor Kurlaender's points of view. And I think
4	that the bibliographies that are out there tend to
5	support that, so I object. But, whatever. Let's keep
6	it going.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What if we deleted
8	the second paragraph of number 3, instead of bringing
9	in the examples, just sort of plucking out the studies
LO	that we want to highlight, and just leave the first
L1	paragraph as it is, which just says there are varied
L2	results, and mixed results.
L3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you support that
L4	finding?
L5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And not pluck out
L6	the examples that we like.
L7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And, by the way, the
L8	things I'm looking at, which come from the David Armor
L9	bibliography, were all post 1978.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I think if you took
21	out the second paragraph it would be
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. I move
23	that we strike the second paragraph in number 3.
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
25	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is

1	Commissioner Melendez. Hello?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have in my
4	recommendation that I sent in, that was it possible to
5	consolidate finding 3-5. We got 20, I was wondering
6	is there any consolidate any of these?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would you support the
8	document with that change?
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Well, that's just
LO	one component. I don't know if this is I'm trying
L1	to take my comments line by line right now.
L2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I guess I'm
L3	trying to see I mean, we're changing the document
L4	and we're trying to accommodate some of the concerns
L5	of Commissioners Melendez and Yaki, and I'm just
L6	trying to see if that's going to be enough to get
L7	support. And if not, then
L8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I think you can
L9	pretty much count on the fact I'm not going to support
20	this document. The fact you're going through this
21	exercise is, I think, nice.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think we still
23	need to do it.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You're working on your
25	own dime now, Mr. Chairman.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It needs to be
2	done. I just
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We could not have
5	a regime where we have to vote up and down
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: on serious
8	findings and recommendations without going through
9	them as a commission.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Otherwise, we're
12	just a rubber stamp for the staff.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I mean, there's no
14	disagreement. We are already doing what you have
15	suggested.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So
17	we're striking the second paragraph of number 3.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That's fine.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I want to kind of
20	piggyback on what Commissioner Melendez just said
21	about some of the subsequent findings, seeming a
22	little drawn out, and maybe recommending a
23	consolidation.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we strike the
25	second paragraph of 3.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I mean, it
2	seems that 4, 5, and 6 are not really findings, but
3	just summaries. They're summaries of studies, they're
4	not findings.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think a piece of 4
6	is a finding, and the discussion about the
7	mythological weaknesses.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, that is a
9	finding. No, 4 is a finding, but 5 and 6 are not
10	findings, they're summaries of research.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This is probably
12	something more appropriate in the body of the
13	document.
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: 5 and 6 is really what
15	I wanted to talk to Chris about.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would strike 5
17	and 6, to be honest with you.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is the first
19	sentence in 5, is that accurate, or is that
20	misleading?
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Why would you suspect
22	that that's
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, if we're
24	striking it, to me, the first sentence seems to be an
25	important finding.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Some ongoing
2	research, including several longitudinal studies
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, those are if
4	we think that is where the research is really going, I
5	think that's an important point. I don't need the
6	examples afterward.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean,
8	the examples are something that should be either in a
9	footnote, or
10	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, they should be
11	in a footnote.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: They're not
13	findings.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So what I am
15	hearing is keep the first sentence of finding 5, and
16	either delete or drop the remaining information in a
17	footnote.
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Drop it in a
19	footnote. I think the information is useful, and then
20	anyone who is interested in the finding can refer to
21	the footnote, and then go to the original source
22	material.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So 5 and 6 would
24	go into a footnote?
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that's

right. Keep the first sentence of 5, and the balance of 5, and all of 6 would be a footnote, probably to the finding, although, I prefer it to be in the text somewhere, at the appropriate place in the text.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, there is no appropriate -- see, here's the other thing, there is no appropriate place because there's no commission opinion, as it were. Right? There's a summary of what the panelists said and what the discussion was like, and then there's the panelists' papers, but there's no place in these documents, other than the findings and recommendations, where we offer our own views.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Then let's put it in a footnote.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I think it should in a footnote, but I also think the first sentence needs to be tweaked a little bit. "Raise questions about" is a little vague. I would just say some ongoing research, including blah, blah, blah, suggests that - whatever it suggests. And then there's a footnote. Right?

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would just like to point out from a scholarship point of view that neither of these papers has actually been published

NEAL R. GROSS

1	yet under the first two by Fulker, and Ladd, and
2	Cooley, at least according to the bibliography, one
3	was a paper presented at a research conference, the
4	other one is an unpublished manuscript, so we do not
5	know whether or not, what kind of peer review its gone
6	through before it has entered the academic mainstream.
7	I just thought I'd point that out.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would be fine
9	striking it all together, to be honest with you.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm comfortable.
11	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I have no strong
12	feelings about it. It's more of a question than
13	anything else.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, it's
15	interesting, but it's not critical to the rest of
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's drop it.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Strike 5
18	and 6.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So we're at 7.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm sorry. How did
21	we handle 4?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We're leaving it,
23	as is.
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Let's go to
25	number 7.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 6 you mean, 7.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 5 and 6 have been
3	stricken, struck, eliminated.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Struck.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 7 makes a different
6	point. The piece that discusses controlling for socio
7	economic status.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think it's fine.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 8. I like 8.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's consistent
11	with the questions that we posed to them.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm interested in
13	the relationship that racial and ethnic diversity has
14	on people's performance in shop class.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Penmanship. Mine
16	was penmanship. I acknowledge that these questions,
17	that they are kind of silly, but I thought, you know,
18	no more silly than trying to come up with measurable
19	differences in performance between students who are in
20	a diverse setting, and those who are not, with respect
21	to whether or not it promotes cross-cultural
22	understanding, or there is an improvement in the
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, yes.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: global
25	marketplace. How do you measure those things?

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Do people still
2	take home ec?
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, they do.
4	What I did is, when I posed those questions, I went
5	through the
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's one of his
7	teaching assignments. Right?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I went through
9	report cards that you might find through K-12, and I
10	just
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, okay.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: pulled out
13	every single one and said give it to me.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. Well,
15	I think 8 is fine.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 9.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That's not
18	consistent with what Professor Armor said.
-	
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent with some of the other studies, but that's okay. I'm
19 20 21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent with some of the other studies, but that's okay. I'm not voting for it, anyway.
19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's not consistent with some of the other studies, but that's okay. I'm not voting for it, anyway. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is can we just

elementary and secondary schools were somewhat more 2 likely to engage in spirited classroom discussion than 3 their racially isolated peers. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm comfortable with 4 5 that, but, I mean, the horse trader in me, I don't feel comfortable handing over compromises --6 7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: To quid no pro. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. 8 9 (Laughter.) **BRACERAS:** 10 COMMISSIONER It's not 11 compromise to try to get the result. 12 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I feel like I'm negotiating against myself. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. It's 14 not 15 negotiating against yourself. We're not changing the 16 language to buy their votes. I mean, if they want to 17 vote for it, that's great. And if they don't feel they can vote for it, that's their prerogative. 18 19 want to change it to make it a better document, and to make it as neutral and fair, as possible. And some of 20 21 the points that they raise I think are valid, and we should incorporate them, not because we're trying to 22 23 get their votes, but because they're good comments. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Commissioner 24 25 Braceras' comment, the impact of it actually dilutes

1	whether or not spirited classroom discussions are
2	supportable, findings are supportable. She said
3	"somewhat more likely".
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, because it
5	says they found only a small difference.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, there was a
7	very small difference. When you take a look at what
8	Professor Armor said, and there was really no
9	contradiction I'm sorry, not Professor Armor.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm sorry, that's not
11	true.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It is true.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It is not true.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It is true.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: We can pull the
16	transcript.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Well, then let's
18	pull it.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Since we've obviously
20	gone beyond the transcript in all these things, let's
21	get Chris out here, pull out the Amy Wells report that
22	went after the long-term impacts of classroom
23	interaction. Let's pull it out.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: My recollection is
25	that in response, Professor - I think it's Professor

