JO: FIDROXA 1

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

MEETING

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1996

The Commission met in Conference Room 540, 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 at 9:30 a.m., Mary Frances Berry, Chair, presiding.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY Chairperson

CRUZ REYNOSO Vice Chairperson

CARL A. ANDERSON Commissioner

ROBERT P. GEORGE Commissioner

A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, Jr. Commissioner

YVONNE Y. LEE Commissioner

RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH Commissioner (via telephone)

MARY K. MATHEWS Staff Director

LIBRARY

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS



NEAL R. GROSS

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

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

BARBARA BROOKS

JAMES S. CUNNINGHAM

KI TAEK CHUN

BETTY EDMINSTON

GERRI HALL

GEORGE HARBISON

CAROL LEE-HURLEY

JACQUELINE L. JOHNSON

WILLIAM LEE

STEPHANIE Y. MOORE, General Counsel

VERONIQUE PLUVIOSE-FENTON

CHARLES RIVERA

MIGUEL SAPP, Parlimentarian

ANTHONY K. WELLS, Sr.

AUDREY WRIGHT

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

RONALD BROWN
JOSEPH BROADUS
ADERSON FRANCOIS
CHARLOTTE PONTICELLI
WILLIAM L. SAUNDERS, Jr.
CYNTHIA VALENZUELA



T.S. CONMISSION ON CYIL PULLS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

AGENDA

2	Agenda Item	<u>Page</u>
3	Approval of Agenda	6
4	Approval of Minutes of December 15, 1995 and	
5	March 6, 1996 Meetings	6
6	Announcements	6
7	Staff Director's Report	6
8	Program Planning Retreat Discussion	42
9	Commission's Subpoena Power	130
10	State Advisory Committee Reports	
11	Resources Devoted to Local and Federal	
12	Civil Rights Enforcement in Minnesota	160
13	Racial Tensions in Tennessee	162
14	State Advisory Committee Appointments	163

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

2	(9:40 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're going to call
4	the meeting to order. The first item is the approval
5	of the agenda. Approval of the agenda for the
6	meeting.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair,
8	I'd like to ask that we have an executive session to
9	discuss a personnel matter.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there a second?
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. It's been moved
13	then, seconded, that we add to the agenda an executive
14	session at some point to discuss a sensitive personnel
15	matter. Is there any objection?
16	All in favor, say aye. Opposed?
17	Good morning, is that Russell?
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. Good
19	morning.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, good morning to
21	you, Russell sunshine.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: May I speak to
23	the agenda?
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, you may.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: My time is
	NEAL D. CDOCC

1	limited this morning. I will need to leave at about
2	11:00. Therefore, I ask that discussion on the staff
3	proposal for projects to be deferred, delayed,
4	dismissed, be moved higher on the agenda so I might
5	participate in the discussion.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. We will make
7	sure that we discuss those earlier. We'll move them
8	up somewhere here.
9	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: To make sure we get to
11	them well before 11:00. The executive session that's
12	being proposed, do you envision it being short, Mr.
13	Vice Chair?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I do.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Are there any
16	other additions to the agenda before we with that
17	addition and with the modification that we'll move the
18	planning retreat discussion up earlier. I'll just see
19	how the first part of it goes, Russell, but I promise
20	you I'll move it up far enough so we'll have plenty of
21	time to discuss it.
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's fine.
23	Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that all right?
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. Certainly.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. With that, can
2	we get a motion to approve the agenda?
3	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: So moved.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor, say aye.
6	Opposed?
7	Okay. The next item is the approval of
8	the minutes of December 15, 1995, and March 6, 1996.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, on
10	the minutes of December 15, 1995, I have one of the
11	most important suggestions I have ever made. On the
12	second line, instead of a comma should be a period.
13	(Laughter.)
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Any objection?
15	Does anyone else have any changes they'd like to make
16	in the minutes for either one of these days? If not,
17	can I get a motion to approve the minutes?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Second.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor, say aye.
21	Opposed?
22	Okay. The next item is announcements. Do
23	you have any announcements, Staff Director?
24	MS. MATHEWS: I do, Madam Chair.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh good. Well, go
	NEAL D. CDOCC

right ahead.

MS. MATHEWS: I first wanted to address the funding situation. Many of you may have noticed the events on Capitol Hill yesterday in regard to the continuing resolution. The Commission, as you know, is one of the agencies that is affected by this. It is my understanding that the House and Senate both passed, yesterday late in the day, a continuing resolution that would extend funding until March 29, which is another week. We are going to be making an announcement to the employees to report to work Monday, since the current CR expires today at midnight.

Another funding issue is the Commission's inclusion in the President's budget, which was submitted to the Capitol this week as well. This is the budget request for next fiscal year, FY 1997. The Commission is reflected in this budget request with the Administration's support for \$11.4 million. There are a few charts in this document that refer to a \$9.3 million number for the Commission, but the Administration is supporting the \$11.4 number for us.

I have also now some follow-up items I wanted to just touch on briefly from the December meeting, since we have not had a Commission meeting

since then. You will recall we sent a letter that the Commissioners agreed to at the December meeting to the Secretary of the Army. It was in regard to the hate group activity and racially motivated killings at Fort Bragg. We followed up with the Army Department to see if they had concluded their investigation.

learned that there was press conference yesterday in which the Department had We have copies released a report. for each Commissioner. I know some of you, since you are flying back, you may not want to carry it with you, but if you would like, we have copies today. We just got them late yesterday. This is entitled, "The Secretary of the Army's Task Force on Extremist Activities." Or we can mail it to you, whichever you would prefer.

Another follow-up item from the December meeting is the terms for Commissioners Anderson and Redenbaugh. Commission follow-up items in that regard involved a letter that was sent to the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate expressing the Commissioners' interpretation of our statute in this area.

We received replies back from each individual. Speaker Gingrich replied that

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 Anderson's current term would expire on
2	February 11, current at that time, I should say,
3	Commissioner Anderson. And that he had been
4	reappointed for a new six-year term beginning February
5	12, 1996.
6	Senator Thurmond responded back,
7	indicating that on first impression it would appear
8	that Commissioner Redenbaugh's first term expired
9	December 12, 1995. Senator Thurmond added that he
10	believed that consideration should be given though to
11	clarification in this area by the full Senate. We
12	have not received any word further on that issue.
13	Commissioner
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Excuse me.
15	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Senator
17	Thurmond, in what capacity was he speaking?
18	MS. MATHEWS: As the President Pro
19	Tempore.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, I see.
21	Okay.
22	MS. MATHEWS: Commissioner Redenbaugh
23	also was reappointed for a new six-year term by
24	announcement on the Senate floor December 22, 1995.
25	Following up some other items, you will

recall we discussed at the December meeting the report on Title VI. The Commissioners agreed at that time to vote by facsimile transmission to my office. The agreed upon date was December 28. I believe on that date precisely, the Chair wrote to each Commissioner to extend the voting opportunity until Monday, January 8. At which point we had the closing of the Washington, D.C. offices due to snow.

So we extended the opportunity for Commissioners to vote until 2:00 p.m. the first work day the Federal Government was re-opened here in Washington. The result of the vote was a passage of the Title VI report by a vote of five to three. Advance copies of the report were forwarded to Capitol Hill and to the White House, as is our customary practice. We are currently in the latter stages of preparing the document for printing.

Another follow-up item were reports that I forwarded to each of you. They were from the regional directors, the appropriate geographical area covering the following three issues. One was an item mentioned by Commissioner George at the December meeting about an activity by a group known as the Rickies in Oregon. The other was on the racially motivated killings in Fort Bragg. The third was on

11 killings in Harlem. 1 Moving on here to another issue. 2 Chair Revnoso brought up a point at the December 3 meeting about frequent flyer miles. 4 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I had that 5 noted in my remarks. 6 MS. MATHEWS: Staff has researched this 7 issue and we are at this point -- we've looked at the 8 Federal travel procedure in this area. We have 9 determined that the best course of action is to assess 10 how to track, were we to implement an official program 11 in this area. We are getting some demonstrations from 12 some systems about how to track this in about two 13 14 weeks. So I should have a further report for you in the near future on that. 15 We also forwarded to each Commissioner a 16 17 copy of the disk for the Commission's first radio public service announcement. I hadn't received a 18 reply from any of you, but I am hoping you found it as 19 20 good a start in this area as I think it was. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I notice there's an 21 22 increase in the Commission's -- complaints filed with

the Commission. Last time I looked, I think it was 700 and something a month. Was there an increase attributed to this PSA or not?

23

24

1	MS. MATHEWS: Yes. I appreciate you
2	asking that question. I had talked to our Assistant
3	Staff Director for Civil Rights Evaluation about that
4	matter. He reported most definitely that this PSA has
5	received wide play around the country. As a result,
6	we're getting a significant higher volume of civil
7	rights complaints from individuals, in which they tell
8	us that they are writing to us by virtue of hearing
9	this public service announcement because we have
10	included in it our 800 number for individuals to call
11	in, obviously at no expense to themselves.
12	So it is a very good public service. I am
13	very pleased about the connection that has been made
14	there.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director, we are
16	going to give you one more minute.
17	MS. MATHEWS: Okay. Well, we haven't met
18	in a while, Madam Chair. I'll follow up here then
19	briefly on the March telephonic Commission meeting,
20	and indicate that Commissioner decisions made at that
21	meeting were transmitted or followed up and
22	implemented.
23	By that, I mean that the House Oversight
24	Subcommittee was informed orally of the decisions and
25	that the documents both in the official system of

1 records and any other documents that staff may have relevant to the Oversight Subcommittee's request were 2 collected, logged, and forwarded to the subcommittee. 3 That's it, Madam Chair. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, now what 5 we will do is just have a brief executive session, and 6 7 then go to the program proposals so that we can have time. unless someone wants to make 8 announcement or discuss something else relevant to the 9 announcements. I have one announcement to make. 10 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Thank you, Madam 11 Should we continue announcements now or 12 Chairman. pick them up after the executive --13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead now. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. I had a 16 couple of things. First of all, I wanted to introduce 17 my new special assistant. I know that Judge Higginbotham and Judge Reynoso both have new special 18 19 assistants as well. It would be nice to meet them. 20 Mine is Bill Saunders, who comes to us from the 21 Lawyer's Committee on Human Rights. He's a lawyer, graduate of the Harvard Law School and former law 22 23 professor at Catholic University. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Ι know that 25 Commissioner Redenbaugh has a new special assistant

1	also. Is that true, Commissioner Redenbaugh?
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. It is.
3	This would be the right moment. She is Charlotte
4	Ponticelli, who joined us this month, and comes from
5	among other places, previously the State Department.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. She is right
7	over there.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What law school did
9	she graduate from?
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Her law school
11	degree has not been delivered yet.
12	(Laughter.)
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm actually an
14	equal opportunity employer.
15	(Laughter.)
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have people
17	who don't have law degrees.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I want to say too that
19	this is the first meeting at which Judge Higginbotham
20	has been present in person. Although he was in person
21	on the phone at the last meeting. So therefore, I
22	want to I know you agree with me, that we extend a
23	warm welcome to him to the Commission, and look
24	forward to working with him productively.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Absolutely.

2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Judge Higginbotham,
3	would you mind introducing your special assistant?
4	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I have the
5	pleasure of introducing Aderson Francois. Aderson is
6	a star, like all of the other special assistants. A
7	graduate of New York University Law School. The only
8	profound disadvantage he has had in life is that he
9	served a two-year clerkship on the United States Court
10	of Appeals for me. Thereafter, he was at Paul Weiss
11	Rifkind Wharton Garrison, where he was highly
12	respected. He has a commitment to civil rights and
13	was willing to take about a 60 percent reduction in
14	income. So I feel very, very privileged to have him
15	as a colleague.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, thank you very
17	much. Welcome to you also.
18	Did I miss anybody? No, I didn't.
19	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Has Cruz introduced
20	his
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Cruz, did you
22	introduce Cindy last time?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: We did. But
24	I'll introduce her again. My relatively new assistant
25	is Cindy Valenzuela stand up who is a recent

Welcome.

1	UCLA law graduate.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There she is, right
3	over there.
4	Did you have another announcement?
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I did. I have two
6	more. One, I wonder if we can get a quick update, if
7	you happen to have the information to hand about the
8	matter of the religious rights of Americans in Saudi
9	Arabia. I know Commissioner Horner has raised that
10	matter before.
11	I continue to hear press reports about it.
12	I wondered if there is any information about whether
13	this situation has been resolved favorably to the
14	cause of civil and religious rights or not.
15	MS. MATHEWS: I do not have any further
16	update from the State Department, but we'd be glad to
17	
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Would it be possible
19	to look into the matter and see?
20	MS. MATHEWS: Certainly.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I just heard
22	something about it in the middle of this week. I
23	thought that it had been resolved, but I'd like very
24	much to know if it hasn't.
25	MS. MATHEWS: Certainly.

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 GEORGE: Then the Staff Director made reference to my inquiry regarding alleged anti-Catholic activity abetted by a city, which conducted a parade out in Oregon. I received, as all of you did, a report from Philip Montez, our regional director for the Western Regional Office. I want to commend Regional Director Montez on the report, which was quite thorough and useful.

Because it's good news, I thought I would call attention to the comments made by individuals, one, a spokesperson for the group that was involved in the activity called the Rickies. page two of Director Montez's report, the spokesperson says that the Rickies fully accept criticism from anyone who might think our entry was not funny. However, no one should construe our intentions or our actions as bigoted or hateful. We neither intended nor displayed bigotry, simply parody. The Rickies are sorry that some people are offended by our actions.

Well, I'm not quite sure at what level that really is an apology, and to what extent there's a recognition that any offensive goings on occurred. However, it is clear that the mayor of the city of Eugene, Ruth Bascom, has put on the record I think, a fully adequate apology in a letter that's quoted in

Director Montez's report to the local Catholic pastor, 1 whose name is Father Scott Vandehey. 2 The Eugene celebration, Mayor Bascom said, 3 which for me is a wonder of humor and political satire 4 and colorful community participation, must also 5 maintain and respect the diversity and be sensitive to 6 deeply held beliefs. I regret that this year's parade 7 entry by the Rickies lacked that sensitivity to people 8 of our worshipping Catholic communities. 9 I think we all recognize that we ought to 10 be over sensitive to good natured light-hearted ethnic 11 12 or religious humor. There are strong traditions within our ethnic groups and our religious communities 13 of engaging in that sort of humor. 14 My concern, and I know the concern of the 15 Catholic League for Civil and Religious Rights which 16 brought this matter to my attention, is that this was 17 18 a case where it really did go over the line. Therefore, I'm happy to report and to bring to the 19 pubic's attention the apology issued by Mayor Bascom 20 21 of the City of Eugene as its reported to us in 22 Director Montez's report. 23 Thank you, Madam Chairman. That's all. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Thank you. 25 Any other announcements? Okay. Well then we are

i going to have a brief executive session. I am saying 2 that so the staff knows not to go away and have breakfast and coffee and second breakfasts. 3 Then 4 we're going to do the program proposals. So as soon 5 as we can clear everybody out, we'll go ahead. I want only here the parliamentarian and 6 7 the Commissioners, period. If you are not a 8 Commissioner and you are not a parliamentarian --9 (Whereupon, the proceedings went immediately into closed session.) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 (10:25 a.m.) 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We are going to take 3 up the program planning retreat discussion which is 4 listed as item number eight on the agenda. This item 5 is necessary in view of our -- we do program planning 6 anyway, as you know. 7 But we now have some budgetary changes 8 that have been made which require us to look at our 9 10 projects to make some judgements about which ones we want to keep, which ones we want to get rid of, what 11 kind of modifications do we want to make in these 12 projects. We have before us recommendations from the 13 staff as to how they think we should best do this in 14 view of the budgetary reality. 15 16 Is there someone who would like to either make a motion for purposes of discussion? Perhaps if 17 we could get a motion to either accept, reject, 18 19 discuss these, perhaps accept and then can make modifications as we go along or would you like to do 20 them one by one or how would you like to do these? 21 What is your pleasure, Commissioners? 22

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think I'd prefer to do them one by one. It might be easier.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

23

24

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right. 1 2 terms of your time, I'll make sure we get in whatever you want to particularly call attention to before you 3 end, Commissioner Redenbaugh. I'll keep my eye on the 4 clock. 5 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: All right. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But on the first page of this report, we have the fiscal year of 1996. 8 9 These are changes that they are proposing in the 10 projects that we already approved. We didn't get a 11 full appropriation. We know this. The monies have 12 been reduced, so we have to -- and projects have been 13 delayed by the furloughs and all the other things that 14 have happened. 15 They are recommending that we take --16 right now, they are working on the equal educational 17 opportunity report, which would be our statutory 18 report for this year. That is the one where, you 19 know, every year we have to do one of these. 20 correct, that this is our statutory report for the 21 year and that the statute says we have to produce 22 every year, Commissioner Redenbaugh. 23 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I Yes. 24 understand that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And the educational

opportunity one is that one for this year. The staff
is currently working on it. The update does not
propose that we discontinue working on it, that we
just continue with that one. That was the first one.

