

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the matter of
Full Commission Line-Drawing Meeting

University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law
Classroom C
3200 Fifth Avenue
Sacramento, California

VOLUME II

Wednesday, June 1, 2011

3:56 P.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Commissioners Present

Connie Galambos Malloy, Chairperson

Lilbert "Gil" Ontai, Vice-Chairperson

Maria Blanco

Gabino T. Aguirre

Angelo Ancheta

Vincent Barabba

Cynthia Dai

Michelle DiGuilio

Stanley Forbes

M. Andre Parvenu

Jeanne Raya

Michael Ward

Peter Yao

Commissioner Absent

Jodie Filkins Webber

Staff Present

Dan Claypool, Executive Director

Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel

Rob Wilcox, Communications Director

Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

Also Present

Presenters

George Brown, VRA Attorney, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher
(Present via telephone)

Karin MacDonald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Jamie Clark, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Tamina Alon, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Public Comment

Alice Huffman, NAACP

David Salaverry

I N D E X

	Page
1. Introduction and Agenda Overview	5
2. Gibson, Dunn Consultation on VRA Section 2&5	12
3. Commission provides direction to Q2 for line-drawing	45
Break (12:11 p.m. - 1:18 p.m.)	
Public Comment -- Alice Huffman, NAACP	134
Commission resumes providing direction to Q2 for line-drawing	139
4. Technical Discussion Topics	294
1. Tracking of line-drawing directions	
2. Reliability of non-Census redistricting data	
3. Consideration of supplementary data sources at the input hearings	
4. In-line process review: status update & next steps	
5. Provision of equivalency files for 2 nd and 3 rd round maps	
6. Second & third-round Input Hearings: technical Methodology & structure (joint w/Outreach)	
a. Consideration of meta-analyses for draft maps	
Adjournment	429
Certificate of Reporter	430

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to welcome everyone back to this session of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

We are providing line-drawing directions to our technical consultants, Q2.

The way we will proceed for the remainder of this line-drawing session is that we'd like to turn our attention, now, to the Congressional districts for the entire State, and following that to take a look at some of the Senate districts.

We only have, really, a handful of Senate districts that are ready, so to speak, for us to look at. But what Q2 would like us to do is to be able to look at an overlay Senate districts onto Assembly districts, and begin to give them guidance on issues around nesting.

So, those are the two activities that will take us up to roughly dinner time.

I did get some feedback from the Commission that our desire is to take maybe a short snack break around dinner time, and then come back and actually work through. So, we may actually end around 8:00 as opposed to 9:00 o'clock, so that's what we're looking at.

I'd like to finish the maps before we take our break, and then we can come back and move into committee

1 work for the remainder of the evening.

2 So, with that I'll transfer over to Q2.

3 MS. CLARK: Okay, again, if we can begin in the
4 north of the State, looking at this coastal district, on
5 page 22. The intact counties of DelNorte, Humboldt,
6 Trinity, Mendocino, again here Sonoma is split and Marin
7 County is wholly intact.

8 The cities in Sonoma County that are included in
9 this visualization, along Highway 101, Cloverdale,
10 Healdsburg, Windsor, Sebastopol, Petaluma. I believe that
11 the only city split here is Petaluma and there are just
12 some noncontiguous zero population blocks. And, again,
13 Marin County is intact.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, I'm just curious onto
15 the borders there, the south where the splits happen, how
16 that differs from Assembly. I thought I remembered maybe
17 Rohnert, Petaluma was --

18 MS. CLARK: I believe it --

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I was curious how the
20 difference is between Congressional and Assembly?

21 MS. CLARK: I believe that, really, the main
22 difference is that with Assembly Windsor is included
23 with -- or would be to the east side of the split, like
24 Windsor would be with Santa Rosa. And in this
25 configuration Windsor and Santa Rosa are in separate

1 districts. I believe that that's the only difference.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Thank you.

3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: I'm sorry, Jaime, was
4 there a page that we were supposed to be looking at?

5 MS. CLARK: Page 22.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

7 COMMISSIONER YAO: Can you just comment in general
8 as to why we would want to do this instead of trying to
9 nest two Assembly districts --

10 MS. CLARK: Right now we're looking at
11 Congressional.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm not
13 awake yet.

14 (Laughter)

15 MS. CLARK: Me, neither.

16 (Laughter)

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Other questions or
18 direction? Commissioner Ancheta?

19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Maybe we did this when we
20 gave you instructions, but I guess the -- the
21 alternative -- the question that will come up is why not
22 keep Sonoma intact and then split Marin. Obviously,
23 there's implications for the adjacent district, but I
24 don't know if we gave you any options on that kind of
25 split.

1 MS. CLARK: This is sort of a hybrid district
2 between mine and Tamina's regions. However, I had
3 direction to -- and there's a lot of COI testimony
4 advocating for a coastal district from DelNorte all the
5 way down to Marin. And if all of Sonoma was included in
6 this plan and Marin was split off, then unless we came
7 over the Golden Gate Bridge into San Francisco then there
8 would be water contiguity between Marin and the other
9 counties in its district, but there would be no land
10 contiguity.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any further
12 direction to Q2 or do we generally feel comfortable with
13 this district?

14 All right, looks good, let's move on.

15 MS. CLARK: Great. So, again, if we're looking
16 Northern California, here again is this sort of mountain
17 cap district, the Counties of Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen,
18 Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Plumas, Sierra, and then almost all
19 of Nevada County. The areas of Nevada County that are
20 split in this are just south of Alta Sierra, just yeah,
21 right here, not a very high population, and then running
22 up here on the border. This is also a zero population
23 area.

24 And then included in this plan, as well, Truckee
25 and this unincorporated area that was -- we had a lot of

1 COI testimony saying this was actually part of Truckee, as
2 well, and Lake Tahoe.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Blanco?

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: This is just, I guess, a
5 question for all of us and maybe Commissioner Ancheta.
6 So, this is that -- the first coastal district, so it's
7 very long and, you know, we have talked about compactness,
8 and I know we've heard testimony about coastal, and I know
9 we've also discussed it a lot on the Commission that there
10 are real reasons why coastal counties have -- I mean
11 coastal regions have similarities and, you know, in terms
12 of environmental and concerns about water, and et cetera,
13 et cetera.

14 But I just wanted to make sure, since we are going
15 to get into other issues later about compactness and these
16 sort of long districts that we feel okay about the
17 compactness of such a long district.

18 So, any comments from my fellow Commissioners on
19 that?

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: you know, my
21 perspective is that we -- we have actually heard
22 significant COI testimony, and I may even say overwhelming
23 COI testimony in support of a coastal district, and the
24 only way to make that feasible is to actually go as far
25 south as we see in this proposed district.

1 Knowing that it's the draft, I would feel
2 comfortable moving forward with this type of a district
3 and knowing that, you know, once the public who has been
4 in support of this type of district sees it, that they
5 will give us the feedback if they feel like this has just
6 gone too far.

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
9 Barabba?

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, and I would venture to
11 say if you had a population density dot map on that
12 district, you would see most of the population is in the
13 southern part. And given the size of the counties
14 geographically, with their population, you don't have much
15 of a choice other than to have a long district.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes?

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, I was going to point
18 out that if you would just shorten it up by taking out
19 Marin, you'd have to add Siskiyou, Modoc, Shasta; I mean
20 you'd have to add about five counties in the north, that's
21 just the way it works out.

22 I would like to see, if we could, the western edge
23 of Nevada County. My question is, is Grass Valley in the
24 same district as Nevada City?

25 MS. CLARK: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

3 COMMISSIONER YAO: Since we allowed the Assembly
4 district on the east side to go all the way down to Lake
5 Tahoe, does it make sense for us to try to keep the
6 counties together in this particular map?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: I would say no. I mean, I
8 think -- I think the Lake Tahoe Basin is very important
9 for a Congressional. There's been a lot of work on
10 protecting Lake Tahoe, and so I think they need to have
11 the same representative.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think the COI
13 testimony has really reflected this need to preserve the
14 Tahoe Basin. So, for this first draft I feel like we have
15 the data on our side to say keep Tahoe together. And if
16 we hear something in response that says, hey, keep the
17 counties together in one type of district, then I would be
18 open to that possibility. But without having seen that
19 feedback, yet, I think this looks good.

20 All right, I think we can move forward.

21 MS. CLARK: Okay. We've already seen this
22 district, it's one of the Section 5 districts for Yuba
23 County. Again, it's Yuba, Sutter, Glenn, Colusa, Lake,
24 Napa, this eastern area of -- southeastern area of Sonoma
25 County and northern Yolo County.

1 And if we're referring to page 23, we can move on.
2 This district is all of Solano County, and grabs just this
3 little bit of Napa County, including the City of American
4 Canyon. It includes this sort of southern area of Yolo
5 County, including Woodland, Davis and Winters.

6 And then also comes up north here for population
7 into Sacramento County. However, it does not split the
8 City of Sacramento. And also down here grabs this very
9 furthest south area of Sacramento County. It picks up
10 Walnut Grove and Isleton, and as well as the City of
11 Pittsburg which, I believe is intact. In this
12 visualization it picks up the City of Pittsburgh for
13 population.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And so Pittsburgh
15 and Antioch are split?

16 MS. CLARK: Pittsburgh and Antioch are split.
17 Yes, it crosses the county boundary into Contra Costa.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners?

19 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Does that include crossing
20 over the strait there?

21 MS. CLARK: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can you go up northeast a
23 little bit? I have a problem with that Pittsburgh, I'm
24 wondering if there's some way we can take Pittsburgh out
25 of that and --

1 MS. CLARK: Pittsburgh has a population of
2 approximately 57,000.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, that's why I'm just
4 trying to zoom out a little bit. Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I sort of have a similar
6 view with regard to Davis, but it doesn't go anyplace else
7 is the problem. There's no way to make it up.

8 MS. CLARK: I'm going to try and grab these
9 labels. Most of these districts are at about -- well,
10 definitely below one percent deviation.

11 Okay, this has a -.14 percent deviation. I can
12 tell you exactly how many people that is, if anyone's
13 interested?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, please tell.

15 MS. CLARK: It's negative 1,016.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any direction from
17 the Commission?

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I guess the only thing I
19 would ask is the surrounding districts to the south, do
20 you know if any of them are over?

21 MS. CLARK: San Joaquin is .47 percent over and
22 this is -- this is northern San Joaquin County, going into
23 Contra Costa County.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
25 DiGuilio?

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Is there any way to get
2 that other part of Contra Costa County, the
3 Brentwood/Oakley area, to take Pittsburgh out? Because it
4 seems like you kind of jumped over all of those. I'm
5 wondering if it would maybe make more sense to take
6 Pittsburgh out and include some of those -- if you have
7 some of those areas that are a little more contiguous. At
8 least Bethel Island, Oakley, that's still not enough,
9 Discovery Bay, Brentwood.

10 MS. CLARK: But I think that Brentwood and Oakley
11 together are almost there, and maybe some of these -- if
12 we're picking up these tracts for contiguity, anyway, then
13 maybe we can investigate that and see how close we can
14 get.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It seems like if
16 you're -- it's still not ideal, but you're jumping into
17 the middle of that line with grabbing Pittsburgh.

18 MS. CLARK: Right, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It seems to make more
20 sense to come down on the eastern side a little bit more,
21 rather than jumping over, just grabbing Pittsburgh.
22 Nothing's ideal there, but that might be something to take
23 into consideration.

24 MS. CLARK: Uh-hum.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And since San Joaquin,

1 that San Joaquin district is over, maybe you could afford
2 to let go of some extras.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Forbes?

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: No, that's all.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

6 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, I think
8 we can move on.

9 MS. CLARK: This yellow district, I guess also
10 page 23, but this is the City of Sacramento. Again, the
11 City of Elk Grove, which we heard COI testimony about, and
12 West Sacramento, the City of, which is part of Yolo
13 County, .09 percent deviation. Pretty good?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum, let's keep
15 moving.

16 MS. CLARK: Okay. And this is the remainder of
17 Sacramento County, .12 percent deviation.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Is there a split
19 with the El Dorado Hills?

20 MS. CLARK: This is the -- this is the county
21 split and El Dorado Hills is right here in a very, very
22 west El Dorado County.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. All right,
24 let's move on to the next district.

25 MS. CLARK: Okay. If we move south here, we heard

1 a little bit of input about this. This is San Joaquin
2 County, excluding the Cities of Manteca, and Tracy,
3 Escalon.

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: What page?

5 MS. CLARK: Page 21. This has a .47 percent
6 deviation, again. That's 3,306 individuals.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, again, maybe if we
8 took a little from the eastern part of that -- the western
9 part, the Oakley/Discovery Bay, maybe you could bump it
10 down a little bit to incorporate. I don't know, you're
11 going to have to split it somewhere so --

12 MS. CLARK: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think it keeps the
14 integrity of the southern county with Stanislaus County,
15 and the northern area which includes Galt, and Morada, and
16 Stockton, Blockford, all that together.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any direction for
18 revisions? No. All right, the next district.

19 MS. CLARK: This is Stanislaus County and then,
20 again, Manteca, Escalon, Ripon -- Ripon --

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Ripon.

22 MS. CLARK: Ripon and Tracy. Zero percent
23 deviation.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, in here, again,
25 before Modesto was split for both the Assembly, I'm

1 imagining maybe for -- well, for Assembly it was split but
2 here, together, Modesto can be Congressional. Correct? I
3 mean it can be whole for the Congressional?

4 MS. CLARK: Right, yes, it is.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: It is?

6 MS. CLARK: It is.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, seeing no
8 further comments, let's move farther south.

9 MS. CLARK: Or let's head west to the greater Bay
10 Area.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

12 MS. ALON: Okay. So, given the previous direction
13 to deal with this Pittsburgh, Antioch, Discovery Bay
14 area --

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: Page number?

16 MS. ALON: Page 25 has a partial view, it's right
17 there.

18 We have the Lafayette, La Mirinda area over here,
19 down to San Ramon, to the county line. So, this is the
20 county line over here for Contra Costa County.

21 And then this part over here that takes Richmond
22 up to the bridge.

23 Page 19, I'm told is better. Yes, sorry about
24 that, page 19.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So this is Contra Costa.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners?

2 Commissioner DiGuilio?

3 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So, in this one we had
4 the San Ramon Valley, with the La Mirinda, and then we
5 went up and over, kind of a wrap -- this is, I believe,
6 Commissioner Forbes had mentioned some of these ideas, to
7 wrap up in north and around west. Is that correct?

8 MS. ALON: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yeah, okay. How does
10 that split? I'm just curious for those in the area of the
11 north of Oakland is that a -- is that a good split there,
12 and then also the identification with those on the other
13 side of the mountains?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I ask for a
15 clarification, is Richmond wholly -- which district does
16 Richmond fall into and is it split?

17 MS. ALON: Richmond has a couple of little
18 unincorporated -- I mean -- unincorporated -- a couple of
19 little areas, like the annex that are over here, but the
20 majority of Richmond is down here. So, yes, it is
21 technically a split.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Did you try options
23 that would have incorporated those other small areas of
24 Richmond and, roughly, what population would you be
25 talking about with that other area that's not currently

1 integrated?

2 MS. ALON: I can check that right now.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Even if it was
4 rough, just a --

5 MS. ALON: I don't know off the top of my head.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, does this -- it looks --
7 I don't know if I'm reading this right or not. It looks
8 like this picks up most of Contra Costa County, is that
9 right, that it's almost a match with the county?

10 MS. ALON: It does, yes. And the individuals who
11 are outside the yellow, who are in the green, are 52,084.
12 So, a little bit more --

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, can you
14 point to what you are mentioning there?

15 MS. ALON: So that the blue areas here are parts
16 of Richmond that would go with this body of Richmond,
17 interrupted by some areas which are not Richmond. And so
18 the blue areas are about 52,000 individuals out of the
19 total population of 99,000.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I actually
21 have some concerns about that because Richmond is not that
22 large of a city and we're talking about splitting it in
23 half, which I'm thinking it through at the Congressional
24 level.

25 Did you explore other options?

1 MS. ALON: I can definitely look at it some more.
2 It's just that between the rest of Richmond and all of the
3 little areas in between the Richmond area, it actually
4 gets to be a little large. But I will definitely look at
5 it some more.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: One suggestion is El
7 Cerrito, which is my former home, it's actually Contra
8 Costa County. So, in keeping with the idea of trying to,
9 you know, have a Contra Costa district you could
10 potentially put El Cerrito, you know, in with Contra Costa
11 and maybe pick up Richmond. Just, you know, that's one
12 possibility.

13 MS. ALON: Uh-hum. El Cerrito has 23,000 and this
14 balance has about 50,000, so I can try to get some more
15 from when we move around these areas over here, we'll
16 definitely -- Jaime and I will look at that very closely.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Uh-hum.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.

19 All right, so let's move into the -- is this the
20 Alameda County district?

21 MS. ALON: So, this is the Alameda County and
22 called the -- it says Oakland here but -- we have Albany,
23 Berkeley, Emeryville, Piedmont, and Oakland over here, and
24 a little bit of Castro Valley, just taking it for
25 population.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would wonder if
2 you could clean up the Castro Valley end of the district?

3 MS. ALON: I was thinking that in possibly moving
4 El Cerrito, as you just said, I could do that, so I'm
5 going to be looking into that.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.

7 All right, let's move farther south.

8 MS. ALON: Okay, this is the balance of Alameda
9 County; San Lorenzo, San Leandro. We'll fix the Castro
10 Valley thing over here. Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore
11 area, down to Sunol, and breaking off over here for the
12 Fremont, Milpitas, Berryessa area. This area of Fremont
13 is split over here.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, Fremont is split or
15 it's been able to be kept intact?

16 MS. ALON: Fremont is split. Newark is wholly
17 encapsulated in Fremont, and so this area down here is
18 also Fremont.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners,
21 questions?

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm just curious from my
23 fellow Commissioners if this seems to make sense for that
24 area? Yeah, okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm debating whether

1 Commissioner Ancheta or Dai is about to weigh in.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, can you just pan up
3 again a little bit, just to -- yeah, I was just trying to
4 see if you could keep more of Fremont in the Union
5 City/Newark area, but I don't know where to go, frankly.

6 (Laughter)

7 MS. ALON: There are too many people there.
8 But I'll definitely note that, as we move things around if
9 there's any possibility.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let's
11 move farther south.

12 MS. ALON: Okay, further south, again, the
13 Fremont, Milpitas, Berryessa area, coming down further
14 into San Jose, following both freeways along here, the 680
15 and the 880.

16 And I'm just going to zoom out a bit so you can
17 see that we're coming up -- this yellow over here is the
18 Monterey Section 5 area, so that's why that's going to
19 heavily shape these three districts on the bottom side.
20 That's where their sides come from, rather.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I understand we have
22 some real population constraints in this area, but I --
23 when you pan out and you see that region together, the
24 Fremont finger is of concern to me, especially when you
25 couple it with the COI testimony that we've seen that

1 groups Fremont with kind of Hayward, Newark, Union City,
2 et cetera.

3 So, I don't know that we have a lot of flexibility
4 there, but I just wanted to note for the record that if
5 there were ways to kind of clean that up, I'd want to
6 explore those further.

7 MS. ALON: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Actually, the COI testimony is
9 about the high-tech corridor, which goes south. But
10 Fremont and Newark are generally spoken of in one breath
11 because Newark is completely enclosed by the City of
12 Fremont.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: They're normally
14 paired. So, if we had Newark together with Fremont, it
15 wouldn't look like a finger. But because we've isolated
16 it and gone south, then it does look more like a finger.

17 Commissioner DiGuilio?

18 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. I've kind of got a
19 bigger picture question here, so if you could zoom out a
20 little bit so I could see the Alameda -- let me see -- oh,
21 gosh, what I need is another map in front of me, right.

22 Okay, so maybe zoom in one. So, we kind of have
23 that finger area. I'm wondering if you looked -- I'm
24 assuming you did, but maybe you could give us the reason
25 why this was chosen, the option of a Congressional

1 district that kind of mirrors what had happened with the
2 Assembly, where you had the Tri-Valley -- if you kind of
3 shifted everything up and around, where you took the
4 eastern part of Alameda, so you took kind of that area and
5 you moved up into the same corridor, up in there, and you
6 took that. And then, I'm not sure how far that would get
7 you up. I'm assuming up into -- it would capture all
8 of --probably a lot of that part, except for the
9 northwestern part. So, then you started your
10 Congressional district up at the northwestern part. What
11 is that, is that -- no, it's not Benicia.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Up towards El
13 Sobrante or Rodeo?

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, below the bridge.
15 And then you took it down and wrapped around, and was able
16 to get more of -- I don't know how much of Oakland you'd
17 be able to get.

18 So, then you kind of start your districts on the
19 northwestern part there and come down, which might not
20 have the issue of the finger because you've split Alameda
21 County about where that finger is, where Fremont is. Does
22 that make sense?

23 I had a little -- if I had my -- you know, if I
24 had -- do we have a little laser? Maybe you don't want to
25 put it in my hands. It's bad enough that I'm in the front

1 row, right.

2 And I don't know if that -- I'm just throwing out
3 another option there in terms of trying to shift
4 everything around. Do I need to use it or do people
5 understand?

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, I'm interested
7 in exploring this further because the other thing that you
8 have happening -- and, granted, not everyone is going to
9 get what they want on all the layers of maps we need to
10 do, but we've also split the Tri-County area with the
11 current Congressional district that we're seeing here, to
12 the east.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Uh-hum. And I guess with
14 Alameda, too, I didn't know -- and only knowing that area
15 a little bit but, again, whether the similarities between
16 the Tri-Valley, the Livermore, Pleasanton, if going over
17 into the Hayward area if that was -- it seems like there's
18 going to be some dissimilarity somewhere, but maybe in
19 keeping with -- with the East Bay kind of more intact on a
20 north/south line, and the same with the Tri-Valley area,
21 North/South, instead of that big east/west of Alameda
22 splitting it in the middle.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think when you
24 look at the east/west corridor, the COI there would really
25 be the commute shed. But if you look at other types of

1 factors related to community of interest, it would make
2 more sense to do more of an east/west configuration of the
3 districts.

4 Tamina?

5 MS. ALON: I was just thinking, we did try to kind
6 of push up this way and go around, but then the question
7 again becomes where to split Oakland, and I was trying to
8 spread the paint around, as directed. So, in this
9 district Oakland is whole.

10 But if you want to do that, then I guess the
11 question comes back to where you would like to split
12 Oakland.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: The other thing I start
14 worrying about is in other parts, except in the Section 5,
15 where we've been constrained, we've really tried to, even
16 in the Congressional, keep counties whole.

17 And here we have some -- in this iteration we have
18 some semblance of that with Contra Costa kind of whole.
19 Alameda is a little split because we've got Oakland, you
20 know, which is Alameda, separate.

21 If we did an iteration that then draws a little
22 bit of a more diagonal then we have Alameda probably split
23 in three or, you know -- and so we start getting into the
24 splitting counties, which is, you know, problematic, too,
25 I think.

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, just for this record
2 this is kind of a preference -- is this a preference way
3 of doing this so that the benefit would be to keep
4 counties whole, more whole, likely, and to also keep the
5 City of Oakland whole, where it had been split under other
6 things?

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I don't know if that's why
8 we ended up with this, it's what we have. I don't know if
9 that was our instruction to tell you the truth, I don't
10 remember. But I do know that if we go away from it, we
11 will be -- now, Alameda is a huge county so I think, you
12 know, that plus some community of interest testimony about
13 the Tri-Valley and not wanting to go -- we did hear a lot
14 of testimony about not -- about the east Alameda being
15 very different than west Alameda County and not going
16 over, you know, the mountains.

