



ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

**FORUM ON UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES AND
the Regulation Process**

Panel 1: Identifying Underserved Communities

November 3, 2021

TRANSCRIPT
(Not Reviewed for Errors)

Panelists

Danielle Y. Conley, Deputy Counsel to the President, Office of the White House Counsel

K. Sabeel Rahman, Senior Counsel to the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

Lee Rainie, Director of Internet and Technology Research, Pew Research Center

William M. Yeatman, Research Fellow, Cato Institute

Moderator

Adam White, Co-Executive Director, The C. Boyden Gray Center for the Study of the Administrative State, George Mason University Antonin Scalia Law School; Public Member, Administrative Conference of the United States

- 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

ACUS Panel

Transcription of Video File

Video Runtime: 0:58:25

1 (Beginning of Video Recording.)

2 MR. WEINER: Good afternoon, I'm Matt

3 Weiner, the acting chairman -- vice-chairman

4 -- and executive director of the

5 Administrative Conference of the United

6 States or just ACUS for short. Thank you

7 very much for joining us.

8 One of the President's first actions

9 upon taking office was to issue Executive

10 Order 13985 titled Advancing Racial Equality

11 and Support for Underserved Communities

12 Through the Federal Government. The order

13 calls on federal agencies to adopt a

14 systematic approach to embedding fairness for

15 these communities in their decision-making

16 processes.

17 This forum will address an important

18 component of that mandate, and that is the

19 participation of historically underserved

20 groups in the decision-making processes,

21 including rule making and adjudication of

22 federal agencies in carrying out their

23 regulatory programs.

24 ACUS is pleased and honored to sponsor

25 a forum on so important of a topic. We do so

1 in furtherance of our statutory mission first
2 to, and I quote, "arrange for the cooperative
3 exchange of information among federal
4 agencies assisted by outside experts to the
5 end that regulatory activities may be carried
6 out expeditiously in the public interest.

7 And second, to promote more effective
8 participation in the rule making process."

9 Perhaps the most important objective
10 of this forum is to help agencies carry out
11 their obligations under the executive order.
12 It will not yield recommendations, let alone
13 compliance guidelines, but it will, I am
14 confident, help inform the answers agencies
15 give to the questions that the executive
16 order requires them to consider.

17 That includes the question of today's
18 panel -- which communities have been
19 historically underserved by agency processes
20 for regulatory policy making?

21 Before we turn to the panel, I'd like
22 to thank my colleagues Mark Thompson for
23 planning this forum and (inaudible) and
24 Jeremy Grayboice for their very good counsel
25 along the way; our panelists and moderators

1 for giving us their time and expertise; and
2 the administration for supporting ACUS's work
3 in so many ways.

4 I'd now like to recognize Adam White,
5 a member of ACUS -- a public member of
6 ACUS -- to introduce the subject of today's
7 panel. And our distinguished guest -- Adam,
8 I'll turn it over to you with my thanks.

9 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Matt. Thanks to
10 ACUS and to all our speakers today and those
11 of you who have tuned in to hear this
12 conversation. It's a real pleasure to be
13 here. And I will move things right along to
14 the speakers that you've come to see.

15 I'll introduce them one at a time as
16 it's each person's turn to speak. We're
17 going to begin the conversation on
18 identifying underserved communities in the
19 regulatory process with Lee Rainie of the Pew
20 Research Center. Lee is the research -- Pew
21 Research's director of internet and
22 technology research. His own writing and the
23 writing that he leads at Pew focuses on
24 people's online activities and the ways in
25 which internet is affecting all of our lives.

1 Among his many books is the one he coauthored
2 with Bear Wellman titled Network: The New
3 Social Operating System. And Lee will kick-
4 off the conversation with a survey of the
5 current state of affairs. Lee.

6 MR. RAINIE: Thanks so much, Adam.
7 It's a delight to be here. And I'm -- it's a
8 special honor for Pew Research to be here
9 because we do the kind of work that we hope
10 is useful to people like you, but we don't do
11 it from a perspective of advocating for
12 anything except a social science that we hope
13 people can use.

14 When you think about underserved
15 communities, sort of obvious places to start
16 (break in audio) which is mapped in the
17 following ways by wonderful sort of
18 interactive features on this census bureau.
19 Here you can see where the percentages of
20 people in poverty are highest in the country
21 and where they're not so high.

22 And we've known forever, since the
23 dawn of civil social science research, that
24 those who are poor are less likely to be
25 engaged in civic life and less likely to be

1 sought out in furtherance of civic life.

2 Similarly, that the other part of
3 social economic reality that affects
4 regulatory processes and people's engagements
5 in civic life is educational attainment. For
6 a long time, it's been one of the strongest
7 predictors of people's willingness to be
8 participatory in the public life of their
9 communities and in their nation.

10 And here's what it looks like again.

11 Sort of -- quite similar. This is the
12 percentage of people who are graduated from
13 high school by the year they turn 25 in the
14 United States, and it looks pretty similar to
15 that poverty map. And again, so those are
16 geographic representation of communities that
17 probably are struggling to be involved in
18 civic processes and struggling to be reached
19 by regulatory agencies.

20 I cite those two things because
21 they're so important to understanding the
22 most important civic act that Americans
23 perform, which is voting. Pew Research does
24 a lot of work understanding both voters and
25 nonvoters. And these are data from the 2016

1 and 2020 elections, looking at validated
2 voters and their participation and in the
3 processes.

4 And you can see that the nonvoter
5 population is more composed of people who
6 have a high school diploma or less than it is
7 for people who have higher levels of
8 education. It's also composed of people who
9 have lower levels of household income than
10 people who have higher levels of household
11 income.

12 There's a sort of similar story about
13 underserved and under-represented people in
14 the civic culture by age. Those who are
15 younger -- ages 18-29, the first stage of
16 voting -- they are not as likely to vote as
17 people who are considerably older. And since
18 there's so much focus on race and ethnicity
19 in the country, I -- I displayed these data
20 as well too.

21 There are ways in which obviously, the
22 white population is still a dominant part of
23 the nonvoter population, but there are ways
24 in which nonvoters are sort of
25 overrepresented among black Americans,

1 Hispanic Americans in particular.

2 We don't have geographic maps yet from
3 the 2020 election, but this sort of shows the
4 overlay of the two maps I showed before on
5 poverty and educational attainment to show
6 where voting participation is (break in
7 audio) slides get, the less likely it is that
8 people that participated in the election
9 process and this is by counties.