Does anyone have any objection to our
continuing to work on or want to discuss further the

continuing to work on or want to discuss further the
equal educational opportunity law enforcement report?

I see no signs of anyone wanting to disrupt it, so we

can go to the next one.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Ι have You touched on it and I endorsed what we question. But I asked for a little further have just done. explanation because it strikes me that about 90 days ago or so, and I'm not at all clear about the date, we had assurances that our projects and plans were moving roughly on schedule. It strikes me that this reduction in our anticipated output is much greater the reduction in our appropriation than anticipation and the furlough and snow closings would justify.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So your question is?

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: These look like very big cuts relative to what I would expect from the budget reality and shut-down.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Commissioner Redenbaugh believes that the cuts that
2	are being proposed on projects, the adjustments on
3	projects, seem on the surface at least to be greater
4	than or not commensurate with the actual cuts in the
5	appropriation. He is wondering about that and would
6	like some kind of response in general.
7	MS. MATHEWS: Well, in general, these
8	recommendations that are included in the program
9	planning memorandum to the Commissioners, were made by
10	the staff that are managing the programs.
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: This is a
12	document that we received this week.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's correct. The
14	one that says program planning.
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: My colleagues
16	may have much greater capacity to read these things
17	than I do, but that seemed like very short time for us
18	to then decide this. So anyway, you were saying?
19	MS. MATHEWS: It is a recommendation.
20	Obviously the Commissioners can discuss and end up in
21	a different place. But it is a recommendation based
22	on our assessment of current work load demands. Also,
23	it's a reflection of the original agreement upon which
24	these proposals were approved by the Commissioners.
25	As you know, that was an assumption of a significantly

higher amount of money that was requested of OMB. 1 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: How much higher? 2 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: \$11.4. Well, \$11.4 is what the 4 MS. MATHEWS: Administration put forward for the Commission last 5 year, in other words, in the last cycle, for this 6 7 current fiscal year 1996. But the Commissioners 8 approved these project proposals at a higher amount than that. 9 10 As you know, we have not received a full 11 appropriation this year. We have been operating under these CRs, with two good chunks of time of temporary 12 13 shutdown and furlough of almost all staff. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: One thing that may 15 help to answer the question is what percentage reduction do we have from the amount that the 16 17 Commission thought we had when we approved the proposals? In other words, the number we were working 18 with when we approved these proposals was what, and 19 20 the number now, so that we can figure out whether 21 we've got half of what we thought we had or what. 22 Maybe that would help. 23 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. That's a 24 very good way to ask the guestion. Thank you. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So how much did we

I

- 1	diffine we were proposing. Was it is someoning. I
2	forgot what the numbers were.
3	MS. MATHEWS: It was in the middle range
4	of \$12 million. I can get the figure in a minute or
5	two by checking with the appropriate staff. But I am
6	going to approximate about \$12.4 or \$12.5.
7	We have had CRs this year. The first
8	period of time, a couple weeks, was factored at I
9	believe \$8.3 million. Then we had a furlough. Then
10	the next CR was factored at an annual assumption of
11	\$8.5 brought down to the couple weeks the CR covered.
12	The last CR and this one that is going to be for next
13	week is factored on an annual assumption of \$8.75
14	million. So they have been slightly different in
15	terms of the allocation of money.
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But all
17	basically in the eight.
18	MS. MATHEWS: Yes. Correct.
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does that help you,
21	Commissioner Redenbaugh?
22	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. It does.
23	Thank you.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now the fair
25	employment law enforcement report, they are asking
	NEAL D. ODOCC

think we were proposing? Was it 13 something?

1	that it be delayed rather than because it's the one
2	on the EEOC. Is this for our statutory report for the
3	next year? This is our statutory report for 1997. So
4	the one for this year is the equal opportunity one.
5	The one for next year is the one looking at the EEOC,
6	which is the fair employment law enforcement.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That's the
8	statutory.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. That's the
10	statutory.
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, they are both
12	statutory.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. One for this
14	year. The next one for the next year.
15	So those, we approved those as our
16	statutory ones. It would seem to me that where we
17	should be looking for making adjustments would not be
18	to change those because we have to do statutory.
19	Unless we have some other statutory.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I would
21	definitely concur with that.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. So maybe we
23	shouldn't spend a lot of time trying to figure out
24	whether we want to keep those or not, and then move to
25	the things that are not statutory, where we have more

flexibility. Is that agreed? 1 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Fine with me. 2 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George? 3 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think that is a 4 good idea. I would also suggest having just agreed to 5 what we agreed to, that we avoid taking any action 6 that we don't have to take today. This is a matter of 7 establishing priorities and so forth. It would be 8 good to have a bit more time to think through these 9 10 possibilities here. So I wonder if we could air views and 11 12 considerations and get answers to questions from each other and from the Staff Director today. 13 14 perfectly happy to take action on things that everybody already agree that 15 can to controversial. 16 In a question, when we raise questions of 17 18 priorities, people are going to have different views. 19 So if we get into any questions that discussion is necessary for, I hope we can have discussion and just 20 21 delay the vote until our next meeting if possible. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Unless there is 22 23 something that someone in particular thinks that we ought to vote on. 24

GEORGE:

COMMISSIONER

25

That's

Yes.

pressing or anything.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we can, without objection then, say that the statutory reports we will keep as they are and move on to discuss others. Is there any objection to that? No objection. So we don't have to go back to those again.

Then we go to just the purposes of looking at them and making any comments. The expanding economic opportunities of African-American, Asian, and Latino youth. They ask that this be delayed, not abandoned but delayed on the grounds of fiscal problems.

Then that we should discontinue plans to continue a project on inappropriate discrimination of credit, which we had scheduled for 1997. And that they would include this in the economic opportunities report of African-American, Asian and Latino youth. I don't understand how that would go, but --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, that's the question I have. I mean depending upon how you define youth, I don't know what their access to credit is other than their parents anyway.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that one I didn't understand. So we would need further clarification, Staff Director, on what this means in terms of credit

1 opportunity. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Where would that 2 3 actually go? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. Then we get to 4 enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act. 5 The recommendation is that we not do a separate report 6 7 on the enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act and that we defer one part of the report until 8 1997. Then we reformulate it if the recommendation to 9 drop the one part is adopted. 10 The part that is proposed that we not do 11 The rationale is that 12 is the employment aspect. employment will be included in the fair employment law 13 project report. So that is what the suggestion here 14 15 is for the ADA. Commissioner Redenbaugh, you had some 16 comments about this, I think. 17 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Ι 18 have I would say first that the process, 19 commented. selecting of the mix of programs and the timing of 20 21 them is clearly a political process. I mean that in 22 the good sense of the word political. 23 I think it's unwise and fraught with 24 danger to make these proposals four days before a 25 meeting and ask us to vote it up or down without the benefit of discussion and compromise and an effort to reach political consensus. I think that would have been the purpose of our planning retreat that was either monied out or snowed out, I can't remember which now.

But I think the wisdom in having the planning retreat was very good. I don't know how at this meeting we can reach a consensus about these things. So that's my comment about the process in general.

About the ADA in particular, I think the people who are interested in the ADA have been waiting for us for a long time to do something. I think to them, you know without more discussion and coalition building, to move to shrink and delay the program or the studying this way I don't support it at all. I don't believe that a majority of the Commissioners — well, we'll find out I guess. But I don't believe that a majority of the Commissioners will want to do that.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, Russell, in response to the first set of comments, I think what we just agreed to after my proposal a moment ago was to not vote on things like this. So we're not being

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 forced to -- I don't think that there is a problem in -- secondly, I agree that we need to do something on 2 People have been waiting a long time. 3 this. Third is just one I can't resist, which is 4 since Russell has introduced the idea of political in 5 the good sense, just a reminder of Aristotle's 6 7 definition of politics, which he said was the highest and best of the sciences because it studied what was 8 highest and best in man. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, okay. VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: There's that in 11 Mexico and Spanish culture of putting sayings that you 12 should have in mind all the time over the door. 13 14 should put that --15 (Laughter.) COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What I just quoted 16 17 to you is on the wall as you enter the Politics Department of Princeton. A little self-aggrandizing 18 comment. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's why he made it. 21 I think that the Commission has not done a report on disabilities, I don't think, since we did something 22 23 before most of you were on the Commission, called Accommodating The Spectrum Of Individual Abilities. 24 25 People are nodding their heads, so maybe I got it right. That was some time ago. That was a very important report.

When we decided we would do this one, we discussed that, we as Commissioners, and the fact that we hadn't done one in a long time. This is a very crucial and important issue. So I too am wondering how we would justify it. I mean I think it's important enough it ought to be done by itself. There are other things that are listed here that I would be willing to jettison before I would jettison this. That's just my own personal view.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would Yes. agree with that. I think it maybe inadvertently sends the wrong signal coming from the Commission. I would be prepared to vote on it today. My vote would be to track, and accept not to it on recommendation. But if we have to defer it, maybe there's something that would change my mind, but I don't think so right now.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now the Staff Director, would one of your staff members who I guess is involved in this, one of your directors is trying to get recognized. Would you be willing to have this person speak?

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	MS. MATHEWS: Yes. I would be glad to
2	have actually both office heads, the General Counsel.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If they want to say
4	anything.
5	MS. MATHEWS: Yes. Well if it's
.6	convenient to a further discussion, they could
7	certainly come and be available for any further
8	question.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think, Mr. Isler,
10	did you want to make a comment?
11	MR. ISLER: Yes. I did.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you come
13	forward and make it?
14	COMMISSIONËR GEORGE: Madam Chairman,
15	while he is coming forward, can I ask that the Staff
16	Director supply us with copies of that earlier report
17	on accommodating facilities?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Certainly.
19	Yes, Mr. Isler?
20	MR. ISLER: The staff does not recommend
21	that we jettison or discontinue reports on the
22	Americans with Disability Act project. What we are
23	recommending is that that project be handled
24	exclusively by OGC. That was as a result of long
25	discussions with the General Counsel. We feel that

1 that is a very legal statute and that the fact finding 2 could be done much better and more efficiently in a hearing process than in a fact finding process by the 3 OCRE staff. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me ask you a The part of it that says that the 6 question. employment part would be put into the employment 7 project. What does that mean? 8 9 MR. ISLER: That was already included. The Americans with Disability Act Title I is already 10 11 included in the Fair Employment Practice project. 12 That will be an extensive part of the Fair Employment Practice project. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So in other words, 14 15 this recommendation is unartfully phrased. 16 MR. ISLER: That's correct. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But there is the idea 18 of deferring it until fiscal 1997? 19 MR. ISLER: That's correct. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. So that 21 what the Commission is saying is that we don't want to 22 defer it, at least some of us are saying and I think 23 others agree. One, we do not want to defer it. 24 we want to do it as a free-standing project. Whether 25 it is done by OGC or not, who does it, I mean which

1	office does it, that would depend on what kind of
2	project it is.
3	But I understand your point. You are
4	saying that you are not for abandoning the project.
5	Now we have the question of do we defer it and the
6	scope of it.
7	MR. ISLER: That's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson?
9	I thought you had your hand up.
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes. What I
11	understand is that we are jettisoning part of it,
12	turning responsibility to OGC, and then the component
13	that OGC is responsible for gets shifted into the
14	other report? Is that what we are doing?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I still don't
16	understand. Let me try this and see if this is right.
17	What you said, I think, and what we are
18	supposed to understand, is that this project, what was
19	meant was that the project wouldn't be abandoned. It
20	would be moved to 1997 instead of 1996. Two, before
21	the project had OCRE and OGC doing the project
22	together. Is that correct?
23	MR. ISLER: That's correct.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the staff is
25	suggesting that now it be done only by OGC. You are

1	pointing out to us that when you do the Fair
2	Employment Project, which is our statutory report for
3	next year, you will have in it am I wrong?
4	MR. ISLER: That's correct.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You will have in it
6	some employment matters related to ADA, because the
7	EEOC handles disability employment claims.
8	MR. ISLER: That's correct.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Am I understanding
10	that?
11	MR. ISLER: What we are saying
12	specifically is that the project calls for OGC and
13	OCRE doing Title II of the ADA, which relates to
14	public accommodations. The Fair Employment Practice
15	Project calls for OCRE to do Title I of the ADA, which
16	we will be doing in the Fair Employment.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
18	MR. ISLER: So we are not abandoning
19	either Title I or Title II. We are just asking that
20	Title II be conducted by OGC through the hearing
21	process.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The accommodations
23	part?
24	MR. ISLER: The public accommodations,
25	where you are dealing with the Department of Justice.

1 They are responsible for Title II. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 2 MR. ISLER: We'll handle Title I of the 3 ADA that's related to employment, which is under the 4 5 jurisdiction of EEOC. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now I understand 6 what you are saying. Did you understand that? 7 least we understand what is being suggesting. 8 So what we are suggesting is that we want 9 free-standing report on ADA to update 10 accommodations part that we did before in 1980 11 something or other. The only query is, do we want the 12 13 employment part of ADA taken out of the employment study that you are doing and put in with the 14 accommodations part, so that both employment and 15 16 public accommodations would be in the same report, or 17 do we have any preference one way or the other? That would be the only question left for us to think about. 18 19 But thank you very much. That is a clarification. COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: 20 Madam Chair, I am still a little confused. We have a deadline 21 22 problem which I gather is inherently implied when you 23 talk about deferring until 1997. So that we have to decide whether you want to defer. 24 25 If you do not want a deferment, for me I leave it to the administrators to decide whether OCR or the Office of General Counsel, how they will allocate the responsibilities. That's a staff judgment.

But I think that what we have to meet head

on is whether it should be deferred until 1997. If we are against deferring to 1997, then what we need to hear from the staff is what is its impact upon other projects we have. So that what would be ideal for me would be to get a timeflow sheet with a proposed schedule for these projects and then to get an alternative timeflow sheet for these projects.

Now I recognize that if you have to do the Americans with Disability Act and you want to have that finished during fiscal year 1996, then it's going to impact on others. I'd like to know what would happen on the others.

So I think that then we would be voting on the totality with some wisdom, rather than just voting the specific project as if it is not related to anything else.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. That's very good. We can have that before we actually vote. But listening to what has been said so far, I would think we should do ADA in fiscal 1996, and start it.

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

the

1

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I am for that.

accommodations part, which will update what we did

before at least. If there are hearings or anything

like that, try to do them. But then we have the

question which we're going to get to of other hearings

and other hearing reports and what we will be giving

there's obviously a lot of support and probably

unanimity on this particular issue, I would still

suggest, especially in light of Judge Higginbotham's

I think very wise proposal, that we not make any

formal commitment, take any vote on even this where

there's unanimity, until we see it integrated into the

whole package. I have no doubt what the outcome will

be, but let's look at what the Judge called flow

this is going to be right in there on both of them for

charts, and we'll see which options.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

BERRY:

CHAIRPERSON

up and what we will do and the like.

Commissioner George?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE:

quite right, yes.

do

But you are

So even though

I imagine that

And

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

okay with you, Commissioner Redenbaugh?

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Absolutely. Ι

Right.

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

early completion.

So is that

1 think these things have to be decided as a whole. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Everybody wants 2 to do it. We will do it. We are just going to figure 3 out what else we're able to cut or how we do it. 4 5 Okay? COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 6 Yes. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right. Now naturalization issues. The suggestion is that we do 8 9 a short clearinghouse report in 1997 instead of -- in other words, that's being deferred. The idea is that 10 the money problems mean and the time problems means 11 12 that that should be deferred until next year, which is a staff judgement about how much they can do. 13 Does anybody have any comments? 14 15 COMMISSIONER LEE: Madam Chair, on the naturalization issue, there's an ongoing national 16 debate on citizenship and naturalization this year. 17 18 If we were to defer it to next year, I think the Commission may miss the opportunity to provide some 19 20 really valuable information to the national debate. 21 So what was the rationale behind deferring it until 22 next year? You mentioned there's only a few staff members working on the project. 23 24 MS. MATHEWS: It is really a workload

assessment based on others that are proposed here to

be retained in this fiscal year. So since we are in a readjustment conversation, I mean obviously the Commissioners could look at readjusting any of these.