17 And so I think we could support a division, yet
18 more further division of the Alameda County with COI, but
19 we would be now having two splits of the county so, I
20 mean, I just think we should be aware of it.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I ask if there
22 was interest or agreement around the idea of trying to
23 group Newark and Fremont together? Commissioner Dai?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, they are together in the
25 other -- in the Assembly. So, I was actually just -- I

1 was trying to think if there is a possibility of putting,
2 in the Congressional district to put Fremont, Newark and
3 Union City together, so that's a Tri-City area that's
4 talked about a lot and they are split in the Assembly.

5 So, but to do -- so if we made Fremont whole in
6 this, that would require us to come down somewhere else.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I mean, we could basically
9 turn it this way, turn it.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, that might be something to
12 look at.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, the direction
14 would be to look at what it would take to keep Fremont,
15 Newark and Union City grouped together

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Would that open up the
17 possibility that then that portion of Alameda that has
18 Oakland could come south and then we can split --

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, rotate
20 everything.

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: You know, we split Alameda
22 along what's already been suggested by some of the
23 testimony, you know, east and west, and come down, and
24 that might be a bay -- sort of a bay Alameda district, and
25 then the more inland Alameda district.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think it's worth exploring.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

3 MS. ALON: We can definitely explore that. There
4 is much, much more population on this side than on the
5 other side. Fremont, alone, is 200,000 people. But we
6 will definitely look into it.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.
8 Any other comments on this map?

9 All right, let's move to the next one.

10 MS. ALON: Okay, this is Santa Clara County,
11 pretty much just follows the county lines into the border
12 of this other district.

13 So, we have Gilroy, San Martin and Morgan Hill
14 together, per COI testimony.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I get a page
16 number?

17 MS. ALON: I'm sorry. Twenty-one.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

19 MS. ALON: Twenty-five has a close-up of this
20 western part we're looking at now, if you'd like to -- we
21 have Lexington Hills over here, Los Gatos, Cambrian Park,
22 Campbell area, and Fruitdale, and part of San Jose.
23 The majority of San Jose.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm seeing nods from
25 the locals. All right, let's keep moving.

1 MS. ALON: This is the Monterey, San Benito and
2 part of Santa Cruz County, most of Santa Cruz County,
3 which you've seen before, our Section 5 district.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, what's
5 the page number?

6 MS. ALON: Twenty.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Twenty. All right,
8 let's keep moving.

9 MS. ALON: Okay, moving further north we have the
10 balance here of Santa Cruz County, which has Scotts Valley
11 and Boulder Creek to be included in the Silicon Valley
12 area.

13 We are on page 25, now.

14 And then it takes Santa Clara, Cupertino, Mountain
15 View, Los Altos, Saratoga, Stanford, Palo Alto, Woodside,
16 Portola into this area, and Atherton.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Direction from the
18 Commission? Commissioner Barabba?

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would say they handled a
20 very difficult situation very well.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right. With
22 that, let's move on.

23 MS. ALON: So, this is northern San Mateo County,
24 straight up along the coast, and over here East Palo Alto,
25 Redwood City, Foster City, Burlingame, San Bruno, South

1 San Francisco, Brisbane, Daly City, up into a little part
2 of San Francisco over here.

3 MS. CLARK: I can describe this -- these
4 neighborhoods in San Francisco. Lake Merced, coming up
5 into Twin Peaks, grabbing parts of Noe Valley, and
6 Ingleside and Ocean View.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
8 Ancheta?

9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Actually, could we go
10 south, first, there was a sort of finger near East Palo
11 Alto that I was wondering about?

12 MS. CLARK: That is the shape of East Palo Alto.

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay.

14 (Laughter)

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Very good. Okay, back up
16 again. Can you zoom in on the -- that section right
17 there?

18 MS. CLARK: Would you like street layers on, the
19 street names?

20 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Sure.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And this may be an
22 area in which we charge Commissioners Dai and Ancheta to
23 look at alternatives.

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Is that the -- from the
25 southern -- the San Francisco/San Mateo County border --

1 MS. CLARK: This is the county line.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Is that -- is it 280 that's
3 running along there?

4 MS. CLARK: Yes, this is 280.

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay.

6 MS. CLARK: This is actually after I -- yeah, I
7 helped draw this district just based on my knowledge of
8 San Francisco neighborhoods, and because there was sort of
9 a lack of COI testimony and --

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, there was some testimony
11 about Sunset being in the same district with the rest of
12 San Francisco which is, I'm assuming, why you cut that
13 out?

14 MS. CLARK: Yeah, the Sunset is intact. And,
15 actually, after drawing this we were looking at the CAPAFR
16 lines and it's pretty similar, just for a point of
17 reference.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: But where did you split Noe
19 Valley?

20 MS. CLARK: Let's see --

21 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: There goes my house, again.
22 (Laughter)

23 MS. CLARK: That works. Everyone look, let's take
24 a look.

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Are you in the district or are

1 you not?

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I'm in the purple, I'm
3 always in the purple.

4 MS. CLARK: Yeah, this is Monterey Boulevard.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, that's reasonable. That
6 follows 280, that's reasonable.

7 MS. CLARK: So, this is 30th --

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's actually Glen Park,
9 yeah.

10 MS. CLARK: Yeah, this is 30th coming up here.
11 This goes Castro, 29th, Diamond, 28th, Douglas.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay. Yeah, so Glen Park's in
13 the other district.

14 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, there's some -- I
15 mean, we can start with this but, you know, there's some
16 issues around the Ingleside district being more of a lower
17 income area, and then if you wanted to have more
18 similarities with Daly City, you might start going
19 northward into the Sunset more. But you would -- you'd
20 probably have to split the Sunset in some way.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, right now you have, what, a
22 little part of Noe Valley, basically? Maybe.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Given what a small
24 geographic area it is, I might task, along with the other
25 districts you'll be looking at, to add this, Commissioners

1 Dai and Ancheta, so you can follow up for clarifications.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, but I wouldn't see
3 anything too -- this is actually a good basic starting
4 point, how you'd probably want to link up San Francisco
5 with San Mateo County. So, I wouldn't see a major
6 variation from this -- this configuration.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think it's perfectly fine for
8 a first draft.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent.

10 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: But just what's the
11 deviation on this?

12 MS. CLARK: This San Francisco-based district is
13 zero percent, and this is also zero percent.

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Oh, all right.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Great work.

16 MS. CLARK: Okay, so heading back east to our
17 Foothills district, page 21, we have these eastern -- or,
18 excuse me, western regions of Place and El Dorado
19 Counties. This is excluding the Lake Tahoe Basin. All of
20 Alpine, Amador, Calaveras -- how do you say it again?

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Tuolumne.

22 MS. CLARK: Tuolumne. I can't get that one,
23 Tuolumne. Mariposa, just this eastern flatlands area of
24 Madera County and, again, just the eastern areas of Fresno
25 County.

1 And I believe the deviation on this is zero
2 percent.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That's good.

4 MS. CLARK: Yeah, zero population deviation.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let's
6 move on.

7 MS. CLARK: You've seen these districts, these are
8 the Section 5 districts.

9 To remove -- I removed Fresno, the City of Fresno
10 from the rest of --

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What page number?

12 MS. CLARK: One moment, please. On page 20,
13 that's right, thank you.

14 So, to sort of remove these more metropolitan
15 areas from this proposed Foothills district, this
16 visualization includes the rest of the City of Fresno, and
17 then comes down to include -- oh, along the 99 corridor,
18 and it includes Visalia and Tulare, in Tulare County.
19 Those are the two most populated cities in Tulare County
20 and the only city split is Fresno.

21 Zero percent deviation. One moment, please. On
22 page 20, that's right, thank you.

23 So, to sort of remove these more metropolitan
24 areas from this proposed Foothills district, this
25 visualization includes the rest of the City of Fresno, and

1 then comes down to include -- oh, along the 99 corridor,
2 and it includes Visalia and Tulare, in Tulare County.
3 Those are the two most populated cities in Tulare County
4 and the only city split is Fresno.

5 Zero percent deviation.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let's move on.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Just a question; how big
8 is the population of Fresno?

9 MS. CLARK: The entire city? Four hundred and
10 twenty-seven thousand.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I'm assuming those
12 splits happened along some of the -- we did have a lot of
13 COI testimony that distinguished the different areas of
14 Fresno, is that kind of what it was based on?

15 MS. CLARK: Right. So, if you remember, then this
16 Section 5 county, Merced, this district picks up this
17 southern Fresno, City of area, based on COI testimony.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right, let's
20 move on.

21 MS. CLARK: This visualization -- this
22 visualization is not quite finished, we need to pick up
23 approximately 85,000 people, but it does include just this
24 little left-over bit for population in Fresno County. And
25 then this eastern Tulare County, all of the rest of Kern

1 County, and then I am -- left it in the hands of Nichole
2 and Alex to pick up the rest of the 84,000 people.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That was very considerate of
4 you.

5 MS. CLARK: To be continued.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Smart, too.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, Kern's only split once,
8 is that right?

9 MS. CLARK: Excuse me?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: How many times is Kern County
11 split?

12 MS. CLARK: Kern County is split once.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, that's a big improvement
14 over the last time.

15 MS. CLARK: If we refer to page 24, this is the --
16 again, the Tri-County area, Region 5, the intact Counties
17 of San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara. Here, in Ventura
18 County, we're having a similar issue with this
19 potential -- or with this community of interest.

20 Maybe we should just focus on this one, first.
21 All of San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, and
22 then northern Ventura County and Ojai.

23 Are there any questions about that? Zero percent
24 population deviation.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, I'm sorry, so what's

1 included in the southern part of the San Luis Obispo and
2 Santa Barbara, is that Ojai is actually included in that?
3 I didn't see Carpinteria.

4 MS. CLARK: Yes, Ojai is -- Ojai is the only
5 Census place that Maptitude shows, that is from Ventura
6 County, that is included in this visualization with San
7 Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think you may have some
9 problems again. Commissioner Aguirre, isn't Ojai as
10 geographically -- I don't think you can go from
11 Carpinteria, up over the mountains, up and again into
12 Ojai. I don't believe it's -- you can only go down the
13 101 and then you can take whatever that is.

14 MS. CLARK: 33.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, I know there are --
16 so, how much of Ojai did you take?

17 MS. CLARK: All of Ojai.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Seven thousand?

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. Because, again,
21 for continuity we couldn't do that, is that correct, if
22 you have not access point to Ojai from the --

23 MS. CLARK: The 150 runs right here. I don't know
24 how drivable it is.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I see, so you went around

1 for the --

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
3 Aguirre, are you familiar with the road in question?

4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes. Yes, the question, I
5 think that Ms. DiGuilio's referring to is do you have to
6 have access from a community with your particular
7 district. And in this case, the way that's it's drawing,
8 there is no road north of Ojai that goes into -- into the
9 green shaded area.

10 The only -- the only way out of Ojai, there's
11 actually three. Well, there's one going south into
12 Ventura, there's one going north out toward Bakersfield,
13 which is Highway 33, but that would be about the only
14 connection that there would be.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Because I don't -- I
16 don't think you can get the 33 back over into Carpinteria
17 and Santa Barbara.

18 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: No.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: You can't go back over
20 the mountains.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I don't think that's in
23 our -- I mean it is a contiguous area. The transportation
24 and access is a separate issue.

25 I think the question really is, is Ojai similar to

1 Carpinteria and the rest of --

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, the problem is you
3 just don't -- you could go down-- the only other option
4 would maybe be to go down. There are -- maybe there's not
5 Census tracts, but there are some populations, like
6 Rincon, and things that are down below Carpinteria and the
7 northern part right in there, but I'm sure the
8 population's very small.

9 The only option would be maybe to get the very
10 western part of Ventura, the City of Ventura. I don't
11 know, Commissioner Aguirre, would you suggest -- I was
12 going to say this coastal. You'd have to get maybe the
13 avenue again, but then that splits -- that's an issue.

14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, the --

15 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think there would be
16 more argument for the Avenue, though, than Ojai.

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, the Avenue is
18 bordered on the west side by Highway 33. So, actually,
19 that whole neighborhood would be -- if you go down Highway
20 33, then you would miss that whole neighborhood, except
21 for once you get down into Ventura, and that's like an
22 industrial area.

23 So, the -- if you come down 33, that triangle that
24 you see between Carpinteria and Ventura is largely
25 uninhabited land, that's just mountains and hills.

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, one more time,
2 how many -- how much population do you need to pick up?
3 Thirty-seven?

4 MS. CLARK: Ojai is 7,800.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, I guess I'd just
6 suggest maybe running something that looks like taking
7 just a little bit off the northern part of the City of
8 Ventura as opposed -- I mean that's something that the
9 people in Ventura, in that greater Ventura County area
10 will have to make a decision, you know, do you want to put
11 Ojai with the County of Santa Barbara or do you want to
12 take a little bit out of the City of Ventura, the
13 western -- the very western part of the City of Ventura
14 and put it with Santa Barbara.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I think the
16 question for the Commission is do we feel comfortable with
17 this as a first-draft map or would we like to direct Q2 to
18 make some changes regarding Ojai's placement?

19 Commissioner Aguirre, you know we're going to
20 defer to you.

21 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah. Well, I'm going to
22 be working offline with them on the Oxnard question, so I
23 could get together with them on this question, too.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.
25 All right, let's move on.

1 MS. CLARK: Okay, the last one. This, again, is
2 the east Ventura area. It's 15 percent over-populated. I
3 believe that that -- I can tell you the exact number,
4 111,000 over-populated. Which, again, I left with Nicole.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Which is helpful for
6 her, I hope.

7 MS. CLARK: And so here we have Oxnard, Port
8 Hueneme, Ventura, Santa Paula, Fillmore, Pyru, and this is
9 also with Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, and Simi Valley.

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It's interesting that Simi
11 Valley is 111,000. I mean, that would be the first thing
12 I'd look at.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah. So, I think
14 the direction is to look at taking Simi Valley out of this
15 district.

16 COMMISSIONER FORBES: If I could make one
17 additional comment?

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, please.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: There was a variety of
20 testimony that talked about putting Simi Valley with Santa
21 Clarita, so that's an option, so I don't feel too badly
22 about taking it out because it has a home, potentially.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. All
24 right, let's move on.

25 MS. CLARK: Okay, that is it for Congressional

1 districts. Can we move on to Senate?

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, please do.

3 MS. CLARK: So, we don't have a complete Senate
4 plan. However, we do have an overlay of the Assembly
5 districts and we're hoping that we could go through with
6 those and maybe after we have done our adjustments on our
7 assembly districts, then we can look at nesting those and
8 see which -- which of the assemblies you would like to
9 nest into Senate districts.

10 If we start in the -- if we start in the north,
11 again, then this north coast district is nested with Lake
12 and Napa.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What page?

14 MS. CLARK: Page 10. Oh, page 18. Page 18.

15 So, in this visualization we have the Counties of
16 DelNorte, Humboldt, Trinity, Mendocino, Lake, Napa and
17 Sonoma. Sonoma, again, this very southern point is
18 excluded based on Assembly districts, or based on our
19 Assembly district plans.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right. Okay,
21 let's keep moving.

22 MS. CLARK: And then this is our Yuba Senate
23 district, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Shasta, Tehama, Plumas,
24 Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sierra, Nevada, Yuba, Sutter,
25 northern areas of Yolo County. And then in Placer and El

1 Dorado, the Lake Tahoe area.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum. All right,
3 let's move on.

4 MS. CLARK: Okay. The rest are Section 5
5 districts, so those we will not be able to nest based on,
6 you know, Section 5 criteria. But I will turn on this
7 Assembly district's layer, and then we can look at this
8 together and see what the Commission would like to try and
9 nest.

10 If there is any way to make this more easier to
11 view for you guys, then please let me know and I can
12 change any of the stylings or the labels on these.

13 Maybe we should start here in this Sacramento
14 metropolitan area.

15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Page 23?

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can you explain
17 right now what we are seeing as boundaries; the bright
18 blue?

19 MS. CLARK: The bright blue boundaries that you're
20 seeing are the Assembly district lines that we just saw
21 earlier today.

22 And my idea about this is that I can -- if you
23 tell us which -- which districts you would like for us to
24 attempt to nest, then I can highlight them in the same
25 color and then we can match them up that way.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I believe this
2 is page 23.

3 MS. CLARK: Page 23.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, you're asking us to
6 look at the Assemblies that you discussed earlier and see
7 how we can match those up, now, because you don't have
8 that.

9 MS. CLARK: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Everything south of the
11 Yuba one.

12 MS. CLARK: Yes, please. Maybe we can start with
13 this west Placer, going into Folsom and Citrus Heights.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
15 Parvenu?

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Is it possible for you to
17 make the borders bolder?

18 MS. CLARK: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay.

20 MS. CLARK: Is that better or would you like them
21 to be thicker than that?

22 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thicker.

23 MS. CLARK: Okay. Would it be helpful if I took
24 off the cities so then it would --

25 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

1 MS. CLARK: How's that?

2 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Okay.

3 MS. CLARK: Maybe better?

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, those are Assemblies?

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Should I throw out, maybe
6 just to get the conversation started --

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: -- I mean I think the two
9 larger Sacramento Assemblies maybe could be nested
10 together, right?

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And then I see a natural
13 fit with San Joaquin and Stanislaus. That kind of leaves
14 the Yolo, Solano having then to go south, into Contra
15 Costa, is that correct? And now on my map it cuts off.

16 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I guess -- I guess --

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And what does that leave
18 the Foothill district with, what's left?

19 MS. CLARK: I was going to ask that question,
20 that's a big district and I was wondering if Commissioner
21 DiGuilio had a suggestion on which valley, whether we
22 should put it with the valley floor or --

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, I think there's
24 kind of some of the constraints and maybe Commissioner
25 Forbes -- I think the two Sacramento have to go together.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: The two Sacramento have to
2 go together.

3 MS. CLARK: Okay. So, I just want to be clear, is
4 that --

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: There are actually three
6 Sacramento districts.

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: You're right. The West
8 Sacramento -- Sacramento should go with the Elk Grove.

9 MS. CLARK: Okay, these two?

10 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, okay.

12 MS. CLARK: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And then maybe you would
14 take that other -- the eastern Sacramento and put it with
15 the foothills.

16 MS. CLARK: Place.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, and with El
18 Dorado.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It can go -- at this point
20 it can either north or it can go west -- or east, rather.
21 Like that.

22 MS. CLARK: These two?

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Those two, yeah.

25 MS. CLARK: Okay. Should --

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Now, I would be inclined to
2 actually put Solano with San Joaquin.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would as well, I
4 think we -- they are rural and we have gotten some COI
5 testimony indicating as such.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: But San Joaquin has two
7 Assembly districts, so you could put the two Assembly
8 districts of San Joaquin together though, right?

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Don't they have one and a
10 half.

11 MS. CLARK: Also, I just would like to mention
12 that there's this Marin AD, which the boundaries of that
13 sounds like are going to change for our first draft maps,
14 but we don't want to isolate this.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think Marin and Solano,
17 I'm just going to throw that out, as having more
18 similarities than Solano and San Joaquin.

19 Because, again, Solano's not the same type of --
20 as Stan mentioned, there's the deltas, that everything
21 south of the deltas --

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's true.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: -- San Joaquin being the
24 first county, it just doesn't have the similarities in
25 terms of agriculture, or watersheds, or anything else as

1 Solano. San Joaquin County south, with the San Joaquin
2 Valley, have more similarities.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: And I would agree because I
4 think the -- I think that between Solana and San Joaquin
5 water is the issue and so they should probably not be on
6 the same side in that one.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The Hatfields and the
8 McCoys.

9 MS. CLARK: Is the Commission satisfied with this
10 decision for now?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: What northern part of --
12 I'm trying to remember what part of northern San
13 Joaquin -- what's in the northern part of San Joaquin?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What cities are in
15 northern San Joaquin district?

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. So, that was where
17 we're going to try and get Lodi and Galt, at least Lodi
18 back into San Joaquin, is that correct?

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. I think under that
21 that would be fine.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: What State Senate district,
23 where did we put Sonoma?

24 MS. CLARK: The City of Sonoma?

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: No, the -- you know, that

1 Assembly district that was --

2 MS. CLARK: This --

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: With Napa.

4 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, that's with Napa in a
5 State Senate district?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, that one makes sense.
8 All right.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, I'm still curious who we
10 matched the Foothills with?

11 MS. CLARK: My suggestion would possibly be
12 with -- not my suggestion, but there is this east Fresno
13 County area that there was COI testimony that this -- that
14 the Foothills district could extend from east Fresno to El
15 Dorado County. That seems like a natural point.

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's as good as any, I think.

17 MS. CLARK: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I mean if you're looking for
19 a contact, Fresno is one of the access points to Yosemite.

20 MS. CLARK: Should I -- one thing to consider is
21 that this eastern -- or western Madera County, rather,
22 is -- is included with this benchmark -- or, I'm sorry,
23 with the Section 5 Merced district. So, again, these
24 lines aren't necessarily set in stone, and once we're
25 looking at this more closely, then we'll have to adjust

1 based on population.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

3 MS. CLARK: Should we go back to the Sacramento
4 metropolitan area?

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

6 MS. CLARK: Okay. So, what we have left here is
7 this Stockton and east San Joaquin area, the eastern
8 Stanislaus County area, and then coming over into the bay.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, again, I see the
10 San Joaquin and the -- the south part of San Joaquin and
11 eastern Stanislaus being one.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And then when we go
15 over to the Bay Area can we just zoom in a little closer?

16 MS. CLARK: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could you remind me where
18 we decided to put the Foothills?

19 MS. CLARK: With east Fresno.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: With east Fresno.

21 MS. CLARK: Would you like to start in East Bay or
22 San Francisco?

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: East Bay.

24 MS. CLARK: Okay. So, here these districts are
25 the Pittsburgh, Antioch district, west Contra Costa

1 County, east Alameda, coming up the 680, Hayward, and then
2 this Oakland-based district.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would like to look
4 at putting Alameda County back together, so the Oakland
5 district and I guess on this map it's called the Hayward
6 district.

7 MS. CLARK: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Is this page 8?

9 MS. CLARK: One moment, please.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, you kind of -- I
11 think we have to look a little further south. If we do
12 that, then you'll have the upper part -- you'll have
13 three -- you have three left over and you have to decide
14 what you're going to do.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: How you're going to --
17 you're either going to have that other part of Alameda
18 that's going to have to go south or you're going to have a
19 lone wolf up there. If you put Alameda and Contra Costa
20 together then you have an island. If you put the Contra
21 Costa in the northern --

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can you remind me
23 where are -- if you're going up on the 80, towards the
24 north of this Contra Costa district, where -- that eastern
25 side, which cities did we cut between?

1 MS. CLARK: So, north a little bit. I'm sorry.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, what is --
3 what is that line, remind me, is that -- that's the hills,
4 right?

5 MS. CLARK: Yeah, Pacheco, Pleasant Hill --

6 COMMISSIONER DAI: I think I would be more
7 inclined to put this district north/south.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do a Richmond and
9 Oakland?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right.

11 MS. CLARK: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, then you could put the
13 two east hills together.

14 MS. CLARK: So, this Pittsburgh and Antioch, and
15 then the east Alameda?

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right. And that way we would
17 reunite Fremont, Newark and Union City.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And Union City, uh-
19 hum.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Got it together, finally.

21 MS. CLARK: So, then I'd like -- how about these
22 two?

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We had wanted to put
24 those two farther south together because then we could get
25 Hayward -- I mean Union City, Fremont and Newark together.

1 So, the Hayward, I think what you're calling the Hayward
2 district and the --

3 MS. CLARK: This Milpitas/Berryessa?

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Milpitas/Berryessa,
5 yes.

6 MS. CLARK: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: MILPBERRY. Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Then let's do San Francisco.

