

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
APPLICANT REVIEW PANEL

PUBLIC MEETING

555 CAPITOL MALL, 5TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2010

10:32 A.M.

Reported by:

Kathryn Swank, CSR, RPR

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS
1107 2nd Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-498-9288

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

APPEARANCES

PANEL MEMBERS:

Mary Camacho, Chairperson

Nasir Ahmadi

Kerri Spano

STAFF:

Stephanie Ramirez-Ridgeway, Counsel

Diane Hamel, Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

Leslie Arnell

Ana Henderson, UC Berkeley School of Law

Douglas Johnson, The Rose Institute

Maricela Morales, Central Coast Alliance United for
a Sustainable Economy

Elizabeth Nataki

Steve Rawlinson

Randi Swisley

---o0o---

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

INDEX

ITEM	PAGE
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
Election of Chair and Vice Chair	4
Approval of Minutes from February 25, 2010	16
Selection of Robert's Rules of Order Procedures	18
Establishment of Ground Rules for Meetings	24
Presentation by Ana Henderson, UC Berkeley Law School, "Communities of Interest, the Voting Rights Act, and Redistricting in California"	34
Anticipate Timeline for Process for Applicant Review and Selection	67
Desirable Applicant Qualities	88
Public Comment	92
Adjournment	103
Reporter's Certificate	104

---o0o---

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Okay. Good morning. The
3 hour being 10:31 and the quorum being present, I call to
4 order the April 19, 2010, meeting of the Applicant
5 Review Panel.

6 Secretary, please call the roll.

7 MS. HAMEL: Mr. Ahmadi?

8 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Here.

9 MS. HAMEL: Ms. Camacho?

10 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: Here.

11 MS. HAMEL: Ms. Spano?

12 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Here.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Our first item of business
14 is the selection of chair and vice chair. The panel may
15 discuss the issue and hear from the public before making
16 a motion.

17 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you, Stephanie.

18 I think the panel would like to discuss what
19 might be the best approach in terms of selecting a chair
20 for this meeting only or maybe for the duration of the
21 meetings that we will have through October 1st. So what
22 do you guys think?

23 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: My view is, because of the
24 very -- we bring various experiences, because of our
25 backgrounds, and also that it's going to be a large

1 burden on a particular person to perform a
2 chairmanship's duties for an extended period of time
3 when we have the interviews, which could last up to six
4 weeks, I would suggest thinking about maybe having the
5 chairman and vice chair on a rotating basis. I was
6 thinking possibly on a weekly basis, like a Monday
7 through Friday, that person would have the chairmanship
8 when there's an open meeting.

9 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: So we have to decide now
10 based on alphabetical order of the last names, maybe?

11 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: Yeah.

12 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Like we can have the first
13 person be -- become the chair for this meeting and then
14 rotate as we move on?

15 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Yeah. I gave some
16 consideration similar to what Mary brought up also,
17 about rotating the chairmanship alphabetically by panel
18 member's last name. I think it creates a -- it's not
19 about partisanship. It's about sharing the
20 responsibility and you did a great job last time --

21 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you.

22 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: -- of chairing, as chair.

23 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: And what also I was
24 thinking in the sense of, since you did chair, Nasir, at
25 the last meeting, since we would go possibly

1 alphabetically, I would be the chair for this meeting,
2 and then Kerri would be the chair for the next meeting.

3 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: That's fine. So first we
4 have to make a motion that we will decide on a rotation
5 -- I move that we decide on selecting the chair for each
6 meeting on a rotational basis based on the last -- based
7 on alphabetical order of the last names. And since I
8 have been the chair, had the privilege to be the chair
9 last meeting, this meeting will be the next person based
10 on that alphabetical order.

11 Do we have a second on that?

12 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Second.

13 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: Could we -- before we
14 second on that, could we include in the sense of on the
15 rotation, maybe making it a little bit more defined?

16 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Like what do you mean,
17 "defined"?

18 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: In the sense of rotating.
19 So I would suggest that a motion would read in the sense
20 of we rotate the chairmanship based alphabetically on
21 the panel member's last name. In instances where the
22 meeting extends beyond a week, which is Monday through
23 Friday, a rotation will occur. Since Nasir was chair
24 for the first meeting, I would be chair -- so Camacho
25 would be the chair for this meeting, and Spano would be

1 the chair for the next meeting.

2 I would also include a motion that the vice chair
3 would follow in a similar rotation as the chair.

4 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I would suggest that maybe
5 if you intend to rotate the chairmanship, you do it
6 simply by meetings, so that for this meeting, for
7 instance, you would serve as the chair, Ms. Camacho, for
8 the duration of this meeting, even if it rolls to
9 another week which I don't anticipate it will. It has
10 not been noticed appropriately.

11 But then certainly if someone started on a
12 Friday, being the chair for one meeting, and that
13 meeting rolled to a week, through the weekend, and to
14 the following week, whoever is the chair at the start of
15 the meeting remain the chair for the duration of the
16 meeting.

17 I would also suggest that maybe you hear from the
18 public about the public's thoughts before you actually
19 make a motion.

20 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yes.

21 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: One concern I do have with
22 that in the sense of meetings, when you get into the
23 interview, is a meeting one interview or is it the whole
24 interview process?

25 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It would be the interviews

1 for that particular day. Now, one of the things that we
2 need to -- we haven't flushed that out yet. We haven't
3 gotten to a point where you've talked about how you're
4 planning to schedule your meetings and that's something
5 that you will want to do as you get closer to the
6 interview process. You will want to talk about how you
7 intend to run those meetings, whether we do one agenda
8 or it's a continuing agenda. But I think that's a
9 bridge maybe you don't have to cross.

10 The regulations actually permit you to revise, by
11 vote of the panel, your chairmanship at any point in
12 time. You might decide at that point that one or two of
13 you has decided they no longer wish to be chair or that
14 one of you feels very strongly that you are a natural
15 leader and everyone agrees. So you do have some
16 flexibility per the regulations in how you designate
17 your chairmanship, and I think until you actually
18 identify the interview process, you likely don't want to
19 try to decide who's going to be chair until you know
20 what your process will be for interviews.

21 That will be my recommendation.

22 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: And, you know, I can see
23 your point, Stephanie, and I do agree with that, because
24 being a chairperson for the meetings, that doesn't give
25 us any privilege or anything. It's just an additional

1 responsibility to make sure that we are efficient in our
2 process in that we are transparent, basically, to make
3 sure that we are doing this in accordance with all the
4 regulations and the requirements that we have in place.

5 And I personally think that, you know, a decision
6 made today, if the panel agrees that later on, we can
7 definitely make it flexible and see what our needs are,
8 because at this point, as you know, most of you know and
9 you will hear, we haven't had a chance to look at any
10 applications and we don't know what we're expecting in
11 terms of the duration of the meetings and what will be
12 involved in terms of the detail of the discussions and
13 all that.

14 So that having been said, I accept your point of
15 view, Mary. But I think we can make the rotational
16 assignment based per meeting, and the meetings will last
17 maybe a day or two a week, whatever it takes. And that
18 also brings some consistency in our approaches because I
19 think that if we put a time limit as to one person can
20 be the chair for -- let's say, for example, a meeting
21 takes more than a week. If at the end of that week we
22 change the chairmanship, the chairpersonship, on that
23 meeting, it may be unnecessary. That's my thought.

24 But you know, I mean, I'm opening the discussion
25 for the public. We want to hear from you. This is kind

1 of like, you know, everybody has a direct stake in this.

2 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Is there public comment on
3 chairmanship? Please come to the microphone. Provide
4 your name and your perspective.

5 MS. NATAKI: This way?

6 Good morning. Elizabeth Nataki.

7 I disagree with the concept of having the
8 consistency per topic, whatever that particular --
9 whatever we're dealing with at that time, it would seem
10 to me logical to have that person continue until that
11 particular issue has been ended, and then start the
12 rotation, although I do like the idea of the rotation
13 being alphabetical and going through each of you,
14 because it will be a very intense nine months.

15 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Okay. Thank you so much
16 for the comment. Any other comments, questions,
17 concerns?

18 So I draw my first motion. And I would like to
19 make a motion that we'll have the chairpersonship for
20 these town meetings on a rotational basis based on
21 alphabetical order of last names and specific to each
22 topic that we are discussing in the meetings.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Specific to each topic or
24 specific to each agendized meeting?

25 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Specific to each agendized

1 meeting. Thank you, Stephanie.

2 Do we have a second for that?

3 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: Before we do that, did you
4 want to also include a motion to include the vice chair,
5 in that same motion?

6 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: If you feel that we should
7 do that, of course.

8 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: That way, we can kind of
9 keep it consistent.

10 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Does the Counsel have any
11 comments on that?

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I haven't heard you
13 discuss who will be your vice chair or how you would
14 rotate that. So maybe you need to talk about that. I'm
15 not clear what you have in mind.

16 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: What I did discuss was in
17 the sense of having the vote -- vice chair also rotate
18 as the same chair. So in the sense of when the chair is
19 Nasir, Camacho, which is the next alphabetical person
20 would be the vice chair. When Camacho is the chair,
21 Spano would be the vice chair.

22 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I would suggest, just for
23 simplicity sake, that you do separate motions on that.
24 You have a motion for your chair and then you address
25 your vice chair. In one motion, it could get a little

1 complicated.

2 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: My motion is still on the
3 table for discussion and comments. First of all, do we
4 have a second for that? Do you want me to repeat the
5 motion?

6 I think the motion is that we will have
7 rotational chairpersonship for these meetings based
8 alphabetically on the order of last -- first letter in
9 the last name, starting with Ms. Camacho for this
10 meeting.

11 Do we have a second for that?

12 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Can I --

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yes, please.

14 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Specific to each agendized
15 meeting, right?

16 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Specific to each agendized
17 meeting. Thank you.

18 PANEL MEMBER CAMACHO: I second that.

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: All in favor?

20 (Ayes)

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Any opposed?

22 The motion -- there being no opposition, the
23 motion is carried.

24 Ms. Camacho, you are now the chair for this
25 meeting.

1 And the next item on your agenda is vice
2 chairmanship.

3 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Our next item is the
4 selection of the vice chair.

5 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: You get to use this.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Oh, thank you. I know you
7 wanted to use it.

8 So is there any -- do you have any feelings or
9 comments regarding the vice chairmanship?

10 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I think what you just
11 proposed makes sense.

12 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. So is everyone happy
13 about --

14 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: If you can repeat your
15 motion so the audience and us are clear on that, and
16 then we will see if we have any comments or concerns
17 from the public.

18 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So in the sense of the vice
19 chair, I'm suggesting that we have a similar motion to
20 the chairman and that it would be based on last name and
21 the vice chair would be the next person on the list.

22 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Alphabetically.

23 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Alphabetically to be the
24 chair.

25 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: The vice chair would be

1 the next in line alphabetically.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Next in line
3 alphabetically.

4 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And that would carry per
5 meeting; correct?

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Correct.

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: So you might want to
8 restate.

9 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Let me get it
10 written down.

11 So I suggest that we would have the vice chair
12 follow the same similar rotation as the chair, which is
13 specific to each agenda item.

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Each agenda item or each
15 agenda?

16 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Each agenda.

17 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Can I clarify on that? Each
18 agendized meeting?

19 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Agendized meeting.

20 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay.

21 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: And the next in line or the
22 person that would be the chair would be the vice chair.

23 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I second it.

24 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: No.

25 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I'm sorry.

1 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Can you clarify that again?

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Yep. No problem.

3 So basically what's happening or what I am
4 suggesting is that the vice chair would follow a similar
5 rotation as the chair, which is also specific to each
6 agendized --

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Each meeting.

8 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Each agendized meeting.
9 And it would follow in the sense of alphabetically. So
10 the vice chair would be next in line to be chair at the
11 next agendized meeting.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I understand what you are
13 saying.

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Do we have any public
15 comment?

16 Seeing there is none, I will make a motion. I
17 would like to make a motion that the vice chair would
18 follow a similar rotation as the chair, and it would be
19 specific to each agendized meeting. The individual that
20 would be the chair would be -- or the vice chair would
21 be the person that is next in line to be the chair in
22 the next agendized meeting.

23 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I second it.

24 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All in favor?