_	Armor referred to the frawed hature of that study, and
2	there were at least two other studies
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, we're taking his
4	word that it was flawed, and she says his stuff is
5	flawed back. And we can sit here and argue all day
6	about it.
7	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And what we're
8	saying is there's research to support, despite the
9	fact that he says they're flawed, we're actually going
10	with
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There's some
12	evidence indicated.
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: If we're simply
14	relying on Professor Armor, we wouldn't even say
15	there's any evidence.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, if we were
18	relying on Professor Armor, we'd be in a much
19	different country than we are right now.
20	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Professor Armor
21	says that he disputes that.
22	(Simultaneous speech.)
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, that's the
24	question that I asked him during the thing, and I
25	stand by that.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think all the
2	evidence we heard during our briefing on historically
3	black colleges and universities - now, granted it's
4	higher ed and not primary and secondary ed, but,
5	basically, came to the opposite conclusion; that
6	students that attend historically black colleges and
7	universities, which are majority black, tend to be
8	more confident, and more engaged in spirited classroom
9	discussion, so I think evidence is all over the place
10	of it. I don't know which way that cuts
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I believe that
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: but I think we
13	should say that there is some evidence that comes to
14	this other conclusion. That's fine.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think this is an
16	accurate summary
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Before we go on, we
18	have an issue. Ken.
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'm just going to
20	remind commissioners that under our Defame and Degrade
21	Rules, any individual who might be defamed or degraded
22	by remarks here will have a right to respond, and the
23	transcript we'll review for purposes of compliance
24	after the meeting.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS:

25

So

Okay.

Fine.

1	number 9, here's my suggestion.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I thought it was a
3	good shot.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There is some
5	evidence
6	COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS: and he has a sense
7	of humor.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: There is some
9	evidence indicating that students in racially diverse
10	elementary and secondary schools -
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Were somewhat more
12	likely.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: were somewhat
14	more likely to engage in spirited classroom
15	discussions than their racially isolated peers,
16	period.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's good.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Number 10.
19	I'm okay with number 10.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Number 11.
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm still reading.
22	Please bear with me. I don't read as quickly as some
23	of you. I'm fine with it. Number 11.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't
25	understand.

1 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This seems 2 redundant here. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't know that 5 we need 11, since we've made the point pretty much in 6 10. 7 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's strike it. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Strike 11. Yeah, 8 9 I think that similar to number 5, I think that some of the citations to these other studies that weren't in 10 the transcript should just go into a footnote. 11 12 mean, I know we ended up striking five all together, in this case, I would stop after the word 13 "definitive", period, footnote. And then the whole 14 "For example" part, I would put in a footnote. 15 16 then I would come back to the text with, "It is 17 difficult". COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm okay with 18 19 that. 20 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yep. 21 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But take out -well, I'd put the whole thing in a footnote. I'd stop 22 "definitive", and put everything else 23 footnote. 24

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, by the way, Mr.
2	Staff Director, given the characterization of Ms.
3	Kurlaender's testimony in the beginning of the
4	document, I suggest that if you're going to do a
5	defame and degrade process, you should send that to
6	her, because when I last communicated with her, she
7	thought that was an overly narrow characterization of
8	her testimony, and she didn't have a chance to correct
9	it.
10	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would be pleased
11	to submit the entire matter for a defame and degrade
12	review.
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fine.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Number 13.
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I'm just a little
16	puzzled as to why we are making reference to early
17	studies. What do we yield from that? What gain do we
18	get from that? I mean, I think there's good academic
19	reason for that, but I'm not sure that needs to be a
20	finding of ours.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would strike
22	number 13 for that reason.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's strike
24	it.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: And let me just

1	say that I would not be opposed to putting this into a
2	footnote or somewhere. I mean, I think it's useful
3	information, but I don't know why it would be a
4	finding.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let's just strike
6	it for now, because well, let's just strike it,
7	because then we're going to vote, and we can't ask
8	for, at this point, the staff to go back and reword,
9	so I think it's either in or out.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any strong feelings on
11	that matter, on whether it goes into the footnote or
12	not?
13	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I don't have a
14	strong feeling.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's strike
16	it.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So in number 14, I
18	haven't read it carefully just now, but I would delete
19	the word "more", because it makes sense if we're
20	taking out 13, and start with "recent".
21	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Right. Exactly.
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I had a question.
23	Commissioner Melendez. I had suggested that merging
24	it into finding two and my comments, if that's
25	noggihle

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Merging 14 into 2?
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, is that
3	possible? We've got too many findings, in my opinion.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I think it's
5	different, because one has to do with academic
6	well, number 2 has to do with academic achievement,
7	and number 14 has to do with cross-racial friendships.
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes, there are two
9	different components. One is the hard component, the
LO	other one is the soft component.
L1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But I would in
L2	addition to striking the word "more" at the beginning,
L3	after the sentence that ends "racially isolated
L4	schools, period." I would take that data, 2005 study,
L5	and put it in a footnote at the bottom.
L6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections?
L7	Anything else for 14? Okay, 15.
L8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 14, I would take -
L9	- I'm sorry, 15.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 15.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I would start with
22	"A study by Crane and Mihard", and then down to the
23	bottom and put that in a footnote.
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: You know, I
>5	wouldn't Jennifer and I'll tell you why

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You wouldn't?
2	Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. Because the
4	first sentence deals with military academies, the
5	second one has to do with occupational aspirations.
6	It's a different subject. I was initially inclined to
7	do that, but I think it should remain as-is. We're
8	talking about two different concepts.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait a minute.
10	Where is it military academies?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The first one says
12	that racial composition has no effect on whether or
13	not someone is more likely to attend military
14	academies, or become officers. 15, right there, for
15	example.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Okay. And then it
18	goes to occupational aspirations, in general.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, gotcha. All
20	right. Keep it, keep 15 as-is.
21	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I don't
22	persuasive, it says a little persuasive evidence?
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Delete
24	persuasive.
25	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's a good point. 2 Anything else on 15? 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Wait a minute. 4 Hold on a second. 5 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Number 16, I would 6 I agree with the statement. In fact, this is 7 a statement that I think I made, but I don't think it's a finding. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I agree. 10 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: This goes to the whole rationale by O'Connor under Sweezey v. 11 12 Hampshire, the Frankfurter rationale related to the benefits or the deference accorded to institutions of 13 14 higher education, so let's delete that. 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ι don't agree, but 16 I'll go along. I think that that's inordinate. 17 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think that this makes it a tighter document. I think it has -- I 18 19 thought the document originally had good integrity in terms of reflecting what was adduced at the hearing, 20 21 and I think this is a very useful exercise. However we adopt or don't adopt changes to the procedure for 22 23 briefings, and I think Commissioner Braceras' work on this is going to be very helpful, I think that this 24

improves this particular document. And I hope we can

do something - if we ever have findings and recommendations for briefings, and I have issues with respect to whether or not we should do that - but if we do that, and for statutory reports, I think this kind of exercise, first of all, is useful in terms of sheer transparency, the procedural aspect of this.

Second, I think it vets the document one Third, I think it reflects more accurately last time. the consensus of the commission, and so that we can support this document more readily in a public domain. If we're ever asked in hearings, or by the press, or anyone else, I think that we have a more effective means by which we can respond, because this is -- I reflect think this does the of the consensus commission. And, going to what Commissioner Braceras indicated before, the Battered Commissioner is the antithesis of what had occurred I asked the question, are we potted plants? before. Because something would be presented to us, and the commission - by the way, let me just say, the staff had always done fine work, and it was within the parameters of what their charge was, but we would be presented with it, and we said we either sign off on it, or don't sign off on it.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That is the first

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	time we've done this, and I think it was extremely
2	helpful. So, anyway, I guess I'd move that we approve
3	the document, as edited by the commission.
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I second.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Discussion?
6	Commissioner Yaki.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just wanted to thank
8	the rest of the commission for going through this
9	process. I think that for this document, it was a
10	good exercise. I still believe that for future
11	briefings, we need to look at a different process all
12	together.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think that there is
14	
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And I am not a member
16	of I do not have Battered Commissioner Syndrome,
17	but I'm wondering if I stay here too long, if I'll get
18	Stockholm Syndrome.
19	(Laughter.)
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You might.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in favor?
22	(Chorus of ayes.)
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All the folks who
24	object?
25	(Vote taken.)
	NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record reflect that Commissioners Yaki and Melendez voted against the amended motion, and the remaining commissioners voted in favor, the motion passes.

V. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

Next up, last month all of the members of the commission signed letters urging the Attorney General to investigate very disturbing allegations of Anti-Hispanic Voter Discrimination in Orange County, California. I am pleased that the commissioners were unanimous in calling upon the Attorney General in this matter. This unanimity is reflective, I believe, of the level of cooperation we should strive for. I thank Commissioner Michael Yaki for bringing this matter to the attention commission, and Ι thank all of the commissioners for accepting Commissioner Yaki's recommendation to send the letters.

These letters, I think, should be accessible to the public. May I have a motion for posting to the website the letters from Commissioners Braceras, Taylor, Yaki, Kirsanow, and Reynolds, the letter that was sent to Attorney General Gonzalez on 18th October regarding an Anti-Hispanic Voter Harassment Letter, and the letter that was sent by

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Vice Chair Abigail Thernstrom and Commissioner
2	Melendez to Attorney Gonzalez dated October 19 th
3	regarding the same topic.
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion? All in
6	favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any objections,
9	abstentions? The motion carries unanimously.
10	Okay. Now it's time to set a schedule for
11	the meetings during the 2007 calendar year. May I
12	have a motion to approve the proposed 2007 business
13	meeting and briefing calendar that was distributed to
14	the commissioners via email and hard copy sent on
15	November 9 th , 2006? May I have a motion?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So move.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Second?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
20	Braceras.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, I'd like to
22	discuss. A couple of things; first, I think as our
23	previous discussion indicates, we need more time in
24	the calendar for business meetings, and for thoughtful
25	consideration of our reports so I would like to

propose -- I mean, the way it's set up right now is we have four briefings scheduled back-to-back, and then everything right now is open, but I assume that the theory was that we would plug briefings into those other slots. I think it's very difficult to have a productive business meeting and a briefing on the same I know the commissioners that come from farther day. away have to get home, the commissioners who have children need to get home at the end of the day, and it's just hard to go late in the day on Friday, for a variety of reasons. So what I would like to propose is that we do fewer briefings, and perhaps get on an every other month rotation, where we'd every other month have briefings, and business meeting where we can really hash out the because I think while we put out fewer reports, reports and fewer briefings, they would be of a higher quality, and we wouldn't rush through our agenda.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I like the idea, but I would ask that, would anyone object to tabling this issue so that we can think about it some more? I like the idea of reducing the number of briefings for the very reasons you've just articulated.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think the staff needs to know what they're going to be preparing

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

79 for January, February, and March, so I think -- I mean, my proposal would be to have a briefing in January, to not have a briefing in February, and then we could go from there. And I think -- I'd like to sort of discuss the order of the briefings, too. if you want to just first vote on the calendar and the dates, we could do that, and then --CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, how about this; how about we keep the briefing schedule for January,

and table everything else until we give this some more thought in terms of restructuring our approach, and also the order of the briefings.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I quess I'm not sure why it's not something we can just discuss right now. It doesn't seem that complicated. If there are concerns, let's discuss them. I mean, it's simply a question of whether the quantity of work product is more important than breathing room, because I, myself, feel that I need breathing room, and I think some other commissioners do, as well.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So basically, we would move everything -- well, we would space -- we would add a business meeting between each briefing.

> COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

after CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** Starting

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

January.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. Hopefully, would avoid a situation where have continuously table our votes on reports because people feel that they haven't had the time to discuss or consider it, because we've been discussing considering them at the meeting, so it might end up helping us to produce our reports more quickly in the end.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I understand the sentiment, but I object.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Two reasons; like the briefings, I think that they provide intellectual and civic discussion of important issues, number one. Number two, a lot of this could be solved if we didn't have this insanely cumbersome mininational report process for briefing reports, that has a habit of consuming staff time while they're busy also trying to prepare for briefings in the And, number three, I have my own parochial future. objection, because so far, those items which I had proposed keep on getting bumped further and further back, and an alternate schedule will put anything that

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I had an interest in probably into 2008, and I'm just
2	
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Which are your
4	priorities on the list?
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: None of the ones right
6	there.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But tell me which
8	ones on the broader list are your priorities?
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, let's see, the
10	Patriot Act is now back to 2008, but the Domestic
11	wiretapping issue is something that I'm very
12	interested in, and it got a high number of votes, and
13	it could be it's last on that list, hopefully not
14	in terms of priority, but it always appears there
15	last, and I'm just worried that's going to get kicked
16	off yet again.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I mean, that
18	is very understandable, and I, personally, am more
19	than happy to see some of your priorities
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Moved up.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: moved up to
22	early this year, early 2007.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Folks, let's take a
24	10-minute break.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why now, we're in

1	mid-conversation?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Because I have to
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I would rather not
5	respond.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: All right. All you
7	have to do is hand the gavel over, walk out the door.
8	No one is going
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, hand the
10	gavel over.
11	(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
12	record at 10:55:59 a.m., and went back on the record
13	at 11:06:47 a.m.)
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Everyone is here.
15	Let's go back on the record.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I wanted to, if
17	it's okay, just discuss strictly the dates in the
18	calendar, first, before we discuss anything else, if
19	that's okay. And I raise the point that I know right
20	now that Friday, June 8 th , doesn't work for me. I do
21	appreciate the September meeting not conflicting with
22	the first day of school this year, that's very
23	helpful, but December 14 th , I'd like to point out is, I
24	believe, several days after Commissioner Kirsanow's

term and my term expire. Maybe you care about that,

1	maybe you don't, but if you wanted us to participate
2	in the December meeting
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: When does it expire,
4	when does your
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think both of
6	ours is the same date, December 9 th .
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: December 7 th , or
8	the 9 th .
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The 7 th .
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: 6 th .
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yaki can't get
13	them down fast enough.
14	(Laughter.)
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Does anyone
16	let's see, let me get out my gizmo. Okay. Let's
17	start with June. Will the 7^{th} , you said that that may
18	possibly work, the 7 th .
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't know how
20	Thursdays work for other people. I could do a
21	different week, or I could do
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How does the 7 th , June
23	7 th work for everyone?
24	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It's fine with me.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: For the west coasters,

1	that kind of bites.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thursday bites?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: This is
6	Commissioner Melendez. Thursdays would be hard for
7	me, but Friday would work.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: How about the 15 th ?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, what about
11	earlier, what's the Friday before?
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The first. Are kids
13	out of school on the 15 th ?
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, we go almost
15	until July in New England.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What has happened to
17	education since we went to school?
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Really.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The first and
20	the 15^{th} - the first works for me, and so does the 15^{th} .
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, it is
22	true, depending on snow days, that could potentially
23	be the last day of school, but we tend to go much
24	later. So the first would be preferable, just from my
25	

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They tack on school
3	days for snow days now?
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Outrageous. I think
6	we ought to have a hearing on that.
7	(Laughter.)
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I know their civil
9	rights are being violated.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Absolutely.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So unless I
12	hear an objection, I'll put it down for June 1st.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez,
15	is that okay with you?
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: That's fine. I
17	had another question about next month's meeting, was
18	that a Thursday instead of a Friday?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a Friday.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, it's a
21	Thursday, because Friday is the
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, next month.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Friday, that
24	Friday in December is the first day of Chanukah.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Also, one of the worst
	NEAL D. ODOGG

	travel days of the year.
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: We can't move it a
3	week earlier?
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's take a
5	look.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's too late, isn't
7	it? We have to give 30 days notice or something like
8	that.
9	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I'm not aware of a
LO	legal requirement.
11	PARTICIPANT: No, we don't need a 30-day
12	notice for agendas or attending a meeting.
L3	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: No, it makes it a
L4	little bit more difficult in terms of notice to the
15	panelists for the briefing, but I'm not aware of any
16	legal requirement.
L7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: What is our
18	December briefing?
19	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Elementary and
20	secondary desegregation.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Haven't we already
22	sent out the have we received the responses?
23	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We've not yet.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. If that's the
25	case, then, we wouldn't be asking the panelists to