10 We spend a bunch of time at Pew
11 talking to people about why they don't vote.
12 And the most recent data we gathered were in
13 the 2018 midterms -- and this is pretty
14 representative of what we've heard over the
15 years about the reasons that people don't
16 vote.

17 So a substantial portion said they
18 just don't like politics. Another feels
19 alienated because they don't feel their vote
20 makes a difference. They don't see their
21 voice mattering in the political culture.
22 It's inconvenient for some. There's some
23 that are just not registered, and some just
24 don't care about who gets elected in their
25 area. And a portion (break in audio) vote.

1 But again, it's sort of (break in audio) the
2 people who are not (break in audio) likely to
3 be ignored, maybe by the regulatory process
4 and not invited into the regulatory process.

5 And then to sort of -- a final round
6 of slides really speak to what we study a lot
7 in the technology research unit at Pew -- we
8 look at how these new tools might be able to
9 enable civic participation in the culture.

10 But we don't find that there's much of a
11 difference between people who participate
12 digitally and people who participate in other
13 kinds of civic activities.

14 So the last time we studied this
15 really intensively was a couple of years ago,
16 so these data might be slightly out of date,
17 but in about half of Americans directly
18 participated in a civic activity in the
19 previous 12 months.

20 And we get that 48 percent by adding
21 up all the people who said yes to at least
22 one of the following six kinds of civic
23 (break in audio). 39 percent of adults
24 recently contacted a government official or
25 spoke out both online and offline -- again,

1 it's adding up all the yes answers to people
2 to these four basic ways that people can
3 engage directly with -- with policy makers in
4 the policy community.

5 And finally, we've taken a special
6 look at people who use the internet to do
7 these things. So these data, again, we're
8 taking -- after social networking and social
9 media got off the ground but it's not nearly
10 the same environment now as it was (break in
11 audio) engage with it, but the number I've
12 circled there is about 39 percent of all
13 Americans have done at least one of these
14 kinds of engagement activities with political
15 officials and with official capacities.

16 And we know that the other factors
17 that are involved with civic engagement
18 relate to partisanship. The more intense
19 someone is -- cares about politics and
20 follows politics and sort of is engaged with
21 politics, the more likely they are to be
22 engaged with all kinds of rulemaking and
23 other elements of civil society.

24 This is what partisanship looks like
25 in the United States. We don't have details

1 about intensity of partisanship, but this is
2 not a bad way to sort of get a representation
3 of sort of different communities and their
4 different -- the voices that are dominant in
5 their political cultures.

6 We do know that people who take the
7 time to donate to political candidates are
8 very engaged with the political process, and
9 basically have oversized voices in the
10 process. And this -- this is what the
11 partisan map looks like on that.

12 We also know that news is a very
13 important component of people's engagement
14 with civic life. If they're in a robust news
15 culture, if they pay a lot of attention to
16 news, they're much more likely to be involved
17 in politics and civic life.

18 And this is what news deserts look
19 like in the United States. The red counties
20 as you can see have no newspaper in them.
21 And the yellow counties have only one
22 newspaper. And the hollowing out,
23 particularly of print journalism and local
24 newspapers, has been one of the elements of
25 change in political life in this country.

1 And now we get into my area, the
2 broadband area where there are lots of maps
3 that are generated about people having access
4 to broadband. Right now, 77 percent of
5 American adults have broadband in their home.
6 So 23 percent don't have broadband in their
7 home. And there's a big controversy about
8 what broadband means.

9 (Break in audio) with which people
10 connect actually in their real homes is not
11 nearly what the advertised speed is when they
12 buy their services.

13 And here's sort of look at the
14 connectivity portrait of Americans. About 85
15 percent of American adults now have smart
16 phones. 77 percent have broadband as I just
17 mentioned, and you can see that the other
18 side of those gaps of people who are older
19 are less likely to have the technologies.
20 People who are poorer are less likely to have
21 the technologies. And people who have
22 less -- lower levels of education are less
23 likely to have these technologies.

24 And sort of the final component to
25 this story is whether people actually can

1 feel comfortable using the technology itself.
2 So I think a lot of the work that the
3 regulatory community is thinking about
4 involves putting a lot more material online
5 and inviting people to participate in
6 rulemaking proceedings by online
7 contributions.

8 About 30 percent of American adults --
9 even though they have technology -- struggle
10 with it. Either they're not confident that
11 they can use their devices well to do what
12 they want to do. Or they need help if they
13 have a new application or a new device in
14 their life. And you can see here it's
15 particularly likely to be the case of older
16 Americans, poorer Americans, and less well-
17 educated Americans.

18 So that's the sort of panoramic
19 picture of what civic life looks like, and I
20 hope that's a useful starting point for this
21 conversation that really is so important.
22 Thanks a lot, Adam.

23 MR. WHITE: Well, thank you, Lee. I
24 think it is a useful starting point. And now
25 maybe we'll focus a bit more directly on the

1 current administration and regulatory
2 engagement, specifically. We're very lucky
3 to be joined today by two -- two senior
4 officials from the Biden Administration who
5 will each offer some opening remarks of their
6 sense of this issue.

7 If I may, I think I'll begin with
8 Sabeel Rahman who serves in OIRA. Of course
9 this perhaps a little more directly involved
10 in regulation, per se, before we'll be joined
11 by Danielle Conley.

12 Sabeel Rahman is a senior counselor in
13 the White House Office of Information and
14 Regulatory Affairs which, as was mentioned at
15 the outset, under President Biden is focused
16 on ways to reform and modernize OIRA and the
17 regulatory review process more generally.
18 Sabeel previously served as president of
19 DAMOS and as an associate professor of law at
20 the Brooklyn Law School. Sabeel, thanks for
21 joining us.

22 MR. RAHMAN: Yeah, thanks Adam and
23 ACUS for having us. I'm excited to share
24 this part of this conversation with my
25 colleague Danielle who we'll hear from in a

1 minute.

2 So maybe I can take up Lee left us
3 off. And like I said, it's a double pleasure
4 for me to be in ACUS as an admin law person
5 as Adam alluded. So grateful for this space.

6 So maybe I can zoom out a little bit
7 and lay out some of the big pieces for the
8 equity executive order and the regulatory
9 review process writ large.

10 And so, you know, the equity executive
11 order itself commits the federal government
12 to a whole of government approach and Adam
13 alluded to as well the modernizing regulatory
14 review project as well which is also part of
15 the President's day one agenda. And, you
16 know, there's been an enormous amount of
17 work. It's been a great team who's been
18 working on all of this.

