UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 13, 2018

+ + + + +

The United States Sentencing Commission met in Suite 2-500, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Washington, D.C., at 10:30 a.m., the Honorable William H. Pryor, Jr., Acting Chair, presiding.

PRESENT

WILLIAM H. PRYOR, JR., Acting Chair RACHEL E. BARKOW, Commissioner CHARLES R. BREYER, Commissioner DANNY C. REEVES, Commissioner DAVID RYBICKI, Ex Officio Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT

KENNETH P. COHEN, Staff Director KATHLEEN C. GRILLI, General Counsel

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:32 a.m.
3	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: (presiding) Good
4	morning. I want to call this meeting to order.
5	Thank you for attending this public
6	meeting of the United States Sentencing
7	Commission. The Commission appreciates the
8	attendance of those joining us here at the
9	Thurgood Marshall building, as well as those
10	watching our livestream broadcast on the
11	Commission's website. As always, we welcome the
12	significant public interest in the ongoing work
13	of the Commission.
14	I would like to start today by
15	introducing the other members of the Commission.
16	First, to my immediate left, is
17	Commissioner Rachel Barkow. Commissioner Barkow
18	is the Segal Family Professor of Regulatory Law
19	and Policy at the New York University School of
20	Law and serves as the faculty director of the
21	Center on the Administration of Criminal Law at

1	the law school.
2	To my immediate right is Judge Charles
3	Breyer, who is a Senior District Judge for the
4	Northern District of California and has served as
5	a United States District Judge since 1998.
6	To my far left is Judge Danny Reeves,
7	who is a United States District Judge for the
8	Eastern District of Kentucky and has served in
9	that position since 2001.
10	David Rybicki, to my far right, joins
11	as the Ex Officio Commissioner from the
12	Department of Justice. Commissioner Rybicki was
13	appointed Deputy Assistant Attorney General for
14	the Department of Justice's Criminal Division in
15	2017.
16	Patricia Cushwa, who represents the
17	Parole Commission as the designated Ex Officio
18	member of the Commission, is not able to attend
19	today's meeting.
20	Before we proceed with the business of
21	the day, I would like to take a moment to comment

1 Commissioner Barkow's service the on on 2 Sentencing Commission. Today's public meeting 3 marks Commissioner Barkow's last meeting with us and caps a five-year tenure as a Commissioner. 4 5 We've worked alongside each other here was confirmed, since we 6 since she were both 7 confirmed by the Senate in 2013. Among our accomplishments during her 8 tenure are the 9 Commission's Drugs Minus Two Amendment and its 10 retroactivity that reduced sentences for eligible 11 offenders by about 17 percent; the comprehensive 12 rewrite of the Illegal Reentry guideline that has 13 proved very popular with district judges; last 14 year's synthetic drug amendment that responded to

retroactivity that reduced sentences for eligible offenders by about 17 percent; the comprehensive rewrite of the Illegal Reentry guideline that has proved very popular with district judges; last year's synthetic drug amendment that responded to the urgent problem of synthetic cathinones, synthetic cannabinoids, and fentanyl; the Commission's Report to Congress on the Career Offender guideline; the series of reports on the impact of federal mandatory minimum penalties, and several research publications on recidivism, just to name a few. Her steadfast commitment to

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	fair sentencing and her quick ability to process
2	sentencing data has served the Commission and the
3	public well.
4	Commissioner Barkow, thank you for
5	your service. I will miss you.
6	The first order of business is a vote
7	to adopt the August 23, 2018 public meeting
8	minutes. Is there a motion to do so?
9	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: So moved.
10	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a
11	second?
12	COMMISSIONER REEVES: Second.
13	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there any
14	discussion on the motion?
15	(No response.)
16	Vote on the motion by saying aye.
17	(unanimous ayes)
18	Any nays?
19	The motion is adopted by a voice vote.
20	The next item of business is the
21	report of the Chair. Let me start with an update