9 MS. CLARK: Okay, moving --

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: Unite San Francisco, that's
11 easy.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, you got off easy on
13 that one.

14 MS. CLARK: Yeah. This San Mateo County.

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, put that together.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm assuming that up
17 farther north that Treasure Island was always included
18 with San Francisco's eastern portions; is that true?

19 MS. CLARK: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, thank you.

21 MS. CLARK: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: Commissioner Ancheta, your
23 inclination?

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Oh, well, yeah, the two
25 inland and the two more towards the coast.

1 MS. CLARK: Okay. We can look at trying to keep
2 these areas together. Here, we're also going to run into
3 some Section 5 issues, so maybe we can just make notes of
4 what here you would like to see together, if we have the
5 population for it to be, I believe, nested.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yeah, there's two -- are
7 there four Assembly districts there?

8 COMMISSIONER DAI: Right, but she's saying that
9 the Section 5 Senate districts may change the lines.

10 MS. CLARK: Right. So, based on looking at this
11 or based on looking at the notes that you just gave us,
12 we're going to have to adjust some stuff around here and
13 then just try and do our best to keep these areas together
14 as best as we can.

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: This approach pretty much
16 slides Santa Cruz and Monterey apart right at the middle
17 of the bay, again.

18 Because I think, as I -- below there you got
19 Monterey going all the way down to Ventura.

20 MS. MAC DONALD: We don't have to nest. You know,
21 that's really the downside of nesting is that when you --
22 when you create an issue on the Assembly and you simply
23 nest, then you duplicate the problem.

24 So, what we can do is we can just start with
25 nesting and then adjust from there, that's one way of

1 doing it. And I don't know if we made that clear, to
2 basically just take the largest areas and, you know, I
3 mean the idea behind nesting is basically just -- you
4 know, it's for voter simplicity and, you know, there's
5 just a lot of convenience there for registrars as well.

6 But, you know, if you keep most of the areas
7 nested, then that would achieve a lot of that goal as
8 well.

9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: This might be an example of
10 where you might have to get over it.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: As the local, we
12 will allow you to say that in regards to these.

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Well, when you see the next
14 map I mean it's pretty clear.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, generally, we
16 did an east/west split here with this area, with these
17 districts.

18 MS. CLARK: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, our guidelines, by
20 the way, since Ms. MacDonald had brought that up, is that
21 we're directing them to do this nesting based on what
22 we've -- these connections, but to make adjustments when
23 necessary, even with those that aren't quite as
24 complicated as this. Is that correct?

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, that's my

1 interpretation.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Does that resonate
4 with the Commission? Yes.

5 MS. CLARK: Now, we're sort of heading into the
6 Section 5 territory and I think that looking at these
7 Assembly districts as potential like nesting ground is
8 less viable. Nesting ground --

9 (Laughter)

10 MS. CLARK: But we can sort of -- I mean I think
11 that based on the general direction that the Commission
12 gave at our Northridge hearing, before the 7th I can take a
13 look more at these counties that aren't assigned to a
14 buddy just yet and see how the population shakes out.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Sounds good.

16 MS. CLARK: Which is pretty much just Tulare and
17 Kern right now.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, by the time we
19 would meet again -- that would not be for tomorrow, that
20 would be for Tuesday of next week, we'd have that -- so,
21 by the time we would meet again -- that would not be for
22 tomorrow, that would be for Tuesday of next week, we'd
23 have that --

24 MS. CLARK: Right. Yeah, I can't --

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, understood.

1 All right.

2 MS. CLARK: I believe that that's it, thank you so
3 much for your direction and for your patience.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And thank you for your
6 effort. I can hardly wait to see what you guys can do
7 when you get sleep.

8 (Laughter)

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I think we're
10 approaching being able to take a snack break. But one
11 thing that I think would be a good use of time while we
12 actually have Q2 here in the room with us, it won't
13 actually take that long, is that it came to my attention
14 that we had really not, as a Commission, taken a more
15 detailed look at sort of a day-by-day progression of what
16 it will take us as a Commission, and working with Q2,
17 working with Gibson Dunn & Crutcher in order to meet our
18 June 10th deadline.

19 And in light of some of the agenda items that we
20 have coming up later on in the evening, on the technical
21 and outreach side, I do think it would be important for me
22 to be able to share what I've learned about, I think, what
23 is a feasible time line and for us to make a few decisions
24 regarding when we're meeting, what we're covering during
25 those meetings.

1 And so this is a conversation that Commissioner
2 Ontai and Commissioner Aguirre, myself, have initiated as
3 the chairs who are in leadership during this key time.

4 So, obviously, today and tomorrow are a strong
5 push on line-drawing. We were joined by Mr. Brown earlier
6 today, from Gibson Dunn & Crutcher. He will also be
7 joining us by phone for a portion of tomorrow afternoon.

8 When we adjourn, the 3rd through the 6th
9 essentially are days for Q2 to implement all of the
10 direction that we have given them, and for Gibson Dunn &
11 Crutcher to then analyze the maps coming out of our
12 direction, and be able to come back to us on the 7th with
13 an analysis of what we've done.

14 And, Ms. MacDonald, feel free, we can elaborate on
15 this pieces. I'm trying to just give a general overview.

16 We have confirmed that Mr. Kolkey, of Gibson Dunn
17 & Crutcher is available to join us on Tuesday. I
18 anticipate that under Commissioner Ontai's leadership it
19 will be a productive day, but potentially a very long day
20 because this is really our last heavy push to provide more
21 direction and clarifications that will feed into this
22 draft on the 10th.

23 We should, again, be receiving the visualizations
24 that we will be looking at on the 7th, we will be receiving
25 them the night before they will be posted online for the

1 public to be able to view. And we, as a Commission, will
2 have similar to today, although we'll do a better job to
3 make sure that they're easily labeled to be able to
4 follow, both for the public watching at home, and for the
5 Commissioners. So, we'll have those materials in hand.

6 On the 8th of June is when Q2 and staff will be
7 really working back at their shop to again go into
8 implementation of all the decisions that we've made on the
9 7th.

10 The question remains to be answered, and I think
11 would largely fall under Commissioner Ontai's leadership,
12 as to how we use this day.

13 Now, I have had conversations with our staff. My
14 observations or recommendations on how we think about the
15 8th may be that if we don't go into session on the 8th,
16 again Q2 would not be available that day, they will be
17 implementing. There are other ways which we could think
18 about using Commissioners' time.

19 Mr. Wilcox, our communications director, to have
20 the opportunity to do individual trainings and coaching
21 around our big release, push, and media strategy.

22 Another is that we would want to have
23 Commissioners on call to be available to answer specific
24 questions and clarifications that are coming from Q2's
25 shop as they go to implement the direction that we've

1 given them.

2 So, even if we were not in full session that day,
3 formally meeting, there is the sense that we would need to
4 be thinking of that day as on call. You may not want to
5 go home if you're not a local to the Sacramento area.

6 The 9th we can expect to have either someone from
7 Q2 in person or by phone being able to walk us through,
8 essentially, a preview of the information that we are
9 going to be receiving. You know, how to read the
10 information, a kind of summary of challenges and issues
11 that came up in implementing these draft maps.

12 Again, not so that we can solve those issues,
13 because at that point, on the 9th, our draft work is done,
14 it's implemented and these are more tracking issues that
15 we need to take into consideration as we move into round
16 two.

17 We can also use a portion of that date, on the
18 9th, to be doing other Commission business. And late --
19 sometime on the night of the 9th, then we would expect to
20 receive the equivalency files and screen shots for the
21 maps that Q2 has gone to implement.

22 And then on the 10th, after a conversation with
23 Commissioner Aguirre, the sense is that we would go into
24 session as a full Commission, have some sort of process
25 around acknowledging the receipt of the maps, providing

1 our kind of perspective, framing. We will get into more
2 details tomorrow, when we have Mr. Wilcox here, but there
3 may be a possibility of a press release.

4 There's going to be a series of different media
5 activities that the Commissioners need to be able to do.
6 And so it may not be that we're actually in session for a
7 full day, but that we're in session for some hours and
8 then participating in media activities the rest of the
9 day.

10 I'd like to clarify, if that makes sense based on
11 the conversations we've had with Q2?

12 MS. MAC DONALD: That makes sense.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. And then the
14 next question that would come to mind would be,
15 Commissioner Ontai, whether you have a sense of whether
16 you would like to call -- we are agendaized to do
17 Commissioner work on the 8th, if you have a sense of how
18 you would like to use that day?

19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Well, I think you just
20 summed it up. I can't add anything else to it, unless
21 there's some comments from the Commissioners.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

23 COMMISSIONER YAO: I know on June 10th our
24 obligation is to release the map, and numerous times we
25 talked about documentation as to how we reached the

1 decision that we reached.

2 And I know that individually we've been assigned
3 to keep good notes. I think maybe a way to use the 8th
4 really is to get together as a group, maybe district by
5 district, maybe region by region, really come together and
6 put these documentation in some kind of order so that not
7 only would it make sense to us, but it would make sense
8 for somebody that's looking at the map from a very high
9 level down, okay.

10 And I know a lot of our decisions that we have
11 made is based on individual districts, but I don't believe
12 we have really had a chance to stand back and look at it,
13 and perhaps that would be a good way to use -- to use that
14 block of time.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What my suggestion
16 would be, because we actually have a block of time this
17 evening, under technical, and it's listed under there as
18 consideration of META analysis for draft maps. So, I know
19 that Commissioners DiGuilio and Raya, from the perspective
20 of the Technical Committee and the Public Information
21 Committee have put some thought into this. So, I do
22 believe we will dig deeper on this both today and
23 tomorrow.

24 But what my hope was, just laying out the time
25 line that we could come into general agreement, the time

1 line makes sense, we're all on board, we still have the
2 potential to dip into the 8th, if we needed to use it for
3 various Commission functions. And I think that the answer
4 on whether we need to do that or not will become clearer
5 as we move through our committee meetings later this
6 evening and tomorrow.

7 So, are there any questions just regarding the
8 time line overall? Commissioner Blanco?

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: On the 8th, if we're on call
10 to answer questions that Q2 might have, is that individual
11 or are we -- do we have to answer the questions as a full
12 body. So, that's a question for counsel, I guess.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum. So, our --
14 and I had talked with Mr. Miller about this and I don't
15 know if -- would you like to answer this or would you like
16 to have me try and you add in?

17 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: You're the chair.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, so I'll give
19 you my best interpretation.

20 We are comfortable with the concept of Q2 reaching
21 out to Commissioners who are familiar with individual
22 regions for clarifications regarding the direction that
23 we've already provided.

24 If there is ever a circumstance where there is
25 more than a clarification, where actually an issue arises

1 that perhaps we did not give clear direction on, as a
2 Commission, when we reconvene as a Commission then we
3 would need to simply share whatever the issue was that had
4 arisen and come to some agreement as a Commission in order
5 to move forward.

6 But during my tenure as chair the types of
7 clarifications that have been coming up are very minor,
8 very specific, and easily resolved by a quick conversation
9 with the Commissioner who's familiar with the area.

10 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: That's a good
11 explanation. I'd just add that in the absence of that
12 reconvening and then stating to the full body here what
13 was conveyed, we lack the record that Mr. Brown was
14 talking about earlier to support the decision.

15 So, I think it is helpful to -- and necessary to
16 the process to bring it back to the full Committee so that
17 there's clarity about what -- how the final decision was
18 rendered and why.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So that under --
20 when we reconvene after our break, on the Technical
21 Committee agenda, one of the items is around tracking
22 line-drawing directions, and one of the pieces of that
23 would just to be to provide for the few Commissioners that
24 did answer questions for Q2, in the time since we met at
25 Northridge, if they could just give a very high-level

1 summary of what were some of those issues that arose and
2 how they were resolved.

3 So, a long answer to your question, Commissioner
4 Blanco, would be that the 8th does not need to be the
5 Commission as a body giving direction, it was more that
6 we'd be available for individual calls.

7 Okay, so with that I know we are going to break
8 for our snack. I wanted to ask one clarifying question to
9 Ms. MacDonald before -- before we break.

10 Because we are going to revisit the line-drawing
11 directions, I know that we had explored various options
12 for you to be getting the most efficient and clear notes.
13 I hear that we may have a solution coming up next week.
14 Would you like to share?

15 MS. MAC DONALD: We're working on the solution and
16 we will probably know more tomorrow. Is tomorrow Friday?

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Tomorrow's Thursday.

18 MS. MAC DONALD: Thursday or Friday.

19 (Laughter)

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, sounds good.

21 Well, we have our regional Commissioners assigned and
22 until you hear otherwise, your duties are as assigned on
23 your various regions.

24 So, let's plan on taking a break -- oh, Ms.
25 MacDonald.

1 MS. MAC DONALD: Sorry. Could we please get your
2 notes tonight, or like right now? Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We'll send them as long
4 as you overlook all spelling mistakes and everything else,
5 because they're not perfect.

6 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, that's fine. No problem.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I ask, process-
8 wise, what is the system for centralizing the various
9 notes that you were taking? And the reason that I ask is
10 that I do anticipate there should be some questions in
11 there that we'd want to flag for Gibson Dunn & Crutcher as
12 soon as possible.

13 Perhaps you could send them to me as chair, or
14 to -- would that be something Commissioner Ontai would be
15 willing to take on, if all of the Commissioners could send
16 their notes to Ms. MacDonald, and cc Commissioner Ontai,
17 and he can be the point with communicating with Gibson
18 Dunn & Crutcher regarding outstanding questions.

19 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: By what time?

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: May I just ask a question; are
21 you asking everyone to send our notes, or only the
22 contacts?

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, let me
24 clarify that. The Commissioners who volunteered or who
25 were assigned to take notes on a certain region of the

1 State, if those notes could be provided at your earliest
2 convenience, potentially during our snack break but, if
3 not, as soon after.

4 MS. MAC DONALD: As soon as practicable. Tonight.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well said. So, I
6 will do my best to make sure that we adjourn at a timely
7 fashion so they can do that for you.

8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Well, just as a
9 clarification point who's supposed to be doing that? So,
10 we have four, five, right, six.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can we just allow -- I'm
12 sorry to do business like this, but if it's a Google doc
13 we can just open it up and allow -- does Q2 have access to
14 our Google docs?

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We can provide that.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, we just share it with
17 them and they can access the Google docs right now.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. All right, so
19 we will set a deadline tonight, by 10:00 p.m., that
20 Commissioners will do their best to make sure that their
21 notes have been transferred to Q2 and Commissioner Ontai.

22 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: And misspelled words will
23 be accepted.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, with that,
25 thank you so much to Q2 for all your work today, and we

1 look forward to seeing you again tomorrow.

2 And I'd like to invite the Commission to take a
3 break. We will reconvene at about 6:00 p.m. My thought
4 is that then we'll put in about two hours of work, adjourn
5 at 8:00, go have dinner and then start up again tomorrow
6 morning at 9:00. But I think that will at least allow us
7 to make significant headway, if not complete the Technical
8 and Outreach discussion topics.

9 So, we'll meet back here at 6:00.

10 (Off the record at 5:28 p.m.)

11 (Back on the record at 6:12 p.m.)

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Good evening. Good
13 evening, I'd like to welcome everybody back to this
14 session of the California Citizens Redistricting
15 Commission.

16 We have just concluded a very productive session
17 working with Q2, providing line-drawing direction.

18 We will resume that line-drawing direction again
19 tomorrow afternoon, following our lunch break.

20 What we'd like to do for the remainder of the
21 evening is to shift our attention to our advisory
22 committees. And there are a series of items that call
23 under the Technical Committee and the Outreach Committee.

24 So, I would be asking Commissioner DiGuilio and
25 Commissioner Ontai to play lead roles in these

1 conversations.

2 And we also have with us some of our key staff,
3 who will be able to weigh in on issues as we approach
4 them.

5 So, with that, I will turn the floor over to
6 Commissioner DiGuilio.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. Okay, we'll just
8 start with the first item, which is tracking of line-
9 drawing directions.

10 I think there's kind of two elements to that. As
11 we mentioned this morning we have decided, at least for
12 these next two days, in order to better capture some of
13 the line-drawing directions -- our mappers from Q2 do a
14 very good job of capturing a lot of what we -- are said in
15 our discussions, but based on the large amount of data
16 that we go through in the different districts, we felt
17 there was some need to have some nuances captured.

18 So, as we discussed this morning, we broke up the
19 responsibilities for tracking some of these directions to
20 the line-drawers by individual Commissioners, so I believe
21 that will continue tomorrow with the southern part of the
22 State.

23 I think in the long term the directions -- I
24 believe the option was talking about a 24-hour turnaround
25 with transcripts, or the option to have Q2 bring someone

1 aboard that will actually be dedicated to taking those
2 notes, and I believe that's their preference.

3 I think part of that was the issue with 24-hour
4 transcription, the costs for that were really quite
5 astronomical. And I think since there was another option
6 that was available, we chose to go that route.

7 I think the only other note with that would be, as
8 Commissioner Galambos Malloy mentioned, was that when --
9 when the mappers do have questions of clarification that
10 they will talk to individual Commissioners offline, and
11 then once that happens those Commissioners will then, in
12 the next session report out.

13 And I think based on that, I know a couple of us
14 probably do have some disclosures that we did talk to the
15 mappers. So, I don't know if we'd like to talk about
16 the -- the tracking of line-drawing directions as a larger
17 context, if there's anyone else who would like to comment
18 on that before we talk about our individual discussions
19 with Q2 mappers?

20 And I can't really see behind me, so if there's
21 anyone that's raising their hand, I think Commissioner
22 Galambos Malloy is going to call you.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward?

24 COMMISSIONER WARD: You know, I'm looking at the
25 agenda, maybe this is item 5. I'll let you tell me if it

1 is, I will retract it.

2 I was just curious, I'm having trouble
3 understanding what files and public input that are
4 currently being considered in our inside options and what
5 isn't? Obviously, we had, you know, multiple map
6 presentation days, on which I know a lot of data was
7 provided in a short period of time, making it almost
8 impossible to go through it all at this point.

9 But it would be, I think, helpful to know what is
10 exactly, you know, contributed to putting together the
11 insight and then, also, when the bulk of it would be
12 expected to be considered as well.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think we will have a
14 discussion about the equivalency files and what we're
15 going to be releasing after the second and third round
16 maps, or even after this first round, for that matter.

17 But I think, it's my understanding that based on
18 what's been considered for these visualizations was the
19 COI testimony, the VRA issues, our wrap-up. During the
20 wrap-up session for each region we gave direction to the
21 line-drawers.

22 And then the last session in Northridge, when we
23 did an overview, we gave some additional direction. So, I
24 believe a lot of that has been incorporated into these
25 visualizations.

1 I'm not sure if anyone else has a comment about
2 that?

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

4 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think documenting the
5 direction we give to the mappers is just step number one.
6 I think we need to have some kind of closure on those
7 directions. In other words, if it's impossible to
8 implement or if they found a better way of doing it, we
9 need to capture those decisions as well.

10 So, I'm not suggesting that needs to be done
11 simultaneously, but I think before we're finished we
12 either have to acknowledge that those were received and
13 implemented or those were received and rejected, and on
14 and on.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Later in the agenda
16 we have an item regarding the consideration of meta-
17 analyses for the draft and for the final maps. So, if
18 it's okay to punt that to just slightly later?

19 One thing I would like to clarify, my own
20 understanding and perhaps staff can weigh in on this, is
21 that given the timing of when the statewide presentations
22 happened in Oakland and in Northridge, that it largely
23 fell upon the Commission to be the ones reviewing and
24 interpreted the statewide maps that we received.

25 And then where we found alternatives that we

1 wanted Q2 to implement or consider, that we did so in our
2 initial line-drawing. Of course, we'll continue to do
3 more of that. But I think even today we referred to maps
4 that had been presented to us by various groups.

5 So, I think where there are State maps that we
6 want to use to further inform our next rounds, that that
7 would be the process.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward?

9 COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just wondering, is there
10 any mechanism, though, by which we're capturing what data
11 is being considered for each set of visualizations?

12 For example, I know there were several
13 visualizations that were presented, not today, but last
14 round, in which, you know, CAPAFR, you know, was -- oh,
15 this was CAPAFR's info or -- you know, which was great,
16 it's what we get that input for. But then, certainly,
17 there were other ones that hadn't had time to be.

18 So, it would just be nice to know so that when we
19 come at the second round through we can say, oh, this plan
20 was something that I don't know if it's been considered,
21 yet, or whatever the case may be.

22 And without some kind of mechanism to track when a
23 certain input map has been considered in our
24 visualizations, it's impossible to kind of go back and
25 make sure that we've considered everything.

1 So, I'm just wondering what the mechanism is to
2 capture that.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, I think part of
4 this has been pre-determined that we gave a -- that was
5 why it was so critical, I think back in L.A., that we gave
6 some direction to our line-drawers based on the, you know,
7 population, the VRA issues, and the direction to keep
8 cities and counties whole, and some of those other
9 directions that we gave Q2. That was what started and so
10 based on those parameters they had very large initial
11 options. So, each time we met we narrowed it down.

12 So, I think, again, there's only been a few cases,
13 if you remember in Northridge, where we had to choose from
14 different visualizations. There really wasn't -- I don't
15 recall any time when there was more than two
16 visualizations. Maybe there was a third in the Central
17 Valley, I'm trying to remember, in the San Joaquin Valley.

18 But based on those parameters and the options that
19 were presented because there were -- if Q2 follows our
20 direction with the integrity of some of the geographic
21 boundaries, the population, the VRA, there's really not as
22 many visualization options as possible based on the
23 criteria that we, as a Commission, set forth.

24 So, I think it's not as if we can go back and pick
25 one of those other ones, we made a decision based on the

1 information then and it's pre-determined all of the other
2 decisions that we kept going forward with.

3 I'm not sure if that answers the question.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Other thoughts,
5 Commissioner Ward or other Commissioners? Commissioner
6 Raya?

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I'm thinking ahead to --
8 it's kind of we're jumping around, but I know there's
9 another topic about other data that we might solicit or
10 consider and that might also go to Commissioner Ward's
11 question. At some point, if we're adding in some
12 information or get further input, I think he's asking, you
13 know, that we're making sure we're keeping a record. And
14 I think it may be even more important if we determine that
15 we're going to use outside sources or we're going to
16 document, as our counsel suggested, individual
17 Commissioners' knowledge and experience about a particular
18 area.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: One task that
20 Commissioner Filkins Webber, as lead for the Legal
21 Committee has undertaken, and we'll be discussing some
22 initial thought on tomorrow is regarding our VRA
23 attorney's counsel that I think is along the lines of what
24 Commissioner Ward is suggesting, of how are we tracking
25 the basis on which we're making various decisions.

1 He, Mr. Brown, when he was with us, was discussing
2 it in terms of communities of interest. And so,
3 Commissioner Filkins Webber, tomorrow, will begin to get
4 your feedback on a suggested process and chain of command
5 on how those communities of interest get actually,
6 formally acknowledge and tracked, so that then we can go
7 back and revisit that record as necessary.

8 Does that start to address your question,
9 Commissioner Ward?

10 COMMISSIONER WARD: I think it might if it also
11 ties into when that data is then a part of the data pool
12 within which visualizations are drawn out of or based out
13 of.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER WARD: So, I think if it does that,
16 that will probably suffice.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, that's really
18 our goal to be able to, as a Commission, have a
19 documentation of why we made the decisions that we did
20 based on COI data. Because, again, the COI data pool is,
21 you know, very diverse, sometimes internally conflicting,
22 and so we want to acknowledge where, for example, we have
23 to reconcile competing testimony and why we actually
24 decide that one community of interest definition may make
25 more sense in a geographic area than another.