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

(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All opposed?

The motion has passed.

The next item of business is the Robert's Rules
of Order Procedures.

MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Actually, it's approval of
the minutes.

CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Oh, sorry. Approval of the
minutes. The minutes have been provided to the panel
members; correct?

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Correct.

PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: There's also -- there were
some that was also printed in or provided in the back of
the -- by the back door.

Is there any corrections to those prior minutes?

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: That we may have?

CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: That we may have.

PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Actually, no. I feel that
it adequately reflects the record of the primary things
that we discussed at the meeting. If the public wants
more detail, they can go to the website and the video as
well as the transcript of exactly what was said in more
detail.

So I was satisfied with the minutes.

1 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Since there's no
2 corrections to the minutes, they are approved.

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Actually, you will want to
4 hear from the public, and then you will need to make a
5 motion to -- and vote to approve the minutes.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any comments from
7 the public regarding the prior minutes?

8 Seeing there is none, I approve --

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I move.

10 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: I move that we approve the
11 minutes.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: From the
13 February 25th meeting.

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: From the
15 February 25th meeting.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: As written.

17 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: As written.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You will get it. By
19 September, you'll know how to do it all.

20 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I second that.

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: All in favor?

22 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All in favor?

23 (Ayes)

24 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All opposed?

25 Seeing that there is none --

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: The motion is carried.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- the motion is carried.

3 Our next item is the selection of Robert's Rules
4 of Order Procedures.

5 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Counsel has provided us
6 some guidance, and, of course, in our training, we
7 received a lot of detail about the Rules of Order from
8 these public settings and public meetings, and we have
9 been reviewing all those details in the past few weeks,
10 actually.

11 And the guidelines that we received suggest that
12 for the size of the panel that we have here, and for the
13 type of tasks that we will be undertaking and the
14 discussion that we will be conducting, we will be
15 having -- I think we can talk about whether or not we
16 can adapt the informal Rules of Order as stated in the
17 Robert's Rules of Order.

18 I personally favor to -- I personally favor the
19 informal procedures. And I believe that that will
20 provide us efficiency in the process and more
21 transparency in terms of, you know, getting the public
22 involved and having open discussions about the items,
23 and -- you know, so what do you guys think about that?

24 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: I just want to make a
25 comment. I think there was also some handouts in the

1 back that -- so you can see the -- okay -- our
2 recommendations in the sense of the Robert's Rules of
3 Orders, so that's what we would be discussing now.

4 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I like the informal
5 procedures of Robert Rules. I think it facilitates
6 discussion effectively for small commissions, small
7 groups, and our panel particularly would benefit from
8 the informal procedures. And I think it would help the
9 public understand. As we start discussing these in more
10 detail, maybe it will fall better without all the
11 formalities.

12 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: I agree with you.

13 I also agree that there should be some
14 modifications to those informal procedures in the sense
15 of Item No. 2, which is, "Motions need not be seconded."
16 I feel that to ensure that the public understands what
17 the process is, I feel that all motions should be
18 seconded. Also in the sense of No. 5, which is, "Votes
19 may be taken initially by show of hands," I feel that it
20 should be a voice vote.

21 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I agree.

22 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: And then also No. 6, which
23 is, "If a proposal is perfectly clear to everyone, it
24 may be voted on even though no formal motion has been
25 made."

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: You are referring to
2 Robert's Rule of Order informal on that, a brief -- is
3 that a -- what is the name of that book? I'm sorry.

4 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It's Robert's Rules of
5 Order, the condensed version.

6 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: The condensed version. I'm
7 referring to that one.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: If I'm hearing you
9 correctly, it sounds like you like -- I don't want to
10 presuppose -- but it sounds as though you are looking
11 towards adopting counsel's recommendation?

12 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Correct.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And if that's the case,
14 you can certainly hear from the public and see what the
15 public is thinking on the matter. And if you're still
16 in agreement that that's what you would like to do, you
17 can simply move to adopt Counsel's recommendation with
18 regard to the informal procedures as modified in
19 Counsel's memo.

20 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. I kind of feel that
21 we will just have a brief discussion on those. So I
22 think we're kind of getting to the same consensus that
23 we are in agreement with the counsel's suggestion.

24 Do we have any public comments regarding those?

25 And what I will do is, I will state what those

1 are. They are the informal procedures which states:

2 "Board members do not have to stand to be
3 recognized by the chair in order to speak or make
4 motions;

5 "A board member may speak any number of times on
6 a question (instead of only twice), and motions to close
7 or limit debate are generally not permitted;

8 "A motion does not have to be pending in
9 order to discuss a subject informally;

10 "In putting questions to a vote, the chair need
11 not stand;

12 "The chair can participate in debate just as any
13 other board member and, subject to the custom in the
14 particular board, can also make motions and vote."

15 So those are the ones that we feel should be
16 adopted.

17 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: In your last item, you
18 mentioned something about "subject to the custom in the
19 particular board." I think that's the language that
20 came from the Robert's Rules of Order, but it doesn't
21 apply to us. So to make it more concise, it would be,
22 the chair can participate in debate, just as any other
23 board member, and also make a motion and vote. Correct?

24 I'm going to read the last item as you stated
25 there: "The chair can participate in debate just as in

1 any other board member and also make motion and vote."

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So you are saying just take
3 out "subject to custom in the particular board."

4 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Correct.

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Since you have no custom,
6 that makes sense.

7 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Right.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You will have some
9 probably by August.

10 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: So with that correction, I
11 second that motion.

12 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. What I would like to
13 do first is to have -- receive public comment on that.

14 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Sure.

15 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any public
16 comment?

17 Seeing there is -- oh. Please.

18 MS. MORALES: Good morning. My name is Maricela
19 Morales. I'm with CAUSE, the Central Coastal Alliance
20 United for a Sustainable Economy, based in Ventura
21 County.

22 And I just want to state that I really appreciate
23 the intent from the applicant review panel to facilitate
24 public participation and to support and protect
25 transparency. And I really appreciate that as a public

1 member.

2 Thank you.

3 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you. Glad to hear
4 that. Thank you.

5 Do we have any other comments, questions on this
6 motion?

7 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I believe you have a
9 motion pending. Did you want to restate it?

10 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Yes, I would like to
11 restate that.

12 So in the sense of our informal procedures, the
13 ones that we will be adopting, is:

14 "Board members do not have to stand to be
15 recognized by the chair in order to speak or make
16 motions;

17 "A board member may speak any number of times on
18 a question (instead of only twice), and motions to close
19 or limit debate are generally not permitted;

20 "A motion does not have to be pending in order to
21 discuss a subject informally;

22 "In putting questions to a vote, the chair need
23 not stand;

24 "The chair can participate in debate just as any
25 other panel member and can also make motions and vote."

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I second that.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All in favor?

3 (Ayes)

4 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All opposed?

5 Seeing there is none, the motion has passed.

6 Our next item of business is establishment of
7 ground rules for panel meetings. The -- our counsel has
8 provided us some suggested ground rules.

9 Does the panel have any items they would like to
10 discuss regarding the suggested ground rules?

11 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I like the ground rules that
12 Counsel suggested. I wasn't opposed to any of them.
13 They were pretty clear. Did anyone else have any
14 thoughts?

15 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I agree with you. The
16 ground rules that are in the same memo, that the copy of
17 which is available in the back door, which was suggested
18 by Counsel, is something that I believe will help us to
19 have the process and help facilitate the meetings and
20 the discussions, public participation.

21 And I believe that if we follow these rules, not
22 only would we be in compliance with all the laws that we
23 have to be in compliance with, but also it provides for
24 more transparency and public participation and make our
25 process more efficient.

1 So for that reason, I agree completely with the
2 suggested procedures.

3 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: As stated in the memo.

4 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yes, as stated in the memo
5 provided by the counsel.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Question for Counsel: Can
7 we -- do I need to read through this?

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You can certainly move to
9 adopt the recommended ground rules and then incorporate
10 the memo into our -- it's already part of our public
11 record. So you can certainly move to adopt them without
12 reading -- say, "I move to adopt Counsel's suggested
13 ground rules. Is there a second?"

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. And then the people
15 that are viewing this via the Webcast, they will be able
16 to see this?

17 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We will put this online
18 for them. And I would recommend that at some point we
19 actually make a poster of these and post them for each
20 meeting so that the public and you guys can be reminded
21 of your order of operation.

22 You may wish to hear from the public before you
23 have a motion. But certainly, you can move to adopt the
24 counsel's recommended ground rules.

25 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Is there any public

1 comment regarding the ground rules?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning. I'm Douglas Johnson
3 from The Rose Institute. The only one I have a comment
4 on is "Ground Rules for Panel Members" No. 4: "The
5 Panel will strive to identify those qualities, in
6 addition to those set forth in the law, that the Panel
7 members agree are important for a commissioner to
8 possess."

9 I would strongly caution you to stick to the ones
10 in the law. Those have been pretty clear by Department
11 of Justice. And if you start adding new rules and new
12 criteria, you are going to step on some landmines.

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you for the comment.

14 If I can just make a clarification. I do
15 understand that given the language here can be perceived
16 as, you know, the panel has -- or will come up with
17 qualifications or criteria that's beyond the law.
18 That's not the case here.

19 We will absolutely be in compliance with the
20 requirements in the law, which is three minimum
21 qualifications. And as you know, the law requires us to
22 also ensure that we select the most qualified
23 applicants. In order for the selection to be consistent
24 and, you know, effective, we will have to come up with
25 some descriptive approaches or criteria that the panel

1 will have to agree on when we are reviewing those
2 applications. It doesn't mean that we will have
3 additional criteria or additional qualifications that we
4 do not have.

5 So in our next meeting, we will be discussing
6 some of the detail of what those qualifications are that
7 we, the panel members, are looking at to help us better
8 make those judgment and decisions on who's the most
9 qualified applicant.

10 So thanks for the comment.

11 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Certainly. And my
12 recommendation, if I may, is simply that there are some
13 subjective factors that play a role in your selection,
14 because we have the regulations, many of the components
15 of the relations are, in fact, suggested criteria. A
16 panel -- an applicant may demonstrate that they have an
17 ability to be impartial through the following, but you
18 may need to agree that perhaps there are other things
19 that an applicant may do that would demonstrate
20 impartiality, and those are the types of subjective
21 qualities that we're talking about.

22 MR. JOHNSON: I guess if I can talk just very
23 briefly, I would be very careful to stick within what
24 went to DOJ as the criteria being used, because step out
25 of those lines, the whole thing falls apart.

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Sure. Thanks for the
2 comment.

3 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Any other public comment?

4 I think that what we should do is kind of take a
5 look at No. 4 a little bit closer, so if we could just
6 spend a couple minutes doing that --

7 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- and discussing it.

9 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Okay.

10 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: As I mentioned, you know,
11 the way it's worded here, "The Panel will strive to
12 identify those qualities, in addition to those set forth
13 in the law," to me, it doesn't mean anything beyond what
14 is already stated in the law in terms of, you know, the
15 first focus would be on the minimum qualifications,
16 which is the skills, ability to be impartial, and
17 appreciation for California's diverse demographics and
18 geography. And then beyond that, as Stephanie alluded
19 to, there are some subjective criteria that we have to
20 apply in terms of, you know, we make judgment about the
21 quality of the responses.

22 And as I mentioned, we will be looking -- we will
23 be discussing the details of what the panel will be
24 looking at. What is my ideal commissioner? What am I
25 looking for? We will be discussing all of those in the

1 next meeting.

2 And later on -- later in the agenda we have a
3 discussion item on the qualifications of the applicants,
4 which we will get to, and I have some concerns about
5 that as well.

6 But you know, I personally think that the wording
7 in No. 4 is in line with the legal requirements to
8 enable us to make those subjective judgments in terms of
9 who might be the most qualified applicant which will
10 be -- so.

11 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I believe that with every
12 decision that we make, and as we review the applications
13 and as we narrow them down to the 60 of the most
14 qualified, as we make our recommendations, that we will
15 first and foremost always apply the law as stated. And
16 I feel that I'm comfortable and I'm hoping that the
17 public will have confidence that we will do that,
18 because I trust my colleagues, I trust my panel members'
19 judgment, in that this is what we will follow, however
20 these laws are very broad.