1	on the work of the Commission since our last
2	public meeting in August.
3	Most significantly, I'd like to call
4	your attention to our new 2018 Guidelines Manual,
5	which incorporates guideline amendments that took
6	effect on November 1, 2018. For judges,
7	probation officers, members of the bar, and other
8	practitioners who have a hard copy of the new
9	Guidelines Manual, you may notice that this
10	year's version bears the color crimson, the color
11	of a certain football team in Tuscaloosa,
12	Alabama. Roll Tide.
13	(Laughter.)
14	You will notice that for the first
15	time there is a list and short description of
16	each of the new amendments incorporated in the
17	new Guidelines Manual.
18	In addition to being on the
19	Commission's website, the 2018 manual is
20	available as a web-based app that features
21	additional tools to assist in understanding and

1 applying the federal sentencing guidelines. 2 With respect to research and 3 publications, September, the Commission in published a report entitled, "Mandatory Minimum 4 Penalties for Identity Theft Offenses 5 in the System." Federal Criminal Justice 6 This 7 publication is the fifth in the Commission's series the impact of mandatory minimum 8 on penalties on federal offenders. 9 The publication 10 examines recent trends in the charging of general 11 identity theft and aggravated identity theft offenses. 12 Some of the key findings include that 13 14 1.6 percent of all federal offenders were 15 convicted under 18 U.S.C. § 1028A, the aggravated 16 identity theft statute that carries a mandatory 17 consecutive two-year penalty. These offenders, 18 however, comprised slightly more than half of all 19 federal identity theft offenders and have more than doubled in number over the last decade. 20 21 The Commission will publish the final

1 report in its current series on mandatory minimum 2 penalties in January, which will study the impact of mandatory minimum penalties on federal sex 3 offenders. 4 5 November, the Commission also publication 6 updated its titled, "Federal 7 Sentencing: The Basics." This publication is a great resource for understanding 8 basic 9 application of the sentencing guidelines, related 10 federal statutes, and rules of procedure. 11 publication discusses the landmark passage of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, key Supreme Court 12 13 decisions concerning the guidelines, and the 14 sentencing process today. The Commission will have several other 15 reports ready for publication in early 2019. 16 17 January, the Commission will release another 18 report in our series of reports on recidivism, 19 this one focusing on violent offenders. 20 our findings are that violent federal offenders

recidivate much more often than non-violent

1 federal offenders, with a recidivism rate of 64 2 percent compared to 40 percent for non-violent Violent offenders recidivate more 3 offenders. quickly and commit more serious offenses than 4 5 non-violent offenders, and violent offenders do not age out of committing crime nearly to the 6 7 degree as non-violent offenders. Over one-third, 36 percent, of violent offenders older than 50 at 8 the time of release reoffend, more than double 9 10 the rate for non-violent offenders, 15 percent. 11 The Commission also plans to release 12 a report on recidivism and firearms offenders 13 early in 2019. 14 The last upcoming report that I'd like to highlight is a part of our ongoing examination 15 16 of the overall structure and operation of the 17 quidelines post-Booker. As part of that 18 examination, in November 2017, we updated the 19 analysis of demographic differences in federal 20 sentencing in the 2012 Booker Report. Much like 21 the Booker Report, that updated analysis found

1 that sentence length continues to be associated 2 with some demographic factors, including race. 3 the Commission will In January, release a report that updates the portion of the 4 5 2012 Booker Report discussing different 6 sentencing practices among judges in the same 7 federal district; that is, intra-district For this upcoming report, we have 8 differences. 9 refined our methodology to focus on judges who 10 sit in the same city. It analyzes the sentencing 11 practices of judges 30 located in large 12 metropolitan areas nationwide and finds 13 even within individual cities, sentencina 14 practices vary significantly. 15 Before I turn to the General Counsel 16 advise on possible publish to votes to us 17 proposed amendments, I should note that, since 18 March 2017, the Commission has operated with four 19 voting Commissioners. Although only three publish 20 affirmative votes required are to 21 proposed amendments, which we are doing today, by