I might add one other thing, if I could elaborate on one other point. The recommendations that are here using this example of the naturalization issues, this is a recommendation to produce a short clearinghouse report as contrasted with the original Commission proposal, which was a statutory report with findings and recommendations. So that is a difference also.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we will do is keep in mind when you are re-working this for our decision, what Commissioner Lee has just said about the national debate is going on now. You can see and rework it and reconfigure on other points.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes. Could I just get a very brief precis of what sorts of issues we would be discussing in the clearinghouse report? What sorts of information we would be trying to break out. I think I understand at the general level what Commissioner Lee said, but it would be helpful in evaluating just how important it is to know exactly what types of issues we might be talking about. Is it citizenship —

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The Vice Cair was the one who proposed it.

WICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes. Just the whole issue of -- it's been phrased variously whether to put the N back into INS because so little effort has been placed budgetarily and so on into the naturalization process. You see newspaper accounts day in and day out of lines of hundreds of people waiting to get their naturalization papers. We have the phenomenon of people having passed all the examinations and confirmed for citizenship, having to wait months and months and months and months to be sworn in. During that time, they obviously don't have the protection of citizenship.

I personally participated in a program. A judge invited me to participate in a program where 2,000 people were being sworn in in Sacramento at the same time. Somehow, citizenship is so important and yet the national government has not put the resources and emphasis that needs to be placed in encouraging citizenship, which I think all the polls indicate the American people want. Even in responding to the immigrants who want to become citizens. So they are resource and priority issues.

They are also issues beyond that, in terms

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	of how immigrants should be approached to become
2	citizens. The effort to integrate them into American
3	life without their having a sense of rejecting their
4	cultural life before they come to this country. There
5	has been that tension.
6	I think any report that we provide and
7	as indicated, that national debate is taking place
8	right now in Congress and elsewhere. Again, it's a
9	matter of priorities. But if by chance it can be done
10	while that national debate is going on, obviously it
11	would be better.
12	Those are the big issues that I see.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we can keep that in
14	mind as you rework the naturalization issue.
15	Then we have the Los Angeles hearing
16	report. The staff asks that the Commission again
17	consider holding a mini hearing in Los Angeles to
18	update the record. We did this hearing in I forget
19	when we did it.
20	MS. MATHEWS: June 1993.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And a lot of
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 1993?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. And a lot of
24	water has flowed under the dam.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REVNOSO: 1993 not 1983

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In Los Angeles since 1 The staff reiterates its request that we 1993. 2 consider within our project proposals letting them 3 hold a mini hearing in Los Angeles to update the 4 record. 5 Commissioner Lee had something to say. 6 7 COMMISSIONER LEE: I'm just sorry I wasn't here in 1993 to attend the hearing. I'm sure the 8 hearing was very productive and you got a lot of 9 10 information. But it has been three years and a lot of 11 things have happened in LA. In a recent visit to LA, I was approached 12 13 by several people who told me that there were four incidents involving Korean Americans as highly 14 suspicious in nature. That is this year alone. 15 16 Tension is really high there. I think that it would be a great time for us to go back for another hearing 17 to amend any report that you have done in 1993. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair? 20 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: This is where 21 we end up in conflict. Even though I am very much in 22 favor of the ADA and naturalization, I must say that 23 I guess just structurally it seems to me that we need 24 to wrap up the things we've been involved in already.

So when it comes down to it, my vote is going to be to

finish up the things that we have done already. 1 would be very much in favor of authorizing the mini 2 hearings, which I take it is with two Commissioners 3 and anybody else that can attend, to try to do that 4 and wrap up those hearings, update the hearings and 5 get that report out. 6 My reaction will be the same for the New 7 York hearings. That is, the things that we have 8 already done, we need to get out as guickly as 9 I'm sure that will be my ultimate vote. possible. 10 Then do as much of the other things as we can. 11 But I would be very much in favor for that 12 recommendation. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson? 14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 15 Thank you. Ι would concur with that. I think we have to get these 16 17 hearings done. We've got to get the reports out. 18 think just about every time we went to one of these 19 hearings we had at least one witness get up and say 20 you know, you come into town, you do another hearing, you issue another report, and nothing happens. 21 22 Now we have to go back and do a second 23 hearing because we haven't even gotten the report out yet. So I think whether or not I'm going to vote for 24 25 a hearing, I'm not decided yet, but I think we ought to really prioritize putting these reports on the fast track.

There probably is something to doing an update on this and just see looking back over two and a half, three years since we were there, has there been any change in these kinds of problems, better or worse. I think that's worth it, rather than coming out with a report that is three years old in terms of the evidence.

commissioner Higginbotham: I'd just like to add a footnote. I think you look foolish to say that the whole investigatory process which this Commission symbolizes, is that we were supposed to do what courts and all these other agencies can't do, to handle something expeditiously. For us to come out in 1997 or late 1996 on a report of a hearing of 1993, if I had to vote I would rather just say we scrap it, than to come out with the old.

But I would much prefer that we have this mini hearing, conditioned upon again in our time flow chart, that we have deadlines as to when we expect a hearing, expect the report to be finished. It seems to me that staff, and I used to be chief judge for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and the Virgin Islands. The one thing I could never do with staff is

say we've got to get all these projects finished. 1 They have got to know a deadline. We've 2 got to know that it is workable. So that I'm coming 3 back to the same thing. 4 My vote would be do the mini hearing. 5 hypothetically the staff's recommendation as to when 6 7 it would be, and also when the report would be finished. If you don't do that, I'd just say scrap it 8 all. 9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I would agree with 10 that. I would ask the Staff Director if she would let 11 the General Counsel come forward so we can ask her her 12 views about the timing on all this. 13 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Madam Chairman? 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I do have to 16 leave the call now. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 18 Okav. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 19 Thank you very 20 much for elevating this in the agenda. I want to 21 concur with Judge Higginbotham. I am not convinced 22 yet, the staff has not indicated to me that we need a 23 mini hearing to complete or to write a report. But I think -- I certainly agree with the opinion that it's 24 25 way too long between the event and the report. We

1	need to either complete these or abandon them.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Thank you very
4	much.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you.
6	Would you ask the General Counsel to
7	MS. MATHEWS: Yes. General Counsel?
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: General Counsel, Ms.
9	Moore, in view of the comments that have been made,
10	you explained to us at an earlier meeting why the
11	staff thought there ought to be a mini hearing because
12	of gaps in the record. You told us that staff had
13	been working on it before you became General Counsel,
14	trying to write the report. Is that correct?
15	MS. MOORE: Yes, Madam Chair.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The staff found gaps
17	in it and was having trouble completing it. On your
18	watch in view of the comments of Commissioner
19	Anderson and Commissioner Higginbotham and
20	Commissioner Redenbaugh, if the Commission were to
21	agree, which we have not done yet, to hold a mini
22	hearing
23	A mini hearing for those of you who
24	haven't been here, just means that two Commissioners
25	can go instead of the whole Commission. Everybody can

ĺ go if they want to, but if you can find the time, that at least two Commissioners can go so long as they are 2 not from the same political party. You can hold the 3 hearing anyway. That's why we call it a mini hearing. 4 It is less expensive, because everybody 5 doesn't have to go, although others can go if they 6 In terms of people's schedules and their 7 time, it is easier to work out. If we have a defined 8 9 purpose, a very clear purpose, and we send people 10 there. 11 What do you think about the possibility if 12 the Commission were to agree, well even if we don't 13 agree, what do you think of the possibility of getting 14 this Los Angeles report done in some kind of time 15 table that is expeditious, if we were to update it or 16 agree to let the staff go out and update it with a 17 couple of Commissioners? 18 MS. MOORE: Well, if I can approach the 19 question this way. There were two separate 20 recommendations with respect to updating the Los Angeles hearing report. One emanated from the staff. 21 22 One emanated from the Commission. 23 Our recommendation here follows up on the discussion that the Commission itself had with respect 24 25 to the Mark Fuhrman tapes and the ongoing events

around police brutality.

So we were not re-raising the recommendation that we had made earlier in 1994 with respect to the other three provisions that were developed in the Los Angeles hearing. That was the economic opportunities, media and police. So we have only — this recommendation was only meant to follow up on the Commission's own discussion with respect to the police.

would you do in the -- in other words, when we discuss this as a Commission now, I remember that you reminded me, we talked about the Fuhrman tapes and OJ Simpson and all the things that have happened. So you are saying, the staff is saying that if we want the report to be updated in the areas of police community relations and other issues, then you'd have to go send somebody out to get the information to update it?

MS. MOORE: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In the absence of that, how would the staff go about finishing this report?

MS. MOORE: The staff will complete the report on the record already compiled.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: With the gaps that you

NEAL R. GROSS

1	had found before?
2	MS. MOORE: Exactly.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you would follow
4	the Commission's instructions and simply complete it?
5	Ms. MOORE: Right.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
7	MS. MOORE: We would and could do that.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In this fiscal year?
9	MS. MOORE: Yes. We could accomplish that
10	in this fiscal year.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So it is up to us as
12	to whether we want to reiterate that the staff should
13	finish the report with the gaps you acknowledged and
14	discussed with us, without attention to the things
15	that have happened in Los Angeles since 1993 or
16	whether we want you to update the report so that we do
17	give attention to the things that have happened since
18	1993 and finish the report. Is that the way I should
19	frame the question?
20	MS. MOORE: Yes. Just another point of
21	information. I'd also note that at the time the
22	Commission, which did precede my tenure, was in LA,
23	the results and the recommendations of the Christopher
24	and Colts Commissions had not yet been implemented.

Those have now been implemented. For us to write a

report without any follow-up on those commissions I think again, I guess echoing the words of the good judge, would be unwise.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: If we have a mini hearing to update, and we put the highest priority on it, which would be my own inclination so that the hearing could take place quickly and so on, can you provide for us by the next meeting a time line about like when the hearing could take place, by when the report could be done?

MS. MOORE: Sure, but just a general comment. I mean I think everything is going to depend on what is decided overall here. We have in OGC, two hearings that were cancelled last year. If I could just in terms of ADA, remind the Commission when we talk about fiscal 1997, we are only talking about a matter of six months from now. So the deferral for ADA to October, really as early as October of this year, contemplates taking or following through with the affirmative action and the Mississippi Delta hearings in the time period in between.

We only have a staff of 13 lawyers here. So those are the dilemmas that we are dealing with. But we could indeed give you a timeflow chart after the Commission has considered all of these projects,

and come up with reasonable deadlines.

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

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So in other words, after you hear the rest of our discussion on the hearings which are listed here, you would be able to give us a flow chart telling us how this would all work out?

MS. MOORE: Yes, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. You really clarified thing for This one me. report, recommendation on the mini hearing is not to repeat the recommendation that failed before. It is to say that if you want us to update since 1993, then we need to go back to do it. That makes sense. I mean I understand it now, the sense of the recommendation.

MS. MOORE: Of course it would be our desire to update the full record, but because the more favorable discussion within the Commission was held around the police issues, we have narrowed our recommendation to that.

commissioner Higginbotham: May I make a suggestion to your superb, our superb General Counsel? It would be very helpful to me when we got our next report, that we had a categorization of the significant documents which have been filed subsequent to the visit to Los Angeles. The Christopher report,

There's a whole substantial

comment. Therefore, it would help us in assessing how 2 much you want to go in. 3 I would hope, I would hope that we would 4 have the broadest picture and not get caught, and I 5 know that the General Counsel would never fall in this 6 7 trap, of what I believe is the OJ Simpson syndrome. That case has received enough publicity for public 8 information that the Civil Rights Commission has no 9 10 need to enlighten the American public on that issue. But the whole issue of police conduct, 11 exclusive of the O.J. Simpson case. I mean the Furman 12 13 testimony is significant, I submit respectfully, not as to what happened in the O.J. Simpson case. And I 14 to vote right now, I 15 would vote 16 considering the O.J. Simpson case per se, but looking 17 at police conduct in toto. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So could you -- yes, 18 19 Commissioner Anderson? 20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The difficulty 21 that I see that we have here is we're pushing these 22 decisions into April which is now going to give us 23 five months and we're not going to do anything in 24 August, so that gives us four months. The balance 25 here is, it's hard to make decisions without the kind

the follow-up on that.

of outlay that you've described. On the other hand, I think in my own mind I'm coming to the conclusion that we ought to prioritize just a couple priorities, that is, getting the statutory report out this year, getting the L.A. report out this year, doing the LA. mini-hearing and doing one other hearing. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And seeing whether

today we can come to some consensus, if that's do-able within the four working months or five working months that we have. If that's so, then maybe that ought to be built into the April analysis, so that at least between now and April we're not -- we've got the direction we're going into, in terms of goals and objectives that we think we can fulfill. Now what that does to the ADA and other things, maybe we can assess them in April, but it seems to me we ought to identify key priorities today and move forward.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you list those again, please, if you remember what you just said?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The statutory report that we're looking at in terms of equal education opportunity, the L.A. report of the minihearing --

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then another one.
2	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: One additional
3	hearing whichever is
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Would you be willing
5	to accept as one additional one finishing the
6	Mississippi Delta, because that if we finish
7	Mississippi Delta, we will be through with the racial
8	am I right? Am I counting right? The whole racial
9	tensions project will be finished.
10	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think we ought
11	to do that.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then we'll be able
13	to say we finished that.
14	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So if we could somehow
16	do those this year, I think we would be I mean, we
17	could then move on. I mean, bring some kind of
18	closure in doing these racial tensions hearings.
19	Yes, go ahead.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Just as a
21	reminder that I know that the General Counsel has
22	already been working on the statutory report for '97,
23	so
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: OCRE.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So that in

telling us how far the resources will go, it seems to me all that they're doing should be input. Frankly, I'd be very pleased if this year we could do those three things.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So could we -- I think you're right, Commissioner Anderson. If we wait until next month to decide that we're going to do at least these things, then we're just pushing off decisions and we won't be able to plan. So if we feel, if there's consensus among us at least, that we want to do those things, why don't we agree to do them and have the staff come back and give us the time lines and build it into the rest of the project decisions as we go along and continue to discuss them. Unless somebody sees something wrong with that, at least we'll know what we're doing.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I guess the only problem that I have is that Russell left us thinking that we wouldn't make any decisions. I feel a little bit uncomfortable about that.

commissioner and erson: Could I -- could we, what I'd like to see us do is do the framework that has been suggested with those four priorities as the key priorities and then we can see at the next meeting what that does to, say, the ADA report and

1 other things and then we can come to a final conclusion at that meeting. 2 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 3 Okav. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: That we want to go 4 ahead and do it this way or we want to amend it 5 because we do want to do the ADA or we want to put 6 7 something else into it, but not take a final cut today, just give sort of a guidance as to how we 8 prepare the final decision document for the next 9 10 meeting. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that the staff will 11 12 know as far as the consensus around this table is 13 concerned, there's a sense that the statutory report, the L.A. mini-hearing to update and Mississippi Delta 14 to finish out the racial tensions projects seem to be 15 16 priorities for at least those of us sitting at the 17 table as they build what they're going to present to 18 us and what we're going to decide at the next meeting. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: And what that does 19 20 to everything else. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Everything else that's 22 here. 23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Then we can make 24 a final cut. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, all right.

