Supplementary Materials for

Jordan Tama, "Crises, Commissions, and Reform: The Impact of Blue-Ribbon

Panels," *Political Research Quarterly* 67, 1 (March 2014): 152-164

Note: This Appendix is also available from the publisher at

U.S. National Security Commissions Data Set Codebook

Purpose

The U.S. National Security Commissions Data Set presents information related to U.S. blue-ribbon commissions that examined national security issues between January 1981 and January 2009. The purpose of the data set is to enable analysis of the influence of blue-ribbon commissions and of the conditions and characteristics that affect the influence of these commissions.

Scope and definitions

The universe of cases in this data set consists of all U.S. blue-ribbon commissions that examined one or more elements of national security policy between the beginning of the Reagan administration on January 20, 1981 and the end of the George W. Bush administration on January 20, 2009. The data set only includes commissions that were created and completed their work between those two dates.

I define a blue-ribbon commission as a temporary advisory panel lacking formal policymaking power that is established by statute or an official act of the executive branch and is mandated to complete its work within four years. The panel must have at least two members, and at least one of its members must not be a government official.

I consider a blue-ribbon commission to be a national security commission if its mandate directly concerns U.S. policies, programs, or strategies to prevent, respond to, or recover from current or future threats to U.S. security, or to promote peace or security overseas. I include in the data set all commissions that fit this definition.

Defining the universe of cases in this way excludes the following types of panels:

- Permanent advisory commissions, such as the Defense Policy Board and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, and ad hoc panels created by such permanent commissions;

- Panels created by nonpartisan research arms of the federal government, such as the National Academy of Sciences;

- Commissions whose mandates only cover administrative or personnel issues, such as panels that have reviewed medical care for Gulf War veterans, Defense Department procurement rules, military compensation, and sexual harassment at the military service academies; and

- Historical commissions that only study past policies, such as a panel that retroactively examined the U.S. Internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

The following standards also delimit my universe of commissions:

- I exclude advisory panels with formal proposal power, such as the Base Realignment and Closure commissions whose recommendations on the closure of military bases must be accepted or rejected by Congress without revision.

- I include commissions on nuclear issues only if their mandate directly concerns nuclear weapons or nuclear weapon programs.

- I include commissions on space policy only if their mandate directly concerns national security aspects of space policy.

- I exclude commissions that did not issue a public final report or a declassified version of the report.

Identification of commissions

I used several sources to identify all of the commissions that met the criteria outlined above for a blue-ribbon national security commission. These sources included a database created by Amy Zegart of U.S. commissions from 1981 to 2001, which Zegart kindly shared with me; the Encyclopedia of Governmental Advisory Organizations; data reported by the federal government in compliance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (available at http://www.fido.gov/facadatabase); and archives of the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. Regarding the last source, I used Lexis-Nexis to search all articles in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* between 1981 and 2009 that included "panel" or "commission," and "security," "defense," or "military." This search of over 20,000 articles turned up several commissions that were not listed in any of the other sources, because some commissions that meet my criteria are not classified as commissions under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

With this approach I identified 55 commissions that met my criteria for a blue-ribbon national security commission. While I cannot be sure that this set includes every blue-ribbon national security commission that operated between 1981 and 2009, I am reasonably confident that I have identified all such commissions that are listed in government records of commissions or that received newspaper coverage.

Variables and coding

Each of the 55 commissions is given an ID number (labeled *Commission ID*) in the data set. In what follows, I describe the other variables included on each of the data set's sheets.

<u>Sheet labeled "Master"</u>

Crisis: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established in response to an event that placed significant political pressure on policymakers. I coded this variable by researching exhaustively the origins of each commission, including through contemporaneous newspaper coverage, other publicly available information, and interviews of commission participants and government officials.

Disaster: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established in response to a terrorist attack or other unexpected event involving the loss of American lives. I coded this variable with the same method I used to code *crisis*.

Scandal: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established in response to an incident or accusation of government wrongdoing or fraud. I coded this variable with the same method I used to code *crisis*.

High casualties: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was created in response to an event involving the loss of over 100 American lives.

Salience: This variable represents the number of front-page articles in the *New York Times and Washington Post* on the issue addressed by a commission during the 90 days before the commission was created. I determined the subject of an article based on its headline and opening paragraphs.

Ln salience: This variable represents the natural log of *salience*.

Statutory: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established by a statute.

Presidential: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established by an Executive Order or other presidential directive.

Agency: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission was established by a directive from the head of an executive branch agency.

Scope: This binary variable is coded as 1 if a commission's official mandate concerns only one issue or event, and involves only one government agency or program. Coding of the variable treats the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps as separate agencies.