1	statute, four affirmative votes are required to
2	promulgate amendments. As mentioned at the
3	outset, Commissioner Barkow's term will come to
4	an end when Congress adjourns sine die, as will
5	mine.
6	Four nominations are currently
7	pending in the United States Senate, including
8	mine, to serve as a second term along with a
9	separate nomination to serve as Chair.
10	Therefore, unless the Senate confirms at least
11	two Commissioners, the Commission will lose its
12	voting quorum and not be able to vote to
13	promulgate the proposed amendments we publish
14	today until a voting quorum is restored.
15	The next item of business is a
16	possible vote to publish in the Federal Register
17	proposed guideline amendments and issues for
18	public comment.
19	The General Counsel, Kathleen Grilli,
20	will advise the Commission on the first possible
21	vote concerning a proposed technical amendment.

1	MS. GRILLI: Thank you, Judge Pryor.
2	The proposed amendment makes various
3	technical changes to the Guidelines Manual. Part
4	A makes technical changes to reflect editorial
5	reclassification of certain sections in the
6	United States Code. Part B makes certain
7	technical changes to the Commentary of §2D1.1.
8	Part C makes technical changes to the Commentary
9	of §§2A4.2, 2A6.1, 2B3.2, and to Appendix A. And
10	finally, Part D makes clerical changes to various
11	parts of the commentary in the manual.
12	A motion to publish the proposed
13	technical amendment with an original comment
14	period closing on February 19, 2019, and a reply
15	comment period closing on March 15, 2019, would
16	be in order at this time.
17	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a motion
18	to publish the proposed amendment as suggested by
19	the General Counsel?
20	COMMISSIONER BREYER: So moved.
21	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a

1	second?
2	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: Second.
3	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Any discussion of
4	the motion?
5	(No response.)
6	Vote on the motion by saying aye.
7	(unanimous ayes)
8	Any nays?
9	The motion is adopted, and let the
10	record reflect that at least three Commissioners
11	voted in favor of the motion to publish.
12	The General Counsel will now advise
13	the Commission on a possible vote concerning a
14	proposed amendment on §1B1.10.
15	MS. GRILLI: Yes. This proposed
16	amendment contains two parts. The Commission is
17	considering whether to promulgate either or both
18	parts of these, as they are not mutually
19	exclusive.
20	Part A of the proposed amendment is
21	the result of the Commission's consideration of

1	miscellaneous amendment issues, including
2	possible amendments to this guideline in light of
3	Koons v. United States. Part A would revise
4	§1B1.10 in various ways and includes three
5	options for responding to United States v. Koons.
6	Part B of the proposed amendment would
7	resolve a circuit conflict concerning application
8	of §1B1.10, pursuant to the Commission's
9	authority under 28 United States Code § 991(b) in
10	Braxton v. United States. This circuit conflict
11	has arisen concerning whether the court is
12	permitted under §1B1.10 to reduce a sentence
13	below the amended guideline range to reflect
14	departures other than substantial assistance that
15	the defendant received at his original
16	sentencing.
17	The 7th and the 9th Circuits have held
18	that, if a defendant received a substantial
19	assistance departure, a court may reduce a
20	defendant's sentence further below the amended
21	guideline minimum to reflect those other

1	departures, in addition to substantial
2	assistance. The 6th and 11th Circuits have held
3	that they may not.
4	Part B of the proposed amendment would
5	revise Application Note 3 of the Commentary to
6	resolve this circuit conflict and providing two
7	options for resolving that conflict. One, which
8	would adopt the approach of the 6th and the 11th
9	Circuits, the other which would adopt the
10	approach of the 7th and the 9th Circuits.
11	A motion to publish the proposed
12	amendment with an original comment period closing
13	on February 19, a reply comment period closing or
14	March 15, 2019, and technical and conforming
15	amendment authority to staff, is appropriate at
16	this time.
17	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a motion
18	to publish the proposed amendment as suggested by
19	the General Counsel?
20	COMMISSIONER Reeves: So moved.
21	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a