19 I think there are a number of high
20 level points I want to put on the table for
21 folks to think about right at the outset. So
22 one is when we think about what it means to
23 incorporate equity into regulatory policy or
24 federal government policy, that's actually a
25 pretty broad mandate.

1 And so OMB issued a report to the
2 President a few months ago, laying out some
3 of the key prongs for this work. One of it
4 is actually developing the methodologies
5 needed to analyze equity in the first place.
6 So how do we collect the data, how do we
7 incorporate equity impacts into policy making
8 from an analytic standpoint. You know, that
9 itself is a pretty important and
10 methodologically challenging question.

11 Then there are questions around
12 actual, sort of, what would this mean in the
13 world. So one of the areas that we
14 highlighted in our OMB report, for example,
15 is the issue of burden. There are many
16 government programs, social services, that
17 are high impact, touch lots of
18 constituencies, and also don't reach a lot of
19 constituencies that they're meant to reach.
20 How do we think about the policy making
21 process, the paperwork process, the kind of
22 mechanics of administration in a way to
23 reduce those burdens and enhance access in a
24 way that centers equity.

25 A third piece I want to mention is

1 federal resources themselves. So when you
2 think about procurement or contracting,
3 that's another piece mentioned in the EO and
4 that OMB has been looking at and highlights
5 in its study.

6 And finally, to pick up maybe where
7 Lee left us off, on stakeholder engagement.
8 You know, I think we all know that the
9 challenges of civic engagement for those of
10 us who study this work are incredibly high.
11 They're perhaps even more high when it comes
12 to really complex, often technical matters
13 like regulatory policy.

14 And one thing that OMB report to the
15 President from a few months ago highlights is
16 the real -- the need to think about civic
17 engagement and stakeholder engagement not
18 just in a passive, open door, whoever, you
19 know, can file a comment on a notes and
20 comment docket -- great, God bless. Right?

21 I think it's actually the need to
22 think more (break in audio) who are the
23 communities that we're trying to reach, what
24 are the barriers and challenges they face in
25 engaging with government, and how do we

1 design modes of engagement that meet people
2 where they're at, that use technologies that
3 can be helpful in that regard, and that can
4 imagine different processes or approaches to
5 engagement.

6 Right, and so that's -- those are all
7 four very big buckets. You know, happy to
8 talk more about it as you get into the
9 conversation. But just want to give folks a
10 sense of sort of the scope of the executive
11 order and what it's looking like on this end.

12 MR. WHITE: (Break in audio)
13 Administration Danielle Conley. Danielle
14 serves in the White House Counsel's office as
15 deputy counsel to the President. She
16 previously served in the justice department
17 from 2015 to 2017 as Associate Deputy
18 Attorney-General. And before (break in
19 audio) she's been a partner at the law firm
20 WilmerHale. Danielle.

21 MS. CONLEY: Thanks very much, Adam,
22 and very good to be with all of you this
23 afternoon. So I'll pick up where Sabeel left
24 off, and as he highlighted, President Biden
25 has expressed a clear commitment to advancing

1 equity throughout the federal government.

2 And as a part of that, he charged
3 every federal agency and all of our teams
4 here in the White House with advancing equity
5 in all of our policy work and decision making
6 from drafting legislation to proposing a
7 budget to developing rules and regulations in
8 agency programs.

9 And the White House counsel's office
10 plays a crucial role in helping the structure
11 and support most of these efforts. So I lead
12 the White House counsel's office racial
13 justice and equity team, which helps support
14 agencies and the White House in advancing
15 this commitment to equity and provides advice
16 about the best ways to structure federal
17 programs and use the various levers that we
18 have available in order to advance the
19 President's agenda.

20 So as Sabeel mentioned, on day (break
21 in audio) this executive order requiring a
22 systematic approach to advancing equity and
23 embedding fairness and decision making in all
24 of the federal government's actions.

25 And in implementing the executive

1 order, my team has really advised agencies on
2 the specific ways that they can embrace and
3 advance principles of equity consistent with
4 both legal requirements and the
5 administration's policy objectives.

6 And one of the early questions that
7 arose was how we define underserved
8 communities in a way that's aligned with the
9 administration's commitment to advance equity
10 for a number of communities that have
11 historically experienced barriers in access
12 to and participation in agency policies and
13 programs.

14 And the starting point for the
15 understanding of underserved communities was
16 the order's definition of equity, which the
17 order broadly defined to mean "the consistent
18 and systematic fair, just, and impartial
19 treatment of all individuals, including
20 individuals who belong to underserved
21 communities that have been denied such
22 treatment such as Black, Latino, indigenous
23 and Native American people, Asian Americans
24 and Pacific Islanders, and other peoples of
25 color, the LGBTQ community, members of

1 religious minorities, people with
2 disabilities, people who live in rural areas
3 (break in audio) affected by persistent
4 poverty or inequality."

5 And grounded in that sort of broad
6 understanding of equity, the order goes on to
7 define underserved communities even more
8 broadly to encompass geographic communities,
9 populations that share particular (break in
10 audio) communities that have been
11 systematically denied a full opportunity to
12 participate in economic, social, and civic
13 life.

14 So from a legal perspective, one of
15 the things that -- that that definition
16 reflects is the federal government's broad
17 authority to take action to advance equity
18 for all. The order requires agencies to
19 review the full scope of their programmatic
20 work, and to really drill down and identify
21 barriers to equitable access.

22 And so specifically, under the order,
23 agencies will examine what benefits they're
24 delivering to the public, what current
25 pathways exist to accessing those benefits,

1 and what, if any, barriers exist to that --
2 to accessing those particular benefits.

3 And as Sabeel mentioned, agencies are
4 also specifically tasked with assessing their
5 procurement procedures with a similar set of
6 questions in mind -- who has traditionally
7 had access and who's prevented from having
8 access.

9 And based on those assessments,
10 agencies then have to devise specific
11 strategies that really are aimed at
12 addressing those particular barriers.

13 And, you know, the broad mandate of
14 the EO means that agencies have a broad array
15 of potential levers to use to advance equity,
16 but in light of the breadth, there's also a
17 very diverse set of legal questions
18 surrounding how you craft strategies to
19 address such barriers. And that's really
20 where our offices come in.

21 So just to highlight a couple of
22 examples that -- of the legal issues that
23 we've dealt with with agencies and
24 implementing the order. (Break in audio)
25 have to be cognizant of a variety of legal

1 principles that come into play when thinking
2 about how to structure programs that advance
3 equity -- gender equity, in particular.

