+ + + + +

COMMISSION MEETING

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1999



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

PRESENT:

MARY FRANCES BERRY, Chairperson CRUZ REYNOSO, Vice Chairperson CARL A. ANDERSON, Commissioner YVONNE Y. LEE, Commissioner RUSSELL G. REDENBAUGH, Commissioner (via telephone)

RUBY G. MOY, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

KIMBERLEY ALTON DAVID ARONSON ERIK BROWN MARGARET BUTLER SICILIA CHINN, Parliamentarian KI-TAEK CHUN PAMELA DUNSTON BETTY EDMISTON ADERSON FRANCOIS M. CATHERINE GATES EDWARD HAILES, JR. GEORGE HARBISON CAROL-LEE HURLEY FREDERICK D. ISLER LISA M. JONES REBECCA KRAUSE STEPHANIE Y. MOORE, General Counsel STAFF PRESENT: (Continued)

MARC PENTINO
JESSICA ROFF
MARCIA TYLER
AUDREY WRIGHT
CHRIS YIANILOS
MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHARLOTTE PONTICELLI KRISHNA TOOLSIE

A-G-E-N-D-A

		PAGE
I.	Approval of Agenda	4
II.	Approval of Minutes of December 11, 1998 Meeting	5
IĮI.	Announcements	8
IV.	Executive Session	19
v.	Staff Director's Report	21
VI.	State Advisory Committee Report "Racial Harassment in Vermont Public Schools" (Vermont)	24
VII.	State Advisory Appointments for District of Columbia, Maryland, and New York	26
VIII.	Project Planning	27
IX.	Future Agenda Items	108

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
(9:36 a.m.)
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The meeting will
come to order.
I. Approval of Agenda
We have approval of the agenda. The
only addition we have to the agenda is we would like
to have the Commissioners take a vote on the
President's nominations and designations for
Commissioners, Chair, and Vice Chair. So if we
could add that, without objection, to the agenda,
and do that at the beginning, I don't have any other
additions.
Does anybody else want to add anything
to the agenda?
Okay. I guess I need a motion to
approve it.
COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So moved.
CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Second,
somebody?
VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Second.

(Ayes.)

indicate by saying aye.

Opposed?

23

24

1	(No response.)
2	Okay. So ordered.
3	II. Approval of Minutes of December 11, 1998
4	Meeting
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The first item
6	well, let's do the minutes first. The minutes of
7	the December 11, 1998, meeting does anyone have
8	any changes, additions, things they'd like to add,
9	to the minutes?
10	Yes, Commissioner Lee?
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: Madame Chair, on
12	page 2
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER LEE: there must be a
15	typo. I don't
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Page
17	COMMISSIONER LEE: think that there
18	was a Kennedy finance controversy, none that I know
19	of. It should be campaign finance controversy.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. Campaign
21	finance controversy instead of Kennedy finance
22	controversy, on page 2.
23	The only other one that I can see
24	there are a couple of places where I think a word
25	an article or something has been left out, but they

deal with this, like the word "complement" 1 instead of "compliment." 2 There was -- on the project that the --3 on the King Report, there was a statement that 4 Commissioner Higginbotham made when he said that 5 other things were -- where is this on the King --6 COMMISSIONER LEE: Page 5. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Page 5. There was 8 something -- oh, there are other civil rights issues 9 that are just as important as Dr. King. I think 10 what he said was as other civil rights issues that 11 are just as important as a project on Dr. King and 12 not Dr. King himself personally. 13 (Laughter.) 14 So I think we ought to -- I don't think 15 he meant that Dr. King wasn't that important. So I 16 think we should point that out. 17 And if there are other typos that 18 anybody sees, if they could call them to the 19 20 attention -- yes, Carl? COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Madame Chair, 21 perhaps you could refresh my memory. I was under 22 impression that the Report on Schools and 23 Religion was not going to make recommendations, but 24

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What page are you
2	on, Carl?
3	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Page 2 at the
4	top.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The
6	discussion we had last time was that the executive
7	summary that the staff is doing could have
8	conclusions in it. And we didn't mean
9	recommendations like the findings and
10	recommendations that we make in reports you know,
11	that the numbers and whatever but that if in the
12	conclusions there were any statements that they
13	thought grew out of the conclusions, that ought to
14	be made they could do that's what this means
15	by "recommendations."
16	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It doesn't mean
18	recommendations, formal
19	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: All right.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: findings and
21	recommendations. And we would, of course, see it.
22	So we would know whether it was going beyond that
23	kind of generalized kind of statement.
24	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Good. Well,
25	with that clarification

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Have I made that
2	clear, or not?
3	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah, I think
4	it's clear.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
6	Anybody see anything else?
7	I think on the first page Mr. Manalili,
8	who is a new staff member, I think his name may be
9	spelled wrong. M-A-N-A-L-I-L-I, I think it is.
10	But any other typos or articles left
11	out, or anything else anybody sees, you can point
12	that out or tell the staff and they can change it,
13	as long as it doesn't change the substance.
14	With that, could I get a motion to
15	approve the minutes?
16	COMMISSIONER LEE: So moved.
17	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Second.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All in favor,
19	indicate by saying aye.
20	(Ayes.)
21	Opposed?
22	(No response.)
23	So ordered.
24	III. Announcements
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now we come to

announcements. But before we do announcements, why don't I first ask the Commissioners to vote on the President's designations.

Somewhere I have a letter, which I cannot find now, from the Office of Presidential Personnel, Bob Nash, which says that the President has selected me and Cruz Reynoso as members and Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission, respectively, and asked us to either poll or call a meeting of the members of the Commission to affirm the President's decision regarding the Chair and Vice Chair positions.

I have already discussed this matter with the Commissioners who are already informed that this has happened. It is not a new topic of discussion, and we did not do a poll because we thought we would do this in the meeting, in the public meeting.

So I would ask now for the Commissioners to indicate -- and we'll need a piece of paper with the Commissioners' names on it, so we can -- somebody can mark it down, because we have to send it over there -- whether they agree. The question is, first, whether the Commissioners approve or vote to affirm the President's designation of Mary

1	Frances Berry as Chair of the U.S. Commission on
2	Civil Rights. And we'll have to do them separately.
3	So could we see the roll, so we could
4	call it? Does anyone want to say anything before we
5	call the roll?
6	Okay. Commissioner Anderson?
7	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee?
9	COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
11	Redenbaugh?
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
14	Reynoso?
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So we have
17	ayes from all of the Commissioners. If I were to
18	vote, I'd vote yes, probably, but
19	(Laughter.)
20	I abstain.
21	The second one is whether the
22	Commissioners agree or affirm the President's
23	designation of Cruz Reynoso as Vice Chair of the
24	U.S. Civil Rights Commission. And we will do it in
25	the same way

the same way.

25 |

1	11
1	Would you please indicate your approval
2	by saying aye and your disapproval by saying no, or
3	your abstention.
4	Commissioner Anderson?
5	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Aye.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner Lee?
7	COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
9	Redenbaugh?
10	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Aye.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
12	Reynoso?
13	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And Commissioner
15	Berry? Aye.
16	Okay. So you can this makes it
17	unanimous, and we will now report to Mr. Nash that
18	this has happened.
19	And in case you're wondering, any of
20	you, for the record, how this could happen, since we
21	are already members of the U.S. Commission on Civil
22	Rights, Commissioner Vice Chair and I will resign
23	our positions as Commissioners appointed by the
24	Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore
25	of the Senate, respectively, effective at the moment

1	that you voted to designate us as Chair and Vice
2	Chair. And our commissions as Commissioners
3	appointed by the President, and designated by the
4	President, will take effect today, at the same time
5	that you took this action.
6	And this information will all be
7	conveyed to the Speaker of the House, to the
8	President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and to the
9	Office of Presidential Personnel this day.
10	All right. Okay. Is there anything
11	else on that? If not, let's move to the next
12	thank you very much item on the agenda, which is
13	announcements.
14	I can't find my announcements. What are
15	they under? Anybody know?
16	COMMISSIONER LEE: Section 3.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, there we are.
18	First of all, Commissioner Higginbotham, as we all
19	know, A. Leon Higginbotham, passed after the last
20	Commission meeting. The Commission sent out a press
21	release expressing its sadness at the death of
22	Commissioner Higginbotham.
23	I have already said to everyone that for
24	me it was not simply a matter of an official having
25	died, or somebody who was on the Commission, but he

was a personal friend of mine and had been for more years than I can remember, and was very supportive.

And I was very pleased, that after not having him at the Commission meeting on very many occasions because of his illness, that he was able to come into town for the meeting and I was able to spend some time with him.

I did go to the funeral in Boston and have expressed my personal sympathy, as well as those of the Commission, to the family. There will be other tributes, and expressions of sympathy can still be sent to Mrs. Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham and family, in care of Carol Derby, D-E-R-B-Y, at Paul, Weiss, Rifkin, Horton & Garrison, the law firm in New York.

will be memorial services in There various places. I had a list, which I planned to bring with me this morning, and I left it on the dining room table in my house, so that's not going to help me -- of places where the memorials will be But we will circulate that so that taking place. people will know. There is going to be one in New Haven, there's going to be one in Philadelphia, and one here in Washington, D.C.

The last time a sitting member of 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

Chairman Clarence expired was when Commission Pendleton, Jr., had a heart attack and passed away while he was Chair. There were memorial services for him everywhere. The way the Commission handled it was to do the same thing we did this time. people went to the funeral. I went to the funeral. funeral for Higginbotham. Ι the went to Commissioners went to Clarence Pendleton's funeral. And at the memorial service, which took place in Washington, Commission staff who wanted to go, and Commissioners, went.

So I would suggest that members of the Commission or staff members who wish to go should go to the memorial service when it takes place here in Washington, D.C.

There are other ideas about tributes that the Commissioners -- the Commission, as a body, might make in Judge Higginbotham's memory. And we might think of those. One idea is to dedicate one issue of the Civil Rights Journal to him, and there are other ideas about which we can -- we can discuss those more.

We don't have to really come up with anything at this point that we think would work.

But that's the way it was handled the last time when

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Chair of the Commission died, and I think we are behaving appropriately in keeping with that tradition.

announcement is Vice The next that President Gore announced earlier this week that the Administration is proposing an additional increase in civil rights enforcement spending. The increase in civil Administration got an enforcement spending last year in the omnibus budget negotiations for all of the enforcement agencies. They are requesting the same this time.

This Commission, as you know, requested a -- has for years recommended an increase in the budget of the federal civil rights enforcement agencies. I have personally, in the past, not only in press conferences here but with Vice President Gore and the President, urged them to increase the budget.

The President's Race Initiative took up that same cause. And the Civil Rights Commission, on which we serve, did not receive a budget increase, except for a small amount for -- I think it was a cost of living increase. Is that right, George, last time? Although the President had requested an increase.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This time, the President is requesting \$11 million for us, which is, again, an increase.

Our problem is whether we can get the Congress to appropriate an increase in our budget, and we are being whipsawed from all sides on whether we should get budget increases. There are some people who think we shouldn't because they don't think we manage the agency well. But they are management issues, and I hope that those are being resolved.