1 Commissioner Blanco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, and I think in the
3 short run, I think we'll have to have a really tighter and
4 tighter documentation going forward. But even between now
5 and the first -- the release of the first draft, I suggest
6 that we do -- I think we began to do it today, based on
7 Mr. Brown's recommendation.

8 When we would get into one of those situations in
9 the visualization that looked -- you know, we'd have a
10 concern about something that looked not compact, or
11 whatever, we'd say why did you -- what was your thought,
12 what did you base this line on, what was your thinking,
13 and then they would say your direction, the COI -- you
14 know, so I think we're going to have to be much more
15 conscious about that even in the next week, as we're doing
16 is -- every time we get to that, even if it's tedious,
17 really asking the question or us stating why we're giving
18 the direction, or them answering our questions about why
19 something was drawn a particular way.

20 And that will be true after we do the next two
21 iterations. Because I think that's the other way to do it
22 is just in the record by us asking.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I mean I think this is
25 also something that might be a layer of detail that we

1 might even include in our kind of high-level narrative
2 that would go with the first draft maps, because I think
3 there's some -- some hard, fast rules that we really try
4 to adhere to, like not going over the Sierras, for
5 example, not going over the Golden Gate Bridge.

6 And a lot of those, where we got very, very
7 consistent testimony, a lot of those really determined,
8 you know, many of the other districts. The ripple effects
9 from those decisions, plus the Section 5 districts pre-
10 determined, you know, a lot of areas, as we saw, you know,
11 when we got to the bottom of Ventura County I mean, they
12 just got squeezed because they've got the coast on one
13 side and the mountains on the other.

14 So, I think being clear where we try to adhere to
15 a hard line that was very consistent was public testimony.

16 And then I think there are many other areas where
17 we have more complex situations where there's either
18 conflicting testimony or there are overlapping communities
19 of interest that have slightly different boundaries.

20 And in that case I think I see those as options
21 for the Commission. And we may have a preferred option,
22 but there may be, you know, a second option that actually
23 is more compatible with the other districts.

24 So, to me, it's a reasonable alternative, even
25 though it may not have been the one we would have liked to

1 have gone with. And so I think there are kind of layers
2 here because there are -- there's going to be testimony
3 that is just more compatible with not wrecking too many
4 other districts.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, the points I'm
6 taking from this are, one, that much in the vein that we
7 have done so today, really moving into tomorrow's -- I
8 think tomorrow, again, we're going to be going to Southern
9 California, a much more densely populated, complex region.
10 And so we, as a Commission, as we're providing direction
11 to our line-drawers should be pausing as we give that
12 direction to affirm that we are on the same page about the
13 reasons for where we are directing Q2 to implement certain
14 district lines.

15 The second piece of that is that Commissioner
16 Filkins Webber has been tasked, and will talk with us some
17 tomorrow about a way, potentially, supplementary to the
18 transcripts, but may more of a kind of a tracking system
19 where we're just documenting the communities of interest
20 and various data sources.

21 Commissioner Yao?

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think all the discussion so
23 far, we basically are documenting things as they -- like
24 events or decisions, as they happen.

25 But at the end of the day we have 177, if my math

1 is correct, separate districts.

2 And from the people that are looking at our maps,
3 most likely they're only interested in a few of those
4 quantities, and they want to be able to look at the
5 district that they're interested in and ask a question on
6 that basis.

7 So, the question I have is are we going to make
8 any attempt to try to have a file for each of the
9 districts or are we still basically looking at our process
10 saying, okay, we discussed such and such this evening and
11 then we're just going to document a decision we made by
12 our time frame that we discussed it.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think to answer that
14 question is similar to what Commissioner Dai said, and
15 this goes into we were going to discuss it a little bit
16 later, but we can jump in now, is the intention after this
17 first release, first draft map is to have a high-level
18 narrative description of what we did for these decisions.
19 Again, some of the really over-arching areas that are in
20 our -- that are in our mandate, as well as some of the
21 specific things where there were geographic boundaries, or
22 there were other considerations that framed a lot of this.

23 But to answer Commissioner Yao's question, our
24 intention is not to get into a lot of detail on each
25 individual region, or county, or city, partly because I

1 think a lot of those high-level narrative frames what we
2 did. And the intention for this was to really get the
3 first draft maps out and get the reaction to that, and to
4 allow people to tell us if we were right, or if we were
5 wrong. And ultimately, our justifications for those
6 regions may be reinforced or they may be changed so,
7 therefore, the reasons for that will change. So, we're
8 waiting until we get further down the process and we feel
9 more comfortable as a Commission with those decisions.
10 So, right now it really will remain at a very high level.

11 And this will come up later, but Public
12 Information has been tasked with putting together some of
13 those descriptions and I think will do a very good job of
14 providing a framework for the public to understand what we
15 did.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya?

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: All right, I think we're
18 talking about two different products in a sense here. One
19 is that -- the narrative that Commissioner DiGuilio is
20 referring to in connection with the release of draft maps.

21 But the other is that making sure we have the
22 information for the ultimate reports.

23 So, my question is there was mention of a
24 person -- I'm just sitting here thinking we're all, you
25 know, typing like crazy here for, you know, hours a day,

1 trying to keep some kind of record for ourselves and now
2 for our new process.

3 But are we in fact going to get a person who will
4 be dedicated to capturing the directions and rationales,
5 because I don't know how it can happen otherwise?

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think this is an
7 area where I might ask our legal counsel to weigh in. Mr.
8 Miller, do you have a mic?

9 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I do, thank you.

10 Well, I think it's -- as we've talked about
11 before, I think it's useful to differentiate this first
12 set of maps and what we say about them, and the level of
13 detail from the final maps.

14 And a lot of thought needs to go into gathering
15 the facts in a way that marshals as much support as we
16 possibly can for what the final maps provide.

17 That's going to be an all-hands activity, if you
18 will, it's going to require ourselves, myself, Gibson Dunn
19 and Q2 to coalesce around culling out, from a very lengthy
20 record, now, what supports our community of interest
21 decisions and the other criteria in the California
22 Constitution.

23 Encouraging that process is useful. To the extent
24 that we can make that search of the record easier between
25 now and the end, that's a good thing to do.

1 What we're counting on presently is some ability
2 that's been baked into the system to search the extensive
3 document base that we have.

4 I am a little bit concerned that when we get to
5 the end and we need it to work, it's not as robust as
6 using a tool like Westlaw, which is highly indexed to get
7 you to the key words and names in, you know, a hundred
8 years of American jurisprudence. That's a perfect system.

9 We have something more modest than that in what
10 we've been able to build.

11 So, I would just say, then, that's the end game.
12 I think we're doing the best we can right now to keep up
13 with the flood of information that comes in to get it into
14 some kind of order.

15 For example, we're logging things at the office by
16 region, so it's not completely random.

17 But then, again, if we end up with 2,000 documents
18 for Siskiyou County, that's a lot to go through to pull
19 the ones that we think are best.

20 So, I guess I don't have the kind of crisp answer
21 I would like as to what happens between now and the final
22 report. To the extent that we're able to design a
23 resource that will facilitate pulling out the right stuff
24 at the right time, that is in our best interest.

25 One way to handle this would be to officially

1 charge Gibson Dunn, and I'll myself, and Q2 to discuss,
2 think about the record as it now stands and how it will be
3 augmented between now and then, and come back to the
4 Commission with some thoughts about how to get the value
5 out of what we have to support the maps.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Claypool?

7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Raya, I
8 just want some clarification. You had actually, though,
9 also asked about what you thought this individual that we
10 were contemplating offering up to assist Q2, what they
11 would provide.

12 And so, it's important for all of you to think
13 about this; when we started with that offer, our main
14 intent was to free you up from that task of taking your
15 specific directions to Q2 and having somebody collect
16 those for you.

17 And so that's -- that's what that particular
18 position was intended to do, was to capture that
19 information so that Q2 would have those -- those
20 instructions quickly and that it would meet their
21 criteria.

22 Now, whether or not it serves a dual purpose will
23 have to be how we frame it with that individual, whether
24 it also then serves the purpose of keeping you equally as
25 aware of what your instructions were, and so we'll have to

1 build that into the process.

2 But that's what that particular position was
3 intended to be.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we did also
5 have some concerns regarding Commissioners' individual
6 ability to actually participate in the line-drawing
7 process when they were tasked with keeping such detailed
8 notes, and so this is a way to ensure that we are actually
9 making decisions, giving guidance as a full body, as
10 opposed to 12 out of 14, minus the two who are taking
11 notes.

12 I actually would, given how full of an agenda we
13 have for the Technical Committee, if we all feel
14 comfortable with this alternative, I would recommend that
15 we task staff, with Mr. Miller as being lead, that he
16 actually do some work between now and the next business
17 meeting with Gibson Dunn & Crutcher, and Q2, to come back
18 to us with his recommendations moving forward on what this
19 record-keeping system actually could look like. Again,
20 working with Commissioner Filkins Webber as lead of Legal.

21 Any concerns or objections to that?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It sounds like a reasonable
23 approach.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
25 Aguirre?

1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I mean is it -- is it as
2 simple as purchasing some qualitative software that tracks
3 on -- based on key words and concepts?

4 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Well, the good news,
5 there is some of that in the system now.

6 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Uh-hum.

7 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: And I don't know to
8 what extent there's an opportunity to augment that, that's
9 something that would be the subject of our discussion.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I am debating, I had
11 thought that this might go under Finance tomorrow, but
12 since we're already on the topic, we did need to actually
13 address as a Commission under this idea around line-
14 drawing directions for the Commission to consider
15 augmenting the amount of money in Q2's contract so that
16 they're able to add this capacity that I think we are in
17 general agreement is needed.

18 Mr. Claypool, can you give us a sense of what kind
19 of numbers we're talking about?

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Well, always, I want
21 to deal in terms of personal services contracts because
22 those are the easiest things to produce, and so that would
23 be \$4,999 or less.

24 But in this particular case, though, we have room
25 within their budget and I think that it would just be the

1 matter of finding out from Ms. MacDonald what she believes
2 this person would do for them, and fleshing that out, and
3 then getting a cost, and putting it under their contract.
4 We have that room under their contract, so it would just
5 be adding this particular person to their current staff.

6 Now, the one thing that would come with this,
7 then, is you have to approve this person, as you have to
8 approve any new personnel under that contract. But I'm
9 assuming you would want to do that, anyway.

10 So, if you could -- I don't think that it's going
11 to be a significant amount, but it would certainly be in
12 probably the realm of \$5,000.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
14 DiGuilio?

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And just to be clear, we
16 would be looking for this person to not only do the
17 actual, physical note-taking, like we're doing today, but
18 then that person would also be able to put together some
19 type of record-keeping system so, as Commissioner Yao
20 said, at the end we would be able to have a way to track
21 what we've done and the justification. And if we wanted
22 to pull up a region, or an Assembly or a Senate, there
23 would be a reason for why we did it.

24 So, not only would they be physically taking the
25 notes for us and alleviating Commissioners to do that, but

1 they would also be working on the other end of creating
2 the record for us.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya?

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, the only concern I
5 have -- I'm sorry for jumping in. But the only concern I
6 have about the second half of that is that I think it
7 really falls to Mr. Miller, Gibson Dunn, and Q2 to work
8 out the second part of that. I don't think we're hiring
9 somebody to develop the system. I just want to be sure
10 that's clear.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, I'm sorry, I meant
12 not to develop it, but the person that would be
13 responsible for it. Because I think -- I think the
14 parties could probably come to some type of -- someone's
15 going to have to be responsible to do it no matter what
16 they come up with. I didn't know if this person would be
17 responsible for doing it.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Ward?

19 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yeah, I'm just hearing this
20 for the first time and thinking about it. I'm wondering,
21 if we're going to bring someone else on staff, especially
22 considering Commissioner DiGuilio's vision, would it not
23 be more beneficial to bring them on CRC staff, task them
24 with that, and then also that way the CRC is technically
25 responsible for building that database, and maintaining

1 it, and things like that.

2 It seems to me like that would be a more
3 appropriate way to address it.

4 But is it in the contract with our technical
5 consultants, was in the contract -- did it include the
6 capacity to track these items?

7 In other words, I thought we already kind of
8 assigned this to -- in the contract. Is that not the
9 case?

10 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Well, certainly --
11 certainly, you can envision that this would have been
12 something that goes with the territory of line-drawing and
13 so I would say that they do, in fact, track that
14 information. I mean, they track that information because
15 you see it in the visualizations that they provide to you.

16 I would actually be more in favor of this person
17 being under their contract because this -- really, this
18 person is there to provide clarity on your instruction to
19 them. And we haven't -- I hesitate to kind of bifurcate
20 this process, have one person with that expertise under
21 us, when it's really providing this service to them.
22 That's my -- that would be my thought.

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
24 Barabba?

25 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think it might be, I

1 think to address Commissioner Ward's, I think, legitimate
2 concern, if we set it up so that Mr. Miller had some
3 direction over how that person performed that activity, so
4 that we have some sense that the staff is fully aware of
5 how it was done and that the reports we're getting reflect
6 what was actually captured.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Claypool?

8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Again, I think
9 I'm -- going back to what Commissioner Raya had said, and
10 I think she's absolutely correct, we have two separate
11 issues going on here. This person, as we envisioned it
12 and at this amount, is really a line-drawer's assistant,
13 somebody who's going to make sure that -- come back to you
14 almost, if I will, the way Janeece comes back to you with
15 your motions and says, listen, is this what I heard, so
16 that we make sure that motion is correct.

17 COMMISSIONER WARD: Okay.

18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: That's this side
19 of the equation.

20 I think the other side of the equation, as far
21 as putting together this system for cataloguing your
22 information and so forth, that should be a higher level
23 discussion. And, again, I think Kirk, and our VRA
24 attorney, and Q2 should be involved in that.

25 But I don't see this person as serving both of

1 those functions. To me, they're just entirely different.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
3 Barabba?

4 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So, in essence, this
5 person would be taking the notes, as Janeece takes the
6 notes, and then comes back and says before I put this into
7 the system, did I reflect what you actually said, and then
8 the Commission could react to that.

9 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: And I actually --
10 and forgive me for this, I actually see this person doing
11 exactly what Janeece says, and before you go on to the
12 next visualization, I want to read back what you just
13 instructed so that we have it at that moment. It will add
14 some time, but it will give you some confirmation at that
15 moment, as well as Q2, that we have exactly what you're
16 asking them to do.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: My perspective on
18 this issue is I think we are actually bunching two issues
19 together that initially came up as separate issues. And
20 so, let me take them one at a time.

21 One is regarding the concept of augmenting Q2's
22 note-taking capacity to be able to capture the
23 information, the direction that we're giving.

24 If we seem generally in agreement that we
25 would -- again, having worked with staff to look at

1 various options, generally in agreement that this is a
2 cost-effective and efficient way to move forward, we can
3 task staff with actually working with Q2 to come back to
4 us, at our next business meeting with a budget number,
5 with information on who this person would be because,
6 again, we need to review who they are and approve them
7 coming onto the team.

8 I would want to take that separately from the
9 piece around setting up this system for documentation and
10 ask that we allow Mr. Miller some time to work with our
11 consultants and, again, bring back some options to us.
12 Because we had -- we had actually not tasked him with this
13 previous to this meeting, so I feel like he's not had,
14 really, and opportunity to explore in the depth that we
15 would like.

16 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: And just very
17 briefly, I agree with what you've said. I just want to
18 state, again, that there is a system in place presently to
19 catalogue the input that we're receiving.

20 What I think we need to do is the next step, is
21 to begin testing how well that system works so that we can
22 either do something more with it, if that's possible, or
23 at least be thinking about how it needs to work to deliver
24 what we need at the end of the day.

25 But there is a system in place now, I just think

1 we need to push it a little harder to make sure we can get
2 what we need out of it.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: At this point I'd
4 like to, I think, actually entertain some sort of motion
5 regarding direction for staff on these two separate
6 issues.

7 Commissioner Blanco?

8 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, I move that we draw up
9 a personal services contract to hire a assistant note-
10 taker for Q2, to assist Q2 and ourselves during the line-
11 drawing sessions.

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can I ask for a
14 clarification on this point in terms -- I believe that
15 what Mr. Claypool was suggesting was that we look at
16 changing the terms of their -- or that we have some
17 flexibility within the contract that we currently have,
18 where we would not need to use a personal services
19 agreement?

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Yeah, that's
21 correct. I was thinking in terms of a personal services
22 contract in that amount of money. But I think it would be
23 better if we simply gave them the permission, we'll go to
24 DGS and expand the terms of their contract, and then we
25 can go from there. And it will just be easier, I think,

1 on us.

2 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Whatever's easier and
3 faster.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Would you be open
5 to a friendly amendment or like to restate your motion?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Sure. So, the motion is
7 that we give -- that we hire a note-taker for Q2 by
8 reallocating Q2's budget with -- who do we have to go to
9 for that, DG?

10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Yeah, we expand
11 their budget to include a note-taker.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: That we will expand Q2's
13 budget to include a note-taker.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.
15 Commissioner Barabba, are you okay with the amendment?

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, I will.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Could I have the
18 motion read back, Ms. Saris?

19 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: The motion is
20 for the Commission to -- sorry, I can't read my own
21 writing.

22 For the Commission to give -- to expand Q2's
23 budget so that they can hire a note-taker to assist Q2 and
24 the Commission in line-drawing sessions.

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And just a point

1 of clarification and question for Mr. Miller. My
2 understanding is then we would be brought, the Commission
3 would be brought forward more detailed information at our
4 next business meeting regarding the budget implications,
5 opportunity to actually review the candidates' resume
6 qualifications in the same way that we did the rest of
7 Q2's staff. Is that correct?

8 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yeah, I think you
9 can choose any procedure that you're most comfortable
10 with.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: That sounds like a good
12 procedure.

13 (Laughter)

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: My understanding is that
16 we're opting for this in order to provide -- in order to
17 compensate for the fact that we are not doing real-time
18 transcripts. Is that correct? I would like to clarify
19 that for the full Commission.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, we looked
21 into -- it felt like between the Northridge meeting and
22 now looked into various options at how we could get at
23 this same issue of having timely, clear direction to our
24 line-drawers.

25 And I can have Mr. Claypool give you a more

1 exact sense of how prohibitive, cost-prohibitive the
2 shorter transcription time was.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So, we had the
4 issue where we were moving to have our transcripts sent to
5 Foothill, so that they would do them from the video, and
6 that was going to cost us approximately \$15,000 to do the
7 remainder of the meetings.

8 Because of a series of mishaps we -- that wasn't
9 working, so we moved to put our transcriptionist back in
10 the room.

11 That moved us from \$15,000 to \$45,000 for the
12 same services.

13 I asked Raul, today, to give me the cost of
14 going with 20 -- or not 24-hour. I'm sorry, 24- to 48-
15 hour transcription and that would move us from \$45,000 to
16 \$75,000. It goes from \$5.95 a page to \$10.00. You have
17 roughly 300-page meetings, and on average, by the way.

18 So, we have that issue. It is -- in that
19 particular case, to expend \$5,000 in expansion of the
20 budget versus \$30,000 in expansion of that. And only in
21 realizing that at 24 to 48, just because of the length of
22 these meetings you're going to end up being out at the 48,
23 nobody's going to come in, in 48 hours, so that's our
24 issue.

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao

1 and then DiGuilio.

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Since we broke the problem
3 down into two parts, immediate problem and something
4 that's a little more extensive --

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe we
6 actually have a motion on the floor --

7 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: -- so I just
9 wanted to confirm you're weighting in on the motion.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: I am.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: I just wanted to clarify that
13 this is just for the service between now and the release
14 of the draft map or is this going to be for the duration
15 of our tasks, until mid-August? I guess it's really a
16 clarification question for Mr. Claypool.

17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Well, I had him --
18 those numbers run out to the end of the process. Those
19 weren't -- I just assumed you would want to know what the
20 cost was to move straight in and stay with that process.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: So, this \$5,000,
22 approximately, that we're talking about, that goes until
23 the end of the process?

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Again, what we're
25 doing here is essentially tasking staff to come back to us

1 at the next business meeting with the details on what the
2 budget implications will be and who the actual candidate
3 is, but we're giving general -- a general blessing that
4 this is the direction we want to move in.

5 Commissioner Blanco?

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: My motion was intended for
7 all line-drawing sessions from now until the end, where we
8 are giving direction to Q2, not just for the draft maps.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, that's
10 useful. And our understanding is just that in terms of
11 logistics, I mean we wouldn't be able to approve this
12 person until our next business meeting next week, so they
13 would not effectively be able to start until we were
14 already kind of at the finish line for our draft maps.
15 So, functionally, it would have to be moving forward.

16 Commissioner DiGuilio?

17 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And again, I just would
18 like to address what Commissioner Dai asked. I think to
19 kind of look at this on the bigger picture, the idea
20 behind this was that there are quite a few nuances to some
21 of the decisions that we make, but on a small scale.

22 So, to prevent having discussions between
23 mappers and individual Commissioners offline, even though
24 we've asked them to do that a couple of times, with the
25 ability for us to disclose that, the idea was this only

1 increases our level of transparency because then an
2 individual is tasked with capturing those nuances and,
3 hopefully, can remind the mappers, so that we can again do
4 as much as we can in the open process, so just increased
5 transparency.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Any other thoughts
7 or questions regarding the motion on the floor?

8 Okay. Seeing none, I'd like to invite any
9 members of the public who would like to comment on the
10 motion?

11 Okay, seeing none, I'd like to call a vote.
12 Actually, let me do a show of hands.

13 All in favor say aye?

14 (Ayes)

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Actually, point of order,
16 Chair, I believe staff has requested to do roll calls on
17 all votes for tracking purposes.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And thank you,
19 Commissioner Ancheta for reminding me of that fact.

20 So, Ms. Sargis, when you're ready, if you could
21 take roll, please?

22 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Commissioner
23 Aguirre?

24 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ancheta?

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Barabba?

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Blanco?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Dai?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: DiGuilio?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yes.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Forbes?

11 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Galambos

13 Malloy?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

15 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ontai?

16 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yes.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Parvenu?

18 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

19 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Raya?

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yes.

21 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ward?

22 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yes.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Yao?

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: The motion

1 passes.

2 So, the remainder of our discussion, the second
3 piece around, again, kind of revisiting and augmenting
4 what our existing tracking system is, in partnership with
5 Gibson Dunn and Q2, my suggestion was that if we are in
6 general agreement that staff needs to come back to us with
7 some options, that we could task Mr. Miller in this
8 regard. And then he could come back to the next business
9 meeting and at that time we may need to take some formal
10 action, or a vote to move a certain direction.

11 Unless I hear any dissent, that's the direction
12 that we'll move.

13 Okay, so we are done with Agenda Item 1 on
14 Technical Committee.

15 (Laughter)

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can we just very
17 quickly, would you -- would the Commission like us to do
18 the disclosure of what we discussed with the line-drawers
19 off-line, just to be for --

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. Please do.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I think
22 Commissioner Forbes, and Commissioner Dai, and I were on a
23 conference call, met with -- I don't know their last
24 names, so excuse my informality. But with Jaime --

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Karin and Alex.

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, Karin and Alex I
2 believe was the other. And I know I answered some
3 questions about the nuances of San Joaquin County, about
4 where the south split is, which communities -- like I came
5 them direction that Manteca, and Lathrop, and Tracy belong
6 more in the south part of the county. It just was
7 identified, and the other parts for Stockton, Lodi, some
8 of the discussions we had, some of that was able to be
9 taken into consideration and some wasn't, obviously, but
10 it was just to give them an idea of where a split would
11 happen in a county that was most acceptable.