1	second?
2	COMMISSIONER Breyer: Second.
3	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Any discussion on
4	the motion?
5	(No response.)
6	Vote on the motion by saying aye.
7	(unanimous ayes)
8	Any nays?
9	The motion is adopted, and let the
10	record reflect that at least three Commissioners
11	voted in favor of the motion to publish.
12	The General Counsel will now advise
13	the Commission on a possible vote concerning a
14	proposed miscellaneous amendment.
15	MS. GRILLI: Yes. This proposed
16	amendment contains five parts. The Commission is
17	considering whether to promulgate any or all of
18	these parts, as they are not mutually exclusive.
19	Part A responds to the FDA
20	Reauthorization Act of 2017 and amends Appendix
21	A and the Commentary to \$2N2.1 and makes a

1	technical correction to the Commentary of §2N1.1.
2	Part B responds to the FAA
3	Reauthorization Act by amending Appendix A,
4	§2A5.2, and the commentaries to §§2A2.4 and
5	2X5.2.
6	Part C responds to the Allow States
7	and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act
8	of 2017 by amending Appendix A, §§2G1.1 and
9	2G1.3.
10	Part D responds to a guideline
11	application issue concerning the interaction of
12	§§2G1.3 and 3D1.2.
13	And Part E revises the guidelines to
14	address the fact that the Bureau of Prisons no
15	longer operates a shock incarceration program, as
16	described in §5F1.7 of the Guidelines Manual.
17	A motion to publish the proposed
18	amendment with an original comment period closing
19	on February 19, a reply comment period closing on
20	March 15, 2019, and technical and conforming
21	amendment authority to staff would be in order at

1	this time.
2	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a motion
3	to publish the proposed amendment as suggested by
4	the General Counsel?
5	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: So moved.
6	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a
7	second?
8	COMMISSIONER BREYER: Second.
9	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there any
10	discussion on the motion?
11	(No response.)
12	Vote on the motion by saying aye.
13	(unanimous ayes)
14	Any nays?
15	The motion is adopted, and let the
16	record reflect that at least three Commissioners
17	voted in favor of the motion to publish.
18	The General Counsel will now advise
19	the Commission on a possible vote concerning a
20	proposed career offender amendment.
21	MS. GRILLI: Yes. This proposed

1	amendment contains four parts, Parts A through D,
2	and the Commission is considering whether to
3	promulgate any or all of these parts, as they are
4	not mutually exclusive.
5	I'll start with Parts B through D.
6	Parts B through D address various issues that
7	came to the Commission's attention during the
8	public comment period.
9	Part B would address the concern that
10	certain robbery offenses such as Hobbs Act
11	robbery no longer constitute a crime of violence
12	under §4B1.2, as amended in 2016. Three options
13	to address this issue are presented.
14	Part C would amend §4B1.2 to address
15	certain issues regarding the commentary provision
16	stating that the terms "crimes of violence" and
17	"controlled substance offense" include the
18	offenses of aiding and abetting, conspiring to
19	commit, and attempting to commit those crimes.
20	Again, three options are presented to resolve
21	this issue.

1	And finally, Part D of the proposed
2	amendment would amend the definition of
2	amendment would amend the definition of
3	"controlled substance defense" in §4B1.2(b) to
4	include offenses involving an offer to sell a
5	controlled substance and offenses described in
6	46 United States Code §§ $70503(a)$ and $70506(b)$.
7	A motion to publish Parts B through D
8	of the Career Offender amendment with an original
9	comment period closing on February 19th and a
10	reply comment period closing on March 15, 2019,
11	and technical and conforming amendment authority
12	to staff is appropriate at this time.
13	COMMISSIONER BREYER: So moved.
14	COMMISSIONER REEVES: Second.
15	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: I didn't call the
16	motion yet.
17	(Laughter.)
18	But it has been moved and seconded.
19	Is there any discussion on the motion?
20	(No response.)
21	Vote on the motion by saying aye.