There are other people who think that we do not produce anything that is on the cutting edge of civil rights, that our reports are too late. They may be good, but they're too late. And that we have not found ways to -- to express the Commission's view on important issues of the day in a timely fashion, so that they can be taken up in the policy debate. There are people who think that.

Now, we may disagree or agree with what these people think, but I'm just telling you that there are people who think this. And I would think that it behooves the staff of the Commission, and the management of the Commission, to be very thoughtful about these concerns, about the management issues, the way the agency is managed.

And we are responding to the GAO audit, and we'll

hear more about that, and we'll be discussing this as we go along this day and at other times, and to take seriously all of these management issues.

And that we should also take seriously our duty to get reports done in a timely fashion, and we should take seriously the responsibility for all of us to try to think of how we can express ourselves on issues to the benefit of the American public.

And to serve in the way that the Commission is supposed to serve on the issues of the day, keeping in mind the differences in technology, in communications, which are very different from when the Commission got started -- the fast response to things, and how this is necessary.

The office that Fred runs got its statute -- got added to its statute that it had to do a report every year by a certain time because for years it never produced any reports on time. And the arguments -- and I've sat through them here years and years -- were that it took a long time to do anything well, so no one should complain if it took forever.

Well, there is a balance. No one wants people to do shoddy work. No Commissioner is

1	suggesting that anybody do shoddy work. But what we
2	are suggesting is that people figure out how to
3	manage the agency in such a way, and manage their
4	own offices in such a way that they can, in fact,
5	respond to crises when they occur, respond to
6	personnel changes and shifts and people coming and
7	going, because that's part of management. And,
8	indeed, figure out how to do their work.
9	We will make the best case we can for
10	the enforcement, and I would hope that we do it in a
11	way that will end up being bipartisan or non-
12	partisan, because Russell and I are not partisan.
13	Right, Russell?
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Not at all.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah.
16	(Laughter.)
17	So and that can happen.
18	Okay. The status report on the GAO
19	recommendations that we're supposed to send to the
20	Senate. Is that right? This is talking about the
21	Senate thing? Is that what this
22	MS. MOY: To the Congress, right.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: is about?
24	MS. MOY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's due to Congress

by next Friday in order to meet the January 1 1999, deadline. 2 Does anybody else have any announcements 3 or want to say anything about anything at all at 4 this point? 5 MS. MOY: Yes, I do, Madame Chair. 6 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Go ahead. 7 MS. MOY: Some time ago we had 8 situation in Syracuse with Denny's Restaurant, and I 9 would just like to bring a brief update on what 10 Denny's has done with some of these lawsuits that 11 involved minority plaintiffs. 12 So the Office of Civil Rights Monitor 13 has decided to -- let me start all over. I'm sorry. 14 involved protracted Denny's been in 15 has discrimination lawsuits brought by minority 16 plaintiffs, which resulted in a consent decree 17 establishing the Office of the Civil Rights Monitor 18 to track discrimination complaints against Denny's. 19 Last week, Advantica Restaurant Group, 20 which is the parent company of Denny's Restaurant, 21 22 held a press conference. They announced a million television ad campaign promoting racial 23 And I've seen some of these ads on 24 diversity.

television.

1	And they also are to report on the
2	progress the company has made in terms of work force
3	and franchisee diversity.
4	As of now, the law offices of Sharon
5	Hartman in Los Angeles will monitor this program
6	until May 1999, at which time it may be extended for
7	two more years. So since this is a confidentiality
8	agreement, Hartman was not able to disclose any new
9	cases of discrimination reported against Denny's,
10	but our Eastern Regional Office will continue to
11	monitor this as necessary.
12	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I'm sorry. Who was
13	monitoring it? Sharon Hartman?
14	MS. MOY: Sharon Libeck Hartman.
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Hartman.
16	MS. MOY: Law offices in L.A.
17	Thank you, Madame Chair.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All right.
19	Anyone else have any announcements or anything?
20	IV. Executive Session
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. The next item
22	on the agenda is an executive session. The
23	executive session is on the agenda for the
24	discussion of a personnel matter involving a

specific member of the staff of the Civil Rights

Commission. And so I need, I quess, to ask need a motion, first, is that right? somebody to move that we go into executive session. VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: So moved. CHATRPERSON BERRY: Is there a second? COMMISSIONER LEE: Second. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then I need an

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And then I need an opinion from the parliamentarian, ethics officer, everything else. You've got about five titles, Sicilia.

(Laughter.)

As to whether, in fact, we can do this.

MS. CHINN: Okay. Based on today's motion, I certify that pursuant to exemptions numbers 2 and 6 of the Government Sunshine Act, we shall permit closure if the matter relates solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of agencies, or concerns information of a personal nature, or disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, the discussion may be closed to the public.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Then I need to have a vote on the motion. All those in favor of proceeding with the execution session, indicate by saying aye.

1	(Ayes.)
2	Opposed?
3	(No response.)
4	For the purposes of the staff, which may
5	wonder how long this is going to take, it should
6	take no more than about half an hour. Okay? All
7	right.
8	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
9	foregoing matter went into executive
10	session at 9:55 a.m. and returned to
11	open session at 10:40 a.m.)
12	V. Staff Director's Report
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In the Staff
14	Director's report the Staff Director's report,
15	does anyone have any questions or comments on
16	anything in the Staff Director's report?
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'd like to
18	compliment the Staff Director for including
19	completion dates of commitments in her report.
20	MS. MOY: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And I'd like
22	to ask the Staff Director, are those completion
23	dates reliable?
24	MS. MOY: As of the last MIS submission.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And are these dates

1	we can count on?
2	MS. MOY: As of today, yes.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What does that mean?
4	MS. MOY: Well, in the event that there
5	are no changes that we would have to make in the
6	planning or change of dates for any reason.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Let me see if
8	I have the same understanding. So you're committing
9	to these dates, not guaranteeing them?
10	MS. MOY: Well
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: And you will
12	advise us as your commitment changes?
13	MS. MOY: Correct.
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
15	MS. MOY: And we'll let you know
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So this means
17	that you're going to act consistently with that and
18	you can't guarantee that there won't be slippages.
19	MS. MOY: Correct. And you'll be
20	notified.
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: But these look
22	like reasonably good estimates, reasonably
23	MS. MOY: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: solid
25	promises?

1	MS. MOY: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: For example, we will
4	get the New York Report, according to your current
5	comment on March 17, 1999. That's what it says on
6	page 2.
7	MS. MOY: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And Mississippi
9	Delta on April 8th, Commission review April 8, 1999,
10	and Schools and Religion, which has been pushed
11	forward to June 24, 1999. Now, these dates are all
12	different from last time, right?
1 3	MS. MOY: Right.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. But they are
15	your best guesstimate today. The Los Angeles Report
16	is being printed.
17	MS. MOY: Correct.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When do we expect to
19	have it?
20	MS. MOY: April.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: April?
22	MS. MOY: April.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We would like to
24	have a press conference in Los Angeles on the Los
25	Angeles Report when we get it. So we need to

with the Commissioners -- we don't have to do this in the meeting, but you should think about this. We need to set a date for a press conference in Los Angeles on the Los Angeles Report.

There are a lot of police issues there that are very salient, and we can update ourselves on matters that have happened since then by getting a memo from Public Affairs Staff Director on issues that have happened in -- anything that's in the press that has happened. But we should have, I think, a press conference in Los Angeles on that.

Anybody else have any comments on the Staff Director's report?

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: No. I just want to say that I find the projected dates very encouraging because it looks as though we are wrapping up some of the hearings that took place a little while ago. So it looks as though we're really doing quite well along those lines.

VI. State Advisory Committee Report "Racial Harassment in Vermont Public Schools" (Vermont)

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And the next item, then, is the State Advisory Committee Report from Vermont, which is called "Racial Harassment in Vermont Public Schools." Could I have a motion to

1	approve that?
2	COMMISSIONER LEE: So moved.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I have a
4	second?
5	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Second.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is there any
7	discussion?
8	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Well, I just want
9	to say that I was moved, actually, by the reports of
10	the parents, in terms of the experiences that their
11	children are having in some of those schools. And
12	it just reminded me of how hard and how long we, as
13	a people, have to work to better the lives of our
14	children, so they don't go through the experiences
15	described by the parents in that report. But I
16	thought it was a good report.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. All in favor,
18	indicate by saying aye.
19	(Ayes.)
20	Opposed?
21	(No response.)
22	So ordered.
23	VII. State Advisory Appointments for District of
24	Columbia, Maryland, and New York
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: State advisory

1	appointments for the District of Columbia, Maryland,
2	and New York. Could we get a motion to approve the
3	advisory appointments, please?
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So moved.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Second? Second?
6	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any discussion? All
8	in favor, indicate by saying aye.
9	(Ayes.)
10	Opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	No? So ordered.
13	VIII. Project Planning
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now we go to project
15	planning.
16	MS. MOY: Madame Chair, may I
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
18	MS. MOY: just make a comment about
19	the Vermont SAC report. I've been informed by the
20	Eastern Region Office that Governor Howard Dean
21	noted the rapidly increasing minority population, so
22	he has proposed two appropriations which would
23	recruit minority high school students for teacher
24	training programs, and also fund a pilot program in
	l craining programs, and arbo rand a prior program in

1	And we have since learned that many of
2	the legislators are eager to have the Advisory
3 .	Committee's report at the start of the 1999
4	legislative session, so that various educational
5	subcommittees can consider the topic in their
6	debate. And the SAC Chairperson is and other
7	Advisory Committee members will be meeting
8	informally with key legislators.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now we go to
10	project planning. But before we do that, we have
11	this report that goes to the Senate that we had a
12	draft of and we got comments, and the staff prepared
13	a new draft based on the comments. And so I want to
14	know if you have objections to our now sending the
15	latest draft to the Senate, so that it can get there
16	when it's supposed to go there.
17	Anybody have any objections? You don't
18	have any further objections?
19	You sent some comments in, Russell, and
20	they
21	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah. You
22	know, I have to confess, I haven't read this thing
23	that you're now referring to. Were my comments
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, yeah, your

comments --

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think so.
3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: to my
4	satisfaction? Okay.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because you were
6	expressing the notion that we don't really know how
7	all of this is going to turn out yet.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It's way too
9	soon to tell.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And so I agreed with
11	that.
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And so they modified
14	it to make it less inclusionary about how great
15	everything was. So I think you know, I think
16	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: now it can go.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I have no
19	objection.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And if we
21	need to send anything else later, we can.
22	Now, in project planning, we have to
23	figure out what the Commission will be doing for the
24	year 2000 and the year 2001. Fair Employment is our
25	statutory report next year that is what Fred's shop

1	is doing.
2	We approved already Expanding the
3	Economic Opportunities of African-American, Asian,
4	Latino Youth, and it was my impression that we added
5	Native Americans to that. Did we not? Does anybody
6	remember? It doesn't say that in this memo.
7	MS. MOY: No, that was supposed to be
8	like 2000. It's on the back.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you remember that
10	we did, anybody?
11	COMMISSIONER LEE: I thought we did. I
12	thought we added Native Americans.
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah, I think
14	so. I'm not clear, but I have a vague memory we did
15	that.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, do we want to?
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: We have it in
18	our proposal for 2001, right?
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Correct. Yeah.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: What's that
21	about? I can't remember.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Housing.
23	MS. MOY: It's Housing.
24	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, it's only
25	housing.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah.
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, on this
3.	economic opportunities
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.
5	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think,
6	particularly if we add Native Americans, I think we
7	ought to either do it in paces and/or stretch it
8	out. Why I say that is because I think the economic
9	issues are quite different, or certainly the answers
10	are quite different. They may suggest, you know, a
11	segmented approach.
12	What size is the project now? It's
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What size is this
14	project, Staff Director?
15	MS. MOY: It will take let's see,
16	starting on page 3, it's a three-year project right
17	now.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's a three-year
19	project?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So it's
21	already stretched. Okay.
22	Then, let me check my notes here and see
23	what I've got.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Charlie, do you want
25	to remind Russell of anything about this project?