1	change their schedule. December.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Don't change - if you
3	change the 14 th , I'm toast.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a Thursday.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It's currently
7	scheduled for Thursday.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's the only
9	Thursday that actually works for me. The only
10	Thursday, what about a Friday? Say the
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The 8 th does not work.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Oh, not for me.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Any later in the
14	month is probably untenable
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But that's okay, I
17	can participate by phone.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: You're going to get
19	snowed in at the airport, anyway, or the train
20	station.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Here are the
22	ugly options, the 29^{th} , the 1^{st} .
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Of what?
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: December.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: The 29 th ?
	NEAL P. GPOSS

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chairman
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I said
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: is your middle name
4	Grinch?
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I prefaced my
6	statements by saying that these are the ugly options.
7	You're not available on any Thursday, except the $14^{ ext{th}}$.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I actually could
9	do the 29 th , now that I think about it.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm in Hawaii.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Good man.
12	(Off the record comments.)
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, folks. Where
14	are we on December? Jennifer is fine with the 29^{th} .
15	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'm fine with
16	that, too.
17	(Laughter.)
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What was that laugh?
19	What the hell laugh was that? If you want to fly on
20	the weekend before New Year's, that is just
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Folks, the 29 th , I
22	mean, Jennifer, Arlan, I just think that the 29^{th} is
23	just bad.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff is going to want
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	to prepare for the New Year's, and all that good
2	stuff, and people will take time, at least I hope.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes. No, that's
4	fine.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Scrooge.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Let me just throw
7	something else out there. Do we need a December
8	meeting? We had an August meeting.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We have a briefing
10	scheduled.
11	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We could postpone
12	the briefing to January.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: We can't make it
14	earlier in December? And what's the problem with the
15	date we have on the calendar?
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Who is the trouble
17	maker?
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I thought it was you.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, I'm fine with
20	it. I think Commissioner Melendez raised it.
21	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I have a meeting
22	on Wednesday night. I will pull a red-eye, like
23	Michael Yaki did the last time.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, would you be
25	willing to participate by phone?

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, I guess I
2	could do that, if I have to.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Keep it where it
5	is then.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, it's good. I
9	like it. It's the only Thursday that works for me.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other dates that
11	are problematic?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, the only
13	other one I raised was the December 14 th .
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Of next year.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of next year.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Of 2007.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Actually, I have a
20	problem with that date, too.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can we do it the
23	week before?
24	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We need to move it
25	up another week.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right. So like the
2	first.
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: I'd be in the same
4	situation, a Wednesday meeting.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, the 7 th .
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: It needs to be the
7	week before that if Commissioner Kirsanow and I are
8	going to participate. And we'll be expecting a big
9	farewell party with beverages and pastries.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, they said their
12	terms expire the 6^{th} , so we have to do it before the
13	6 th .
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, the 6 th .
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So Wednesday, the 5 th ?
17	Or Monday?
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The 3 rd works for me.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I can actually do it
20	Monday.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Is that the 3 rd ?
22	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: It doesn't matter
24	to me.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.
	NFALR GROSS

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: What date?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The 3 rd , which is a
3	Monday. How much pain does that inflict on you?
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: That's fine.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: If you guys get
7	reappointed before then, I want to move
8	(Laughter.)
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Are we done
10	with the we are done with the dates. Okay.
11	Briefings. I suggest that we take two items that are
12	not currently slotted. One would be, assuming that
13	Commissioner Yaki approves, is to put the domestic
14	wiretapping briefing on the calendar, and also
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Excuse me. I'm
16	sorry. Can we deal with the structural question first?
17	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. I think so,
18	as to whether or not we're going to have on-day/off-
19	day, or on-briefing
20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can I ask a
21	question? This is Commissioner Melendez. As far as
22	alternating may not be feasible, but I think maybe one
23	time we should have just strictly not a briefing
24	meeting, similar to today's meeting.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Even if it's just

1	once a quarter.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Like two on, one off,
3	two on, one off.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Like the Senate
6	schedule, two weeks in, one week off.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is everyone
8	comfortable with that approach?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm comfortable
10	with that, as long as we have some that are designated
11	for purely business agendas.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. If that is the
14	case, then the question of when this starts.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So, if we have a
16	briefing in December, then maybe we want to have a
17	business meeting in January, and a briefing in
18	February, and in March, and a business meeting in
19	April. What does the Staff Director think of that?
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: He thinks it's crazy.
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think that
22	there's no problem with that. I think we're
23	indifferent as to where the breaks are.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I mean if the

1	breaks have some operational ramifications that I
2	think balance out. One is that we might have had
3	difficulty doing all of these briefings in light of
4	the expected appropriations, anyhow, so this is
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So there will be seven
6	briefings for next year.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: On the other hand,
8	we've announced publicly and to Congress the briefings
9	we're going to have, so we'll have to revise that, and
LO	let them know we're going to do less than we initially
L1	committed to, that may be a wash.
L2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think
L3	that's okay.
L4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So if I
L5	understand this right, we will have a briefing in
L6	December, a business meeting in January, then a
L7	briefing in February.
L8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I think I
L9	preferred having a briefing in January, given the fact
20	that we've had a briefing today. Let's do December,
21	January, then take
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Break in February.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Business meeting in
24	December.
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No, no.
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Briefing in
3	December, briefing in January, then we'll take
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And a business
5	meeting in February.
6	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: February for a
7	business meeting. So it'll go March, April, business
8	meeting in May.
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So that means the last
10	meeting can be done strictly to extolling your
11	virtues, and
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Exactly.
13	(Off the record comments.)
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So it would be seven
15	briefings, four meetings.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. And then
17	as Kim points out, the end of the fiscal year in
18	September, that would be a strictly business meeting,
19	which might be good. So briefing January, business
20	February, briefings for March and April, business May,
21	briefings June and July, business September, briefings
22	October and November.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is anybody writing
24	this down?
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And party in December.

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And party for Pete
2	and me in December.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So we are done,
5	I believe, with that.
6	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Can I ask a
7	question?
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Are we set for
10	four briefings next year already all the way up to
11	April?
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We are about to tackle
13	that issue, as soon as we're done with the briefing
14	versus business meeting.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So we've
16	got the calendar now. Now we're going to plug in the
17	topics.
18	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay, go ahead.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I would like to
20	move two issues that are not currently calendared, and
21	they are the No Child Left Behind briefing, and the
22	Domestic Wiretapping Briefing.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'd like to add,
24	Commissioner Melendez' important one was the
25	discrimination against the American Border towns.

_	
2	waiting a long time for that one, also.
3	(Off the record comments.)
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I mean, why don't
5	we let the Democrats pick the March briefing. You
6	work that out amongst yourselves.
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, we're both going
8	to get one. What are you talking about?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, which do you
10	want in March? You can't have two in March.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, in March.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you don't have
13	to decide now. You can consult with Commissioner
14	Melendez, and just let the Staff Director know.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I propose that
17	the one on No Child Left Behind, NCLB, that that go
18	forward in January.
19	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: As a briefing.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That's fine.
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And March will be
23	the topic of the Democratically appointed
24	Commissioners' choice. The Democrats choice.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Arlan, do you mind if
	NEAL D. ODGGG

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. I've been

1	I put mine there?
2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Go ahead, that's
3	fine.
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Domestic
6	wiretapping?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.
8	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: For March.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So you pulled rank on
10	him.
11	(Laughter.)
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I asked did he mind.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, that's right.
14	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No, that's fine.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sort of like when my
16	boss asks me if I want to do something. Okay. So we
17	have December covered, January covered, March covered.
18	When is the next briefing?
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: April.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: April. Thoughts?
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, one thought
22	I have is that we haven't done anything on gender, and
23	so that might be an appropriate slot for the Title 9
24	topic.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm still recovering
	NEAL P. GPOSS