1	(unanimous ayes)
2	Any nays?
3	The motion is adopted, and let the
4	record reflect that at least three Commissioners
5	voted in favor of the motion to publish Parts B
6	through D of the proposed Career Offender
7	amendment.
8	The General Counsel will now advise
9	the Commission on a possible vote concerning Part
10	A of the proposed Career Offender amendment.
11	MS. GRILLI: Yes. Part A of the
12	proposed amendment would amend \$4B1.2 to
13	establish that the categorical approach and
14	modified categorical approach do not apply in
15	determining whether a conviction is a crime
16	violence or controlled substance offense.
17	Specifically, it would provide that, in making
18	that determination, a court shall consider any
19	element or alternative means for meeting an
20	element of the offense committed by the defendant
21	as well as the conduct that formed the basis of

1	the offense of conviction.
2	Part A would also allow courts to look
3	at sources from the judicial record beyond the
4	statute of conviction in determining the conduct
5	that formed the basis of the conviction, and
6	would make similar revision to \$2L1.2 as well as
7	additional conforming changes to the guidelines
8	that use the terms "crime of violence" and
9	"controlled substance offense."
10	A motion to publish Part A of the
11	Career Offender amendment with an original
12	comment period closing on February 19, 2019, and
13	a reply comment period closing on March 15, 2019,
14	technical and conforming amendment authority to
15	staff would be in order at this time.
16	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a motion
17	to publish Part A of the proposed amendment as
18	suggested by the General Counsel?
19	COMMISSIONER REEVES: So moved.
20	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Second?
21	COMMISSIONER BREYER: Second.

1	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Any discussion?
2	(No response.)
3	Hearing no discussion, will the
4	General Counsel please call the roll?
5	MS. GRILLI: Yes.
6	Commissioner Barkow?
7	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: I vote no on
8	this for the reasons that I gave at our prior
9	meeting.
10	MS. GRILLI: Judge Breyer?
11	COMMISSIONER BREYER: Aye.
12	MS. GRILLI: Judge Reeves?
13	COMMISSIONER REEVES: Aye.
14	MS. GRILLI: Judge Pryor?
15	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Aye.
16	The motion is adopted. Let the record
17	reflect that at least three Commissioners voted
18	in favor of the motion to publish Part A of the
19	proposed Career Offender amendment.
20	Is there any further discussion before
21	the Commission?

1	COMMISSIONER RYBICKI: I'd like to
2	make a comment, Judge Pryor.
3	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER RYBICKI: Thank you,
5	Judge Pryor.
6	On behalf of the Department of
7	Justice, I'd like to thank the Commission for
8	taking up the Department's top priority for this
9	amendment cycle; namely, the categorical
10	approach. As the Department explained at length
11	in its annual report to the Commission, the
12	categorical approach often results in arbitrary,
13	inconsistent, and unjust sentencing outcomes.
14	The approach has severely impaired the proper
15	functioning of sentencing enhancements under the
16	Armed Career Criminal Act, the Career Offender
17	guideline, and §2K2.1.
18	We appreciate that the draft amendment
19	language for public comment, which you voted on
20	today, addresses many of the problems created by
21	the categorical approach, which we highlighted to

1	you in our report. Here's just a few of those
2	<pre>problems:</pre>
3	First, state robbery offenses often do
4	not qualify as crimes of violence at all. So, in
5	the 9th Circuit, neither California nor Nevada
6	state robbery is a crime of violence, even when,
7	as in one case, the defendant put a gun to the
8	victim's head and shot a second victim. This is
9	a problem in other federal circuits as well.
10	Second, unbelievably enough,
11	conspiracy to commit murder and aid of
12	racketeering under 19 U.S.C. § 1959 is not a
13	crime of violence in some federal circuits.
14	And third, as has been mentioned,
15	Hobbs Act robbery does not constitute a crime of
16	violence in the 10th Circuit.
17	Today's draft amendment suggests
18	making additional documents available to federal
19	judges when they determine whether a previous
20	conviction constitutes a crime of violence. The
21	draft amendments also simplify the procedure for

1 inchoate offenses.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2 And finally, the Commission invited comment on the threshold issue, as 3 whether Part A of the proposed amendment 4 is 5 consistent with Commission authority under The Department does not think 6 28 U.S.C. § 994. 7 this is a particularly close question and will further explain our reasoning in a letter in 8 9 response to the proposed amendments.