21 And I believe each applicant brings a little
22 special something to -- that makes them stand out in
23 addition to meeting qualifications as stated in the law.
24 So we will -- we will apply the law for every applicant.
25 But there are instances where it's kind of squishy.

1 It's immeasurable, these qualifications and assessments
2 of these candidates. So just to keep that in mind as
3 well when reviewing the applications.

4 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: So for our purposes here,
5 for this discussion, do we all agree that we should
6 leave that item as one of our ground rules for the panel
7 members to identify any additional qualities to be
8 considered when we're actually reviewing the
9 applications? Do we want to leave that item in the
10 ground rules?

11 Because I believe there's certain benefit in
12 having it in there, because it is our responsibility to
13 at least identify for the public what is it that we are
14 looking at, what qualities we are looking at beyond
15 what's stated in the law, which means there's an issue
16 about diversity. There is an issue about certain other
17 personal characteristics that may come across when we
18 are reviewing the essays or, you know, the information
19 on the applications.

20 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So basically what you are
21 saying is that in the sense of the three main qualities
22 within an applicant -- so you have impartiality,
23 diversity, and the relevant analytical skills -- we're
24 not adding any additional onto that, but maybe
25 clarifying those qualities?

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: What I am saying is that
2 for the purpose of this discussion item, this agendized
3 item today, we will have that item as a ground rule for
4 the panel member to later on come and discuss any other
5 additional qualities or any quality that we are looking
6 for in addition to what's in the law.

7 So in other words, we want to have a discussion
8 about what the panel members are looking for when
9 reviewing these applications in more detailed
10 terminology beyond what's stated in the law.

11 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So basically we'd --

12 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: We just leave the item as a
13 ground rule in our ground rules, basically.

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: But keep in mind that we
15 are following and we will discuss this --

16 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Exactly.

17 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- at other meetings.

18 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: We will have a discussion.

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We're not going to let you
20 veer off course. But there may be a circumstance where
21 you are comparing two equally qualified applicants and
22 after interviewing, having had the opportunity to speak
23 to those applicants, there's just something intangible
24 about one of them that makes you all confident that that
25 particular candidate is the best person to go out into

1 the public and speak, for instance.

2 That's in the regulations. So you might have an
3 opportunity or a need to talk about, well, what is
4 special about this person? There's this baseline
5 qualification in the relations. What qualities does
6 this particular applicant possess that really speak to
7 me as a panel member and make me confident the person
8 can do the job? That's really what this is about. You
9 are not allowed to deviate from the regulations. You
10 can't set a new, higher bar.

11 But you most certainly have a need, I think, to
12 discuss what you like about applicants as that fits
13 within the relations. And people aren't going to say,
14 "I'm impartial." They are going to tell you something
15 about themselves, and you are going to need to talk
16 about what that is and why it matters to you or why it
17 doesn't.

18 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: And our goal is to share
19 with the public. Because this process is transparent.
20 We want to make sure we share our top process when
21 reviewing those applications and share with the public
22 what exactly am I looking for, given that we will be
23 within the boundaries of those requirements that are
24 stated in the law, nothing -- we will not add to it as
25 the counsel has stated.

1 So having it in the ground rules will require the
2 panel members to go with that rule and identify those
3 and discuss them and share with the public. That's my
4 thoughts.

5 MS. SWISLEY: May I just submit that comment?

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Yes.

7 MS. SWISLEY: My name is Randi Swisley and I'm a
8 resident of Placer County.

9 And if the law was clear enough to select the
10 people that you need to select from the over 2,000 that
11 you have, we wouldn't need the applicant panel. So I
12 actually think that there are some things that are
13 subjective because you are human, that you know you are
14 going to have to apply your judgment to, that no matter
15 how anybody writes the law, they are not going to be
16 able to be clear enough to sort out those people in the
17 right way.

18 And I also think that the key to this is that it
19 is so open and people are allowed -- and you are being
20 watched by a lot of people. And that's going to be the
21 key to the success of it. So I support that bullet item
22 staying in, if you care.

23 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you so much.

24 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any other
25 comments?

1 Okay. Would the panel like to make a motion?

2 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: We already made the motion
3 to adopt the counsel's suggested ground rules as stated
4 in that memo.

5 I second that.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: You second that.

7 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I did second that.

8 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. All in favor of the
9 motion?

10 (Ayes)

11 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All opposed?

12 The motion is carried.

13 Our next item of business is we have a
14 presentation -- nope. Sorry. It's establishment of --
15 no. We've done that. I need to mark these off. Sorry.

16 We have a presentation by Ana Henderson from the
17 University of California Berkeley Law School, director
18 of Opportunity and Inclusion, Chief Justice Earl Warren
19 Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity. And she
20 will be providing the panel with training and
21 information regarding the state's demographics and how
22 California's unique diversity impacts the task of
23 redistricting.

24 Ms. Henderson, do you need just a little bit of
25 time? Do we need to take a break?

1 MS. HENDERSON: I'm actually good.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: You are good? Okay.

3 MS. HENDERSON: Good morning. I want to thank
4 you, first of all, for having me here today. I'm very
5 happy to be here to talk to you about this very
6 important issue and to be involved in such an important
7 process.

8 I'm also juggling computers here, so bear with me
9 if I have a technical issue.

10 So here's a road map of what I'll be going over
11 today. I'm going to be giving you a brief overview of
12 redistricting and the Voting Rights Act. I know that
13 you've already had some training about the Voting Rights
14 Act, so I won't want to go into it too much, but I do
15 want to touch on a couple things. If there are
16 questions that you have, feel free to ask them as well.

17 Then I will be going into a discussion of
18 California's diversity. I'm going to be focusing on
19 race and ethnic diversity in California, just trying to
20 give you a little sketch of some of the things that are
21 unique about California and that commissioners and
22 yourselves should keep in mind.

23 I'm going to give you some thoughts on what the
24 commission can do regarding the Voting Rights Act and
25 California's diversity through the redistricting

1 process.

2 Just a note about myself. I am at UC Berkeley
3 now. I've been there for almost five years. Before I
4 came out here, I was an attorney at the U.S. Department
5 of Justice Civil Rights Division in the voting section.
6 While I was there, I reviewed redistricting plans
7 through the Section 5 process. I also defended Section
8 5 litigation when the state pursued it for clearance.
9 And in addition, I did the language assistance
10 enforcement and also had to draw plans for Section 2
11 enforcement, so I've got a lot of experience with
12 redistricting. It's complex and interesting, sometimes
13 frustrating, but an incredibly important experience and
14 thing to do. And I would like to make sure that
15 everyone appreciates, which I think you already do, that
16 redistricting can have a huge impact on people's lives.

17 Thank you.

18 California's redistricting criteria. The law
19 states they need to comply with the US Constitution;
20 that it includes a reasonably equal population, or the
21 concept of one person, one vote; and then compliance
22 with the Voting Rights Act.

23 Regarding the districts themselves, they need to
24 be contiguous. That means that they need to be whole.

25 They need to try to respect political

1 subdivisions, neighborhoods, and communities of
2 interest.

3 They need to try to be compact, which in
4 California is a little bit different than the
5 traditional Voting Rights Act. The idea of compactness,
6 it means not stretching to far-reaching populations and
7 bypassing local populations.

8 They need to be nested, meaning that the district
9 should have two Assembly districts and the Board of
10 Equalization district should have ten Senate districts.

11 And there should be no regard for incumbents'
12 domicile in making redistricting decisions.

13 But some of the criteria are stated to be subject
14 to Voting Right Act compliance. These include the
15 population calculus; the following of political
16 boundaries, neighborhoods, and communities of interest;
17 compactness; and nesting.

18 Sorry, this is the slide.

19 These requirements can be disregarded to the
20 extent that you need to comply with the Voting Rights
21 Act. So if one person, one vote -- very strict
22 adherence of the one person, one vote is going to lead
23 to a dilution or a lesser ability to elect a candidate
24 of your choice, you can disregard that criteria to some
25 extent.

1 A little bit about the Voting Rights Act.
2 There's two main provisions of the Voting Rights Act
3 that are involved in the redistricting. The first is
4 Section 2, which prohibits the denial or abridgment of
5 voting rights on the basis of race or language minority
6 status. This mostly is called vote dilution. It's a
7 term of art, and it means that all voters have an
8 opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

9 What we usually worry about, when we're talking
10 about vote dilution, is packing of minority voters into
11 a district, so having a district that's 80 or 90 percent
12 Latino, for example, when that population could be
13 divided into more than one district; or the cracking of
14 populations, so where you could have a majority or
15 minority district but it's actually divided into several
16 districts where they cannot constitute a majority.

17 The other main provision is Section 5, and that
18 requires certain jurisdictions to obtain permission or
19 pre-clearance -- it's a term of art -- before they can
20 make changes to voting procedures. This includes
21 redistricting and includes actually any voting change
22 that a jurisdiction might want to make.

23 In California, there's four counties that are
24 covered by Section 5. They are King, Merced, Monterey,
25 and Yuba Counties. But because of we have those four

1 counties covered, the whole plan will end up being
2 submitted to the DOJ for preclearance because you can't
3 just look at the four counties that are involved,
4 because -- I actually did -- I reviewed a plan that was
5 like this -- it was the state of North Carolina -- where
6 there's some jurisdictions that are covered and some
7 that are not. And there's really no way to just look at
8 the covered jurisdictions. I know that was a question
9 that came up in the last training, so I wanted to
10 address it.

11 So the redistricting process: I like this little
12 graphic here. I'm not sure if they are pushing them
13 together or pulling them apart. But what I have noticed
14 is that a lot of times people look at districts and
15 think, gosh, these districts are so ugly, they look so
16 funny. How in the world do they come about? Why don't
17 we just divide up the state like a checkerboard or just
18 follow county lines or city lines or something that
19 would be easy and make sense and it wouldn't be so
20 unruly?

21 The problem is that there's difficulties with
22 that. And here's a very quick example: This map is
23 actually showing the population in every county in
24 California. The big box is a population of 10 million.
25 The tiny dot is fewer than 10,000. So because of

1 unequal distribution of population throughout the state,
2 if you were just going to follow county lines, you would
3 end up with really, really unequal districts.

4 So in L.A. County would be, you know -- have a
5 district with 10 million people, whereas folks in Inyo
6 County, for example, would be a district with about a
7 hundred thousand. That would mean that folks in Inyo
8 would have a lot more influence. Their vote would be
9 worth more than in L.A. County. So that's one of the
10 reasons why it can't be as simple as following county
11 lines.

12 The checkerboard also is kind of difficult
13 because you have such uneven population distribution.
14 If there were one person per acre, then all of the state
15 of California would be easy to do this. Unfortunately,
16 that's not what we have.

17 So a question that I understand has come up often
18 is, how do you go about doing this? It seems like a
19 daunting thing to do, especially in a large state like
20 California with a big population. And from the a -- so
21 I want to talk about some different ways to think about
22 actually drawing lines and redistricting.

23 From a voting rights perspective, your goal is to
24 avoid diluting the voting strength of protected
25 communities. So one of the things that you probably

1 want to do, first off, is to look at census data for the
2 geographic distribution for protected communities. You
3 want to identify communities of interest, and that also
4 includes racial groups. You probably want to sketch out
5 Voting Rights Act districts or majority/minority
6 districts or coalition districts. And then you want to
7 kind of fit in the rest of the plan.

8 As I mentioned earlier, the redistricting
9 criteria in California can be adjusted, some of them to
10 comply with the Voting Rights Act. You know, you could
11 redistrict the whole state and then try to draw in your
12 Voting Rights Act districts, but it's so hard to redraw
13 the state, that I suggest you looking at the populations
14 first and just getting an idea of where things -- the
15 lay of the land.

16 Some other ways to do redistricting could include
17 just basing it on population, just drawing districts
18 that only look at the population, making sure you have
19 one person, one vote, equal population through all
20 districts, without regard to anything else;

21 Following existing boundaries, like county
22 boundaries or city boundaries;

23 Basing only on compactness, trying to make it as
24 neat or clear as you can;

25 Or basing solely on nesting. Have a very strong

1 nesting criteria.