Scope alternative: This binary variable represents an alternative measure of the scope of a commission's mandate. The measure is the same as that for scope, except that the entire Defense Department is treated as a single agency.

Stature: This variable measures the average prominence of the most senior position held by each member of a commission prior to his or her commission service, based on the following 0-5 scale, which I created. Using this scale, I assigned each commission member a value between 0 and 5, and then averaged these values for a commission's full membership to create an aggregate stature measure for each commission.

> 5: President
>
> 4: Vice President, Speaker of the House, House Majority Leader, House Minority Leader, Senate Majority Leader, or Senate Minority Leader

3: Member of Congress; National Security Advisor; Cabinet Secretary or other Cabinet-level official (e.g. Attorney General, Director of Central Intelligence, Director of National Intelligence, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff); Supreme Court Justice; State Governor

2: Deputy Secretary of a federal department; Director or Administrator of an agency; Secretary or Chief of Staff of a military service; Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Combatant Commander; CEO or Chairman of a Fortune 500 company; President of a Top 20 research university

1: Senate-confirmed official; Senior White House official; Military officer with rank of General or Admiral; CEO or Chairman of a corporation; University President; Dean of an academic institution; Think tank director; Staff director of a congressional committee; Federal judge; Mayor of a city

0: None of the above

Stature of chair(s): This variable represents the average stature of a commission's chair(s) and vice chair (if there is one), based on the same 0-5 scale outlined above for *stature*.

Government officials: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if at least one commission member was a congressional or executive branch official at the time of the commission's operation.

Executive branch officials: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if at least one commission member was an executive branch official at the time of the commission's operation.

Congressional officials: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if at least one commission member was a congressional official at the time of the commission's operation.

Proportion of government officials: This variable represents the proportion of a commission's members who were serving in Congress or the executive branch at the time of the commission's operation.

Evenly bipartisan: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a commission has an even number of Republican and Democratic members, or, in cases where the partisan affiliation of a member is unclear, an even number of Republican-appointed and Democratic-appointed members.

Experience with issue: This variable represents the proportion of a commission's members with previous professional experience working directly on the issue addressed by a commission.

Size: This variable represents the number of a commission's members.

Size squared: This variable represents the square of the number of a commission's members.

Large: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a commission has 16 or more members (a size that is more than one standard deviation above the average size of a commission).

Staff: This variable represents the number of staff members on a commission.

Ln staff: This variable represents the natural log of *staff*.

Cost: This is a 3-category variable, in which a commission takes a value of 0 if its total budget was less than $700,000, 1 if its total budget was greater than $700,000 and less than $2 million, and 2 if its total budget was greater than $2 million, in 2006 inflation-adjusted dollars. I collected budget data from publicly available records and from interviews of commission participants. When I could not obtain precise budget data, I estimated the commission's total budget based on the size of its staff and the number of months it operated. I chose the breakpoints of $700,000 and $2 million because the use of these breakpoints placed about one-third of the commissions in each of the three categories.

Unanimous: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a commission's final report does not include any dissenting opinions or additional views.

Duration: This variable represents the number of months between a commission's creation and the release of its final report.

Divided govt when created: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if both branches of government were not controlled by the same political party on the date the commission was created.

Divided govt when reporting: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if both branches of government were not controlled by the same political party on the date the commission issued its final report.

Polarization when created: This variable represents the degree of political polarization on the date the commission was created. The measure is based on the McCarty/Poole/Rosenthal DW Nominate First Dimension data, available at voteview.com. For each Congress I calculated the difference between the Democratic and Republican means for the House and Senate, and then averaged those two differences to create a single polarization score.

Polarization when reporting: This variable represents the degree of political polarization on the date the commission issued its final report. The measure is based on the same data and method described above for *polarization when created*.

Presidential popularity when created: This variable represents the president's approval rating in the most recent Gallup poll prior to the creation of a commission, based on Gallup data available at www.presidency.ucsb/data/popularity.

Presidential popularity when reporting: This variable represents the president's approval rating in the most recent Gallup poll prior to the release of a commission's final report, based on the same data described above for *presidential popularity when created*.

Budgetary climate: This variable represents the size of the federal budget surplus or deficit as a percentage of government outlays in the year a commission issued its final report, based on data available at www.presidency.ucsb.edu/data/budget.

Months into term: This variable represents the number of months between the president's inauguration and the release of a commission's final report.

Beginning of term: This is a binary variable that takes a value of 1 if a commission reported during the first year of a president's term.

End of term: This is a binary variable that takes a value of 1 if a commission reported during the final year of a president's term.