4 So in many instances, agencies can
5 advance equities using race and gender tools
6 that if they're ultimately subject to legal
7 challenge, will receive extremely
8 differential review and those policies cover
9 a lot of ground under the EO. But if an
10 agency concludes that a program requires
11 making a classification that's based on race
12 or sex, obviously the Constitution will come
13 into play. And such classifications are
14 typically, you know, subject to a very
15 heightened judicial scrutiny, and so the
16 record that the agency develops really will
17 be crucial here.

18 As you all probably know, courts
19 looked at things in the record like
20 historical and ongoing discrimination against
21 a particular population as well as documented
22 disparities, the effectiveness of race or sex
23 neutral policies that could effectively cure
24 those disparities, the flexibility of the
25 governmental program that's at issue, as well

1 as a number of other factors.

2 So in addition to counseling agencies
3 on those issues, you know, agencies also in
4 this context have to be cognizant of the
5 requirements of the APA when developing and
6 issuing regulations that are designed to
7 advance equity.

8 So, you know, again, with all of that,
9 we've been working very closely with agencies
10 as they do this work. And they're still very
11 much actively devising their plans.

12 Under the EO, agencies were required
13 in August to submit equity assessments to the
14 assistant to the President for domestic
15 policy (break in audio) assessments.

16 Agencies are now turning to the work of
17 developing actions to address the inequities
18 in their programs to the extent that they
19 exist.

20 And by January 20th, the one-year mark
21 of the administration, all of the agencies
22 will submit these forward-looking action
23 plans. And I think that's where our work --
24 our work will get really interesting is
25 really working with them to provide guidance

1 to insure that they simultaneously pursue the
2 President's ambitious directives in this
3 space but while carefully navigating all of
4 the relevant legal considerations.

5 With that, I'll turn it back over to
6 you, Adam.

7 MR. WHITE: A very helpful overview.

8 Thanks again, Sabeel, as well, for this
9 presentation on the Administration's
10 approach.

11 Our last speaker on the panel today is
12 William Yeatman. Will is a research fellow
13 at the Cato Institute where he writes on
14 administrative law, constitutional structure,
15 and regulatory reform. And he writes widely
16 on these issues for legal journals and the
17 popular press, including the Yale Journal on
18 Regulations notice and comment blog where he
19 has a regular column on developments in the
20 Ninth Circuit. Will, thanks for joining us.

21 MR. YEATMAN: Oh, thank you -- thank
22 you so much for having me, Adam, and thank
23 you to ACUS for hearing me out today and
24 allowing me to participate. I'll be brief.

25 We're talking here -- our charge was

1 to discuss best practices when it comes to
2 identifying underserved communities. But
3 from what I've seen, agencies have employed
4 only one practice. And here's what I'm
5 talking about.

6 A handful of agencies in performing
7 their equity assessments sought information
8 from the public -- veterans, USDA, interior,
9 NASA, and the transportation department. All
10 these information requests are virtually the
11 same.

12 What they all do is they -- they set
13 forth the definition, they take it wholesale
14 from Executive Order 13895 of equity and
15 underserved communities, and then they ask
16 the public to come forward and to (break in
17 audio) self-identify as a member of these
18 underserved communities pursuant to the
19 definition, verbatim, that's employed in the
20 executive order.

21 So, you know, I guess my point is the
22 ball is already rolling when it comes to
23 identifying or how agencies go about
24 identifying these underserved communities.

25 Regardless of best practices, it seems

1 as though the only practice is self-
2 identification by the community members
3 themselves.

4 I'll end on sort of a note of caution,
5 if you will, about the capaciousness of the
6 definition of underserved community.
7 Danielle read it out, and if you'll note, it
8 includes communities affected by regional
9 bias, religious bias, and class bias. And I
10 wonder -- to my ears, that sounds like at
11 least 85 percent of the US population.

12 So I wonder whether or not it's by
13 trying to help everyone you end up helping no
14 one. I mean, I wonder feasibility concerns
15 and the like.

16 So that's really my two cents is that,
17 you know, we're speaking about best practices
18 but we've seen a sort of a uniform practice
19 employed by agencies in identifying these
20 communities, and again, I'm a little bit
21 uneasy with the breadth of the definition in
22 terms of feasibility. Thank you.

23 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Will. And by the
24 way, speaking of agency engagement and
25 outreach, everybody who's tuned in has the

1 opportunity to send questions. Please do it
2 through the Q and A function, and I'll get to
3 as many questions as I can. I have a couple
4 questions of my own, which I'll get to in a
5 moment.

6 But maybe before that, we'll give
7 Danielle and Sabeel an opportunity to offer
8 any sort of further thoughts they have in
9 response to what Lee and Will said, and then
10 I'll return to Will -- sorry, to Lee for some
11 thoughts on what we've heard so far. Sabeel,
12 Danielle -- anything you'd like to offer so
13 far in response to what Will or --

14 MR. RAHMAN: I mean, maybe one just
15 high level thought, which is, you know, I
16 think going back to Danielle's point earlier,
17 right. I think there's sort of -- there are
18 two tracks in some ways to think about what
19 this executive order entails, right.

20 One is a sort of longer arc of
21 building capacity -- building up best
22 practices, building up sort of the
23 infrastructure and ideas needed to do this
24 work for the long haul. And the other are
25 like on some of these specific areas of

1 focus, you know, mentioned in the EO and
2 elsewhere.

3 And so I just mention that because I
4 think some of -- some of what we're learning
5 in this early stage of the work, you know,
6 OMB put out an RFI, as well. We got about
7 499 comments back really from folks who are
8 engaged in equity work in their own context,
9 sort of offering what they've learned so that
10 we're not reinventing the wheel.

11 And I mention that because I think,
12 you know, part of the implementation of this
13 is that longer arc of creating best practices
14 and new systems, you know, for the federal
15 government as well as the more specific
16 things that might arise in context of say
17 procurement, for example -- as Danielle
18 mentioned. You know, kind of (break in
19 audio) focus.

20 And so I think, you know, we've all
21 heard the metaphor it's both a marathon and a
22 sprint, right, but that's particularly true
23 of this kind of work. So just wanted to add
24 that bit of context.

25 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Sabeel.