2 Some of the problems with this is that it's
3 logistically difficult, as I mentioned with the
4 population redistribution map. All these criteria can
5 conflict with each other.

6 And one of the things that's helpful in Prop 11
7 is there's kind of -- the criteria are in range order so
8 you can tell, you know, if there is a big conflict
9 between some of the criteria, you take one of the higher
10 level in the list.

11 This -- taking these types of approach can also
12 dilute minority voting strength. For example, there was
13 a study done on some Midwest states applying a
14 boundary-following plan and it led to vote dilution of
15 minority communities. There's also been a study done
16 about nesting, that it also can have a diluting effect
17 on voting rights. And it can divide also other
18 communities of interest. I think that Karin Mac
19 Donald's presentation before talked about communities of
20 interest, and so there's other interests that are out
21 there in the community.

22 If you are just looking at a map, if you are just
23 drawing lines very mechanically, you can be dividing
24 those interests.

25 So diversity is a really important issue in the

1 California law. The law states the Commission must
2 reasonably be representative of the state's diversity.
3 That includes racial, ethnic, geographic, economic, and
4 gender characteristics of the population of California.

5 In addition, the Committee members also need to
6 have an appreciation for California's diversity, as I
7 was mentioning earlier. That includes racial diversity
8 but also other types of diversity. For example, the
9 geographic diversity of the state, rural versus urban,
10 northern versus southern California, coastal versus
11 inland communities, etc. Also, personal and community
12 characteristics such as sexual orientation, gender,
13 economic status, and more.

14 Some of these nonracial characteristics are
15 actually collected -- data about them are collected by
16 government sources and are publicly available. Some of
17 them, they are not. So that's something else the
18 commissioners will need to keep in mind, is try to
19 gather information about these different aspects of
20 diversity.

21 And also, of course, the commissioners must also
22 be able to apply the law impartially.

23 So the example that -- some of the information
24 that's publicly available is -- this rural versus urban.
25 This is actually some census data that's available. It

1 talks about the proportion of the population in each
2 county that lives in an urban area. And so you can see
3 some of the differences in the Southern California and
4 Bay Area counties as opposed to some of the northern
5 California counties.

6 Can you see the percentages there? Okay.

7 But some of the other aspects of diversity, such
8 as sexual orientation, the census doesn't collect
9 information about that so that's going to be something
10 that the commissioners will want to go into the
11 community to try to collect information about.

12 I'm going to focus on race and ethnic diversity
13 in California for a while, because that's what the
14 Voting Rights Act is really focused on. The proportion
15 of racial/ethnic groups in California is a little bit
16 different than the rest of the population. The
17 distribution of groups is different.

18 So you can see here that non-Hispanic whites in
19 the nation as a whole are 69.1 percent, but 46.7 percent
20 in California; the black population in California is
21 actually lower than the nation as a whole; Native
22 American population is about the same; the
23 Asian-American and Pacific Islander population is
24 significantly larger, as is the Latino population.

25 I'm just going to talk briefly about what this

1 means. In addition to this kind of, like, baseline
2 California versus United States statistics, it's
3 important to keep in mind that some of California's
4 minority groups also have high degrees of within-group
5 diversity. And I will talk about that a little bit
6 later on when I talk about Asian Pacific Islanders and
7 Latinos.

8 In addition, there's a great degree of language
9 diversity among minority citizens in California. This
10 includes what language is spoken and also the degree of
11 limited English proficiency.

12 The state is increasingly diverse. So there is
13 an increase in diversity between the 1990 and 2000
14 census. And I should mention that most of the numbers
15 that I have in this presentation are actually 2000
16 census numbers, so we will be getting updated
17 information; they are pretty dated at this point, but
18 they are the most reliable numbers, in my opinion.

19 In addition, there's substantial residential
20 segregation and also geographic segregation in the
21 state. From a redistricting point of view, that makes a
22 voting -- drawing Voting Rights Act districts a little
23 bit easier. It has, you know, social implications that
24 are much more serious than are outside the scope of this
25 presentation. I'll be talking about that as well.

1 And also, before I get into maps, I want to
2 mention that this is -- what I'm presenting is the
3 county level. There is much more fine-grain data
4 available to look at census block level or city level
5 segregation. But for this, I just wanted to give you an
6 idea of what's going on.

7 So here's a map that shows the county
8 distribution of Native American and Alaska Native
9 population. The overall population in the state, the
10 proportion of the population in the state, is about the
11 same as national average, but there's areas of
12 concentration. And if we had a more fine-grain map in
13 the county level, you would probably see even more
14 variation.

15 I know that there's -- I didn't have -- the
16 census didn't give just aggregated data just for
17 rancherias. So most of the -- I'm not able to address
18 that at this point. What I can tell you is that the
19 native population was about 600,000 individuals. Of
20 those, the biggest group was unspecified Native
21 American, about 200,000. That was followed by Cherokee,
22 other tribes, Apache, Choctaw.

23 The very green county here is Alpine County. It
24 had 22.9 percent Native American population and Inyo had
25 only 12 percent.

1 This is the distribution of non-Hispanic white
2 populations. And although non-Hispanic white is now
3 lower than the majority in the state, there are several
4 counties where they constitute a higher proportion of
5 the population. The dark green color here is 80 to
6 90 percent. And the light green color is 69 to
7 78.6 percent.

8 And although the African American population in
9 California is smaller than the rest of the nation, it
10 still constitutes about 2.5 million people, and this is
11 back in 2000. In addition, there's some counties that
12 have higher proportion of black population than the
13 nation, such as Solano County at 16.6 percent, and
14 Alameda County of 16.2 percent.

15 This is a map of the nation. California's Asian
16 population is among the largest in the U.S. Only Hawaii
17 has a higher proportion of Asian population. This map
18 here is actually 2008 projection data. It's sample data
19 from the American Community Survey.

20 Whereas the Asian population is about
21 12.3 percent in California in 2000, it was only about
22 4 percent for the nation.

23 And then this map is showing the concentration
24 among the different counties of the Asian population.
25 The Bay Area, the Asian Pacific Island community is

1 concentrated in the Bay Area, L.A. area, and the Central
2 Valley. The Bay Area counties in particular have very
3 high proportions of Asian American population. Those
4 include San Mateo at 22 percent, San Francisco at
5 32 percent, Alameda County at 22 percent, and Santa
6 Clara at 27 and a half percent.

7 And here's a map only showing Pacific Islander
8 communities. Although Pacific Islander communities are
9 a much smaller proportion than of the overall population
10 in California, there still is geographic concentration
11 of these populations around the Bay Area and Southern
12 California.

13 Here's some information informing about Asian
14 Pacific Islanders, and I'm going to say "API" for short.
15 The fastest growing group in California between 1990 and
16 2000. In 1990, it was 9 percent; in 2000 it was
17 12 percent and it's still growing. The 2008 estimate
18 was nearly 13 percent only for Asian alone, so that
19 didn't include Pacific Islanders, and it also didn't
20 include anyone that had Asian plus another racial group.
21 When you add the folks that have Asian plus another
22 racial group, the number will increase.

23 It's also a very diverse group. So the Asian
24 category contains 16 subgroups that are named in
25 addition to another Asian group. That's kind of a

1 catchall. And the Pacific Islanders have eight
2 enumerated groups in the census. So you are looking at
3 about 20 to 24 groups depending on how you count them in
4 the census.

5 California has a diverse distribution of API.
6 The 2000 census showed 4.2 million Asian, Chinese -- I'm
7 sorry, Asian Americans. Chinese and Filipino population
8 was over 1 million each, so together they are about half
9 of the Asian population; followed by Vietnamese at over
10 a half-million; Japanese and Korean Americans at nearly
11 400,000 each.

12 I know a lot of people think of Asian Americans
13 and Pacific Islanders as just one group. There's a lot
14 of differences and diversity among the group. And these
15 are just some examples: For example, region of
16 residence. While APIs are concentrated in the Bay Area
17 and Southern California and the Central Valley, the
18 subgroups can vary by location. For example, 80 percent
19 of Hmongs live and most Laotians live in the Central
20 Valley. Eighty percent of Taiwanese and more than
21 75 percent of Koreans live in Southern California.

22 There's also important differences in educational
23 attainment. According to 2000 census, more than
24 50 percent of Hmong, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans
25 have less than a high school education, compared with

1 only 7 percent for Japanese Americans, 12 percent for
2 Korean, and Filipino Americans, each. And one of
3 our six API groups in California have low average high
4 school attainment.

5 There's also differences in place of birth and
6 citizenship. The majority of groups in all API groups
7 except for Japanese Americans are foreign born. But a
8 majority of foreign-born APIs are naturalized citizens.

9 There's also diversity in poverty or income.
10 Eleven API groups have poverty rates above state
11 averages, including 50 percent of Hmong and nearly
12 one-third of Cambodians and Laotians.

13 There's also differences in language. Of course,
14 the language groups from the different groups are very
15 different. But in addition to that, there's high rates
16 of limited English proficiency, including 48 percent of
17 all Chinese Americans in the state, which are the
18 largest Asian group in the state. In San Francisco
19 County, Los Angeles County, and Orange County, there's
20 particularly high proportion of limited English
21 proficient Asian Pacific Islander Americans.

22 However, it's important to note that there's
23 probably more similarities than differences. It's just
24 that the commissioners should be aware that when they
25 are dealing with groups, they may need to delve a little

1 bit deeper than just saying we talked to an Asian group.
2 They need to recognize that the different areas of the
3 state, there are different populations involved, and
4 they may have different interests.

5 Moving on to Latinos. This map all is showing
6 the distribution of Latinos indicating the percent in
7 each county that is Latino. The dark green color is the
8 range of 43 percent to 72 percent.

9 Latinos are also a pretty diverse group. Like
10 Asian Americans, they are made up of several subgroups.
11 In California, Latinos are predominantly Mexican origin,
12 but there are also other groups. For example, the
13 Mexican origin are about 80 percent of Latinos in
14 California. They are followed by a group called "other
15 Latino," which includes a variety of groups that
16 includes Spanish. It includes also people who have been
17 designated specific Latino origin. And then the next
18 group after that is Central American origin, which are
19 predominantly Salvadoran and Guatemalan.

20 The highest concentrations of Latinos are in
21 Southern California and the Central Valley, but they are
22 also found in other areas of the state.

23 In 2000, 68 percent of Latinos were citizens and
24 about 60 percent of them were native-born citizens, so
25 born in the United States.

1 In addition, about 53 percent of Spanish speakers
2 spoke English less than very well, so were considered
3 limited English proficient, and this includes many
4 Latino citizens.

5 So here's some examples also of differences
6 between major Latino groups in California. About
7 44 percent of Mexican Americans over 25 had a high
8 school diploma or higher, compared with 36 percent of
9 Salvadorans. And 43 percent of Mexican Americans were
10 foreign-born, compared with 81 percent of Salvadorans.

11 So California's diversity offers challenges and
12 opportunities in redistricting. One of the challenges
13 is that there's many communities to consider. And the
14 Commission's going to need to really carefully consider
15 various interests that may sometimes conflict or may
16 not.

17 One of the things they will need to keep into
18 consideration is when there may be more than one
19 minority group in an area. They need to try to
20 determine if those minority groups work together, can be
21 a coalition district. And there's ways to do that. I
22 will talk about those in just a moment.

23 The large and often concentrated minority
24 populations makes drawing constitutional voting rights
25 districts a little bit easier, and also complying with

1 the Prop 11 requirements because, for example,
2 compactness, you need to have a compact district and
3 your population is large and it's very centralized, then
4 you are not going to have to be reaching about to
5 distant populations.

6 In addition, California law also provides for
7 other interests in diversity. And so in addition to the
8 Voting Rights Act and racial consideration, the
9 Commission should be looking at other aspects including
10 geography, income, and sexual orientation.

11 So let me first address diversity. One is
12 diversity in the Commission itself. The California law,
13 of course, requires the commissioners to have an
14 appreciation for California's diversity. One way to
15 address that is to make sure that the members of the
16 Commission itself are diverse. But even more than that,
17 you need to demonstrate that they are open-minded and
18 able to be impartial.

19 Another way to have appreciation for diversity of
20 the state is to have experience with it. So proven
21 experience with diverse communities is something else to
22 look at.