1	Can you? Is there something
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I can't find
3	what notes are being
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Can you Charlie
5	is going to remind you, if I can find something for
6	her to talk into.
7	MS. PONTICELLI: Hi, Russell.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Hi.
9	MS. PONTICELLI: This was a project that
10	we had discussed. You were interested in knowing
11	the status of the MIS for this project.
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Oh, right.
13	That's right.
14	MS. PONTICELLI: And also, a
15	consideration as to whether this should be made
16	actually, not stretched but condensed to two years
17	instead of three, beginning in 2000.
18	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah. Okay.
19	Good. Thanks, Charlie.
20	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Madame Chair?
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: With respect to
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I'll get an answer
24	in a minute.
25	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: I'm sorry. I'm

still on the expanding the economic opportunities.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's what we're talking about.

Yeah. That REYNOSO: VICE CHAIR I iust Ι remember it and program, doublechecked and it seems to be correct -going to concentrate not generally on the economic opportunities but economic opportunities in And it seems to me that it would be innercity. appropriate, if we haven't already, to add Native American youth, because, actually, a majority of Native Americans now live in the cities, not reservations. I think that it would be correct that the issues are quite different for them when we're talking about economic development and reservations.

But insofar as we're talking about the innercity, I think maybe some of the issues that the innercity Native Americans deal with, Native American youths, might be somewhat related to the issues that African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Latino youths face. I'm not sure, but it seems to me that it likely would --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We should also -when we say Asian, shouldn't we say Asian-Americans?
We're not talking about Asians in Asia, are we?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right. No.
2	COMMISSIONER LEE: Asian-Americans and
3	Pacific Islanders.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah. And not
5	Asians because that sounds like we're talking about
6	people in Asia.
7	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right. Right.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which we're not, I
9	don't think.
10	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.
11	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So, Cruz, this
12	is urban?
13	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Okay.
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: This is urban and
16	even even innercity, as I understood it, and
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Innercity
18	and
19	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yeah.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah. I think
21	the issues intersect.
22	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yeah.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
24	Lee?
25	COMMISSIONER LEE: And when you look at

1	the background description, it does include Native
2	Americans. So it might be just an oversight
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In the title.
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: yeah, in the
5	title, because the title was the original title. It
6	has not changed to reflect other changes, such as
7	Pacific Islander, so so I'm pretty sure we
8	approved adding on Native Americans, because I think
9	we had two discussions on that.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, I remember
11	that, too, so we
12	COMMISSIONER LEE: Right.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: will do that.
14	Now, where is the MIS for this project?
15	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: It looks like
16	it's not there yet.
17	MS. MOY: No, it is.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is it?
19	MS. MOY: Oh, just a minute. No, I'm
20	sorry. It isn't.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It isn't there?
22	MS. MOY: No.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: There is no MIS for
24	this project?
25	MS. MOY: No.

- 1	
1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
2	MS. MOY: And also, Madame Chair, I
3	believe that Native Americans are subject to a
4	different body of law.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, that's true.
6	Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: No, but this
8	is economic
9	MS. MOY: Yeah.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And that can be
11	taken into account when we do it.
12	Are you waving your hand?
13	MS. ROFF: Yes. I'm Jessica Roff. I'm
14	a new attorney in the General Counsel's office.
15	Federal Indian law only applies on
16	federal Indian lands. Individuals who are within
17	the boundaries of state or city locality are not
18	going to be impacted by a different set of laws, so
19	just for clarification.
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you, Jessica.
21	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Thank you.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you very much.
2 3	And welcome.
24	(Laughter.)
25	Okay. Now, there is no MIS yet for this

1	because what what was the answer to that?
2	MS. MOY: We haven't done it. It has
3	not been scheduled.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because it hasn't
5	been scheduled.
6	MS. MOY: This is all planning.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Because it hasn't
8	been because we're planning. Did you hear that,
9	Russell?
LO	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah. Now,
Ll	what year are we in now?
L2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We're in FY
L3	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 2001 for this?
L4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: This says FY 2000,
L5	it's supposed to well, it's supposed to start, it
L6	says here, FY 1999.
L7	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm skeptical
18	about that. If we haven't planned for it, how could
19	that be?
20	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Is this still
21	planned to start in FY 1999, or not? Or do you want
22	to push that into the year 2000?
23	Well, the first question we have to ask
24	ourselves, and I don't know the answer to this on
25	your point you keep making, Russell, about sizing

things down to the money we have. Is it realistic, first of all, for OGC to say that it's going to finish all of the projects that it has now before 2000? Because if it isn't realistic, then we don't need to be adding a bunch of projects to start when they're not going to finish the ones that they already have. So we need to know that first.

And if Mississippi and New York and the disability thing are all going to be pushed over until the next year, then obviously Expanding Economic Opportunity isn't going to be done.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We also have Crisis of Young African-American Men. So the first thing we need to know is: are the OGC projects that are already underway going to be completed on time, Staff Director, in FY1999, so that we can have a clear shot at what we're going to do in 2000? That's the first thing we need to know.

MS. MOY: I'm sorry. Would you --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We need to know whether the OGC projects that are listed for completion with dates under your Staff Director report, which are commitments, which may change, whether it's realistic to conclude that they're

1	going to be finished before the end of the fiscal
2	year. Because if they're not, then when you
3	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Which is July 1?
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes. We need to
5	October September 30th.
6	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: September 30th.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We need to rethink
8	what we're going to do about 2000. That influences
9	what we do about 2000.
10	MS. MOY: Madame Chair, I would like to
11	defer this to the General Counsel's Office. Most of
12	these should be completed in '99. But I would like
13	to defer the answers to the Office of General
14	Counsel, Stephanie Moore.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But don't you know
16	whether they will be finished or not? I mean,
17	hasn't the General Counsel shared with you
18	MS. MOY: Most should be completed, yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. So
20	MS. MOY: But probably ADA will not be.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: ADA will not be?
22	When is ADA supposed to be completed, according to
23	the MIS?
24	MS. MOY: Okay.
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It must be listed in

1	the Staff Director's report, too.
2	MS. MOY: Right. I'm going to look in
3.	
4	. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When is it supposed
5	to be finished?
6	I'm only asking because I don't think we
7	should commit ourselves or start talking about
8	MS. MOY: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: doing a bunch of
10	other stuff if we know we're not going to have space
11	to do it.
12	Russell, do you understand that?
13	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah. I am
14	starting to agree with you on this.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
16	MS. MOY: Wait a minute. I don't
17	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I'm supportive
18	of this project, Mary
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: but I think
21	we shouldn't start it in '99. That we ought to do
22	an MIS and make sure it fits in 2000.
23	MS. MOY: Our MIS says June '99, but
24	right now the MIS is wrong.
25	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The MIS
2	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I think it
3	makes your report wrong.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The MIS and the OGC
5	and the Staff Director says the Commissioner review
6	and comment on Americans With Disabilities will
7	begin June 17th. Is that right?
8	MS. MOY: Well, I have to make a
9	statement that I did not find out until yesterday
10	that some of the MIS software in OGC has had linkage
11	problems to the tasks before. So some of the
12	adjustments will have to be made, and we'll have to
13	resubmit the new dates, unless you can tell me now.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we don't know
15	whether these can be done? So we should assume
16	probably
17	MS. MOY: Most of them should be
18	completed by this fiscal year.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Russell, what did
20	you say about expanding economic just shift it
21	over to 2000?
22	
	over to 2000?

light of what was just said and in light of if we

don't have an MIS plan for this project. Then, based on that, we start it in 2000, not in '99, and that we shorten it up to two years.

We cannot forget what we were trying to do. You don't have to remember for three years. So the -- so I think we should shorten it. That's what I would propose.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And that we also keep in mind what we said the last time, which is that any project that we do, we want the report on the project, once we have an activity, like a hearing or --

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: -- whatever it is, to come out within a year of the time that we have the activity.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that we ask -- we accept this project, but we ask the Staff Director to have it rewritten to conform with the things we just said. Have it sized to within two years, make sure that it says that whatever is going to be done at each stage, the report on that stage is going to be done within a year of the date that we have the activity, and that all of this should be included in

our approval of the project.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes. And it all fits with the other projects that we have committed for this -- for that same time period.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So we're not

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: So we're not moving things that are impossible.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well --

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Madame Chair, I wonder if it might be that we express sort of a policy principle from the Commissioners, and then see whether the staff agrees or disagrees with that policy principle. If they disagree, then we need to have some discussions with the staff.

But I would articulate the policy principle as follows -- that once we accept a project, we would hope that the project would be done as quickly as possible, and then the reports would be done as quickly as possible after that. So that we would do, even if necessary, sort of project by project, rather than having four or five projects going on at the same time.

Or maybe, if the SAC believes that the staff is better dispersed if it has some people working on one project -- more than one project at

the same time, and yet it will be consistent with the principle that once we have a project it would be better to have it done quickly than have it published quickly.

For example, even on the issue of employment of youth of color, which apparently is projected now for three years, Russell suggests two years. I don't know. Maybe if the staff can really focus on it, they can -- we could hold hearings, or whatever, suggest that, and even a matter of six months, and then try to have -- then try to get the report out -- again, if they can put in the resources, instead of working on several projects at the same time.

At least as I've heard the discussions around the table in the last few years, it seems to me that that is -- I gather that to be the wish of the Commission, that we'd rather concentrate on a project, get it done, get it printed, so we can speak to those issues quickly instead of, say, waiting three years to be able to speak with some authority on the issue of employment of youth of color.

And so if my enunciation of the wish of the Commissioners is correct, maybe we can indicate

that to the staff, even on this project, and then they can come back and say, "Yeah, we agree," if they agree with that -- with those general notions. And they can say, "Well, we've got so much staff, if we really concentrate on it, having finished our other work, we can get it done in so much time. And by putting most of our staff, or whatever, on getting the report done, we think we can do it in so much time."