12 Stan, what did -- there was a question about
13 Sacramento that you answered?

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: It dealt with, as I
15 recall, where the Foothills line should be, what towns
16 should be included and what excluded.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. Commissioner
18 Dai, do you have a recollection about --

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, and I think I was just
20 included because I had sent them a note to clarify some of
21 the direction in the session. For example, the comment
22 that I'd made about the small community of Clarkfield, not
23 considering at the time that this would create a new
24 Section 5 district for Monterey.

25 So, I just wanted them to know if we keep them

1 together in the Senate district, that that was sufficient
2 to taking that into account.

3 But I think this just brought home the point of
4 why we just took the action we did, because under normal
5 circumstances line-drawers are provided with transcripts
6 so they can go back and double check.

7 And a lot of the conversation was just
8 confirming some of the instructions, they wanted to make
9 sure they got it right.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And that's basically
11 what it was. It wasn't necessarily providing new
12 information, it was providing a supplement -- I mean, it
13 was discussed what we had, to remind them of what we had
14 already discussed in the session. I'd say, with the
15 exception, I did provide the detail of San Joaquin County,
16 which I think we talked a little bit. But in the essence
17 of time, we didn't get into some of those details in the
18 full session.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. So,
20 the next one.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, so the other one,
22 the next, Item number 2, Technical moving right along;
23 reliability of non-Census redistricting data. And for the
24 sake of time, I might just throw this over to Commissioner
25 Barabba.

1 This was a discussion maybe to look at the level
2 of reliability, assigning various databases beyond the
3 actual sense count that we will be using, such as CVAP,
4 and others.

5 So, I don't know if, Commissioner Barabba, you'd
6 like to expand on that in terms of discussion points?

7 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes. The thing that came
8 to mind was that we've heard on several occasions, and
9 particularly from our counsel, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher,
10 that there's questions about some of the datasets that are
11 being used. And based on my understanding of how they're
12 being collected, I would have the same reservations.

13 And I just don't know how we deal with that
14 if -- if they're the accepted data, even though we know
15 they may or may not be correct, do we treat them as
16 precisely as we would treat the count or are we allowed
17 some leeway based on a clear understanding of the
18 precision of those numbers. That was the question that
19 was on my mind.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Would you have any
21 recommendations on next steps?

22 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Well, I'm concerned that
23 it's probably a legal answer to that one and I think that
24 might be unfortunate. Because some of the numbers that
25 we've seen, we get within, you know, tenths of a percent,

1 and the reliability of those numbers really are not very
2 high, and that was my concern.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.
4 Commissioner Ancheta?

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, could I just ask a
6 question in terms of which data we're most concerned
7 about? Because there is the CVAP data, which is based on
8 ACS five-year averages, which is also not quite up to
9 date.

10 Are there additional ones that you were --

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: That was the one that
12 bothered me the most. And then the other thing that came
13 up is people said we would go to other datasets from --
14 whether you might get them from a county or a city. And
15 it seemed to me at that point we were kind of opening
16 ourselves up to look at data for which we will not have
17 time to check its reliability.

18 And if we ever have to find ourselves in a
19 lawsuit, defending a number that we just accepted without
20 really understanding it, it seemed to me we can put
21 ourselves a little bit at risk.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
23 Ancheta?

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, I think -- I think
25 the suggestion that Gibson Dunn has offered us is simply

1 look -- we'll have to look at CVAP and VAP. And there's
2 also conflicting legal precedent, too.

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: But let's assume CVAP, in
5 California, is acquired by the Federal Court of Appeals,
6 the Ninth Circuit, but that we should back ourselves up by
7 looking at the VAP numbers and making -- for example, if
8 you're looking at Latino numbers or Asian numbers, you
9 might have elevated VAP number of, you know, 60 to 65
10 percent, which is sort of functionality equivalent to
11 about 50 percent CVAP. That's a very rough sort of
12 metric, but that's sort of the sense of it.

13 It wouldn't be quite a high for African
14 Americans because the non-citizen number is not quite as
15 high, or it's not really that high at all.

16 The hard part is if you wanted to adjust the
17 CVAP, I don't know what we do about that. There's not
18 much you can do. There's no competing -- I don't think
19 there's another -- there's no State database that has
20 something comparable to CVAP.

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, that was my concern
22 because, obviously, there's nothing else out there. But
23 the question is, given what you know about its
24 limitations, are we restricted to accept it as the number
25 or is there a range in which we can, you know, be a little

1 bit more tolerant when we are trying to get down to the --
2 one or more person per district. And then all of the
3 sudden you find if you do that, you're going to lose two-
4 tenths of a point off a number you don't believe in the
5 first place.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I also have problems
8 with trying to get a level of precision on numbers that
9 start out to be unreliable.

10 But if I recall the testimony -- not the
11 testimony -- the advice of counsel was actually, you know,
12 that if we're within a couple of percentage points of 50
13 percent CVAP, for example, that we should take a closer
14 look at that. So, he was actually giving a couple of
15 percentage points range because, as he kept on stating,
16 we're using data that the Census Bureau tells us not to
17 use.

18 So, I think, you know, keeping that in mind, you
19 know, I certainly think tenths of a percent are not
20 relevant. And I think looking at VAP, instead, of voting
21 age population, which is considered to be reliable, in
22 combination with the CVAP number, might be the way we just
23 have to go.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, this may be an
25 area that we could task Mr. Miller for some follow up.

1 We're interested in this idea of perhaps identifying a
2 percentage difference under which we would feel that it's
3 close enough that we want -- and two percent, I believe,
4 was what Gibson Dunn & Crutcher had suggested under those
5 circumstances where we would need to, or want to be able
6 to also cross-check against the VAP data in those
7 circumstances.

8 So, perhaps we could have you come back to us at
9 the next meeting with more guidance on that.

10 Commissioner Blanco?

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just -- it was not just
12 the VAP data, I think what their suggestion was that we
13 look at surname registration data, because the surname
14 registration data, which is more current, could actually
15 fine tune the CVAP to give us a more accurate number.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. And I think,
17 if I remember correctly, in our line-drawing we actually
18 did direct Q2 to take a look at that, at least in one
19 district that comes to mind. But it seems that adopting
20 some sort of standard that we apply uniformly across the
21 board would be of use.

22 Commissioner Ward?

23 COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just wondering if, for
24 the record, we could give legal to give an explanation of
25 how surname registration data would be different from

1 using or identifying political registration data or
2 partisan registration data.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I can definitely
4 flag that for the Legal Committee.

5 Commissioner Raya?

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I have a further questions,
7 that I've had all along about the surname data, because
8 people marry people.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: So, aren't there some
11 possibilities for inaccuracy?

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes. I think in
13 all data sources there are varying levels of potential for
14 inaccuracy. Why don't we task legal with this item, to
15 come back to us with kind of an overview, so that we
16 understand the different datasets and their relative
17 reliability.

18 All right, with that I'll pass it back over to
19 Commissioner DiGuilio.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. The next item is
21 the consideration of supplementary data sources at the
22 input hearings. This arose because in everything that
23 we've been getting, whether it be input hearings, or even
24 submitted to us online, it's -- California, and all those
25 that are in California are a very wide and diverse group,

1 and even though at times we feel flooded by e-mails and
2 things that are coming in, it's still, in the end, a small
3 snapshot of data -- of data about the State of California,
4 and communities of interest, and other things.

5 So, I think this was brought up in terms of
6 looking at if we need to look at other data sources and,
7 if so, how would that take place?

8 And with that being said, having set that up,
9 I'm going to punt it back, to Mr. Miller. He's going to
10 wonder whether he's really in Legal or Technical because,
11 as I understand it, he's been working with Commissioner
12 Blanco a little bit on this issue.

13 Or, I'm sorry, maybe he'll put it over to Mr.
14 Claypool. Double punt, okay.

15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Actually, we
16 started looking at that from the last meeting and what
17 we've done to this point is we've looked at different
18 sources that might be -- might be useful in giving us a
19 different view. For instance, we've looked at the -- the
20 SACOG, I forget the --

21 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Council of Area
22 Governments.

23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Council of Area
24 Governments. We've also looked at county boards of
25 supervisors as individuals, or groups, who might be able

1 to come and give you a brief presentation, a little bit
2 longer, for their area as you move into these regions and
3 give you a sense of different information that you might
4 be willing to receive.

5 But that's as far as we've gotten to this point.
6 We've identified these sources, we've actually reached out
7 and asked about what -- what might be possible, and that's
8 as far as we've gone.

9 If anybody has a suggestion, we'd be glad to
10 take it up. But we plan on having a greater presentation
11 at the next meeting.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
13 Blanco?

14 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Just to back up to sort of
15 what the origin and the intent of this is, and I think now
16 we've seen it more as we're getting close to the finish
17 line on the draft maps, which is that the concern is what
18 do we do in situations where we have no COI testimony? In
19 particular, where there's no COI testimony and we're
20 making a tough call about a population deviation, or about
21 splitting a county, or splitting a city and we have no
22 basis, other than our own subjective, you know, decision
23 making for making that decision.

24 And so I think - I think it's important to think
25 of it like that because I don't think we necessarily want

1 to go up and down the State -- I don't know, this is up
2 for discussion -- and get sort of a whole different set of
3 information. And maybe we do.

4 But my concern, originally, was where we don't
5 have any COI testimony and where we have, like I say,
6 we're making decisions that impact the criteria that are
7 laid out in Prop. 11 and 20.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And I would add to
9 that, I could see it as being useful in areas where we may
10 have COI, but it may be conflicting COI, where it's not
11 clear to us, as a Commission, which argument regarding COI
12 really establishes the COI that should take precedence.

13 Let me open up the floor to a discussion around
14 this point. Commissioner Ontai?

15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, along that line
16 wouldn't it be probably that once we release the initial
17 maps we're probably going to get a lot of COI response to
18 these questions?

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
20 Barabba?

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would concur with
22 Commissioner Ontai's point because it's hard for somebody
23 to tell you anything unless they know exactly what you're
24 talking about. And I think these maps will bring out some
25 real concerns and at that point we should make an

1 assessment of whether we need to go further in outreach,
2 because I think we're going to get a lot of direct
3 contact.

4 And the other nice thing on that is that it
5 really puts emphasis that this is the initial set of maps
6 and the purpose is to get people to react to them. And
7 we're not trying to convince anybody it's the final set of
8 maps. In fact, the whole purpose is for people to react
9 to them and I think we should emphasize that in the
10 release.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
12 Aguirre?

13 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: However, even though we
14 do get additional COI, some of that is going to be
15 conflicting. So, I think the question is given a
16 situation where we have to make some hard questions, then,
17 are there some reliable data sources available that we
18 could consider in making such decisions.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, my suggestion
20 on how to move forward is as Mr. Claypool indicated,
21 they've been doing some initial outreach, could come to us
22 next week with their assessment of kind of what's out
23 there and how it might be useful to have an initial
24 conversation.

25 And then I also think it would be important for

1 this to be an agenda item that carries over to our meeting
2 on June 16th, when we will have actually passed through the
3 public review period and have a better sense of what level
4 of COI testimony that we've gotten, once the first draft
5 maps are out there, where we're potentially still having
6 scant information on which to base our decisions, or where
7 we're really stuck in moving forward, and that can help
8 inform how we reach out for supplemental data sources and
9 which ones we choose to really solicit.

10 Commissioner Barabba?

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, just -- excuse me,
12 I haven't thought this fully through, but maybe in our
13 announcement of the initial maps is we could say if you
14 really have something that you think needs to be changed,
15 please just don't bring your opinion, bring some evidence
16 to support it. And maybe at that point we'll -- if at
17 least we put them on notice that it's not about opinions
18 here, it's about whatever facts they have available.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Other
20 Commissioners? Commissioner Yao?

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, I want to make sure
22 that we don't set an expectation that we can't meet.
23 Given the amount of time, given the amount of money that
24 we have to work with, I think we have to accept the
25 reality that whatever COI information we get, probably

1 five percent of all the necessary information that we must
2 have in order to draw the lines properly. But we're going
3 to get what we get and I don't believe that Prop. 11 or 20
4 expect this Commission to be experts in COI throughout
5 California, to draw the lines in a perfect manner.

6 They expect us to take whatever reasonable
7 amount of action to try to get that information, and the
8 public has an action to provide those to us. And by
9 listening to our conversation right now they should be
10 encouraged to submit whatever information that they sense
11 that we need.

12 But for us to take on the role of pulling these
13 information into the Commission, on our own, I just don't
14 think that we can meet that expectation.

15 So, maybe what I'm -- what I'm recommending is
16 doing the best that we can to encourage people to bring
17 forth that information, but don't feel that we have to
18 have all the information to draw the line.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, there's
20 definitely the sense that we will never have all the
21 information we need to draw perfect lines, but we are
22 going to do our best.

23 Commissioner Dai?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I have to say I agree
25 with Commissioner Yao on this. I think that, you know,

1 we've been given an impossible task to do in an impossible
2 amount of time, and adding original research to that, I
3 think, is an unrealistic addition to our mandate.

4 I also think it gets us into shaky legal ground,
5 and this is something that maybe Mr. Miller could comment
6 on. Because I think we get into the situation of, you
7 know, what are -- what's the reliability of these other
8 sources? What if I'm a citizen and I don't believe -- I
9 don't agree with my, you know, board of supervisors? I
10 mean, we've gotten some testimony to that fact that, you
11 know, I was at the hearing and all these local government
12 officials testified about this, but as an average citizen,
13 I don't agree with that.

14 So, we've already, you know, gotten some
15 indication. So, while we may perceive local elected
16 officials to be a reliable source, other people may not
17 agree.

18 So, I think, you know, we're doing the best job
19 that we can in terms of really reaching out to as many
20 different communities as possible. And at some point we
21 have to hope that they're engaged enough in this process
22 to respond and to give us compelling testimony which,
23 hopefully, is evidence-based, which I think we've gotten a
24 lot of.

25 So, I just think we get onto shaky legal ground

1 if we start seeking things out because then we need to do
2 it consistently, there's a question of the reliability of
3 the various data sources. And then there's just the issue
4 of time to process that information.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I'm hearing
6 two things coming out of this conversation. One is that
7 we do have a general sense of cautiousness and concern
8 regarding the reliability of outside data sources, and
9 would like Mr. Miller to give us a more informed opinion
10 for next week.

11 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I think I can
12 comment now, as well as --

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That would be
14 wonderful because Gil's agenda is getting really long
15 here.

16 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I think the effort
17 was simply, as I understood Commissioner Blanco's idea,
18 was perhaps to get a different set of input than we'd
19 gotten previously, just to add to the record.

20 I think it's fair in this context to use the
21 analogy that a judge might give a jury when a police
22 officer testifies, which is you don't give that witness
23 extra credit, or a particular benefit of the doubt just
24 because they're a police officer.

25 Similarly, I don't think you should give extra

1 weight because an elected official might choose to
2 testify. That you're really the tryers of fact here and
3 can give anything you hear such weight as you deem it to
4 be most credible.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.
6 Commissioner Blanco?

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I think this is a
8 good conversation. I think I'm really convinced that,
9 one, hopefully, when we do our drafts that people will
10 step up and we'll get that -- you know, we'll get
11 information.

12 And then, as counsel has said, in the situations
13 when we were talking to him, I guess it was yesterday, or
14 today, about Stockton and he said, you know, well, you
15 know, in situations like this maybe it's okay solicit
16 information from the Hmong community.

17 So, I think, you know, we can do case by case on
18 the advice of counsel, when we feel we're in a situation
19 where we might need additional information.

20 But for now let's just assume that we'll get
21 that information as we move forward with the drafts.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.
23 Commissioner Ward?

24 COMMISSIONER WARD: I don't think we probably
25 need an echo. I just appreciate the poignant points of my

1 fellow Commissioners. I mean, I agree, I think in the
2 spirit of the propositions, you know, for the first time
3 the public has a seat at the table. But I don't -- I
4 never -- I did read out of the propositions that we're
5 drafting or selective-servicing COI, or anything like
6 that.

7 So, it seems like, you know, that's what we're
8 doing and going beyond that, you know, seems shaky to me,
9 too.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, excellent.
11 So, with that, Commissioner DiGuilio?

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I just wanted to follow
13 up on a kind of a technical note in this conversation. We
14 have identified, today, some areas where we were going to
15 look for supplemental testimony from areas, and I would
16 imagine we'll probably get some tomorrow.

17 Have we determined a process for that or would
18 this Commission like to decide on a process for how we're
19 going to go about those selected areas?

20 Will staff talk to those areas, will our
21 technical team?

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, can you
23 repeat what you just said?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. We've identified
25 a few areas, such as the Asian/Pacific community -- API

1 community in Merced, Stanislaus, Stockton, whom we might
2 need to get some additional testimony from them. I think
3 there were some other ones in our notes and I imagine
4 we'll have some more.

5 Do we have a process for how we're going to get
6 that? I mean, I'm not sure that they're necessarily
7 listening to this so will our staff reach out to get that
8 information, will our line-drawers, will we develop a
9 formal process for soliciting that?

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well, what I would
11 like to suggest is that when we have -- this, I think,
12 might be a question that would pick up on the advice of
13 our VRA counsel, where we had left off today. I think it
14 was anticipated that we might need more feedback from
15 certain areas. We really didn't discuss a process to do
16 that, that would have a strong legal grounding and protect
17 us from litigation risk.

18 So, perhaps this is a question we could
19 initially pose to Gibson Dunn & Crutcher for some initial
20 guidance on how -- before we actually go out and make the
21 move to solicit any sort of feedback.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, that sounds
23 great. I think that would be very wise to get the legal
24 advice on that.

25 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: I have a comment.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner

2 Ontai?

3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yeah, I think that's a
4 good point and we can bounce that off of our VRA attorney.

5 But I'm also thinking of the Native American
6 community, which we haven't heard anything from. So, it
7 would be good to have some response from them, or at least
8 some opinion from counsel as to how we approach that.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. So, I can
10 take the lead on relaying this request to Gibson Dunn &
11 Crutcher and, hopefully, they would be able to weigh in on
12 this tomorrow afternoon and, if not, definitely on Tuesday
13 next week.

14 So, Commissioner DiGuilio, I am wondering if it
15 is possible to get through points four and five between
16 now and 7:45 and then around 7:45 to be transitioning to
17 the constellation of agenda items related to the second
18 and third round of input hearings. We'll do our best.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Are you addressing that
20 to me or to everyone behind me?

21 (Laughter)

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: A little bit of
23 both. Well, it's your dinner so, you know, if you want to
24 go until 9:00, you know we actually have the space as late
25 as we need it so --

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, since I can't see
2 what's behind -- who's behind me, I'll let Commissioner
3 Galambos Malloy crack the whip on that one.

4 Okay, the fourth one is the in-line process
5 review, the status update and next steps. It's kind of a
6 large issue and I'm going to ask staff to kind of give us
7 an overview of where that stands right now. But,
8 basically, after we've heard some of the available options
9 from staff, I believe this Commission needs to kind of
10 refine -- it would help the IFB process, and would only be
11 fair to anyone who was going to apply, that they had a
12 good sense of what we expect this person to do, or what
13 responsibilities we're asking them.

14 And part of that, again, is some options that
15 staff will discuss or whether we'd like someone to kind of
16 look at the process as we're going along, looking at the
17 data sources, and whether those have been accurately
18 represented in the maps that we, as Commissioners, have
19 chosen to do, or whether or not we need to have the IFB be
20 framed in terms of an as-needed. And, if so, we'd have to
21 have a discussion about what triggers the as-needed, or a
22 combination of having both of those available, and how
23 that would play out in the actual IFB, itself.

24 So, with that, I might have Mr. Claypool, who is
25 much more eloquent than I, give you the details.

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Well, we've had a
2 lot of discussion about this particular point and we need
3 to move forward with this IFB so we can actually find out
4 who's available to perform this function for this
5 Commission.

6 There is, certainly, an arc of services that
7 this person or persons could provide to us. On one end we
8 have the concept that this person would only be brought in
9 to look at those areas where this Commission desired them
10 to review, and then make some qualitative statement
11 regarding whether or not the Commission's instructions had
12 been adhered to, and whether or not that they were in
13 compliance with the laws and regulations governing the
14 districts.

15 On the other end of the spectrum we have,
16 conceptually, the idea that this person or persons would
17 actually follow this process and review virtually all of
18 the maps. I mean, give you a qualitative statement about
19 whether or not your directions had been followed and where
20 you thought -- or where that person might think that there
21 could be improvement, make some type of statement.

22 I believe that is -- is exactly what we're
23 looking at. We need to know where this Commission
24 believes this person kind of fits.

25 As I explained earlier to Commissioner DiGuilio,

1 we could very well have our cake and eat it, too, at this
2 point and simply tell something that that is the kind of
3 width of what we would expect from them, that they
4 could -- they may come in to look at it all or they may
5 just come in to look at a portion of it.

6 But if that's what this Commission wants, that's
7 what we have to draft, both the technical aspects of the
8 position to say and the statement of work.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And if I may,
10 where I believe that we had arrived, as a Commission, the
11 last time that we discussed this in Santa Rosa, is that we
12 were in agreement regarding the concept of an in-line
13 review on an as-needed basis.

14 So, I think that there's two directions we could
15 go here. One, having established that we agree that this
16 would happen on an as-needed basis, we need to come up
17 for -- come up with a definition of what constitutes as-
18 needed, so that we can be prepared to move immediately in
19 that direction if those circumstances are met.

20 You know, the second piece, which it seemed that
21 we have not come to agreement as a Commission on, would be
22 regarding if we are interested in this other form that
23 would be more of kind of an ongoing fact checking. And I
24 think that if that latter option was to be considered, we
25 would need to develop, now, a more robust definition of

1 what, exactly, that would entail.

2 Commissioner Ward?

3 COMMISSIONER WARD: Sorry, you caught me off
4 guard, now.

5 The -- I appreciate the conversation. I think
6 after the last business meeting that was my biggest
7 concern was that there didn't seem to be united vision,
8 you know, amongst the Commission, of what the in-line
9 process review should practically look like.

10 I'm understanding that, from I think your added
11 comments, that we're deferring back to the original
12 motion, which make it an as-needed process. And in
13 listening to Mr. Claypool, I understood as well that
14 there's still a breadth of definition for what the in-line
15 process reviewer might do for this Commission, the service
16 they might fill.

17 And, you know, after many discussions it seemed
18 that there was kind of a common thread of wanting an
19 impartial referee, you know, who can be called in to help
20 broker solutions to mapping spotted issues, at the
21 Commission's request.

22 But it seems to me that this in-line can serve,
23 as well, as an invaluable resource in validating the
24 Citizens Commission as an institution, as well as being
25 our best weapon at defending our maps and achieving, you

1 know, public buy-in at the end of this.

2 The in-line review process, you know, I think
3 can maximally offer us an opportunity to take, you know,
4 transparency, which is our number one thing, to a whole
5 new level.

6 I mean, we're setting precedence across the
7 nation as a governmental entity. We have the means via
8 this peer review, an opportunity to further distinguish
9 ourselves as the model of what transparency in government
10 can be.

11 You know, in the Air Force we had a common
12 phrase of "who's checking the checker?" I know that we're
13 all proud of the process and the work we're doing with it,
14 why not highlight this effort by volunteering to have a
15 third-party neutral inspect, advise, and report on the
16 very processes we've so deliberately employed and that we
17 meet and exceed what the expectations of what the public
18 at large, the Commission staff and us, as Commissioners,
19 you know, desired.

20 I think the application of this would consist of
21 bringing this peer reviewer on board between the first and
22 second set of draft maps. The person could be responsible
23 to review and report to the Commission their assessment of
24 what our major map-drawing processes are.

25 Tasks like reviewing Commission process for

1 instructing the line-drawers. They would evaluate the
2 sufficiency of the direction provided to our technical and
3 VRA consultants. Is it clear, is it consistent, is it
4 contradictory? Evaluate how instruction and guidance from
5 the Commission, direction is communicated amongst the
6 Commission and various map-making staff.