_	Tron my involvement with little 9 when I was at the
2	Department of Education, but that's fine.
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: So you have Battered
4	Title 9 Syndrome. Is that
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, indeed. Yes,
6	indeed, angry women, angry girls.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay, go ahead.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's fine with me.
9	Is there does anyone else have concerns? Okay.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: How would you like to
11	reserve either October or November for Arlan's
12	briefing?
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. What are
14	the months?
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Either October or
16	November for Arlan's briefing.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure. Okay. How
18	about we put it down for October?
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Is that good?
20	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Thank you.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And you guys can work
22	out the rest offline.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I think that's
24	a good suggestion.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is everyone in
2	agreement that we would work out the rest of the slots
3	offline?
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: All right. So
5	it's NCLB in January, domestic wiretapping in March,
6	Title 9 in April, and the rest is to be determined?
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No. And the border
8	towns.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry, where
10	is that?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: October.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: October.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And why October,
14	as opposed to
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just chose October.
16	And then you can
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I defer to the
18	Democrats.
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: That'll give you a
20	nice stream of uninterrupted Republican briefings, so
21	
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You didn't want
23	the summer, you'll be vacationing?
24	(Laughter.)
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. October is
	NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

border town.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have good attendance here.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the rest is to be determined from this list. Sounds good.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Where am I?

VI. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ISSUES

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The staff has done an exemplary job of preparing the recharter packages for the commission's consideration for the State of California. In this instance, the recharter package was initially presented to the commission for a vote in July of 2006. At the request of a commissioner, the vote was delayed until today's meeting. At this point, I would like to discuss the folks who are being voted on. Well, I'll skip that piece.

Okay. I'm going to move that the following individuals be appointed to the California SAC; Gail Heriot, Luis Alejo, James Bolton, Sharon Browne, Jack Citrin, John Dodd, Marc Dollinger, Percy Duran, Thomas Gray, Lance Izumi, Manual Klausner, Sanford Lakoff, Al Latham, Leonard Mitchell, Velma Montoya, and Matthew Rosenthal. And I also move that the commission appoint Gail Heriot as Chair of the

NEAL R. GROSS

newly rechartered California State Advisory Committee. These members will serve as uncompensated government employees. Under the motion, the authorizes the Staff Director to execute the appropriate paperwork for the appointment of these individuals. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. is Commissioner Melendez. Again, I have a real concern in the makeup of some of our advisory committee members. One of my concerns, as I mentioned, and even some of Connecticut, and these other State Advisory Committees, was that I think there's a lack of women. As you know, there was only 19 percent in California SAC nominees, of 13 percent Connecticut, and only 27 percent in Georgia, as far as number of women that are being appointed to the SAC. And the other thing was that there's four returning members to this California SAC, and I was wondering why one of those returning members wasn't the Chair, would be nominated then for the Chair.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I probably nominated Gail. I know her personally. She's scary smart. She knows a lot of the issues that come before 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	commission, and I just thought that she'd do a fine
2	job. So that's the rationale.
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: And then the other
4	thing I had was, there is the other question was
5	how qualified are our commissioners with respect to
6	civil rights work, and I think there was one question
7	as far as this John L. Dodd, who didn't really appear
8	to me that he has a lot of experience in civil rights
9	issues. That was my other concern.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I went through
11	the rechartering packages last night, and I looked at
12	each individual in terms of their interest in civil
13	rights, and no one jumped out at me as not having an
14	interest, but give me a moment while I find his paper.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Can I ask a question
16	of the solicitor?
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Sure. Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: What are the conflict
19	of interest rules regarding, can a SAC committee
20	member participate on an item in which he or she is
21	involved in litigation on the subject? In other
22	words, if the SAC were to consider desegregation, and
23	one of the attorneys is involved in a desegregation

ability to deal with items for which we are receiving

I know that we have some conflicts in our

case.

24

1	remuneration or compensation for specific items,
2	specific topics. I just want to know whether or not
3	that applies to SAC members, as well.
4	MS. MONROIG: Well, the regional directors
5	have and in some cases, civil rights analysts have
6	been appointed Deputy Ethics Officers. The
7	appropriate thing is for members of SACs that might
8	have a conflict to disclose all the circumstances, and
9	for them, in the first instance, to analyze it to see
10	if there's a conflict, and maybe consult on the
11	matter.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I would like to know
13	from the Staff Director whether or not the California
14	SAC is one of the SACs that would be dealing with the
15	desegregation issue.
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think that the
17	SAC would have to convene together, and talk about
18	what they want to deal with. At this point, I would
19	say that the
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: But I
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: You mean for our
22	national report.
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. I had understood
24	that some of the SACs were being tasked with dealing
25	with some of the issues related to the national

my

1 report. 2 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: But don't they have to decide to --3 4 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Let me just answer 5 these. That is, part of it is if they get to decide. California is not one of the states that we are 6 7 relying on in the sense that we feel it is important to our national report to get something from them. 8 don't recall off-hand whether it was one of the ones 9 that we designated with a request, that designation 10 was based on whether they had certain filings there, 11 12 but it's not one of the ones that we feel that we 13 need. 14 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, response to that is I find that very odd, given that 15 16 it's one of the --17 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Yaki, and I can say further that it is 18 19 not one of the ones that we even made a request of. COMMISSIONER YAKI: 20 Okay. I was just 21 going to say that's odd, given that it's one of the 22 most diverse states in the country with some of the

> STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The requests were not based on subjective evaluations, but based on the

biggest issues involving deseg, but hey, whatever.

NEAL R. GROSS

23

24

Τ	Department of Justice docket.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Getting back to
3	Commissioner Melendez' issue. I have before me the
4	rechartering package, and, quite frankly, I am
5	comfortable with his background. Apparently, he has
6	done work in the area of Criminal Justice,
7	representing the indigent, and I think that that is
8	well, I'm satisfied. Other questions?
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm sorry, the
10	indigent?
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Are they within our
13	charter?
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Under certain
15	circumstances, yes. To the extent that these issues
16	relate to race, ethnicity.
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Well, may I
18	speak on this subject?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have, as someone who
21	has been an elected official in the great State of
22	California, who has campaigned up and down the state,
23	been involved in campaigns there, and electoral and
24	public policy issues for 20 years of my life, I have
25	to say that I am absolutely 100 percent - and you may

send this out for defame or degrade, whatever way you want - I'm completely appalled by the nominees to the California State Advisory Committee. There is a difference between having diversity of viewpoint on a committee, and creating uniformity of viewpoint in that diversity.

You these individuals have amongst overlapping -- let me put it another way. Three to four members of the appointees were all part of the Prop. 209 campaign, which has done horrific things to in affirmative action issues the University of California system. You have people who have been involved, who are currently involved working together on the Seattle and Louisville cases. They are, by most parts, all lawyers or professors, hardly a crosssection of the type - even if we cut out the issues of ethnicity, hardly a cross-section, a representation of the people of California.