Commissioner George?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I agree with everything except I'm still not certain that I'm for the mini-hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.

commissioner George: So what I think I'd like to do if I understood the General Counsel Moore correctly on this, is as to the scope of the proposed mini-hearing. If she could prepare for us a brief statement of precisely what we were going after in relation to police conduct, the police conduct issue and that it would be limited to the police conduct issue in a mini-hearing. In other words, if I was satisfied about the scope, a very do-able scope in a mini-hearing, one that would not be inappropriate for us to do it with only a couple of Commissioners there without broader representation of the Commissioners, then I think I would comfortable with it. So if that could be prepared, I'd be happy to go forward.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now Commissioner George, keep in mind when we say "mini-hearing" that doesn't preclude the participation of other Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I understand.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We only say that so

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

	82
1	that if it turns out that there are two Commissioners
2	and other Commissioners either don't want to come or
3	something, so we can facilitate having a hearing. So
4	we're not saying other people can't participate. Just
5	keep that in mind.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I do understand.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: But it doesn't move
9	me from my
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, I
11	understand. And this doesn't change the formulation
12	that Commissioner Anderson made that everyone seems to
13	agree with because if we decided not to do a mini-
14	hearing, we still would be finishing the L.A. report
15	as part of the series of things we're trying to
16	finish. We just wouldn't be doing a mini-hearing and
17	we wouldn't be doing any update and we'd be finishing
18	in whatever way we could finish it, but the commitment
19	is to try to finish these things this year. That's
20	the sense of what we're talking about here.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I agree with that.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, okay. Now
23	at that we need to discuss the New York hearing
24	report. Why don't you just sit there for a minute,

General Counsel, because these are all hearing things

1	in case anybody wants to ask you anything.
2	The New York hearing report, the
3	Commission staff is just simply recommending that we
4	finish it which sounds like a good idea, if we see how
5	it fits in with everything else.
6	The Affirmative Action hearing, now we
7	have here an issue. I guess we'd have to see how that
8	fits in with our plans to finish Mississippi Delta and
9	the rest of the things that we want to do.
10	Does anybody have any particular
11	expression that they'd like to make right now, a sense
12	of it? Yes.
13	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Could I just ask
14	for a status? Is there going to be a referendum
15	initiative in California?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: On it this fall?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: The report is
19	that it's on the ballot for November, the CCRI.
20	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which means we could
22	do it in the next well, I don't know what we should
23	do. Let's think about it because we could defer it
24	until since we haven't done it, if we decide to do
25	the others and we don't have time, we could do it

Or we could do it now. I don't know. 1 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: had been 2 enthusiastic about doing this, in part, because it's 3 such an important issue and, in part, because I 4 thought we would have such a rollicking good time and 5 get in a real knock down drag out when we -- there 6 aren't any personalities, it was really on the issues. 7 (Laughter.) 8 Now in light of the press of other 9 concerns, I'm not sure that we should. On the other 10 11 hand, some work has been done on this already. let's just see how it fits into the larger picture and 12 13 prioritize things. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I agree with you. At 14 15 the time it sounded like a lot of fun. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: We were going to 16 17 have a lot of fun. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But now it's sort of 18 19 like well, I don't know. We can talk about it some 20 more. There was somebody over here. 21 22 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I can't quote Aristotle, but I can quote the English poet who said, 23 "I live in a sea of words where the nouns and the 24 25 adjectives flow, where the verbs speak of action which

is a real description of where we've been. 2 My instincts are that if we can't do the 3 other things in the next few months, there are a lot 4 of risks in starting up affirmative action which is 5 such a comprehensive, such a controversial that I 6 would hope that when we decide to go into affirmative 7 action, that we're really ready to give it a probing 8 analysis, just the way the Civil Rights Commission 9 went into Mississippi in 1963, '62, and they changed 10 the whole climate. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Spent six months 13 there. COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think this 14 15 Affirmative Action hearing is more a headline than 16 depth in terms of the staff. We've got a great staff, 17 but I don't see how much they can carry on their back. 18 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Maybe we need to do --19 we can think about all this, but maybe what would be 20 better at this point, it may be more fun, Mr. George, 21 is to after they do the California whatever, to have a whole series of things, not just one or two days, 22 23 discussions about what we do now. 24 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: That's a good point. 25 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's more exciting

never take place and the sentences come and go." That

1	at this point, I mean.
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: That's right. Yeah.
3	This is going to be an area where we're going to find
4	we have a lot of common ends even if we differ as to
5	means and as the situation clarifies politically with
6	the focus on those ends we can make some constructive
7	contribution to this thing.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then the staff
9	work, whatever they've done, some of those same people
10	could be involved there.
11	Why don't we what we're doing here is
12	just giving the staff a sense of what we're thinking.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Good.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let's look at the
15	Miami the Miami hearing report is being written.
16	Is that right?
17	MS. MOORE: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You wanted to say
19	something?
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: No, no. In
21	fact, should I mention that we went over the New York
22	hearing report too quickly and the Miami hearing
23	report. Again, these hearings took place and I'd
24	rather have OGC put priority on finishing what we've
25	done and preparing for new hearings. I'd very much

would like to get a sense of the General Counsel where 1 they are or how much preparing for a new hearing, even 2 the Mississippi hearing would interfere with getting 3 these out because it just seems to me once we have a 4 hearing, the highest priority ought to be in getting 5 those reports out. That's just my own view. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 7 Okay. MS. MOORE: Well, Vice Chair Reynoso, the 8 staff has been concentrating since the cancellation of 9 the last two hearings exclusively on the production of 10 these reports and we have gone -- I think we've made 11 12 substantial progress on the Miami hearing report, additional work is still being conducted on the 13 volumes of documents we received from the New York 14 15 documents hearing in July of last year. 16 analysis of those documents is on-going, but I do 17 think that we've made substantial progress and that those two can be completed this year. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we expect to have 20 them this fiscal year? 21 MS. MOORE: Yes. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's great. 23 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Both of them? 24 MS. MOORE: Both of them. 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Great.

MS. MOORE: We have the process that a 1 draft will be produced within this fiscal year, 2 whether it has made its way up to the Commission based 3 on the milestone charts is another issue. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But the OGC will 5 finish it? 6 7 MS. MOORE: Yes. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's good. That's 8 hear. Miami is being written. 9 real good to Mississippi Delta, we just discussed and we've talked 10 about putting, doing some time lines on that, of 11 course, and discuss it at the next meeting and 12 indicated what our priorities are. 13 And then we would have a summary of the 14 racial and ethnic tensions once we finish all the 15 hearings and all the reports and so that would be in 16 17 FY 1997 because even if we do all these hearings, we'd 18 have to write the report, so that, I think, would be, make sense. 19 Then we have the technological change and 20 job opportunities. Staff points out that that 21 22 proposal it sounds like the implications for civil 23 rights and global economic demographic technological 24 change which is something that we discussed, which

seems to cover the same topic and so the idea is that

1 we would do that in 1997, the second one. 2 Does anyone have any comments about that? As I go along, if you have comments about 3 any of them that you want to share with the staff, 4 5 please do. Schools and religion. The proposal is to 6 7 delay it until 1997 and then we change it from five mini-hearings to a smaller number. 8 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I just have an inquiry. How many months does 1997 have? 10 11 (Laughter.) 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Good question. Not 13 Does anyone -- I think Commissioner Horner proposed this, but I'm not sure. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: If I didn't propose 16 it, I'm a strong supporter of it. I don't mind the I think it's necessary in view of the other 17 18 priorities, as the Staff Director composes the flow 19 charts. But I would need to be talked into -reducing the number of the mini-hearings for reasons 20 21 I'd be happy to go into, if you want me to go into 22 more detail. I really want to get a cross section and 23 a significant sampling of things here, so I'm going to 24 be inclined when we do into more substance to make the

case strongly for retaining the scope and the number

1	of the mini-hearings, but I don't mind the delay.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so the staff
3	should keep that in mind as they do the flow charts.
4	That's why these comments are useful.
5	Financial aid for higher education for FY
6	1997, too, because of the issues, many of you have
7	children going to college and know something about
8	financial aid or some day you will have children going
9	to college. Anybody have any comments about this
LO	proposal or shall we the staff will just work that
11	in and see how it fits in?
L2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Can we advocate
L3	financial aid for professors and not just for
L4	students?
L5	(Laughter.)
L6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Professors.
L7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It says "higher
L8	education." The money always goes to the students.
L9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, right. Why do
20	we need the students anyway?
21	(Laughter.)
22	Universities would be much better. I
23	didn't say that. Charlie, tell the press that I
24	didn't say that.
25	(Laughter.)

1	Voting rights
2	COMMISSIONER LEE: Excuse me, Madam Chair?
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: I have a question. Now
5	what if the can we combine the financial aid for
6	higher education with the expanded economic
7	opportunity?
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is that?
9	COMMISSIONER LEE: Earlier.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The one over on
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: Yeah. Is it possible
12	to combine that instead of having two reports?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, go ahead.
14	MS. MOORE: Madam Chair, we had not
15	considered that, Commissioner Lee. We had, however,
16	considered the relationship between the financial aid
17	for higher education project and the affirmative
18	action project. But we have not considered that. I'm
19	sure the staff can take a look at that relationship of
20	those two projects as developed in the concepts.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So it would be OGC and
22	OCRE together? So Staff Director, maybe you could
23	rework this and see if they would fit together somehow
24	and have that as an option that you could look at.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: That's not a

bad idea because some will go to college and some 1 won't. 2 COMMISSIONER LEE: Right. It's an 3 interesting proposition and yes, we can definitely 4 rework this and combine. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Environmental justice, 6 7 they ask that it be postponed. I don't have any problem with that. I don't know if anybody else does. 8 Then the rest of this is -- did I skip 9 voting rights? Well, voting rights. Does anyone have 10 any particular comments about voting rights that the 11 staff would find useful? 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 13 Well, again, the issue of what effect motor voter bill has had on 14 15 increases of registration, whether that increase in registration meant an increase in voting. It's really 16 17 quite crucial, but again, it's a matter of priorities. I can't say that it's more crucial in getting done 18 reports on hearings we already have, for example. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I think that that 21 should be -- we might consider consolidating the project for 1997 on motor voter with voting rights in 22 23 general. 24 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 25 MS. MOORE: Because this was a majority

1	minority district.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. But we could
3	consider, the staff could consider consolidating the
4	two voting rights projects under the rubric of voting
5	rights. I don't know conceptually how that would
6	work, but you can consider.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It doesn't sound
8	promising to me. They seem such different subjects.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, it does
11	have to do, I think, with participatory democracy.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Does it really save
13	any time to do it that way? Are we getting any value
14	out of combining these two?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I don't know.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: If we're not, they
17	really do seem to be distinct, especially the majority
18	minority issue. It seems to me that stands on its own
19	feet. It's a real interesting controversy.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think you are
21	philosophically and logically correct. A political
22	philosopher.
23	(Laughter.)
24	We might, I guess, Commissioner George, on
25	reflection, that's probably why he thinks the two of

1	these don't go together.
2	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Can you please
3	help me? What is the voting rights project?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Majority minority
5	districts remedies.
6	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Only?
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, that's what
8	that is.
9	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Okay.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now the motor voter
11	though, it seems to me that would be a monitoring
12	project as well as a legal project, because it's being
13	implemented, isn't it?
14	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
15	Ms. Moore: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So the question is
17	what happens when it's implemented? So that's not
18	just a legal or it's OGC because it would be
19	hearings. Is that the idea?
20	Ms. MOORE: Right.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. But there might
22	also be research evaluation, so you might consider
23	whether OCRE has a role to play in that.
24	Now under the for the purposes of
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Madam Chair,
5	l control of the cont

if I can just intervene since we've left voting rights. Justice Frankfurter used to say "I can define the term. I can guarantee the answer." You can frame this voting issue as a majority minority district or you can frame it pluralism and depending on what lens you look at it, you may very well come out quite differently. You've had majority minority districts in this country from 190 -- I mean you've had no majority minority districts from 1901 to 1929 and the real question was pluralism then. It may very well be now.

What I would hope when we categorize it, that we be very, very careful to not buy in on some of the buzz words and whether we use the term majority minority or whether we use the term "pluralism" or whether we combine them, I think it's important because the moment you use majority minority district, you have accepted a certain political culture and I think I should say just for the record that I'm Chief Counsel in Shreveport, Louisiana so I wanted to make that disclosure, but I think we should watch our definition.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, and what would have been helpful for those of you who are new is to have given you the project descriptions.

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

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM:

whether we sent them for this meeting or not, but we had them before when we voted on it and you don't — all you have is this sheet with these little paragraphs which is very difficult to figure out, but what the heck are we talking about here. So that would be helpful to you and next time I think people should have the project proposals as well as the flow charts and take under advisement the comments.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, I just want to underscore, Commissioner Higginbotham said from the point of view that in talking about maybe combining the two disparate issues, I was thinking more in terms of just does this enhance or not enhance a Republican form of government and so one can phrase the issue in different ways. I framed it as a participatory democracy and I just want to agree that how these issues are framed or who we start thinking about it is important.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now this list of things we have under 1997, we have already discussed the ones that are on the first page. On the second page, we have already discussed the first four. The one we haven't discussed is the crisis of young

NEAL R. GROSS

African-American males in the inner cities. And the project calls for deference until 1998. I'm sure that the crisis of young African-American males in the inner cities will not be ended by 1998, unfortunately. So that this is a long standing problem. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I can't find it,

Madam Chairman. What page?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Page 5 in the middle of the page. Right before the -- oh no, the crease is in mine. I had it folded. Ιt was before environmental justice. Do you see that?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, I see it. take your point, but it's the depth of the crisis that -- and the urgency of it. When I hear these statistics about the number of young African-American males in jail or in the criminal justice system, I mean this says to me just how horrible the situation is and at least from my point of view as we're prioritizing these things, I would probably put that one higher up than some of the ones that we've been discussing on the list here, just because of its urgency. I am very uncertain about what everybody can come forward with as far as concrete proposals to do something about this, but my goodness, if there are people we ought to hear from them about this and if

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	there's any contribution we can make, I think we need
2	to be doing it.
3	I'm not all that comfortable with putting
4	it off to 1998. I think I would put it over some
5	other things, but then you have a right to have me
6	tell you what other things I would put it over.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I actually, if I
8	were doing it personally, I would put it in my own
9	personal ranking after the things that Carl was
10	summarizing that we need to finish because we're doing
11	them and we need to finish them. I would put it
12	somewhere in that next group.
13	MS. MATHEWS: If I might add something,
14	Madam Chair?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
16	MS. MATHEWS: Just to clarify the nature
17	of this project, it calls for five hearings in five
18	different cities. The report would cover a period of
19	about five years, so I just wanted to clarify that
20	this is a very large project.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: A big undertaking.
22	MS. MATHEWS: Right.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But we might be able
24	to begin it.
25	Ms. MATHEWs: Yes.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In '97.
2	MS. MATHEWS: Right.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And have one of the
4	hearings or at least start it or do something or have
5	an overview of it here or have a briefing or do
6	something.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I'd like to hear if
8	there are other Commissioners who have anything to say
9	about it.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Maybe this isn't the
12	hearing that we can really do anything about. It's a
13	problem that's terrible, but maybe we don't have a
14	contribution to make here, but if we do, I'd like to
15	make it.
16	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Well, I think
17	it's a profound problem and I will just join in the
18	chorus of saying it's a problem, that that's a
19	positive contribution, but I am a little worried about
20	how much we can do well. In the long run, I think
21	this Commission's credibility is not going to be the
·22	number of press releases we can have, but how many
23	qualitative reports we gave which made a difference.
24	What I would be delighted to see in the
25	time flow, I'm willing to look at four options. If

someone wants to put this young African-American on, then it means we take something else out and that's what I think we have to do because otherwise we're being foolishly authoritative, talking to a staff which is a fixed number and acting as if we've got a two horse stagecoach and assuming you've got six. Or you've got two jets and assuming you've got eight jets, whatever level we're at. I think it's a fair comment by Commissioner George, I'm willing to look at it, but I'm only willing to look at it if we've got three or four alternatives where the staff can swear to that if we do these things we can get them done.

that, I think that we ought to ask the staff to do a review of the literature on this subject and give us a paper. Because as you point out, there's a lot of stuff done and a lot of discussion; review of the literature not that there's a problem, but state the problem, but a review of the literature of what people have proposed.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think that's a terrific idea because on the basis of that we might be able to judge whether we really do have a contribution to make.

I agree that it would be a contribution

just for us to join the chorus because the chorus 1 isn't loud enough yet. But this might really give us 2 an idea of what contribution we have to make, if 3 anything. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Anderson? 5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I strongly 6 7 supported this when we initially talked about it. And I would be willing to move it up. I don't like moving 8 I don't know whether we should do it over 9 it back. five years. I think we ought to re-look at the scope 10 of the project, maybe based on the literature search 11 paper that it seems to me we're going to get. 12 13 We do some reports, the recommendations of which are in my opinion modest in the sense of the 14 15 situation is basically or the system is basically 16 good, but we think we can modify 5 percent or 10 17 percent at the aegis. My initial impression of this problem is not that kind of a problem and so unless 18 19 we're prepared as a Commission to make some very 20 serious deep recommendations which I think is what the crisis calls for, I don't think we ought to venture 21 22 into it at all. 23 The other question I have is whether we're 24 going to learn substantially different things by going

into five or six different cities. I don't know, but

I'm not sure we are. I'd have to be convinced that the situation is so much different in Washington, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, whatever, that we need to go to five or six different cities and do those kinds of hearings.

I'd like to have a cut as to whether the crisis is generalized enough that maybe two hearings is sufficient, but whether we really do see a variation that we need to do sort of a national kind of thing. Those are the kind of questions I think we ought to look at, but I'd be for doing this at a more accelerated basis given how it affects the other objectives.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Madam Chair, it strikes me that we have sort of two types of hearings in terms of timing. There are the hearings where the national debate is going on and if we're going to be of influence, we should do it as quickly as possible. Then there are these types of hearings, as the ethnic tension hearings where we really need to go more into depth and provide to the nation something more than what was already said and put our own imprimatur on it.