> We think these amendments represent a positive first step in resolving the systemic problems created by the categorical approach. However, while the Department commends Commission for the guideline amendment language under consideration today, we are disappointed that the Commission is not publishing language that more forcefully suggests that courts should consider the actual conduct of defendants determining whether prior conviction а purposes of the advisory quideline calculation is, in fact, a violent crime.

1 Allowing judges to consider the facts 2 of a previous conviction will help to ensure that violent conduct is not overlooked 3 and that recidivist defendants 4 receive sentences 5 sufficient to protect the public. Publishing amendment 6 language allows courts to consider actual conduct would 7 8 have given future Commissioners the benefit of 9 thoughtful submissions from law professors, 10 defenders, victims' groups, and 11 stakeholders on this important issue. We are 12 disappointed that the Commission chose not to 13 follow this course. 14 Many federal courts have noted the 15 absurd results that the categorical approach has 16 produced. Just last month, Judge Jerry Smith, 17 writing for the en banc 5th Circuit in a decision 18 involving a defendant who beat the victim to 19 death with a baseball bat, said, quote, "It is 20 time for this Court to take a mulligan on crimes 21 of violence. The well-intentioned experiment

1 launched 15 years ago has crashed and 2 By requiring sentencing courts and this ignore 3 specifics Court to the of prior convictions well beyond what the categorical 4 5 approach and Supreme Court precedent instruct, 6 jurisprudence has proven unworkable and our 7 By employing unwise. the term `crime of8 violence, ' Congress and the U.S. Sentencina 9 Commission obviously meant to implement a policy 10 penalizing felons for past crimes that are, by 11 any reasonable reckoning, violent; hence, 12 term." Unquote. The Department of Justice sincerely 13 14 that, when the Commission regains 15 quorum next year, it promulgates amendments that allow federal courts to consider conduct 16 17 sentencing. The Commission has a statutory duty 18 to ensure that federal sentencing accurately 19 reflects the seriousness of offenses committed by 20 criminal defendants. And in the Department's 21 view, the Commission cannot satisfy this duty by

1	leaving unaddressed the serious and unjust
2	inconsistencies that the categorical approach
3	creates.
4	Acting Chair Pryor, I thank you, and
5	I look forward to working with the Commission on
6	behalf of the Department in the new year.
7	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Commissioner
8	Barkow?
9	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: Yes. I just
10	wanted to say a few words, since this is my last
11	official hearing here.
12	First, I'd like to thank you, Chair
13	Pryor, and prior Chair Saris, and my fellow
14	Commissioners, current and past, as well as the
15	amazing staff here at the Commission, for making
16	my time really a wonderful experience. The
17	people here work really hard. They're the best
18	public servants you can imagine, and it's really
19	been a joy to work with everyone. So, I want to
20	thank you.
21	I also want to say how grateful I am

1 to the various stakeholders and citizens who take 2 the time to comment on our proposals, offer us 3 priorities that we should consider, keep informed about what's happening on the ground. 4 5 There are many committed advocates out there, and I've been really thankful to have your input over 6 7 It's been tremendously helpful to me the years. as we have considered our proposals. 8 I am proud of what the Commission has 9 10 accomplished, almost always with unanimous and 11 bipartisan agreement, in my time here, which I 12 think is too infrequently happening in other 13 parts of government. But I do believe it happens 14 here uniquely because we focus on facts and data, 15 and then, we let them guide us to the right policy outcomes that are consistent with the law. 16 17 And I should add that I do believe 18 that we could achieve even better results, that 19 would be better for public safety and 20 proportional sentences, if some of those laws 21 were changed. But, within the bounds of what we

are authorized to do here at the Commission, I
think we've passed many amendments in my time
here that have improved sentencing.

And I won't catalog them all, but the highlight for me that I do want to mention was our vote on Drugs Minus Two and, in particular, making it retroactive as well. It allowed more than 31,000 people to obtain more proportionate sentences, it saved prison resources, and it did not compromise public safety.