23 Awareness of other communities and their
24 diversity within those communities as well. And then
25 also a willingness to make efforts to learn more and to

1 go out into new and different communities where maybe
2 one hasn't been before.

3 And then addressing California's diversity.
4 What's can the Commission itself do? I think some of
5 the most important things to do are to proactively
6 engage all areas, groups, and concerns in the state.
7 That means that the Commission should not be locked up
8 in an office in Sacramento looking at GIS maps. They
9 should be getting out into the field and trying to meet
10 people. That can include people in places where maybe
11 you have never been and maybe you never thought you
12 would ever go in your entire life.

13 It's going to mean maybe going out of your
14 comfort zone a little bit and going into an area where
15 you say, oh, my gosh, I never thought I would be there.
16 And it means being open to meeting people that are
17 different from yourself.

18 In California, especially with Latino and API
19 citizens, that's going to mean being able to work with
20 people who may speak a different language than you do.
21 So maybe being able to learn how to work with an
22 interpreter, which can be challenging. I know from
23 experience, I had a lot of trouble working through an
24 interpreter once.

25 I think that if I can give some of my own

1 experience with doing this kind of work. I had cases
2 where I had to go out into communities that I had never
3 been to before, didn't know anyone, had to find out what
4 in the world was going on. And when it was a Latino
5 community or a Spanish-speaking community, it was really
6 easy for me because I'm bilingual and I could go out and
7 I could speak to everyone on my own and I could ask
8 questions and I knew more or less where to go and what
9 kind of community organizations were involved.

10 When it was a case in New Mexico dealing with
11 Tewa language, I had no idea. And when it was a case in
12 Alaska dealing with the Filipino voters, I also didn't
13 know that much. And so what I did was, I went out and I
14 tried to find community leaders. They could be anything
15 from actual voting rights advocates to social workers.
16 I kind of found people wherever I could, that could tell
17 me about the community, what was important.

18 And my case in Alaska was dealing with language
19 assistance. And the key provision there was to make
20 sure that the assistance provided was helpful and
21 effective to the population.

22 The state had already done a lot, translating
23 stuff into Tagalog. When I was out in the field,
24 however, I found out that most of the voters in question
25 actually spoke Visayon, which is a different Filipino

1 language. Before I did this case, I didn't even know
2 there was more than one Filipino language, so I learned
3 a great deal through the process.

4 But because I was out in the field and I was
5 asking questions, I found this out and I was able to go
6 back to the election officials and say, you know what?
7 I think this may be more helpful. Why don't you go look
8 into it. So that's the kind of grassroots outreach that
9 I would suggest that the commissioners do.

10 And so here's some kind of do's and don't. I
11 would say don't rely solely on census maps. As I
12 mentioned before, don't be locked up in an office in
13 Sacramento, only looking at maps. It will help you a
14 lot and I think you should look at maps some, but it
15 shouldn't be all you do. So you should look at maps and
16 get an idea of where populations are, what are the
17 different population centers, where are different
18 populations located in the state, who do you need to go
19 talk to, to find out more about the communities of
20 interest.

21 Another reason not to rely solely on census maps
22 is they won't have all the information you want. As I
23 mentioned previously, some of the data -- some of the
24 diversity aspects that the law asked the commissioners
25 to look at are not collected by the census, so that

1 informing will not be there.

2 Don't rely solely on communities coming to you.

3 One thing that's important to keep in mind is some of
4 these communities and some of these individuals have
5 never been engaged in the political process. And even
6 more than that, they have even been excluded from the
7 political process. And so this may be the first time
8 that someone in the government is actually coming,
9 saying, "You know, I want to hear from you." So they
10 may not know that they should come see the Commission.
11 The Commission should be going to them.

12 Do learn about communities of interest. Go out
13 into the field and ask questions. Ask questions like,
14 "What is the most important issue for your community?";
15 "Are there other communities that work with you?"

16 One thing I have heard is that in the Central
17 Valley, there's a lot of coalition work between Asian
18 American and Latino populations because there's a lot of
19 common interests in that area. And so that's something
20 important for the Commission to know when they are
21 thinking about communities of interests and how to draw
22 districts.

23 Do encourage participation by community leaders
24 and members. Do outreach. Find out who they are and
25 make sure that they know that the Commission wants to

1 talk to them.

2 Do travel around the state. I am from the tiny
3 state of Maryland. I am still getting used to how long
4 it takes to go across the state, because for me I'm
5 like, it takes the same amount of time to drive from
6 here to L.A. as it does to go from D.C. to New York.

7 And so I definitely feel for the commissioners.
8 They are going to be putting in a lot of miles. But
9 it's going to be really important, because even though
10 you might have the same type of population, same ethnic
11 population in one area, it doesn't mean they are the
12 same in every area.

13 So Latino population in the Bay Area may be very
14 different from the Central Valley, very different from
15 Southern California, so you need to be checking into
16 that.

17 Do listen even to complaints. It's possible --
18 it's probably likely that not everyone that talks to
19 Commission members is going to be happy with what's
20 going on. So another thing to take into consideration
21 for Commission members is to be able to take in
22 complaints as well.

23 And it's not always easy. I know from
24 experience, it's not always easy, but that's an
25 important thing. It's an important comment to be

1 getting from the public as well.

2 And do remember that your actions can have major
3 impact on people's lives.

4 And I will end with that. Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Do the panel members have
6 any questions?

7 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I do have a question. I'm
8 sorry.

9 Could you please talk a little bit about the
10 differences between Section 2 and Section 5 of the
11 Voting Right Act?

12 MS. HENDERSON: Sure.

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Because I'm a little bit
14 confused as to what it means by saying that the Section
15 2 requires that the aim is not to dilute minorities.
16 And then Section 5 indicates that you shouldn't
17 intentionally manipulate the proportion of the
18 population.

19 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. Actually, Section 5, the
20 main thing that it says is you can't make the population
21 worse off than it was. So the idea with Section 5, to
22 give kind of a really kind of basic example, if you had
23 a plan that had five majority and minority districts,
24 and then you submitted a plan that had two, that would
25 be -- that could be a Section 5 problem, unless, for

1 some reason there was a massive reduction in population
2 and you couldn't avoid doing that. But the DOJ would
3 come and say that you needed to explain why there was a
4 reduction like that.

5 Section 2 is different. Section 2, you are not
6 really looking at what the current plan is. It's almost
7 like -- think of it from starting from a fresh slate.
8 So I guess that's the best way I can explain it.

9 Section 2 is really looking proactively to see
10 could you have done -- I guess from a litigator's point
11 of view, you would be thinking, could this jurisdiction
12 have done better than what they did?

13 From a Section 5 position, you are saying, did
14 the jurisdiction make the population worse off?

15 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Okay. Thank you. That
16 helps.

17 MS. HENDERSON: It's not like a super hard line,
18 but that's kind of basic.

19 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: That helps. Thank you so
20 much.

21 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Any other questions from
22 the panel members?

23 Ms. Henderson, would you mind taking public
24 comment, public questions? Do we have any questions
25 from the public that would --

1 MR. RAWLINSON: My name is Steve Rawlinson. I'm
2 from San Jose, California.

3 Could you speak a little bit about the nesting
4 requirement for districts and, in particular, there's
5 this requirement, apparently, that a legislative
6 district must be nested in a senate district, and this
7 seems somewhat of an artificial requirement to me.

8 MS. HENDERSON: Yeah. Do you want me to talk
9 about it from a Voting Rights Act perspective?

10 MR. RAWLINSON: Pardon me?

11 MS. HENDERSON: Do you want me to talk about it
12 from a Voting Rights Act perspective or just in general?

13 Yeah. So the nesting requirement, I think, is
14 one of the lower requirements on California's
15 redistricting criteria. It does say that there should
16 be two legislative districts within every Senate
17 district, and then ten Senate districts within each
18 Board of Equalization district.

19 It is one of the requirements that says, you
20 know, as practicable and subject to the Voting Rights
21 Act requirement. So if there were a conflict between
22 that and the Voting Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act
23 would win. It would trump the nesting requirement.

24 It could become a problem if -- because each of
25 these different districts is looking at different

1 population levels. So the legislative district would
2 have a smaller population than a Senate district.

3 So if a Senate district were drawn like a big
4 square, like this, and there were a minority population
5 right in the middle of that Senate corner, if you had to
6 draw two districts, you could split that population
7 right down the middle, and that would constitute a
8 Voting Rights Act problem because then those legislative
9 districts, it would have cracked the population; it
10 would have split it in two. Does that answer --

11 MR. RAWLINSON: Well, I guess my concern about
12 this is that we have two different houses of the
13 Legislature, Senate and then the Assembly. And it seems
14 like they should be decoupled to the maximum extent
15 possible, and this nesting requirement forces them to be
16 closely coupled, which seems to be the antithesis of
17 what you really want.

18 MS. HENDERSON: So you are saying, you don't like
19 the requirement, basically?

20 MR. RAWLINSON: I think it's an artificial
21 requirement.

22 MS. HENDERSON: I can't speak to the genesis of
23 it or why it was in the proposition.

24 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Any other questions?

25 MR. JOHNSON: Again, Doug Johnson. To somewhat

1 answer that question, we used nesting in 7D3 in '91 when
2 the court stepped in, and they were able to do voting
3 rights compliance issue.

4 What it does is two things: It encourages
5 competition because instead of one Senate district being
6 divided among six Assembly districts, where the Assembly
7 members can't really run against the senator, now you
8 have two assembly members who either one has a good case
9 to challenge a senator, if they want. The other thing
10 that's probably more important, is every time you draw a
11 line, the Redistricting Commission has to make a
12 decision and that decision will engage controversy. It
13 will engage debate as laid out very well today.

14 Wherever you draw these lines, there's a lot of
15 debate, and people like it and not like it. If you are
16 nesting, you are drawing fewer lines, because you have
17 drawn one set of lines in an area and then you just
18 either combine Assembly districts or divide Senate
19 districts in that area.

20 One thing that comes up a lot in the Berkeley
21 study on nesting -- I think you missed this point --
22 that in some areas, you can draw a Senate Voting Rights
23 district, as you said. In others, you can only draw an
24 Assembly district, so you have to draw your Voting
25 Rights district first. So you can't draw the whole

1 State Senate and then split them all up. Some parts,
2 you have to draw Senate first and other parts, you have
3 to draw Assembly first.

4 But it does kind of reduce the number of lines
5 you are drawing and reduce the mischief for controversy
6 to come up. And it makes it easier for voters. If you
7 are in a given Assembly district, then you know what
8 Senate district you are in.

9 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

10 Any other questions?

11 MS. ARNELL: Leslie Arnell [phonetic] from
12 Sacramento, here. On one of your first slides, you
13 state that the California redistricting criteria is --
14 the last one is no regard for incumbent's domicile.
15 That particular provision in the act, though, is a
16 little bit longer than that. I thought it also said --
17 and I wish I had it now -- but something akin to, you
18 know, we won't take into account the interests of
19 political parties. I wish I could quote it right now,
20 but I don't have it.

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: That's actually in a
22 different section. You are correct, that the intent
23 language related to the proposition --

24 MS. ARNELL: Correct.

25 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: -- that they wanted to

1 take it from the political process.

2 But as Ms. Henderson indicated, the specific
3 provision related to the residence of a politician is
4 more limited than that, in that particular section.

5 MS. HENDERSON: I think you might be thinking --
6 if I can interject. I think you might be thinking of
7 the definition of "community of interest." It's not
8 supposed to include political --

9 MS. ARNELL: Yes. And I'm not so sure who I'm
10 addressing. Am I addressing these three? Am I
11 addressing you? Am I addressing you?

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Everyone.

13 MS. ARNELL: Here's my question: I went back and
14 read a 1992 California Supreme Court case -- forgive me.
15 I don't have the citation. They had -- one of the
16 challenges that was being addressed in that particular
17 case was that the way they drew the lines, this
18 particular three-person commission drew the lines, was
19 to have the effect of taking four democratic seats and
20 reducing it to one.

21 And so if a Commission member were to get that
22 particular question out there as we're floating through
23 the state of California, somebody objects, "Wait, you
24 are talking four democratic seats and reducing to one,"
25 what's our response? I just want to make sure that I

1 understand the act and that our response is irrelevant
2 to that particular question or similar questions.