7 Evaluate how the VRA and technical consultants
8 process and apply Commission direction, guidance and
9 instructions. They would validate the VRA and technical
10 consultant work, their work product, their maps for
11 sufficiency with Commission instructions.

12 And then, lastly, they could be that third-party
13 neutral deliberation support to be called in at-will, as-
14 needed by the Commission to help broker Commission-spotted
15 issues.

16 This in-line review concept also saves the
17 Commission and the State a lot of money because it
18 justifies post-August Commission activity as the work
19 product or maps that are third-party neutral inspected,
20 allows for a hot wash, or a postmortem of this historic
21 process.

22 It lays the foundation for this Commission to
23 improve itself, lobby for necessary changes for next
24 decade, and justify a release of funds for post-map
25 Commission activity.

1 I think for all of these reasons the Commission
2 should carefully consider adopting a concept of an in-line
3 reviewer that contains all of those elements. It
4 maximizes this Commission's opportunity for success.

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, let me have a
6 comment here.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, Commissioner Ward,
9 you're saying that this entity, similar to what an IG,
10 inspector general, would do, using military form.

11 COMMISSIONER WARD: You know, I don't, because
12 I -- they're looking for problems. I think this is more
13 of a peer evaluation that helps us fine tune, that helps
14 us issue spot and incorrect, not -- I mean we're building
15 a process here. And as we're seeing, like today, you
16 know, we're all taking notes, we're learning, hey, we need
17 to fine tune this. If we had a peer reviewer, who could
18 come in and from the start of the first draft maps and on,
19 you now, our second draft maps and on, like I said, start
20 kind of checking, looking at these things, helping us
21 issue spot and providing some third-party neutral guidance
22 on how to better do it.

23 And then kind of the end of this all give the
24 public a thumbs up that our processes were sound, our
25 instruction was good and sufficient, and that the

1 processes used to employ that direction was complete and
2 that the work product, the maps accurately and fully
3 reflect that instruction. That's the kind of transparency
4 and that's the kind of confidence that I think this
5 opportunity an in-line reviewer will give the public. So,
6 that was my vision for it.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I want to just
8 clarify where we are at this point and then I have a
9 couple of Commissioners in the stack.

10 We definitely, as a Commission, need to clarify
11 what we mean by as-needed basis in regards to this review.
12 And what I hear is that Commissioner Ward is actually
13 suggesting that -- hasn't formed it in the form of a
14 motion, but is suggest that, as opposed to an as-needed
15 basis, that we consider a concept of an ongoing, fact-
16 checking sort of review.

17 So, with that, Commissioner Barabba?

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes. My reservation with
19 that approach is that I think in their wisdom the people,
20 who put together the Act that created this Commission,
21 chose to have more than one person there and to have 14
22 people, who have been vetted very carefully, and it's in
23 the diversity of the interests of these 14 Commissioners
24 that we are less likely to have one point of view prevail.

25 And the concern I have about any one individual

1 looking at our work, all of us bring our own experiences
2 to bear on how we see things. And I would be concerned
3 about one person having the judgment over the decisions of
4 this very diverse group. And with that, I just don't
5 understand the need.

6 Because this is an unprecedented level of
7 transparency and impartiality demonstrated by 14 different
8 people, and I don't think the 14 different people need
9 somebody telling them whether they're doing it right or
10 wrong.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I've given a lot of
13 thought to this. I think that I agree with Commissioner
14 Barabba's points. I mean, I think, ultimately, the
15 Commission is going to be the -- you know, make the call
16 on whether we feel, you know, we come up with a set of
17 maps we can all support, that's built into our process.

18 So, I mean for me, I think the as-needed part
19 for me is really -- would only be useful if we see this as
20 an augment to our existing line-drawing resources, which
21 we know are very taxed right now, again, to meet an
22 impossible deadline.

23 And I've been trying to figure out how much this
24 is needed? After we received the testimony from groups
25 that, you know, had professional line-drawing resources of

1 their own, most of them working far longer than we have
2 had to work on our maps, have come up with their
3 proposals, and they're statewide maps. And, you know,
4 many of us have been referring to various versions of
5 these maps as we've been giving direction to our line-
6 drawers.

7 For example, I think it's not an accident that,
8 for example, in several of the Section 5 districts that we
9 got exactly the same looking district, with the small, you
10 know, permutations around the edges from varied groups, as
11 varied as the California Institute, and MALDEF to, you
12 know, the Conservative Action Group, and they all came up
13 with the same picture, with some slight tweaks.

14 That tells you that a bunch of folks, perhaps
15 with different interests in mind, tried really hard to
16 draw these districts and all came to the same conclusion.
17 So, I think we have already received a lot of information,
18 because it's already been tried in the public with a lot
19 of different redistricting resources.

20 So, I guess the incremental value that I would
21 see is if we got really stuck in an area. For example,
22 you know, we were trying to figure out how we could get
23 some of the districts in the Bay Area, you know, to gel a
24 little bit more with the COI testimony, individualizations
25 that we had originally drawn in isolation, and trying to

1 get it to now work together in the puzzle pieces. And we
2 asked Q2 to go try some options.

3 So, I would see possibly a need for this if we
4 get stuck and we can't figure out how to accommodate it,
5 and we just want additional resources to see if they can,
6 you know, try to accommodate the Commission's direction
7 somehow, and come up with some other creative solution.
8 You know, to me that would be the best use.

9 I do think a lot of the general issues, when we
10 end up with a very similar looking district, from very
11 different redistricting sources, that I don't know that
12 there would be additional value to having yet another
13 person validate that we have to adhere to the Monterey
14 County line.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to invite
16 Commissioners, who haven't weighed in on this definition
17 of as-needed basis. Commissioner Yao.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think the two key works
19 that were drawing over is "process" and "review."

20 First of all on the process, I think we're way
21 too far along in terms of where we are to change our
22 process. We're a week away from doing the draft map, and
23 in between each of the versions of the map we only have
24 one week to make changes, so we're not going to be able to
25 make any changes in our process.

1 So, what's left is just the word "review." One
2 thing that we probably haven't given due consideration is
3 whether we have quality control or not. If everything
4 works out fine we're going to get to the end point in good
5 order. But what we don't have is an ability to review
6 ourselves, to see if anything could have gone wrong, okay.

7 And I think we have seen that we have
8 shortcomings and we adjust for it in real time. For
9 example, having Commissioners taking notes, and circulate
10 it, and doing these types of things.

11 But at the end of the day a quality control is
12 probably the thing, I think, we're missing. There's
13 nobody that's impartial to what we're doing looking over
14 our shoulder to make sure that we do what we said we're
15 going to do, that we do it well enough to meet the
16 requirement of the task.

17 So, in terms of -- and also, along the way the
18 funding has been, in a certain way, defined us, \$50,000,
19 okay. And I'm not suggesting that anybody did anything
20 improper, we just defined it to the point where there
21 isn't enough time, there isn't enough money to truly do
22 what we initially had thought about setting out to do.

23 So, at this point in time it's really whether we
24 want to put some quality control into the remaining of the
25 process so that we have a higher confidence of getting a

1 real good product. And to me that's probably the only
2 thing we can do from this point to the end.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
4 Blanco?

5 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, I always had -- it's
6 interesting, I never -- I always had concerns about this
7 as an "in-line" process. When we first started talking
8 about this way back when, we had started talking about a
9 peer review process, which was something that, you know,
10 had made sense to me. Like at what point when we get down
11 the road do we have an expert say, you know, these maps --
12 if these are the guidelines, they have followed them,
13 they're well done, they include the -- you know, sort of a
14 backstop on, you know -- on the maps.

15 I never really understood the need for in-line
16 or in-process review, precisely for the reasons that
17 Commissioner Barabba mentioned. I felt like our process
18 is here for everybody to see and if it's not a good
19 process, then I feel like we've been reminded of that by
20 the public. We've -- we go back, we adjust. Today, we
21 adjusted with the note-taker.

22 And I always felt that that really came -- the
23 process review came from a feeling that we weren't sure if
24 our mappers were going to follow what we were telling
25 them. And I feel like they're so -- you know, since we

1 first had that conversation and now, I feel like that's
2 been put to rest, the question of who's giving
3 instructions to whom. Are they drawing and we're just
4 sitting here or are we driving the bus? You know, I feel
5 like that's been put to rest.

6 I don't feel that necessarily the issue of
7 whether it would be in our best interest to have a sort of
8 a -- as Commissioner Yao says, a quality, or a review of
9 the product. I've always thought that that was in
10 interesting idea, sort of a peer review of the maps. And
11 I'm not sure at which stage, is that between the first and
12 the second map, or after the second round of input, the
13 second and third map. Because I think that is a concept
14 of, okay, let's get a second read because, after all,
15 we're 14 people that are not, in a sense, professionals,
16 why not get that second opinion, so to speak.

17 So, I really would like -- I'm leaning more
18 towards less discuss is this about the process or is this
19 about a second opinion from, you know, to back us up or to
20 see where our problems are?

21 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
22 DiGuilio, then Forbes.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I guess I'm kind of
24 along the same lines. My one concern with the peer review
25 of the maps is it would have to -- in my mind, it would

1 have to be process-based. Based on here are the maps
2 they've done did -- did they get accurate data, did the
3 mappers take the instructions the Commissioners gave, and
4 if they did all that then our maps would be acceptable.

5 It's not, oh, we're going to look at your maps
6 and I don't like them so we're going to -- I'm going to
7 redraw them and give you another suggestion.

8 Because I think, as Commissioner Barabba said,
9 is we are the Commission of 14, we've taken -- we have
10 legal advice, in-house and special counsel. We are an
11 open and transparent process. We have established -- we
12 have made decisions, collectively, for these maps based on
13 all that data.

14 And I'm sure if you were to ask ten people that
15 have been involved in this process, outside of us, they
16 may all want to present a different map.

17 And we're not here -- they're not a part of the
18 process so, in my mind, anybody we get is not to recreate
19 maps for us at all. We've done the mapping, we're out
20 there, we're accountable to the public.

21 If someone wants to look at those maps, I would
22 see it only in the context of, you know, did we have the
23 right data sources? Was the COI testimony incorporated?
24 Was -- you know, kind of an internal.

25 But then you have to ask yourself, I guess to

1 some degree, is it worth it to have someone kind of do an
2 internal audit, basically, is what it is. Maybe it is.
3 Maybe we should just have that so that we -- they can say
4 yes.

5 But other than for them to comment on whether or
6 not we just -- whether the maps reflect what we had asked
7 the mappers to do, that could give us credence for our
8 maps. But beyond that, to say whether or not they like
9 the decisions we made, it's not their choice to say
10 whether they liked the decisions. We'll have plenty of
11 feedback as to whether people like those decisions.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
13 Forbes.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: So, for instant
15 conversation, it strikes me that we're too far into the
16 process to have an in-line review. I mean, I don't know
17 what we would do with it because we're not going to change
18 the process that we're undergoing, now.

19 THE REPORTER: Can you speak a little more
20 directly into the mic?

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'm sorry. Thank you.
22 But I do think it would be useful after the fact to hire
23 someone who would evaluate the process, to determine --
24 you know, we draw maps on our COI, and we can test that.
25 But what did we miss? What could we have done that we did

1 not do?

2 How did we interpret information in a way that
3 perhaps could have been interpreted in another way? And
4 I'll let other questions like that come about.

5 And the purpose of this is -- I mean, this is a
6 grand experiment that we're engaging in here. We don't
7 have anybody, besides ourselves, to evaluate what we've
8 done. And I think to have someone, after the fact, to
9 give us, I'll call it, an academic review of what we did,
10 what we could have done to make the process better, that
11 then could be carried forward to the next time this is
12 done.

13 I mean, again, I'm concerned that -- I mean, we
14 have a process, I have complete confidence in Q2. But at
15 this point, because I'm so in the middle of it, I don't
16 know what I don't know.

17 And I think -- I think a process after the fact
18 that does that would be advantageous.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
20 Aguirre?

21 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, I would -- I would
22 concur with most of the comments that have already been
23 made.

24 The term as-needed, to me, means that if
25 something's broken, you fix it. And in this particular

1 time I don't really see that we're -- anything's broken.
2 I think our process is very transparent, it's available to
3 the public, accessible to the public. All of us are
4 working very hard at developing maps that I'm convinced
5 will follow all of the criteria as called for by the
6 proposition and the Constitution.

7 So, as far as the -- as far as what we do once
8 those maps are submitted in August, I agree with
9 Commissioner Forbes that when we first talked about peer
10 review, in the academic area it's after you've published a
11 result that you ask your colleagues to weigh in on, you
12 know, on any comments and to provide comments on whether
13 you missed the mark or not.

14 For us, once the maps come out, I think that we
15 will -- it will be difficult for us to assess how much we
16 hit the mark, even though I think that we will, because
17 the whole effect of the maps are going to play out over
18 various elections in the following years.

19 So, in that regard then I agree that perhaps
20 after the maps come out it will be good for us to review
21 what we've done and to perhaps suggest some -- make some
22 suggestions in concert with our reviewer, so that we can
23 set the stage for the next Commission coming on, down the
24 line.

25 But I think that there are -- that the results

1 of our work are not going to be readily visible to us,
2 discernible to us until after the subsequent elections,
3 where we will be able to see an increase in voter
4 engagement, an increase in citizen participation, and a
5 raised level of confidence in the politics, perhaps some
6 effects on the Legislature and how they conduct their
7 business. All of those factors are going to be indicative
8 of how well we did our job.

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya
10 and then Forbes?

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I've had difficulty with
12 this concept from the beginning and I have to say I, at
13 this point, support all the statements in a sense against
14 going into this now.

15 But the question I really had, even assuming
16 that we think this is the time to do something like this,
17 I have no idea who that person would be that I, or we,
18 would consider qualified, in a position to come into the
19 process at this point and make a judgment.

20 I mean, pick, you know, any person in this room,
21 people who have been following us closely might have just
22 as much credibility or, you know, opinion to weigh in at
23 this point.

24 I just have real difficulty seeing how we have
25 the time, even if we wanted to do this, to bring somebody

1 in and make a determination this is the right person and
2 this is what we want you to do.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'll take one more
4 comment from Commissioner Forbes and then I'm going to
5 make some suggestions on how to move forward.

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I do want to address the
7 concern. I know that one of the purposes of having an in-
8 line review or discussing it was to increase the
9 confidence level of others, who do not necessarily have
10 confidence in the process.

11 But as I've said before and that others have
12 said, I don't think we can do that at this point in the
13 process.

14 But I think that we could have, as part of the
15 review process, after it's over, a discussion with them,
16 or whoever would be doing the review, a discussion with
17 them to sort of say what could have been done, if
18 anything, do you have -- given you have a greater
19 confidence factor in the process.

20 So that way at least their concerns would
21 ultimately be addressed in a fashion. But I see that that
22 could be part of the after-the-fact process and I think
23 that would, hopefully, you know, give them some comfort
24 that at least in the future their concerns would be
25 addressed.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, if I may, I'm
2 actually going to take a moment to summarize where I think
3 we're at.

4 One, I think as a result of this conversation
5 and previous conversations as a Commission, we do seem to
6 be in agreement around having some sort of a peer review
7 and evaluation that would actually follow our process,
8 that would be post-August 15. I think it's something we
9 talked about months ago, even as we were just crafting our
10 skeleton budget at the time. It's something that I think
11 that we're affirming across the board here, today.

12 And so one next step along those lines is that
13 we could ask our staff, Mr. Claypool, to begin to put
14 those wheels in motion and perhaps come to us with some
15 ideas on what a time line might look like, to make sure
16 that we're positioned to move into that at the conclusion
17 of our map-drawing process.

18 I think the second piece, which I am not hearing
19 that we're still in agreement on, and I think we are going
20 to have to either put it to bed or move forward with it,
21 is regarding this idea of some sort of review that would
22 happen now.

23 And where I seemed to see some interest on the
24 part of the Commissioners was regarding this as-needed
25 basis, if we were to get stuck in an area where we are

1 simply having difficulty, not able to meet what we feel
2 are satisfactory fulfillments of our requirements under
3 the California Constitution.

4 And that that would be our trigger moment to
5 know that we needed to work with said individual or firm
6 to help us look at other options, as an augmentation to
7 our existing line-drawing capacity through Q2.

8 So, that is the concept that I would like to
9 hear feedback on right now.

10 Commissioner Barabba?

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And that would represent
12 my point of view.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
14 DiGuilio?

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think similarly, I
16 like the idea of as-needed, because if we do need
17 something it would be for a specific area, we could ask
18 for that, the type of review, whether it be the data
19 sources or our suggested alternatives. But, again, it's
20 not so much that someone's going to present another map to
21 us, but it's to let us know what our options are and then
22 we can -- we can take that in consideration and present
23 another visualization.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I'd be open to
25 entertain a motion in this regard from the Commission.

1 Commissioner Dai?

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Point of order. Don't we
3 have a motion that already green-lighted this? Do we just
4 need to provide some more specifics for the substance of
5 the --

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: What I would like
7 to see -- we don't have a definition of what constitutes
8 as-needed. So, what I am looking for some definitive
9 direction from the Commission is to define what
10 constitutes as-needed in order to flesh out the IFB and to
11 allow the public to have a sense of what to expect moving
12 forward.

13 Commissioner DiGuilio?

14 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And could we also maybe
15 just take a moment to touch base with Mr. Claypool, that
16 part of the reason this discussion is here is so that we
17 can fine tune the IFB. And if they know, now, that it
18 will be on an as-needed basis, it seems like we need to
19 answer both what will trigger the as-needed, but then we
20 have to provide some idea of what that person would be
21 expected to do once triggered, so we can reflect it in the
22 IFB. Is that correct, Mr. Claypool?

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Claypool?

24 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Yes, it is. We
25 just -- besides the trigger, you'd have to give us

1 direction as to the type of technical expertise you'd
2 expect this individual or individuals to have, and that
3 would encompass what you expect them to do.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Raya?

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm not going to try to
6 define the as-needed, but I do have a question.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

8 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Getting to that point where
9 we are stuck, does that mean we've had advice from
10 counsel, we've had plenty of discussion among us, and we
11 cannot reach a consensus? Does it just mean that we can't
12 reach a consensus or does it mean that all 14 of us say I
13 have no idea what to do at this point?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

15 COMMISSIONER DAI: I might suggest, for example,
16 we saw some visualizations today which we were not very
17 happy with, right, because it was not consistent with some
18 of the COI testimony and it split some communities that we
19 didn't want to see split.

20 So, you know, so we know that Q2 tried certain
21 things and we've asked them to try some additional things.
22 And at some point, if we're still unhappy with it --
23 that's what I define as getting stuck. That maybe -- and
24 I would by the way, define this person would have to be
25 someone with mapping skills, who would be able to say have

1 you tried -- you know, here's the 21st idea you could try,
2 you know.

3 Because, like I said, I think in many parts of
4 the State we've clearly had professional mappers try and
5 they've ended up in the same place. So, you know, they've
6 probably tried the same things. And so there might be
7 possibilities, particularly between the second and the
8 third round for enhancements, because we'd like to see you
9 improve here, and reduce the number of splits.

10 You know, we tried some things like that, you
11 know, can we go around, instead. That's what I'm
12 thinking.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
14 Ontai?

15 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, in response to
16 Commissioner Dai's question or response to that, are we
17 looking for someone that would act as a mediator or a
18 facilitator between honest disagreements between the
19 Commissioners?

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: No, I think it's just a
21 source of creativity and augment to our current mapping
22 resource, that's the way I see it.

23 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, it would have to be
24 someone who really understands the underlying issues, as
25 well, an expert in the field.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: A mapper, yeah.

2 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: A mapper.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Somebody who has done mapping
4 before.

5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: But also the legal
6 issues, as well.

7 COMMISSIONER DAI: That's right.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners Yao
9 and then Barabba.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Since we're looking for a
11 solution to a problem that we can't define at this point
12 in time, I would suggest that maybe the best way to solve
13 it is just simply table it until such time we can identify
14 the problem.

15 Tabling it, basically, would be telling staff
16 don't do anything further until you get direction from us.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
18 Barabba and then I'll interject.

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think that poses a
20 problem for getting a contract out, which we may need to
21 do in a hurry. And if we wait until we need it, we may
22 not get it.

23 I think Commissioner Dai was on the right track
24 in the sense that the triggering event would be when we've
25 gone through our discussions with the Q2, and after the

1 third or fourth time when we're saying you're not getting
2 what we told you to do, and they say, well, we don't think
3 it's doable, that would be a sense to me that we might
4 want to see if somebody else could come in and help us get
5 it done. That would be an example of a triggering event
6 in my mind.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
8 Forbes?

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Another triggering event
10 in my mind would be if these maps are offered, we can't
11 get nine of the appropriate votes for it, so if the
12 Commissioner were stuck. You know, I would like to have
13 somebody else come in and perhaps, you know, break the log
14 jam so we could come up with a consensus solution.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I feel like as
16 a Commissioner we're essentially saying similar things in
17 different ways. So, I would be interested in entertaining
18 some sort of formal motion where we can have a common
19 definition of as-needed basis as it relates to the review
20 for the IFB.

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Connie, before we make
22 a further discussion, can I ask Mr. Claypool, don't we
23 already have a definition in the IFB, some type of
24 description?

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No, we don't.

1 Right now we have a description of what their role will
2 be, that says it's a -- and this has changed. Is a
3 procedure to confirm that the criteria required by Voters
4 First Act and the directions provided by the Commission to
5 the technical consultants are reflected in all maps. And
6 that the results of the review will consist of their
7 determination to the extent that the maps under review
8 conform to the Commission's stated criteria.

9 And then we have a list of basic technical
10 skills, but we don't have anything in this that would
11 indicate when they might receive direction to be used.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
13 Barabba?

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Could we do something as
15 general as the action taken is when the Commission makes a
16 determination that we need the resources of this person,
17 because it's hard to put all the things that might trigger
18 something.

19 And if we just say that the person will be
20 brought in when the Commission, as a Commission,
21 determines we need those resources.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners
23 DiGuilio and then Blanco.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I think if we used
25 Commissioner Barabba's parameters it gives us quite a bit

1 of leeway, and that would solve one problem, as the as-
2 needed. And the other would just be a -- to add what's
3 been said, particularly by Commissioner Dai, about they'd
4 obviously need mapping skills, a technical knowledge. And
5 I would reiterate what Commissioner Ontai said that, along
6 with that, they'd have to have some level of a legal
7 understanding. They don't have to be VRA experts, but
8 they obviously have to understand why there's Section 5
9 drawn, and they have to know that there's Section 2.

10 So, to the extent that it impacts the mapping,
11 they have to have an understanding of legal issues. And I
12 think that would probably give us a pretty wide pool from
13 which to choose.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to
15 suggest that in order to move this forward, now that we
16 have some progress on this as-needed understanding, is
17 that we actually task a couple of Commissioners, much in
18 the way that we have tasked Commissioners Filkins Webber
19 and Ancheta to move forward on the racially polarized
20 voting analysis process, that we task a couple of
21 Commissioners to work with staff to just simply flesh out
22 the definition of what are the skill sets that -- the
23 range of skill sets that any individual or firm that would
24 be fulfilling this function would need to have.

25 The IFB is very close to being finished, I think

1 it would be a fairly simple task that could be
2 accomplished within the next few days.

3 Potentially, my idea was that Commissioner
4 Forbes, as representing the Legal Committee, and
5 Commissioner DiGuilio, representing the Technical
6 Committee may be able to take this work and move it
7 forward for us.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: That's funny because I
9 was going to nominate Commissioner Barabba and
10 Commissioner Dai.

11 (Laughter)

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think you throw
13 Commissioner Forbes in there and you've got a
14 three-party -- a three-party triangle right there.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I think we
16 do.