It strikes me that this is the latter type

and we need to balance those two types of hearings as we go along.

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: If I felt that the General Counsel had nothing to do, this is what I would have to say right now. I say forget the hearings throughout the country. Why don't we just assemble some people here for one day and say is there anyone here who thinks it's not a crisis? All right. If everyone agrees it's a crisis, why do we have to have a hearing? I mean it's a crisis. therefore put our imprimatur, it's a crisis, on which lots of people have to focus. Now whether we are the catalyst for solution or not, we're the catalyst for saying that this is a crisis and this crisis impacts on human rights and dignity and all of these things and then maybe you just close the door and then you let someone else do it or maybe a congressional committee.

I think that -- let me just give you an analogy in the federal court because I went on in 1964. I was 35 years old and all my colleagues, most of them, had sons older than me. When I suggested one day that we use computers to my seniors, it was considered to be -- what's this kid doing here? What you had was a system which wasn't working and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

whole way you solved it was we've always had a 1 2 stagecoach, so we used to use four horses and now we have six. Six is not working. You add two more and 3 you have eight. Well, you get to the point if you 4 keep on using a stagecoach, you're never going to get 5 where you want. You may have to go to a completely 6 7 different transportation form. What I'm saying to you just from my 8 observation, as a neophyte here, there are some things 9 where we can make an impact without the national 10 journey. On those things you do it and get it in back 11 12 of you. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, it's also the 14 case that some things we have found we have made 15 impacts just by having a briefing. 16 MS. MATHEWS: That's right. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It doesn't involve, 18 when I say "impact" I mean on public opinion in the 19 midst of things and we use briefings for that where we discuss the issue here and it doesn't require the kind 20 21 of investment. We don't have fact finding from it and 22 we can't write reports from it, but in terms of 23 disseminating ideas, it's an inexpensive way of to do

Commissioner Anderson?

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

so.

24

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: What I see are two

major options which I would support and a middle option which I don't support. The two options that I support are either doing what you suggested, that is, highlight the problem and put our weight behind highlighting a problem or really setting this as a course that we really want to do something profound on and take as the analogy maybe Mississippi in the '60s because there are many ways this could be that kind of

a response by the Commission.

What I don't want to see us do is put out another report that sits on the shelf and sort of makes a moderate kind of addition to the literature search. That's what I don't think we should do. I think we should do either a major concentration here and do something very important nationally. That doesn't necessarily mean do hearings, or do the sort of red flare kind of -- more moderate.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Uh-huh. Which means that there's a sense of which if we did the last thing you pose here, the second option, it might be like six months in Mississippi, you either concentrate it in one place and really get at solutions, or you go to places not because you think the problem is different, but because you are searching for solutions and you're

1 highlighting it at the same time. I'm not saying you should. I'm just trying to think about how you would 2 go about doing that. 3 Mississippi the analogy? Is 4 Is Mississippi us staying in one place and going in depth 5 or are there lots of Mississippi places that you go to 6 to find out the solution? 7 I think the literature research, with what 8 solutions have already been proposed, what is 9 generally out there, even though we read about it in 10 the paper and hear about it in the news and we see it 11 12 and react to it, I think it would be useful as a start for us to try to figure out what we're doing. 13 14 But I agree with you. We don't want just another report so we can say we did a report on the 15 crisis among African-American males and there it is on 16 17 the shelf and move on. I think that's right. Robert, did you? 18 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't know to what 19 20 extent -- there are probably aspects to the analogy with Mississippi holds up, but you know it's just such 21 a different problem. There's not a clear operational 22 desegregation was 23 objective the clear way 24 operational objective. The good guys and bad guys 25 aren't so clear. The problem just seems to me it's so

(202) 234-4433

much more complicated and intractable. It's so difficult to know what to do.

It obviously is going to require a lot of people who are in a position to do something to stand back from it and take a very sober look and try to press in from our preordained judgments about the thing. I guess I just want to hear from a lot of people who are sort of on the street who are in the system, in the criminal system, the religious leaders who are trying to deal in their communities and churches with trying to deal with the problem. I guess we really do need to hear a diversity of voices here and some real hard listening has got to go on before we can do anything else.

I guess it doesn't matter all that much whether we're here or we're out around the country, as long as we can get the diversity of voices. Here, we're not so much representing ideological points of view. When you have an ideological point of view you want a diversity of voices so you can sort the thing out ideologically. Here, you just want to know who is doing what and what is having some impact, at least.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Could we do like briefings first and then follow-up with a full scale

report. That does not take five years because I do have problems with lengthy reports. By the time we finish the report, a whole generation is gone.

But if you can do briefings first to identify certain points of views, so that that gets all of us acclimated in some way and then follow it up with a report, that might take just two or three years.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, what we could do
is put in our list of things to do briefings about
which we do informally as a Commission, that we want
some briefings on this and the staff has heard that
and the literature search and that gives us a start
without having to wait to do anything beyond that and
on any other topic, just for your information, people
may have an interest and we can do the same thing.
That's a very good idea. We can do briefings on this.

Okay, staff has heard that. On this page, on page 6, we discussed the other items on that page. We discussed ADA, the Department of Justice CRS and any sense of the priority of this project to do something about whether CRS, to evaluate the community relations service? It has been proposed it be merged and I don't know if those are on-going or was this just a time sensitive issue that people were concerned

1	about?
2	Does this project still have viability
3	even? It says OCRE. If you want to now, General
4	Counsel, I think we are somewhat finished with you
5	here at the moment, unless there's something else and
6	we'll call you back up. Okay? Thank you very much.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: We were pleased
8	to hear you have 103 lawyers working for you.
9	(Laughter.)
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director, do you
11	think this project still have viability or is this
12	just some proposal I haven't followed any of this,
13	I don't know. Is this low - high priority or does
14	anybody here have any sense of it? I don't.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, the
16	courts have pretty well rejected the challenges, so I
17	would think that
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no. I talking
19	about CRS. We've already done the I skipped over
20	motor voter because we already discussed it.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I'm sorry.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're on page 6 and
23	I'm all the way down to community relations service of
24	DOJ because we already did ADA.
25	Yes, Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would think that 1 this is the kind of issue that comes up in a 2 transition from one administration to the next, unless 3 we see that there's some big problem either that we 4 ought to get rid of it or there's some great flood and 5 we want to make sure it's capped. 6 I don't see why fine tuning CRS 7 particularly our interest at this point, given the 8 priorities of some of these other things. 9 But mv memory could be refreshed on that. I don't see it at 10 the moment. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, let's go to fair employment law enforcement. We've already had 13 that. We discussed that. 14 That's a statutory report 15 from '97. Now we have federal employee EEO and 16 17 affirmative employment programs to be delayed until 18 1998 which means that we have plenty of time to 19 consider what we do when 1998 comes. Does anyone have 20 any concerns about the delay in this? 21 Yes? 22 MS. MATHEWS: I want to interject here a 23 thought which I would hope the Commissioners would 24 have in mind since we're now focusing more than we 25 have been earlier in this discussion on projects for

1998 and the overall objective of our planning 1 discussion is to end up whether it be at this meeting 2 or the next meeting with approved projects for 1998 at 3 the conceptual stage and staff would then flush them 4 out in more detail and eventually that would become 5 our proposal to OMB in September for budget requests. 6 7 I just wanted to highlight that. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, we'll keep that 8 in mind. Does anyone have any views about whether we 9 10 should jettison, do anything with or anything else with this EEO affirmative employment program or just 11 leave it as a 1998 and put priorities on it? Okay. 12 13 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: What page are you on? 14 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'm on page Federal civil rights enforcement effort. 16 This is 17 after OCRE completes the employment law project which 18 is our 1997 statutory report. They would in 1998 do 19 a statutory report updating the federal civil rights 20 enforcement effort. 21 The Commission used to, years and years ago, when there was money and when there was a 22 23 different period, every year do a federal civil rights 24 enforcement effort report, looking at every federal level agency that enforced civil rights and updating 25

making

during the year,

recommendations. 2 We are now doing one statutory report on 3 one agency a year, given resources and given that the 4 data base hadn't been kept up to date. As I 5 understand this project, it would be that now that 6 7 we've looked at the agencies around the government now, we would begin trying to do a comprehensive 8 assessment again on a timely basis and that that's 9 what this project is proposed to do anyway and that 10 would be our statutory report for 1998. 11 correct? 12 MS. MATHEWS: Yes. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And after that we will 14 try to do such a report. Is that basically what this 15 is about or not? If it's not, then somebody tell me. 16 Okay, Staff Director says yes. 17 Okav. Now we have credit nationalization. 18 1998. We've already considered delaying the credit project. 19 Anybody have any -- and then we have 1998 proposals, 20 These are things we just discussed, but 21 all listed. they're now listed as things that would be for the 22 23 1998 year. Is that right? 24 MS. MATHEWS: That's right. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Once you're delayed 25

they

what

1

had

done

and did all of the rest of the things that are in 1 1996, 1997 as proposals, this is what 1998 would look 2 like. 3 MS. MATHEWS: That's right. 4 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I just think what we 5 ought to do is we've commented on all of these we've 6 given you our reactions. Wait to see the next piece 7 we get. Let's go to project concepts at the end. The 8 first one is on federal block grants. This is for 9 1998? 10 MS. MATHEWS: Yes. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: These are new project concepts that the Commission has not considered before 13 that would be done in 1998. The first one is on block 14 grants, delivery of services and civil rights 15 enforcement. This would be a big project for 1998. 16 17 Does anyone have any general reaction to block grants in 1998? 18 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I think it's 19 absolutely critical because the way the research is 20 being changed, and there's no safety net on some of 21 these programs, particularly to children, the debate 22 goes, as I understand it, "look, the states can do a 23 24 better job. I'm taking the social needs. 25 bureaucrats in Washington. Let's send all the money

down to the states." Now someone has to make an 1 evaluation. Are the poor kids getting lunch programs? 2 Are they get health care? What's the implication of 3 all these? I think looking at federal block grants is 4 a very high priority. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have any 6 further comments on the block grant proposal and 7

whether we should continue to consider it?

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, I agree that it's very important and again it's actually on the political table now, but clearly we won't have the resources to look at it. It seems to me one thing has been missing in the debate thus far, as I have heard it, and that is what is the history of the states and local governments in protecting children and enforcing civil rights laws, etc. It seems to me that the past may not be a bad cause for the future and I think that whole debate needs to be expanded and I think it would be a very fruitful endeavor for us. My problem has to do with priorities, because we've already talked about priorities.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right. If there are no other comments on this, how about the health care proposal which is the next one after this project concept? Access to health care for women and members

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2:3

24

of racial and ethnic minority groups and there's all about the health care disparities in here and that we would look at this as an issue.

Does anyone have any feelings about this compared to anything else?

Yes?

actually not about this, but the problem of not having enough time really to go through these carefully and think about them and adjust them and think about what alternatives I might propose and I know other Commissioners might have things that they might want to propose, here really kicks in more than it did than the other one, so I suspect I'm going to want to contribute to the discussion and debate about these, but I'm just not equipped right now to -- I have read them through, but that's all I've done is read them through.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I want to add a footnote to this one. It's again important, but it's a matter of priorities. The footnote I would add is that there's a unit at UCLA that studies health among Latinos and Latinas, particularly, and in a report about a year ago, it's interesting, that even though the Latino people as a whole are underemployed

1	and on the lower rungs of the economic ladder, the
2	report indicated that babies born to Latinas,
3	particularly immigrant Latinas were among the
4	healthiest in Los Angeles County and it's just of
5	interest to me that we might in looking at issues of
6	health care, looking beyond just some of the figures
7	that are given here to what really goes to providing
8	good health. It wasn't just money, at least insofar
9	as that one unit of health is concerned. It's just
10	interesting to me that so often poverty and poor baby
11	nutrition and weight and survivability and all that go
12	together, but certainly not among Latinas in Los
13	Angeles County.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about the one on
15	does anybody have any comment at present on Project
16	Concept 3 which has to do with discrimination against
17	persons with HIV and AIDS as a proposal?
18	If not, then we will defer the discussion
19	of all this next time and I think we've given about as
20	much advice as we are able to give.
21	Did I miss something?
22	MS. MATHEWS: Consumer racism.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is that Project 4? Oh
24	yeah, I remember that. Consumer racism. We talked
25	about having a briefing on consumer racism and then

the snow came or the furlough or something happened and we never did do it.

They now have put here one of the most important provisions in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the public accommodation section. And we talked about this subject at a meeting, maybe in December and so the idea is that we would have a project that would look at the extent of this kind of discrimination. We might reiterate our request, if we still want to do that we can have a briefing at some point on this.

your briefing, Madam Chair, I'm all for it. You can't look at merely consumer racism. The data seems to indicate that the Federal Trade Commission did the study and indicated a woman goes in to buy an automobile. She pays — white or black — pays considerably more than the male. So when we see a problem where there's an across the board pathology, it's probably helpful if we included so —

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So it would be consumer racism and sexism. Like women pay more to have blouses cleaned and ironed than men do to have shirts cleaned and ironed, even if they're large men and they're twice as large as I am and their shirt is larger, I still have to pay more.

1	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I don't know
2	if we have to go into that.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Or when I go to the
5	store to buy athletic shoes and I go in the boys'
6	section to buy a pair of shoes that will fit me, they
7	are cheaper than if I go in the women's section to buy
8	the same pair of shoes. Isn't that interesting?
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, there's an
10	easy solution to that.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why should I be forced
12	to go into the boys section. If I go to the mens'
13	room the line is shorter.
14	(Laughter.)
15	In any case, I guess it's not consumer
16	racism or sexism. I don't know what that is.
17	In any case, your point is well taken and
18	staff keep that in mind.
19	Now could we, having given them this
20	advice and since we agreed not to actually take votes,
21	could we go back quickly to the rest of the agenda
22	unless someone wants to comment?
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Just one final
24	point. On Judge Higginbotham's suggestion about the
25	flow sheets or flow charts, a couple of points about
1	

1	it, one, if it's possible it would be good to have
2	those and I realize we're on short time frame because
3	the next meeting is three weeks away, but if we could
4	have those in advance of the meeting to review
5	ourselves, if it's possible.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We'd like to have
7	those at least 10 days before the meeting.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It would be really
9	terrific.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: As a pronouncement.
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And the other thing
12	is I'm wondering whether it would be possible or
13	advisable not to try to do the flow charts all the way
14	out into 1998, but to do them for now. We know we
15	have decisions to make down the line through those
16	1997 possibilities and we'll try to get ourselves some
17	commitments made. We'll try to get some commitments
18	made for ourselves, I should say, on those knowing
19	that we are going to have to make decisions down the
20	line about '98 and beyond.
21	Does that make sense? Maybe it doesn't.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone object?
23	Does staff object that that be done?
24	MS. MATHEWS: It certainly could be done.
25	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: What's best

for you? 1 MS. MATHEWS: The impact of that though is 2 just to delay the entire preparation of our internal 3 collection of information for the budget and my 4 5 preference would be not to delay that. It's a very detailed process that typically gets underway in April 6 and early May and if we don't have decisions on 1998 7 concepts in April, then it will just defer all of the 8 staff work. 9 10 Typically, the budget requests are due to OMB September 1 and that, in essence, means the end of 11 12 August. 13 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But when would we make 14 1998 decisions under your description, Commissioner George? 15 16 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Not at the next 17 meeting. I'm prepared to make commitments through '97 at the next meeting, but I'm not comfortable yet in 18 19 three weeks making commitments that we're going to 20 hold ourselves to beyond that. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about would you be 22 prepared to do it in May? It seems like we have to turn the budget 23 24 in at some point and we need --