1 Danielle, do you have anything you'd
2 like to add so far?

3 MS. CONLEY: Yeah, I'll just add to
4 the point that William made about the -- how
5 broad the definition of underserved
6 populations -- underserved communities is,
7 and, you know, we -- look, there was a lot of
8 thought given to that, and I think, you know,
9 at bottom, the idea here is that (break in
10 audio) populations of folks that in one way
11 or the other have been left behind or have
12 not had sort of the robust access (break in
13 audio) to make sure that we had agencies
14 really take a hard look at, you know, beyond
15 some of the -- the historical communities
16 that immediately come to mind, but to really
17 look at a broad array of communities that may
18 not have the same education, access, and just
19 understanding about the services and programs
20 that the federal government provides.

21 So, yes, it is broad, but I do think,
22 you know, intentionally so to make sure
23 that -- that really all of America can truly
24 benefit from agency programs and policies.

25 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Danielle.

1 Lee, you started us off with a
2 presentation on civic engagement more
3 broadly, and now we've focused a little more
4 directly on regulatory engagement. I'd love
5 to hear your thoughts on the presentations
6 that followed you either on the
7 administration's approached so far or Will's
8 own concerns.

9 MR. RAINIE: Two points. The material
10 I was presenting almost seemed like the
11 mirror image of what William was talking
12 about in the sense that there were so --
13 depending on how you define it, there really
14 is so little civic engagement for -- in the
15 culture, and that sort of makes it -- it puts
16 a lot of the burden, I think, on the -- on
17 the professional civic engagement
18 community -- the regulators themselves -- to
19 sort of reach people where they are rather
20 than depending on people to sort of navigate
21 their pathway to them.

22 The other thing that we've spent a lot
23 of time at Pew studying that is so directly
24 related to this is trust in the broader
25 culture both in trusting institutions and

1 interpersonal trust, which actually go hand
2 in hand together in interesting kinds of
3 ways.

4 So in a way, what's important about
5 this conversation is the degree to which it
6 intersects with a well-functioning society
7 and people thinking that their voices matter.
8 And the highest level of distrust in this
9 culture is invested in either institutions or
10 other people who don't see me -- who don't
11 understand my voice and don't understand my
12 circumstances.

13 And so there's a -- this is a big,
14 profound conversation. Even the slice of
15 life we're looking at isn't necessarily
16 embraced or participated in by large chunks
17 of the culture.

18 MR. WHITE: You know, the way you
19 phrased that last point about individuals who
20 are sort of outside of the process looking in
21 or don't even know about it and that were --
22 the administration is asking for them to
23 offer their voice so we can see them, that
24 actually raises a broader point that I wanted
25 to get to, and it's about what we've lost, as

1 you all see it, from the current regulatory
2 approach that has given rise to this need for
3 reform.

4 I guess what I'm saying, we -- civic
5 engagement incorporates -- actions with our
6 own civic institutions. Regulatory
7 engagement is obviously a much more specific
8 thing. What's lost -- what's been lost by
9 the absence of these underserved communities
10 in the regulatory process? Is it a -- I
11 suppose part of it is political, people's
12 values. Part of it is just concrete examples
13 of how regulation or lack of regulation
14 affects people's lives. Surely all manner of
15 things. And I'd love to hear how each of you
16 think this through of what's been lost by the
17 absence of these underserved communities.
18 Maybe we'll give Danielle a chance to go
19 first.

20 MS. CONLEY: Sorry, I was still muted.
21 It's a really interesting question. I think
22 for me the first thing that comes to mind
23 about what's lost -- it's the ability of
24 people in certain populations to not have
25 access to certain programs, whether it's

1 because they weren't in full -- they didn't
2 have the education, right. They weren't
3 informed about what the program is. Maybe
4 there was a language barrier, right? There's
5 documents about federal programs. Maybe they
6 were just printed in English and what that
7 actually posed a barrier to certain
8 populations receiving the benefits of those
9 programs.

10 And so I really look at it as -- to
11 me, what's lost is, you know, if you've got
12 federal programs that are designed to help
13 people, then you want all of the (break in
14 audio) to understand that those programs are
15 there and the benefits that they provide.
16 So, I mean, I guess, from my perspective,
17 it's that simple.

18 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Danielle.

19 Sabeel, would you like to add
20 anything?

21 MR. RAHMAN: Yeah, I think maybe just
22 riffing off of that a little bit. You know,
23 where government is here to serve the public
24 at large, right, and it's hard to do that if
25 you're not actually -- have the mechanisms to

1 engage particularly folks who are underserved
2 or face (inaudible) barriers of various
3 kinds.

4 And you know, I think that's both on
5 an implementation kind of design appoint as
6 Danielle was saying, and on a like general
7 good government kind of having evidence to
8 inform public policy point, right.

9 Like if we want to design policy to
10 respond to public needs and sort of this type
11 of equity analysis and everything we're
12 talking about here, including the engagement
13 with folks directly, is all central to
14 identifying what those needs are and then
15 figuring out how best to meet them.

16 One other small example I'll give,
17 which just sort of similar to what Danielle
18 was describing is -- you know, if you think
19 about how do people access -- how do we help
20 people access those services that they might
21 be -- or protections that they might be
22 entitled to.

23 It's not just do they even know about
24 it, you might know about a program, but the
25 steps you have to go through to even like get

1 that benefit or protection or that service,
2 are -- might already be so much as to kind of
3 chill people away from that program.

4 And so, you know, user-based -- user-
5 based testing, for example, of form design or
6 of enrollment processes -- you know, these
7 are also things that we talk about in sort of
8 civic engagement more broadly. But also want
9 to kind of highlight that that type of
10 engagement's also pretty essential to just
11 (break in audio) comes to implementation.

12 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Sabeel.

13 Will, Lee -- do either of you have
14 anything to add on this point about what this
15 kind of outreach would add to the regulatory
16 process?

17 MR. YEATMAN: I've got one thing to
18 riff off what Sabeel just said regarding how
19 administrative burdens can engender inequity.
20 And I agree with 100 percent.

21 You know, I believe the ONB in that
22 report, they recommended administrative -- or
23 paperwork audits, in essence, for agencies to
24 conduct those in the spirit of advancing
25 equity.

1 I will note, however, and this perhaps
2 gets to the difficulty of this endeavor writ
3 large, when agencies first undertook their
4 equity analyses, as I understand it, they
5 immediately came to realize they've got a big
6 problem-- that the government doesn't collect
7 demographic data regarding beneficiaries or
8 regulative parties. I mean, they didn't have
9 anything to work with in terms of advancing
10 the equity agenda.