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: So, for the people that
18 are going to take this on, the one thing I would want some
19 clarification on is when we get to this point and this
20 person does this I -- do we agree, they would have to
21 review all of the community of interest testimony.
22 Because I don't think that they could really be making an
23 assessment of this without a total review of the -- of
24 that testimony that went into our -- because if not it
25 becomes this abstract exercise and we have not really --

1 you know, we're putting a lot of emphasis on the community
2 of interest. So, I just want to make sure it's reflected
3 that we would expect this person to do that.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
5 Barabba?

6 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would concur, but we
7 don't know what's going to be the triggering event, it may
8 not be related to community of interest, so that's why we
9 have to be prepared for virtually anything.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, would
11 Commissioners, in this case, Dai, Forbes and Barabba, be
12 amenable to working together? In this configuration we
13 would have a Commissioner from Technical, a Commissioner
14 from Finance and Administration, and from Legal, a
15 Republican, a Democrat, and a decline-to-state voter that
16 would be tasked with moving this forward.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I see no
18 dissent; I will move forward and consider this agenda
19 item --

20 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Madam Chair, if I
21 could just ask one clarifying question?

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

23 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: In the case of
24 Commissioner Filkins Webber and Commissioner Ancheta,
25 where there were just two individuals, we gave them the

1 responsibility to really conclude the transaction with the
2 polarized voting study.

3 We could do that because there were just two of
4 them.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Gotcha.

6 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: They don't
7 constitute a public body.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I will withdraw.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I guess the -- the
11 wisdom there, we would be better served to have a
12 committee of two, than three, for this purpose.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. Thank
14 you for mentioning that.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Commissioner Barabba is
16 lucky I'm not within hitting distance. But I like to have
17 the idea of a Technical person there. If Commissioner --

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Technical and maybe
20 Legal, if Commissioner Dai is willing --

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: I withdraw.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. I may not be
23 able to get near my fellow Commissioners for a while
24 but --

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: No.

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: -- I don't know, what
2 do the other Commissioners feel about that?

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I agree. Or,
4 Commissioners, do I hear any dissent to Commissioners
5 Barabba and Forbes carrying this work for us?

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I second that.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

8 (Laughter)

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. All right,
10 with that we continue on this fast clip here on the
11 Technical Committee Agenda.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: We will move, now,
14 into provision of equivalency files and data for second
15 and third round maps.

16 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Chair?

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry, Mr.
18 Miller.

19 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Yeah, it's hard to
20 think quick enough. If you wish to give these
21 Commissioners the same breadth of charge that we gave the
22 others, I think it would be in our best interest to have a
23 motion expressly doing that.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Could I entertain
25 a motion to that effect?

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: I move that Commissioners
2 Barabba and Forbes be tasked with finalizing the scope of
3 work for the in-line process reviewer, so we can get that
4 IFB out.

5 COMMISSIONER YAO: I second that motion.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Do we have -- I'm
7 sorry, as a point of order, do we have to clarify that we
8 give them the power to make decisions, too, because I --

9 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: Well, if -- I mean
10 that's fine if that's as far as you wish to go. If you
11 want to actually identify the person with these two
12 individuals taking the lead, do you want to try to
13 schedule interviews with the committee in the same way
14 that we did with the lawyers and the line-drawers, or is
15 this a subset where you can give a more complete charge to
16 a sub-group to make the determination, that would be the
17 follow-on question.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai,
19 it's your motion.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: I would be happy to further
21 delegate the authority, should we reach a trigger point,
22 that they would then interview potential consultants and
23 make a recommendation to the full Commission.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: I will continue to second
25 that motion. I will continue to second that motion.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: The floor's open for
2 discussion.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I support the
4 efficiency of that as long as it comes back to the full
5 Commission for a final vote and discussion.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Miller?

7 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: If I could? In the
8 event we wait until there's a trigger point, it could be
9 early August, let's say, and that would perhaps squeeze
10 us. So, I think it would be in the Commission's best
11 interest to identify the person, even assuming they do no
12 work, before the time when we would need to pull the
13 trigger.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
15 DiGuilio?

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can -- I would imagine
17 we may not just be getting a person of one stripe. That
18 applies; there may be strengths and weaknesses to the
19 applications. And based on our need, since it's a pool,
20 can our designated Commissioners do some type of review or
21 interview of them, and then be able to give the Commission
22 a list of the strengths?

23 So, one person may be good based on one
24 circumstance we run into, another person would be good in
25 another circumstance. I don't think we should narrow

1 ourselves down to one individual right away. But it would
2 be beneficial to have an understanding of what the
3 strengths and weaknesses of our pool is.

4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: As long as we
5 understand that we have to let -- and that's the important
6 part, we have to let this IFB and see what that pool is,
7 and then come back to the Commission.

8 But it does require that we move now, to survey
9 that pool.

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And it's my understanding
11 that our Commission is to work with them to get the IFP
12 out, and then later on we worry about who we interview and
13 things of that nature.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, in the
15 interest of time, if there's no urgent commentary, I'd
16 like to open it up to see if any members of the public
17 would like to comment.

18 Please, come forward. We have a microphone down
19 on this side, by Mr. Miller.

20 MR. SALAVERY: Hi, David Salaverry, again. I
21 had hoped not to have to comment on this today, because I
22 was actually going to give you a little bit of an in-line
23 process review tomorrow.

24 But I think that an in-line process review is
25 probably a good idea. However, August 15th, I think is an

1 unrealistic time frame. That's really going to be lawsuit
2 season, if there are lawsuits. And, therefore, a review
3 then will probably be under great pressure to make a few
4 non-threatening criticisms that allow the Commission,
5 basically, to go forward. And I think that's an issue
6 that you need to think about.

7 But as to, you know, whether to have it in-line,
8 I think that probably at this point it is too late to
9 start remaking all the processes.

10 I'd just like to say just a couple of things
11 about an in-line process review, which is that I think
12 there's actually been very little intelligent reformed --
13 informed, rather, review of your processes so far.

14 I have been, you know, trying to tell you all
15 along that I'm not finding the processes that transparent.
16 Unfortunately, you know, with the issues with the videos,
17 you know, not being posted in a timely manner. I think
18 you've more or less settled that problem.

19 But something that you talked about earlier was
20 a system to track the -- you know, all of the COI
21 testimony. I think the lack of transcripts of all of the
22 input hearings is a huge problem that may come back to
23 bite you guys a little bit.

24 And without that, I think that, you know,
25 there's really no way for the public to -- you know, to

1 look at this process, which is incredibly complex. And
2 although I've been, you know, basically following it with
3 a very high degree of dedication, you know, I haven't
4 really been able to understand it fully up to this point.

5 So, there's a lot that could be said as far as,
6 you know, an -- some type of an in-line process review
7 right now which, as I said, hoped to make tomorrow. Not
8 to, I don't know, you know -- I think that, you know, as a
9 group we are moving our -- you know, our maps forward a
10 little bit with you guys, and so I hesitate to be, you
11 know, really critical.

12 But I think that the -- Commissioner Ward is
13 right, this is a great experiment and how it ultimately
14 turns out is going to be, I think largely a matter of how
15 much serious and intelligent criticism you get and how
16 much of it you listen to. Thanks.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. With
18 that, I'll turn it back to the Commission, if there are
19 any further discussion points before we go to a vote?

20 All right, Ms. Sargis, I'd like to request a
21 roll call, please.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: And would you
23 like the motion restated?

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That would be
25 great.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Okay. The
2 motion is that Commissioner Barabba and Commissioner
3 Forbes shall be tasked with finalizing the scope of work
4 for the in-line process review IFB, and the Commission
5 further delegates Commissioner Barabba and Commissioner
6 Forbes to interview potential consultants and make a
7 recommendation to the Commission based on those
8 interviews.

9 Commissioner Aguirre?

10 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ancheta?

12 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yes.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Barabba?

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Sorta -- yes.

15 (Laughter)

16 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Blanco?

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yes.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Dai?

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: Definitely.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: DiGuilio?

21 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Yes.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Forbes?

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Yes.

24 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Galambos

25 Malloy?

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

2 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ontai?

3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Aye.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Parvenu?

5 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

6 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Raya?

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yes.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Ward?

9 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yes.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Yao?

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yes.

12 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: The motion

13 passes.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Great work, team.

15 This is an issue that we have labored long and hard over

16 and I appreciate us being able to revisit it and come to a

17 conclusion that we were able to reach unanimously, I think

18 that's a significant accomplishment given the previous

19 discussions we've had on this matter.

20 With that I am just going to do a time check

21 with you because, clearly, we are not adjourning at 8:00.

22 I am wondering how much longer you will indulge me, if I

23 could have at least until nine o'clock of your time?

24 I feel like we're really making progress today

25 and tomorrow we have significant headway that we need to

1 make in terms of the line-drawing in Southern California.

2 So, I do think we could actually make some
3 significant progress on these remaining agenda items.

4 So, Commissioner Forbes?

5 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Madam Chair, I have to --
6 I was due at the store at eight o'clock.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Because I was told we were
9 going to be done at eight o'clock. So, I excuse myself
10 and I'll see you all in the morning.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, sounds good.
12 We will aim to adjourn at 9:00, if that's -- if folks
13 think they can hang in until there. Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, we're tough.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, back to
16 Commissioner DiGuilio.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, and I think those
18 are some of the bulk of the heavy topics, knock on wood.

19 So, number 5 is the provision of equivalency
20 files for second and third round maps. And I'm actually
21 going to ask the Chair, we had so many discussions today
22 for clarification, is this in regards to what we'll need
23 for second round or this was our discussion about what we
24 will be providing after the first round, which is just
25 basically the equivalency files, but not a report?

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, I think that
2 it would, you know, be helpful just to revisit what the
3 public can expect to receive from us at various stages of
4 the process --

5 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: -- for the first
7 round release, the second round release, and the third
8 round release.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I thought that's what we
10 were, but my conversations are blurring at this point.

11 So, there has -- it occurred to us that we
12 haven't been as clear as we could to the public in terms
13 of what we'll be releasing.

14 We will be, as we had stated from the very
15 beginning, on -- the intention is June 10th is that we will
16 be releasing our maps, which will be released in
17 equivalency files.

18 But we did not have an intention to actually
19 release a report.

20 If you'll recall on our overall calendar,
21 original calendar --

22 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And can you
23 clarify, if I may interject, what you mean by report?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: A report is supplement
25 information that goes -- written material that goes with

1 those reports?

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I mean, I'm
3 pushing a little harder on this because I think that we --
4 we had come to some initial agreement as a Commission that
5 we wanted there to be some sort of high level kind of
6 framing or meta-analysis that would accompany it.

7 So, if you could just clarify the different
8 types of reports that we might be referring to?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, and that goes
10 into the 6.a, I guess, as well.

11 So, the idea is that, if you recall, we'd have
12 a -- we'd actually have our first draft report released
13 with the second draft map. But with the first draft map
14 we would be, as mentioned earlier, releasing a meta-
15 analysis of our activities and what we had based the first
16 round draft map on.

17 And I'm about to have a good coughing attack, so
18 if I lose it, I'll pass it back.

19 So, I think with that there will be release of
20 the actual equivalency files of the maps with the first
21 round, but other than that, again, it will be in a very
22 high-level narrative for the first round maps in terms of
23 what we're doing for a meta-analysis to accompany those
24 maps.

25 So, go ahead, Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: And the only other
2 thing I would add to that is that we will be providing
3 equivalency files for all three rounds of maps, which I
4 think we've all been on the same page about that from
5 early on.

6 And our understanding of the timing, as I
7 mentioned earlier today, with the time line, is that
8 sometime the night of the 9th is when we'll actually obtain
9 the equivalency files and the -- the visualization that
10 we'll then -- we'll be able to post to our website and
11 distribute to the public.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, unless there's any
13 questions about that, we could even just jump into the --

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, let's move
15 forward.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. So, this kind of
17 is a segue between Technical and Outreach, where
18 Commissioner Ontai will kind of take the ball.

19 But there was some -- as we mentioned, I think
20 maybe in Santa Rosa, when we started to look at the second
21 and third round input hearings, particularly as it relates
22 to the third round where we have to identify the venues,
23 is what we should expect and what we should have a
24 discussion in terms of what the input hearings will be.

25 To some extent that's not -- there's recognition

1 that the input hearings will not be on a large scale of
2 just, generally, what is your community of interest? It's
3 more -- thank you very much -- a comment on -- on the maps
4 that we're presenting. And so as a way, a discussion
5 point as to how to frame that discussion for the public so
6 that we can get the best, most effective COI testimony,
7 and also so that individuals will feel like we're not
8 starting from scratch with testimony but, again, we're
9 looking to comment to make revisions to the maps, if
10 necessary.

11 And then the third round, in consultation, in
12 talking with Ms. MacDonald, as I had mentioned earlier
13 there's a limitation to how much -- in all likelihood
14 there's only, I think, about two weeks, if even that, of
15 actual input hearings for that third round. So that any
16 change -- what we'll be seeking after the second draft
17 maps is really a reaction to the fine details, the nuances
18 of neighborhoods, the nuances of have we not split a
19 community of interest, there's just areas that we haven't
20 recognized.

21 Because at that point there's not going to be a
22 lot of ability to change the maps drastically, there will
23 be just some real fine tuning.

24 That's the idea of having two draft maps is so
25 your first one that we put out is really a rough draft.

1 We can get some comments, we can get a better, much better
2 second draft, and then after the second draft is really
3 comments that allow us to do fine tuning.

4 So, that was the technical side of making sure
5 that the input hearings on one level are structured so
6 that the type of input we get will be helpful, in terms of
7 reviewing the maps that we've done.

8 And the second aspect of the technical side of
9 that is knowing the restrictions of what we can accomplish
10 in our input hearings in the second and, especially, the
11 third round.

12 So, that's kind of the technical side of that.
13 And with that, maybe I would -- it's a good segue to have
14 Commissioner Ontai have a discussion about what the
15 Commission sees based on those technical parameters, what
16 will happen in the input hearings.

17 Is that --

18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Trying to move the
20 process forward.

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Sure. Three weeks ago
22 I would say I would be very nervous about our meeting a
23 deadline, but I think we all feel comfortable that we're
24 going to have some maps by next week.

25 So, the question would be in these -- in these

1 outreach meetings what, exactly -- what clear message are
2 we going to be telling the public?

3 And as Commissioner DiGuilio mentioned, part of
4 that message would be what did we accomplish, what's the
5 focus?

6 Was the focus on getting Section 2 and Section 5
7 criteria accomplished? Is that our basic message? And
8 what kind of input do we want back at that time?

9 So, this is a commentary I just want to have a
10 discussion on.

11 What, exactly, do we tell the public?

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
13 Barabba?

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I think you did a good
15 job of introducing the possibilities, which we just go
16 down the priorities. I mean, our objective was to get
17 the -- meet the population requirement. Because of the
18 Voting Rights Act we addressed these districts first,
19 because we had to address it. And then we went in, with
20 all the other commitments, and laid it out pretty much as
21 we were instructed in the Constitution.

22 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Any other comments?

23 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, I think we pretty
25 much know, for example, if somebody still insists on an

1 east/west North California district, we're not going to be
2 able to make that kind of changes.

3 But if somebody wants a county included in a
4 certain district or a county excluded from a certain
5 district are we going to entertain that kind of discussion
6 or do we want that kind of input? I guess I'm trying to
7 also figure out what is our willingness to -- to what
8 extent are we willing to modify the first draft map, okay?

9 Because if we set too tight a limit, then we
10 discourage a lot of additional inputs, and if we don't set
11 any limits then we may find ourselves to start all over
12 again.

13 And the second question I have maybe is part of
14 Item Number 5, the equivalency file. Obviously, the
15 groups will be able to interpret that, but are individuals
16 going to be able to get down to the street level so that
17 they know exactly whether they and their neighbors are in
18 the same district or not.

19 So, those are the -- some of the technical
20 criteria in order for them to give us any additional
21 input.

22 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: So, there's two issues
23 that Commissioner Yao raised. To what extent do we tell
24 the public that it's still wide open? Or are we saying
25 that the core districts have been defined in this initial

1 round and that we're limiting input to the -- a narrower
2 frame? That's one issue.

3 The second issue is to what extent do we release
4 the files, the data, how much information do we give out?
5 And when do we release that, what do we tell the public at
6 that time?

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
8 DiGuilio?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think kind of to
10 build on what Commissioner Ontai said, I think what we
11 need to have a discussion as a Commissioner is to --
12 there's an educational element to this in terms of when we
13 release this data, and I think that's where we have
14 been -- in conjunction with Commissioner Raya and Public
15 Information, this kind of is a tri-fold.

16 There's an educational element so people can
17 understand what we did, so that when they give their
18 testimony it's more effective on a technical side. As
19 Commissioner Yao said, we'd like to make sure that we
20 have -- they're educated enough to know what they can
21 comment on.

22 So -- now, I've lost my train of thought. But
23 there's the element of the education which relies with the
24 public information, and then there's the technical aspects
25 of what will be most helpful in getting the data. And

1 then it's what the Outreach Committee needs to know, how
2 to structure the input hearings.

3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Commissioner Aguirre?

4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, there's a -- there's
5 certainly a campaign -- there must be a campaign to inform
6 the public and kind of prepare the public to the fact that
7 not only do we have these maps that are coming, but that
8 these maps represent close adherence to all of the
9 criteria as called for by the Proposition 11 and 20, and
10 the Constitution. And that this is based on extensive
11 public input, and established legal criteria that we
12 started by building around Section 5 counties, and kind of
13 went from there.

14 That regarding splits, that we tried in those
15 instances where there have been splits, that we tried to
16 share the pain between Assembly districts, Senate
17 districts, and Congressional districts.

18 That we are -- that we would like public input
19 now around neighborhoods at the micro level versus cities
20 and counties at the macro level, which we have considered
21 before.

22 And that we want information on -- that we want
23 to go beyond opinions to evidence. So, if you have any
24 substantive evidence that you would like the Commission to
25 consider regarding some modification of this first-draft

1 maps, that we will certainly consider that.

2 But as far as, you know, any major revisions
3 like the north/south, east/west kind of redrawing of
4 districts, that we're kind of beyond that based on all of
5 the input that we have received through these 30 plus
6 input hearings that we've had around California.

7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Well, I know there's
8 some overlapping with the Communications Advisory
9 Committee. So, to what extent does Rob send this message
10 out to the community, do we have a plan on how we're going
11 to do this?

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Let me just
13 preview that tomorrow. In the Public Information
14 Committee we will be digging deeper into the, I think,
15 media communication strategy which will have, you know,
16 talking points, press releases, engagement with the
17 Commissioners.

18 I think what we were hoping to focus on now is
19 actually the input hearings, themselves, for rounds two
20 and three. What they look like? Where they take place?
21 How many of them we want to have? What is our strategy
22 for insuring that we have a productive working environment
23 for those input hearings?

24 Commissioner Aguirre?

25 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, just one additional

1 comment that I failed to mention and that is that not only
2 should we release the first set of draft maps, but we
3 should also, simultaneously, release the pre-existing maps
4 that show all of the districts as they have existed
5 before.

6 Because certainly I am convinced, and I think as
7 a Commissioner we're sure that it will certainly be an
8 improvement of what existed before.

9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: That's a good point.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.
11 Commissioner Barabba?

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: If I could add to
13 Commissioner Aguirre's point is that what I found in
14 talking to people, they don't know where their district
15 is. And so if we could provide them with that, I think
16 that will be helpful them.

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Yeah, that's an
18 excellent point.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I actually just want to
21 focus this discussion on the structure of the outreach, I
22 think, because we will be going into a detailed discussion
23 about this in the Public Information hearing, tomorrow.
24 But these are all great points.

25 So, my thought and I know we started this

1 discussion at the last meeting about the TBD meetings.
2 And in looking at our insane schedule, I just don't see
3 how we can do that number of meetings and have Q2 at those
4 meetings, taking input, and actually expect them to have
5 any time to incorporate that input, you know, into actual
6 maps.

7 So, I think there's -- we need to do a reality
8 check here of what kind of, you know, input is actually
9 feasible for us to have the time to process and to give Q2
10 enough time to incorporate.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioners
12 Blanco and then DiGuilio.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Yeah, and sort of along
14 those lines I'd like us to back up and talk about what it
15 is we want to get from the next round. Not what are we
16 going to do and what are we -- I mean, the messaging, I
17 think.

18 But where, and what and how depends on what is
19 it that we want to get out of -- what do we want from the
20 public. And that should drive our decisions. And I don't
21 have the answer to it, but I think that's got to be what
22 we base the location, the format, everything is what do we
23 want from this next round?

24 I think we know what we don't want, but I'm not
25 sure -- at least I'm not clear what we are going to --

1 what we want to take away from this next round and what
2 are we going to do with it. And so maybe that might help
3 shape, a little bit, this conversation.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'd like to pass
5 it back to Commissioner DiGuilio but -- well, I think that
6 given the level of conversations you've had with our
7 consultants at Q2, you may be able to kind of frame what
8 will be useful at that point in time, what -- not just
9 from the terms of us hearing from the public, but what
10 information -- what influence can that information
11 actually have on our maps at stage two and at stage three
12 of the process.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Again, from what I
14 understand in my conversations with Ms. MacDonald is we
15 really need to find a method in our input hearings to
16 encourage the public to comment on the maps that we have
17 done so far.

18 Having said that, there's obviously room for us,
19 and we've made that clear for all of us Commissioners,
20 even if we agree to approve these draft maps, there is
21 plenty of room for any and all of us to change our minds.
22 With the exceptions, probably, of some of those VRA issue
23 districts, there's just not going to be that many choices,
24 probably.

25 So, having said that I think we, as a

1 Commission, are open to change of minor or large details,
2 but we have to remember and the public has to recognize
3 that there are only choices in some areas, particularly
4 those that are constrained by VRA issues and, of course,
5 always taking into consideration population issues.

6 So, having said that, the second -- the ability
7 to have a first round map released gives us a chance to do
8 some larger scale revisions, if we need to.

9 When you get to the second round, comments on
10 that second round, your ability to make changes are going
11 to be much smaller. So, for our final draft map and our
12 third round input hearings, the ability to make
13 significant changes will be greatly reduced, but you do
14 gain the ability to really hear testimony that's related
15 to that neighborhood, and that small detail level to make
16 sure that the boundaries, particularly when you're dealing
17 with such a low deviation, and on Congressional no-
18 deviation numbers, to really have the integrity of
19 neighborhoods and communities of interest be kept whole.

20 So, that's what the comments would be for the
21 third round, and after the second draft map. And for our
22 second round input hearings, after this first draft will
23 be comment -- A, is comments on the maps, themselves and,
24 B, working within the constraints that we have. And if
25 there are any significant changes, they can make those

1 proposals.

2 Does that help a little bit?

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It does help. But
4 let me throw a couple of thoughts out, just for sake of
5 conversation.

6 So, then I feel like given the fact that we
7 actually have already identified our locations for this
8 second round of input hearings, we do have a rough sense
9 of what we want the public to weigh in on.

10 We want them to respond to our draft maps, we
11 want them to give us feedback on where we've made
12 signification decisions. You know, did we put X county in
13 the right district and why or why not, that level -- that
14 larger level of feedback is helpful at that point in the
15 process.

16 By the time we get to the next round we're
17 really talking about refinements, fine tuning.

18 To me, as I'm hearing you talk about it, it
19 would largely center on edges and borders, where different
20 districts meet each other and being able to, you know,
21 move streets, or move neighborhood level, that fine grade
22 of detail.

23 In which case we, I think, have seen, through
24 our map-drawing processes, now, some general regions or
25 sub-regions where we are already encountering some

1 challenges.