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, and we need to

give the staff enough time to meet that September 1 deadline. 2 When are the dates of the May and June 3 4 meetings? MS. MATHEWS: The May meeting is May 10. 5 June is June 14th. 6 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: How about a crunch 7 8 if we gave ourselves a June deadline, how bad would the crunch be for you? 9 Extremely bad. 10 MS. MATHEWS: COMMISSIONER GEORGE: We'll do it in May 11 then. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: By May, at the latest, 13 14 even though Commissioner George may find that he has 15 more time on his hands than otherwise and make up his mind about 1998 by next month, he may come in and say 16 17 well, gee, I really had nothing to do and now I'm 18 persuaded. Otherwise, in May, by May at the latest, we would make 1998 decisions and at the next meeting 19 20 in April we will make decisions for 1996 and '97. 21 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Let me try to 22 sort out at least in my mind, I'm not asking 23 Commissioner George to make a commitment at all for that year. What I'm suggesting is if you give us your 24 views so that if we have it stretched out over these 25

two or three years, you're saying this is the way it 1 should go, maybe we will only be deciding for next 2 3 year --COMMISSIONER GEORGE: We can put a line 4 down the flow chart and say well, here's what we're 5 6 committing -- here's the menu, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. choose 2 or make some variant of 2 and we choose 2, 7 but our commitment at this meeting is cuts here at the 8 9 '97 projects. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, is that clear to 10 you, Staff Director? 11 12 MS. MATHEWS: Yes. That's clear to me. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's not clear to me, 13 but that's fine. 14 15 Commissioner Anderson? COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: In looking at the 16 17 project concept papers for '98, the question arises 18 for me on the crisis of young African-American males 19 project. Now my view at present is that we ought to 20 accelerate that and therefore start it in '97 and try 21 to get a lot done on it. If we're going to do it in 22 '98, I wonder if we shouldn't have some kind of a 23 project concept incorporating that kind of a proposal, if that's what we're doing because certainly if we're 24 25 going to take that project and do it seriously is a

1	substantial one and move into it in '98 in a big way.
2	It's going to impact on some of the other ones and
3	maybe we ought to factor that in as to that's the way
4	we want to go.
5	I don't know whether that calls for a
6	concept paper or what, maybe it does.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did we have a concept
8	paper before on the African-American males
9	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, we did
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You don't have to find
11	it right now.
12	MS. MATHEWS: It was approved with
13	specific cities for these five hearings. Shreveport,
14	Louisiana; Cleveland, Ohio.
15	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'd go to
16	Shreveport.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you give us
18	back the project concepts, the ones that we don't have
19	projects concepts now and revised ones in light of the
20	discussion.
21	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: It may be that we
22	don't want to do five cities in hearings over five
23	years. We might want to do something in two years and
24	maybe we ought to have a concept paper more like that.
25	My sense is that's what we're thinking about.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's where the 1 discussion seemed to be heading. In light of the 2 discussion, the project concepts on the ones where we 3 had a discussion and it seemed the discussion was 4 headed someplace other than where the project concept 5 seemed to have bene headed before, okay. 6 MS. MATHEWS: That's fine. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, the General 8 Counsel wants to say something. 9 MS. MOORE: Well, I'll just --10 MS. MATHEWS: General Counsel, would you 11 mind coming up because of the microphone issue. I 12 don't think they'll pick you up back there. 13 MS. MOORE: Okay, I'm sorry. I just 14 wanted clarification for the staff in light of the 15 last exchange. Are we to actually develop a new 16 project proposal for the crisis of the African-17 American male or first conduct a literature review and 18 produce the paper after which a determination would be 19 20 made as to how to go forward on that? 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, my understanding based on what all of our discussion has been is that 22 23 separately somebody, I don't know who the somebody is, 24 will prepare a literature review paper for us to read. 25

Separate from that, for the next meeting with all

these flow charts and all the other things we were talking about, we will have project concepts and that one of the project concepts and the project concepts will be modified, the ones that have already been done, to reflect the discussion we've been having here. And the one on the African-American male would be modified to reflect the discussion we've been having here and we would have that next time.

We are going to do the project. The literature is to help review, help us sort out our thinking. Now we may, we hope we have the literature review by next time. If we don't, at least we need to have it at some point so that we can understand conceptually the solutions and what's been proposed.

MS. MOORE: We can certainly do that. I had misunderstood the original request to be for the literature review to help define the scope of a possible hearing which would mean that we really couldn't do the project concept until that had been concluded.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I understand your point and it did sound like that and it does make logical sense, but in a sense we're being sort of illogical because we have to make these decisions so we're asking for the project concept and as a

literature review goes forward, there may be something ŀ in it that helps to modify it. But in any case we 2 need a project concept in order to make these 3 decisions. 4 5 Okay, now if we can go back quickly to the rest of the agenda. The only other announcement we 6 7 did make is that the Commission's authorization expires on September 30th. Some of you know this 8 already and were they given a draft authorization 9 bill? 10 11 MS. MATHEWS: Yes, Madam Chair. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You were given a draft authorization bill because the Commission has to have 13 an authorization bill to submit to OMB and to the 14 Congress and so on as our participation in the process 15 16 of asking that we be reauthorized. The authorization bill that you were given is only one page and as I 17 18 read it, it doesn't make any changes in what we do. I don't see any changes here except for inserting from 19 20 dates and striking one date and inserting another one 21 and then saying it will terminate in 2002. 22 Is there anything else I've missed. 23 MS. MATHEWS: You have not missed a thing. 24 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's exactly like the 25 one -- except we ask that it extend to the year 2002

which is six years.

authorized and if we do, do we want to support this bill or is there something else we'd like to do about reauthorization. We do this every time we have to be reauthorized. The Commission makes a proposal or recommends that we are or are not reauthorized but we may think it should be 10 years and this is proposed as six years and we think it should be 2 years. There are all sorts of things or there may be things that we'd like to propose to add to it or change, but this is the purpose of the discussion.

Is there anyone who has any views or would you rather discuss this another time? Yes, Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Can I ask what our time line is for submission to the committee of the proposal?

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Staff Director?

MS. MATHEWS: There is no specific time line that I'm aware of. It's advisable, I think, for us to weigh in though as soon as possible and it has been recent past Commission practice, once Commissioners agree to a draft bill to forward it to OMB and to have OMB then forward it to the Congress

1	officially.
2	There have not been any even tentative
3	discussions to my knowledge with either the House or
4	the Senate Cversight Subcommittees about hearing
5	dates.
6	We would want, I would think, we would
7	want to have a position developed that could be
8	discussed at an oversight reauthorization hearing.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we ask Staff
10	Director if Mr. Cunningham, who is the Congressional
11	Liaison has any information to add to this?
12	Ms. MATHEWS: Dr. Cunningham, would you
13	mind coming forward to the microphone?
14	DR. CUNNINGHAM: Hi. I'm James
15	Cunningham. As the Staff Director said, we don't have
16	even tentative dates at this time. We can expect
L7	hearings, perhaps in May, but that's unknown at this
18	point.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, thank you
20	very much for that.
21	Any other Commissioner questions or
22	comments, yes, Vice Chair?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: My only
24	druthers would be, of course, to have it be a longer
25	term than two years, but I leave that to the

1	discretion of the staff of what they think is do-able.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Longer term. What
3	does it say?
4	MS. MATHEWS: This is six years.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Down at the bottom,
6	2002.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Oh, okay, good.
8	That sounds good. How did I miss that.
9	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: May I? Why
10	don't we just go on record supporting this? It seems
11	to me that if anyone wants to change it, fine. But if
12	we can get some unanimity among our colleagues or at
13	least a clear majority. If we're all in favor of
14	extensions to 2002, why wait? So I propose that we
15	support the extension of 2002, Lord be willing, most
16	of us will be here.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's a motion?
19	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The motion is to
21	approve the recommendation that we be reauthorized at
22	least through the Year 2002 and we forward this to OMB
23	like we usually do. Is there a second?
24	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion? All
2	those in favor indicate by saying "aye."
3	(AYES.)
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, I'm sorry,
5	discussion.
6	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Obviously, the
7	committee is going to be looking at some issues. one
8	of the issues is no secret. I think it's going to be
9	the subpoena power of the Commission.
10	Now in the past I have supported a
11	straight reauthorization of the Commission because I
12	think that's the safest position for us to be in and
13	then we can go up and discuss and answer the questions
14	and negotiate with the Committee members.
15	I have the tendency to do that again this
16	time, but I think it's worth taking a minute just to
17	have a brief discussion before we just move the
18	question and vote as if there's no issues under here
19	that ought to be considered for a minute.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I ask the maker
21	of the motion and the seconder to withdraw their
22	motion?
23	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Withdrawn.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Until no, we'll
25	have it again. I'll tell you why I'm doing it. To

1	withdraw that motion in light of Commissioner
2	Anderson's comment and that maybe it would be better
3	to consider voting on this after we discuss the
4	subpoena issue, since that's one of the issues, as I
5	understand it, is a major issue that's before us, or
6	any other issues pertinent to the subpoena issue since
7	that's been the major issue that's been discussed
8	during the reauthorization. Is that all right with
9	you if we do it that way?
10	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: It's okay with
11	me or we could keep the motion on the floor and begin
12	to discuss this subpoena. Whatever.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, either one.
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Is it crucial that
15	we settle it today?
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If we can, we should.
17	If we can't, then we can't. Why don't we then,
18	instead of withdrawing the motion we'll defer
19	consideration of it until after we discuss the
20	subpoena issue.
21	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Let me tell
22	you what my reaction is. If we're going to at some
23	point or some members of the Commission want to modify
24	the subpoena power, that is not in my view
25	inconsistent. This is just saying that the Commission

1	will live until the Year 2002, not necessarily in its
2	present format on everything it does. So that that
3	was merely the reason I proposed it. But I don't
4	consider a vote for this, a vote that you what your
5	position is on subpoena power. It seems to me that
6	the Commission lots of other things could change on
7	the Commission, at least if you're in being, you've
8	got a chance to deal with those, but I'd be delighted
9	to withdraw my recommendation, my motion. We want to
10	do subpoena power first.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What is your
12	preference, Commissioner Anderson?
13	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Doesn't matter to
14	me?
15	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Why don't we
16	do subpoena power.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, let's do
18	subpoena power which is item 7. No one objects to my
19	moving it to this point on the agenda. You were sent
20	a bunch of memos and you had memos last time we
21	discussed the subpoena issue and we said we would
22	discuss it again today and you also have a draft, a
23	bill it's not a draft bill, a proposed bill that
24	was introduced by Congressman Foley that we sent out
25	and all of you got a copy of that as well as a couple

of memos that the Staff Director had written by Mr.

Isler and Dr. Cunningham on their views about how this related to the Commission. It was interesting from a staff perspective, as well as an earlier memo from General Counsel, giving us the history of the subpoena power and how we operate and all the rest.

So the subpoena power is an issue. It's been raised in hearings. It's been discussed. So what we want to do today is discuss it again and see if there's anything the Commission, in any way the Commission wants to respond. We said we'd put it on the agenda again and that's the purpose of having it on the agenda today.

Is there anyone who wants to discuss this issue or has anything that they want to suggest or anything else?

Commissioner George?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I've been thinking about this issue a lot since it arose in connection with Miami hearing. My thought is that the subpoena practices of the Commission are in need of reform, but I would hate to see those reforms imposed on us by Congress. I'd rather do it ourselves. I certainly would not like to see for many of the reasons that have been outlined

134 and some of the materials we've gotten the subpoena 1 power of the Commission stripped at all. I think that 2 would be a very bad outcome. And so to that end I 3 have drafted a motion which is detailed which proposes 4 somewhat detailed policies for dealing with subpoenas 5 and with subpoenas duces tecum and the subpoenas that 6 are subpoenas that include requests for documents. 7 And let me ask Bill Saunders to distribute my proposal 8 which I would like to put in the format, Madam 9 Chairman, of a motion to issue a policy directive. . 10 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okav. 11 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: To order the Staff 12 Director to amend the Administrative instructions of 13 I hope that this will at least 14 the Commission. provide the form of a solution to our problem and to 15 the wise and prudent reform of our subpoena practices. 16 It's got many points and maybe we won't agree on all 17 of them. Some can be changed without changing others, 18 so can we take a moment to read it or do you want me 19 20 to read it into the record? CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't you read it 21

into the record and we will read along and however people like to read while you do it?

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: This is a motion to issue a policy directive to order to Staff Director to

22

23

24

135
amend the Administrative Instructions. It's in two
parts. The first part pertains to witnesses. That is
in turn two parts, part a, a witness at Commission
hearings either testifies as to facts at issue or
offers a perspective on the general matter under
review. The former witness may be designated as a
fact witness. The latter witness who possesses
expertise and who advocates a particular point of view
may be designated as a perspective witness.
Perspective witnesses will not be included in
Commission hearings, but only in other Commission
informational proceedings which may be conducted in
connection with the hearings. Information presented
in such proceedings should ordinarily be included in
hearing reports identified appropriately. Therefore,
no subpoenas will be issued for appearance of a
perspective witness at a Commission hearing. Part b
of Section 1: Any Commissioner who recommends a
witness for appearance at a hearing should indicate
whether that witness is being recommended as a fact
witness or as a perspective witness. Because a fact
witness will be served with a subpoena, a Commissioner
should not recommend as a fact witness anyone against
whom the Commissioner would not support enforcement of

the subpoena in the event of noncompliance.

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

Now section 2 on documents, again in parts A and B, part A: When officers or employees of the local governments have been federal state and subpoenaed to testify with respect to their official governmental duties, issuance of a subpoena duces tecum for the production of documents relevant to their testimony may be authorized by the Commission chair without the prior approval of the Commissioners. Subpoenas duces tecum and all other cases will be B: issued only in connection with the documents hearing, except as described below and only after a description of the requested documents and the precise language of the documents request has been submitted at least one week in advance of the Commission meeting at which the issuance of the subpoena duces tecum will considered to the Commissioner's for review and The question whether to issue the subpoena duces tecum shall be placed on the agenda by the consideration Commission for at the regularly scheduled Commission meeting which proceeds the hearing for which the subpoena duces tecum is being The Commission must vote by a majority to sought. approve the issuance of such proposed subpoena duces The Commission may request and obtain tecum. documents relevant to a Commission hearing or report

through a request on the record during the hearing.

A subpoena duces tecum may be issued only after a failure to comply with this request. The Commission by vote of a majority must approve the issuance of such proposed subpoena duces tecum.

Now I recognize that there are problems that would arise in connection with trying to execute this strategy. My proposal is that there are problems that are worth living with or we can live with easier than with the unreformed practices or with any reforms that I've been able to think of as an alternative and perhaps you'd be able to think of some that would be better than what I'm proposing.

Deviously one problem is the distinction between perspective witnesses and fact witnesses. There are going to be clear cases and gray areas and unfortunately there will be a lot of gray areas and someone would have to decide how a particular witness would be designated and therefore whether that witness would be testifying subject to subpoena or not.

I think that this is a problem that we can live with, certainly when it comes to the witnesses that are being recommended by the Commissioners. The Commissioners can recommend one way or another as a fact witness or as a perspective and I would suspect

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that the staff, unless they have compelling reasons to 1 do otherwise would simply proceed as advised by the 2 Commissioner. 3 Well, maybe I should just stop there and 4 give everybody a chance to digest the proposal a 5 little bit and perhaps comment on it. I realize also 6 that I'm springing this on a lot of people and it is 7 detailed, so I'm willing to -- very happy to handle it 8 in any manner that you would like in giving everybody 9 as much time as they would like to do this. 10 I would like to act before Congress acts, 11 if Congress is to act on this, but with that one 12 consideration in mind, it seems to me nonessential 13 that we move immediately and it is essential that we 14 move deliberately and carefully so that we do a good 15 job in this area of cleaning up our own house. 16 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think for purposes 17 of discussion, that is in the form of a motion, could 18 I get a second, just so we can discuss it? 19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Second. 20 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, Commissioner 21 Anderson has seconded the proposal made by 22 23 Commissioner George. Would anyone be interested -- I had a 24 25 couple of questions, but I'll wait and see if others

have --

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 HIGGINBOTHAM: Ι had a One, I don't see at first glance any very serious problem. I don't know what the history which triggered this, but I've got two questions which I need an answer for before I can intelligently vote. This term "perspective witness" I don't know if that's a word of art or a new philosophical definition. Where does that term "perspective witness" come from? COMMISSIONER GEORGE: It's pure invention of mine, I'm afraid. Can I say why I'm trying to come up with it because I think the history is relevant and of course, as you say, you weren't on the Commission when the problem arose.

Another that term struck me as а possibility, although there were reasons for not using it was an opinion witness as opposed to a "perspective The distinction here is the problem is witness". compelling by subpoena opinion. Some very substantial serious thoughtful people who had been subject to subpoena to give their opinions on I think it was affirmative action, that was the context in which it arose, objected on the ground, I forget who I'm quoting now, Judge, but the old line about I can give you my opinion freely, but it can never be compelled.

so that for first amendment reasons and just reasons of elementary justice, when we're asking someone for an opinion we shouldn't be compelling that opinion. On the other hand, when we're asking somebody for facts which are within their grasp, we shouldn't necessarily have that hesitation about compelling, that they know the facts and they're available to that person and it's not an offense to the first amendment if we compel it.

So what I have in mind is that distinction. That's the historical background which explains why I'm interested in it. I chose the term "perspective" instead of opinion because I wanted to avoid the implication of some rules in trial courts having to do with expert opinion testimony.