That is, I think I'd like to proceed on sort of the principle of once we accept a project, get it done as quickly as possible, then get the report done as quickly as possible, then have a dialogue or report back from the staff on whether or not that's doable.

For example, we are presumably going to vote on Crises of the African-American Young Men, and I think that's very important, too. But, frankly, if both projects are going to take a long time, I'd rather just vote on one and go forward on that, and then vote on the other one.

So I just want to express that general principle because I want to be respectful of the staff in terms of their being able to analyze where all of their resources are, and then they'd be able

to tell us, "Yeah. If we really concentrate on it, we can get it done in so much time." So that's the only sort of long footnote I would add.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, Crisis is already being done. We're going to have the consultation in -- when is it? April. That's going to take place in April.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay. Okay.

what I CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Now, was suggesting is not inconsistent with what you said, Russell, but I'm saying that what the staff should do -- the Staff Director should do -- is go back and take our decision and have the staff rewrite the project to make it fit, in whatever way. Whatever they have to cut out, whatever they have to add, to make sure that it fits within the notion that we just laid out, the two things that we just laid out in the discussion, and to make sure that it's going to happen within a certain period of time, and so that everybody knows that.

And when they propose things, they should keep in mind not to propose anything if they can't get it done within that period of time.

Because I think, really, what's going to happen if we don't start to clean this up is that they're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

going to put some language in our appropriations bill or our statute, just like they did with Fred's office, saying that we need to get things done by a And I think we can manage that certain time. ourselves, rather than having somebody tell us to do that, and that's what we ought to do.

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

So we're going to do expanding the opportunity issue.

Now we've got -- and Fair Employment. Those are two to begin in the year 2000. Is there anything else that -- we need to do an affirmative action project. We talked about that last time when we were here. And we need to figure out how to do that project.

We have someone writing a briefing paper for us, and we've talked about that. I think we probably -- maybe we could have a briefing here for ourselves, just like we have briefings all the time, to discuss some of the issues. Maybe in 19 -- in the year 2000, we could have some activity -- I'm not sure what kind, whether a forum or whether a hearing, or whatever -- in some of the places where this issue has generated a lot of heat on higher education.

Maybe in Texas, maybe in California

- 1	S and the second
1	somewhere, maybe in the State of Washington, to ask
2	ourselves the three questions that we discussed last
3	time what's the issue? What has happened? What
4	do we do? What is being done?
5	But I don't know if that ought to be a
6	project for 19 for 2000. It's not a project for
7	this year. All that's happening is the briefing
8	paper is being written for us to discuss and any
9	briefing we might have.
10	So if we had an affirmative action
11	project in 2000, how would that impact on the work
12	that is already on the books for the year 2000? And
13	would we be able to start the expanding economic
14	opportunity? Which office is doing the expanding
15	economic opportunity?
16	Ms. MOY: OGC
17	MR. ISLER: Both offices.
18	MS. MOY: Both offices.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's a joint
20	project. Who is doing the first part of it?
21	MR. ISLER: OCRE.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. If we did
23	affirmative action and made that a joint project in
24	the same way, would we be able to accommodate that?
25	And we would probably, if we did if we had any

	49
1	hearing component, we would probably do transcripts
2	and statements like we're doing with Schools and
3	Religion, as opposed to trying to do findings and
4	recommendations, which takes forever, apparently, to
5	get done.
6	MS. MOY: I think the first thing we
7	would have to look at is the 11 million passback
8	that we received or recommended. So then we
9	would have to pare down some of these projects that
10	have already that we have already put monies into
11	the approved projects for fiscal 2000.
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The only projects
13	that are down here are Fair Employment and Expanding
14	Economic Opportunity. Those are the only two that
15	are listed. So if you assume that all of the 1999
16	projects are going to be finished, then would the
17	budget be able as currently constituted, to
18	accommodate something on affirmative action? So why
19	don't we are you trying to say something, Fred?
20	What?
21	MR. ISLER: Are we making an assumption
22	based on 11 million?
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We are making that
24	assumption based on what we have now.

Okay, well we, of course, would have to

50 have a project concept and all that stuff down the 1 I'm just speaking conceptually here. 2 haven't seen anything, and we don't even know what 3 the shape of it would be because we haven't gotten 4 the briefing paper yet or had the briefing. 5 But I'm just saying that, for purposes 6 of planning, thinking about down the road doing some 7 sort of project. 8 in the say for now, Why don't we 9 10

interest of time -- I know Russell, you're going to have to go pretty soon.

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Very soon.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That we would agree that we want to do a project, but we would have to more clearly define it once we have the briefing paper, the briefing; but that we'll put a plug in or a space in for -- and have them think about what sort of project could be done within the resources we have available.

How's that?

COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I like that. And you mean by that, Mary, that, after this is all looked at, they would say well we've got a vast amount of money --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Right.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: in 2000,
2	here's what we can do for X.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's what I mean.
4	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yeah, good. I
5	like that.
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And this is the time
7	it would take us to do it.
8	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, okay.
10	Now we go to 2001, which is way out.
11	Block Grants have been on the books, I think, for a
12	long time. Does anyone still think we need to do a
13	project given all the time that's past and the
14	issues that have been raised?
15	Is this still a salient issue that the
16	Commission needs to, in the year 2001, keep on the
17	books as something that we might possibly do?
18	MS. MOY: Madame Chair, if we're to do
19	this, it would have to start in fiscal 2000 and it's
20	a two year project.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It says 2001 on this
22	memo I'm looking at.
23	Cruz, were you about to say something?
24	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Well, I was going
25	to comment that I think both block grants and the

1	issue we've talked about, about measuring
2	discrimination, don't have immediacy, but I just
3.	think they're so important that they should remain
4	on our books.
5	And those are going to be, I think
6	well, particularly measuring discrimination is going
7	to be, I think, pretty complicated. Block grants
8	probably would not be as complicated.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Let me just tell
10	you, Russell, since you for all of us, and since
11	you may have to leave. Under 2001, the block grants
12	and measuring discrimination, which are long term
13	projects
14	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and, no matter
16	when they're finished, they'd probably have some
17	saliency, so maybe we should leave them there as an
18	out year sort of thing to look at.
19	But here's what the others are:
20	Expanding Economic Opportunities I don't know
21	what that is, but I guess I could read the
22	description.
23	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Well, that's
24	the carrying forward of
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: That's the same one

we're doing, and we're going to drop it back to two 1 2 years. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Right. 3 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And evaluation of 4 federal civil rights enforcement efforts. This is 5 something OCRE proposed that we --6 COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Extension for 7 8 that year. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, maybe we could 9 And that would fit 10 make that a statutory report. the statutory report concept. 11 It fits right COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 12 13 in for --CHAIRPERSON BERRY: If we were to do it, 14 Were you proposing it as a statutory report? 15 16 MR. ISLER: Yes, yes. Okay. So that would 17 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Then we've got one they're proposing in 18 be good. 19 discrimination in professional sports. I'm not 20 sure. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: I don't think 21 they entice enough people. Although an interesting 22 23 issue, it's not on the frontier of civil rights, I don't think, in terms of -- I mean, when you compare 24 25 it to something like crisis in youth or employment

1	opportunity, color.
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What about you,
3	Carl, does it make your heart stop?
4	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, the
5	prospect of taking on the Major League Baseball
6	leagues sort of makes my heart stop at times, but
7	I'd be willing to consider that, although I'd like
8	to discuss it in a little bit larger context.
9	So if we're prepared to do that, we can,
10	or do you want to wait until later?
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Why don't we go
12	ahead and do that.
13	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, I'll just list
15	the rest of them for Russell before he leaves.
16	Financial Aid for Higher Education,
17	Voting Rights, Discrimination Against Persons with
18	HIV and AIDS. I think that that
19	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: That fits over
20	in ADA.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, we've covered
22	that, so we don't need to worry about that.
23	Consumer racism that was an issue we had a
24	briefing on. Remember that?
25	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yeah.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Racism and sexism we
2	had a briefing on. That one I think what's the
3.	status of that issue? There have been some lawsuits
4	that have been won. Consumer people buying
5	things in stores and I don't know, what's the
6	priority of that?
7	The gender disparities, wasn't that in
8	health, employment and what else health,
9	employment
10	MS. MOY: Access to health, that's it.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Gender disparities.
12	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Mary, I'm
13	sorry, I'm going to have to leave.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Well, and the
15	last one, Native American issues, that was a housing
16	one. We'll go back and continue to discuss these,
17	but we'll leave block grants and measuring, and
18	we'll go ahead and discuss the rest of them, all
19	right?
20	COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: Yes, good.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And we've
22	agreed before you go, Russell, we've agreed that
23	the statutory report will be civil rights
24	enforcement efforts. We'll keep block grants on and
25	measuring. So we've got five people here to agree

to that. 1 Any objection to that? 2 Without objection, those are ordered to 3 be included and we'll go on with the others. 4 Now, let's discuss professional sports, 5 Carl. 6 Thanks. COMMISSIONER REDENBAUGH: 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Thank you. 8 VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Thank you, Russell. 9 If I could back COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: 10 up for a minute and address Cruz's point earlier 11 about shorter time frames. I'd like to hear from 12 both Stephanie and Fred, at an appropriate time, as 13 to what they think the benefits of longer time 14 frames for reports versus shorter time frames, what 15 problems are endemic in the longer time frame in 16 terms of us meeting our schedule. 17 think all Ι mean, Ι we know 18 hypothetically what some of them are; but, 19 practical matter, I think it would be good to hear 20 Obviously the complexity of some of the 21 from them. topics of the reports mandate a longer time frame. 22 23 There's a trade off there, and perhaps whether it wouldn't 24 ought consider beneficial for us in the next couple of years to do 25

more narrow reports in a shorter time frame than 1 2 3 4 5 of a project. 6 7 8 9 10 appropriate to work on it? 11 12 13 14 their input on it. 15 16 17 18 19

more complex reports over a much longer time frame.

I think it would also be interesting, at least for me, to know what we get when we close off a report and decide we're not going to do this type

Do we actually free up people who can be immediately assigned to a different report, or is it because of the complexities of that report you cannot assign the people because they're not

I think those kind of things would be interesting to discuss with the offices that are actually day to day working on these reports and get

Now, baseball. I think I would be open to looking at that as a report. But, you know, if you're going to take on the national leagues like this project suggests, then I think we have to have a very well prepared product, and a product that meets time lines, and a product that is credible, and a product that doesn't have, for example, anecdotal information.

Because, I mean, what we're really doing is targeting an industry, and I suspect that they

20

21

22

23

24

are going to have whatever resources are at their disposal to respond to it, so we have to have a very good product.

That being the case, I think it's not a \$200,000 project. I think it's, you know, a greater outlay of resources. So that's what I have to say about that, but I'd be open to it.

But I think we ought to consider it in a little bit more of that broader context that, Cruz, you're raising.

For example, looking at the health care issue of women, that project. I mean, as I read the project outline there, it seems to me that a lot of this is already in the general domain, that we can reinforce that, and that's a good thing if that's what we see ourselves doing.