2 I don't think we're to the point where we could
3 definitely say where we want to have those input hearings.
4 However, if we were to adopt a regional approach and agree
5 that we were not necessarily going to use every single one
6 of those TBD dates, but that we knew that we could
7 anticipate X, Y, Z regions that we would need to have
8 hearings, we could begin to flesh out more where the
9 regions would be, at least, and then potentially revisit
10 once we actually started to get the public feedback on our
11 map. So, just to throw something out for discussion.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And can I --

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
14 DiGuilio?

15 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Commissioner Galambos
16 Malloy, having that said I think second round we have
17 those locations, we have an idea of what we can
18 communicate to the public. It's the third round of what
19 we see the purpose and where we can go to achieve that.

20 I might just want to throw out something for the
21 discussion, that's been thrown around, is that because we
22 probably have better use of time with Q2, if they were
23 actually doing the maps, we could look at the round three
24 as -- we started this whole process as the idea of maybe
25 we could send out smaller groups of Commissioners out to

1 locations and cover more locations. And having said that,
2 we could still hold hearings that allow us to do some more
3 presenting of our maps and to get maybe some small
4 details, knowing that and encouraging electronic
5 submission because those might be able to be incorporated
6 by our line-drawers in some ways easier than having to
7 review a lot of public testimony.

8 So, these would be smaller venues, shorter time
9 frames to kind of be informative to regions rather than
10 actual solicitation of input.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That's just for
12 the second round?

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, for the
14 third round, the very third round, yes. And that could be
15 in the auspices of smaller parties of the Commissioners
16 because, again, it's not for the integrity for the full
17 Commissioner to be there to hear the input because we
18 won't be able to incorporate a lot of input on the large
19 scale, but it would be the nuances that we're trying to
20 present to people.

21 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Commissioner DiGuilio,
22 excuse me, maybe I misunderstood you. But are you saying
23 then that this next round, after we release the initial
24 maps, that we're asking the public to suggest a completely
25 different alternatives in some of the regional maps?

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: No, I don't think -- of
2 course, they could, but it would have to be based on
3 something.

4 I think, really, what we're asking them to do is
5 to comment on the maps. And if they have -- as
6 Commissioner Aguirre said, if they have suggestions for
7 changes, it has to be evidenced-based, so maybe they --
8 you know, they've have to have an understanding of Section
9 5 and Section , restraints that we're working under. And
10 so, maybe, they may have some suggestions to move a couple
11 cities around, but I would imagine the limitations for
12 huge changes will be -- will be limited. I'm just making
13 that assumption.

14 So, I think we're asking them to comment on the
15 map and to make suggestions based on the constraints that
16 we all are dealing with as a -- under Proposition 11.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think my concern has been
19 addressed. As long as we're not continue moving counties
20 and cities, and so on, because if we do that then we're
21 going to create another set of issues that people would --
22 can only comment after the release of the second map. And
23 at that point in time we already told them that we can't
24 do anything about it. So, the unintended consequences of
25 making any major changes during -- after the first draft,

1 I think we need to set some really realistic expectation.

2 But after I heard the last comment, I'm
3 satisfied with it.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, one thing that I'm going
6 to propose and this is previewing some of the comments I
7 was going to make tomorrow but, I mean, I've been telling
8 people these are rough drafts, but we're probably 80
9 percent there, at least.

10 So, with an 80-percent map you're not going to
11 make dramatic changes to it, but that in the way of
12 expectation setting, that might be the way that we can get
13 that across.

14 So, for the round between the second and the
15 third, I mean I think that at a minimum I would think we'd
16 want to do one in Southern California, probably L.A. One
17 in Northern California, we can debate kind of where we
18 think we're going to have the most problem areas in the
19 northern part.

20 Possibly one in the Central Valley, although
21 that's so determined by Section 5 I don't know if the
22 incremental information we would get would be that
23 valuable.

24 So, just trying to throw out an idea and then
25 see if that's -- if we were to do this as a full

1 Commission I do think Commissioner DiGuilio has a point,
2 if we were to do this in smaller groups.

3 I don't know how -- logistically, how that's
4 going to work because that would result in many more
5 venues and we'd have to think about the impact of that for
6 planning purposes.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think along
8 those lines, there's a way in which we might think it's
9 easier on us as Commissioners to travel as small groups,
10 but the effect that would have on our staff's capability
11 to staff us, depending on the timing of how all these
12 various engagements were going, I think might get rather
13 complex.

14 Commissioner Barabba, did I see your hand?

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Just the thing I've been
16 impressed by is how often you heard from the people there
17 that they appreciated that we were all there. And I'm not
18 sure what the reaction would be if only two or three
19 showed up, and it might look a little different to them.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
21 DiGuilio?

22 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I'd say, I just
23 would like to go back to looking at -- I think the issue
24 is probably the third round of input hearings that we're
25 looking at, really, that's the question mark.

1 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I think we, as a
3 Commission, do have to think about what -- what we'll be
4 doing in those meetings. Because at that point we are
5 looking for those very nuance level details and if we
6 go -- there's going to be probably hundreds of those
7 elements of nuances in L.A., or maybe even more than that.

8 So, I'm just curious if we go to one location in
9 L.A. will we be covering that?

10 And I understand the regional approach and I'm
11 just -- I think we need to think about how we would
12 actually hold that meeting to try and solicit such fine
13 level details in such a -- such as these large regional
14 areas. Whether that is our first intention or if our
15 first intention is really to go there to present the maps,
16 and to encourage people to comment on them, but I don't
17 know if we'll be able to solicit the type of input on a
18 technical level that we'll need for the nuances for the
19 last map.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
21 Blanco, and then Yao, and then I'd like to interject.

22 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: One thing we could do for
23 the third round, or second -- yeah, second round.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: The last round.

25 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: Whatever, the last round.

1 Is -- and we might have time to do this, is think about a
2 combined approach where we really bear down and ask people
3 for a lot of stuff in writing. You know, so it's both
4 hearings, but also a real targeted request for -- I think
5 that's part of it, it's got to be targeted, and it's got
6 to be not just hearings, but written materials. You know,
7 whether it's mini-maps or, you know, explanations.

8 But I would -- I think we might -- when we get
9 to that point we might not just rely on who shows up, but
10 we might want to go really, you know, deeper.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Yao?

12 COMMISSIONER YAO: Two thoughts. The first one
13 is the cities that we picked, we picked those very, very
14 early on, not knowing what our maps actually -- or what
15 the districts actually are.

16 And I would say that those meeting places we do
17 have, let's say, scheduled beyond the 14 days, we think
18 through as to where we anticipate the most serious
19 problems and hold those meetings at those locations, as
20 compared to staying with the schedule that we already have
21 published.

22 And the second point I want to make is if we
23 really are interested in just refining our maps, we really
24 need to narrow the discussion, saying if you're not going
25 to comment about where the line is, okay, give us your

1 input in writing.

2 And because these meetings are strictly to help
3 us move the lines, not to draw the lines, okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, if I may, I
5 have a couple of thoughts about where we've landed in this
6 conversation. I think it's useful to just get an initial,
7 I don't know, gut check, if you will, of what we as
8 Commissioners have visualized for these various rounds of
9 input.

10 I do think it would be useful at this point in
11 time if we could task some sub-grouping of our Technical
12 and/or Outreach Committee to actually -- much in the way
13 as we approached the first round of input hearings, to
14 actually come back to us next week with a proposed draft
15 agenda and outreach strategy for rounds two and three.

16 And the reason that I'm suggesting that we look
17 at both of these together is they really do fit together
18 as two pieces of -- the other two pieces of our whole.
19 So, I think it would be difficult to bite them off
20 sequentially and only look at round two without having a
21 solid sense of what round three would look like.

22 So, I'm wanting a suggestion on who the
23 Commissioners, who could come back with this next week.

24 I think the other reason, you know, just in
25 terms of time that we'd like to do it next week is that it

1 could be very helpful for our communication strategy, as
2 we talk about the draft maps, to really have a solid way
3 of talking about how the public can most effectively weigh
4 in, and being able to foreshadow the input hearings that
5 are left to come.

6 I think one of the issues that I think we need
7 to put to bed sooner, rather than later is, you know, much
8 as we had a deadline for this first round of draft maps,
9 for public testimony to be considered in that round, we
10 need to work with Q2 to determine what is our cutoff date
11 for the next round.

12 And then, by the time we get to that last round,
13 because what I have heard some members of the public say,
14 wait, more feedback is coming, wait, more feedback is
15 coming.

16 And I think we really do need to impress upon
17 them a sense of urgency that this process is moving, we do
18 have a deadline to meet, and have some clarity around at
19 which point their ability to influence is going to
20 diminish significantly.

21 So, just to throw that out, an idea that we
22 task, potentially, two members of Outreach and two members
23 of Technical to come back to us.

24 Yes, I would -- I'm going to task one person.
25 But the other point I would make, it might not be next

1 week, it might be after we get some feedback on the maps
2 that it might be easier to determine where and how many
3 places we anticipate we need to go.

4 But we have to provide staff -- we have to get a
5 sense from staff how much time they need to identify and
6 get us a place to meet.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So, that would be it.
9 And after that, I would recommend Commissioner Dai on this
10 activity.

11 (Laughter)

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Well, what I --
13 let me clarify what my task was. I would actually
14 think --

15 (Laughter)

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That for next week
17 what would be useful is the draft agendas. The draft
18 agendas for what does the format of those sessions look
19 like.

20 And then, as we get more feedback from the
21 public, then we're able to nail down where we have the
22 meetings, and how many of the meetings we have, but that
23 way we at least get the process rolling.

24 With that, maybe I can turn to staff and ask for
25 some feedback, you know, what is our absolute date by

1 which we would have needed to make a decision on where
2 we'd like to hold these third round hearings?

3 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Well, there's
4 actually two issues, there's the posting issue as far as
5 Bagley-Keene and there's being able to post a venue when
6 we have to post for Bagley-Keene.

7 It's going to depend on how quickly we can get
8 venues secured. I mean, we're still working on securing
9 two venues for the second round, that we've been working
10 on since March.

11 It's just something to consider, the more lead
12 time we have in trying to confirm a place to have a
13 meeting, the better.

14 Would it be possible to have a definitive
15 decision around June 23rd, toward the end of the --

16 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SARGIS: Or sooner?

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would suggest
19 that this needs to be -- that this actually needs to
20 become a standing agenda item, that we would expect by our
21 next business meeting next week that we would have some
22 draft agendas to look at for the second and third round
23 meetings.

24 That by the time we have our business meeting on
25 the 16th that we're putting forward where we think we

1 actually know, if there's a couple locations that rise to
2 the top as absolute, we can go ahead and put those in
3 motion.

4 And the 23rd is the absolute last moment to add a
5 date into that block, but we will do our best efforts to
6 move forward on the 16th, based on the information we have.

7 Okay. So, with that, I heard a volunteer in the
8 form --

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I heard someone
11 volunteered in the form of Commissioner Dai?

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I will be happy to help
13 with this. I think you requested to members of Technical
14 and two members of Outreach, so I am on neither committee.

15 (Laughter)

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: However, I'm happy to offer
17 my opinion to whoever gets tasked with this.

18 Okay, so Commissioner Parvenu?

19 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes, I'll volunteer.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Oh, Commissioner
21 Parvenu is volunteering. Okay, excellent.

22 So, we have Commissioners Parvenu -- do we have
23 another member of Technical?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I can do Technical,
25 only because I've had some of the conversations already.

1 But unless someone else from Technical would like to, I
2 don't want to monopolize so --

3 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think that since
4 we had already volunteered Commissioner Barabba for the
5 RFP, this might make more sense.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Okay. Could I suggest
7 maybe for Outreach Jeanne, because she also overlaps with
8 PI, just to --

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And only -- I also was
11 going to look at Commissioner Aguirre, but I know he's got
12 some chair duties coming up and I don't know if that's --

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: It's your call.
14 I'll let you, and Commissioner Ontai, and Commissioner
15 Aguirre figure it out.

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Commissioner Aguirre's
17 both Technical and Outreach, so that's even plus.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Oh, but is that three,
19 then?

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think then we
21 would be treading on thin ice with having the three
22 representatives of Technical. So, will you be willing to
23 be volunteered, Commissioner Aguirre?

24 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Excellent. So,

1 our four leads to come back to us next week, at our
2 business meeting, with some draft agendas, would be
3 Parvenu, DiGuilio, Raya, and Aguirre.

4 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I'm sorry, did you say
5 that Commissioner Aguirre, Parvenu, and myself are all
6 three Technical?

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I had thought that
8 Commissioner Aguirre was Outreach.

9 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, he's both.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: He is both.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: He is both. Okay,
13 so then we would have an issue with -- pardon?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: You're on Outreach
15 as well.

16 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: I can work on it. I'm not
17 on either of those committees, though.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, let me have
19 Commissioner -- if I just make a judgment call on this so
20 we avoid having three from the same committee,
21 Commissioner Raya, Commissioner Aguirre, and Commissioner
22 Blanco.

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Go for it.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Are we okay with
25 that?

1 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, they'll come
3 back next week.

4 Commissioner Yao?

5 COMMISSIONER YAO: Can I have the Chair consider
6 adding one more bit of work to their work scope? I
7 question as to whether Q2 needs to be present in these
8 future meetings, because I think they would serve us
9 better by working on the map, and for us to bring back
10 these more changes to them, as compared to having them
11 spend time with us during these off-site meetings.

12 So, again, I'm not making a recommendation or a
13 suggestion, but have them think -- talk through it, think
14 through it, and make a recommendation.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Dai?

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: One other thought is that by
17 the time we're done with the second round, I would like Q2
18 to take a more proactive role in actually posing a set of
19 questions. So, you know, did we draw the line correctly
20 when we split Turlock, or whatever. I mean, really asking
21 specific questions, you know, if we're uncertain about a
22 neighborhood line, so that we can solicit the kind of
23 specific feedback that we're looking for.

24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: They haven't been shy
25 to do that in the past.

1 COMMISSIONER DAI: Well, we have not posed any
2 specific questions to the public.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Can I suggest one
4 thing?

5 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Uh-hum.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, we have a lot of
7 Democrats on the --Well, we have a lot of Democrats on
8 the --

9 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: You read my mind.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm just thinking of a
11 solution. If Commissioner Blanco would recuse herself, we
12 could do Commissioner Raya, Commissioner Aguirre, we could
13 do Commissioner Ontai --

14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: I'll be chairing it.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: You're the chair.

16 Okay, the other thing is --

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Commissioner Yao.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'll do it.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, excellent.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And can I just throw
22 out one more, that you can add another, as well, from the
23 Technical, because we don't have a Technical. And I think
24 if it's Commissioner Parvenu you can still do that because
25 there's just two -- wait, wait, are you on Outreach?

1 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I'm on the Outreach and
2 Technical -- and Technical.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Then, I'm sorry,
4 Commissioner Parvenu -- so I could do other on Technical.

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, so who's the final
6 group.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: All right. So,
8 let me make sure that I'm catching it right, that our
9 suggestion for our group to move forward on these agendas
10 would be Commissioners DiGuilio, in her capacity on
11 Technical, and as a decline-to-state. Commissioner Yao,
12 as Finance Administration, as a Republican. Commissioner
13 Aguirre on the Outreach Committee, and Commissioner Raya
14 representing Public Information. Who is also on outreach,
15 but we are still below our -- at our two-person threshold
16 per committee.

17 Okay, so I think we have our team identified.

18 Mr. Miller, please?

19 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: I don't want to
20 stop a clean getaway here.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Someone take that
22 microphone away from him.

23 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: There have been
24 some very good suggestions. I'm speaking on behalf of Rob
25 Wilcox, he just doesn't know this.

1 Very good suggestions in terms of informing the
2 public about what you need to make their input most
3 valuable.

4 But thinking of the long-term strategy here,
5 where we've been very open and collected a lot of
6 information, I think it's best, if you can, to make that
7 message in the positive vein, in terms of what is most
8 helpful to the Committee.

9 And stop with that, rather than adding the
10 rejoinder, and we won't take certain other types of
11 information. These are public meetings; I think people
12 have the right to say whatever they want.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: That's right.

14 CHIEF LEGAL COUNSEL MILLER: And you'll probably
15 get the vast majority of testimony along the lines you're
16 seeking, without giving somebody the argument that you
17 excluded some point of view.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think that's a
19 point well taken, and much in the spirit of all of the
20 hearings that we have had to date, we can give as much
21 guidance as we can, with all the best intentions, and the
22 truth is it's an individual's two or three minutes of fame
23 to tell us exactly what they feel like we need to hear at
24 that moment. And so, of course, we are -- a part of our
25 function is to listen and receive that information.

1 So, I'm going to take a look back, I feel like
2 we have actually moved very effectively through the
3 Technical and Outreach discussion topics.

4 The one item which I actually think we could
5 cover fairly quickly might be a preview of the security
6 protocol. You know, much in the spirit of creating
7 very -- a very welcoming and safe environment for all
8 members of the public to come and give testimony,
9 Commissioner Ward has been working closely with staff to
10 think about enhancements to our existing protocol, and
11 would like to share those with us, now, as they relate to
12 these last two rounds of input hearings. And we will
13 consider that as our final agenda item that we will take
14 on for today.

15 COMMISSIONER WARD: Thanks, Chair. Yeah, first
16 I want to thank staff. Staff's worked really hard and
17 done a really diligent job of putting together some
18 fantastic thoughts for how we can upgrade security.
19 Obviously, safety is of the utmost importance.

20 Some modifications to our overall security plan
21 for our next couple of rounds here, through August,
22 include upgrading our current security at off-site
23 meetings -- or I should say input hearings -- to CHP or
24 off-duty police officers.

25 And Technical -- or Finance Committee will have

1 the financials available on all of these upgrades. But
2 for now it's just important to note that we are going to
3 upgrade the caliber of physical security on site, as we do
4 these public input hearings.

5 I'm just reading through the list here of what's
6 relevant. Local law enforcement agencies, in the cities
7 that we're meeting, will be notified of the meeting and
8 will be put on standby, so that they'll know what's going
9 on and be able to provide a more timely response.

10 And staff, who set up the venues, will be able
11 to provide an evacuation plan for each venue, that removes
12 Commissioners from any type of hostile situation, in a
13 safe manner.

14 And at each venue, some of the things we've
15 identified is, as a Commission, we need to arrive early
16 and be prepped by on-site staff as to those evacuation
17 routes, and be alerted of any known threats or issues that
18 might be present for any given input hearing. And we felt
19 that it's important that we all enter together, as a team,
20 and sit down. And when we break, do the same thing.

21 Instead of separating from the herd, or going an
22 interacting with the public, but to stay together as a
23 team and save public interaction or individual contact
24 with the public at large until after the meeting is
25 concluded.

1 Did you have a question, Chair?

2 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: No.

3 COMMISSIONER WARD: Oh, I'm sorry.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: No, you're doing
5 great.

6 COMMISSIONER WARD: Okay. Let's see. Sir?

7 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I thought it was
8 reasonably helpful when Peter, and I noticed Cynthia were
9 out in the audience before the meeting, and letting them
10 know that Commissioners are human beings interested in
11 their -- and I just don't if that would be a violation,
12 how that would have a negative effect on security.

13 And if it does then, obviously, we shouldn't do
14 it. But it seems to me that's been a kind of a positive
15 way of setting the audience up for communicating with us.

16 COMMISSIONER WARD: I think that's an excellent
17 point, Commissioner Barabba. Another thing that we've
18 changed, that has also been helpful that way, is
19 Commissioner introductions.

20 But on both those fronts, we're anticipating
21 that there's going to be more contention at future input
22 hearings, and that until the contentiousness of any given
23 crowd is developed, that it's just probably not a smart
24 move for people to put themselves in a position to be
25 mobbed -- you know, ganged up against or, you know, again,

1 individually beat up on. So, that's kind of the intention
2 behind that.

3 After the meeting, you know, there's general
4 sense of the theme of the night. And if it seems
5 appropriate, certainly, there will be plenty of time
6 following to be able to go and interact with the public
7 and provide personal interaction.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think we have a
9 question from Commissioner Raya.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Oh, just had a comment about
11 that change in our approach. I think it's important, as
12 we're getting into the actual decision making process,
13 it's nice that we put forth a friendly face and, you know,
14 we're just your citizen next door.

15 But now it's getting to the tough part and I
16 think making it a little more formalized and business like
17 I think might help to convey the seriousness with which we
18 are approaching this part of our work.

19 COMMISSIONER WARD: That's very timely feedback
20 as, again, one of the changes we're implementing is in
21 doing away with the personal introduction, or individual
22 introductions.

23 Also, we're trying to formalize the beginning of
24 the meetings to set a tone, similar to what you've
25 suggested, Commissioner Raya.

1 Included in that will be a chair statement of
2 expectations that will be provided to attendees -- it will
3 also be provided to attendees at the door, and posted, a
4 set of rules that clearly state what will be considered
5 grounds for asking a member of the public to leave, and
6 what will prompt the use of security.

7 And, let's see, we also have come up with a
8 system that will be or, in some cases, might have already
9 been forwarded to you via e-mail. It's a system of
10 notification to notify the chair of any issues that might
11 be seen, and a suggested protocol for making staff aware
12 of these situations and handling them.

13 And I'm going to leave that for us to review
14 privately, and that's the gist.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Do we have any
16 questions? Commissioner Ontai?

17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON ONTAI: Are we going to go over
18 this tomorrow, I thought I saw it on the agenda.

19 COMMISSIONER WARD: We were going to cover the
20 financials impact. There are some added costs to what
21 security as a whole was prior to these upgrades. And so,
22 in the Finance Committee we'll simply just report the
23 financial difference.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner
25 DiGuilio?

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I just had a question,
2 kind of how we see I implemented, and you mentioned it
3 here and I'd read about it, was the idea of us all
4 entering the room together.

5 So, is the idea that we would have a designated
6 spot to meet before the meeting begins, so we would
7 congregate somewhere in the back room and then we'd all
8 come out together. Or is it -- right now we tend to kind
9 of arrived at various different times. I'm just curious
10 how you see that playing out? If what you're
11 recommendation is to -- as a safety thing, how we would
12 handle that?

13 COMMISSIONER WARD: I think the, and this open
14 to discussion, just the recommendation was that the chair
15 at the time set an expectation the Commissioner be
16 present, you know, probably 15 minutes, at a minimum,
17 prior to the start of the input hearing. And, yeah,
18 you're right, the idea would be to meet in a location that
19 probably will be the evacuation route for a briefing from
20 staff, an update, again on security concerns. Anything
21 that might be helpful to know about that area before we
22 start the input hearing. And, again, an explanation of
23 the quickest route out and what might be done in the case
24 of any contingency.

25 So, all that needs to be done as a group and

1 that requires us to, you know, be there early. And we'll
2 defer to the chairs to set up for any given location, what
3 would be the appropriate time for that.

4 And the idea of entering as a group is, again,
5 trying to take control of the tone and the format of these
6 input hearings, and present more of a structured approach,
7 as opposed to a free-flowing exchange.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, with that,
9 we're looking at about nine o'clock. So, if I don't see
10 any significant questions or comments, we can plan on
11 revising the budgetary implications of this enhanced
12 security procedure tomorrow.

13 Looking at our agenda tomorrow, we are scheduled
14 to start up back here in this room, about 12 hours from
15 now.

16 So, thank you all for an excellent day's work.
17 We have with us our Communications Director, Mr. Wilcox,
18 who will be providing us with a summary of what we've
19 accomplished here together, today.

20 COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER WILCOX: Thank you. The
21 Commissioner consulted with their Voting Rights Act
22 Counsel on Section 2 and 5 issues.

23 The Commission directed technical line-drawings
24 for Congressional, Assembly and State Senate districts.

25 The Commission approved hiring a note-taker to