I think that this is an elite group of individuals, who share a distinct point of view. I do not believe there is diversity. I look at the fact that 75 percent of the new nominees are white, and male. I look at the fact that 63 percent of the committee is going to be white in a state that is majority minority, and even if you say well, we have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

no quotas, the mere fact you would ignore the fact that in a state where ethnicity and race plays such a major role in how things work, by having the committee of this makeup, I think is a slap in the face to It's a slap in the face Californians. to the communities of color in California, and I cannot support this in any way, shape, or form. And, to me, the idea that Gail Heriot would be named Chair, when I found her to be wholly unconvincing and evasive during her testimony on the Native Hawaiian Act, send that to her, let her respond, is a double insult to the people of color in California. And that is my statement, and I don't even want to participate in this vote.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We will treat Commissioner Yaki's actions as an abstention.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I won't even be here.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Not voting at all. I refuse to have my name appear in any way, shape, or form with any vote on the composition of this committee. This committee is anathema to everything that people of color, that women, and minorities in California have worked for, for years. And this is -- I mean, as I've said before, there is diversity, and there is uniformity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is this because those
2	three individuals
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It's more than the
4	three. I could have gone into much more detail about
5	all the different back about all the similarity of
6	backgrounds, about all the organizations that they all
7	cross-belong to.
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki
9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The fact that they
10	belong to the same network of people, and it just does
11	not say to me that this commission is seriously
12	interested, as I said it was, in promoting balance and
13	diversity of viewpoint.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Yaki
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: And the State Advisory
16	Committees, especially in a state as big, and as
17	important, as California. Because of that, I cannot
18	participate in this farce of a proceeding on the
19	California State Advisory Committee.
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is the driver that the
21	individuals that you mentioned were in the forefront
22	of Prop. 209, a proposition that was supported by a
23	majority of the folks living in California?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: The driver is that the
25	overall composition of this committee, the selection

1	process that was used, the criteria that evidently was
2	pulled together, creates homogeneity of viewpoint and
3	background that is completely contrary
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Am I mistaken
5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: There's more than
6	three people.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. You
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Am I mistaken, I
9	thought this was a pretty evenly balanced panel in
10	terms of 50 percent sort of liberals, and 50 percent
11	conservatives?
12	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, because if you
13	look at some of the resumes for the independents and
14	the Ds, they're not.
15	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: They're not what?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: They're not liberals.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So would you like
18	to remove some of the independents and Ds, and come up
19	with your own suggestion?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I've already spoken
21	with the Chair. There is no desire to remove any of
22	the people involved, and
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So you just want
24	more Ds.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I just think that

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Not different Ds.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just think that the idea that if the commission were willing to think about looking at these names differently, adding a different kind of viewpoint and ethnic balance to the committee - for the life of me, I don't understand --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Why don't you sit down and we'll discuss it.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: -- how the commission could believe that it could, with a straight face, nominate a SAC that is completely out of whack with the State of California.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: How so?

The idea COMMISSIONER YAKI: that the State Advisory Committee would be 64 percent Caucasian in a state that is majority minority is, in and of itself, indicative of a lack of understanding. cannot find conservatives, people of color to articulate a viewpoint and put it out there, I have little trouble with that. Let that debate go on. That's number one.

Number two, is the fact that when you look at from where the recruitment began, there is such similarity and cross-overlap of bodies of work, of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	organizations that they belong to, that it just does
2	not seem to me it would be one thing to say I'm
3	going to get someone from this community who is
4	conservative and believes in dahdala dahdala da, but
5	doesn't necessarily belong to the same three groups as
6	three other people do.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm not sure that
8	belonging to an organization, that that's a proxy for
9	each issue. For example, the Federalist Society,
10	there are libertarians.
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have heard
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Conservatives
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Mr. Chairman, with all
14	due respect, I have heard your argument on that time
15	and time again. The fact of the matter is, is that
16	the fact that we cannot, especially in a state as big
17	and as diverse, and as populous as California, with as
18	many different interests, and people involved, that
19	you cannot go outside the box of certain
20	organizations, and instead, rely on the fact that
21	well, maybe they're not all the same. Well, Democrats
22	aren't all the same, Republicans aren't all the same.
23	I understand that.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: We have in various

SACs, I would wager that a number of SACs, if not most, have more than one, two, three individuals who belong to the same organization, such as the NAACP. don't know that belonging to the same organization is necessarily a disqualifying factor. I understand your I also don't think that, and I would be personally opposed to some type of proportional ethnic representation. If the chips fall where they may and that happens, fine. But I think one of the things we to avoid was ethnicity as wanted а proxy viewpoint. So, because you're from California, you've got a particular knowledge of that, I mean, I'm sensitive to your view, but I'm not necessarily persuaded by it.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I would say that you can look at certain areas, certain regions, certain states, and make differential conclusions about where interests lie, what groups should be involved. But I'm just saying this as a practical fact, it is California, it is the largest state in the Union, it is the most diverse state in the Union, it is the seventh largest economy in the entire world, it is a place where people of all colors, all creeds, all political persuasions get together and have a friendly hash fight, and not so friendly hash fight every two,

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 going on. 3 just strikes me as bizarre, and 4 certainly indicative of either lack of effort, 5 imagination, or creativity to find a little bit more 6 Just look at it from one point of view. 7 Why is the vast majority of the new appointees all Why is the vast majority or professors? 8 9 That's it, that's the group. Certainly, there are other types of individuals involved in the civil 10 11 rights perspective from both left and right, who don't 12 necessarily belong in the lawyer drafting camp, and the professor camp. 13 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I have a question 14 15 for you. May I ask a question of Commissioner Yaki? 16 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If this group were to contain more community activists, more people of 18 19 color, as you suggest, but it still contained the names of the three individuals with whom I understand 20 21 you have strong objection, would you vote for the 22 panel? 23 COMMISSIONER YAKI: Let me just say this; I named three individuals as being sort of from the 24 25 same cut of cloth. If you really want my --

four, or six years, depending on what election is

1	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: If Gail Heriot
2	were still named as Chairman, and the other two
3	individuals - I forget who they are, even, that you
4	object to - are still on the panel, is it Manny
5	Klausner, is that one of them?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not going to get
7	into names.
8	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. Well, if
9	Gail were still named as Chair, and the other two
10	individuals to whom you object are still on the panel,
11	but there was reshuffling of other individuals to
12	include more community activists, and other types of
13	criteria that you desire, would you vote for the
14	panel?
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I might.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Because I don't
17	believe that you would vote for a panel with Gail
18	Heriot on it, no matter what it looked like. And so
19	that's why
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, Gail I have
21	trouble with. I think overall in terms of what I
22	mean, I've been a politician most of my life.
23	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. So what
24	I'm saying is I think you're bluffing a little bit,
25	because I think you would reject any panel that

Τ	included Professor Heriot.
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No. I can tell you
3	right now, I would not reject any panel that included
4	Professor Heriot.
5	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: As Chair?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It would depend on who
7	the Vice Chair was, and would depend on the
8	composition of the rest of the committee. Never say
9	no, never say never.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: But you're not
11	saying yes.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that we vote
13	on the
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'm not saying yes,
15	because I've been informed that that's not going to
16	happen. And that's not going to happen, I can't vote
17	for it. I'm not going to vote on speculation that
18	maybe
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm not asking you
20	to vote. I'm just asking your intention.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that we vote
22	on this slate, and this is 16 individuals. I believe
23	California has what, 18 slots? Is that correct?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Our standard is to
25	go up to 19, no more than 19.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We could
2	continue these conversations with respect to the
3	remaining slots, and see if through discussions we can
4	come up with some candidates that have the support of
5	Commissioner Yaki. But in the meantime, I suggest
6	that we vote. All in favor?
7	(Chorus of ayes.)
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
9	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Aye.
LO	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That would be a
L1	nay.
L2	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No. I vote no.
L3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Please let the record
L4	reflect that Commissioners Braceras, Kirsanow, Taylor
L5	and Reynolds voted in favor of the California SAC
L6	members proposed, and that Commissioner Yaki did not
L7	vote, and that Commissioner Melendez voted against the
L8	motion. The motion passes.
L9	COMMISSIONER YAKI: For the record,
20	Commissioner Yaki left the room so he did not vote.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let the record reflect
22	that Commissioner Yaki left the room so he did not
23	vote.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Would not vote.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Would not vote,

refused to vote. Next up, Future Agenda Items.

VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do any of the commissioners have any items that they'd like to discuss?

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes. This is Commissioner Melendez. Are we going to have an update on the audit?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, but -- one, two.

Okay. We have to wait until Commissioner Braceras returns so that we will have a quorum. Okay. We're going to start the discussion of the Staff Director's Report.

VIII. STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director Marcus.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. First, I just wanted to make a brief announcement about the Utah State Advisory Committee, which is one of our most newly rechartered committees.

On December 13, the Utah Advisory Committee will conduct a briefing in Salt Lake City, Utah regarding discrimination against Native Americans in border communities. Our Denver office is working hard to put on what I think will be a very fine panel on that topic. The governor of Utah is now scheduled to

NEAL R. GROSS

participate, as is the mayor of Salt Lake County, Utah.