I raised it is the federal rules of evidence, you have the term "opinion" evidence and several references and it seems to me that you have the burden of explaining to us in memorandum why you do not use the traditional distinction. This is an expression from Blackstone. "Since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary" and since you had -- I'm talking about Wigmore, for decades, this categorization I don't want for us to later get into court and "what do you mean by

perspective witness, where did that dome from?" 1 this philosopher at Princeton University --2 3 (Laughter.) COMMISSIONER GEORGE: You have to pardon 4 me my footnote in history. 5 (Laughter.) 6 COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: If you use the 7 word "perspective witness" and we made it clear that 8 that is not dissimilar to what the Federal Rules of 9 Evidence calls opinion witness, I have no trouble. 10 But I mean I got to know what is the distinction, if 11 any, between an opinion witness which courts have 12 written for decades and a perspective. If it's the 13 same, but you think clear, I have no problem. 14 No 15 problem. 16 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Let me explain. 17 deliberately avoided the term opinion precisely 18 because it is the term that's used in the litigational 19 context because I did not want to create the impression that such a witness would have to be 20 21 qualified as such a witness has to be qualified under 22 the Federal Rules in the trial situation or that there 23 would be other procedural evidentiary rules that would apply to those witnesses. Since we don't operate 24

under those types of litigational rules in general

1	here, I thought it was best to avoid the term.
2	Now I'm perfectly happy, Judge
3	Higginbotham, to change it to opinion, but then I
4	think we should add some footnote that would indicate
5	that an opinion witness needn't be qualified as a
6	courtroom trial expert.
7	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I am willing
8	to use your term provided that somewhere in this
9	document we even note that this is synonym for opinion
10	witness or that it's dissimilar. I mean we've got
11	the 14th amendment says due process equal protection
12	privileges. All right.
13	Suppose someone else said well, I'm going
14	to change it to not unequal protection. I mean
15	therefore what does it mean? I like this, I like the
16	thinking process. I'm thinking in terms of
17	litigation.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: May I make a
19	suggestion
20	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: We don't have
21	to decide right now.
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I understand.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I suggest that
24	the way to resolve this based on what you are saying
25	to each other is if we should approve this, you would
	NEAL D. ODOGO

1	either insert or you'd have a footnote or you'd have
2	an asterisk or you'd have a bracket or you'd have a
3	comma and you'd say it means the same thing as opinion
4	witness for some purposes or not and explain it in the
5	document.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, I think the
7	answer is to accept both Judge Higginbotham's
8	suggestions and not treat them as alternatives, but to
9	say with respect to it's similar to opinion testimony,
10	but then the respect in which it's difference, having
11	mainly to do with qualifications and other evidentiary
12	rules that we operate under.
13	So yeah, I'd be very happy to do that and
14	I'm indifferent about the term, really.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I like the term.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Once things have
17	been explained it doesn't matter the key thing is
18	the explanation.
19	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: The other
20	minor point. On this question of subpoena, what I
21 .	want to know is how other agencies handle this? I
22	mean I was the Commissioner for the Federal Trade
23	Commission I guess before most of these people here
24	were born in 1962. And
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON REVNOSO: I was born

And what I

before 1962.

2

1

(Laughter.)

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wasn't. CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: think we should do, I don't care whether your specialist does it or someone else, but I think we as to how all of information should get administrative agencies deal with this problem. mean do they have a rule or regulation, audit and then we will know whether we are coming up with something which is very different or not. There's a 10-volume work by Davidson on administrative procedure. I'm certain if you looked in that you'd find something -but I would want to know what does SEC, how does SEC handle it? How does National Labor Relations Board handle it, just so that we are not caught in court someone looking at the Administrative Procedures Act and saying what happened to these guys and girls? what we're doing is consistent with normal administrative agency -- no problem. If what we're doing is profoundly dissimilar, I'm not going to say I'm going to vote against it, I'd just like to know.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think that's a terrific suggestion and why don't we step back and my assistant can go to work on it and maybe help with

1	some of the other assistants, but that too reminds me
2	of the oldest debate in philosophy which is between
3	Plato and Aristotle whether the forms are existing in
4	a transcended realm so that there's an ideal form of
5	a thing that we know by abstraction or whether they
6	exist only in the exemplars and Judge Higginbotham has
7	established himself as a Platonist saying we should
8	look to see how it's done. As an Aristotelian, and I
9	have made the Platonic error of trying to think it up
10	out of whole cloth without referencing any reality, so
11	we'll take the Aristotelian route here and look at how
12	it's exemplified in real cases.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What we will do since
14	Commissioner George accepts that, are you going to
15	speak to that same point?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: On the exemplar
17	point, we're dealing not just with the administrative
18	agencies but with independent administrative agencies.
19	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I'd go through
20	the whole thing. I just want to know whether I
21	want to know how closely
22	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: That's an excellent
23	idea.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In terms of how we do
25	it here in the Commission, the General Counsel's

office will do this task and the special assistants
can be involved or whatever, but it's their job to go
out and find out all that stuff, so they can — they
hear what it is we want. Tell us what all the
agencies do.

We have to keep in mind though when this assignment is being done is that this Agency is like and unlike other agencies. Keep that in mind. We are part-time Commissioners, remember that. We're not full time, like the SEC or the FTC or the NLRB. I don't know what the answer is. I'm just saying keep that in mind. And also keep in mind that we are not an enforcement agency.

MS. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Or a regulatory agency. We are a fact-finding agency. So I'm saying that all this will be useful to us and we ought to know it and I think it's important to know it and I'm just saying that we should all keep that in mind there are certain distinctions in terms of commission and I am sure that when they set up our statute, Herbert Brownell and all those folks, I'm sure that they looked at the administrative procedure and we may find that what we're doing is exactly like what everybody else does already. I'm sure they didn't make it up

out of whole cloth. Just keep that in mind and Commissioner Anderson, were you about to say something?

commissioner and commissions. Well, maybe I'm gilding your point, but it seems to me that since we're not rulemaking or enforcement, we're principally advisory in that sense. If we can come across advisory commissions, subpoena power, that would be important as well to highlight that.

commissioner George: I think particularly entities which regularly elicit something like opinion testimony or what I'm calling perspective testimony, I mean that would be very helpful.

what and I apologize, Madam Chair, for talking too much, what I really think of this is in a contempt context. The moment we get into a contempt situation, no court is going to care whether the subpoena, whether the person who is sent to jail gets there by way of the advisory committee or full independent regulatory, look in terms of what are the rights of the litigants so that I guess I am probably looking at it from down the road, if you have litigation so that we can justify our position. I think it can be justified, but if we can then present to a court our

1	basis for having made these choices
2	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Can I then suggest
3	that Judge Higginbotham move to table my motion?
4	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: No, no, no.
5	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Or I'll move to
6	table my own motion. In other words, I've got a
7	motion on the table and what we should do now is not
8	vote on it at this meeting.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can we have more
10	discussion to see if there are other points before we
11	table it?
12	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I don't think
13	we should table it. I'm just not prepared to vote.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We will accept your
15	we'll let you do it, but we'll first see if anybody
16	has, and we've accepted those points. General Counsel
17	will give us this information so we can have a basis
18	for what's going on.
19	Are there other things that people would
20	like to see? I had a couple of questions myself.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I have a
22	question on 2, but I think we're still on 1.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, my question is
24	on I think that simply put on 1(b), any
2.5	Commissioner who recommends the witness for appearance

should say "at a Commission proceeding" not "at a 1 hearing." 2 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Oh, right. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because we're talking 4 about people who wouldn't be at a hearing and not be 5 at a hearing. So if we say "proceeding" that covers 6 both. 7 And then we can go to duces tecum. Does 8 anybody have any suggestions on duces tecum, the 9 second part documents? 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: 11 My quick reaction is to have some qualms about the procedure 12 suggested. I guess if we agree say on 1, and the 13 staff has to clear instructions from us, then 14 15 presumably they should be issuing a subpoena duces tecum only in the proper -- with the proper witnesses. 16 17 I guess I -- it strikes me -- it's an awfully cumbersome procedure to have us vote on this, 18 the Commission vote on these matters, if we give clear 19 instructions to the staff. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, as I see it, 22 this is to respond to the concern that our request for 23 documents may have been overbroad. Am I correct? Is that what this is responding to? 24 25 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, and to require

the Commissioners themselves to exercise very hands on -- exercise hands on supervision of the issuance of reviewing these kinds of documents.

VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just wonder whether before we, as Commissioners, get into it, we ought not to have a review of where we think it's been too broad or when it's not been too broad to see if we can structure some instructions to staff. strikes me as awkward and cumbersome to have us be jumping in on each subpoena. If we could come up with instructions to staff and then later it turns out that there's something wrong and we could either work further on the instructions to refine them or maybe at some point do this, it just strikes me as awkward, I would say.

COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't think I can allay that concern completely, but in one little dimension of it I do have some draft language which I didn't include on this sheet, but I can do on an amended version which would indicate that where subpoenas are in identical form for similarly situated entities, the Commissioners wouldn't vote on each individual subpoena, they would be given the form and given the list of who -- the ideal example here of who they are, I should finish the thought, a list of who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

they are and then vote on them together. The ideal 1 example here is our New York documents hearings, you 2 get a list of financial houses, Merrill Lynch, Goldman 3 & Sachs, Bear, Stearns and so forth and so on. 4 There's going to be one form of the subpoena. 5 Commissioners can see the subpoena that's brought 6 before them by the staff. If we like that scope or we 7 think it's too broad or not and then you know, vote to 8 wholesale issue that subpoena to all the financial 9 houses. 10 Now that doesn't allay all your concern, 11 but in the -- there wouldn't be the cumbersomeness of 12 voting on individual subpoenas in the very many cases 13 where they're asking for the same scope for similarly 14 situated organizations. 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I quess I 16 harken back to Judge Higginbotham's suggestion. Maybe 17 we should put General Counsel and the 13 lawyers --18 (Laughter.) 19 I guess I sort of would like to know what 20 21 other agencies do here also because in some ways it sounds very burdensome and on the other hand, I don't 22 know, I would doubt that the chair has ever not signed 23 24 a subpoena that the staff has prepared because she assumes they have thought it through and done it 25

carefully and all that. So that would argue that it won't take much of our time. On the other hand, it's not going to take, if it's going to be routine, then it seems counterproductive because then the staff might take the view, well, if they don't like it, don't tell us. I'd rather keep the responsibility focused, if you will, and the people that know most about who the witnesses are, what documents they might have and so on would be full court and with the General Counsel and if I had my druthers, well, first of all, I think I would like to know what other agencies do.

Secondly, just in terms of my experience on the Commission thus far, I think if I had my druthers, I'd rather work on giving the General Counsel more precise instruction if we're unhappy with some of the things that have happened.

COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Let me just throw out my anxiety. You can't predict the future and you've got to be very careful that you don't put any self-executing prohibitions. You've got to have some language, whatever it is, unless in exceptional circumstances. Let me do this. You say submit it at least one week in advance of a Commission meeting. What if there's a snow storm and someone gets it in

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

five days before. The subpoenaed person has a right 1 to go and file a motion to guash on the ground that 2 the Commission failed to comply with their own 3 procedures and therefore it's a void issue. 4 what I'm looking at is a hostile witness, who without 5 justification is hostile, is going to take these as 6 7 rights. What we're concerned about is fairness. 8 I think we've got to be very, very careful that we 9 don't find out all of a sudden that there's a 10 snowstorm. We've got a hearing schedule and you find 11 out for some crazy reason because of snow, it's 36 12 inches high and Mary Mathews didn't come in and the 13 14 whole hearing is jettisoned. And this is the way defense lawyers are going to use it. 15 I think the concept is good, but I think 16 we have just got to think really hard in terms of the 17 operational experience and I'm not -- I don't want you 18 to feel I'm being negative. I'm trying to avoid the 19 20 sand traps. 21 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You have to think about whether you want an exceptional circumstance 22 23 clause. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah. I'm already 24

drafting some language here. I think I've got it.

1	I take the point
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Which approach
3	are you taking? Is this the Aristotelian approach?
4	(Laughter.)
5	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Exactly.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Having been properly
7	tutored by the Judge now, I've shifted from Plato to
8	Aristotle.
9	Yeah, I think we can build something in
10	where with the consent of the majority of
11	Commissioners, an exception can be made and then I
12	think extraordinary circumstances can then be
13	sufficient. You can get some Commissioners on the
14	phone to get the thing issued in a snowstorm.
15	Were there other points like that where
16	exceptional circumstances would need to be built in?
17	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: I don't know.
18	I had two minutes to look at this before you started
19	reading it. All I'm saying is give us a little time.
20	The concept the concern is certainly rational. We
21	want to not throw the baby out with the wash.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: May I say that the
23	only points I have to make was in the last paragraph.
24	We have in our statute now the right to proceed by
25	interrogatories and I was wondering if you wanted to

	Include in your that we may request and obtain
2	documents, not only during the hearing, but by way of
3	interrogatories.
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I thought I had that
5	in there as a matter of fact, let me just check.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Or even during
7	interviews.
8	(Pause.)
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Madam Chair, there's
10	been some miscommunication. We'll have to sort out
11	I'll either give you a reason or get that back in
12	there. It was in my original draft.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Would you consider
14	putting in by way of interrogatories or even during
15	interviews because these are all voluntary.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And they're even pre-
18	hearing interviews, when people interview witnesses.
19	They can say no. There's other voluntary
20	ways to do it. That was my only concern. Now here's
21	where I think we are on this. Are you suggesting
22	you'll give us an answer later to that query?
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I take it we're not
24	going to solve
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no. I mean do you

1	you will give us an answer later as to whether you
2	will include it or why you won't?
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, exactly.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we do the
5	following? Why don't we agree that you will revise
6	your proposal in light of the discussion and the
7	agreements that you made here and send it out.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we'll get the
10	information we asked for from the General Counsel and
11	you will now suggest tabling the motion until next
12	time.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I so move.
14	(Laughter.)
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is he permitted? I
16	guess you are permitted.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I withdraw the
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, no. We will
19	vote on this motion. We will consider this motion
20	again at the next meeting.
21	Now we have one other thing we must do
22	then. We said we would discuss this before we discuss
23	the authorization. Staff Director, can we hold over
24	discussing the authorization motion until next time or
25	do we have to act on it now, one way or the other?

The one, the 2002?

commissioner Higginbotham: Why don't we go on record now. We're all flexible. I don't want anyone to think that we may not want to be around, like us, they didn't even know whether they wanted to be around.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I'll have to ask

Commissioner Anderson since he was the one that we

deferred to. Is there some reason why we shouldn't

take this up now or would you feel more comfortable if

we didn't?

commissioner and erson: I think it would be fine to take it up now. It's just that the current authorization has the subpoena power, so I thought if we went on record prior to discussing the subpoena question it seemed as though we were taking a cut on how to come out on that and I am not sure we wanted to do that without any discussion.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right, well, we are all agreed, if I hear the consensus around the table that we're going to address the subpoena issue. It's just simply a question of you heard the discussion and the discussion is in the record, but now what we're really doing is trying to decide whether the Commission is in favor of being reauthorized and

1	whether we can go forward. So the motion is that the
2	Commission is in favor of being reauthorized until the
3.	Year 2002. And is there any further discussion?
4	There was a second. Who moved you moved it.
5	Anybody second it?
6	COMMISSIONER LEE: Seconded.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You seconded it. Yes,
8	Staff Director?
9	MS. MATHEWS: Madam Chair, when this draft
10	was prepared and sent to you, the President's budget
11	proposal for Congress had not been officially
12	submitted and as a result in Section 4, there was a
13	blank left there for the monetary proposal for 1997.
14	I would suggest that we consider inserting \$11.4 in
15	that blank area
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which is Fiscal 1997?
17	MS. MATHEWS: Correct.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, well, with
19	that addition, do you accept that the maker of the
20	motion and the seconder? Is there any further
21	discussion?
22	All right, all in favor of supporting the
23	motion indicate by saying aye.
24	(Ayes.)
25	Opposed? Okay, the motion passes. Now

1	the next item it says the Stair Director report. I
2	would like to ask, to tell the Commission in this
3	morning's paper there is an article, <u>New York Times</u> ,
4	"Radio Show Prank at Mosque Angers Muslims in
5	Colorado" and it's about some folks who went to a
6	mosque and some disk jockeys engaged in some pranks to
7	demean and defame, according to this article, the
8	sanctity of the mosque and dressed up like clowns and
9	interrupted the religious ceremony that was going on
10	in the mosque. I would like to ask my colleagues if
11	we should ask the staff and people who are involved,
12	are asking the Justice Department to investigate this
13	issue, if they would be willing, just based on my
14	having told them that this happened, to have the staff
15	investigate it as to whether it did, in fact, happen.
16	And if, in fact, as alleged, such an incident
17	occurred, to make appropriate inquiries and to join,
18	as we usually do in asking, drafting a letter which
19	you can see, asking the Attorney General to
20	investigate.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Absolutely. I so
22	move.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, so we'll get
24	back to you. Does anybody object? Seconded the
25	motion? I guess we need a motion.