3 We are not paying attention to political parties
4 or incumbents as Commission members. But I want to hear
5 it from the horse's mouth. That was my interpretation.

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Well, the horse isn't
7 here.

8 MS. ARNELL: The horse isn't here.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You will have legal
10 counsel. If you are seated on the Commission, you will
11 have legal counsel who will give you legal advice as to
12 what you should do in that circumstance. And you will
13 also, I assume, have extensive training before you go
14 out into the field, so you will have a better comfort
15 level about what the rules are.

16 The act does state that the residence of a
17 particular politician does not play a factor in where
18 you draw the lines. And how the Commission ultimately
19 makes those decisions is really up to the Commission
20 based upon the assistance of their consultants and their
21 legal counsel.

22 MS. ARNELL: Thanks.

23 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any other
24 questions?

25 Seeing there is none, I would like at this time,

1 since it's getting close to lunchtime, take a short
2 recess for about an hour. It is --

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: 11:51.

4 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: 11:51. We will reconvene
5 at 12:51 or 1 o'clock. How about 1 o'clock. Make it
6 easy. Okay? So we will reconvene at 1 o'clock.

7 I would like to say thank you to Mrs. Henderson.

8 MS. HENDERSON: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Your information was very
10 informative and I'm really happy that we were able to
11 get a little bit more training on the diversity subject.

12 MS. HENDERSON: Thank you very much.

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you so much.

14 (Break taken in proceedings)

15 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Since a quorum is present,
16 we will reconvene the meeting. Our next agendized item
17 is basically just discussions and information. Due to
18 the Voter Right Act stating that all of our discussions
19 regarding any Voters Right Act information for panel --
20 or Voters First Act for panel members has to be during
21 public meetings, so there could be some times where you
22 are wondering what we're doing. It's pretty much just
23 kind of discuss items among the panel members, and we
24 will be asking for public comment on some of those
25 items.

1 There is no -- going to be no motions most likely
2 today, for these next two agenda items.

3 Our first item is anticipated timeline and
4 process for applicant review and selection.

5 I would like to state that the panel members have
6 not received nor reviewed any applicants. We won't be
7 receiving or reviewing any of the supplemental
8 applications until I think it's 5 o'clock, when the
9 deadline is today. So most likely, we will be getting
10 them either today after five or starting tomorrow. So
11 we can begin reviewing those then.

12 Today is the final filing date for the
13 supplemental applications and we've received about 22
14 completed applications. When I say -- 2200 completed
15 applications. That would be very simple if it was 22.

16 The 2200 completed applications, those are the
17 applications where we've received the supplemental
18 application and the three letters of recommendation.

19 We've also received about 3700 supplemental
20 applications. There is going to be some sort of lag
21 between the time that the letters of recommendations and
22 the supplemental applications could be linked up. So
23 there could be a couple-day lag when we have some final
24 numbers on the completed.

25 One thing I want you to know is that we need to

1 provide to the four legislative leaders at least a list
2 of 60 of the most qualified and diverse applicants by
3 October 1st. So that is our deadline.

4 Panel members, do you have anything to kind of
5 discuss that we can discuss in the sense of the
6 timeline?

7 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I kind of would like to go
8 into what our goal is between now and October 1st. And
9 right now we have kind of a plan, but we haven't seen
10 anything. So it's just a general idea of what we hope
11 to accomplish.

12 I believe that around the end of this month, we
13 have another meeting to discuss in more detail the ARP's
14 desirable qualifications of a candidate. Today we're
15 going to discuss some general terms, what we think is
16 important to see in the applicant, in an ideal
17 applicant.

18 But, you know, by April 30th, we probably won't
19 be talking about the applicants or discussing them by
20 name. We're just trying to whittle down the potential
21 3700 pool. I don't think we're going to get that many
22 down to a manageable pool where we can talk more in
23 detail about the applicants.

24 And on May -- this is probably where we're going
25 to do our significant review and utilize staff

1 appropriately and do a diligent review of the
2 applications. And chime in if you feel any differently.

3 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: If I'm quiet, that means I
4 agree.

5 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: But we're going to try to
6 whittle it down by the end of May, maybe end of June, a
7 group of ideal 300 to 500 most qualified and diverse
8 applicants.

9 We have a lot of work ahead of us, so we're going
10 to work very hard, day and night, to get what we need to
11 get done. I think as soon as we get a sense of next
12 couple weeks of the applications, we will be in a better
13 position to describe in more detail the candidate
14 qualities that we feel are important to us.

15 And --

16 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: So our goal is to reduce
17 the pool of the applicants to a manageable size,
18 hopefully by the end of -- towards the end of June,
19 where we will have probably about 200 or so applicants,
20 at which time we will focus more on the details for each
21 of those applicants.

22 And depending on what the final number of
23 completed applications might be, I also want to add a
24 comment about the fact that we want to leave the timing
25 of our public meetings open for now because we don't

1 know exactly what we are expecting, as Mary suggested.
2 We haven't seen the applications. We don't know what
3 the information tells us in terms of, you know, how much
4 work we need to do and how much we need to share with
5 the public.

6 As we mentioned this morning, by the end of this
7 month, we will have a public meeting where we will
8 discuss in more detail the qualifications that the panel
9 members are looking at as part of their review process,
10 basically. And at which time we will be discussing in
11 more detail the qualifications.

12 But for now, our goal is to apply the minimum
13 qualifications that are stated in the law, to reduce the
14 pool to a manageable -- the three minimum
15 qualifications, and to reduce the pool to a manageable
16 size by, let's say, about June 30th, kind of like
17 towards the end of June, about 200.

18 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So when you are saying is a
19 manageable number -- so from what I am hearing, we're
20 going to be doing this in phases; correct? So we're
21 going to reduce it, like Kerri says, from -- reduce a
22 pool, the applicants that we may receive up to 3700,
23 reduce those down to about 300 to 500 and then do
24 another reduction --

25 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- to about 200?

2 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I think that will work for
3 us because if we have a pool of, let's say, 500
4 applicants at the beginning of June, then of course
5 we're going to have a public meeting to see who they are
6 and what the panel members' rating of those applications
7 are.

8 And based on the decisions in that public
9 meeting, if once we decide on the pool of 500
10 applicants, then we can focus on those 500 applicants
11 and try to reduce it down to about 200 by the end of
12 June. And then, of course, we're going to have another
13 public meeting to discuss each one of these applicants
14 and share our thoughts in terms of why you think that
15 they are the most qualified of all.

16 I would like to make sure that I mention this:
17 Everybody in the pool will be open for review, because
18 our review is comparative. We are not going to
19 eliminate anybody until we have a solid sense of
20 agreement in the panel members' decision who are the
21 most qualified individuals to serve on the
22 communication.

23 So I agree that our goal should be to leave all
24 the applications open at the beginning, look at all of
25 them, and do not make a decision until we have a chance

1 to look at each single application. And if we can do
2 that by the -- let's say the beginning of June, because
3 at the same time, you want to have the process as
4 efficient as possible. And we want to encourage public
5 participation at those meetings to help us.

6 If there's any information that can help the
7 panel members to reach a better decision in terms of,
8 you know, making sure that we have all the information
9 that's relevant for each applicant, we encourage that.

10 So assuming that we are able to go through all
11 the applications by the beginning of June and that we
12 have consensus in terms of, you know, who are amongst
13 the most qualified, our goal is to -- or at least my
14 goal is to -- be able to reduce it down to a manageable
15 size of about 500 at the beginning of June and then we
16 apply the same steps in the process, reviewing each one
17 of them comparatively. And then by the end of June,
18 have an even smaller pool of maybe about 200 applicants.

19 Now, these numbers, I'm just throwing it out
20 there. It's not predetermined numbers. We don't score
21 the applicants. We don't have any idea about what --
22 because we haven't seen the applications.

23 But again, I'm kind of applying my own experience
24 and trying to make the process as efficient as I can,
25 based on my limited knowledge of the applications at

1 this point.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Now, we have to also keep
3 in mind that we're going to be conducting interviews and
4 we're going to be conducting interviews of 120
5 applicants, up to 120 applicants. And to do that, I'm
6 estimating it's going to take about six weeks of
7 interview time to perform those interviews. And then
8 after that, we're going to have to have a meeting --
9 we're going to have to have time to review those
10 interviews and then to have a meeting to reduce those
11 applicants down to 60 of the most qualified and diverse
12 applicants to provide to the legislative leaders by
13 October 1st.

14 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Correct.

15 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So to get those phases
16 down, I'm thinking we have to get -- make sure that we
17 can meet that beginning of August time frame to start
18 those interviews.

19 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I think -- for the most
20 part, I think that's achievable, because if we can
21 reduce the pool down to about 500 by the end of June,
22 then we will have about at least two weeks or so by mid
23 July to reduce the pool down to about 120 that's stated
24 in the law.

25 Because then from the mid July to August 1st

1 where we have -- we're planning to have the interviews
2 during August and early September. And again, we will
3 discuss the specifics about those interviews, perhaps if
4 not now, in the next meeting once we have more
5 information about the applications and applicants and
6 all that.

7 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: And also possibly at a
8 later meeting about those interviews.

9 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yeah. So I think if
10 everything works out the way I envision it, and I'm glad
11 that you agree with me, I think it will work for us to
12 keep in focus that initially we will have -- our review
13 will be within the parameters of the legal requirements,
14 which is the three minimum qualifications and all that.
15 And once we have a manageable pool, then we will get
16 into more details.

17 For example, we need to have a commission that's
18 diverse in terms of demographics, geography, and
19 education -- not education. Those five criteria that's
20 in the law, in the regulations.

21 So in order for us to assess what is the final
22 make-up of this commission, we have to be able to look
23 into the details for each one of them to see, of those
24 that are the most qualified, which ones may be best to
25 fit it's purpose of diversity. But that's of course

1 second.

2 So if we go to, for example, about 120 by mid
3 July, then of course there are some logistics involved
4 in terms of scheduling all those interviews in August
5 and early September.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: And that kind of goes into
7 the whole thing of, we also have to give the bureau some
8 time to perform background checks on some of
9 those -- some of those individuals.

10 So we have to take that into consideration. And
11 also, there's the Form 700s that the certain applicants
12 have to fill out, and I think they have a 30-day
13 requirement on submitting those back. And then there's
14 also, I think, a requirement of about ten days for
15 scheduling interviews.

16 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Seven calendar days.

17 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Seven calendar days.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Yes. And we're actually
19 working right now to try and create an automated sign-up
20 system for interviews similar to what you may have
21 experienced when you make online hotel reservations.

22 We're working with our IT unit to see whether
23 it's possible to give each of the 120 candidates we
24 decide to interview, a log-in time and a password so
25 that they can sign up for their own interview times.

1 We would establish 130 or 140 slots and let them
2 sign up, which would give you all flexibility in case
3 either one of you or an applicant wasn't able to make it
4 at the last minute. But that is something that we're
5 working with IT on. I don't know that we will be able
6 to make that happen, but we're going to work on it.

7 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: That will be wonderful,
8 actually.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It may save you some time.
10 If applicants could log in on a Saturday at noon and
11 sign up, it may give you a few more days.

12 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: So then -- so let's say we
13 do all the interviews -- as part of the process, again,
14 at a high level, once we have interviewed those 120 or
15 about 120 most qualified applicants, then we will need
16 to have at least about a week or two to dwindle it down
17 to 60 of the most qualified applicants.

18 And of course, we're going to have another public
19 meeting and discuss the results of the interviews and
20 each one of those interviews would be in a public
21 meeting setting. So the public has access, they can
22 share their concerns and make comments about the
23 applications.

24 And again, I encourage the public to help us in
25 that process because the more information that's

1 relevant and valuable in our decision making process we
2 have, the better it is. The outcome will be achieved.

3 Any comments you have, Kerri?

4 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: No. You know, I just want
5 the public to understand that it's an evolving process.
6 So it could change from meeting to meeting, as we see
7 more applications. So what we discuss today may change
8 and we're as a panel -- as a panel member, I'm willing
9 to be flexible, but I'm confident we will be able to
10 determine the 60 of the most qualified candidates to
11 serve as commissioners and for the Legislature to
12 select.