11 And, I guess, what is the solution to
12 that -- it is, of course, more paperwork.
13 And so, you know, on the one hand we've got
14 administrative burdens being a source of
15 inequity. On the other hand, we've got the
16 solution to advancing equity is to impose
17 greater administrative burdens -- I mean,
18 more paperwork. So, it does, to my mind,
19 speak of sort of the implementation
20 difficulties, you know, of this project.

21 MR. WHITE: Lee?

22 MR. RAINIE: I'm going to return to
23 this point that the most despairing people
24 and the most detached in distrusting people
25 in the culture are those who feel their voice

1 isn't in the process and those who think the
2 game is rigged. And so there's no reason to
3 participate.

4 And one of the most interesting not
5 good developments in the regulatory process
6 in recent years has been the advent of trolls
7 and bots. You know, there are ways now that
8 you can jam the inboxes and jam the comment,
9 you know, functions of the regulatory process
10 in a way that people can see. They can see
11 that their voice, you know, is in this welter
12 of junkie kind of stuff or, you know, cut and
13 paste kind of stuff. And so you lose sort of
14 citizen trust, and that's not good for
15 democracy.

16 The other part of this is just to
17 remind everybody that there's just a ton of
18 social science. That the more diverse things
19 are, the more points of view that are implied
20 by any measure of diversity you care to add,
21 the smarter institutions and organizations
22 get.

23 And that's true for individuals too.
24 The bigger your social network and the more
25 diverse it is, the smarter you are in the way

1 you can navigate life better.

2 MR. WHITE: Thanks Lee, and, Lee,
3 you point out the recent problem of trolls
4 and bots in the regulatory practice. And as
5 it happens, as many know, that's something
6 that ACUS itself has been studying in recent
7 years, and obviously it's become a big issue.

8 Now, again, thanks to all who have
9 submitted comments or questions so far. I'll
10 get to those in just a moment. But if folks
11 will just humor me, maybe one more question
12 from me. Of course, ACUS is focused first
13 and foremost on procedural design and
14 institutional design and thinking through how
15 these -- this approach might be instituted
16 and formalized over the course of years to
17 come. I wonder what the institutions would
18 look like.

19 Often times, we've seen within
20 agencies or within administrations -- you
21 might almost call them counter-institutions,
22 right -- parts of an agency or an
23 administration that are sort of there
24 specifically to participate in a process,
25 whether it's Offices of Environmental Justice

1 and now Offices of Equity as well, and we see
2 it also with things like the Small Business
3 Administration.

4 I mean, in some ways, was your office
5 (break in audio) and so, I guess, my question
6 is, what's the best way to institutionalize
7 this in the long run? Is it creating new
8 institutions within agencies? Is it creating
9 new institutions within administrations? Is
10 it looking into other parts of government for
11 those kinds of new institutions? Is it
12 looking (break in audio) carry this out.
13 Lee, maybe we'll start with you this time.

14 MR. RAINIE: Wow, I'm -- maybe be way
15 off -- off the grid here in this answer. But
16 it sort of starts with the internet for me in
17 the sense of thinking networked rather than
18 hierarchical or top down. It might be a
19 useful thing.

20 In the age of lots of citizen science,
21 in the age of lots of lots of peer to peer
22 patient groups that are making substantial
23 contributions to medical literature and
24 findings.

25 In the period where sort of citizen

1 based or citizen enabled budget making is
2 taking place in a variety of communities,
3 sort of finding mechanisms to invite in the
4 willing who just literally need a link or a
5 way to connect to each other to be engaged
6 with the process.

7 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Lee.

8 Sabeel, would you have any thoughts on
9 this?

10 MR. RAHMAN: Yeah, I mean, I think
11 there are lots of ways that this could go,
12 and, you know, however, we were just at the
13 start of what I hope is a long process of
14 figuring this out and trying this sort of
15 embed some of these ideas.

16 Maybe in the spirit of your question,
17 Adam, one of the things that we mention in
18 our OMB study to the President a couple
19 months ago is that is actually highlighting a
20 couple of different examples of how this
21 might go, right.

22 So like one of the examples in the
23 study talks about sort of more issue --
24 issue-specific expertise, so we have a
25 customer experience team, for example, who's

1 expertise is in engaging the public to --
2 talking about a minute ago. At the same time
3 we also have existing efforts that
4 (inaudible) has a participatory research
5 program to try to engage in some of those
6 types of expert and citizen -- expert and
7 community collaboration.

8 So there are lots of examples already,
9 right. I think part of what we're looking
10 forward to in this process is that agencies
11 are identifying their sort of one-year
12 strategic plans that Danielle mentioned -- is
13 sort of thinking about what are those
14 promising avenues to like explore more, do
15 more on, to -- that we haven't tried yet,
16 that we ought to be trying, right.

17 And I think all of us hope that this
18 would be something that becomes part of the
19 day to day practice of agencies, and I think
20 that requires a couple of different types --
21 probably overlapping types -- of
22 institutionalization.

23 MR. WHITE: Danielle, Will -- do
24 either of you have anything to add on that?

25 MS. CONLEY: I'll just agree with

1 everything that Sabeel said on that, and I do
2 think that one of things that agencies are
3 thinking about is how do we create that
4 muscle memory.

5 Like how do we embed -- a lot of them
6 are creating equity teams or have an equity
7 point person who is working with senior
8 leadership at the agency to really ask these
9 questions about various policies and programs
10 and I think, you know, the more that that
11 becomes sort of a regular day to day process,
12 you know -- we're developing a new program,
13 we're developing a new policy -- let's ask
14 these questions.

15 Who are the intended recipients? How
16 are we going to reach those intended
17 recipients? Is there anyone that we're
18 leaving behind really at the front end of the
19 policy process?

20 Hopefully, those kinds of questions
21 and that sort of assessment or analysis will
22 become embedded in everything that the
23 agencies are doing. At least, you know, that
24 is certainly our hope.

25 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Danielle.

1 Will?

2 MR. YEATMAN: Just super brief (break
3 in audio) that there's civic engagement. I
4 mean, you know, these are get out the vote
5 type efforts, time memorial, and it's just
6 really, really difficult. I mean, I'll note
7 this with respect to potential barriers to
8 participating in the regulatory process, it
9 could not be easier to submit a comment or to
10 participate in the notice and comment
11 process.

12 I mean, if you google even around the
13 subject matter of an important rule, it'll
14 take you right to the Federal Register
15 page -- federalregister.gov -- and on the top
16 right in a big green button, it says submit
17 comment here. You know, it just doesn't get
18 any easier than that in today's age.