There are some other issues, it seems to me. For example, in health care of women, using the male physiology as the model. Now, that seems to be kind of a cutting edge issue in medical school education. But if a report by the Commission were to focus more on that kind of an issue, it could be done much more quickly and could be distributed to every medical school.

That would have a narrow, initially,

impact, but it could have a major impact. Every medical school suddenly confronted with a report by the Civil Rights Commission that there is a fundamental flaw in their approach to medical school education in terms of women's health care.

The fact that maybe some women are researchers at a particular hospital or medical school have already sort of begun that discussion is different than us getting into it. It could have a long term effect.

That's a different -- that's kind of a different report strategy than we've been thinking about in the past, but maybe it's something we ought to consider as part of the idea of narrowing a shorter time frame and getting reports that would have an effect, even it's a more narrow effect than a broader effect that we hope, but is more difficult to measure.

And I think it has an impact on morale of the staff, as we were discussing earlier, because it seems to me we need to get better feedback. And the best thing we can do in terms of increasing the product of the Commission is to get at least some segments of the nation responding to our reports in a very timely and positive way.

And that means, I think, we have to have more of a rifle shot approach to our audience.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Madame Chair, I agree with those observations, and particularly with respect to my emphasis on getting the work done as quickly as possible to manifest some projects that per force, in terms of the time it will take to research and all that, will take longer.

But I would like to have the staff think about whether it's a project that naturally will take longer, or whether it's a project that, in times past, has taken longer simply because we didn't have the resources, which appears to have been certainly true in some of the areas we've had.

If it's the latter, that we don't have resources, I'd rather have the resources go toward that project to get it done rather than working on two or three others. But if there's a project that, by nature, is going to take even three years, then you simply can't push it forward.

But that, presumably, will only take a moderately small percentage of the staff. And then if meanwhile other projects that are maybe a year project or whatever can be done by other staff

13.

members, I would think that would make for a good combination.

But I agree that some projects, by their nature, would take a long time. But we should know -- we should hear from the staff whether, in their view, it's that type of project or whether they think it's going to take longer just because we don't have the staff.

Then we can decide hey, we'd rather free up the staff to work on that project and get it done more quickly than be working on two or three projects at the same time. But I think the observations are apt.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I think that the gender report proposal ought to be rewritten in light of the comments that Carl made about an approach to the health care issue. The main thing we need to get from our projects is impact, as you said, impact in the public; that there is some responsiveness and that we are dealing with issues that are crucial, and that's one way to do it.

I am going to let us hear from Fred and Stephanie. But, before I do that, I wanted to say that another suggestion that we might make to sort of speed up the process of doing our reports is to -

- this is just a suggestion -- is to let the staff do the hearings and things like that, and then to hire someone to write the actual reports.

Because the Commission has done that in the past. It has happened. And that way, the staff can -- since the major difficulty seems to be in trying to get the reports written, that somebody else could write them.

have reports We can either not summaries and transcripts and simply have statements, which may take a shorter period of time, or we may hire someone whose job it is -- or we may the responsibility some in divide up organization so that there are folks who prepare hearings and do them, and the staff seems to be very good at that, and there are people who write the reports.

I mean, I don't know what the issues are, but those are suggestions. Or we may go back to that there are some things that we might contract out and get the agreement with our committee that that's something we ought to do for whatever the thing is, particular projects, as a way of trying to get more work done.

But I really do think that, in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

nanagement terms, if the way to manage is to figure out how much time something is going to take when one proposes it, and to take into account contingencies which are not new contingencies -- they arise all the time -- when it -- inevitably someone will get sick, someone will -- something will happen, it always does -- and to take that into account when one is planning.

But anyway, I think the health -- this gender thing ought to be rewritten in light of that.

And on professional sports, I think that it ought to be rewritten in view of the comments that Carl was making. Although it's a valid concept, it's actually going to cost a lot more money than what's proposed here.

Yes?

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Again, Madame Commissioner Anderson's Chair, agree with Ι observation that we would be taking on an industry that has prided itself on diversity and opportunity to all Americans, and we would be saying maybe so, but only in part of the industry. Look at these other parts of the industry.

And I think they would be responding rather vociferously. And I agree with Carl that we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

really have to have a solid base beyond anecdotes in terms of showing. We've heard, of course -- there's some folk who follow this, as we know, professionally, and we would have to be very solid on the staffing of central offices that we've heard complaints about, on some sports being conspicuously absent in terms of diversity.

And we would have facts and figures and look at the background of why that happened and all that. I think it would have to be a very, very solid report that would be unassailable. And hopefully, after the report, the leaders of the industry would say yeah we've been saying how great we are, but we have to recognize that here we've got to improve.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And I also think though that the report -- that the proposal is, in a sense, too narrow because there are a lot of issues related to gender discrimination involved with professional sports and not just race discrimination.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So that to focus on race and not on gender at all doesn't make any sense. So if the proposal is rewritten, it ought to

take into account both those things. And I'd be 1 We'll see it when it's willing to support it. 2 rewritten and support it right now conceptually, but 3 with a sufficient amount of money to do it well. 4 On Native American issues, I am not sure 5 -- and I need to be persuaded, Staff Director --6 that for Native Americans the housing issue is the 7 We said we were going to do most important issue. 8 more issues. We have Native Americans added to the 9 10 expanding economic opportunity. How did this come about? Is housing, of 11 all the other -- I thought Native Americans were 12 13 concerned about casinos and fishing rights and all sorts of self-determination issues like that. 14 the housing -- from whence comes the -- what is the 15 16 rationale for the housing proposal being the one that we would pick to do? 17 18 MOY: Ιf you're going to MS. 19 Stephanie and Fred up here, then she can explain 20 I thought it was in the expanding economic this. 21 opportunities. 22 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But do you agree 23 with her that this housing thing is the --24 MS. MOY: Yes, it is an important issue,

as well as what you just mentioned before about the

	66
1	casinos in light of that as well. And I also
2	understand that some treaties are also coming to the
3	end of their term, so we may be able to expand that
4	a little bit more.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
6	MS. MOY: But I think also, before we do
7	that, in fiscal year '99 we need to know from
8	Commissioners if you still would like for the Office
9	of General Counsel to conduct a health care hearing.
10	And then, if yes, we need to set a date for that.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Where is the health
12	care hearing listed? Where?
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Under item number
14	one under
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Oh, you mean the
16	enforcement of nondiscrimination laws related to
17	health care for women and members of
18	Ms. MOY: Right.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: racial and ethnic
20	minority groups, statutory reporting hearing?
21	MS. MOY: Uh-huh.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: My own view would be
23	
23	that, given the dates that you have given us for the

which is already a hearing, and the dates that we

have for things in 2000, that there's no room to do this in FY1999, and that all we would have 2 another report with a transcript and no report, you 3 know, which would be added to the other stuff to do 4 in the year 2000. 5 So I would say that we I don't know. 6 would push that off to another year if we intend to 7 And we can't do it next year either given 8 what we have decided to do unless we get more money. 9 We clearly can't do it this year. 10 In my view, I don't see any time to do 11 So that answer, unless somebody objects, is no, 12 we aren't going to do that this year. 13 MS. MOY: Okay. 14 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And we would then 15 push that over to 2001 and take a look at it again. 16 17 So, the only other activity that we have this year is -- that will be produced, aside from the reports 18 that are coming up, is Fred's report which is to go 19 to the Congress. 20 And the OGC hearing was related to that. 21 But even if we did the OGC hearing, when would the 22 report be done according to the proposal? I don't 23 see that here in my book. 24

Does anybody have that proposal?

25

When

1	was it supposed to be done?
2	MS. MOY: Remember I mentioned that
3	there was some slippages in the MIS? So we're going
4	to have to get that for you.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: When was the
6	nondiscrimination, the health care do any of you
7	know?
8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible
9	comment from an unmiked location.)
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, but the
11	question is, how many months after the hearing would
12	it take to do the report, whatever the date is? How
13	many months of work, how many days of work, how many
14	hours of work, how many hours are projected for it
15	to take?
16	MS. MOY: We'll have to ask the General
17	Counsel's Office.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Did you already ask
19	her?
20	MS. MOY: No, I did not.
21	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Madame Chair, I
22	have a different question. Since these projects
23	were approved and scheduled to '99, I don't know
24	whether the staff has actually done work on all

these matters --

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Have they?
2	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: and whether they
3	will be going to waste if we don't proceed. I just
4	think I'd just like to know. It won't determine
5	my opinion, but it's something that will influence
6	it.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: What's the answer?
8	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: No work has been
9	done? Okay.
10	MS. MOY: No work.
11	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay, okay, that
12	helps me.
13	MS. MOY: And then also for the fair
14	employment, OCRE staff, they will be finished with
15	part of their project, and so they need to start
16	their next after their health care, they need to
17	start their fair employment in '99, fiscal '99.
18	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: But we need to nail
20	down I already said we might push this to 2001.
21	However, it is obviously related to the project that
22	Fred is finishing up, which is how it started.
23	MS. MOY: Right.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So the question is,
25	how many months would it take after we agreed to a

	70
1	hearing to get the report done? Okay, you don't
2	need dates to know that. You just need to know how
3	many months it would take to do the report.
4	MS. MOY: My guess would be six months.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Six months? So if
6	indeed what do we have scheduled for February for
7	the Commission meeting to act on, any projects or
8	anything? The crisis is in April.
9	So if we decided to do a hearing though,
10	how long would it take OGC to get ready to do the
11	hearing since they haven't done any work on it?
12	So my question really is, is it possible
13	for them to do a hearing? Let me just answer the
14	question. Having done no work on it
15	MS. MOY: No.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and having the
17	dates that you have in the staff director's report
18	for all the other things, is it possible, even if we
19	said we wanted them to do it, for a hearing to take
20	place this year from OGC?
21	MS. MOY: No.
22	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, then that's
23	the answer to the question.
24	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay, okay.
1	1

CHAIRPERSON BERRY:

25

We can't do it

1	anyway.
2	MS. MOY: Okay.
3	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So now the question
4	is, should we do it next year? And the answer to
5	that question relates to whether everything else is
6	going to be finished and whether we can do the three
7	things that we've already agreed to do in the year
8	2000.
9	What's the answer to that?
10	MS. MOY: No.
11	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We can't?
12	MS. MOY: Correct.
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So we can't. So the
14	only possibility is to move it over to the year 2001
15	and hope that if we got some money by that time and
16	everything else was straightened out, we would be
17	able to do it then.
18	Isn't that the only hope?
19	MS. MOY: Yes.
20	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Now, we could
22	hear briefly did you want to say something, Carl?
23	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: No.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could we hear
25	briefly from Stephanie and Fred in answer to

Commissioner Anderson's question?

MR. ISLER: Commissioner Anderson, in order for me to answer your question, let me use the health care project proposal as an example of length of time and the complexity.

When we originally proposed the health care project proposal to the Commissioners, we proposed that that project would take from 14 to 18 months to do. We also indicated because we were looking at over maybe 10,000 state programs, health care state programs in addition to HHS, we also proposed that we have health science administrators assigned to that project.

