

December 19, 2007

Stephen Llewellyn, Executive Officer Executive Secretariat, EEOC, 10th Fl 1801 L. Street, NW Washington, DC 20507

Dear Mr. Llewellyn,

RE: Comments on: Federal Register: November 15, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 220),

After thorough review of the Federal Register: November 15, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 220), I have the following comment in reference to page 7 of 8, item 4. "Race":

I do not agree with having to spell out what each numbered race category encompasses. This can open up many instances of conversation/interpretation about each stated sub-category, leading only to widen the gap in understanding of diversity, and add to workload for those working in the handling such data/issues. Furthermore, I do not fully agree with, nor understand how the subcategories were officially established; as in some instances they apply and in others they are lacking in accordance with both the dictionary and encyclopedia's definitions of each/all. In conclusion, I feel it best to simply list the races as numbered <u>without</u> any subcategories attached as follows: (i.e. 1. American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2. Asian, 3. Black, 4. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 5. White), as in many online applications.

That is the only comment I have with regard to the document as proposed. I ask that the above stated comment be thoroughly considered as the issue of Race as currently listed in the proposal leaves much open for interpretation serving only to make heavier the workload and create more gaps rather than brining diversity closer together.

Sincerely,

Dianne E. Marin

Management Analyst/EEO Counselor & Mediator