19 So I just -- I certainly aspire and
20 hope for 100 percent civic engagement in this
21 country, but I do -- I recognize how tough it
22 is, and I'm not sure how much easier it can
23 be to participate in the regulatory process.

24 MR. WHITE: (inaudible) participation
25 -- let's turn to some of the audience

1 questions. At least a couple of them so far
2 have raised questions about what this
3 participation would look like. I'll do my
4 best to summarize the questions that are
5 coming in -- I apologize -- apologies in
6 advance if I butcher anybody's question.

7 But Grant MacIntyre, for example, he
8 points out that even if there is increased
9 outreaching and engagement with underserved
10 communities, he says the trade groups and
11 NGOs that already get visits with agency
12 heads will surely have an outsized role on
13 the regulatory process while underserved
14 populations will still be at risk of getting
15 lumped together in summaries or comments in
16 the Federal Register.

17 Similarly, Amit Nurang -- Amit Nurang,
18 I'm sorry -- offers the -- a similar
19 question, saying that every time we add more
20 steps to the regulatory process, we get more
21 opportunity for those who are already the
22 loudest voices in the room to have their
23 outsized impact.

24 So I guess a practical matter -- how
25 do we not just promote outreach to

1 underserved communities but also give a
2 weight to their comments in a way that
3 counterweights a little bit the outsized
4 loudest voices in the room? I already
5 butchered two questions. I'm sorry.

6 Lee or Danielle (inaudible) the last
7 time. Would you like to go first on this?

8 MS. CONLEY: Sure. I mean, I
9 think -- I think a part of this really is
10 about -- and Sabeel touched on this
11 briefly -- about engaging stakeholders and
12 how that's one of the -- the key pieces of
13 this is ensuring that like agencies are
14 engaging stakeholders.

15 But I think we've got to look at a
16 wide variety of stake holders, and so it's
17 not just this same, you know -- the same NGOs
18 and others who get voices, you know, with
19 administrations all the time. But really
20 being thoughtful about engaging stakeholders
21 that maybe, you know, the government hasn't
22 traditionally engaged before.

23 And like really thinking through like
24 who are the populations we haven't touched
25 and who are the folks who represent those

1 populations -- their interests.
2 You know, and I do think that agencies
3 are trying to be thoughtful about that --
4 about, you know, thinking through the various
5 stakeholders that they can touch to get at
6 these various populations, but, you know, I
7 think it's an area where there's always room
8 for improvement.

9 MR. WHITE: Sabeel?

10 MR. RAHMAN: Yeah, and I mean, I think
11 these are points well taken to us and as
12 Danielle mentioned, sort of areas to get
13 better -- I mean, you know, if I -- if I do
14 that classic law professor thing of
15 responding to a question and then toss it
16 back to you all with a question.

17 But, you know, as you -- out of ACUS,
18 your expertise is, in fact, institutional
19 design, and so I feel like this would be a
20 great topic for you all.

21 You know, I think we're very much
22 thinking through some of those implications
23 and tradeoffs and really looking to learn and
24 experiment as we go deeper into this work,
25 and so there -- you know, there's rarely a

1 silver bullet perfect answer, right, about
2 what the -- what the kind of platonic process
3 ought to be.
4 It's -- my intuition is going to
5 require, again, an all of the above approach
6 in a lot of experimenting, right, to try to
7 find a good balance where we're actually able
8 to get meaningful engagement from folks
9 that's also meaningful to the communities
10 themselves, right. I think they're (break in
11 audio) earlier.

12 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Sabeel. If you
13 hear a noise in the background, that's the
14 ACUS machinery swinging into action.

15 MR. RAHMAN: Love it. That's great.

16 MR. WHITE: So, Will, Lee -- any
17 thoughts on this institutional question about
18 how to not just promote engagement but also
19 to give greater weight to the voices that
20 they might not otherwise receive?

21 MR. RAINIE: I -- in thinking about
22 the hacks that citizens do now to become
23 active participants in their communities --
24 most dramatically, we often see this in
25 natural disasters. Just people find a way to

1 pitch their voices in -- to pitch their

2 hearts and souls and resources into.

3 And there -- I think there might be

4 ways to be opportunistic about things that

5 are happening in the culture -- sort of news

6 flareups or things like that where the

7 administrative and regulatory community might

8 sort of pop in and sort of invite those who

9 are, you know, engaged at the moment to weigh

10 in in a way that they care about. There's

11 sort of a participatory way to this that

12 doesn't sort of fit neatly into forums, but,

13 you know, people would probably be engaged

14 with that.

15 MR. YEATMAN: I'll just add super

16 quick with respect to the question. You

17 know, any given agency is going to have the

18 discretion to give weight to whatever class

19 of comments they want to. So, you know, it's

20 not -- it's a matter of political will really

21 assuming the engagement has been had and

22 assuming the comments have been submitted and

23 whatnot.

24 MR. WHITE: There's a couple of big

25 picture questions in the Q and A that we've

1 touched on a little bit, but I do want to
2 focus on them squarely.
3 Steven Buckley asks for a
4 clarification -- is the term underserved seen
5 as a matter of degrees or is it seen as a
6 binary yes no condition?

7 And similarly, from the outset of the
8 conversation, Courtney Rosen asked in
9 response to Sabeel's presentation -- she
10 asked how the equity order plays into this --
11 how, she asks -- how can policy makers
12 actually analyze equity.

13 So could we just pan back to those one
14 more time. How should an administration --
15 how should agencies and others involved in
16 the process begin by -- with a definition
17 of -- of underserved or equity (break in
18 audio) it's a marathon and we're looking at
19 the longer term.

20 Surely future administrations,
21 Republican and Democrat alike, will see these
22 things in different terms over time. How do
23 you think this will play out in a change from
24 administrations, not just again partisan
25 changes, but just the natural change of a

1 regulatory trajectory over time -- these
2 questions of underserved communities and
3 equity?

4 I don't know whose turn it is to go
5 first this time. Maybe Will? Let you go
6 first this time?

7 MR. YEATMAN: To be perfectly frank, I
8 don't expect -- I think someone said
9 previously and I can't remember whom, but
10 presidencies like to put their gloss on the
11 regulatory policies, and equity is the Biden
12 administration's gloss, and a subsequent
13 president is going to put a different gloss
14 on, you know, how they go about regulatory
15 action.

16 So I fear to the extent that this is a
17 function of presidential administration,
18 it'll last for as long as Biden is president.