Of course, that project was proposed based on our \$16 million dollar budget. Well, as soon as we determined what the pass back was going to be, we immediately discussed that project with the staff director.

And the staff director, in turn, requested that we take another look at that health care project and scale it back and reshape it within the \$8.9 million dollars.

And also, in order to deal with the complexity is sues, we would have to have experts on various state programs, medical programs, health

science administrators, and also experts dealing
with medical theories and concepts, which we were
unable to get because we were unable to contract out
for health science administrators.

So we immediately revised that project proposal to eliminate the section on state programs and where we were going to deal with -- in a cross between medical concepts and theories. We scaled that back to where we would only look at HHS as an agency, and we would only look at Title VI enforcement -- civil rights enforcement and the nondiscrimination provisions in the Hill-Burton Act.

And we also immediately started trying to recruit some interns that were in social policy type fields to do research for us on some of the programs we have like Medicare or Medicaid or managed care, private insurance, so that we would have issue papers written for the staff that we could read so we could come up to speed on some of those issues.

And that cut back on resources because these were unpaid interns. And they -- we really had like 15 unpaid interns last summer working on the project. And that sort of gave us a head start on the project. And we also had briefings with

various health care professionals so that they could help us come up to speed on some of the health care issues.

And we have now scaled the project back not only from 14 to 18 months, to we're trying to do this project really -- the staff is trying to do this project in like nine months and get it to the commissioners, which would be unprecedented.

June, it would be a first for this Commission. And we're very close to doing that. And also, we're trying to also -- I'm trying to use my management skills to not let the staff just go off into tangents and look at every issue that they come across, because you have a tendency to want to do that.

One of the drawbacks in that is trying - and I don't mean disrespect -- you have to try not
to second guess the Commissioners. And you just
have to focus on what you think is important and not
what the Commissioners would want in that report
because then it becomes out of control.

And you have to take that risk that if the Commissioners decide that there's a major issue out there that we missed, then they would give us

the time to go back and deal with that issue. And that's basically it.

And also, one other thing we had to do early on is we couldn't wait until after we had finished all the research to make contact with the agency because it -- we can't control when they provide us with information.

So we had to do that early on and build in a system where, if we missed things, we would have to be able to go back and ask them for the additional information and get them on board with us to understand that we have this deadline and we can't meet this deadline without these agencies working with us.

And get them to understand how important these issues are and we're not just out here to criticize them, we're here to help them ensure that minorities and women are -- have equal access to what I consider quality health care.

And that's basically my response to your question. And we're going to also take a look at the fair employment practice project proposal because that proposal also was -- is really a 14 month project. Well, we don't have 14 months.

So we're going to have to take a look at

1	that and decide what we can scale back. And we
2	would communicate to the staff director. And we are
3	going through that process now.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: So essentially you
5	resize based on and adjust based on the resources
6	that are available?
7	MR. ISLER: That's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. And the time
9	that you have to deadlines you have to meet?
LO	MR. ISLER: Right, and you have to focus
LI	on the expertise you have on your staff, too, and in
L2	what area. And you do as Dr. Berry said, you do
L3	have to anticipate that you're going to have turn-
L4	overs also. You have to anticipate that and try to
Ľ5	give yourself some leeway.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And one of the
L7	advantages you have, Fred, is that you do have this
L8	statutory deadline and you do have one big report to
19	do as an advantage.
20	MR. ISLER: A big advantage.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which means that
22	MR. ISLER: It's a huge advantage.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Which means that
24	let's go now to General Counsel.
25	MS. MOORE: Okay, thank you,

Commissioner Anderson, for posing the question and giving us an opportunity to respond.

I guess, rather than using a specific project, I would respond in the following way in terms -- I think there are four factors that principally affect the longevity of a project, some of them unique to OGC and some of them agency-wide.

First, I think two of the issues Fred has alluded to -- one is the scope of the project itself. That is, what the complexity of the project in terms of subject matter. That certainly can affect how much research is required and how much time it takes for the staff, based on their relative skills, to complete a project.

The unpredictable factors that both Fred and the Chair have alluded to -- sicknesses, turnover and what have you -- also affect the longevity or duration of a project. But there are others -- there are two other major factors that also affect all of our projects, I think, and again some that are unique to OGC.

One is one that I think the Commissioners rarely focus on, and that is the internal processes that are required for each project. Under regulation or AIs, we are required

ı

to take certain steps for certain projects regardless of their complexity.

So a project that may, in some respects, seem to be less complex nevertheless has to go through the legal sufficiency review process, has to go through the editorial board process, the affected agency review process.

And managers have been getting together and talking about these issues with the staff director, and I think that it's -- those types of things are under consideration. But there are time frames that are imposed on -- for some of these elements through the process of a project and some are more based on experience and/or staff resources at the time.

So that's another element. One of the main elements I think that affects OGC is overall management -- central management, if you will, of projects. There -- and I heard reference earlier to MIS figures for some of the projects that are outstanding or have been approved or considered by the Commissioners.

Unfortunately, if you look at the MIS and the specific tasks that are associated with OGC projects, and also I think OCRE projects, one

problem that we encounter in OGC is that all of our dates revolve around a hearing date.

And the Commissioners rarely decide at the beginning of a planning cycle where they want to have the hearing, at what point. Even a general date, you know, just fall, spring, some time frame that we can then begin to piece out an MIS planning schedule.

So that also affects OGC and has affected us throughout my tenure how we can effectively plan hearing projects.

As you know, in the past it's been -hearing projects have been -- or hearing dates have
been announced randomly throughout the year. We
then have to readjust our work priorities and begin
to schedule out a hearing.

It's been my recommendation to the staff director that, for any hearing projects that are approved by the Commission, that we get a date in the beginning of the planning cycle so that we can then prepare MIS and people on the staff would know from the beginning of the planning cycle exactly what their workload is.

But again, one of the things that has affected OGC and its progress on outstanding

projects is that we have to stop and do 1 Schools and Religions hearings. And lawyers know 2 that there's, you know, lead time. If you leave 3 something, when you come back to it you're going to 4 take two or three weeks to get back into it and then 5 to begin to write. 6 So there is some lag time when people 7 are working on two or three projects and they don't 8 know in the beginning of the year precisely what it 9 is that they have on their plate for the full year. 10 So those are the types of things that I 11 think affect the duration of a project. 12 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you have any --13 anyone have any -- yes? 14 I just wonder --VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: 15 it seems to me that we do need to come up with a 16 more sophisticated give and take between staff and 17 Commission decisions 18 SO that for 19 Stephanie mentioned that it would be helpful to staff to have a hearing date. 20 21 We, in turn, would need to know from the 22 staff about how long they think the original 23 internal research is going to take even before they start setting those dates. And then, based on that, 24

we can set a hearing date.

So the information needs to flow both ways. And my impression is, based on the time I've been here, that we haven't had enough of that flow of information going each way.

Then, if we have a project that's going to go a year and it requires three full time attorneys to work on that, when we come up with other projects we have to be sure that we have more than three attorneys to be working on that so that the attorneys can continue working on that project and not have the loss of lag time that we all know happens when you shift particularly big pieces of work like that.

So hopefully out of this discussion maybe we can have that two-way sharing of information, particularly, I would assume, between the staff director and the Chair. And the two of you presumably go through the staff director so we know what's happening.

And then, if we select a project, then you folks -- in fact, I was going to -- it seems that even though the answer was no work has been done on the FY 1999 projects -- it's true that no work has been done, but a lot of thinking has obviously gone into it just from Fred's description

	82
1	on
2	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: No, no, that's
3	Fred's report. Fred finished his part. Stephanie
4	was supposed to have a hearing OGC was going to
5	have a hearing in addition to Fred's component.
6	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right, right.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: He's finishing his.
8	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.
9	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: It's the OGC part
10	that nothing has been done on.
11	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Oh, okay. I
12	thought the report was that nothing had been done.
13	Well, clearly a lot has happened.
14	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, the OCRE part.
15	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay, okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yes, Commissioner
17	Lee?
18	COMMISSIONER LEE: Your presentation is
19	very helpful to me, so thanks very much.
20	I just have one question. We talked
21	about the possibility of either concentrating on one
22	major project or having the staff to do different
23	projects at the same time. Can you share with me

your comments on whether -- what are the benefits

and drawbacks, let's say, to have staff working on a

24

dual track, on multiple projects?

MS. MOORE: I think that -- I mean, you know, we're a legal staff. Lawyers are accustomed to juggling a number of projects at one time. I don't think that that has hampered us. It has been the planning of those multiple tasks and our inability to plan in advance what it is each person is going to be responsible for.

So, I mean, you know, we inherited a backlog, and people are sort of digging -- well, we dug our way out of the backlog; but, from that point forward, there was no -- there was no concerted effort to plan in advance what it is that any given person in OGC would be doing for -- throughout the fiscal year.

So if -- for example, if a particular staff member was assigned to the Los Angeles Project, they're working on the Los Angeles Project either preparing the hearing, interviewing witnesses or writing the report, whatever stage it's in.

And then, you know, the fifth meeting of the Commission, the Commission decides we want to do an L.A. hearing. Then I have to look at the staff and redistribute and assign people to that project who may have been working on L.A. who now have to stop work on L.A. for the immediate purpose of planning a hearing and return to that.

If we know in advance that that person is going to be working on all of these projects, then they can manage their time accordingly. And I guess the other part of this, the other piece of the problem for OGC, Commissioner Lee, is that -- and it ties into what the Vice Chair was asking.

We can certainly anticipate a time frame for background research. But again, because of the nature of the beast and OGC, the type of project that we're planning, we come to a screeching halt at the point of not knowing a hearing date or a hearing time frame because -- for example, I was -- we were discussing this the other day.

If we were looking at L.A. and police, which we did, and the staff -- because we're trying to identify witnesses for an actual public event, it is necessary for us to have a time frame.

Because if we interview Willie Williams, for example, and that is the person that we want to have a hearing date and call. we don't Commission, four months later, put forth a hearing date, and Willie Williams has been -- has left, then all over again with have to start we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

interviewing process.

So it's necessary for us to know again way in advance so that the entire offices' work can be planned at one stage. Now obviously, throughout any year, adjustments have to be made, but we need to know in the beginning of every fiscal year, preferably October, what is on our plate for the full year so that the entire year can be planned out given the staff resources that are available at that time.

COMMISSIONER LEE: So assuming by the end of this fiscal year all your backlogs are cleared -- the L.A., New York and Mississippi reports are all done. Starting fiscal year 2000, if the Commission approves three projects, --

MS. MOORE: Right.

COMMISSIONER LEE: -- measuring discrimination, economic opportunities, affirmative action, your staff will be able -- and we will set a general idea where we want to have the hearing, your staff will be able to conduct all this work and, at the same time, allow some flexibility to deal with certain issues that may come up during the year.