13 And it's -- I think as we progress in this
14 process, you are going to see the panel members
15 discussing more detail of the qualifications of these
16 applicants as we whittle down the pool and as we reduce
17 it, because there are going to be things that we have to
18 discuss that are immeasurable qualities, and it's quite
19 a subjective process and it's similar to the hiring of
20 an employee.

21 So what characteristics speak out to me that
22 support the minimum qualifications or the criteria
23 stated in the law? And so that means what distinguishes
24 one applicant from another to -- as we make the cuts.
25 And I think those are going to be tough decisions and

1 hard decisions, and we're going to solicit input and
2 discuss that openly with each other in order to achieve
3 and maintain a transparent process for the public, in
4 the ultimate goal of observing the Constitution and our
5 obligations.

6 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I agree.

7 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: So basically what we're --
8 the feeling that I'm getting is that we're going to be
9 looking at the applicants and kind of narrowing the
10 applicant pool in phases over certain time frame. I
11 guess what we will be doing is, we're thinking that
12 we're going to have another meeting the end of April to
13 kind of further discuss the applicant qualities. Also,
14 we're going to narrow down the applicant pool to about
15 three --

16 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Three to five hundred.

17 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- to five hundred.
18 Obviously that's going to have to be performed quickly.
19 So around end of May, beginning of June, maybe sooner,
20 we will let everyone know what those timelines are. Is
21 that -- okay.

22 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: You know, we can all
23 have -- this whole thing is -- it has to be flexible
24 because, again, I know I mentioned this before, but we
25 haven't done this work before. We bring some good

1 experience, I believe, but this whole thing is new for
2 all of us. And when we have -- the more information we
3 have about, for example, how much time it takes to
4 review an application, what kind of secondary
5 information does a panel member need in terms of, you
6 know, to come to a educated, for example, decision in
7 terms of, you know, having all the information available
8 that we need to have available.

9 So all of those things are unknown at this point,
10 and, therefore, I think the process in general, as we
11 discussed it here, I think it will work for us. But I
12 want also to make sure everybody understands, and we,
13 that we should leave it open to be flexible in terms of
14 our needs. So once we have a good, solid understanding
15 of what it entails to review all the applications, how
16 much time it takes, what kind of information do we need,
17 what do we need to do in terms of the frequency of
18 public meeting, the input from public meeting, and all
19 that. And we will change the process and make it more
20 specific if we have sufficient evidence that we need to
21 do that.

22 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: If there was one thing that
23 I want to -- and I'm sure the panel members agree with
24 me, and let me know if you don't, is that we will meet
25 that October 1st deadline. That is in law. We will

1 meet that.

2 To meet that, there could be some time frames
3 that seem truncated. However, like Kerri was saying,
4 that if we have to be here to get the job done, we will
5 get the job done. We will look at all applicants --

6 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: -- and review their
8 applications. Like Nasir was saying, I agree with you
9 in the sense of, you know, on our initial review of the
10 applicants, we may not look at the complete application
11 package in the sense of every single question, but most
12 likely the essays, because the essays could -- are
13 definitely, probably, going to cover those three minimum
14 qualifications in the sense of impartiality, diversity,
15 and the related analytical skills. However, the letters
16 of recommendations, we may or may not look at depending
17 on other factors.

18 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Correct. And again --

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You mean for the first
20 pass.

21 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: For the first pass. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: However, as we go along,
24 the applicant pool is going to be less so we can look at
25 more. And definitely, as we go through, we will look at

1 the complete package.

2 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yeah. I think that will
3 work. I think we have a hand raised there.

4 MS. MORALES: Good afternoon. Maricela Morales
5 with CAUSE. One question that comes up, as you are
6 talking about reducing the number to a manageable size,
7 so, say, from 3,000, 3,700, to 500 to 200, to give some
8 thought to and provide clarity to the public as well as
9 applicants, with regard to at what point will you
10 communicate to an applicant, "You are no longer being
11 considered"? Will you all maintain that 3700 up until
12 the 60 go to the legislative leaders? You know, once
13 you get down to 500, do you tell the remaining 2500, you
14 know, "Thank you very much, but you are no longer being
15 considered"? You know, at what point -- it would be
16 worthwhile to, I think, give that some consideration, as
17 applicants may want to ask, "I haven't been invited yet
18 for an interview, but maybe there will still be an
19 opening."

20 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Thank you. Did Legal want
21 to --

22 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I can certainly give you
23 my recommendation, which would be -- it's my
24 understanding, we are in a great deal of outreach, that
25 people are really concerned about their privacy

1 considerations and when they are no longer really being
2 considered, they want to come off the website.
3 Obviously, if they have submitted materials, those are
4 public records. But we want to be pulling people down
5 from the website or putting them in a sort of staging
6 site or a separate site that isn't quite as prominent.

7 So my recommendation would be, obviously you
8 can't do anything individually, so your decision in your
9 office that you may or may not like someone is really
10 meaningless until you have a public meeting where you
11 all agree and you take formal action. But once that
12 formal action is taken, I expect that we will be sending
13 some notification. We will adjust the applicant list on
14 the website, and we will be pulling down those folks who
15 were not included through the remaining of the process.

16 That is my expectation and my recommendation to
17 you.

18 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Yeah. In other words, it
19 will not be hidden. It will be discussed in a public
20 meeting, let's say, for example, at the end of June that
21 the panel members agree on these 500 or these 300,
22 whatever that number might be and as being the top
23 qualified in terms of, you know, who can serve -- who
24 can be the best commissioners for redistricting.

25 So in those public meetings, everybody who is

1 retained in this smaller pool is obviously the ones who
2 move forward and will focus more on the specifics of the
3 information on those. And the others will be still in
4 the pool, but not considered for the next step.

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: There will be
6 applicants -- once you vote to eliminate them from the
7 pool, they will no longer be part of the pool, but they
8 do, as you alluded, remain applicants so, therefore,
9 someone does have the ability to write the bureau a
10 letter and request all applicant -- all applications,
11 and that information would be available, but it won't be
12 prominently placed on the website.

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Correct. Thanks.

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: And I agree with our
15 counsel's recommendation in the sense of once the
16 applicant is no longer in the pool, providing them some
17 sort of notification, and also in the sense of maybe
18 removing them from the public website, once they are
19 removed from the pool.

20 Is that what other panel members were thinking of
21 also?

22 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Right. And I just want to
23 add another comment here: It's my understanding that
24 the law requires all the records to be maintained for --

25 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Twelve years.

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: -- twelve years. So even
2 if they are purged off of the website, the records will
3 be retained.

4 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And there's another
5 component, from just a purely legal perspective.

6 You may be removed from the pool. That doesn't
7 mean you aren't a great candidate. It just means that
8 as of the 3700 we received, you weren't one of the most
9 competitive of that group. But, remember, this is a
10 ten-year gig and any individual who is -- they quit or
11 they have an illness and have to leave the Commission,
12 the regulations require us to go back to those smaller
13 pools of initial applicants to look for our first cut of
14 replacement commissioners.

15 So we do need to retain that information and it
16 doesn't mean you are done. It just means that you are
17 not moving forward on the initial 14 members.

18 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any other public
19 comment?

20 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I think, as I stated, at
21 this point, based on the limited knowledge that we have,
22 I think this appears to be working for us. And we will
23 be flexible and have another meeting at the end of this
24 month and discuss in more detail. We don't want to
25 deviate from what we just discussed.

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Please check the website.

2 We may post an agenda as soon as tomorrow.

3 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: We have a question.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Douglas Johnson for The Rose

5 Institute.

6 You mentioned the Form 700s. And as you know,
7 this is a huge form. One thing, as you are thinking
8 about it, I bet a quarter to half the people that you
9 invite to fill it out, won't. So definitely, as you are
10 looking at who you are going to invite for interviews,
11 make sure that you have enough to get 120 if they
12 haven't filled out the form yet. They may not.

13 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thanks for the comment.

14 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any other public
15 comment?

16 MS. MORALES: Are you moving on to another item
17 on the agenda?

18 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: If we do -- I'm sorry.

19 MS. SWISLEY: My name is Randi Swisley. I am a
20 resident of Placer County. And I agree or I can
21 understand your counsel's point about getting feedback
22 on concerns about privacy. And that was interesting
23 that he thought that you would have trouble getting
24 enough people, as opposed to being overwhelmed with too
25 many people after you require them to fill that form

1 out.

2 One of the things you may consider doing is
3 explaining in very great detail how -- how you will make
4 that information public and how you won't. You know,
5 the details of what will be made public, what won't, and
6 how it will, who will have access, who won't, to which
7 details, because that could help the person decide
8 whether they want to fill it out or not.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Are you referring to the
10 Form 700?

11 MS. SWISLEY: Yes.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Those are, in fact, public
13 records and we obviously redact certain private
14 information, such as your personal residence and the
15 like. If you become a commissioner, you have to fill
16 one out and that is a public record. They are all
17 maintained by the FPBC. We are not going to post them
18 on the website, but public records means that any
19 individual, yourself included, a member of the press,
20 can, in fact, request the documentation that we
21 maintain. And we have limited rights under the Public
22 Record Act to redact anything.

23 MS. SWISLEY: That's very useful information that
24 everybody could use that's filling that out -- what's
25 going to be on the website, what's not, what's going to

1 be public record and what that means, who has access to
2 it, what will be whited out, what won't be whited out,
3 things like that I think would be useful to people.

4 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thanks for the comment.

5 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Our next item of discussion
6 is desirable applicant qualities. Since we haven't
7 really looked at any applications yet and we won't until
8 after 5 o'clock tonight, possibly till tomorrow morning,
9 I'm really hesitant about talking about any of the
10 qualities within the applicants.

11 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: You are just speaking my
12 mind.

13 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Go ahead.

14 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I was, you know, giving it
15 some thought over the weekend and not only have we not
16 seen any applications, but also, if I understand
17 correctly, we had some public comments or calls about
18 this. Counsel?

19 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It's my understanding we
20 received a couple of phone calls from concerned
21 applicants who were worried that anyone who had the
22 ability to either be personally present for or view over
23 the website today's meeting might have some sort of
24 advantage over those applicants who were not able to
25 participate or view the meeting, and that they might

1 revise their applications and they would have some
2 advantage in the process.

3 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thank you.

4 So in the interest of all fairness to all the
5 applicants, I agree with Mary that we should postpone or
6 defer this item for our next meeting, which is towards
7 the end of this month, at which time we will discuss in
8 detail what each of us will share our thoughts about
9 what qualities are we looking at in each application, in
10 each applicant, to be considered for moving forward in
11 this process.

12 So I actually want to make a motion that we defer
13 this item for next meeting, which is scheduled for
14 April 30th.

15 Do we have a second? Comments?

16 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I would like to discuss this
17 a little bit further, because I feel we can maybe
18 discuss some qualifications in general terms and give
19 the public a sense that, you know, our goal is, you
20 know, not to use formulas and quotas, but to really
21 raise the diversity issue and as well as all the other
22 qualities we state in the law -- impartiality, as we
23 learned from training. We've learned about how
24 important impartiality is as a commissioner and the
25 Voters Rights Act and how they not only have to

1 understand it, but embrace the law.

2 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: So the motion pending is
3 to defer the conversation. I would suggest that if
4 that's the pending motion, you probably not want to talk
5 about any qualities that particularly are important to
6 you at this point in time. Also, you may wish to hear
7 from the public.

8 There's nothing in the law that prohibits you
9 from deferring the conversation. I actually placed it
10 on the agenda in case you wanted to talk about these
11 things today, but you are not compelled under the law to
12 discuss it. You would just need to move to defer the
13 conversation.

14 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: To add just one more
15 comment here, to me, I just want to be fair to those
16 applicants who have already submitted their completed
17 applications versus those who might be sitting behind
18 their PCs at this very hour and listening to us.

19 If I voice my -- the details of what I am looking
20 at for someone to be accepted, in my view, in my
21 judgment, as a commissioner, I just don't want those
22 comments to give clues to those applicants who are still
23 working on those applications. And that, to me, it
24 sounds like that wouldn't be fair. So that was my main
25 concern, and this morning when I came in I heard from

1 our counsel that there were actually at least two calls
2 that I'm aware of that they were concerned about this
3 agenda item to be discussed today.