The meeting is very shortly before our commission meeting, which, unfortunately, was an unavoidable conflict. Nevertheless, if there are any commissioners who are interested in attending that meeting, please let me know, and I'm sure that they will be welcome.

I'd like to say a few words about the commission's financial reporting and finances. On Thursday night, Wednesday night, early Thursday morning, we completed and issued our Annual Performance and Accountability Report, including our Audited Financial Statement.

As you know, these reports were seldom prepared and delivered to OMB on time in the past, and getting our paperwork together for the deadline was, I think, nothing short of а heroic effort. Ι particularly would commend Tina Martin and Debra Carr. Staff worked here until 2:30 in the morning to get the work done, and I think that their ability to compile this accountability report really was indication of extraordinary dedication by commission staff.

The report, together with the audited

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

financial statement, paints a picture that I think has two main features. One of them is that it shows that we still have some weaknesses that are significant, and that will require concerted effort in order to fix them and turn them around. We still have a great deal of work to do on our finances, and I think we have a great deal of aggressive work still to do.

On the other hand, they do show rather dramatic improvement from two years ago, and rather dramatic improvement even from last year. commissioners will recall, we have never before been able to get even a qualified opinion on more than one of our financial statements. 2004, In when arrived, the Parker firm was in the middle of an audit took two years to complete, and when they they only looked at completed it, the statement, and were unable to provide even a qualified Instead, they provided a opinion. disclaimer, together with a discussion of weaknesses on that one statement.

Last year, we made substantial progress, even though we still had the same accounting firm that had been contracted by the prior administration, we actually were able to get a full-scope audit, which is to say an audit of all five financial statements, and

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

we were able to get not a disclaimer, but a qualified opinion on our balance sheet, as well as disclaimers on the other four statements.

This year, for the first time, we have opinions on all five financial statements. Becoming auditable, and being able to get qualified opinions on all five statements I think is an extraordinary amount of progress. But what's more is that we didn't get qualified opinion on all five of our statements, we actually got unqualified opinions on every single one of them for the first time, so this is a dramatic improvement.

there still As say, are material weaknesses and reportable conditions. They deal with the travel and approval process, they deal with human needs, travel capital expenses, supporting file documentation, maintenance, travel and and approval processing. These are all things that we are in the process of developing a corrective action plan Nevertheless, the work to ensure that to deal with. our financial reporting is sound, I think was a big is mixed news, still very step forward. So it significant significant issues, very dramatic improvements.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Could I ask 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

question? This is Commissioner Melendez. Here's where we really need what the findings was, maybe the other stuff, but we need the findings, here's where it's really needed. What were the actual findings as far as issues relating to the budget, and spending, those type things?

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Ιf you're referring to the findings of our auditors, Walker and they were distributed to commissioners Company, yesterday. Ι there material As say, were two weaknesses, and three reportable conditions, which is an improvement from the prior year. Is it two and three or two and two? I'm sorry, it's two and two. Two material weaknesses, two reportable conditions, which is an improvement from the prior year, but that everything else is unqualified.

as to have we spent our money appropriately so that we don't really lose funding that reflects on the commission? Because, as you know, we were unable to hire special assistants for a number of months, and I'd hate to see us all of a sudden find out that we did not spend appropriately the money that we have. Could you answer that question?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez,

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

we intend to go into closed session, and that issue will be discussed at that time. But we do have an answer for you.

COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions?

Okay. The Staff Director has requested that the next portion of the meeting be closed pursuant to the commission's regulations implementing the Sunshine Act. Will the General Counsel and Solicitor please certify that the meeting can be closed pursuant to the commission's regulations?

MR. BLACKWOOD: Based on our knowledge of Staff Director is requesting the closed whv the portion of the meeting, we certify in writing and have submitted in writing, that this meeting can be closed, information pertaining the to same withheld. Pursuant the following to provided for in the commission regulations, see 45 CFR Section 702.54. Exemption Two, when a meeting relates to the internal personnel rules and practices of the commission. Exemption Five, when a meeting might involve censoring a person. And Exemption Six, when a meeting might involve disclosing information of personal nature, where disclosure might constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. And

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

	Exemption Ten, when the meeting might involve the
2	commission's participation in a civil action or
3	proceeding.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. May I have a
5	motion to close this meeting pursuant to Exemptions
6	Two, Five, Six, and Ten of the Closed Meetings
7	Procedures for the commission meetings; furthermore,
8	this motion would authorize the Staff Director to
9	place in a location accessible to the public within
10	one working day, business day, the public vote to
11	close the meeting, reflecting an explanation of the
12	decision to close the meeting, and a list of all
13	persons attending the meeting.
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Is there a second?
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I will call out
18	the name of each commissioner. The commissioner
19	should then answer yes, no, or abstain. After the
20	voting is concluded, I will read out how each one of
21	you voted in order to ensure that the tally is
22	correct. Please vote when I call your name.
23	Commissioner Braceras.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Kirsanow.

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Melendez.
3	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor.
5	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I vote yes, also.
7	The tally is as follows, Commissioners Braceras,
8	Kirsanow, Melendez, Taylor, and Reynolds voted in the
9	affirmative. Commissioners Thernstrom and Yaki did
10	not participate in the vote. The motion passes.
11	At this point, I guess we need to clear
12	the room pursuant to the affirmative vote. The
13	individuals who will participate in the closed session
14	are Commissioners Braceras, Kirsanow, Taylor,
15	Melendez, and Reynolds. Also present will be Staff
16	Director Marcus, the General Counsel, David Blackwood,
17	the Assistant Deputy Staff Director, Debra Carr, the
18	Director of Administration, Tina Louise Martin, the
19	Director of Human Resources, Tyro Beatty, Derek Horne,
20	who is the Attorney Advisor to the Staff Director, and
21	the Solicitor, Emma Monroig.
22	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would add that
23	if Commissioner Melendez would want Mr. Schmechel to
24	remain, that there is no problem with his remaining.

I don't know whether Ms. Schuld is here, but if

1	Commissioner Braceras
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: She is no longer
3	here. She needed to catch a flight.
4	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes, Richard can
5	remain.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let the record
7	reflect that Richard Schmechel will also be in
8	attendance. Okay. So everyone is out, doors closed.
9	(CLOSED SESSION.)
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's go back
11	on the record.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: These are just
13	minor questions that I have.
14	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are we required to
15	certify on the back-end?
16	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry?
17	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are we required to
18	certify on the back-end of a closed session?
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. Yes.
20	(Off the record comments.)
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Ms. Monroig, why
22	don't you answer the question.
23	MS. MONROIG: The requirement, according
24	to the regs, is that you read the transcript of the
25	closed session afterwards to determine if there is any

items there that are disclosable to the public or not.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Commissioner
Braceras.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I just had a
question about transcripts, and where we stand in
receiving them, and getting them up on the web for
previous briefings and meetings?
STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes, Commissioner
Braceras. We are now several months behind in making
the transcripts available in final form. The process
that we go through is a time-consuming one. Usually,
it is the Secretary to the Staff Director who does
this work, which involves not just reading the
transcript, but listening to the tapes carefully,
finding any errors, with due respect to court
reporters, which we do find.
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: With respect to
the briefing, or also the meeting portion?
STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Both of them, we
find errors in both. Based on various efforts using
current staff, I've determined that we simply are not
able currently to make our way through the backlog
with the currently available people, particularly

given that the Secretary to the Staff Director remains

on long-term medical leave.

We are bringing on a temporary person for the sole purpose of wading through these transcripts to try and come up to speed. And my expectation is that our temporary employee who is working on that matter, I hope, will be on board on Monday. And the Director of Management is nodding her head yes, we do expect her to be on board, so she can start.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I raise it, simply because I've been asked by members of the public who are interested in some of the briefings we did, and I guess, wanted to do research based on them, whether the transcripts were publicly available.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes. And that's why we're spending the money to bring a temporary person on board, is because we really need to get those --

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: My other question is, is it our intention, with respect to all of the briefings we've done, to try to issue briefing reports, or are some of them just simply verbal briefings? Specifically, I was wondering whether we're putting together a report on the ABA Rules, and on the Omaha briefing that we had.

STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Yes. We are

NEAL R. GROSS

1 working on reports on all of the briefings that we've 2 held so far. 3 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: When do you think 4 the ABA Rules one might come out? 5 STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Fairly confident 6 by the January meeting, and there's a chance that it 7 would be in the December meeting. COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: The reason I ask -8 9 - I'm sorry. Go ahead. 10 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yes, the reason I 11 asked, which may be the same reason that Commissioner 12 Kirsanow was concerned, is that my understanding is that negotiations between the ABA and the Department 13 of Education are moving along at a speedy clip, and I 14 15 understand from folks at the Department of Education 16 that it would be useful for them to have us weigh-in 17 least make the transcripts on the issue, or at available as soon as possible. 18 19 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: That is my 20 My understanding is that the first week of 21 December, the Department of Education is going to have its accreditation hearings. 22 I know I'm going to be testifying at them, and then they're going to 23 making a determination shortly thereafter, so anything 24

that we can do to weigh-in, I think might be helpful.

1 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I would suggest 2 that we make that particular transcript a priority. 3 Is there any chance -- well, what's your estimate in 4 terms of completing the briefing report for that 5 topic? 6 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I think he just 7 said that --STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Well, again, I'm 8 9 pretty confident for January, for December - and the December, I believe, is after the hearing. 10 I think we have a pretty good chance, I don't know if it's 50/50 11 12 or not, but we can certainly try to focus on that above all the others. I have to say, and I may need 13 to focus on it a little bit more, or maybe your input 14 15 would be useful - one of the difficult questions for 16 that briefing and the other briefings that are well 17 advanced in process, is to what extent we need to redo them based on the new draft briefing procedures that I 18 19 think are still in process. COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, let me just 20 21 ask a few questions. What are, other than Omaha and the briefings that are out there that we're 22 ABA, 23 trying to reduce to writing? STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: 24 Voting Fraud and

Intimidation, Misidentification or

25

Misrepresentation

1	of Minorities in the Census.
2	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right.
3	Okay, so ABA, voting, census, and Omaha.
4	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Those are the ones
5	I can think of off-hand.
6	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And which is I
7	mean
8	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I have to say that
9	the some of the staff have been sent out and
10	haven't come back, so I can't guarantee for sure I
11	haven't forgotten something.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. No, no,
13	that's fine, but of these, am I correct - I mean, this
14	is just based on my shaky memory - but am I correct
15	that the oldest, the one that's been out there the
16	longest is ABA, or is it census?
17	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I think it's
18	census. I did forget one. The one that I forgot is
19	the Effectiveness of Historically Black Colleges.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: That's right.
21	HBCUs, okay. Right. And, hence, I think this sort of
22	reiterates our need for separate business meetings,
23	because this is a lot to talk about if we're going to
24	be putting these out. So is the priority to do them
25	in chronological order in terms of getting out the

Τ	priefing reports, or what is the priority?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I suggest that, to the
3	extent an issue - a particular topic that's been
4	covered is being covered by a federal agency - for
5	example, the ABA briefing report, I would suggest that
6	we take that one out of order.
7	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: The ABA report
8	happens to be one of the ones in the most advanced
9	stage.
10	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. I mean, I
11	think it should be, precisely for the reason that the
12	Chair just stated. I mean, other than that, I think
13	we should try to proceed chronologically, but when
14	something is more timely or current, I think we need
15	to move it to the head of the line.
16	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There are, of
17	course, other considerations. For instance, there's
18	at least one that was - the timing of which is
19	affected by a change in personnel.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Being done by
22	attorneys in OGC who are no longer employed here, so
23	it got delayed by that reason.
24	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right.
25	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: There are others
	1

2 resources between OGC, versus OCRE, versus OSD. 3 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay. I quess my 4 concern is that before we allocate staff time and 5 resources to planning further briefings, I think it's 6 important to try to kind of clear the docket, or make 7 headway on the docket before we move on to the next thing. But my particular concern was with the ABA, 8 9 and I'd like to see that moved forward as quickly -- I 10 mean, if we could have with the ABA - if we could get 11 the transcript available ASAP so that it can be useful 12 to the Department as they move into their hearings, that would be great. And then the report will just 13 come when it comes. 14 15 CHAIRMAN **REYNOLDS:** With any luck, by 16 If not December, January. December. 17 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We'll move it to 18 19 the top of the list. 20 COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Right. 21 and why don't we, for purposes of procedure, you know, our procedures are in flux, but why don't we try to --22 well, why don't we schedule -- I think that there 23 needs to be some sort of conference call where a 24 25 minority commissioners member of the the

a little faster based on difference

1

that

1	commissioners in the political minority can kind of go
2	through it with some of the members in the majority,
3	and hash it out line-by-line. I don't know that we
4	need to call it a working group, per se, but I think
5	Commissioner Yaki and myself, and whoever else may be
6	interested with the Staff Director's cooperation, we
7	should all talk soon about this. I don't know if you
8	want to if we can ask the Staff Director's shop to
9	coordinate that conference.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think it's a good
11	suggestion. I think the other commissioners, the ones
12	who are not going to participate in this
13	teleconference, should also read the document that you
14	prepared, and to provide you with their input. But I
15	think that the Staff Director should work with the
16	participants to select a date that this conversation
17	can take place.
18	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Can we try to do
19	that in the next couple of weeks?
20	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: I would certainly
21	be happy to. Commissioner Melendez is on the line,
22	still?
23	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: Yes.
24	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: Did you want to

25

participate on that?

1	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: If I'm available,
2	yes.
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Then we should
4	assume that well, I'm going to assume that
5	Commissioner Yaki, he has a keen interest in these
6	procedural issues.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: How many can we
8	have without violating the Sunshine Act?
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It is four?
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Four.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: So
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would be
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So that would be
14	Yaki, Melendez, Taylor, Braceras.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Right.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And the Staff
17	Director.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's right.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And I think if we
20	can all set aside a chunk of time, an hour or so, or
21	more to hash through it on the phone, we can probably
22	take care of it in one phone call. But if everybody
23	else could get their written comments to me, and to
24	the Staff Director ahead of time, that would be great.
25	I mean, with respect to how to proceed on

the reports you're going to be putting together, I guess I would -- I don't know. Do you have any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This is -- the markers laid down. Well, assuming that we get the new procedures in place quickly, then I don't think that we're going to need -- that we're going to lose too much ground, but there is the potential that we will have to go back and redo some things.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, I think the only risk is that if a report is coming up for the December meeting for a vote, I think if we could separate it physically into two parts, the summary of the proceedings, and the finding and recommendations, then, at the very least, I think we can vote on sort of the clearinghouse version, and approve that without -- hopefully, we could also approve findings and recommendations, but that could be а separate discussion.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, I would be interested to hear from Commissioner Yaki. I have no idea whether that would be an acceptable approach for Commissioner Yaki, but it's a reasonable one.

COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And my guess is

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	that it would be, but I don't want to speak for him.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: It's a reasonable
3	approach.
4	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Like I said before,
5	I am uncomfortable voting to approve any further
6	reports, unless it is either just a clearinghouse
7	report, or unless the process has been put in place
8	beforehand. So if we're not voting on just a
9	clearinghouse report, I would abstain from that vote.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Until we have a
12	process.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I understand. Any
14	other questions or comments? Commissioner Melendez,
15	questions, comments?
16	COMMISSIONER MELENDEZ: No.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, I do have one
18	other question. Where do we stand with the strategic
19	plan right now?
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Ken.
21	STAFF DIRECTOR MARCUS: We're very close
22	to having another draft. I think that we should have
23	one early next week before Tuesday.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thanksgiving reading.
25	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.

1

IX. ADJOURN

2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, on that note,
3	let's adjourn until next month. Thanks, folks.
4	(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the

record at 12:30 p.m.)

5