I should just add, I will never forget the public hearing we had on retroactivity. That hearing was more crowded than this one, way more crowded than this one. And there were a lot of family members there that day who knew what the decision could mean for them. And I remember vividly many tearful, happy tearful responses, when we voted to make that amendment retroactive. And for me, it put a personal face on the very important work that this Commission does every day, and it vividly demonstrated why proportional

1	sentencing has to be at the core of everything
2	that the Commission does.
3	So, I am grateful to President Obama
4	for giving me the opportunity to serve on the
5	Commission. It may not be the dream government
6	job of many to serve on the Sentencing
7	Commission, but it was mine, and it was even more
8	wonderful than I hoped it would be. So, I want
9	to thank everyone for being such wonderful
10	colleagues in my time here.
11	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Thank you.
12	Judge Breyer?
13	COMMISSIONER BREYER: Yes. This is,
14	of course, a bittersweet time for me because we
15	are losing two Commissioners, one I trust
16	temporarily and one a little bit longer than
17	temporarily.
18	So, let me address Commissioner
19	Barkow's tenure while I've served with her. And,
20	you know, I was thinking of what can I say about
21	her, and then, I thought, you know, listening to

1 what you said today is like the best evidence of 2 Commissioner what kind of she was. Her 3 her goals, her thoughtfulness, priorities, experience, she brought to bear on everything 4 that we did from the technical and miscellaneous 5 amendments to the far more substantive amendments 6 7 and far-reaching proposals that were enacted by 8 the Commission. 9 Her attitude towards these matters was 10 never ideological. It was always, what does the 11 evidence show? What are the facts? What has 12 experience? our Indeed, it is the 13 experience and the facts that ought to guide us 14 through sentencing policies and sentencing 15 changes. People can be very farsighted about 16 17 what is the perfect world, what is the ideal world 18 of sentencing? I've said, and I've done it now 19 more than 50 years, I can't tell you what the 20 right sentence is; I have a better idea of what 21 the wrong sentence is, and that's all been borne

1 out by experience.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

And what Commissioner Barkow has done
is always bring us back to the point of "what do
the facts show?" While we are going out of
business as a quorum, we are very much remaining
in business in terms of gathering the facts,
gathering the evidence.

The staff of the Sentencing Commission does a number of really wonderful things in the discharge of their obligation to Congress and to the public. One of which is, I think the most significant, the gathering of information, the digesting of information, the understanding of the information, and seeing what conclusions that information, which is all the experience of the sentencings, thousands every year of upon thousands of federal sentences, what does it all In our Commission meetings, Commissioner show. Barkow has always looked at "what does the evidence show?"

21 It has been a pleasure, Rachel,

1	working with you. You are my counsel, and you
2	will continue to be so in the years to come,
3	because I know that your interest in sentencing
4	remains just as firm and just as much of a guiding
5	light to your life, whether you are on the
6	Commission or not. So, I want to thank you
7	personally for all that you have given to this
8	Commission, and I think will give over the years.
9	As to you, our Acting Chair, now it
10	puts me in somewhat of a ticklish position
11	because, as an appointment filling a slot of a
12	Democrat on this Commission it is a bipartisan
13	Commission, not a nonpartisan Commission, it's
14	bipartisan by statute it is hard to say
15	whether, if I urge the United States Senate to
16	confirm Chair Pryor as the next permanent Chair,
17	whether that will help him or hurt him.
18	(Laughter.)
19	And so, I'll simply say that what he
20	has brought to the Commission, in my experience,
21	as he serves as Acting Chair and formerly as a

1 member, is a strong desire to work together and 2 to seek an accommodation. Understanding that the 3 perfect the enemy of the good, is he has tirelessly tried to achieve some consensus on the 4 5 proposals that we put forward. That's a noble Sometimes it works; sometimes it doesn't. 6 task. 7 But he has never ceased in his efforts to bring about some workable consensus. 8 9 It has been a pleasure working with 10 He has always been polite. He has always him. 11 been deferential. He's always focused on the 12 right issues. He has brought a sense of intellect and commitment and effort to achieve a workable 13 14 solution to the problems that we confront. 15 You know, it's rather remarkable. Ιn session, 16 this duck lame every now and 17 then -- judges I know are not supposed to look at 18 the politics of what's going on, but, as somebody 19 famously remarked, even the Supreme Court looks 20 at election results, and judges do too. 21 we do look out and we do see that right now is