President when created: This variable indicates the identity of the president on the date a commission was created.

President when reporting: This variable indicates the identity of the president on the date a commission issued its final report.

Change in president: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if the identity of the president changed during the life of a commission.

Date created: This variable represents the date on which a commission was created.

Date of report: This variable represents the date on which a commission issued its final report.

Year created: This variable represents the year in which a commission was created.

Year of report: This variable represents the year in which a commission released its final report.

Coverage: This variable represents the number of articles in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* that mentioned a commission during the 90 days following the release of the commission's final report.

> Note: I used the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* as the sample because they are prominent and ideologically diverse newspapers. (The editorial pages of the *Times* and *Post* are generally left-of-center, while the editorial pages of the *Tribune* and *Journal* are generally right-of-center.) I counted articles starting with the first article that discussed the report's findings or recommendations. In some cases, this meant that my count began prior to the official release of the report. I counted wire stories, speech transcripts, and report excerpts published in these newspapers as articles, but did not count letters to the editor, photos, newspaper corrections, or articles published only on websites. I counted articles in the *Tribune* that had previously been published in one of the other newspapers. I also counted brief stories in the "World Wide" section on the front page of the *Journal*, unless there was a corresponding story elsewhere in the newspaper.

Ln coverage: This variable represents the natural log of *coverage*.

Editorials: This variable represents the number of opinion articles in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* that mentioned a commission's final report during the 90 days following the release of the report.

Editorial endorsements: This variable represents the number of opinion articles in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* that praised a commission's final report without offering any criticism of it, during the 90 days following the release of the report.

Endorsement proportion: This variable represents the proportion of the opinion articles mentioning a commission's final report in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* that praised the report without offering any criticism of it, during the 90 days following the release of the report.

Hearings: This is a 3-category variable measuring the extent to which the two chambers of Congress held hearings on a commission's final report (0 = no congressional hearings, 1 = at least one hearing in the House or Senate, 2 = at least one hearing in each chamber of Congress).

Average impact rating: This variable measures the average rating by individuals I interviewed of a commission's impact on policy on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no impact and 5 representing very large impact. (See the section below on the "Interviews" Sheet for more information on these interview ratings.)

Average advocacy rating: This variable measures the average rating by individuals I interviewed of the extent to which a commission promoted its recommendations on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no promotion and 5 representing very extensive promotion.

Average commitment rating: This variable measures the average rating by individuals I interviewed of the commitment to a commission's work by a commission's members on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no commitment and 5 representing very high commitment.

Commission name: This variable refers to a commission's official name.

Commission mandate: This variable refers to a commission's official mandate.

Sheet labeled "Interviews"

This sheet presents data drawn from interviews I conducted of individuals who were knowledgeable about a given commission. The people I interviewed included commission members, commission staff, and executive branch and congressional officials who had responsibility for the issue addressed by a commission. In these interviews, I asked the interviewees to assess commission impact, promotion, and commitment on a scale of 1-5, as outlined below. Since some people I interviewed served on more than one commission or had

responsibility for issues addressed by multiple commissions, some interviewees answered these questions for more than one commission.

Each row on this sheet refers to data from one interview about one commission, which is given a distinct ID number (labeled *Interview ID*). The data set does not provide the names of individuals I interviewed to protect their anonymity.

In what follows I describe all other variables included on this sheet that have not already been described above.

Impact: This variable measures the rating by an individual I interviewed of a commission's impact on policy on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no impact and 5 representing very large impact.

> Note: Some interviewees gave one rating for short-term impact and a different rating for long-term impact. In those cases, I averaged the two ratings unless the period of time for the long-term was two years or less, in which I used the long-term response as the data point.

Advocacy: This variable measures the rating by an individual I interviewed of the extent to which a commission promoted its recommendations on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no promotion and 5 representing very extensive promotion.

Commitment: This variable measures the rating by an individual I interviewed of the commitment to a commission's work by a commission's members on a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing no commitment and 5 representing very high commitment.

> Note: In some cases, an individual I interviewed declined to answer one or more of the three short answer questions. Also, since government officials who did not serve on a commission might not be able to accurately assess the commitment of commissioners and the commission's promotion of its report, I only asked commission participants to rate those two characteristics.

Member or staff: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if an individual I interviewed served on the commission in question as a commission member or staff person.

Chair or staff director: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if an individual I interviewed served as the chair or staff director of the commission in question.

Dissented: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if an individual I interviewed publicly dissented from the final report of the commission in question.

Rated multiple: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if an individual I interviewed rated the impact of more than one of the commissions in the data set.

In person: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if I interviewed an individual in person.