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I make the motion.
2	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Second.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All in favor for
4	proceeding as I have suggested indicate by saying aye.
5	(Ayes.)
6	Opposed? All right, so the motion is
7	carried and you will see a letter of some kind go
8	forward on this subject. Are there other questions on
9	the Staff Director's Report or anything anybody wants
10	to raise at this time. Vice Chair?
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: I just want to
12	say that I read with interest the new <u>Civil Rights</u>
13	Journal and I thought it was very well done.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, the journal is
15	out. It's a fine job, Charlie. It looks good, reads
16	wells. It's literate. May outsell <u>People Magazine</u> .
17	If there are no other questions on this,
18	we'll go to the state advisory committee reports. We
19·	can take them up seriatim.
20	The first one is resources devoted to
21	local and federal civil rights enforcement in
22	Minnesota.
23	Can I have a motion to approve the report?
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?

1	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion? All
3	those in favor of approving the state advisory report
4	from Minnesota, indicate by saying "aye".
5	(Ayes.)
6	Opposed? Abstentions?
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Abstention.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner George
9	abstains.
10	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Can we call the
11	roll, Madam Chairman.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The roll, yes.
13	Commissioner Anderson?
14	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Berry,
16	aye.
17	Commissioner George?
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Abstain.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
20	Higginbotham?
21	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Aye.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner is
23	absent.
24	Commissioner Lee?
25	COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.
į.	II

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
2	Redenbaugh is absent.
3	Vice Chair?
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Aye.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Motion passes. The
6	racial tensions in Tennessee report is the next one.
7	Could I have a motion for its approval?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?
10	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, the motion
12	has been moved and seconded for approval of racial
13	tensions in Tennessee. Do we have any discussion?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Well, I just
15	want to observe that in the observations near the end
16	in Tennessee, the Commission used to be tracking many
17	of the same matters that we've seen in the national
18	scene. I guess it's not surprising, but well, I
19	was surprised at how closely it tracked.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. All those in
21	favor of approving the Tennessee report indicate by
22	saying aye.
23	(Ayes.)
24	Opposed? I'll call the roll again.
25	Commissioner Anderson?

1	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Berry, yes.
3	Commissioner George?
4	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Aye.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
6	Higginbotham?
7	COMMISSIONER HIGGINBOTHAM: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Horner is
9	absent.
10	Commissioner Lee?
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
13	Redenbaugh is absent.
14	Vice Chair?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, the motion is
17	approved. State advisory committee appointments. We
18	can take them either one by one or all together. Is
19	there anyone who has a desire to take them one by one
20	or one in particular you want to address?
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Madam Chair, I have
22	some questions about a number of them and I
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: One by one?
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, to the Staff
25	Director, I wonder if Carol-Lee Hurley could be

1	prepared, if needed, to respond to my questions.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now why don't we then
3	take the up one by one? Could I have a motion to
4	approve the Alaska Advisory Committee Report?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?
7	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: All right, discussion.
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yes, Madam Chairman.
10	Two incumbent members declined the opportunity to be
11	considered for reappointment. I'm not sure whether
12	that means reappointment was offered or how did the
13	procedure work. They were told you can be considered
14	and they said no, I don't want to be considered.
15	MS. MATHEWS: That's my understanding,
16	Commissioner George.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay, so it was
18	unclear as to whether they were going to be
19	reappointed or not.
20	MS. MATHEWS: The individuals receive a
21	letter asking if they wish to be considered for
22	reappointment. These two declined.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And that happens in
24	all cases with all the states?
25	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.

1	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So they
2	affirmatively said no, we don't want to do it. Thank
3	you. That's what I want to know.
4	Next, Madam Chair?
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What about Arizona?
6	Why don't we just ask questions about each one of
7	these and then vote them all together.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: That's just fine.
9	Is Missouri next?
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Arizona is next. Does
11	anybody have any questions about Arizona appointments?
12	We're just going to do the questions and
13	then we'll have one motion for all of them.
14	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, this is the
15	one a current member is not recommended for
16	reappointment, two resigned, one did not attend any
17	meetings and three did not seek reappointment. Did
18	not seek reappointment, does that mean they got
19	just what happened in Alaska, they got the letter?
20	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
21	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. One did not
22	attend any meetings, two resigned. Is this just
23	routine resignations or was there an issue out there
24	that prompted was it routine? Okay. Thank you,
25	Madam Chairman.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: California? Questions
2	about California?
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: That's fine, no
4	questions.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Missouri? The Show Me
6	State. Questions about Missouri?
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Three members are
8	not recommended for reappointment to the Committee.
9	One did not wish to be reappointed. That was the same
10	as Alaska, the letter and so forth.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Two members were not
13	able to participate in the Committee's activities.
14	Does that mean they didn't show up for the meetings?
15	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, that's my
16	understanding.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: And were not able
18	they had good excuses or they just didn't show up?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Carol, would you like
20	to come up?
21	MS. HURLEY: I don't know. I don't recall
22	the exact details, Commissioner George, but basically
23	if participation is minimal or nonexistent that's the
24	phrase that would be used.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay, that's what I

was wondering about because sometimes it says "did not 1 attend meetings" and other times it says "were unable 2 to participate or unable to attend it." 3 strike me that can be a meaningful distinction, but 4 sometimes it just means the same thing. 5 Okay. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So whenever we see 7 those two phrasings, it means the person didn't show 8 9 up. COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Didn't show up, 10 okay. Those two members were informed by a letter of 11 the right to appeal this decision to the Staff 12 13 Director and no response was received. MS. MATHEWS: That's correct. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Nebraska? Anybody for Nebraska? 16 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: No questions. 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vermont? 18 19 COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I do have a question Two members resigned during the appointment 20 period to pursue other interests. The authorized size 21 of the Vermont Advisory Committee is 11. The 22 personnel actions requested, I think, would increase 23 24 the size of the committee to 13 and would assure the 25 effective operation of the Advisory Committee and

1	improve political and racial balance.
2	I don't quite see how the I might be
3	missing something, how the arithmetic on that one
4	works out and if I'm reading it correctly, I don't see
5	how the racial balance is affected. The two new
6	people appointed are both Caucasians.
7	MS. MATHEWS: It's the particular chart
8	that shows you the entire representation and
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Well, race,
10	ethnicity, 9 white, 2 black, one Hispanic. I don't
11	see how adding am I missing something? I don't see
12	how adding two whites, maybe those I don't see how
13	that makes it any it's just more whites.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: You mean like who's
15	being added?
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah.
17	MS. MATHEWS: Do you have any further
	_
18	information, Carol, would you like to come up here?
18	
	information, Carol, would you like to come up here?
19	information, Carol, would you like to come up here? MS. HURLEY: I don't really recall the
19 20	information, Carol, would you like to come up here? MS. HURLEY: I don't really recall the details, but perhaps the Eastern Regional Director who
19 20 21	information, Carol, would you like to come up here? MS. HURLEY: I don't really recall the details, but perhaps the Eastern Regional Director who is here could provide that information.
19 20 21 22	information, Carol, would you like to come up here? MS. HURLEY: I don't really recall the details, but perhaps the Eastern Regional Director who is here could provide that information. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is the Eastern
19 20 21 22 23	information, Carol, would you like to come up here? MS. HURLEY: I don't really recall the details, but perhaps the Eastern Regional Director who is here could provide that information. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is the Eastern Regional

1	white and I will just expect that what is happening is
2	that we're getting more minorities on the Committee.
3	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I don't think I
4	think it's actually not working then.
5	MS. HURLEY: Well, there's so few
6	minorities in Vermont. It's difficult.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Then I just don't
8	see the justification for increasing the size of
9	Vermont. California only has 14 members. I can see
10	it if you have a special reason because of balance of
11	some sort, religious or political or racial, but I
12	wonder if we could put this lay this one aside.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we lay
14	Vermont aside and get a report on it so we can figure
15	out what's going on.
16	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah. Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Wyoming? Go ahead.
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay. The personnel
19	actions requested will provide the balance and
20	appropriate representation. One current member did
21	not wish to be reappointed. Two other current members
22	are not recommended for reappointment. In order to
23	provide appointment opportunities for persons who are
24	currently more actively involved in civil rights.
25	These two persons were informed of their opportunity

1	to appeal this decision to the Commission. No
2	correspondence was received from them.
3	Now I'm wondering about those two people.
4	Does no correspondence from them mean we didn't hear
5	from them at all or that they didn't make a written
6	MS. HURLEY: We didn't hear from them at
. 7	all.
8	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Didn't hear from
9	them at all.
10	MS. MATHEWS: If I can ask, did the Court
11	Reporter pick that up? Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So in other words, we
13	didn't hear anything, but they were told they had a
14	right to appeal?
15	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay, yeah. So the
16	idea is there were two people who you had an
17	opportunity to appoint two people who had more
18	background in civil rights.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Than those people.
20	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Although you decided
21	to not reappoint those people, to appoint the two new
22	people you informed the two new people and they just
23	didn't
24	MS. HURLEY: They did not appeal that
25	decision.

ī	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Get back. Okay.
2	Did the two people who were not reappointed had
3	they been faithful participants in activities of the
4	SAC?
5	MS. HURLEY: I believe they had
6	participated, but not to a fully enthusiastic extent.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
8	MS. HURLEY: You will see, I'm sure more
9	and more of this or at least as many of this sort of
10	replacement as we try to follow the Commissioner's
11	wish to add younger members to the Committees. We
12	can't justify having all Committees of large sizes.
13	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right.
14	MS. HURLEY: So we have to make some
15	difficult choices sometimes to add the younger
16	members.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because in other
18	words, if we kept the same people on forever, there
19	wouldn't be any space to put any new members.
20	Ms. MATHEWS: Right.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But they do have a
22	right to appeal to us.
23	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Right, and they were
24	informed, but didn't communicate.
25	Yeah, okay. Thank you. Next?

Τ	CHAIRPERSON BERRI. We were doing what,
2	Kentucky? Kentucky, yes. Kentucky. We have
3	Kentucky. Anything on Kentucky? Anyone? I said
4	Wyoming, didn't I?
5	We were just doing Wyoming. Kentucky?
6	Commissioner George, do you have anything on Kentucky?
7	Does anybody else have anything on Kentucky?
8	All right, how about Tennessee, interim
9	appointment?
10	Okay, well, with that, we have dropped out
11	Vermont, so now I need a motion to approve all the
12	State Advisory Committee appointments except the one
13	for Vermont which we will consider again when we get
14	more information.
15	Can I have such a motion?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Just another
18	question on Wyoming. I just noticed in my notes. Are
19	we increasing the size of the Wyoming Committee?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Carol-Lee? Is the
21	size of Wyoming being increased?
22	MS. HURLEY: I think it might be increased
23	by one or two persons.
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Um
25	MS. HURLEY: In order to try to meet all

1	the criteria of age and political balance and
2	representation, gender representation. We have
3	difficulty maintaining even for small states or states
4	with low population a committee of 11. It's just not
5	easy.
6	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Uh-huh. In Wyoming,
7	six new people are being recommended for new
8	appointments while only three are being replaced, so
9	I think it's probably three.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Three more.
11	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So we're increasing
12	it by three.
13	Would it be a good thing just for the
14	future to indicate when we're increasing the size?
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If that would be
16	helpful.
17	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: I think it would be
18	helpful to know that.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We'll do that from now
20	on then.
21	MS. HURLEY: That will be
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then we don't have to
23	count it at the meeting. We'll have that information
24	to begin with.
25	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Yeah, did

1	Commissioner Redenbaugh communicate at all about a
2	question he had with the California appointments? Was
3	there any communication, Staff Director?
4	MS. MATHEWS: Madam Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Staff Director?
6	MS. MATHEWS: Commissioner Redenbaugh
7	recommended two additional individuals and they're
8	being considered by the Regional Director.
9	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: For California?
10	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, that was the state,
11	California.
12	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: So, they're being
13	considered but we're rechartering now?
14	MS. MATHEWS: Well, as you know, there are
15	always opportunities as the year progresses for
16	additional interim appointments and that's the
17	consideration that's being given at the current time.
18	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Did the I have a
19	note that Commissioner Redenbaugh was concerned about
20	one of the people who was not being reappointed. Did
21	he raise any issue about that?
22	Ms. MATHEWS: I do not have any
23	information about that.
24	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay.
25 .	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But you have some

1	information about people who he wanted appointed?
2	MS. MATHEWS: Yes, there were two
3	individuals that he recommended for appointment and
4	they are being considered by the Regional Director.
5	That's all that has been communicated to me by
6	Commissioner Redenbaugh for California.
7	COMMISSIONER GEORGE: Okay, well, I would
8	like to put off California, if possible, until next
9	time to give Mr. Redenbaugh an opportunity to raise
10	the issue that he has. That would be my preference.
11	The rest, with the exception of Vermont, I'm prepared
12	to go with.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone object to
14	that?
15	We will consider California and Vermont
16	next time.
17	Commissioner Anderson?
18	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I'm seeing a
19	gradual SAC member creep in terms of the number of
20	members being on the SACs. Is there any economic
21	effect of that? Is there a budgetary consequence of
22	that?
23	MS. MATHEWS: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: If so, what is it,
25	if you can say?

MS. MATHEWS: Madam Chair? 1 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. 2 MATHEWS: The general budgetary 3 MS. consideration is that even though the State Advisory 4 Committee members are not salaried, they're not 5 federal employees, we do provide for them travel 6 reimbursement to SAC meetings. And that's the 7 budgetary impact that I can see that would be directly 8 relevant to the increased SAC size. 9 There might also be some other harder to 10 pin down cost factors associated with regional staff 11 and the coordination efforts with a few additional 12 13 people, things like that. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I don't know if 14 it's de minimis or not, but we're moving even small 15 states like Wyoming, we're increasing in terms of 16 population --17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It is a consideration. 18 19 We've discussed this question over the years, off and There was one point when somebody thought 20 on again. the California SAC should have 50 members because 21 22 California is so large. And they should be divided regionally. And we debated it, but the costs seemed 23 to be absolutely prohibitive. 24

In the past, we have considered the cost

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when we increased the SAC, but maybe we should think about it and tell the staff to think about that after thinking about the kinds of political balance, the ages, all kinds of diversity we like to see. But that is a consideration, and also the size of a state, I mean, if one state has a small population and they have as many SAC members or more than another state, that that does raise some kinds of questions about why.

MS. MATHEWS: Ιt is definitely consideration. I was just going to add on the size of the state point, Alaska is a good example. It's very expensive to hold a SAC meeting in Alaska. Just the SAC members themselves convening in one spot, but the regional staff in California, flying up and back, as contrasted with a small state in the upper Northeast area where many people could drive, wouldn't need to fly and the staff can easily get up and back even in the same day without overnight expenditures. So there are wide variances in terms of costs for these events, and as you may recall, we had a discussion that related to this at the National SAC Chair Conference last summer where we discussed alternative ways of conducting SAC business. One alternative being telephonic meetings and it's my understanding the

1	Regional Directors are pursuing that whenever
2	possible. That wouldn't work obviously for a fact-
3	finding meeting, but it might work for a planning
4	meeting.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we then with
6	that get approval of the motion to approve the SAC
7	appointments with the exclusion of Vermont and
8	California which we will take up next time? That
9	motion is accepted by the maker of the motion and the
.0	seconder. All in favor of the approval indicate by
1	saying "aye".
.2	(Ayes.)
.3	Opposed? All right, the motion-passes and
L4	the SAC appointments are approved.
.5	I am told by the parliamentarian that I
.6	did not properly execute your tabling motion,
.7	Commissioner George. You made the motion to table,
L8	but apparently no one seconded it. Could someone
.9	please second it? I thought that someone did.
20	· Anybody?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: Second.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair. And all
23	in favor of the motion to table, indicate by saying
4	"aye"?
25	(Ayes.)

1	All right, and we're laying it on the
2	table until the next meeting, so it will come up at
3	the next meeting.
4	Are there other matters that should come
5	before the Commission at this time? If there are no
6	other matters, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON REYNOSO: So moved.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second?
9	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Motion to adjourn is
11	nondebatable, so thank you very much. Adjourned.
12	(Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the meeting was
13	concluded.)

14