4 So again, I think those were the bases for my
5 motion to move or defer this item to the next meeting.

6 PANEL MEMBER SPANO: I understand. I guess in
7 the next few weeks we have an opportunity to look at the
8 qualifications -- the applications in more detail and
9 get a better sense of explaining what qualifications we
10 feel make up the ideal candidate and whittle it down,
11 have even more of an understanding of that. So I can
12 understand.

13 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Now we can go for public
14 comment if we want to defer the motion.

15 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It's a motion. So public
16 has the right to comment before you take action.

17 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Does the public have
18 any comment regarding this item?

19 Okay. So the motion is --

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You need to restate the
21 motion and get a second vote.

22 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: The motion is to defer the
23 discussion on the desirable applicant qualities to our
24 next meeting, which is scheduled for April 30th.

25 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: I second that.

1 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Okay. No comments from the
2 public or questions.

3 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All in favor?

4 (Ayes)

5 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: All opposed?

6 The motion passes.

7 Our next item of business is public item --
8 public comment. And what we are going to do is -- there
9 was a sign-in sheet in the back and it's pretty much --
10 what I'm going to do is call off your name and if you
11 want to provide public comment, please do so. Anybody
12 that didn't sign in and if they want to provide public
13 comment, that will be taken after the individuals that
14 have signed in.

15 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Can I just jump in real
16 quick here.

17 Secretary, if you would disburse to the board
18 members, we actually received a written comment from an
19 applicant who was not able to be here today and those --
20 I believe it's a suggested schemata for you interview
21 panel. So we will pass that out to you. Obviously it's
22 unagendized so you can't comment on it. It will also be
23 available to the members of the public who are here, who
24 would like to see the public comment. We will put it on
25 the back table. But that's the only written comment we

1 received.

2 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Okay. Thank you. Since
3 there are nine individuals, how about if we just open it
4 up for public comment.

5 Is it Ms. Morales?

6 MS. MORALES: Good afternoon, everyone. I have
7 written comments to share with you, copies for each of
8 the members and counsel.

9 Again, my name is Maricela Morales and I'm with
10 the Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable
11 Economy.

12 Honorable members of the Applicant Review Panel,
13 congratulations and thank you for your leadership and
14 service on the first applicant review panel. The
15 Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy
16 is a California nonprofit organization based in Ventura
17 County. We serve the six-county central coast region of
18 Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Santa
19 Barbara, and Ventura Counties.

20 CAUSE's mission is to build grassroots power for
21 social, economic, and environmental justice for the
22 people of the central coast. Our strategies include
23 policy research, leadership development, community
24 organizing, coalition building, and advocacy. CAUSE is
25 one of the partners working with the Bureau of State

1 Audits to conduct outreach and applicant assistance to
2 increase the diversity of the applicant pool for the
3 first commission.

4 A little bit of background on CAUSE: In 2001,
5 CAUSE convened the community-based Ventura County
6 Redistricting Task Force. It involved diverse
7 broad-based groups as the Ventura County Living Wage
8 Coalition, El Concilio, LULAC, Ventura County League of
9 Women Voters and the Central Labor Council.

10 This community-based task force conducted
11 research, GIS mapping, and outreach based on local
12 communities of interest, and came up with two GIS maps
13 on the supervisorial districts in our county. The
14 county also produced several redistricting maps to
15 consider. And ultimately, the board of supervisors
16 adopted one of the community generated redistricting
17 maps for the board of supervisors. And that is what is
18 currently in place.

19 In October 2009, CAUSE initiated the Central
20 Coast Redistricting Network to outreach to the central
21 coast area, and we have outreached to well over three
22 dozen community groups and community leaders in the
23 six-county central coast region. CAUSE is also working
24 with the University of Southern California, Program for
25 Environmental and Regional Equity, to conduct an

1 analysis on the new demography, the new economy, and the
2 new environment of the six central coast counties.

3 I'm here before you today because according to
4 the Bureau of State Audits at this time, there are seven
5 regions that applicants are being sort of organized
6 around, geographic regions. So Ventura County is
7 currently placed in the southern coast region that
8 includes Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties.

9 From our perspective, this is not correct, from
10 the standpoint that Ventura County has more in common
11 with the central coast area than it does from the
12 southern coast area.

13 So just a couple of examples: The southern coast
14 counties -- L.A., Orange, and San Diego -- are the top
15 three most populous counties in the state. Ventura
16 County is currently ranked 11th and has a population
17 under a million. All of central coast counties,
18 including Ventura County, have similar populations,
19 under a million. So populationwise, it's more similar.

20 Demographically, whereas the southern coast
21 counties have the Asian Pacific Islander populations
22 that range between 11 and 16 percent, the central coast
23 counties Asian Pacific Islander population is between 3
24 and 7 percent. Ventura County is at about 7 percent.

25 In terms of the black population, the southern

1 coast counties have either between a 6 percent and a
2 9 percent black population. Central coast county is
3 either 1 percent or 2 percent. Ventura County's black
4 population is at about 2 percent.

5 The two dominant populations in terms of race and
6 ethnicity in the central coast counties are the white
7 and Latino populations. In most of the central coast
8 counties, the population of white and Latino combined is
9 between 88 and 94 percent. Ventura County is at 89
10 percent white and Latino combined, versus the southern
11 coast counties; it's as low as 77 percent in terms of
12 white and Latino.

13 So in terms of environmentally, we're much more
14 of an agricultural base county, relatively speaking.
15 We're amongst the 12 counties -- amongst the top 20
16 counties in terms of ag production, and so are the other
17 central coast counties.

18 So our recommendation or request from the
19 Applicant Review Panel is to -- from this point forward
20 consider Ventura County part of the central coast, not
21 the southern coast. And I start with that because the
22 information that follows is regarding our request that
23 in terms of geographic representation, that every
24 geographic region have some representation on the
25 commission.

1 So redistricting is made on the fabric of
2 geography. That's what it's based on. It will be drawn
3 literally among land lines, and so that's geography.
4 And whereas you can be appreciative of an area, it's not
5 the same thing as having a deeper knowledge, interest,
6 and awareness of a geographic area.

7 And I've included some stats in the letter or
8 evaluations from our perspective in terms of where the
9 2001 redistricting, as it involved the central coast,
10 from our perspective -- and this is a preliminary
11 review, we will be doing a much more in-depth review for
12 the public testimony next year. But it seems to us that
13 the central coast was really cracked, that we were
14 basically the go-to county for -- we need, you know, X
15 number additional people. Let's take from over here,
16 you know.

17 As an example, Santa Cruz County is a county
18 that's only about 250,000, yet it is in two Senate
19 districts. So here's a very small county that was split
20 into two.

21 Another example is, in Ventura County, there are
22 two cities that in total population only number 40,000
23 and their Latino population is about 70 percent.
24 Seventy to eighty percent. They were put in a district
25 with -- that spans about 150 miles, where the center of

1 gravity is two communities that, in total, are 280,000,
2 so seven times the size, and only about 20 percent
3 Latino.

4 So this is the sort of kind of more on-the-ground
5 awareness and interest and knowledge that can only come
6 from having representation on the Commission from folks
7 that are going to be willing to take that extra mile to
8 look deeper into every -- or their particular region.

9 And so we're asking that as you consider the
10 make-up of the Commission, that you do look at the
11 regions in terms of having representation on that
12 Commission from each of the regions. And we recommend
13 that it be based on population. So central coast, for
14 instance, would be at about one member.

15 So this information for you to consider and take
16 into account, and the two main points being, if from
17 this point forward, you are organizing along regional
18 lines, that Ventura County be included in the central
19 coast region, not the southern coast region. And as you
20 look at Commission members, in terms of geography, that
21 you seriously consider having representation along
22 population lines from every geographic region to ensure
23 that that closer look is done in the process.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Thanks. There's no quotas

1 within this. And one of the requirements in the law
2 states that the individuals will be diverse. So
3 that's -- that is our goal is to ensure that there's
4 equal representation as much as we can.

5 MS. MORALES: And we agree. In terms of -- we're
6 trying to elevate the significance of the geographic
7 diversity, that the only quotas that currently exist, if
8 you want to call them quotas, are that they -- along
9 partisan political lines. Right? The Voters First Act
10 calls -- or Prop 11 called for five republican, five
11 democrat, and four others. So that's cut and dry.

12 But when we talk about diversity, right, there's
13 no quota around gender.

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Actually, the act
15 specifically forbids the panel from considering any
16 formulas and quotas in diversity issues.

17 MS. MORALES: Right. I'm not asking for a quota.
18 I'm asking that the geographic representation be
19 significantly considered and just as -- I don't think
20 that this panel would be okay with, as a -- as a sort of
21 a very obvious example, a panel of 14 men that all, you
22 know, say and present that they are appreciative of
23 women. Right? That -- I'm assuming that that would not
24 be, you know, good enough.

25 And so likewise, around geography, that, from our

1 perspective, if it comes down to having a panel that all
2 comes from sort of a concentrated place in the state,
3 even though, you know, they have all stated that they
4 appreciate the rest of the state, that that wouldn't be
5 sufficient.

6 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Right. I'm sure all of my
7 panel agrees that we're definitely going to look at the
8 diversity of those members that we select.

9 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: With your permission, I
10 just wanted to add a comment: Basically it's my
11 understanding that the law requires for the Commission
12 to be diverse in terms of not only geography but also
13 ethnicity, race, economic, and gender.

14 In our review, which we will probably allude to
15 more in our next meeting, when we discuss the
16 qualifications of the applications, in my personal view,
17 just because someone is from, let's say, Ventura County,
18 or someone is from north coast county, one of the
19 counties in the north coast, doesn't mean that that
20 individual may not have appreciation for diversity.

21 In other words, even though -- because, you know,
22 no matter how many different ways you cut it, there may
23 still be some limitations in terms of, you know,
24 geographic representation in that commission of 14
25 people, as you stated.

1 Our goal would be to try to have individuals in
2 the Commission who appreciates the diversity of all the
3 different regions.

4 MS. MORALES: Thank you very much. You all have
5 a very tough -- some very tough work ahead of you in
6 terms of balancing all of this out. And our only intent
7 was to want to provide you information and let you know
8 from our place on the ground pertinent information for
9 your consideration.

10 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: I appreciate that very
11 much. Thank you so much.

12 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Any other public comment?

13 MR. RAWLINSON: My name is Steve Rawlinson. I'm
14 from San Jose, California.

15 As the young woman just said, that you have a
16 very difficult task in front of you. Unfortunately, the
17 Commission has an even more daunting task in front of
18 it. And this Commission specifically will have the
19 problem that they are going to be establishing
20 precedents for what future commissions do, and they are
21 going to have to develop processes, etc., that those
22 other commissions are going to probably use in the
23 future.

24 So my real point of this is that you have laid
25 out a set of minimal qualifications in terms of, you

1 know, sort of analytic qualifications that you want and
2 all of the other stuff that we wrote essays on.

3 I believe that there are a secondary set of
4 qualifications that you really need to take into
5 consideration. For example, how nimble your applicants
6 are, because they are going to have to transition
7 between different phases in this project. And that is
8 what is going to make or break this Commission.

9 So I urge you to take that strongly into
10 consideration, because the -- what you have laid out as
11 the minimal set of qualifications, you can have people
12 that satisfy that 100 percent, and you may end up having
13 a Commission that's a failure because the secondary
14 considerations will become -- the major thing such as
15 how well the people are team players, etc., etc., etc.
16 It's my only point.

17 Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Thank you.

19 PANEL MEMBER AHMADI: Thanks.

20 CHAIRPERSON CAMACHO: Is there any other public
21 comment?

22 Seeing that there isn't any, we will adjourn this
23 meeting. And then also definitely keep a look at the

24 //

25 //

1 website for our next meeting, and we will see you then.

2 (Rap gavel)

3 (The meeting concluded at 1:52 p.m.)

4 ---o0o---

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KATHRYN S. SWANK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing Citizens Redistricting Commission Applicant Review Panel Public Meeting was reported in shorthand by me, Kathryn S. Swank, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 20th day of April 2010.

KATHRYN S. SWANK, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13061