By phone: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if I interviewed an individual, by phone.

<u>Sheet labeled "Recommendations"</u>

This sheet presents data related to the principal recommendations of commissions. Each row on the sheet presents data related to one principal recommendation.

I identified the principal recommendations of each commission through the following process. First, I determined whether a commission's final report prioritized six or fewer proposals. If so, I classified these as the report's principal recommendations. (I excluded proposals that were so vague that it would not be possible to determine objectively whether they were adopted, such as a recommendation for a government official to demonstrate leadership on a given issue. I also excluded recommendations that did not require any change in government policy or operations, such as a proposal to maintain military bases in East Asia.)

If the commission report did not prioritize six or fewer proposals, I used a couple of proxies for identifying key recommendations. First, I asked commission chairs and staff directors in my interviews of them what they considered to be the commission's principal recommendations. Second, I determined which proposals were given the most attention in coverage of the commission's report on the day after its release in the *Chicago Tribune*, *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, and *Washington Post*. If more than six proposals were mentioned in these sources, I selected the proposals mentioned first as the principal ones.

The first column in the "Recommendations" sheet lists the recommendations I identified for the 55 commissions through this method. At the end of each recommendation I include in parentheses whether the proposal was identified as a key recommendation by the commission's report or executive summary, by an individual I interviewed, and/or by one or more newspapers (in this column, CT = *Chicago Tribune*, NYT = *New York Times*, WSJ = *Wall Street Journal*, WP = *Washington Post*).

Each recommendation is given an ID number (labeled *Recommendation ID*)

In what follows I describe the other variables on this sheet that were not already described above.

Specificity: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a recommendation calls for a concrete and precisely described action (such as increasing spending on x by $y, ceasing aid to country x, creating a new agency or position to do x, cutting staff in agency x by y, or completing action x by date y).

Requires legislation: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a recommendation requires the enactment of legislation in order to be adopted.

Calls for reorganization: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a recommendation calls for restructuring, creating, or eliminating a government unit, or for moving personnel between units.

Calls for centralization or integration: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if a recommendation calls for a change designed to foster more coordination or integration within or across agencies.

Adoption: This 3-category variable measures the extent to which a key commission proposal was adopted within two years of the release of a commission's final report (0 = not adopted, 1 = partially adopted, 2 = fully adopted).

> Note: I coded *adoption* based on in-depth research on each recommendation using a variety of sources, including subsequent legislation, executive branch regulations, government reports, statements by executive branch and congressional officials, transcripts of congressional hearings, and periodical articles, as well as interviews of government officials and other experts. Collectively, these sources enabled me to determine whether all but four of the key proposals of the 55 commissions in my data set were adopted.

> My classification of a proposal as being fully, partially, or not adopted is only based on whether a proposal was formally adopted by legislation or executive branch action. The classification does not consider whether a proposal was fully implemented after being formally adopted. A standard of implementation would generate much lower rates of "success" for commission proposals since many recommendations are formally adopted without being fully implemented. Indeed, Amy Zegart used a standard of implementation in an analysis of intelligence commissions and found that only about 10% of recommendations by pre-9/11 intelligence commissions were fully implemented.[1] I judged that a standard of adoption is a reasonable measure of commission impact because most commissions have very limited ability to influence the implementation of a proposal after it is formally adopted by the government.

Sheet labeled "Creation"

This sheet presents data related to the creation of commissions, with the data categorized by year, rather than by individual commissions.

Congressional commissions created: This variable represents the number of national security commissions created by statute in each year.

Executive commissions created: This variable represents the number of national security commissions created by the executive branch in each year.

Polarization: This variable represents the degree of political polarization in the year the commission was created. The measure is based on the McCarty/Poole/Rosenthal DW Nominate First Dimension data, available at voteview.com. For each Congress I calculated the difference between the Democratic and Republican means for the House and Senate, and then averaged those two differences to create a single polarization score.

Divided government: This binary variable takes a value of 1 if both branches of government were not controlled by the same political party on the date the commission was created

Presidential popularity: This variable represents the president's approval rating, according to the Gallup poll closest to the middle of a year (July 1), based on the data available at www.presidency.ucsb/data/popularity.

<u>Sheet labeled "Key"</u>

This sheet includes the ID number and full name of each commission.