19 MR. WHITE: Will, let me stick with
20 you for a second and then maybe we'll go to
21 Sabeel next. I mean, surely, for reasons
22 that you identified earlier -- surely even
23 say a future Republican administration would
24 see certain communities that they believe are
25 underserved in the regulatory process --

1 surely they have a view of equity even if
2 the, you know, the term equity has become
3 more prominent in recent years. You don't
4 think really that a future Republican
5 administration might not want -- or might
6 simply cast these -- these programs in their
7 own terms?

8 MR. YEATMAN: Well, geez, Louise,
9 that's the worst of all worlds. I mean, that
10 seems to me the most cynical -- the
11 definition of equity and underserved
12 communities are so broad, so capacious that
13 presidents of entirely opposite political
14 stripes can seize this mantel and kind of
15 pursue business as usual for Republican or
16 Democratic policy.

17 So that's exactly what I was getting
18 at, I guess. That would be a wholesale
19 shift. I mean, if a president with different
20 political values used this same principle to
21 advance different interests, that to me isn't
22 indicative of long-lasting success.

23 MR. WHITE: I hate to sound cynical.
24 So Sabeel, why don't you give this one a shot
25 instead? Why -- first of all, the basic

1 question about how we'll go about thinking
2 the terms equity and underserved, but also,
3 you know, how you think this plays out over
4 time.

5 MR. RAHMAN: Yeah, so, on that first
6 point, Danielle very helpfully sort of
7 articulated, right, our broad and multi-
8 dimensional definitions for equity and
9 underserved in the EO.

10 And I would offer -- I think that's
11 actually a very important conceptual starting
12 point, right, because it's a big country,
13 it's a big government and there are lots of
14 many different kinds of challenges that folks
15 are facing and overlapping challenges, too,
16 right.

17 And so, I mean, I read that broad -- I
18 think we all see that broadness is actually
19 important to making sure we're kind of having
20 the lens needed to speak to those kind of
21 matters of public interest, matters of
22 specific need that we've been talking about
23 today.

24 So it's not trying -- it's not that
25 you cover everything for every policy, right.

1 But it's that you want to make sure you are
2 not missing a set of chronic disparities or
3 challenges that might be particularly salient
4 in one set of issues that (inaudible) -- in
5 one domain.

6 And I think that leads to the other
7 point, too, is that, you know, I don't know
8 what the future holds; I'm not going to
9 prognosticate. But I think, you know, a lot
10 of this equity work is really about good
11 government, right, in the sense that we --
12 there are real, empirical, evidence-based
13 challenges, disparities, issues in the world
14 that we all, you know, I think have a shared
15 interest in trying to solve.

16 And so like that's what this is about,
17 right. I think kind of taking some of the --
18 sort of the present administration points
19 you're making out of it -- government has to
20 make good evidence-based policy that serves
21 (inaudible) purposes and serves the public
22 need.

23 And this is a way -- my view, at
24 least, that we do that better, right, by
25 making sure we're actually paying attention

1 to things that too often are too easily
2 overlooked.

3 MR. WHITE: Danielle?

4 MS. CONLEY: I mean, I just -- I would
5 very much agree with that, especially the
6 like what is good government point. And I do
7 think that, you know, totally appreciating
8 that every president will put his or her own
9 gloss on, you know, what they want their
10 administration to focus on.

11 But I do think at bottom (break in
12 audio) and our government should be concerned
13 about insuring that the programs and the
14 benefits that the government provides really
15 are accessible to everyone who's eligible.

16 And like that should -- I mean, to
17 me -- like that at bottom should be sort of a
18 driving principle across administrations.
19 And I do think that that's how we've tried to
20 interpret this executive order, and that's
21 certainly the mission of the agencies, to
22 make sure that no one's left behind, that
23 there's not a program that, you know, people
24 from rural communities aren't getting the
25 benefit of because they don't have access to

1 it.

2 And I think -- I really do think that
3 that is something that no matter who the
4 president will sort of transcend
5 administrations.

6 Now, what that looks like, obviously,
7 may be different. But I do think at bottom,
8 it is about good government and making sure
9 that we're serving the people.

10 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Danielle. Lee, it
11 looks like we only have a minute left. So I
12 guess you'll get the last word on this.

13 MR. RAINIE: Well, I'll finish on
14 adding on to Danielle's point. I think that
15 larger forces in the culture are -- and in
16 technology in particular -- aren't
17 necessarily political and dependent on
18 administrations. They're -- the structure of
19 organizations themselves is inevitably going
20 to (break in audio) this is an age where we
21 actually have so many more voices in the
22 public square, visible, than we've ever seen
23 before.

24 There's going to be some way that the
25 regulatory state is going to figure out how

1 to watch, monitor, draw the data from them,
2 as Sabeel suggested, and make meaning out of
3 it in a way that doesn't necessarily require
4 people to make a comment in a comment, you
5 know, website on an agency structure.

6 The other thing that will happen is
7 that citizens themselves are just going to
8 make their voices known whether they comply
9 with the, you know, process of -- of
10 commenting on, you know, rules or not. And
11 so I -- things are going to be less
12 hierarchical, they're going to be more
13 visible, there's going to be more data.

14 I can imagine all the agencies
15 represented in the audience here are going to
16 have artificial intelligence tools that are
17 going to help them figure out who's
18 underserved or whose voice isn't yet fully in
19 the process, and so, you know, that kind of
20 stuff is going to change the nature of this
21 over time.

22 MR. WHITE: Thanks, Lee. Thanks again
23 for all of this. And apologies to those in
24 the audience who submitted questions that we
25 didn't get a chance to get to.

1 I see there's a question in there
2 about -- about the eventual nomination of an
3 OIRA administrator. Sabeel, I was looking
4 forward to posing that question to you. I'm
5 just kidding.

6 But for the folks who would like to --
7 whose questions we didn't reach and for all
8 of you -- please keep in mind that this --
9 just the first in a series of conversations
10 that ACUS is hosting about these issues. As
11 it happens, the next one will be on November
12 8th at 1 o'clock P.M. The title is Sources
13 of Reforms to Improve Engagement with
14 Underserved Communities.

15 So I'm looking forward to that
16 conversation myself, and I know you all are
17 too. But in the meantime, thanks again for
18 joining us, and thanks especially to our
19 speakers. This brings our conversation to a
20 close.

21 MS. CONLEY: Thank you.

22 (End of Video Recording.)

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

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

I, Wendy Sawyer, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and transcribed the foregoing recorded proceedings and that the transcript is a true record, to the best of my ability.

DATED this 23rd day of December, 2021.

WENDY SAWYER, CDLT