1 pending before the Senate and before the Congress 2 a bill for criminal justice reform. All I would say about that is, if it 3 does pass, it is testimony to the fact that, No. 4 5 1, there can be a bipartisan solution to a No. 2, it is a very, very high 6 problem, and, 7 priority of the public. It's not just people who are confined in prison, but's also for the 8 9 protection of the public, we must engage 10 criminal justice reform. It's essential that it 11 and reflect the circumstances change that 12 surround each of us in carrying 13 responsibilities. 14 So, I would say that it is my hope 15 that the Senate will act on nominees for this 16 Commission. It's important that we continue with 17 It serves the public and, in fact, if our work. 18 legislation is enacted, it will become even more 19 crucial that the Commission be given a quorum in 20 order to try to implement the will of Congress, as demonstrated by any statute that's enacted. 21

1	So, I hope that you will continue. I
2	hope the next time we meet it will be in your
3	capacity as Chair of the Commission. I am
4	confident confident that a Commission under
5	the Chair of Judge Pryor will be productive, will
6	reach accommodations on any number of things.
7	And I hope, I sincerely hope, that it will bring
8	about some proposals with respect to
9	simplification of the Guidelines which will
10	enable judges, basically our audience, the people
11	that we serve, it will enable these judges to
12	carry out their responsibilities, their
13	sentencing responsibilities, which are the most
14	difficult responsibilities for district court
15	judges.
16	So, thank you.
17	And to Rachel, bon voyage. I have
18	your telephone number. I guess we have to say
19	now I have your email.
20	And to Judge Pryor, I hope that it
21	will be soon that you'll be returning to the

1	Commission.
2	Thank you.
3	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Thank you. Thank
4	you for those very kind words, Judge Breyer. It's
5	been a great pleasure working with you as well.
6	And I, too, hope to be able to return to working
7	with you.
8	Your remarks reminded me of a
9	conversation I had with a man who served as the
10	Attorney General of Alabama before I assumed that
11	office. And he called me when I became the
12	Attorney General of Alabama and said, "Bill, let
13	me know whether you would need me to be for ya or
14	agin ya, whichever will help you the most."
15	(Laughter.)
16	And I want to thank again Commissioner
17	Barkow for her service to the Commission.
18	I also want to thank publicly, and
19	express my personal appreciation, for the
20	important service and contributions made by
0.1	mombors of the Commission's Mistims Advisory

1	Group, who are departing us. The distinguished
2	departing members include the Chair of the
3	Victims Advisory Group, T. Michael Andrews;
4	Elizabeth Cronin; Kimberley Garth-James; Keli
5	Luther; James Marsh; and Virginia Swisher.
6	Similarly, I would like to acknowledge
7	and praise the service and work of Ronald Levine,
8	whose term as Chair of the Commission's
9	Practitioners Advisory Group, has expired, and
10	the other members who are departing us: James
11	Boren, Pamela Mackey, Gordon Armstrong, and Steve
12	Nolder.
13	Finally, I would like to thank Wendy
14	Bremner, a member of the Tribal Issues Advisory
15	Group, for her service.
16	Is there any further business of the
17	Commission?
18	(No response.)
19	Hearing none, is there a motion to
20	adjourn?
21	COMMISSIONER REEVES: So moved.

1	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Is there a
2	second?
3	COMMISSIONER BARKOW: Second.
4	ACTING CHAIR PRYOR: Vote on the
5	motion by saying aye.
6	(unanimous ayes)
7	All in favor?
8	Anyone opposed?
9	All right. The motion is adopted by
10	a voice vote, and the meeting is adjourned. Thank
11	you for joining us today, and, pending further
12	action in the Senate, I hope that I will see you
13	again soon.
14	(Laughter.)
15	(Whereupon, at 11:09 a.m., the meeting
16	was adjourned.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	