U.S. National Security Commissions, 1981-2009

Name	Chair(s)	Report year
President's Commission on Strategic Forces	Brent Scowcroft	1983
Commission on Security and Economic Assistance	Frank Carlucci	1983
Commission on Beirut International Airport Terrorist Act of 23 October 1983	Robert Long	1983
National Bipartisan Commission on Central America	Henry Kissinger	1984
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Media-Military Relations Panel	Winant Sidle	1984
Chemical Warfare Review Commission	Walter Stoessel	1985
President's Blue Ribbon Task Group on Nuclear Weapons Program Management	William Clark	1985
Secretary of State's Advisory Panel on Overseas Security	Bobby Inman	1985
Commission to Review DoD Security Policies and Practices	Richard Stillwell	1985
President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management	David Packard	1986
Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on South Africa	Frank Cary, William Coleman	1987
President's Special Review Board	John Tower	1987
Advisory Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy	Fred Ikle, Albert Wohlstetter	1988
Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense	Jeremiah Denton	1989
President's Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism	Ann McLaughlin	1990
Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces	Robert Herres	1992
United States Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the United Nations	Jim Leach, Charles Lichenstein	1993
Joint Security Commission	Jeffrey Smith	1994
Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces	John White	1995
Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community	Les Aspin followed by Harold Brown	1996
Presidential Advisory Board on Arms Proliferation Policy	Janne Nolan	1996
Small Satellite Review Panel	Robert Hermann	1996
White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security	Al Gore	1997
Commission on Protecting and Reducing Government Secrecy	Daniel Patrick Moynihan	1997
President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection	Robert Marsh	1997
National Defense Panel	Philip Odeen	1997
Federal Advisory Committee on Gender-Integrated Training and Related Issues	Nancy Kassebaum Baker	1997
Long-Range Air Power Review Panel	Larry Welch	1998
Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States	Donald Rumsfeld	1998
Accountability Review Boards on the Embassy Bombings in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam on August 7, 1998	William Crowe	1999
Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction	John Deutch	1999
Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues	Anita Blair	1999
Joint Security Commission 2	Larry Welch	1999
Special Panel on Military Operations in Vieques	Frank Rush	1999
Overseas Presence Advisory Panel	Lewis Kaden	1999
Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement	William Webster	2000

Name	Chair(s)	Report year
National Commission on Terrorism	Paul Bremer	2000
National Commission for the Review of the National Reconnaissance Office	Porter Goss, Bob Kerrey	2000
USS Cole Commission	William Crouch, Harold Gehman	2001
Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization	Donald Rumsfeld	2001
U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century	Gary Hart, Warren Rudman	2001
Panel to Review the V-22 Program	John Dailey	2001
Commission for the Review of FBI Security Programs	William Webster	2002
Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry	Robert Walker	2002
National Advisory Committee on Children and Terrorism	Angela Diaz	2003
National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States	Thomas Kean	2004
Independent Panel to Review Department of Defense Detention Operations	James Schlesinger	2004
Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction	Charles Robb, Laurence Silberman	2005
Task Force on the United Nations	Newt Gingrich, George Mitchell	2005
Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States	Al Cornella	2005
Iraq Study Group	James Baker, Lee Hamilton	2006
Independent Commission on the Security Forces of Iraq	James Jones	2007
Secretary of State's Panel on Personal Protective Services In Iraq	Patrick Kennedy	2007
Commission on the National Guard and Reserve	Arnold Punaro	2008
Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism	Bob Graham, Jim Talent	2008

Distributional Information for Non-Binary Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Stature*	55	1.50	.65	.1	3
Size	55	10.7	5.1	2	25
Newspaper articles mentioning commission report**	55	56.5	150.5	0	745
Opinion articles about commission report***	55	7.4	17.9	0	86
Endorsements****	34	.56	.33	0	1

* This variable is measured on a scale of 0-5, as described in the Codebook for this commission data set.
** This measure represents the number of articles in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal,* and *Washington Post* mentioning the commission's report in the 90 days after it was released.
*** This measure represents the number of opinion articles in the *Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Wall Street Journal, and Washington Post* about the commission's report in the 90 days after it was released.
**** This variable represents, for those commissions that were the subject of at least one opinion article in the four newspapers in my sample, the proportion of such articles that offered praise for the commission's report without offering any criticism of it.

Contributors to the Creation of Congressional Commissions

Variable	Congressional Commissions Created
Polarization	3.14 (2.12)
Unified government	.15 (.56)
Presidential popularity	.00 (.01)
Number of commissions	28

Note: The dependent variable is the number of national security commissions created by Congress each year between 1981 and 2008. Unlike in the other tables presented in this paper, the independent variables of *polarization*, *unified government*, and *presidential popularity* here represent values for those variables at the time the commissions were established (rather than when the commissions reported). This is more appropriate for an analysis of variables that might affect the creation of commissions. Table entries are coefficients of an ordinary least squares regression, with standard errors in parentheses.