Because I know that I hesitate to bring up certain issues that I find relevant. The

1	briefing may answer a lot of my concerns. But
2	because of all these back logs, I haven't been
3	asking. But you are telling us as long as you know
4	in advance what's expected of your office and a time
5	general time frame, you will be able to have the
6	flexibility to not only meet those responsibilities,
7	but, at the same time, allot staff time to deal with
8	expected
9	MS. MOORE: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER LEE: emergencies.
11	MS. MOORE: Yes, yes, I'm saying that,
12	at that time, based on what my staff resources are,
13	I could be able to more effectively respond to the
14	Commissioner's request to do two projects or three
15	projects and plan it out.
16	Now, again, I think that any office is
17	going to experience the unpredictable adjustments
18	that are necessary, but I would suggest that if we
19	begin planning in this more comprehensive way, that
20	any lag or lag time would be no more than a month
21	or two.
22	I mean, you wouldn't have substantial
23	lags in projected time lines and the actual product.
24	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Vice Chair.

REYNOSO:

CHAIR

VICE

25

on

the

Based

1	history as you've seen it, I assume that you're
2	going to factor in the planning for the big projects
3	who will not be there. That is, you know about on
4	the average how many sick days you'll have, and you
5	know also at least you have an indication in the
6	last, say, two or three years how many special
7	projects have come up, as Yvonne has indicated.
8	So presumably, if you have five
9	attorneys and you've figured out that 20% of the
10	time will be taken with sick leave, vacation leave,
11	special projects and so on, then presumably you'd be
12	firmly assigning only four lawyers to be working on
13	those projects.
14	That is, you can take into account what
15	you already know that Commissioners are going to be
16	bringing up issues and you know, based on history,
17	roughly about that that takes one or two attorney
18	year times to do those.
19	I assume that that can be factored into
20	your projection for the year.
21	MS. MOORE: Right, as well as LSRs. I
22	mean, we do quite a bit of work down there.
23	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.
24	MS. MOORE: We've got a very good,
25	committee staff

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.

MS. MOORE: -- who, at the drop of a hat, will stop to do certain legal projects. So yeah, I think that's --

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Commissioner
Anderson.

commissioner and comment of the like you to respond to, but you can comment on the other two if you like. The first is the internal procedures that we ought to know about in which we can be helpful -- for example, the hearing dates -- I think it would be helpful to us if we could have more input like that.

Now, some of the internal procedures have to be dealt with with the staff director and worked out. I'm not interested in those. But where it appears that our actions could be helpful, I think it would be good, whether it's a memo that goes through the staff director to us or another session like this after some reflection.

That's the first. Second, in terms of budget priorities, it seems to me that the last time we discussed the budget there was a rather lengthy discussion, as I remember it, about prioritizing of

projects so that if we receive the full amount of money that we had requested, we would do all of these projects.

If we didn't, then we would not stretch all the projects out, but we would remove certain projects and stay within a certain time line that we were initially projecting. It seems to me what we don't want to do is, if we get less money, then we go back and redo everything either shrinking or elongating.

But that seems to me to be something we need to focus more on in terms of giving you direction, and maybe it's worth a consideration by us again on that.

And the third observation I have is if we were to have a policy that for the next year or the next two years we would have a 12 month or a 14 month time line for every single project, it would not exceed 12 months or would not exceed 14 months conceptually -- that is, there may be something that occurs that lengthens the time line.

But within the project planning process conceptually, no project would take over 12 months or 14 months. Now that would mean obviously that some of the projects would have to be narrowed in

But say if we were to terms of their scope. 1 that, would that -- would a much shorter time line 2 for projects be a better management tool for you? 3 Do you think you'd be able to hit targets more reasonably on a shorter time line? 5 What I'm getting at is, it seems to me we have a two 6 or three year time line for projects and one of the 7 things happens, since the production date is so far 8 out, it's easy to put that project on the bottom of the desk every time something else comes and tends 10 to spread out more. 11 12 13

4

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As the Commissioners over time look at the project, we keep changing it, and so you've got to keep going back to the drawing board. And thirdly, the project, as it gets longer and longer, keeps getting more stale in a lot of ways.

be something we So, should that That is, a much shorter time frame. consider? we're not going to approve of anything that we can't do in 12 or 14 months. Would that be a help to you or would it be a hindrance to you in terms of actually managing and meeting targets within reasonable period of time?

> MS. MOORE: Well, for me that --That's COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

something for us to decide, but, I mean, do you have 1 2 any comment on that? MS. MOORE: Well, for me I think we --3 it's doable, but -- well, let me back up and say 4 there are two questions that arise for me. 5 6 say within 12 months, is that the staff completing 7 its work within 12 months, oris that the Commissioners approving the product and the product 8 being disseminated within that 12 month period? 9 We have no control over the latter, so 10 11 that's one concern. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Ι think I'm 12 talking a target date to us. 13 MS. MOORE: Okay. 14 15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: If 12 months 16 looks too short, maybe make it 14 months. But the 17 point is, within the horizon of a foreseeable 18 future, --19 MS. MOORE: And again, I think that goes 20 back, to me, to the processes that we are required Now, if -- I understand I didn't know 21 to undergo. 22 this history until a couple of days ago, I guess, 23 with -- in the executive staff meeting -- that the 24 affected agency review, for example, which, under 25 our AIs, requires for a four week time period for agencies to respond.

So the report is just sitting waiting on the agencies to respond. And once they respond, traditionally it's been a two to three week period to incorporate -- depending then on the complexity of the document that has been forwarded to them, and depending on the strength or weakness of their comments.

I don't know if -- we're trying to follow what the internal processes require. I don't know whether the staff director has the discretion to dispense with affected agency review for us or for the affected agency review to occur and we simply take it and attach it to the back of the document.

I would assume that there would probably be some political concerns that arise with respect to that whether we simply slap it at the back of a document or attempt to respond to those things. So again, I think that the processes, to me, are what all -- both offices are required to go through.

And when we sit down to plan it out, it would be project specific. I mean, can this particular project -- can we shorten, for example, the interview period to two weeks as opposed to two

months. It would be project specific and we would
have to make that determination at that point.

I just -- I'm not sure in a vacuum that
you could decide that all projects, whatever their

you could decide that all projects, whatever their topic, could be completed within a 12 to 14 month period given the tasks that are associated with it that -- I mean, you can look at it on the MIS there -- I mean, I think OGC has 133 tasks associated with any project, some of which overlap, some of which we have discretion to shrink and broaden.

But it depends on the particular -- I mean, you may want to decide as a policy matter that we won't issue subpoena duces tecums for anything. I don't know what that does to the quality of the given report.

But the other problem, and my staff has emphasized this point, is that the hearing record for us is generally far more than the Commissioners ever see whether it's a duces tecum hearing or not because the witnesses tend to send in -- as they are permitted to do, they do send in quite a bit of documentation, studies and the like that they've done.

So it's hard to answer in a vacuum. In theory, yes, I think that it's doable, but it would

be based on -- it would be project specific, and we would certainly make the effort on any particular project to map out a milestone that would comport with that overall principle.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could I make -- ask, first of all, before I make any comments. The staff director said that the dates in the staff director's report for these reports are wrong. Do you have new dates so that we can be up to date on this?

She said these dates are all wrong.

MS. MOORE: Yes, they are. Our MIS -we placed into the system the date where slippage
had occurred. And it was my understanding -- I
haven't received training on the MIS as of yet. It
was my understanding that the system was to compute
in the column with three weeks, two days.

It was to compute forward. And apparently we did not link or the system did not link -- I don't know what the problem was, but it did not project the dates forward once the new date was inserted. So we have general -- I have general time frames, but not the specific date for any of the projects here.

But the MIS will be submitted to the staff director.

1	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Could you tell us
2	what the general New York, Mississippi, and
3	schools and religion?
4	MS. MOORE: I can. Which three did you
5	ask me?
6	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: New York,
7	Mississippi, and Schools and Religion. And ADA,
8	yes. Crisis we know we're supposed to have the
9	consultation or whatever.
10	MS. MOORE: And which date are you
11	requesting?
12	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The one that it's
13	supposed to come to the Commissioners.
14	MS. MOORE: ADA would be December of
15	this year.
16	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: December 1999?
17	MS. MOORE: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay.
19	MS. MOORE: School and Religion is June
20	of this year.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Mississippi
22	or
23	MS. MOORE: Well, I'm just going
24	through. Mississippi I don't have the second
25	page. It looks like Mississippi is the summer,

early summer, but I don't have the second page with 1 I apologize. 2 me. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. 3 MS. MOORE: And New York is -- appears 4 to be also early -- May, early summer. 5 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay. Did I ask for 6 all of them? Anybody, did I miss anything? 7 And crisis, do you have a date for after 8 the consultation when we'd be able to --9 Those milestones are being -MS. MOORE: 10 - are in preparation, I'm hearing from --11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Do you have any idea 12 in terms of months or what you're projecting? 13 haven't projected anything yet? 14 MS. MOORE: No. 15 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, well one of 16 the things we've learned from this is that ADA will 17 So there will still not be ready this fiscal year. 18 be work going on on it in the next fiscal year. 19 What this means then, and we have to ask 20 light of this discussion, ourselves in 21 realistic for us to propose that enhancing economic 22 opportunities for minority youth, or youth of color, 23 and the -- what was the other one, the affirmative 24 action thing -- whether it's realistic to expect 25

those to be done in the next fiscal year in light of 1 the fact that ADA will not be finished until 2 3 December. Or it won't come to us until December. 4 Which means it will still be being worked on in the 5 fall. So we have --6 7 MS. Well, actually MOORE: no, it 8 doesn't because in the fall it's in the process of those reviews. But the draft has been -- will have 9 been completed substantially before that. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, and mУ question is whether we should -- on the affirmative 12 13 action one, whether we should have it be an OCRE-OGC 14 project or whether we should just get someone else 15 to do it so that OGC will not have the burden of 16 doing that while it's doing the enhancing economic 17 opportunities. I'm just trying to be realistic in terms 18 19 of what we're doing here. Because, from what I've 20 heard here -- I'll put a pin in that while I discuss 21 my reactions to the presentation that Fred and 22 Stephanie made. 23 The first is that on hearings, OSD ought 24 to suggest a hearing date to us when OSD suggests 25 the project to us. That's a responsibility of

management. Management should look at the priorities and what's going on with all the projects and come up with a proposed hearing date and give it to us.

And that hearing date ought to be consistent with everything else that's going on since we're not managing the agency. And then we can respond by either saying yea or nay or we need to do it another time. So we've got the cart before the horse here.

I think that that's absolutely necessary to do. The other thing that I think is that it should possible for every office to figure out how many months it takes to do something even if they don't have a date.

That is, how many months does it take to do research, how many months does it take to look up witnesses, how many -- or Fred's case, how many days does it take to research whatever it is, and how many months does it take to prepare the hearing or whatever the report is, and how many weeks does it take -- so that we would have a time line.

And we used to have that with project proposals for exactly -- we used to make staff do detailed ones exactly how many months it was going

to take for everything before we ever approved it.

The other thing that occurs to me -- and we ought to go back to that.

That again is a management responsibility. It's not our responsibility as commissioners, and we have to have something to review. The second thing -- the third thing is that we did indeed, at one point here, decide that when we received the budget and any budget discussion we had we would have different cuts about what the staff would do at different levels.

We discussed that a long time ago. And so instead of the staff coming back, as you said, Fred, and say okay, we didn't get 16, so now we have 11, so now we're going to do this, when the budget was first prepared there should be an analysis which says that, at this level -- and I think there is.

If we have \$8.9, this is what we're going to do. If we have \$11, this is what we're going to do. If we have \$16, that's what we're going to do. So that we could then come back and review whether we wanted to adhere to that, but we wouldn't be reinventing the wheel because we know that every year the level that comes back is not going to be exactly the level that we ask for.

again that is management So 1 Then I have a fourth responsibility to do that. 2 sort of over arching concern here. Listening to all 3 this, when was the last time that the manual for 4 hearings was rewritten, does anybody know? 5 What is the date on the -- how old is 6 the hearing manual? 7 MR. ISLER: It was written in '92. 8 MS. MOORE: The hearing manual or the --9 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: The hearing manual. 10 MS. MOORE: The hearing manual has been 11 updated since I've been here, so I don't know what 12 13 year that was. CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, maybe there 14 are things in it that could be, you know, cut out or 15 truncated or something, and maybe not. But 16 listening to the conversation, it made me conclude 17 that we are in a bind because hearings are a very 18 19 effective way to get information because we can subpoena people if we need to. . 20 21 But hearings are a totally inefficient 22 way to get anything done where we can say anything 23 about anything that's happening in any reasonable I mean, that's just fact, gang. We might as 24

well accept it, unless we figure out some different

way to do it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Because once you have a hearing, you get the glitz of we've got the hearing on, whatever. And then you can't say anything for three years or two years or whatever it is about whatever it is. And by that time, the issue may be dead and gone, or it may not.

So it may be that we ought to reuse hearings only for issues that have long term saliency where we think something for the ages is an issue. And that's not a criticism. It's just that if we can't figure out another way to do it, we need other work products.

We ought to see our other work products as things that we do -- we ought to see the hearing itself as an event where we get some visibility to the issue. And maybe we ought to begin as Commissioners to comment during the hearing about what we're hearing during the hearing.

That's a possibility for us to think about with the public relations office. You know, today we heard blah, blah, blah. And while there are no definitive statements about X, we, in fact, believe Y, Z.

We might consider, at the end of each

day's hearing, or the middle of the hearing or something, having some kind of statement which says what our impressions are. We ought to think about that. That's one way to get people to know what we think without waiting until the report is done.

The other thing is that we might then, at the end of the hearing, make some kind of preliminary statement. I don't know. But we've got to find some way without interfering with the -- but the processes of hearings and the way they've been described and the way we've experienced them, and coming up with findings and recommendations, and going through the transcripts and getting the other material takes a long time.

That's what I'm hearing. And so I don't know how you balance that. Whether we see briefings as a way to say something or whether we go to transcripts and statements afterwards to sort of speed it up.

But I just think that we, as Commissioners, when we propose things or when we think about issues -- and the final thing I'll say on this is we've got to have a way, Staff Director, to be able to respond to issues as they arise.

Some process, some procedure, something

in our array of tools to be able to do something 1 when something happens, whether it's state advisory 2 committees like we did with the church fires or 3 whether it's something to be able to not just let 4 things pass by without us being able to say anything 5 about them at all or do anything about them at all. 6 So I'll leave it at that. Those were my 7 8 reactions. Does anyone else have anything for Fred 9 and Stephanie? If not, thank you. 10 Yes? 11 I'm sorry, I received a MS. MOORE: 12 question for clarification purposes from the Deputy 13 General Counsel. 14 Commissioner Anderson, on the 12 month 15 time frame, we were also wondering whether it's the 16 Commission's view were you looking at this 12 or 14 17 month time frame from the date of approval of the 18 project or from the date of the -- for us, for our 19 purposes, the public proceeding? 20 Because that's -- you know, there may be 21 three to four months preparation period before the 22 And so that cuts down the -- you 23 actual event. know, if you're saying a 12 month period from the 24

time of the approval, there's four months there that

the event has not occurred that would be counted as 1 part of the 12 months. 2 So we were just trying to estimate which 3 one you were referring to. 4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think it was 5 the second. 6 MS. MOORE: After the event, right. 7 CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Yeah, that's what --8 we already discussed that last month, and we all 9 agreed, and we still agree, that we're talking about 10 the public proceeding. Because what we're really 11 talking about here is the public knowing we did 12 something and then not ever being able to 13 anything about it. 14 So it's 12 months from there. The 15 public doesn't know what we're doing before 16 actually do anything. 17 Well, the transcript was MOORE: 18 MS. 19 unclear from the December meeting. 20 And there are just two other points, if you'll indulge me, that I wanted to make. One was 21 that indeed, since I've been here, I have made 22 recommendations to the staff directors over time for 23 dates that I believe have been communicated and, 24

nevertheless, we didn't get dates until it

convenient for the Commissioners.

So I think that that is a useful sort of consensus amongst the Commissioners that we provide the dates and they go to you immediately upon recommendation.

The second thing I wanted to clarify, since you all are considering the Native American project, is that you may recall that the discussion of Expanding Economic Opportunities -- there was a lengthy discussion by the Commissioners after which the Commissioners concluded that the types of issues that -- and some that Dr. Berry referred to that Native Americans were concerned about were indeed subject to a different body of law than those that we were dealing with under Expanding Economic Opportunities.

And the Commission determined -- and I believe, at that time, John Dulles was actually on a conference call -- that there would be a briefing on those issues. And I don't know what happened after that point.

But the reason we focused on the housing issue is that it was my belief that there would be a briefing to explore the other types of Native American issues that you all expressed some interest

in, and that the Expanding Economic Opportunities 1 cover minorities basically in the 2 cities, as the Vice Chair has alluded to. 3 Okay, CHAIRPERSON BERRY: we are 4 supposed to have a briefing, Staff Director, 5 Native American issues. I don't know what ever 6 7 happened to that. VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: But the way it came 8 up, I thought we were going to have a briefing on 9 Native American issues in the Native American 10 nations, reservations and so on. 11 think it MS. MOORE: Right, I 12 Montana. 13 VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Yeah, not 14 because John mentioned that we often forget about 15 those rural areas. And so, in my view, that was 16 different than the issues in the inner city and so 17 The Native American youth that happen to 18 find themselves in the inner city have a sense that 19 the issues are about the same. 20 But in terms surely of the reservations, 21 true that different John 22 laws apply. it is 23 emphasized different issues apply very often. And so I think Unemployment rates of 70% and so on. 24

it still would be valuable to have a briefing on

| that.

1.3

MS. MOORE: And again, just to be very clear, I think, as Commissioner Lee noted, the Expanding Economic Opportunities project does indeed, in its text, include those Native Americans who are in the inner cities.

So we do intend to cover that.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.

MS. MOORE: But the discussion -- the results of the discussion led us to propose a separate Native American project that didn't duplicate those that you all were considering for a briefing.

VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right.

CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Okay, thank you.

We finally have to -- so we decided to leave on this list of projects the 2001 items except for the HIV and AIDS so far. We didn't say what we wanted to do with consumer racism. And we modified gender disparities in light of the comments that Commissioner Anderson had made.

And Native American issues, I guess in light of the discussion we've just had, we'd leave the housing one. So that we would simply -- and the voting rights one needs to be modified consistent

1	with developments that have happened since the cases
2	that have been decided by the Supreme Court since
3	this Voting Rights Act proposal was written, I
4	think.
5	So, for 2001, with those modifications,
6	we would leave those would leave those proposals
7	as they are. We haven't answered yet, as a result
8	of this discussion I guess we're leaving the
9	project decisions for 2000 as they are in view of
10	the representations that OGC and OCRE will be able
11	to do the projects that we agreed to, so we'll just
12	leave those as they are.
13	Does anyone have anything else before we
14	future agenda items I think is the next item on
15	the agenda.
16	MS. MOY: Madame Chair, what did you say
17	for financial aid for higher education?
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Well, we're leaving
19	all of those just for the time being.
20	IX. Future Agenda Items
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Any other items?
22	Future agenda items?
23	MS. MOY: We just need the approval on
24	the GAO omnibus letter. I know that you had it
25	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I already mentioned

1	that earlier
2	MS. MOY: from Commissioner
3	Redenbaugh.
4	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: and everybody
5	agreed that it was fine,
6	MS. MOY: All right.
7	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: that we could go
8	ahead and send it.
9	MS. MOY: Okay.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I did that before
11	Commissioner Redenbaugh left. We have some new
12	sheets that they're going to give you with updated
13	information on the dollar amounts for these 2000
14	projects. They may need to revise them again
15	consistent with the discussion we just had.
16	So we'll be sending you those numbers as
17	soon as they revise them once again.
18	If there's nothing else, yes,
19	Commissioner?
20	COMMISSIONER LEE: I do like to ask the
21	Commission whether we can revisit the June 11th
22	meeting date.
23	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: June 11th meeting
24	date? Okay. You have a suggestion for a different
25	date?

1	COMMISSIONER LEE: The rest of the month
2	will be open to me. I just found out that day I
3	will be in a wedding party and I won't be able to
4	participate either way.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: June 11th, okay. I
6	could do it either June 6th, June when is the
7	July one?
8	MS. MOY: The May meeting is May 14th.
9	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: July is 9th.
10	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I could do it the
11	6th, I could do it the
12	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: The 4th, you mean?
13	We're talking about June? 4th or 18th, I guess,
14	are the options.
15	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: 4th or 18th.
16	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Looks like I can do
17	either one.
18	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: How about you,
19	Commissioner Anderson?
20	COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Either one.
21	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: We don't know about
22	Russell, do we? Why don't we take a shot and pick
23	the 18th, and then we'll check with Russell. And if
24	that doesn't work with him, then we'll try to
25	we'll come back to you and ask you for something

1	else.
2	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: And may I inquire -
3	- I was confused on my notes on when we're having
4	our meeting in April. I just had down a hearing for
5	the 15th and 16th.
6	MS. MOY: The 15th.
7	VICE. CHAIR REYNOSO: And are we having
8	the meeting during that time, too?
9	MS. MOY: 15th and 16th. The 16th is
10	the Commission meeting
11	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Okay, we're having
12	the meeting on the 16th?
13	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: In consultation at
14	crisis is that time.
15	MS. MOY: 15th and 16th.
16	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: Right, right.
17	Okay, so we have the meeting on the 16th. Okay,
18	that makes sense.
19	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: Does anyone have
20	anything else?
21	All right, yes, we said before
22	Commissioner Redenbaugh left that we were going to
23	send this report to the Senate. That happened
24	earlier, way back. Didn't we do that? Charlie's

shaking her head yes.

1	Okay, then I need a motion to adjourn.
2	VICE CHAIR REYNOSO: So moved.
3 .	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: I need a second.
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.
5	CHAIRPERSON BERRY: And it is not
6	debateable, so, without objection, we adjourn.
7	Thank you very much.
8	(Whereupon, the proceedings were
9	adjourned at 12:22 p.m.)
LO	
LI	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
16	
L7	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	